CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE

PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

October 15, 2019

7:00 p.m.

Present at the 7:00 p.m. meeting:

Chairman:	Will Hurd
Commissioners Present:	Pete Drake Karl Kadar Alan Silverman Bob Stozek Tom Wampler
Commissioners Absent:	Stacy McNatt
Staff Present:	Mary Ellen Gray, Planning and Development Director Tom Coleman, City Manager David Del Grande, Finance Director

Mr. Will Hurd called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

1. **REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF THE 2020-2024 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM.**

Mr. Hurd: I would like to call to order the City of Newark Planning Commission meeting for Tuesday, October 15, 2019. I'd like to begin by welcoming our new Commissioner, fresh, appointed just yesterday, Mr. Pete Drake. Welcome. Welcome to our merry band.

The purpose of tonight's meeting is to approve the Capital Improvements Programs for 2020-2024. This is the only item on the agenda that we are considering tonight. One of the duties of the Planning Commission is to advise the City Council on expenditures for capital improvements where such improvements refer to a matter covered by the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan's vision for Newark is that we are a healthy and active community, a sustainable community, and an inclusive community. Related to that vision, the Comprehensive Plan defines several strategic issues facing the City that are generally addressed by the Capital Improvements Program. These issues are management of the electric infrastructure, management of stormwater infrastructure, source water protection, balancing the needs of automobile transit, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, traffic congestion, safety, and mobility, adequate parking for automobiles and bicycles to support local businesses, protection of the natural environment, clean and sustainable energy, parks and recreation programs catering to diverse ages, interests, and abilities, recreational tourism, connectivity, safety, and accessibility of City parks and trails, City beautification, and preservation of the natural environment. As we work through the Capital Improvements Program, keep in mind that many of these projects are ongoing efforts to maintain the existing infrastructure within the City. Only a few of the projects are completely new projects. The Capital Improvements Program is only one portion of the annual budget. This year, as always, there are hard decisions that Council will be making about the budget. Our role is to advise them on the appropriateness of the capital expenditures related to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Ultimately, the decision about whether a capital project should be admitted or deferred is the responsibility of City Council. This is not the forum for discussions about the budget in general. With that, I'll turn this over to Tom and Dave, who will present upon us.

Mr. Tom Coleman: Thank you. Thank you for hosting us this evening. We're happy to be here tonight to share the highlights of our recommended 2020 through 2024 Capital Improvement Program. Our departments have worked to identify the needs of our community and feel that the five-year Capital Program presented this evening meets those needs. The successful passage of the capital referendum in 2018 has greatly helped us keep our most critical infrastructure projects moving and on-schedule. For those of you who have been through this process before, it's rare for our CIPs to look similar year over year, and we normally have to reshuffle projects due to a lack of funding. That's not the case now for a second year in a row. Most of what you'll see this evening is largely the same as what was presented two years ago in the 2018 CIP and again last year with a few minor changes. To the extent possible, this CIP will serve as our guide for the next five years.

I'd like to take this moment to introduce staff in attendance. Obviously, everyone knows Director Gray. We have Finance Director Del Grande, Public Works Director Filasky, Electric Director Patel, Parks and Recreation Director Spadafino, and Chief Tiernan, for anyone new in the audience.

So, this slide detail represents the charge of the Planning Commission that our Chair went over in more detail, so I'm not going to spend much time on this. But essentially, the Planning Commission has a responsibility to review the recommended CIP and advise Council on the expenditures of capital projects that refer to a matter covered by the Comp Plan or the official map of the City.

So, in developing the Capital Program, our departments begin by reviewing projects that were previously approved or underway from earlier programs. We confirm completion levels and discuss modifications to projects that may have become necessary as we progressed further into them. Likewise, staff and I reviewed the outyear projects, identifying new needs and confirming the continued need and Council and community support for the various projects. 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 2020-2024 CIP aligns with the vision elements noted here on these slides. The City's belief 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 we put in place two years ago in the 2018-2022 CIP and keeps us primarily focused on our infrastructure, maintaining our utilities, and ensuring all who reside or work in Newark are receiving the electric, water, stormwater, and sewer service they require on a daily basis. Lastly, we must safeguard the financial strength of the City via prudent investments and decision making. The authorization of debt with the 2018 referendum helps with our overall financial plan to use our capital reserves conservatively, recover the costs 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.

A successful referendum was 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 our projects were competing for the same dollar, which resulted in the delay of many, including large projects, pushing them out into future years. Lack of resources resulted in five-year capital plans that changed frequently beyond the first year, as it was uncertain how 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, operation 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 2018 and carry it into 2020. In addition, with the State Revolving Loan Program as part of our capital portfolio, we now have access to secure new state grants and principal forgiveness, which we were previously ineligible for. A great example of this is the more than $600,000 in principal forgiveness received from the state for our Water Tank Rehabilitation project that Council will be considering at the next Council meeting, I believe, or is it the 21st? In the next two weeks Council will have a resolution basically accepting that debt along with $600,000 in principal forgiveness, so that's a huge grant.

So, moving into accomplishments from 2019. So, the Electric Department was very busy this year. They extended our 12kV transmission line along Christina Parkway to help improve capacity for the STAR Campus, where we'll be seeing most of our growth in the near term and reduce line losses, which saves everybody money. They also installed automated switching on the 12kV system to help improve reliability and reduce the duration of outages. We also applied for the American Public Power Association's Reliable Public Power Provider Program, which provides several benefits. Firstly, it recognizes the City's excellent reliability and can be helped to recruit businesses to Newark who are looking for reliable power. It also provides us with an objective review of our operations to help identify areas we can work to improve in the future. Even just going through the exercise of filling out the application was educational on our part. We also have an electric rate study currently underway that will be wrapped up in early 2020 where we'll start the rate design process.

Parks and Recreation was also very busy, as you can see here, completing a number of projects both large and small. The most notable project, without question, was the demolition of the Rodney dorm complex, which is currently underway. Next to Rodney, a close second, was the Fairfield Crest connector trail, which we opened recently and has been very popular. I was on it on Saturday and I passed eight people in the length of the three-tenths of a mile, so it's definitely well-used already. One thing you may not know is that this project was designed by our own engineering staff in the Public Works Department. We were able to complete the entire project, including design, for a cost in line with what our engineering consultant had originally estimated for the design portion only. So, really, really good savings for the City in doing that ourselves. This is something that we plan to do wherever possible moving forward, to complete those designs in-house.

Since the majority of the Capital Program is in Public Works, they always have a really good list of accomplishments. Most of Public Works' efforts, kind of operationally, have been on asset management involving our GIS system. They've continued to develop our GIS databases for each utility by completing field surveys, implementing tablets for automated data collection and pushing those out to our maintenance crews in the field. And we do that updating both with internal staff and through an extensive intern program we have with the University of Delaware's engineering program. I think this year we had six, five . . . five interns over the summer and they are incredibly productive, especially with the cost to the City. So, we completed the 2018 street contract earlier this year and the 2019 street contract is currently underway. The largest and most critical project completed this year was definitely the Curtis Water Treatment Plan Upgrade project. So, this was a project to convert away from gaseous chlorine. We had 2,000-pound cylinders of gaseous chlorine in the water treatment plant. It's extremely dangerous so we moved away from that to liquid, essentially a strong bleach for disinfection. It's much safer and, in the process, we completed a lot of updates and renovations to the water treatment plant that had been much needed. To give you an idea of how our previous capital funding affected projects, that project's number first went into the Capital Program in the year 2000, so it took 18 years to get the money together to actually get that project started. So, getting the referendum in place and having it there to free up funding for other critical projects is very important. So, the largest project that's underway currently that isn't named Rodney is the upgrades to the South Well Field water treatment plant. The design plans are complete, and the project is out for bidding currently. This work will take the plant offline for several months over the winter when the demand is low. This project is critical because it replaces aging treatment equipment necessary to remove volatile organic compounds from our groundwater in the South Well Field area. Without that treatment system, we cannot use that treatment plant and it provides about one-third of our water. During our referendum discussions, I put a large focus on the huge unfunded liability associated with our buried infrastructure. That liability has not gone away, which is reflected in our water, sewer, and stormwater pipe maintenance rehabilitation projects. We rehabilitated nearly two miles across the three utilities this year either through replacement, lining, or a different type of lining.

So, with IT, they've completed our disaster recovery site, which will help us get back up and running following a catastrophic incident. They also completed installation of many cameras around town, both in public areas and in our utility facilities, along with a number of other smaller but no less critical projects.

As I mentioned earlier, we were very busy on the GIS front. Public Works now has access to the database via mobile tablets for our field personnel and management. This helps both for day-to-day access, but also for completing field surveys and inspections. We can now enter data directly in the database as opposed to making notes on paper and hoping they get back to the right person to be updated. The process had a tendency to break down in the past. The GIS team is also developing a number of internal dashboards that management can use to quickly review asset condition and prioritize repairs, along with tracking the status of those repairs in real time. So, now I'll hand it over to Dave, who is going to get into the numbers on this presentation.

Mr. Dave Del Grande: Thanks, Tom. So, the City's 2020-2024 CIP totals $82.6 million. In 2020, our request is $20.8 million, which reflects a $600,000 reduction from 2019. If you look at the top of the slide, only $12.1 million of the $20.8 million is new money, as $8.7 million of the 2020 budget has already been authorized in prior years by City Council. Continuing with the 5-year plan, 43% of the funding will be coming from City funds. City funds include the use of current resources via taxes and fees, and also includes utilization of our reserve accounts. The City currently has two reserves that we fund for capital spending. One is the Vehicle and Equipment Replacement reserve and the other is our reserve account.

Some of the main projects are listed here on this slide in our 2020-2024 CIP. Two projects coming down the pike in the future are the proposed New Electric Substation and Upgrades to the Reservoir, which we have listed in 2024. We have staff here this evening to answer your questions if you have any on a particular project.

In the past, the Planning Commission expressed concerns regarding the everchanging out years, as Tom had mentioned and we have since stabilized that, going into our third year with the effusion of the SRL program. In comparing the 2020 CIP to the 2019-2023 budget to what we were proposing for the 2020-2024 budget, there is a $604,000 difference. This slide shows the changes by fund. Going through them briefly here, Stormwater increased by $758,000, which is primarily a shift in funding on the Rodney project due to timing from 2019 to 2020. We're also purchasing an electric vehicle which would be a replacement of an existing gas-powered Ford Focus that has reached the end of its useful life. Our Water fund is declining by $296,000 to just over $5 million for 2020, with no significant changes in programs over last year. The General fund increased $310,000, going from $4.9 million to $5.2 million. $250,000 of this increase includes funding for engineering services for a proposed firing range for our Police Department. Electric increased $53,000 to $1.5 million. Included in this amount is $300,000 in 2020 for additional planning for the new substation that we have added in 2024. The total estimated right now is about $18 million in the CIP for that project. The Sewer fund decreased by $355,000 to $1 million even, and all those funds are going to be utilized for sewer repairs throughout the City. The Maintenance fund includes a project to replace the HVAC system here in City Hall and also at the George Wilson Center. We have included funding for electric vehicle charging stations here at City Hall, which is also in the Maintenance fund budget, and they total $1.2 million. Parking decreased by $375,000 to $343,000. 2019 includes the expansion of Lot 1, which is the reason for the reduction going into 2020. That project is currently underway and will be carrying over into 2020. In 2020, we are continuing with the parking kiosk program and we are replacing one vehicle in our Parking fleet with a fully electric vehicle, as well. So, in total, the City will be going from zero electric vehicles to three electric vehicles in our fleet in 2020. They will all be, as we're seeing right now, Nissan LEAFs. Lastly, the Transportation fund, which is solely related to the Unicity program, declined by $130,000 and as we do not have a

Unicity bus scheduled for replacement in 2020. That $130,000 reflects the full replacement cost, sorry, partial replacement cost, of the Unicity bus.

Moving down, this slide here represents the revenue streams of each of the funds in the Capital Program. The majority of the $12.6 million in funding for Stormwater, Water, and Sewer in 2020 will continue to be the State Revolving Loan Program. Ninety percent, or $11.4 million, to be precise. When you add up the equipment reserves, the capital reserves, and current resources, that totals to just under $5 million for City funds that are directly used to fund the capital budget next year. In other words, $0.24 on every capital dollar spent in 2020 will be coming from City resources.

Here is a visual of our funding sources. $3.6 million, or 17% of the funding for the CIP, is coming from the current resources. Current resources also support all the City's operating expenses and debt service. Another $654,000 comes directly from our capital reserves, or what we call a pay-as-you-go capital spending and does not rely on our debt or borrowing. The majority of the use of reserves in 2020 is to offset the rising cost of our aging equipment and our vehicles. Our use of reserves to fund the CIP dropped in 2020, I'm sorry, it dropped from 6.7% in 2019 to 3.1% in 2020. Vehicle and equipment replacement accounts for $731,000, or 3.5% as a planned funding source through depreciation funding that we commit to annually. While it doesn't cover 100% of our replacement costs, it does help us fund our large equipment purchases year over year. Another 9.7% of our financing comes from the grants that our departments work diligently to obtain each year. Funding in 2020 totals $2 million for our grants.

Our utilities drive our capital spending. Not any different from the past years, 76% of our gross capital spending for 2020 is earmarked for water, sewer, stormwater, streets, and our electric projects. These projects aren't glamorous, they're not pretty, but they are the backbone to the City and often go unnoticed until we have issues that happen to arise. The infrastructure projects in our CIP keep most unforeseen surprises from occurring and they make our utilities reliable and efficient to our customers.

Mr. Coleman: Thank you, Dave. So, I think most of you in here will be relatively familiar with the projects in the CIP, so in order to get to the Q & A portion sooner, I'll move through these relatively quickly. The projects on this slide represent those that have been identified as Priority 1 projects by their respective department directors. By definition, Priority 1 projects are currently underway or have grant funding. The individual CIP sheets will provide further detail as to the funding sources for each project. There are no new non-recurring Priority 1 projects in the budget from what appeared in last year's budget, so there shouldn't be any real surprises here. By non-recurring, I mean projects that aren't like the street program that we have every single year and water main replacement, which is every single year. Funding for all Priority 1 projects totals just under $13 million in 2020, so a large portion of the $20 million.

So, this next slide was first added to our presentation last year based on feedback we received from City Council. It summarizes all equipment sinking fund purchases across each separate fund. As you can see, we have 14 separate sinking fund accounts where we track spending. We are proposing to replace equipment valued just under $893,000 in 2020, down from $1.68 million in the 2019 budget. This is largely driven by the timing of necessary replacement. So, last year we have a few larger vehicles. In case you weren't aware, some of our vehicles can get quite expensive, upwards of $300,000 for a single piece of equipment so, depending on what happens in which year, it can make a big difference. So, this is a good time to remind the Planning Commission of how the equipment sinking fund works. Each piece of equipment in the sinking fund is tracked separately with an amount of money deposited over the expected life of the asset equal to its original purchase price. What that means is that when the equipment needs to be replaced, there is not enough funding in the sinking fund to cover the replacement due to rising equipment costs, inflation, and materials, etc. To make up the difference, we use current resources or capital reserves from the fund within which the vehicle exists. So, if it's a Water piece of equipment, we use Water reserves. If it's Electric, it should be out of the Electric fund, Parking out the Parking fund, etc. When we push a vehicle from the year it was originally set to be replaced, we save money in the near term by avoiding one year's depreciation expense, but it results in a larger differential between what was saved for replacement and the final replacement cost. In 2020, the sinking fund shortfall was $198,770, a considerable increase from, sorry, decrease, from the $643,000 that was included in 2019. This decrease is mostly driven by the smaller equipment replacement budget this year. In order to make it into the current year for replacement, each piece of equipment is evaluated by our mechanics with a report provided to the Public Works director for review with the respective department directors. Vehicles that can be retained for another year are generally only pushed one year in the CIP, which often creates a bulge in the equipment replacement in the second year of the CIP. As you can see above, that is the case again this year. 2021 has a relatively large bump and that would reflect the vehicles that are kind of being pushed forward from year to year as they are delayed, mainly because our mechanics take very good care of them. As you can see above, 2023 and 2024 are going to be difficult equipment replacement years due to large replacements of police and refuse fleet vehicles. It will be worsened or made more complicated if we're pushing a large number of replacements into those numbers in 2023 and 2024. So, it's in our interest to get that $1.93 million in 2021 down before we get to 2023.

So, Priority 2 projects are the highest priority among projects that are new this year, have not been started, or don't have grant funding. Funding for all Priority 2 projects totals $6 million in 2020. So, between Priority 1 and Priority 2, we're up to $19 million. Many of these projects would normally have fallen victim to being bumped in previous years but were able to stay in the budget due to the referendum. I'd like to draw your attention to W1402, in particular, as this is the largest project outside Rodney that's proposed for completion during 2020. This is the South Well Field Water Treatment Plant project that I discussed earlier during the goals and accomplishments section. We also included some preliminary funding for the Firearms Range and Training Facility project as a precautionary measure because we don't know for sure which direction on that until we have a better handle on the project's total cost and potential partners.

Priority 3 projects are medium-to-high priority where the department director has determined the City would be taking a calculated risk in deferral of the project. We have $322,000 work of Priority 3 projects in this year's budget.

Priority 4 projects are still considered needs, but they're projects where there's not a considerable risk from deferring the project. We have $517,000 in Priority 4 projects in this year's budget.

And lastly, Priority 5 projects are ones that can start in year 2 or later in the CIP with no additional risk to the City. We have $175,000 in Priority 5 projects in this year's budget.

So, that wraps up the formal presentation this evening and at this point we'd hand it back to the Chair for any questions.

Mr. Hurd: Thank you so much. Illuminating, as usual. I do want to say, having sat through several of these over the last several years, I'm really appreciating that the formatting is getting clearer and clearer and better to understand. Sort of what's the progress and how we've gotten here, and the notes are good. And I'm really appreciating how the GIS system is really coming into its own here. I know that's something you were pushing on and we were kind of talking about two years ago, at least, and to see here's the report, here's the map, here's the picture, here's the data is really great to be able to see the real data about the real system that really needs replacing. So, good job. I will begin on my left with Commissioner Wampler.

Mr. Tom Wampler: Thank you. I just have a couple of questions about some terminology that I'm not familiar with. Let me get you the slide number. Oh no, this is actually something different. On slide 6, right in the middle it says began update of the Master Plan for the Old Paper Mill Park. Is there a master plan for, I mean we've had that property for a long time, what is the plan for that property?

Mr. Coleman: I'll let Joe interrupt me if I get off-course. But it's my understanding the Master Plan was created at the same time that we put together the design for Curtis Park on the other side, the west side of Paper Mill Road. At the time, the Master Plan had a pretty extensive vision for what was going to happen at Old Paper Mill Park. It was a pretty intensive project. And now I'm going to hand it over to Joe because he can tell you exactly what was in it. But since then, we're kind of scaling back what's proposed, essentially.

Mr. Joe Spadafino: Yes, the Master Plan, the original one was completed, as Tom said, in 2011 along with Curtis Mill Park, the Emerson Bridge, and Old Paper Mill Road Park, and that plan included a skate park, which we did not have any skate parks at the time. Now we have two in the City. It included basketball courts, which we have a number of those around the City, and we just transformed two tennis courts into basketball courts at Kershaw, so we thought it was right to get an update and also some updated cost estimates on what it would cost to plan out the park. So, we're trying to get more up-to-date amenities in there and would also get amenities that would help where we have some voids in our parks. Like I said, we know we don't need tennis courts because we have 18 of those throughout the City, and the former plan had a tennis court, as well, so we're trying to just get some update of that plan to help with what is involved already in the area and included in a very enhanced trail system.

Mr. Coleman: And then to expand on that, one other need that we've identified since Preston's Playground was completed is some additional parking at the reservoir. The parking lot fills up and people park all over the place out along the road, so one of the items, I think the first phase of that was to build a parking lot on the Old Paper Mill Park site and we wanted to make sure that whatever we built fit into the final plan for the site, so we didn't put a parking lot where something else should have gone later.

Mr. Wampler: Do you have a guess as to when some of this might actually, once the plan is updated, when it will be implemented?

Mr. Spadafino: It would be 2021 and 2022.

Mr. Wampler: Okay. Thank you. We've had that property for a while. I remember when we got that property and the plan was really impressive and then it was, there was no money, so not much happened to it.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, we ended up pushing that one out. It basically fell victim to the Emerson Bridge [inaudible]. So, as the bridge got more expensive, Curtis Park moved out and got smaller. Sorry, Paper Mill Park.

Mr. Wampler: On page 18, Project H2002 ADA Accessibility. Is that the program for doing curb cuts for sidewalks . . .?

Mr. Coleman: That's correct.

Mr. Wampler: So that wheelchairs can get up and down?

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Mr. Wampler: And that, I thought a lot of the City had been done but it looks like that's an ongoing project for the next five years.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, originally it was 15- or 20-year, 20-year plan to replace all of them and we probably have about 8 years left roughly.

Mr. Wampler: Oh, and just one more question. On a couple of places but specifically on slide 20, Project W9302, I'm not familiar with the term SCADA. What does that mean?

Mr. Coleman: So, that is SCADA, Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition. So, it's remote control and monitoring of equipment.

Mr. Wampler: So, that's why it applies to both the Water and Electric?

Mr. Coleman: Correct.

Mr. Wampler: Okay, great. Thanks so much.

Mr. Hurd: Alright, thank you. Commissioner Kadar.

Mr. Karl Kadar: Yeah, since this is my first go-through on the capital projects review, I'm relatively new at this and I just want to say one comment. As I've gone through all of these projects, it's kind of refreshing to note that most of them are equipment replacement, repair, and maintain, as opposed to let's do something else that's wonderful and increase the infrastructure base to spend more money in the outgoing years. So, other than that, I have no specific comments about what's on here and, you know, it's nice to see it. I went through and checked all of the projects and tried to identify stuff that I thought was new and improved and there is very little of that, which is good, which is good. And I'm glad to see you're maintaining the infrastructure we already have.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, kind of our motto is fix it first. So, maintaining what we have gets first dibs unless it's a life safety issue, generally speaking.

Mr. Kadar: Thank you.

Mr. Hurd: Alright, thank you. Commissioner Silverman.

Mr. Alan Silverman: I'd like to build on the Chair's comments with respect to the content and the format of the document presented to us. More than five years ago, the Capital Program was little more than a glorified spreadsheet. If you were an accountant, if you were a budget person, it made perfectly good sense. Also, more than five years ago, the GIS system in the City was an afterthought. The effort was dispersed among the many departments. Some departments such as Electric embraced it and moved forward. Other departments still had 30-year employees who knew where all the valves were buried, so they felt they really didn't need it, and through the efforts of the various City Managers and particularly through the efforts over the last year or two, the City has moved just light years ahead with respect to being able to see what it owns, see where it is with respect to maintenance and aging, and I was very pleased to see that the GIS system has now migrated from an afterthought to a key item in the Capital Program and the Capital Budget. That says a lot to the insight and the technical expertise and the forward-looking thinking of the staff.

With respect to some specific things on that topic, and I'm just going to bounce around, you mentioned the South Well Field rehab. As I recall, the South Well Field was shut down a number of years ago. Does the City still draw water from the South Well Field?

Mr. Coleman: We do, so it first started to detect contamination of the groundwater around 2000 or 2001 and they were very low levels. And the rising levels, coincidentally, coincided with the expansion of the South Well Field water treatment plan that happened in 2002 as part of the same effort that built the reservoir. So, there was one referendum [inaudible] the reservoir and expansion of South Well Field, so it was good timing and we installed an air stripper at the same time with the plant upgrades at South Well Field. So, that air stripper is 17 years old and we're keeping it together . . .

Mr. Tim Filasky: With bubblegum.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah and it's not in good shape. It's time to go. And then on top of that, the contaminant levels are kind of rising and we had to replace a well, and when we re-drilled the well, the levels were high enough that we can't use it.

Mr. Silverman: Okay, so the program will not only replace the ongoing water quality treatment, but allow you potentially to draw even more water from that resource?

Mr. Coleman: Yes. We'll be able to bring, we have one well that's offline because of contamination and it was a relatively high production well, I think about 300 gallons a minute, which is in line, I think our highest production well is 400. Most of them are in the 100-300 range.

Mr. Silverman: So, you're adding an additional buffer to our water reserve?

Mr. Coleman: Correct, and its capacity that we used to have until probably 2010 and that's when we lost it.

Mr. Silverman: Good, so it's a valuable resource.

Mr. Coleman: Absolutely.

Mr. Silverman: Less reliance on surface water and skimming.

Mr. Coleman: It will help our drought resilience in the summer because every gallon that we're able to take from South Well Field is one that we don't have to take out of the reservoir.

Mr. Silverman: And that brings to mind something happening at the Laird Tract. Now were the Laird wells shut down and are now coming back online?

Mr. Coleman: That is correct. So, technically, we can use them and I'm probably going to hand it over to Tim because he's been more involved in this now that I've been out for a couple of years. Technically, we can use them because there's not a, it's a secondary limitation on taste and odor and iron levels that it's not necessarily a legal requirement that you can't use it but it's just not desirable. The aesthetics are not good. They'll stain your clothes, it doesn't taste good . . .

Mr. Silverman: Without getting into technical stuff . . .

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, we don't like to use them.

Mr. Silverman: Again, it's just adding to the City's reserve.

Mr. Coleman: So, Tim, do you want to go over the current status of that project?

Mr. Filasky: Yeah, so the Laird Tract Well Restoration you'll see in 2021. That's more for analysis and design. That's $100,000 that's an estimate for a consultant to do some testing on the wells, redevelopment of the wells, and then you see the bigger number there is to actually get the wells up and running. And our intent at this point is to bring the Laird Tract wells online and pump directly to the reservoir. And then the reservoir would be fed by fresh cold well water rather than surface water and that will reduce the potential for algae blooms and other undesirable things in the reservoir. It also helps us cycle the reservoir. So, we would have a pump water to the reservoir and then we would actually use the reservoir more often than we do now. Right now, we use it once every month or so. If we're not compelled to use it, we use it every month or so just to turn the water over on a regular basis. This would allow us to about a million gallons a day in and a million gallons a day out. So, over the course of a year if we were to use it at regular intervals, we would be able to use that water.

Mr. Silverman: Definitely not only a quality of life but a necessity of life issue.

Mr. Filasky: That is correct.

Mr. Coleman: That will extend the duration of time that we can run on the reservoir during a drought by probably 40%.

Mr. Filasky: Easily.

Mr. Silverman: Wow, what a multiplier.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, so it's like increasing the volume 40%.

Mr. Stozek: Hey, Alan?

Mr. Silverman: Yes?

Mr. Stozek: For South Well Field, what is the contaminant?

Mr. Coleman: Trichloroethylene. TCE, PCE, and then we have DCA in one well that we're basically giving up on.

Mr. Stozek: When I worked at the Glasgow site, we had TCE in the ground over there and that was decades ago.

Mr. Silverman: My recollection was it was a combination of going all the way back to the second World War with a prisoner of war camp there. The telephone company had a yard there where they washed . . .

Mr. Coleman: We should talk. You have more information than us.

Mr. Silverman: I'm that old . . . where they washed down construction equipment . . .

Mr. Coleman: That's I'd heard.

Mr. Silverman: And degreased. And that was part of the contamination.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah.

Mr. Silverman: Moving to another part of the document, I don't know how to address this. I notice software for computer systems is still contained within the Capital Budget which assumes a life, and I'm looking at page 25, reference E1203, and somebody has estimated a 15-year life on software. I wish I could get that out of Windows 10. How is that accounted for in the budget process.

Mr. Del Grande: Yeah, 15 years may be a little optimistic, I would say.

Mr. Silverman: Just an observation.

Mr. Del Grande: Yeah, we'll take a double look at that. Ultimately, what we do is we have our software, a lot of our legacy systems, we depreciate those expenses yearly, which funds the equipment reserve, which we then use to fund the software. So, when we do bring in new software, we do look at each piece on a case-by-case basis, so it's not necessarily 15 years. It might just have been an assumption that was put in and I missed that one. I1804?

Mr. Silverman: It's E1203.

Mr. Del Grande: Oh, that's Electric.

Mr. Silverman: And that's not a criticism. It's just an observation. I don't know how the thinking is in budgeting anymore. With respect to how the GIS system is used, referring to page 33 in your report, W1701, something very exciting, the valve inspection program. I think that's an excellent illustration of the GIS system. As I commented in my opening remarks, the City used to bring somebody out of retirement to figure out where the valve was, and this keeps a very important program like in the line of sight because it's contained with the CIP and it's always in front of the people who have to maintain the system. It doesn't just kind of slip away silently and get moved to the back of the queue.

Mr. Coleman: A good example of the expense related to valves is a repair that we did over this past weekend. We replaced a service valve going to a building and a main line valve. The cost to repair them, after you take the equipment, the crews, the road patch and everything, was $30,000 to replace two valves, and we have thousands of valves in the system. More than 3,000, I think.

Mr. Silverman: So, the valve exercise . . .

Mr. Coleman: Keeping them functional is way less expensive than fixing them.

Mr. Silverman: Would have picked that up early on and it wouldn't have been a weekend overtime.

Mr. Coleman: Exactly.

Mr. Silverman: Moving through, I like some of the creative thinking I see within the Capital Program, referring to page 63 in your report, Q1301. Even though the topic deals with storm drainage, some of the thinking that's in there is reflecting the use of undeveloped and unimproved parkland with respect to water retention. So, it's taking some of the thinking that we saw in the Hillside Road project and extending it to other parts of the City, potentially reducing downstream flooding, and I know that's been on the mind of Council people and it comes up regularly with the Planning Commission, what about stormwater management and the impact downstream. So, I think that represents a very creative way of creating retention areas within existing property and City structures. Plus, those area tend to be, they can have a visual impact, they can be edge line for wildlife and flora and fauna, so they're multi-purpose kinds of things.

Moving through, with respect to the purchase of police vehicles, the dollars cited, are those vehicles ready within that $150,000-200,000, are those vehicles ready for the police officer to slide in behind the seat, or is that simply for the vehicle, less radios, less . . .

Mr. Coleman: That is fully equipped.

Mr. Silverman: That's fully equipped. Good. That's a good thing to roll into the Capital Program. With respect to V1703 on page 133 of the report dealing with parking, Lot Countdown Signs, the Planning Commission, through the Parking Committee, put in quite a bit of effort working in a collaborative way with the stakeholders, including the University. I see there's a reference to the University not fully participating in the project. What happened with that? With the countdown signs?

Mr. Coleman: I believe there might have been an assumption that they were going to cooperate, but do you know the background on that one? It didn't get in UD's budget or something like that.

Ms. Gray: Yes, there was. There was, from what I understand, there were discussions with some folks at UD that there was going to be a cooperation to have one sign at the entrance of Main Street and then there wasn't.

Mr. Coleman: We're thinking the people we were speaking with thought it was a good idea . . .

Ms. Gray: Yeah, they thought it was a fabulous idea.

Mr. Coleman: And then maybe it didn't raise up in the queue to actually get paid for.

Mr. Silverman: So, it's something if Council chose to pursue it, it may be something that's still alive, hopefully.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, and I think that's why in 2021, the $15,000 in 2021, is the second go at that collaboration.

Mr. Silverman: That, I believe, concludes my comments. Let me just check my notes here on the back of one sheet. One sidebar comment, the relining of sewer pipe I think is a great program speaking of quality of life in the City. I've noticed those projects go on very late at night, there is minimal disruption, and it's a good Capital project to pursue.

Mr. Hurd: Thank you. Commissioner Drake.

Mr. Pete Drake: I don't have anything at this time.

Mr. Hurd: Okay. Commissioner Stozek.

Mr. Stozek: Yes, I have some questions for clarification. On page 11, I guess what concerns me, the shock effect is when I look at Year 2024 . . .

Mr. Hurd: Of the presentation.

Mr. Coleman: Sorry, what slide was that? Eleven?

Mr. Stozek: Right. When you look at 2024, there's $26 million of funding for expenditures. I'm a firm believer in resource leveling and if you look at this 5-year plan, you're basically talking about $16.5 million a year. My question is, can the City, in the leaner years, in 2022 and 2023 especially, can the City put money away towards those projects early?

Mr. Coleman: So, we actually did that this year. So, in March of this year, we put aside $2 million for this project in particular. So, the answer is yes, and that's something that we intend to continue doing. So, if in that project, right now the Electric Department is developing a capacity study and essentially what the capacity study is to determine is how much capacity do we have today and then what does our growth plan look like for STAR Campus, because really that's where all the demand growth is. Anything else is redevelopment and it doesn't have a real significant impact, but STAR Camps does. So, once we know what our currently capacity is and what does the growth plan look like, we'll be able to project out kind of when are we actually going to need to build this. So, then the next phase is to do a feasibility study to figure out where it would go, how much it would cost. So, in light of all those variables, we wanted to put this in here just so it existed so the project was in there and people would know it's a thing. I couldn't tell you with any level of confidence that it's actually going to happen in 2024 and one thing I mentioned briefly in the Electric section was the rate study that's currently being worked on. One of the items we're going to come out of that with is a capital cost recovery/impact fee. So, when development comes and it has an electrical demand, there will be some dollar amount associated with that electrical demand and we'll generate a fee that will go into an account to help pay for this project.

Mr. Stozek: And although you can't say for sure this is going to happen in 2026, I will probably guarantee that the number will go up by that time.

Mr. Coleman: There's a good chance.

Mr. Stozek: On page 18, I'm just curious, the Emerson Bicycle Pedestrian Bridge is listed at $2 million. Is that the total cost? Is that the next cost to the City?

Mr. Coleman: That is total cost. Net cost to the City is $387,000.

Mr. Stozek: I thought that went up . . .

Mr. Spadafino: Total cost is $2.057 million, and we have over $1.7 million in grants and donations for the project.

Mr. Stozek: Okay, so that's including, somewhere I read recently there was a cost increase projected.

Mr. Spadafino: Yes, that was the $2.057 million, that was with the increase included.

Mr. Stozek: Okay. Into the book now, oh wait a minute, yeah, into the book on page 1 the last line talks about finance and it says other finance sources and it varies anywhere from $100,000 to $5 million. What are some of those other sources?

Mr. Coleman: I'm sorry, where were you?

Mr. Stozek: In the book, page 1.

Mr. Coleman: Alright, go ahead now. Sorry. So, you said the other funding sources, what are the other funding sources?

Mr. Stozek: Yes, it varies from $100,000 to almost $4.5 million. What are those other funding sources?

Mr. Coleman: Give us a second. I think some of that might be the University of Delaware put money toward the Emerson Bridge. New Castle County put money toward the Emerson Bridge.

Mr. Del Grande: [inaudible]

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, in 2021, right now we have all of the cost for the Firearms Training Facility that's not, so we have about $500,000 that we can use generally towards this currently. And the other $4.5 million roughly is put in as other because we don't know how we're going to pay for that yet. So, we didn't want to put a number in there that is assuming we're going to do it or a project partner or whatever else. Somehow . . .

Mr. Stozek: It's hopeful sources?

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, hopeful sources. Aspirational, yes.

Mr. Stozek: And then in the Electric section, I noticed there are a couple of projects here that at in part have to do with UD. There's one about a line across the farm and then there's a new substation that will improve the reliability of the City in general, on page 10 in the booklet, under Electric. So, part of this new substation is to improve reliability overall, but another part goes towards the STAR Campus. I assume it's our responsibility to bring power up to the property line. What, is any of this money having to deal with pushing power into the site or does that come from the developers of the site? How is that done?

Mr. Coleman: So, that's all paid by the developers of the site. We bring it to the property line, like you suggested, and then it's on them to pay to get it into the . . .

Mr. Stozek: So, this is all just getting it to the property line.

Mr. Silverman: And that would be worth a note.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, oftentimes it depends on how it's set up but that would usually be one of those other funding source situations where a lot of the materials they can't buy as a non-utility, so they write us a check and then we write a check out, essentially.

Mr. Kadar: So, we do no work on the STAR Campus other than to bring the utilities to the property and that's it?

Mr. Coleman: I believe we'll do the installation also, but they pay us to do it.

Mr. Bhadresh Patel: So, basically at the STAR Campus, UD installed all the underground conduits and stuff for wires and that, and depending on the project, if the project is small enough that we can handle it in-house, then we will do the labor work and pull all the wires and everything.

Mr. Kadar: And we will be refunded for that?

Mr. Patel: Yes.

Mr. Kadar: Okay.

Mr. Stozek: Dealing with that same issue, with some of these improvements that are having to do with the UD campus, what if the traffic sign, the parking sign, what if they decide they're not going to pay?

Mr. Coleman: So, they're not going to pay to run the line to their building?

Mr. Silverman: It's the contractor who is paying, not UD.

Mr. Coleman: Well, it depends on who is building the building. But if they don't pay, they don't have power, so it . . .

Mr. Hurd: With the parking sign . . .

Mr. Coleman: It's not optional.

Mr. Hurd: The City feels, we felt it was important to have parking information at remote areas. Basically, we're saying if you're using a similar system to us, we can pull your data and put it on that sign as well. If they're not interested in paying for that piece, then the UD garage isn't on the sign. So, that's unfortunately because that's part of our plan was to promote the use of the UD garage as sort of a way to balance some of the load because too many people don't know that you can get in. And it's hard because you drive past it and you're like is that the exit or the entrance?

Mr. Coleman: Actually . . .

Mr. Hurd: A couple of signs that just say park here.

Mr. Coleman: I don't remember who it was but someone at a Council meeting a week or two ago recommended that they move one of the signs that has the count out to the road, or so you can see it from the road. So, we did relay that and it sounded like they were open to the idea and maybe just hadn't thought about it.

Mr. Hurd: Okay.

Mr. Stozek: I think that's all the notes I had. I'd just like to also make the comment that this document gets better and better every year.

Mr. Coleman: Thank you.

Mr. Hurd: Alright. I just have a few. Some are sort of just information, like I may not be understanding the information coming to me so it's just sort of a general question. So, a general question under the vehicle replacement program schedule sheets for each department. When I'm looking at it and I'm looking at the current mileage of this year, the recommended mileage for replacement in the year that something is going to be replaced . . .

Mr. Silverman: What page are you on?

Mr. Hurd: Well, I'll start with page 29 is the first one I've got marked here. I see things sometimes that look like they're scheduled to be replaced in like a year or two, but the mileage hasn't come up to the recommended mileage so I'm a little confused about what is the actual replacement criteria if it's not recommended mileage for replacement.

Mr. Filasky: I can look at it.

Mr. Coleman: Go for it, Tim.

Mr. Filasky: So, each year our mechanics obviously look at the general condition of all the vehicles, so you'll see a lot of them that go the other way. We literally just sold a 2000, I believe, Jeep Cherokee that had 55,000 miles on it. I'm sure we paid $12,000 for it and we got $4,000 back for it 20 years later. It's one of those cars that little things start to break and it's not the mileage because we're a nine square mile City. Even if we drive from one end to the other, it's 20 miles a day. So, it's more of, there's also a lot of, with our service and utility trucks, I think you were referring to page 29, which is an Electric truck, they sit on a job site for a long time and have to run . . .

Mr. Hurd: Okay.

Mr. Filasky: So, our mechanics translate that into hours, not necessarily mileage.

Mr. Coleman: And I think we use that more for projecting the expected life. How long is it going to last, how long do we depreciate the expense?

Mr. Hurd: I guess my recommendation is could there be something else in that column, or not see that column, so that you just said we bought it in this year, we're recommending replacement in this year, full stop. That's all you need to know about it. Because otherwise I start having questions . . .

Mr. Filasky: We like that.

Mr. Hurd: So why is this thing that's only got half of the recommended mileage, why is it scheduled to go out?

Mr. Filasky: Understood.

Mr. Coleman: That's a good recommendation. Thank you.

Mr. Hurd: The skid steer loader, excuse me . . .

Mr. Silverman: Page reference?

Mr. Hurd: Starting on page 78 here. The Skid Steer Purchase, this is part of Public Works, but this is the one that looks like it's going to be shared with Park, I think. Yes.

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Mr. Hurd: The data columns, the summary data columns don't match up, so I'm confused by how this is working. So, for the Stormwater, it's listed as a $75,000 purchase with no useful life entered. And for Parks, it's listed as $36,000 purchase with a 10-year useful life span. So, is that a portion of the purchase price? Because if it's a $75,000 purchase for 10 years and you rent one every year for about $4,000, then the numbers don't make sense.

Mr. Filasky: So, I can give you, I'm not sure about the Parks side of it, but the skid steer for the Public Works and Water Resources Department, the estimated useful life is just a typo. We didn't put one in there.

Mr. Hurd: Okay.

Mr. Filasky: But the other part of that is we spend $4,000 to rent one for maybe a month in the middle of construction season, so that's . . . we need one all year. We don't just need it for one month.

Mr. Hurd: But the impression I got from reading this is that was a piece of equipment that's going to be shared between departments.

Mr. Filasky: So, in general, we would be the owner. Say Public Works would be the owner and we would use it most of the time. If Parks needs it for, you know, a specialty project or something like that, that's when we would share that with Parks, but I believe they have a smaller one.

Mr. Spadafino: We have a mini skid steer to help put in playground equipment and trail improvements. It also has attachments for auger and trench diggers and so forth. Also, all of our equipment we share with all the other departments, should they need it.

Mr. Hurd: Okay, so it's two.

Mr. Spadafino: Yes.

Mr. Hurd: Okay, because the language said and sharing it with Public Works. So, I go to Public Works and that doesn't . . . who is buying it and how is that working out?

Mr. Coleman: Realistically, you could say they're sharing it with Electric and Facilities, too.

Mr. Silverman: It is two units?

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Mr. Hurd: Full size and a mini.

Mr. Silverman: Okay, that did not come through clearly.

Mr. Hurd: Owned by the department but shared with other departments.

Mr. Silverman: Okay.

Mr. Hurd: Okay, so the next person who looks at this might get a little confused, too, so you might want to work the language a little bit on that. Alan, did you say you had a question?

Mr. Silverman: Yes, also on the use of the skid loader, it was good that you pointed out that it was also needed to maintain the future dedicated bicycle lanes because they could not be plowed with ordinary equipment.

Mr. Coleman: That's correct.

Mr. Silverman: I think that illustrates the cost, particularly for Council, of the kind of thing they need to consider when they're looking at projects. The true costs.

Mr. Coleman: And what it will take to plow that is still somewhat unknown because the delineation method between the cycle track and the road is in flux now. So, when it was the delineators, you pretty much have to pick it up and throw it over, so you have to have a blower. But now there's talk it might be a curb, so then, you know, you can plow it over. So, having a vehicle that is flexible . . .

Mr. Silverman: But that was a good illustration of the multi-purpose use of the vehicle.

Mr. Hurd: And an illustration of how we can say we want mobile transportation and then you go, well that means I need to buy a different snow plow. Those were my three, my edits, so . . . Bob, did you have one last thing?

Mr. Stozek: Can I go back? Back on page 1, again, this other financing sources, that bothers me a little bit in that this seems to be a table, a list of where the money is coming from and yet you said those are really unknow at this point, where that money is coming from. I don't know if that needs to be a separate line with a different definition. People could get the wrong impression that that money is available. It's a bunch of little things added up to $1.5 million rather than saying we've got to find this money somewhere. It looks like the money is there rather than it's not there. I would just offer that for clarification, to give it a separate . . .

Mr. Hurd: I mean is it fair to say that it's sort of the gap between known funding sources and expenditures that has to be filled with something? Or is some of it sort of known and some . . .

Mr. Coleman: Some of it's known and some of it's not. So, really, I believe the Firearms Facility is the only one that's not known. It could be reserves or it could be the other person building it, if we have a partner that wants to build it for us. So, it's really hard to say.

Mr. Stozek: Maybe there's some other way to define that.

Mr. Hurd: You have a good point. I mean a $4 million other funding source seems to go, wow, where are we getting this from? Alan, did you have something else?

Mr. Silverman: Yeah, looking at page 79 in the ring binder, a number that jumped out at me was $300,000 next year for the Newark Transportation plan with respect to the upgrades for the Downes School Casho Mill Road area.

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Mr. Silverman: Can you describe this? Is that all City money?

Mr. Coleman: Yes, that's the City portion. So, that's not all the money going into the project, but that is our portion. So, there was a Safe Routes to School program for Downes School that was a grant application that we worked with WILMAPCO and Downes on in 2016, I think. And then we were awarded the grant and basically the grant went through and studied the roadway and did surveys and worked with kids and families and everything else to identify what were the bottlenecks and the things that made it difficult to walk or bike to school. It identified a bunch of improvements that could made and when it came to actually making the improvements, the federal funding source really limits how much you can get done with [inaudible] rates and various other things. So, the costs for them to do it were really high. So essentially, we did all this work and the outcome was a plan and then some bike lanes. But there weren't actual physical improvements.

Mr. Silverman: So, we're spending $300,000 for a nine month out of the year, four hour out of the day service.

Mr. Coleman: Well, it's a little different than that. So, the City . . .

Mr. Silverman: With school crossing guards that are already paid for.

Mr. Coleman: So, what the project is, and this was an item brought forth by Council Morehead at the time, was to see if the City would be interested in funding the delta to get the project done. And what the project now is, there are a number of crosswalks, putting refuge islands in the crosswalks and realigning the crosswalks, and then creating, I believe, two median refuge islands that don't have a crosswalk in them. The goal is traffic calming essentially because Casho Mill Road is somewhat has become a bypass around Newark for people in Cecil County and southern Chester County. They take that to go around to get to I-95. On the police side, as recently as last week, I got an angry call from residents complaining that people are doing 50 miles an hour down Casho Mill Road and this and that. So, the thought was we could put in these features, it would help students get to and from school, and it would also help reduce the speeds with the goal to drop the speed limit on Casho Mill Road from a 30 to a 25.

Mr. Silverman: Even though it was designed as an arterial road.

Mr. Coleman: Well, when it was designed, it was designed to be a four-lane road, two lanes each way.

Mr. Silverman: I remember that.

Mr. Coleman: And that was scrapped. All the feedback we get is the cars go too fast, the demand really isn't there, the lanes are enormous, so . . .

Mr. Silverman: It sounds more like a policing problem, rather than a capital problem.

Mr. Coleman: It's both.

Mr. Hurd: I will add that the physical shape of the road changes how people drive on it. So, when it's straight and wide with wide shoulders, people do 50 because it's a 50-mile-an-hour road. But, yeah, if you skinny it down, if you make it wiggle a little, and do all that, the speed will drop. An officer with a radar gun only works for so long.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, and the road has no parking on its length.

Mr. Silverman: And the school district is not sharing in any of this expense even though it's exclusively for their benefit.

Mr. Coleman: I wouldn't say it's exclusively for their benefit. When I commute in on bike, I take Casho Mill Road. Casho Mill Road is a very popular biking destination. I run at lunch and every day I run down Casho Mill Road, on the same roadway, so it's heavily used.

Mr. Silverman: Okay.

Mr. Coleman: And if you look at the, what trail is that, is that the Maxon-Dixon that goes along there? Yeah, the Mason-Dixon goes along the creek so there are a lot of people that are going along that corridor beyond just the students.

Mr. Silverman: I was just very surprised at the amount of dollars for safety islands and crossings.

Mr. Coleman: Yeah, that fits with the intent of the transportation plan, which is to promote multi-modal transportation options. So, if you make the road safer to ride a bike on, more people will probably ride a bike on it. So, you can, if you build it, they will come, essentially. And you can see it on South Main Street. How many more bikes do you see on South Main Street now that the road will accommodate them. And that's the goal.

Mr. Hurd: Alright. Does that cover everybody? We need a motion, don't we? Okay, the Chair will entertain a motion for approval of the 2020-2024 Capital Improvements Program as presented and discussed.

Mr. Wampler: So moved.

Mr. Stozek: So moved.

Mr. Silverman: Second.

Mr. Hurd: There we go. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Any opposed, say Nay. None? Motion carries.

Mr. Coleman: Thank you.

MOTION BY WAMPLER, SECONDED BY SILVERMAN THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAKE THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL:

THAT CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE 2020-2024 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM AS PRESENTED TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON OCTOBER 15, 2019.

VOTE:	6-0
AYE:	DRAKE, HURD, KADAR, SILVERMAN, STOZEK, WAMPLER
NAY:	NONE
ABSENT:	MCNATT

MOTION PASSED

Mr. Hurd: There being no further business, Chair will entertain a motion for adjournment.

Mr. Silverman: So moved.

Mr. Hurd: Second anyone?

Mr. Silverman: Is there a second?

Mr. Kadar: Second.

Mr. Hurd: Thank you. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. Alright.

MOTION BY SILVERMAN, SECONDED BY KADAR THAT OCTOBER 15, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING BE ADJOURNED.

VOTE:	6-0
AYE:	DRAKE, HURD, KADAR, SILVERMAN, STOZEK, WAMPLER
NAY:	NONE
ABSENT:	MCNATT

MOTION PASSED

There being no further business, the October 15, 2019 Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tom Wampler

Planning Commission Secretary

As transcribed by Michelle Vispi
Planning and Development Department Secretary

Attachments
Exhibit A: Finance Department report (2020-2024 Capital Improvements Program)
Exhibit B: Finance Department presentation (2020-2024 Capital Improvements Program)