



City of Harrisonburg, Virginia

Department of Planning & Community Development
409 South Main Street
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22801
www.harrisonburgva.gov/community-development

Building Inspections: (540) 432-7700
Engineering: (540) 432-7700

Planning and Zoning: (540) 432-7700
Department Fax: (540) 432-7777

December 28, 2017

TO THE MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL CITY OF HARRISONBURG, VIRGINIA

SUBJECT: Public Hearing to consider the proposed Capital Improvement Program, for fiscal years 2018-2019 through fiscal years 2022-2023.

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF HARRISONBURG PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON: December 13, 2017

Chair Way read the request and asked staff for a review.

Mr. Fletcher said the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is a multi-year presentation of planned capital projects of \$50,000 or greater with an appropriate financing plan to fund the projects. The CIP is prepared annually to facilitate planning and the setting of priorities among capital improvement needs over a subsequent five-year period. The CIP is designed to identify projects for all City departments, as well as for Harrisonburg City Public Schools, for which funding has already been committed or is being sought for within the five-year planning period.

Planning Commission's objective is to review and evaluate the CIP and, once the document is in an acceptable format, recommend the document for approval to City Council.

The CIP is not a budget and inclusion of projects does not guarantee that such projects will be funded by the City or any external sources in the year presented or at the level proposed. The actual commitment of funds by the City for any capital item comes with the approval of the annual budget for each fiscal year. However, the CIP serves as an important planning tool for formulating the capital portion of the annual budget.

As can be observed by reviewing previous CIP documents, the CIP is not a static plan. It is part of annual planning and programming, where after each passing year, another year is added to the planning period to maintain the five-year forecast. Each year costs, needs, and revenue sources are reevaluated.

There is no specific staff recommendation. Inclusion of projects in the document does not indicate staff support of or opposition to any of the items or the proposed timing of the projects.

A draft of the CIP was sent out several weeks ago for the Planning Commission to review. We asked for anyone who had any questions beforehand to submit those questions to staff and then we would try to answer those and/or to distribute them to department directors to be able to investigate and provide in-depth answers prior to this meeting. The questions received along with the answers are as follows:

ECC Related CIP Questions:

Questions Sent Via Email from Vice-Chair Fitzgerald on November 26, 2017

QUESTION: Page 15, 16 and 17: Are these projects linked, that is, does ability to upgrade servers and workstation computers and buy a new radio system depend on the buildout of a new ECC center? Can all the tech infrastructure be moved while still keeping the thing running? And on page 16, what does “human interface need from an operations standpoint” mean? Is this more than ECC at the core always requiring smart, well trained people talking to people in crisis on the phone?

RESPONSE: HRECC2 (Page 15 Update ECC Servers/Computers) is linked to HRECC3 (Page 16 Build New ECC). If a new ECC would be built then the HRECC2 project would likely go away as new computer equipment is included in HRECC3 project cost.

If a new ECC would be built, it would be equipped with new equipment and existing equipment would remain in place until such time the new ECC is operational for a period of several months. After that, the old (current) ECC equipment would be decommissioned and used for spare parts if still technologically compatible or sold.

HRECC4 (Page 17 Radio System Upgrade) is not linked to HRECC. HRECC4 is radio sites and is anticipated whether a new ECC is built or not.

“Human interface” means that the ECC Operations personnel must be in relatively close physical contact to one another to perform the ECC’s mission. The question has already arisen from the HRECC Administrative Board if the current ECC floor could somehow be renovated to “make more room” for operations. The answer is no. The only consideration evaluated would be to convert the Training/Meeting room into more operational space but the Operations Personnel placed in that space would be physically separated by three walls, the Technology room and approximately 140’ removed. That consideration is not viable as all ECC Operations personnel need to “human interface” in person to effectively communicate among 9-1-1 call taking and Emergency Services Dispatching.

Fire Department Related CIP Questions:

Questions Sent Via Email from Vice-Chair Fitzgerald on November 26, 2017

QUESTION: Page 10. A request for new Fire Station #5 in Park View has been in the CIP for a long time. The alternative stated is relocating FS #4 to better serve its current area and improve service times to Park View. Is that a real alternative, given such factors as the current state of repair of Station #4 and the size of the area the station serves? Or is the real alternative to just live with the slower Park View response times?

RESPONSE: Moving Station 5 from its current location is an alternative, however, it has some significant consequences with respect to increasing response times in other areas of its response district (including the downtown area). Looking at the call volume and risk analysis throughout Station 4’s response district, relocating the station nearer the Park View area would not be the most desirable option. I would have to agree that living with the slightly longer Park View response times is a more advantageous alternative based on call volume and a sound risk benefit analysis.

QUESTION: Page 12. If the city shared a structural burn building with another locality, how would the ability of the fire department to adequately train be affected? Is that an expensive alternative \$-wise?

RESPONSE: The current burn building is a regional training facility. We receive some state funds for maintenance and we believe we can utilize some state funding for a new/renovated burn building. However, there are significant costs borne by the City, as the regional representative, for this facility. Based on usage, it would make sense to partner with Rockingham County to share these costs.

Including any other locality is impractical as the travel distance makes it unlikely they would be interested. It would be extremely costly for us to travel to a training facility in another jurisdiction as this would create an enormous amount of overtime expenditure as personnel could not travel while working on their normal shift that far outside their response district.

General Properties Related CIP Questions:

Questions Sent Via Email from Vice-Chair Fitzgerald on November 26, 2017

QUESTION: Page 18: Does renovation timing and expenditure of the Muni building depend on what the building is going to be used for? Has that decision been made, and if it hasn't, is there a plan going forward to figure it out? Does the current age and state of the building make a difference here on the cost if we delay, that is, is the building deteriorating?

RESPONSE: The final renovation of the Municipal Building for occupancy will depend on the identified use to a certain extent. Any final use will undoubtedly be office space of some derivation, but none the less it is always wiser to building for a specific use than shell space. The final use of the Municipal Building has not been determined as of yet. City Council has not identified a specific need for which to use the building. The first phase of renovation beginning in early 2018 is being conducted to stabilize the building and minimize or eliminate its potential deterioration.

QUESTION: Page 19: Does Harrison House renovation timing and expenditures depend on how the building is going to be used?

RESPONSE: As with the Municipal Building the final renovation of the THH will also require decisions be made on how it will ultimately be used. It should also be understood that the Margaret Grattan Weaver Foundation has a say in how the space can be improved.

Questions Sent Via Email from Commissioner Finnigan on December 4, 2017

QUESTION: Page 88 Downtown Parking Deck (DP20073)

How much of that has to do with minimum parking requirements? Are there plans to start charging money to park? If not, why are we subsidizing free car parking at a time when we want to encourage biking and public transit use (my understanding is that HDPT ridership is down since the MLK/Mason lot was opened. And, how much will the new parking spaces cost the city when construction is completed?

RESPONSE: The need to replace the Water and Elizabeth Street parking decks has little to do with quantitative data on minimum parking requirements. The replacement of both decks has more to do with increasing parking spaces and the redevelopment of these spaces into more modern mixed-use properties.

The City does currently charge for parking permits, which utilize the top of both decks for longer term parking. This has generally been used by businesses for their employees. There is no effort to return to paid parking as of now, however, any redevelopment of either deck will certainly require the use of tolls to help in covering the construction costs depending on how such a project is financed.

With regard to how much new parking spaces cost the City when construction is completed is, at this time, not known.

Information Technology Department Related CIP Questions:

Questions Sent Via Email from Vice-Chair Fitzgerald on November 26, 2017

QUESTION: The set of requests on pages 1-6 all seem to reflect the data needs of a locality that's grown from a large town to a medium-sized city, with info management needs that have been postponed and are now more urgent. Obvious questions involve whether the platforms integrate with each other (new and old) and whether they will continue to be supported by the vendor.

Page 1: What is the newly required functionality that the current utility billing system lacks, i.e., required by whom?

RESPONSE: All functionality is required by Water Operations Center.

1. GIS integration. This will allow for visualization of assets and parameters, such as meters by size or consumption amount by neighborhoods, that will allow the department to better plan and respond to incidents and inquiries.
2. Personal Identification Data Obfuscation. Removes PID from user screens to help prevent identity theft issues and promote security in the workplace.
3. ACH and web payment processing.
4. Internet technology integration. The program does not natively handle E-mail addresses. E-mail correspondence and notifications.
5. Mobile device compatibility
6. Web portal for customer account information.

Most of these have been internally developed.

QUESTION: Page 2: What does the expansion of CityWorks mean? I read about the platform online, and how it is open source and highly adaptable. Is this a local integration/expansion done by city IT or is the additional functionality developed by the CityWorks platform people themselves?

RESPONSE: CityWorks is a framework that lets you build processes into it. This means we can take our Business processes for streets work orders, and build a work flow system that allows us to track all the assets, equipment, personnel, and tasks utilized in the process. This makes it easier for us to track the actual cost of doing the work performed by the city departments. Currently, we have created workflows for stormwater management, Public Utilities work crews, Public works traffic and streets work crews. Our expansion goal is to grow the program to other departments that use city equipment on city assets, and eventually put a customer Request Management system on top of these processes, so the citizens can make a request by phone, walking, mobile device or the website, and we can track the issue from its creation to completion. It is not open source software, but the cost for the framework is fixed, so it costs the same whether one person or the entire City staff use it. We currently use consultants to assist us in converting our business processes into the computerized work flows, but we are training staff to use the system and anticipate that they will do maintenance and updates to reduce costs.

QUESTION: Page 4, 5 and 6: Are these systems going to be purchased off-the-shelf and then adapted? Custom designed? Supported by the vendor? Will the systems that need to talk to each other be able to do so?

RESPONSE: Documentation Management and Electronic time and attendance will be purchased off-the-shelf packages customized and supported by the vendor. These systems would need be able to communicate with the financial, human resource, tax, utility billing, and other enterprise software packages the city currently owns.

Our current thought on the Citizen Inquiry is to have a consultant built module for the CityWorks framework. That would serve as a citizen and staff front end for the work order and asset

management programs. This would have the ability to give city and departmental management a single pane of glass for management of requests.

Police Department Related CIP Questions:

Questions Sent Via Email from Commissioner Finks on Monday, December 4, 2017

QUESTION: Page 7: In the request it states that there is no workable alternative to building a new facility. Is there no potential to form a public private partnership with an existing private firearms range? Could the city join with the Sherriff's department in finding a shared range?

RESPONSE: There appear to be no private ranges that could accommodate the needs of the Police Department. Regarding whether the Sherriff's office could contribute funding, currently, the Sherriff's office utilizes the existing facility at no charge and it has been a sensitive subject regarding whether additional funds could be contributed by the Sherriff's department.

Public Works Department Related CIP Questions:

Questions Sent Via Email from Commissioner Finks on Monday, December 4, 2017

QUESTION: Page 58 (Project PWSTP-19 Port Republic Road)

A project like this appears to improve streets and sidewalks predominantly used by JMU students. What (if any) would JMU's buy in be on a project like this?

RESPONSE: Port Republic Road is classified as a Minor Arterial within the City and is a primary route in the County. This classification means "a thoroughfare for high capacity urban transportation" and provides connections between collector roads and interstates. Meaning that Port Republic Road serves the City and surrounding area, and is not predominantly a JMU roadway. However, JMU has in the past been a partner with the City on planned capital projects, and Public Works will continue to work with JMU as this and other projects around JMU start to be developed.

QUESTION: Page 60 (Project PWSTP21 East Market Street – Safety Improvement Program) The alternative mentions building new streets around the area. Can this be expanded on?

RESPONSE: This alternative to improvements on East Market Street is intended to build new streets that would improve connections to existing roadways that directly or indirectly provide access to East Market Street, with the hopes that these new connections would decrease the experienced congestion on East Market Street, while not negatively impacting the connecting streets. These connections have not yet been identified, but would be only an alternative to this capital improvement project.

Questions Sent Via Email from Commissioner Finnigan on Monday, December 4, 2017

QUESTION: Page 70 Reservoir Street (PWSTP40)

This is listed as priority 2, but not slated for work until 2021. I believe this is more urgent, given the high foot traffic between Holly Court and Walmart, and the risk of a child or elderly resident getting hit by oncoming traffic. Is there any way to make this a more urgent priority? I'm concerned that someone will be killed or seriously injured near that overpass.

RESPONSE: The City's CIP has a priority ranking system of 1 through 5 with the following explanations:

- 1 = Absolutely required (i.e. required by law)
- 2 = Highly desirable, affects efficiency and effectiveness.
- 3 = Desirable.

- 4 = Marginally beneficial.
- 5 = Not justified.

A priority 2 is essentially the highest ranking a project can receive if it is not required by law.

Stormwater Management (Public Works Department) Related CIP Questions:

Questions Sent Via Email from Vice-Chair Fitzgerald on November 26, 2017

QUESTION: Page 127: Impossible to comment on a big bucket of over “200 potential project locations on public and private property”. This site <https://www.harrisonburgva.gov/stormwater-improvement-plan> has some information, but there is no detail in the city’s CIP about how \$64,000,000 worth of projects will be spent. I know the final plan gets submitted to council on Dec. 5. We have a stormwater fund project tab in the CIP, and if the CIP is supposed to include projects >=\$50,000 by priority- are these individual SWM’s going to also be included in the CIP for review? Or does the nature of these projects (and the legislation that created the mandate to do them) allow or require a different process?

RESPONSE: The intent of PW is to eventually have separate Stormwater projects identified in the CIP, however, this year with the Stormwater Improvement Plan (SWIP) not yet complete we took a wholistic approach towards the capital projects needed to meet the TMDL requirements. We envision that next year’s CIP will include separate Stormwater projects and this larger CIP project would be reduced by some amount due to those individual projects being included. The SWIP document does provide us with a prioritized ranking of the identified projects and we will use that as we start to develop projects in the coming years.

Water (Public Utilities Department) Related CIP Questions:

Question Sent Via Email from Commissioner Finks on Monday, December 4, 2017

QUESTION: Page 106 (Eastern Source Development – proj203) Would this completed project change any of the information we received earlier this year about the possible impact on Harrisonburg’s water from the AC pipeline?

RESPONSE: No.

Mr. Fletcher continued and asked if there were any further questions.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said in looking at page three of the responses document, it was a question that I asked about Harrisonburg Department of Public Transportation (HDPT) ridership since the JMU, Martin Luther King Jr. Way and Mason Street parking deck opened. When the conference center opens, do we expect ridership to bounce back up?

Mr. Fletcher said I do not have an answer for that; I do not know.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said I do not know if JMU knows either. How are they going to use the commuter spaces in the parking deck?

Mrs. Whitten said JMU has put up a sign on the north side of Martin Luther King Jr. Way that states it will only be hotel parking only after December 18th.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said I wonder if it is being used now.

Mr. Finnegan said yes, it is.

Mrs. Whitten said what I am saying is that after the 18th of December it is going to go away.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said I think it is when the students are here it is the commuter students who are using that deck.

Mrs. Whitten said I have a friend who works at the Health Center and they think it is going to be closed for commuter students.

Chair Way said yes, that is correct about December 18th. However, there is a new lot that would be opened next year on Chesapeake Avenue and Grace Street.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said there are a lot of changes and we do not really know what the net impact overtime to ridership would be.

Mr. Fletcher said the best person to answer that would be Gerald Gatobu, HDPT Assistant Director.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said it is more curiosity than anything.

Mr. Fletcher said I can at least offer the sentiment, I believe, from HDPT, that there is a continued concern that ridership will not necessarily bounce back. The concern is that the parking decks are going to encourage students to drive their vehicles downtown and then hop from parking deck to parking deck as the day goes along and that ridership will drop a little bit.

Chair Way said this discussion about the impact of JMU plans, especially as it relates to parking, is something that is important and it impacts the City in interesting ways; and so, I reiterate that invitation about bringing the JMU Master Plan to be presented to the Planning Commission sometime in the new year. I think for these kinds of reasons it is important to know what JMU has in the pipeline in terms of its transportation plan and facility plan.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said because this parking deck hopping has a lot of implications, if that becomes a thing.

Mr. Fletcher said I would be happy to entertain any discussion or questions regarding the CIP. Two thirds of the CIP committee is here this evening, myself and Mr. Banks, Acting City Manager. Larry Propst, Finance Director, is not joining us this evening. But, if there are any questions beyond what has already been out there, I will try to answer them for you.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said the response that I received for the Stormwater Improvement Plan, every question I had was answered in the presentation from last night at City Council. That was a really great presentation of the plan and the plan was adopted. I thought Tom Hartman, Assistant Director of Public Works, did a great job in outlining the method to which various projects need to be prioritized.

Mrs. Whitten said I appreciated Mr. Finks question about the eastern water source. However, the simple answer of “no” was not very satisfactory to me. The previous answer had been regarding the watershed feeding into Switzer Dam not being affected by the Atlantic Coast Pipeline. The Shenandoah and South Fork watershed could very likely be impacted by that pipeline. I think to say “no, there will not be an affect,” but he did not even say there will not be an affect, he just said “no” to the question. It just was not a satisfactory answer to me.

Chair Way asked if there were any more questions or thoughts.

Mr. Finnegan said just one follow up, Mr. Fletcher did answer that priority two is the highest the City could give anything without it being required by law. I wanted to have on record and say that I drive on Reservoir Street every day and see residents using that non-sidewalk area for bikes and for walking and it is a priority two. How soon can we get that built?

Mr. Fletcher said when we have meetings, Mr. Banks can attest to this, with the different directors and representatives they come in with projects prioritized as a “1” all over the place, because they believe so much in their projects. We have to remind them what the standards are and we have to bump many of them back down to priority two because of the requirement reviews.

Chair Way said I agree with Mr. Finnegan on this one. I see it all the time, I think it is very important and critical that pedestrian infra-structure needs to be put there at some point.

Mrs. Whitten said I use to say the same thing about East Market Street. We are saying we are a tourism destination and we do not have crosswalks. We did not have anything but a dirt path on East Market Street; but we have sidewalks now. They were in CIP just the same. I am not happy about the timing, but you do have to have priorities.

Mr. Finks said anyone could look at the CIP and find things that they are going to say are number one, but other people may not.

Mrs. Whitten said it is nice to see it come to fruition.

Mrs. Fitzgerald asked if a motion to adopt and incorporate the comments was needed.

Mr. Fletcher said a consensus, a nod of heads would be sufficient, at least we will have the comment of the responses in the minutes; but definitely a vote to move on to City Council.

Chair Way asked do we have a consensus about the comments as they stand for incorporation into the minutes. We have consensus nods all around. Any motions about recommendation of the CIP?

Mr. Finks moved to recommend adoption of the CIP as presented and send it to City Council.

Chair Way said we have a recommendation of approval for 2018-2019 through 2022-2023 CIP; is there a second?

Mrs. Fitzgerald seconded the motion.

Chair Way said we have a motion and a second for approval, any more discussion. Hearing none, he called for a voice vote on the motion.

All voted in favor (7-0) of the motion to recommend adoption of the 2018-2019 through 2022-2023 CIP and send it to City Council.

Chair Way said this will go forward to City Council on January 9, 2018.

Respectfully Submitted,

Alison Banks

Alison Banks
Senior Planner