

**INTERIM REPORT OF  
THE COMMISSION STUDYING**

**Local and State  
Infrastructure and  
Revenue Resources**

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND  
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



**HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 47**

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
RICHMOND  
1991**

## MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

The Honorable Gladys B. Keating, *Chairman*  
The Honorable Clive L. Duval, 2d, *Vice Chairman*  
The Honorable C. Richard Cranwell  
The Honorable David G. Brickley  
The Honorable Willard R. Finney  
The Honorable Clinton Miller  
The Honorable Robert K. Cunningham, Sr  
The Honorable Charles J. Colgan  
The Honorable Madison E. Marye  
The Honorable Robert E. Russell  
The Honorable Joseph A. Leafe  
Mr. John G. Dicks  
Ms. Lee Broughton  
Mr. Steven W. Pearson  
Mr. Robert T. Skunda  
Ms. Betty S. Thomas  
Mr. Beverly T. Fitzpatrick, Jr.

---

## STAFF

### Legal and Research

#### Division of Legislative Services

John A. Garka, *Manager, Government and Finance*  
Bethany L. Parker, *Economist*  
C.M. Conner, Jr., *Senior Attorney*  
Jane C. Lewis, *Executive Secretary Senior*

### Administrative and Clerical

Lois V. Johnson, Office of the Clerk, House of Delegates

# CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
I. Authority	1
II. Background	1
III. Commission Activities	3
A. Meetings	3
B. Gathering the Infrastructure Data	3
IV. The Cost of Mandates on Infrastructure	5
A. Testimony	6
B. Analysis	7
V. Revenue Resources and Alternate Funding Mechanisms	8
VI. Conclusion	9
VII. Recommendations	10
VIII. Appendices	
A. HJR 432	
B. HJR 205	
C. SJR 74	
D. Infrastructure Questionnaire	
E. Compilation of Infrastructure Data	
F. Infrastructure Data According to Type of Locality	

**Interim Report of the Commission Studying  
State and Local Infrastructure Needs and  
Revenue Resources  
To  
The Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia**

Richmond, Virginia  
January, 1991

TO: The Honorable L. Douglas Wilder, Governor of Virginia,  
and  
The General Assembly of Virginia

## **I. AUTHORITY**

House Joint Resolution No. 432 of the 1989 Session of the General Assembly established this Commission to study infrastructure needs, revenue resources, tax authority, and tax capacity of local governments (Appendix A). In 1990, House Joint Resolution No. 205 added two members to the Commission. (Appendix B). The members of the Commission are as follows: Delegate Gladys B. Keating, Chairman, Senator Clive L. Duval, 2d, Vice Chairman, Delegate C. Richard Cranwell, Delegate David G. Brickley, Delegate Willard R. Finney, Delegate Clinton Miller, Delegate Robert K. Cunningham, Sr., Senator Charles J. Colgan, Senator Madison E. Marye, Senator Robert E. Russell, Mayor Joseph A. Leafe, John G. Dicks, Lee Broughton, Steven W. Pearson, Robert T. Skunda, Betty S. Thomas, and Beverly T. Fitzpatrick.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 74 of the 1990 Session requested that the Commission also examine the need for regional stormwater detention systems and methods of financing such systems (Appendix C). The original resolution which established this study directs the Commission to issue its final report and recommendations to the 1992 General Assembly Session. This interim report reviews the work of this Commission through 1990 and presents its interim recommendations.

## **II. BACKGROUND**

As the fifth fastest growing state in the nation during the 1980's, Virginia has had to spend increasing amounts on infrastructure projects to meet the demands of its growing population. Local governments have seen a larger portion of their budgets being allocated for the construction and maintenance of transportation, water, sewer, education, and other public facilities. Before the Commission was created, however, infrastructure funding needs had never been comprehensively addressed.

The public infrastructure needs of Virginia's local governments vary widely from locality to locality. Over the past decade, 90 percent of Virginia's population growth has occurred in a corridor which extends from Northern Virginia through Richmond to the Hampton Roads area. Even within this corridor, growth has been concentrated, with over two-thirds of it taking place in six localities. These high growth areas are struggling to provide additional public facilities necessary to serve the exploding residential and commercial base. The growing localities experience growth in school-age population that outpaces the construction of new schools. The localities attempt to build schools fast enough to keep up with the demand for more classrooms. The demand for educational facilities has put a strain on the finances of high growth areas, and as a result, education is the second-largest area of infrastructure need over the next five years. Approximately \$1.4 billion in need for educational facilities have been identified among these localities.

Transportation is by far the largest category of need among high growth areas. Approximately \$2.9 billion will be needed to fund roads during the next five years. Transportation projects account for over 80% of the infrastructure need for high growth localities.

Other problems facing growing localities include solid waste removal and ever-increasing needs for water and sewer facilities.

In contrast to these growing areas, growth in many localities outside the corridor has either come to a standstill or begun slowly to decline. During the 1980's almost half of the 104 localities outside the corridor lost population. Over this period Fairfax County alone added three times more population than all of non-corridor Virginia. Many of these localities outside the corridor are experiencing fiscal distress, finding it difficult to retain jobs, keep their young people, and deliver needed public services.

Most of Virginia's older central cities are among those localities suffering slow declines. Richmond, for example, has declined from a peak of 249,000 in 1970 to an estimated 210,000 in 1990. As businesses and the middle class locate in the suburbs, central cities are left with stagnant or declining tax bases to provide expensive services for their residents. Central cities must contend with the high cost of rebuilding and replacing antiquated infrastructure in the light of fiscal stress caused by the uncertain tax base. Roads, education, water, sewer, and solid waste facilities are infrastructure projects that central cities, along with the high growth areas, require.

Rural communities attempt to provide the basic infrastructure which will enable them to attract industry and to offer quality public services vital to growth. Many of these localities have very little tax base with which to provide the infrastructure. Floyd County, for example, must rely increasingly on a static tax base, its property. Most of Floyd County's residents commute outside the locality to work and spend much of their money outside the county. This endangers local businesses and reduces the amount of state sales tax Floyd receives based on point of sale. Also, Floyd has an increasingly older population, which has reduced the amount the county can receive from the state sales tax based on school-aged population. Floyd County, along with most rural localities, has few sources of revenue aside from the property taxes.

Transportation infrastructure projects are not among the top three areas of need for rural counties. Education, water, and sewer are the top areas of need in these counties. Examining the needs of all localities, regardless of their age or size, was the first charge undertaken by the Commission. The 1990 Virginia Assembly on the Future of Local Government in Virginia provided some useful information regarding the infrastructure needs of local governments.

Financing infrastructure projects is a common concern for all localities. The Commission faced a challenge in its responsibility of determining means of financing such projects. To further complicate matters, in the summer of 1990 the Governor announced a budget shortfall of \$1.2 billion. State aid to localities will be cut as the Commonwealth struggles to address its fiscal crisis, leaving local governments with less ability to meet all of their needs, including infrastructure. In light of the state's financial difficulties, the Commission's task has become even more challenging. Determining ways to fund infrastructure projects is now more than ever a pressing issue for localities. During the course of its study, the Commission received many suggestions as to revenue resource options which would benefit most localities. The feasibility of such options will be explored in 1991.

### **III. COMMISSION ACTIVITIES**

#### **A. Meetings**

After its organizational meeting, the Commission held several public hearings around the state in order to allow citizens and government officials to discuss infrastructure needs and ideas for funding. During subsequent meetings, the Commission continued to gather information by inviting state agency officials to discuss their infrastructure problems. The Commission also received data from the localities by sending out a questionnaire and compiling the responses. The final two meetings were working sessions, in which members could discuss what they had heard during the course of their study and recommend the revenue resources that they thought would be the most feasible.

#### **B. Gathering The Infrastructure Data**

A special panel of county and city representatives was created to help the Commission design an infrastructure questionnaire. The questionnaire, which was sent to each locality, asked a series of very detailed questions regarding future infrastructure needs, past infrastructure spending, means of funding the projects, areas of funding shortfall, and local revenue sources. A copy of the questionnaire is attached as Appendix D.

The questionnaire was sent to the localities three times throughout the year in an attempt to solicit the highest possible response rate. Localities that responded to the questionnaire, 29 cities and 50 counties, comprise approximately 80% of the population of the Commonwealth. Compilations of the questionnaire data are attached as Appendices E and F.

The responding localities reported their infrastructure needs to be \$12.2 billion during the next five years. Roads, at 30% of the total need, comprise the largest area of infrastructure need, followed by education at 20.5% (See Table 1).

**TABLE 1**  
**LARGEST AREAS OF NEED**  
*(in millions of dollars)*

<u>Area</u>	<u>Funding Needs for 1990-1994</u>	<u>Percent of Total Need</u>
1. Roads	\$3,675	30.03%
2. Education	\$2,508	20.50%
3. Sewer	\$1,102	9.01%
4. Water	\$1,063	8.68%
5. Solid Waste	\$ 651	5.32%

The localities estimate that they will be able to fund \$7.7 billion, or 63% of their infrastructure needs over the next five years. The portion of needs that will not be funded, the infrastructure gap, is estimated to reach \$4.5 billion. Table 2 shows the areas with the largest funding gaps. It is important to bear in mind, however, that the infrastructure surveys were completed before the economic downturn had fully developed. Decreased revenues from their own residents as well as from the state and federal governments will create an even larger gap.

**TABLE 2**  
**AREAS WITH THE LARGEST INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING GAPS**

<u>Area</u>	<u>Percentage Funding Gap For 1990-1994</u>
1. Roads	50.4%
2. Education	14.2%
3. Sewer	6.6%
4. Other Transportation	3.8%
5. General Government	3.1%

The percentage of needs that will go unfunded increases in later years, as localities contend with a growing demand for infrastructure or a declining tax base. Thus, the funding gap in 1994 is significantly greater than the gap in 1990, because localities are less certain of what funding will be available. Also, it is interesting to note that if the transportation category were excluded, the localities would be able to fund the majority of their infrastructure needs.

The increasing infrastructure needs among the localities, which prompted the establishment of this Commission, were apparent in the data retrieved from the questionnaire. In fact, infrastructure spending has risen by 302% since 1984. Table 3 denotes the areas which have had the largest increases in infrastructure spending during the last five years.

**TABLE 3**  
**AREAS WITH THE LARGEST INCREASES IN NEEDS**

<u>Area</u>	<u>Percent Increase In Since 1984</u>
1. Fire/Rescue	638%
2. Education	506%
3. Water	464%
4. Drainage	328%
5. Sewer	290%

As Appendix E demonstrates, the localities were broken down into five categories and examined according to type. This categorization helped the Commission recognize the differences in need among the localities. Appendix E also points out the differences in the effective real property tax rates, which is the tax rate adjusted for the real estate assessment ratio. The property tax is the localities' largest source of revenue, and the rates range from a high of \$1.35 in Richmond to a low of \$.23 in Cumberland.

Large infrastructure needs exist in all types of localities--high growth, central city, and rural--although different localities have different needs. The Commission's research has shown that rural areas have a large level of needs relative to their tax base. Therefore, some of the tax increases that would help other localities would not help the rural localities. As a result, it appears that there is no single answer to the infrastructure problem; rather, the most reasonable solution is likely to be package of recommendations.

Although the questionnaire data provided the Commission with information about infrastructure spending trends, areas of need and areas of shortfall, and differences in infrastructure needs among the localities, the data should be used with a great deal of caution. The figures in Appendices E and F are rough estimates, not exact numbers, since the localities did not interpret the questions in the same manner. Some reported only the infrastructure projects that they thought they could afford, and some listed all the projects that they would like to undertake if they had the funding.

#### **IV. THE COST OF MANDATES ON INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS**

The Commission was interested in how state and federal mandates affected the cost of infrastructure projects, and heard numerous presentations on the topic. The members wanted to determine whether or not some of the mandates could be relaxed in order to provide relief to the localities. Since the top five areas of infrastructure need were roads, education, water, sewer, and solid waste, the



Commission requested officials from the Departments of Transportation, Health, Education, and Waste Management, and the State Water Control Board to address the problem of infrastructure funding in their areas. The speakers were also asked to describe how state and federal mandates increase the cost of infrastructure and how much of the costs are offset by state infrastructure funds.

#### **A. Testimony**

The Department of Transportation will receive \$3.5 billion in state and federal funds during fiscal years 1990 to 1995. However, the state and federal governments impose mandates that affect the cost of VDOT's projects. State mandates include stormwater management and erosion control plans, the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, leaking underground storage tank removal, asbestos removal from buildings to be cleared for the roadway, and removal of contaminated soil from industrial sites. Federal mandates include the Wetlands Preservation Act, noise control standards, the Clean Air Act, and strict permitting processes for bridge construction.

Compliance with these mandates is extremely costly for localities. For example, noise buffer walls in the Tidewater area added an extra \$6 million to the construction costs of the highways there. The most costly mandate of all, however, is the Wetlands Preservation Act. Compliance with this act can increase construction costs by as much as 100%.

The cost of the Department of Health's projects are affected by the federal Safe Drinking Act, which will add a cost of \$7.05 million to the state and \$143 million to waterworks owners during the fiscal years 1990-1992. The Water Supply Revolving Fund lends \$30.2 million to localities each year, but the loans are not sufficient to fund the \$269.7 million in water infrastructure needs around the state.

Testimony from the State Water Control Board revealed that in 1987 the Board identified wastewater treatment and sewer system needs totalling \$2 billion. This figure does not include new requirements included in the 1987 amendments to the Clean Water Act, such as the implementation of the Toxic Water Quality Standards and the stormwater discharge permit system. The correction of combined sewer overflows, which is also not included in the \$2 billion of identified needs, is a problem that will take an estimated \$500 million to correct. Furthermore, new EPA requirements concerning the management of sludge disposal may also have additional cost implications.

The State Water Control Board receives money from the state lottery to help fund its infrastructure projects. The Board will receive \$6 million in 1990 and \$13 million in 1991. Funds from the revolving loan fund are also available to the Board.

The Department of Waste Management estimates that over the next twenty years local governments will need approximately \$2.4 billion to fund solid waste infrastructure projects. An additional \$900 million will be needed to meet the operational costs of these facilities. The expenditures are necessary in order to comply with the 1988 Virginia Solid Waste Management Regulations.

To meet the costs of the increased regulatory standards for all solid waste, water, and sewer facilities, the Virginia Resources Authority has funds available for local governments interested in pursuing revolving loans or bonds. In fact, any local government entity is eligible for a Resources Authority loan program. The VRA has a \$400,000,000 cap on bonds, with current available bonding capacity at \$173,949,403. The Virginia Resources Authority is one option that localities can consider when planning facility development in their communities.

The Department of Education has its own regulations, which control classroom and site sizes and regulate air quality in classrooms. In addition to the Department's regulations, the state imposes mandates that add to the cost of building and maintaining schools. For example, the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code requires handicapped accessibility, such as elevators and ramps, for existing structures whenever new construction occurs. The Code also requires sprinklers and ventilation air systems in schools. Even slightly more stringent regulations on ventilation systems could drive the initial costs for schools up a few dollars beyond the current cost of \$70 per square foot.

The Commonwealth's Educational Standards of Quality also affect the cost of infrastructure for the Department of Education. The Standards of Quality requires low student/teacher ratios, which translate directly into the need for more classrooms. Along with this requirement is the likely addition of a pre-kindergarten program for at-risk four-year-olds. The program will benefit more children than the federal Head Start program, which only accommodates 27% of the 18,000 at-risk students that have been identified in Virginia. The new program will require about 700 new classrooms at a cost of \$50 million. The annual operating costs will range from \$54-74 million.

The Department of Education must also follow the guidelines of the Wetlands Preservation Act and the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, which increase construction costs considerably. The provisions in these acts lead to fewer available building sites, higher land costs, and higher development costs. Other state and federal regulations for asbestos abatement, lead in drinking water, radon, and underground fuel storage tanks also contribute to higher construction costs.

## **B. Analysis Of The Testimony Regarding Mandates**

Along with testimony from the state agencies, the Commission heard statements from the Virginia Municipal League, Virginia Association of Counties, and the Chesterfield County Office of Budget and Management regarding the cost of mandates on infrastructure. The overall sentiment of the presentations indicated that most of the mandates were sensible and necessary. None of the speakers advocated suspending the mandates. Instead, many suggested that flexibility in meeting the requirements would help localities. Even the federal mandates have state-imposed compliance deadlines, and localities feel that extensions of the deadlines would make the mandates less burdensome.

Relaxing the compliance timetable would give the localities the flexibility they have requested. The versatility would allow them to determine the most efficient way to finance, construct, and operate mandated facilities.

## **V. REVENUE RESOURCES AND ALTERNATE FUNDING MECHANISMS**

Privatization and public/private partnerships are financing methods for infrastructure projects that have gained popularity throughout the country in recent years. And in the Commonwealth, localities are beginning to recognize the merits of privatization. For example, the private toll road planned for Loudoun County is a ground-breaking project that the rest of the country will be watching.

Toll roads are good projects for privatization because there is a recognizable user fee associated with them. Private companies are more likely to invest in a project that has an obvious user fee because there is a greater likelihood of seeing a return on the investment. Other possible privatization projects include toll bridges, bridge extensions, and missing links in highways, where the new road has a good possibility of being used. Also, high density mass transit projects in high growth areas are good projects to share in a public/private partnership.

Assessing the project's demand is crucial in determining whether or not the infrastructure project should be privatized. For example, high speed rail projects do have a user fee that the investor can realize, but rail projects are expensive and hard to sell. A locality should start with a small project, such as a wastewater treatment facility or a bridge extension, before undertaking a larger project.

Charles City County's private landfill is an example of how a locality can benefit from privatization. The county is now free from the burden of operating a landfill. Charles City receives cash payments from the company, and benefits further from the arrangement by being able to deposit waste in the landfill for free. Landfills are feasible projects for public/private partnerships because demand for their services is steady and because the tipping fees can help recover some of the investment costs of the company. Privatization is an option that localities have when considering capital improvement plans.

Regionalization of facilities is another option that localities have when deciding to undertake an infrastructure project. Regional facilities reduce the duplication of services among adjacent localities. They also ease the burden of financing the project by distributing the cost among the localities.

Year-round school systems, which can reduce infrastructure expenditures, are alternatives to traditional school systems. The year-round schools are not ideal for every community, however, and the benefits and drawbacks must be considered before deciding to implement the system. A few benefits include: reduction of building costs for new schools, lower demand for additional classroom space, continuous learning cycle and less memory loss, less overcrowding, reduction in vandalism and the drop-out rate, and increased attendance. A few drawbacks are: increased wear and tear on buildings, no summer down-time for large-scale maintenance projects, increased stress on the child, and a need for tremendous master planning and administration.

A successful year-round school system requires the support of parents, students, teachers, and administrators. Therefore, each community must decide for itself whether or not to implement such a system.

Utility fees are a feasible funding mechanism for stormwater detention systems. The establishment of stormwater utilities is a concept which has achieved growing popularity in the Western and Midwestern United States over the past 15 years and is now beginning to catch on in the Southeast. Seventeen localities in Florida have taken steps to implement a stormwater utility, and in 1989 the North Carolina General Assembly enacted enabling legislation for local stormwater utility fees.

Stormwater management facilities are similar to wastewater systems, which rely on utility fees for funding. Stormwater facilities make productive use of the water by creating parks, lakes, irrigation systems, and reservoirs. The facilities can achieve the goals of the 1989 stormwater management law, the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, and EPA requirements which mandate flooding and erosion control.

The stormwater utility fees could be based on how much each parcel of land contributes to the problem of stormwater runoff. The utility is designed to improve drainage programs while relieving pressure on the local general fund by creating a continuous funding source. A utility program may be more equitable than reliance on general fund revenue, since costs for each landowner are based upon the usage of the drainage system.

Other revenue resources considered by the Commission include: equal taxing authority for both cities and counties, a local income tax, road bond authority for more localities besides just Chesterfield and Fairfax Counties, half a percent of the sales tax, impact fees, and transferable development rights.

## VI. CONCLUSION

The financing of infrastructure is a growing burden on localities. Meeting the \$12.2 billion in needs during the next five years will require stable revenue sources and reliable funding mechanisms. As Secretary of Finance Stuart W. Connock warned, a medley of local option sales and other taxes will not fulfill the long-term infrastructure needs.

The assortment of taxes will fail to provide adequate resources for infrastructure projects and will ignore the fact that not every locality can benefit from these taxes. For example, rural counties, such as Floyd, have very little tax base and cannot generate revenue from local option sales, meals, or lodging taxes. On the other hand, growing localities like Fairfax and Chesterfield Counties could generate substantial revenue from these sources. The taxes are used as a last resort, however, because they are unpopular and may be difficult to pass by referendum.

In fact, a number of localities, Fairfax County and Norfolk, to name just a few, have the option to impose a local income tax, subject to voter approval. No locality has elected to take advantage of this option.

Localities also hesitate to increase the property tax rate to raise money for capital outlays. Even though the tax has no cap, localities would prefer not to have to rely on it for the purpose of financing infrastructure projects.

Granting equal taxing authority to cities and counties would allow all localities access to the same revenue sources. Localities would be able to decide for themselves which revenue option would most benefit them. Along with equalization of taxing authority, the other most efficient and equitable means of financing appear to be regionalization, privatization, and utility fees.

Through the analysis of state mandates, the Commission concludes that mandates do create financial burdens for localities, especially in the present economic downturn. Given this difficult time for local governments, the Commission is considering proposing legislation which would urge the General Assembly and the Governor's cabinet secretaries to evaluate mandates in terms of the financial burden they place on localities. The Commission will continue to identify which mandates impact the localities the most and which compliance deadlines can be postponed. The Commission will either propose legislation regarding mandates to the 1991 Session or continue gathering information throughout the course of its study, whichever the members feel will most benefit the localities.

Given the financial condition of Virginia's localities and the increasing burden that infrastructure has placed on them, it is necessary to focus on options for raising revenue. Although the data that the Commission gathered cannot be relied upon for exact figures, the data did enable the members to recognize the increasing infrastructure needs and to determine the areas of largest needs. The data from the questionnaire also indicated that localities were in desperate need of revenue resources with which to fund their infrastructure projects. Therefore, the Commission concludes that in the final year of its study it will focus on examining funding mechanisms to eliminate the existing backlog of infrastructure needs as well as to keep pace with new requirements.

## **VII. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1. Focus on determining revenue resources, rather than infrastructure needs, during the final year of the study.**

The Commission believes that the first part of its mission has been accomplished--that is, identification of local government infrastructure needs. The final year should focus in depth on methods of meeting those needs and the pluses and minuses of those suggestions given to the Commission as well as any new ideas that may be brought to its attention.

- 2. Refer the infrastructure questionnaire data to the Commission on Population Growth.**

The Commission gathered an abundance of data on the infrastructure needs of the localities. The data was analyzed by category of infrastructure project as well as by different types of localities. Although the Commission

has decided not to collect any more data, the members feel that it may be helpful to the work of the Commission on Population Growth in the course of its five-year study.

**3. Establish a Revenue Resources and Economic Development Commission.**

The Commission recommends that after it finishes its study in 1991, a new Commission be established to address the ongoing problem of determining revenue resources. The new Commission could continue to examine financing methods after this Commission has completed its work and submitted a final report to the 1992 General Assembly. Continuing the examination of revenue resources is important because the need for infrastructure expenditures will be a continuing problem confronting the localities for many years to come.

**4. Examine the method of state reimbursement to localities that undertake regional jail projects.**

The Code currently provides for reimbursement of up to 50% of the cost of regional jail construction. The Commission plans to continue gathering information regarding the financing and operation of regional jail projects to determine whether or not a better reimbursement method exists. The Commission believes that regional jail projects could help ease the funding burden on individual localities, and would like to find a way to encourage such projects.

**5. Use extreme caution when imposing mandates on localities.**

State mandates increase the construction cost of infrastructure projects, leaving the localities to shoulder the burden of financing the projects. State-imposed compliance deadlines far in advance of federal mandate deadlines also cause financial hardship for the localities. The Commission recommends that the General Assembly be extremely cautious when imposing mandates or compliance deadlines, and consider the financial burden that they may create for localities.

**6. Defer final recommendations until the 1992 General Assembly Session, and continue examining the following revenue resources during the final year of the Commission's study:**

1. Equal tax authority between cities and counties.
2. Equal bond authority among localities.
3. More frequent and uniform intervals of property reassessments.
4. Utility fees for the purpose of funding stormwater detention facilities.
5. A state agency that handles the funding of infrastructure projects. The Commission would like to study how other states, such as Kentucky, have established such infrastructure funding agencies.

6. Regional water, sewer, solid waste, and transportation facilities.
7. Public/private partnerships and privatization of infrastructure projects.

The last two items, regionalization and privatization, will be accorded top priority in 1991, since the Commission believes that these two options for infrastructure funding are the most promising.

Respectfully submitted,

The Honorable Gladys B. Keating, *Chairman*

The Honorable Clive L. Duval, 2d, *Vice Chairman*

The Honorable C. Richard Cranwell

The Honorable David G. Brickley

The Honorable Willard R. Finney

The Honorable Clinton Miller

The Honorable Robert K. Cunningham, Sr

The Honorable Charles J. Colgan

The Honorable Madison E. Marye

The Honorable Robert E. Russell

The Honorable Joseph A. Leafe

Mr. John G. Dicks

Ms. Lee Broughton

Mr. Steven W. Pearson

Mr. Robert T. Skunda

Ms. Betty S. Thomas

Mr. Beverly T. Fitzpatrick, Jr.

## **VIII. APPENDICES**

- A. House Joint Resolution No. 432
- B. House Joint Resolution No. 205
- C. Senate Joint Resolution No. 74
- D. Infrastructure Questionnaire
- E. Compilation of Infrastructure Data
- F. Infrastructure Data According to Type of Locality



**APPENDIX A**

**House Joint Resolution No. 432**

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 432

*Creating the Local and State Government Infrastructure and Revenue Resources Commission.*

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, February 24, 1989

Agreed to by the Senate, February 23, 1989

WHEREAS, Virginia is one of the most rapidly growing states in the nation; and

WHEREAS, the United States Bureau of the Census estimates that the Commonwealth's population will have increased from 5,347,000 to 6,157,000 between 1980 and 1990, and projects that the Commonwealth will be home to 6,877,000 persons by the year 2000; and

WHEREAS, the public infrastructure needs of Virginia's local governments are compelling and diverse. High growth areas are laboring unsuccessfully to provide the additional public facilities necessary to serve the exploding residential and commercial base. Central cities struggle to rebuild and replace an antiquated infrastructure in the face of fiscal stress caused by increasing demands, an uncertain tax base, and state-mandated programs. Many rural communities need to build the basic infrastructure which will enable them to attract industry, provide residential amenities, and offer quality public services vital to growth; and -

WHEREAS, the revenue requirements of Virginia's local governments for transportation, water and sewer, school, and other public facilities have not been systematically and comprehensively addressed; and

WHEREAS, as the Commonwealth enters the last decade of this century, it is clearly necessary to inventory the infrastructure requirements of local governments, assess their existing tax authority and revenue capacity, including the present utilization of existing revenue sources, and take steps as may be necessary to enable local governments to develop and maintain the needed infrastructure which will adequately meet the needs of local and state governments for the next century; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That there is hereby created the Local and State Government Infrastructure and Revenue Resources Commission. The Commission shall be composed of six House members appointed by the Speaker of the House; three Senate members appointed by the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections; and six members at-large, appointed by the Governor, two of whom shall be local elected officials, two of whom shall be local appointed officials, and two of whom shall represent business organizations in the Commonwealth. The Commission shall designate a chairman and vice-chairman from among its membership.

The Commission first shall analyze and assess the infrastructure needs of all Virginia local governments, paying due attention to the needs of localities both in areas of high growth and in the rest of the Commonwealth. It shall also assess the available state resources and the debt and taxing authorities and general revenue-raising capacities of local and state governments and the present availability of these sources to fund infrastructure needs. The Commission thereafter shall recommend measures to enable local governments to meet infrastructure needs and revenue requirements for the next decade and recommend any revisions to the debt and taxing authorities granted to localities.

The Commission shall complete its assessment of local government infrastructure needs and of debt and taxing authorities in time to submit an interim report and recommendations to the General Assembly and the Governor at the 1990 Session of the General Assembly.

The Commission shall complete its assessment and recommendations for changes and submit a report with its recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly by December 1, 1991. All such reports shall be submitted in accordance with the procedures of the Division of Legislative Automated Systems for processing legislative documents.

The indirect costs of this study are estimated to be \$17,395; the direct costs of this study shall not exceed \$16,380.

**APPENDIX B**

House Joint Resolution No. 205

**HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 205**

*Adding two new members to the Local and State Government Infrastructure and Revenue Resources Commission established by the 1989 Session of the General Assembly.*

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, February 11, 1990

Agreed to by the Senate, February 27, 1990

WHEREAS, the 1989 Session of the Virginia General Assembly established the Local and State Government Infrastructure and Revenue Resources Commission to study over a two-year period local infrastructure needs, tax authority and tax capacity, and debt levels and borrowing capacity; and

WHEREAS, the Commission began its data gathering and fact finding by sending out a detailed questionnaire to each county, city, and town requesting this historical and prospective information; and

WHEREAS, the task of the Commission is now to undertake the laborious job of analyzing the data and information; and

WHEREAS, there has been a great deal of interest in the work of the Commission not only from high growth areas but from small rural counties which also have large infrastructure needs, relative to their ability to pay for those projects; and

WHEREAS, it would be of great benefit to the Commission if in their deliberations the Commission contained the widest spectrum of expertise and the widest range of representation as it studies the complexities of infrastructure and the financing of those needs; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That in addition to the membership of the Commission as established by House Joint Resolution No. 432 of the 1989 Session, there are hereby added two additional members to be appointed as follows: one individual to be appointed by the Speaker and one individual to be appointed by the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections. These individuals shall be familiar with the work of the Commission or the subject areas being examined by the Commission in order that they assist the Commission to the greatest possible extent.

**APPENDIX C**

**Senate Joint Resolution No. 74**

**SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 74**  
**AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE**  
(Proposed by the House Committee on Rules  
on March 1, 1990)

(Patron Prior to Substitute—Senator Colgan)

*Requesting the Local and State Government Infrastructure and Revenue Resources Commission to examine the need for the construction and maintenance of regional stormwater detention systems and the financing of such systems.*

WHEREAS, the Local and State Government Infrastructure and Revenue Resources Commission is examining infrastructure needs, tax authority, and tax capacity, and outstanding debt and debt capacity of local governments; and

WHEREAS, the Commission is examining sixteen specific areas of infrastructure needs; and

WHEREAS, in most instances the major areas of local infrastructure needs are similar, such as education and transportation facilities; however, there is also a great deal of diversity among the localities; and

WHEREAS, there are some relatively new areas of infrastructure needs which may not be as well known as the others; and

WHEREAS, one of these newer areas is the regional stormwater detention systems; and

WHEREAS, the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act has accelerated the need for these types of facilities in many areas of the Commonwealth; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That the Local and State Government Infrastructure and Revenue Resources Commission is requested to include in the course of examining local infrastructure needs, the need for regional stormwater detention systems. The Commission shall also consider financing methods for the construction and maintenance of such facilities.

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Infrastructure Questionnaire**

**COMMISSION STUDYING LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**  
*(Pursuant to House Joint Resolution No. 432)*

*Delegate John G. Dicks, III, Chairman*

*Senator Clive L. DuVal, 2d, Vice Chairman*

**NAME OF LOCALITY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PREPARED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**TITLE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ADDRESS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**TELEPHONE:** \_\_\_\_\_



1. LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

A. List total dollar amount of all local infrastructure projects which your locality will need to fund during the period of the 1990's, by category and year. Use current 1989 dollars, unadjusted for inflation.

	<u>1989 - 90</u>	<u>1990 - 91</u>	<u>1991 - 92</u>	<u>1992 - 93</u>	<u>1993 - 94</u>
Education					
Roads					
Other Transportation					
(PUBLIC WORKS)					
Water					
Sewer					
Other Utilities					
Solid Waste					
Drainage					
(PUBLIC SAFETY)					
Law Enforcement					
Fire/Rescue					
Jails					
Courts					
(GENERAL GOVERNMENT)					
Human Services					
Other General Government					
Parks & Recreation					
Libraries					
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)					
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)					
<u>TOTAL</u>					

I. LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

A. List total dollar amount of all local infrastructure projects which your locality will need to fund during the period of the 1990's, by category and year. Use current 1989 dollars, unadjusted for inflation.

	<u>1994 - 95</u>	<u>1995 - 96</u>	<u>1996 - 97</u>	<u>1997 - 98</u>	<u>1998 - 99</u>
Education					
Roads					
Other Transportation					
(PUBLIC WORKS)					
Water					
Sewer					
Other Utilities					
Solid Waste					
Drainage					
(PUBLIC SAFETY)					
Law Enforcement					
Fire/Rescue					
Jails					
Courts					
(GENERAL GOVERNMENT)					
Human Services					
Other General Government					
Parks & Recreation					
Libraries					
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)					
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)					
TOTAL					

TOTAL FOR DECADE = \$ \_\_\_\_\_

8. Utilizing existing revenue sources [assume existing tax authority], list the dollar amount of the above infrastructure projects which you anticipate will be funded during the period of the 1990's, by category and year.

	<u>1989 - 90</u>	<u>1990 - 91</u>	<u>1991 - 92</u>	<u>1992 - 93</u>	<u>1993 - 94</u>
Education					
Roads					
Other Transportation					
(PUBLIC WORKS)					
Water					
Sewer					
Other Utilities					
Solid Waste					
Drainage					
(PUBLIC SAFETY)					
Law Enforcement					
Fire/Rescue					
Jails					
Courts					
(GENERAL GOVERNMENT)					
Human Services					
Other General Government					
Parks & Recreation					
Libraries					
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)					
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)					
<u>TOTAL</u>					

B. Utilizing existing revenue sources [assume existing tax authority], list the dollar amount of the above infrastructure projects which you anticipate will be funded during the period of the 1990's, by category and year.

	<u>1994 - 95</u>	<u>1995 - 96</u>	<u>1996 - 97</u>	<u>1997 - 98</u>	<u>1998 - 99</u>
Education					
Roads					
Other Transportation					
(PUBLIC WORKS)					
Water					
Sewer					
Other Utilities					
Solid Waste					
Drainage					
(PUBLIC SAFETY)					
Law Enforcement					
Fire/Rescue					
Jails					
Courts					
(GENERAL GOVERNMENT)					
Human Services					
Other General Government					
Parks & Recreation					
Libraries					
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)					
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)					
TOTAL					

TOTAL FOR DECADE = \$ \_\_\_\_\_

C. List non-local funds (i.e., federal or state, etc.) which your locality would expect to receive to help fund the infrastructure projects listed in "B" above.

	<u>1989 - 90</u>	<u>1990 - 91</u>	<u>1991 - 92</u>	<u>1992 - 93</u>	<u>1993 - 94</u>
<u>Education</u>					
<u>Roads</u>					
<u>Other Transportation</u>					
<u>(PUBLIC WORKS)</u>					
<u>Water</u>					
<u>Sewer</u>					
<u>Other Utilities</u>					
<u>Solid Waste</u>					
<u>Drainage</u>					
<u>(PUBLIC SAFETY)</u>					
<u>Law Enforcement</u>					
<u>Fire/Rescue</u>					
<u>Jails</u>					
<u>Courts</u>					
<u>(GENERAL GOVERNMENT)</u>					
<u>Human Services</u>					
<u>Other General Government</u>					
<u>Parks &amp; Recreation</u>					
<u>Libraries</u>					
<u>OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)</u>					
<u>OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)</u>					
<u>TOTAL</u>					

C. List non-local funds (i.e., federal or state, etc.) which your locality would expect to receive to help fund the infrastructure projects listed in "B" above.

	<u>1994 - 95</u>	<u>1995 - 96</u>	<u>1996 - 97</u>	<u>1997 - 98</u>	<u>1998 - 99</u>
Education					
Roads					
Other Transportation					
(PUBLIC WORKS)					
Water					
Sewer					
Other Utilities					
Solid Waste					
Drainage					
(PUBLIC SAFETY)					
Law Enforcement					
Fire/Rescue					
Jails					
Courts					
(GENERAL GOVERNMENT)					
Human Services					
Other General Government					
Parks & Recreation					
Libraries					
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)					
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)					
TOTAL					

TOTAL FOR DECADE = \$ \_\_\_\_\_

13. Over the next year or so, beginning in 1989-90, how will the local share of each category of infrastructure need be financed?

**1. EDUCATION**

a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

How will the debt be repaid?

1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

**2. ROADS**

a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

How will the debt be repaid?

1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

**3. OTHER TRANSPORTATION**

a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

How will the debt be repaid?

1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

4. WATER

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

How will the debt be repaid?

1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

5. SEWER

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

How will the debt be repaid?

1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

6. OTHER UTILITIES

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

How will the debt be repaid?

1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%



7. *SOLID WASTE*

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%
- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- How will the debt be repaid?
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

8. *DRAINAGE*

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%
- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- How will the debt be repaid?
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

9. *LAW ENFORCEMENT*

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%
- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- How will the debt be repaid?
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

10. FIRE/RESCUE

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_ %
- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- How will the debt be repaid?
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_ %

11. JAILS

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_ %
- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- How will the debt be repaid?
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_ %

12. COURTS

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_ %
- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- How will the debt be repaid?
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_ %

13. HUMAN SERVICES

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_ %
- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- How will the debt be repaid?
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_ %

14. OTHER GENERAL GOVERNMENT

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_ %
- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- How will the debt be repaid?
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_ %

15. PARKS AND RECREATION

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_ %
- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- How will the debt be repaid?
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_ %
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_ %

16. LIBRARIES

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%
- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- How will the debt be repaid?
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

17. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- a. How much will be financed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%
- b. How much will be financed through debt? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- How will the debt be repaid?
1. What percent will come from local general revenue sources? \_\_\_\_\_%
  2. What percent will come from local user fees? \_\_\_\_\_%
  3. What percent will come from the private sector? \_\_\_\_\_%

**NOTE:** Private sector contributions include proffers and impact fees.

E. What has been the total dollar amount spent on infrastructure projects in your locality in each of the five previous years, by category.

	<u>1988 - 89</u>	<u>1987 - 88</u>	<u>1986 - 87</u>	<u>1985 - 86</u>	<u>1984 - 85</u>
Education					
Roads					
Other Transportation					
(PUBLIC WORKS)					
Water					
Sewer					
Other Utilities					
Solid Waste					
Drainage					
(PUBLIC SAFETY)					
Law Enforcement					
Fire/Rescue					
Jails					
Courts					
(GENERAL GOVERNMENT)					
Human Services					
Other General Government					
Parks & Recreation					
Libraries					
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)					
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)					
<u>TOTAL</u>					

1. Over these five years, how much was received from local user fees?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

2. Over these five years, how much was received from local tax sources?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

3. Over these five years, how much was received from state sources?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

4. Over these five years, how much was received from federal sources?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

5. Over these five years, how much was financed by debt?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

6. Over these five years, how much was received from other sources?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

7. Please explain if there were any highly unusual circumstances or outlays in any of the years and the dollar amounts and years involved.

---

---

---

---

---

II. LOCAL REVENUE

A. Total local revenue for the last fiscal year.

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

B. Total local revenue from locally generated sources (non-state or non-federal) for the last fiscal year.

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

C. Provide the following information for each listed tax.

<u>Tax</u>	<u>1989-90 Budgeted Revenue</u>	<u>1989 Tax Rate (As Of 7/1/89)</u>
Real Property	_____	_____
Local Sales Tax	_____	_____
Tangible Personal Property	_____	_____
Machinery & Tools	_____	_____
Local Utility -- RESIDENTIAL	_____	_____
Local Utility -- NON-RESIDENTIAL	_____	_____
BPOL	_____	_____
Merchants Capital	_____	_____
Meals	_____	_____
Lodging (TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY)	_____	_____
Recordation	_____	_____
Cigarette	_____	_____
Admissions	_____	_____
Gasoline	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____
Conditional Zoning Fees	_____	_____

D. What was the assessed value of taxable real property for the last tax year?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

i. Provide an estimated annual growth of assessed value (include both reassessments and new construction) over the next ten years.

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ %

III. Local

A. Total local debt outstanding by category (as of 7/1/89)

	<u>A M O U N T</u>	
	<u>General Obligation</u>	<u>Revenue Bonds</u>
<u>Education</u>		
<u>Roads</u>		
<u>Other Transportation</u>		
<u>(PUBLIC WORKS)</u>		
<u>Water</u>		
<u>Sewer</u>		
<u>Other Utilities</u>		
<u>Solid Waste</u>		
<u>Drainage</u>		
<u>(PUBLIC SAFETY)</u>		
<u>Law Enforcement</u>		
<u>Fire/Rescue</u>		
<u>Jails</u>		
<u>Courts</u>		
<u>(GENERAL GOVERNMENT)</u>		
<u>Human Services</u>		
<u>Other General Government</u>		
<u>Parks &amp; Recreation</u>		
<u>Libraries</u>		
<u>OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)</u>		
<u>OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)</u>		
<u>TOTAL</u>		



B. Amount of General Obligation debt subject to Constitution's debt ceiling (or charter, if applicable).

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

C. Amount of debt not subject to limitation.

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

D. Current General Obligation debt ceiling under the Constitution (or charter) as of the 1989 land book.

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

1. Available debt capacity. \$ \_\_\_\_\_

E. Estimated debt ceiling for the year 1999.

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

IV. DEMOGRAPHIC/OTHER DATA

A. Estimated population for 1989. \_\_\_\_\_

B. Your estimated annual population growth rate for the next ten years. \_\_\_\_\_%

C. Estimated population in 1994. \_\_\_\_\_

D. Estimated population in 1999. \_\_\_\_\_

E. Does your locality currently prepare a capital improvement plan, similar to the plan authorized by § 15.1-464?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes                      \_\_\_\_\_ No

F. Please explain the source of your population projections.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

G. Please explain, in general, how your locality estimated its future infrastructure needs.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## **APPENDIX E**

### **Compilation of Infrastructure Data**

TABLE 1  
TOTAL NEEDS FOR ALL LOCALITIES 1989-1994

	'89-90	% OF YEAR 89-90	'90-91	% OF YEAR 90-91	'91-92	% OF YEAR 91-92	'92-93	% OF YEAR 92-93	'93-94	% OF YEAR 93-94	Five Year Total	% OF TOTAL
EDUCATION:	\$564	22.9%	\$474	17.7%	\$498	20.4%	\$475	19.6%	\$497	22.4%	\$2,508	20.50%
ROADS:	\$683	27.8%	\$873	32.6%	\$811	33.1%	\$629	25.8%	\$679	30.6%	\$3,675	30.03%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$83	3.4%	\$80	3.0%	\$84	3.4%	\$74	3.0%	\$73	3.3%	\$395	3.23%
PUBLIC WORKS:												
Water	\$224	9.1%	\$230	8.6%	\$214	8.7%	\$186	7.7%	\$209	9.4%	\$1,063	8.68%
Sewer	\$263	10.7%	\$275	10.3%	\$192	7.8%	\$187	7.7%	\$185	8.3%	\$1,102	9.01%
Other Utilities	\$64	2.6%	\$36	1.4%	\$44	1.8%	\$39	1.6%	\$33	1.5%	\$217	1.77%
Solid Waste	\$76	3.1%	\$71	2.6%	\$55	2.3%	\$394	16.2%	\$55	2.5%	\$651	5.32%
Drainage	\$31	1.3%	\$60	2.2%	\$71	2.9%	\$52	2.1%	\$57	2.6%	\$271	2.21%
PUBLIC SAFETY:												
Law Enforcement	\$19	0.8%	\$58	2.2%	\$20	0.8%	\$12	0.5%	\$19	0.9%	\$129	1.05%
Fire/Rescue	\$32	1.3%	\$56	2.1%	\$21	0.9%	\$31	1.3%	\$25	1.1%	\$165	1.35%
Jails	\$90	3.7%	\$38	1.4%	\$52	2.1%	\$40	1.6%	\$70	3.2%	\$290	2.37%
Courts	\$34	1.4%	\$62	2.3%	\$64	2.6%	\$14	0.6%	\$11	0.5%	\$186	1.52%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:												
Human Services	\$26	1.1%	\$64	2.4%	\$24	1.0%	\$28	1.2%	\$29	1.3%	\$171	1.39%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$59	2.4%	\$56	2.1%	\$67	2.7%	\$74	3.0%	\$70	3.2%	\$326	2.66%
Parks/Rec.	\$55	2.2%	\$91	3.4%	\$106	4.3%	\$90	3.7%	\$81	3.6%	\$423	3.45%
Libraries	\$16	1.9%	\$57	2.1%	\$19	0.8%	\$17	0.7%	\$13	0.6%	\$151	1.24%
OTHER:	\$107	4.4%	\$99	3.7%	\$104	4.2%	\$91	3.7%	\$113	5.1%	\$515	4.21%

(In Millions of Dollars)

TOTAL:	\$2,457	100.0%	\$2,682	100.0%	\$2,448	100.0%	\$2,432	100.0%	\$2,219	100.0%	\$12,237	100.00%
--------	---------	--------	---------	--------	---------	--------	---------	--------	---------	--------	----------	---------

1) Amount Localities Need:

\$12,237

2) Amount Localities Are Able To Spend:

\$7,734

3) Infrastructure Funding Gap:

---

 \$4,503

36.8% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded

**TABLE 2**  
**INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS THAT WILL BE FUNDED UTILIZING EXISTING REVENUE SOURCES**

	% OF YEAR		% OF YEAR		% OF YEAR		% OF YEAR		% OF YEAR		Five Year Total	% OF TOTAL
	'89-90	89-90	'90-91	90-91	'91-92	91-92	'92-93	92-93	'93-94	93-94		
EDUCATION:	\$192	24.8%	\$422	23.8%	\$416	28.6%	\$247	18.2%	\$291	24.9%	\$1,867	24.1%
ROADS	\$132	21.8%	\$274	15.4%	\$222	15.3%	\$241	17.8%	\$235	20.1%	\$1,403	18.1%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$61	4.1%	\$10	2.3%	\$61	4.2%	\$29	2.1%	\$14	1.2%	\$225	2.9%
PUBLIC WORKS												
Water	\$207	10.5%	\$219	12.3%	\$195	13.4%	\$162	11.9%	\$169	14.4%	\$951	12.3%
Sewer	\$215	10.9%	\$275	15.5%	\$132	9.1%	\$98	7.2%	\$84	7.2%	\$805	10.4%
Other Utilities	\$17	2.4%	\$30	1.7%	\$32	2.2%	\$27	2.0%	\$27	2.3%	\$164	2.1%
Solid Waste	\$76	3.9%	\$47	2.7%	\$36	2.5%	\$259	19.1%	\$48	4.1%	\$467	6.0%
Drainage	\$29	1.5%	\$43	2.4%	\$55	3.8%	\$29	2.2%	\$36	3.0%	\$192	2.5%
PUBLIC SAFETY:												
Law Enforcement	\$13	0.7%	\$58	3.3%	\$6	0.4%	\$10	0.7%	\$9	0.7%	\$97	1.2%
Fire/Rescue	\$32	1.6%	\$32	1.8%	\$19	1.3%	\$25	1.9%	\$17	1.4%	\$125	1.6%
Jails	\$61	3.1%	\$32	1.8%	\$52	3.6%	\$20	1.5%	\$51	4.3%	\$216	2.8%
Courts	\$28	1.4%	\$47	2.7%	\$10	0.7%	\$11	0.8%	\$9	0.8%	\$105	1.4%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:												
Human Services	\$24	1.2%	\$34	1.9%	\$21	1.4%	\$14	1.0%	\$21	1.8%	\$85	1.1%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$42	2.1%	\$40	2.3%	\$42	2.9%	\$52	3.8%	\$38	3.3%	\$214	2.8%
Parks/Rec.	\$49	2.5%	\$50	2.8%	\$67	4.6%	\$54	4.0%	\$62	5.3%	\$282	3.6%
Libraries	\$46	2.3%	\$46	2.6%	\$15	1.0%	\$17	1.3%	\$11	1.0%	\$135	1.7%
OTHER:	\$106	5.3%	\$85	4.8%	\$74	5.1%	\$61	4.5%	\$49	4.2%	\$374	4.8%

(In Millions of Dollars)

TOTAL:	\$1,980	100.0%	\$1,774	100.0%	\$1,455	100.0%	\$1,356	100.0%	\$1,170	100.0%	\$7,734	100.0%
(percent funded)	81.1%		66.9%		60.2%		57.0%		53.5%		64.1%	

- 1) Amount Localities Need: \$12,237
- 2) Amount Localities Are Able To Spend: \$7,734
- 
- 3) Infrastructure Funding Gap: \$4,503
- 36.8% of all needed projects will go unfunded

**TABLE 3**  
**INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS THAT WILL NOT BE FUNDED UTILIZING EXISTING SOURCES**

	% OF YEAR '89-90		% OF YEAR '90-91		% OF YEAR '91-92		% OF YEAR '92-93		% OF YEAR '93-94		Five Year Total	% OF TOTAL
EDUCATION:	\$72	15.1%	\$52	5.7%	\$82	8.3%	\$228	21.2%	\$206	19.6%	\$640	14.21%
ROADS	\$251	52.7%	\$599	66.0%	\$589	59.4%	\$388	36.0%	\$444	42.3%	\$2, 271	50.44%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$2	0.4%	\$40	4.4%	\$23	2.3%	\$45	4.2%	\$59	5.6%	\$169	3.75%
PUBLIC WORKS:												
Water	\$17	3.6%	\$11	1.2%	\$19	1.9%	\$24	2.2%	\$40	3.8%	\$111	2.47%
Sewer	\$18	10.1%	\$0	0.0%	\$60	6.0%	\$89	8.3%	\$101	9.6%	\$298	6.62%
Other Utilities	\$17	3.6%	\$6	0.7%	\$12	1.2%	\$12	1.1%	\$6	0.6%	\$53	1.18%
Solid Waste	\$0	0.0%	\$24	2.6%	\$19	1.9%	\$135	12.5%	\$7	0.7%	\$185	4.11%
Drainage	\$2	0.4%	\$18	2.0%	\$16	1.6%	\$23	2.1%	\$21	2.0%	\$80	1.78%
PUBLIC SAFETY:												
Law Enforcement	\$8	1.3%	\$0	0.0%	\$14	1.4%	\$2	0.2%	\$10	1.0%	\$33	0.73%
Fire/Rescue	\$0	0.0%	\$24	2.6%	\$2	0.2%	\$6	0.6%	\$8	0.8%	\$40	0.89%
Jails	\$29	6.1%	\$6	0.7%	\$0	0.0%	\$20	1.9%	\$19	1.8%	\$74	1.65%
Courts	\$6	1.3%	\$15	1.7%	\$54	5.4%	\$3	0.3%	\$2	0.2%	\$80	1.78%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:												
Human Services	\$2	0.4%	\$30	3.3%	\$3	0.3%	\$14	1.3%	\$8	0.8%	\$57	1.27%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$17	3.6%	\$16	1.8%	\$25	2.5%	\$22	2.0%	\$32	3.1%	\$112	2.49%
Parks/Rec.	\$6	1.3%	\$11	4.5%	\$39	3.9%	\$36	3.3%	\$19	1.8%	\$141	3.13%
Libraries	\$0	0.0%	\$11	1.2%	\$1	0.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$2	0.2%	\$18	0.40%
OTHER:	\$1	0.3%	\$14	1.6%	\$30	3.0%	\$30	2.8%	\$64	6.1%	\$140	3.10%
(In Millions of Dollars)												
TOTAL:	\$477	100.0%	\$908	100.0%	\$992	100.0%	\$1, 077	100.0%	\$1, 049	100.0%	\$4, 503	100.00%

1) Amount Localities Need:

\$12, 237

2) Amount Localities Are Able To Spend:

\$7, 734

3) Infrastructure Funding Gap:

-----  
\$1, 503

36.8% of all needed projects will go unfunded

TABLE 4  
ACTUAL SPENDING FOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS, 1984-1989

	1984-85	% FOR YEAR	1985-86	% FOR YEAR	1986-87	% FOR YEAR	1987-88	% FOR YEAR	1988-89	% FOR YEAR	FIVE YEAR TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
EDUCATION:	\$81	15.6%	\$158	25.1%	\$195	21.6%	\$209	22.1%	\$410	26.2%	\$1,053	23.1%
ROADS	\$68	13.1%	\$78	12.3%	\$145	16.0%	\$130	13.8%	\$194	12.4%	\$615	13.5%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$15	3.0%	\$24	3.8%	\$37	4.1%	\$22	2.3%	\$16	1.0%	\$145	3.2%
PUBLIC WORKS												
Water	\$83	16.0%	\$77	12.1%	\$129	14.2%	\$156	16.5%	\$385	24.6%	\$830	18.2%
Sewer	\$62	11.9%	\$78	12.3%	\$103	11.4%	\$115	12.2%	\$180	11.5%	\$538	11.5%
Other Utilities	\$7	1.3%	\$12	2.0%	\$12	1.3%	\$7	0.7%	\$9	0.6%	\$47	1.0%
Solid Waste	\$5	1.0%	\$5	0.8%	\$9	0.9%	\$7	0.8%	\$7	0.5%	\$33	0.7%
Drainage	\$7	1.4%	\$19	3.0%	\$21	2.3%	\$25	2.6%	\$23	1.5%	\$95	2.1%
PUBLIC SAFETY:												
Law Enforcement	\$5	1.0%	\$3	1.3%	\$22	2.5%	\$7	0.8%	\$9	0.6%	\$52	1.1%
Fire/Rescue	\$3	1.5%	\$3	1.2%	\$9	1.0%	\$10	1.0%	\$51	3.2%	\$85	1.9%
Jails	\$8	1.5%	\$9	1.5%	\$3	0.9%	\$7	0.7%	\$17	1.1%	\$49	1.1%
Courts	\$3	0.6%	\$3	0.5%	\$4	0.5%	\$11	1.2%	\$57	3.7%	\$78	1.7%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:												
Human Services	\$5	0.9%	\$3	0.5%	\$12	1.3%	\$11	1.1%	\$13	0.8%	\$43	1.0%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$33	7.4%	\$13	6.8%	\$10	4.4%	\$74	7.8%	\$56	3.6%	\$251	5.6%
Parks/Rec.	\$28	5.4%	\$25	4.0%	\$13	4.7%	\$89	9.4%	\$50	3.2%	\$235	5.1%
Libraries	\$10	2.0%	\$10	1.5%	\$18	2.0%	\$5	0.6%	\$3	0.5%	\$51	1.1%
OTHER	\$67	10.9%	\$71	11.3%	\$98	10.8%	\$62	6.5%	\$81	5.2%	\$368	8.1%
(In Millions of Dollars)												
TOTAL:	\$518	100.0%	\$631	100.0%	\$905	100.0%	\$946	100.0%	\$1,567	100.0%	\$4,567	100.0%
Percentage Increase Over Previous Year:			+21.8%		+43.4%		+4.5%		+65.6%			

TABLE 5

## LOCALITIES RANKED BY TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN 1988-89

	LOCALITY	AMOUNT SPENT	POPULATION	PER CAPITA SPENDING
1	Fairfax County	\$389,908,000	759,300	\$514
2	Virginia Beach	\$130,172,574	346,300	\$376
3	Arlington County	\$88,000,000	159,000	\$553
4	Henrico County	\$64,031,356	205,200	\$312
5	Newport News	\$63,552,277	162,800	\$390
6	Chesterfield County	\$60,994,803	187,100	\$326
7	Norfolk	\$55,256,000	290,900	\$190
8	Loudoun County	\$48,600,000	75,200	\$646
9	Prince William County	\$45,410,472	194,700	\$233
10	Chesapeake	\$31,681,000	147,100	\$215
11	Mecklenburg County	\$27,154,756	29,700	\$914
12	Richmond	\$23,131,379	214,500	\$108
13	Stafford County	\$22,026,128	55,900	\$394
14	Spotsylvania County	\$19,052,886	44,000	\$433
15	Hampton	\$18,262,700	129,700	\$141
16	James City County	\$17,070,409	32,800	\$520
17	Roanoke	\$12,447,958	98,600	\$126
18	Danville	\$12,244,986	53,700	\$228
19	Greensville County	\$12,195,000	9,200	\$1,326
20	Albemarle County	\$11,563,860	63,200	\$183
21	Portsmouth	\$9,999,740	110,500	\$90
22	Lynchburg	\$9,639,000	69,900	\$138
23	Hopewell	\$9,462,614	24,200	\$391
24	Frederick County	\$8,797,519	39,900	\$220
25	Hanover County	\$7,190,813	59,000	\$122
26	Charlottesville	\$6,672,413	42,100	\$158
27	Fredericksburg	\$6,077,000	21,500	\$283
28	Wise County	\$5,932,000	42,900	\$138
29	Gloucester County	\$5,570,442	30,600	\$182
30	Buchanan County	\$5,487,412	34,200	\$160
31	Russell County	\$5,234,448	31,100	\$168
32	Prince George County	\$4,864,736	27,100	\$180
33	Martinsville	\$4,838,402	18,000	\$269
34	Bedford	\$4,817,813	6,100	\$790
35	Poquoson	\$4,541,565	11,000	\$413
36	Colonial Heights	\$4,327,263	17,500	\$247
37	Williamsburg	\$3,930,033	12,400	\$317
38	Petersburg	\$3,897,794	41,100	\$95
39	Fairfax City	\$3,551,158	20,100	\$177
40	Montgomery County	\$2,732,664	67,000	\$41
41	Norton	\$2,490,250	4,400	\$566

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

TABLE 5. CONTINUED. LOCALITIES RANKED BY TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN 1988-89

42	Prince Edward County	\$1,939,983	17,600	\$110
43	Fauquier County	\$1,917,000	46,100	\$42
44	Wythe County	\$1,913,519	25,600	\$75
45	Floyd County	\$1,778,720	12,000	\$148
46	Falls Church	\$1,742,452	10,100	\$173
47	Alleghany County	\$1,726,500	13,300	\$130
48	Appomattox County	\$1,250,000	12,400	\$101
49	Manassas Park	\$1,197,922	7,300	\$164
50	Halifax County	\$1,000,000	29,400	\$34
51	Galax	\$994,756	6,900	\$144
52	Winchester	\$902,701	22,400	\$40
53	Scott County	\$884,996	25,100	\$35
54	Rappahannock County	\$540,000	6,400	\$84
55	Charles City County	\$302,468	6,600	\$55
56	Southampton County	\$325,283	18,100	\$18
57	Pittsylvania County	\$288,493	55,400	\$5
58	Dinwiddie County	\$250,000	21,100	\$12
59	Richmond County	\$240,976	6,400	\$38
60	Orange County	\$200,000	20,900	\$10
61	Lancaster County	\$60,000	11,000	\$5
62	South Boston	\$25,070	7,000	\$4
63	Nelson County	\$20,000	12,600	\$2



TABLE 6

## LOCALITIES RANKED BY PER CAPITA SPENDING IN 1988-89

	LOCALITY	AMOUNT SPENT	POPULATION	PER CAPITA SPENDING
1	Greensville County	\$12,195,000	9,200	\$1,326
2	Mecklenburg County	\$27,154,756	29,700	\$914
3	Bedford	\$4,817,813	6,100	\$790
4	Loudoun County	\$48,600,000	75,200	\$646
5	Norton	\$2,490,250	4,400	\$566
6	Arlington County	\$88,000,000	159,000	\$553
7	James City County	\$17,070,409	32,800	\$520
8	Fairfax County	\$389,908,000	759,300	\$514
9	Spotsylvania County	\$19,052,886	44,000	\$433
10	Poquoson	\$4,541,565	11,000	\$413
11	Stafford County	\$22,028,128	55,900	\$394
12	Hopewell	\$9,462,614	24,200	\$391
13	Newport News	\$63,552,277	162,800	\$390
14	Virginia Beach	\$130,172,574	346,300	\$376
15	Chesterfield County	\$60,994,803	187,100	\$326
16	Williamsburg	\$3,930,033	12,400	\$317
17	Henrico County	\$4,031,356	205,200	\$312
18	Fredericksburg	\$6,077,000	21,500	\$283
19	Martinsville	\$4,838,402	18,000	\$269
20	Colonial Heights	\$4,327,263	17,500	\$247
21	Prince William County	\$45,410,472	194,700	\$233
22	Danville	\$12,244,986	53,700	\$228
23	Frederick County	\$8,797,519	39,900	\$220
24	Chesapeake	\$31,681,000	147,100	\$215
25	Norfolk	\$55,256,000	290,900	\$190
26	Albemarle County	\$11,563,860	63,200	\$183
27	Gloucester County	\$5,570,442	30,600	\$182
28	Prince George County	\$4,864,736	27,100	\$180
29	Fairfax City	\$3,551,158	20,100	\$177
30	Falls Church	\$1,742,452	10,100	\$173
31	Russell County	\$5,234,448	31,100	\$168
32	Manassas Park	\$1,197,922	7,300	\$164
33	Buchanan County	\$5,487,412	34,200	\$160
34	Charlottesville	\$6,672,413	42,100	\$158
35	Floyd County	\$1,778,720	12,000	\$148
36	Galax	\$994,756	6,900	\$144
37	Hampton	\$18,262,700	129,700	\$141
38	Lynchburg	\$9,639,000	69,900	\$138
39	Wise County	\$5,932,000	42,900	\$138
40	Alleghany County	\$1,726,500	13,300	\$130

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

TABLE D. CONTINUED. LOCALITIES RANKED BY PER CAPITA SPENDING, 1988-89

41	Roanoke	\$12,447,958	98,600	\$126
42	Hanover County	\$7,190,813	59,000	\$122
43	Prince Edward County	\$1,939,983	17,600	\$110
44	Richmond	\$23,131,379	214,500	\$108
45	Appomattox County	\$1,250,000	12,400	\$101
46	Petersburg	\$3,897,794	41,100	\$95
47	Portsmouth	\$9,999,740	110,500	\$90
48	Rappahannock County	\$540,000	6,400	\$84
49	Wythe County	\$1,913,519	25,600	\$75
50	Charles City County	\$362,408	6,600	\$55
51	Fauquier County	\$1,917,000	46,100	\$42
52	Montgomery County	\$2,732,664	67,000	\$41
53	Winchester	\$902,701	22,400	\$40
54	Richmond County	\$240,976	6,400	\$38
55	Scott County	\$884,996	25,100	\$35
56	Halifax County	\$1,000,000	29,400	\$34
57	Southampton County	\$325,283	18,100	\$18
58	Dinwiddie County	\$250,000	21,100	\$12
59	Orange County	\$200,000	20,900	\$10
60	Lancaster County	\$60,000	11,000	\$5
61	Pittsylvania County	\$288,493	55,400	\$5
62	South Boston	\$25,070	7,000	\$4
63	Nelson County	\$20,000	12,600	\$2

TABLE 7

ACTUAL INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDS SPENT IN 1988-89 AND ESTIMATED NEEDS FOR 1989-90, IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS

	Counties	1988-89 (actual)	1989-90 (est.)	Cities	1988-89 (actual)	1989-90 (est.)
1	Ablemarle	\$11.5	\$22	Bedford	\$5	
2	Alleghany	\$2	\$2.8	Charlottesville	\$7	\$6
3	Appomattox	\$1	\$0.4	Chesapeake	\$32	\$159
4	Arlington	\$36	\$24	Colonial Heights	\$4	\$4
5	Botetourt		2	Danville	\$12	\$24
6	Buchanan	\$5.5	\$7	Fairfax City	\$4	\$4
7	Carroll		\$2	Falls Church	\$2	\$3
8	Charles City	\$0.3	\$0.26	Farrardin		\$4
9	Chesterfield	\$61	\$104	Fredericksburg	\$6	\$11
10	Linwiddie	\$3	\$8	Galax	\$6	\$3
11	Essex		\$2	Hampton	18	\$33
12	Fairfax County	\$390	\$649	Hopewell	\$10	\$4
13	Fauquier	\$2	\$13	Lynchburg	\$10	\$67
14	Floyd	\$2	\$2	Manassas		
15	Frederick	\$0	\$32	Manassas Park	\$1	\$5
16	Gloucester	\$6	\$21	Martinsville	\$6	\$6
17	Goochland		\$5	Norton	\$2.5	\$10
18	Greensville	\$12	\$15	Newport News	\$64	\$60
19	Hallfax	\$1		Norfolk	\$55	\$207
20	Hanover	\$7	\$23.7	Petersburg	\$4	\$13.
21	Henrico	\$64	\$188	Poquoson	\$5	\$5
22	James City	\$17	\$27	Portsmouth	\$10	\$12
23	Lancaster	\$0.06	\$8	Richmond	\$23	\$118
24	Loudoun	\$18.6	\$122	Roanoke	\$13	\$12
25	Mecklenburg	\$27	\$26	South Boston	\$025	\$0.4
26	Montgomery	\$3	\$5	Virginia Beach	\$130	\$146
27	Nelson	\$002		Williamsburg	\$3.9	\$4.5
28	Orange	\$2	\$5	Winchester	\$1	\$30
29	Pittsylvania	\$0	\$12			
30	Prince Edward	\$2				
31	Prince George	\$5	\$6			
32	Prince William	\$45	\$182			
33	Russell	\$5.2	\$6.4			
34	Rappahannock	\$0.5	\$6			
35	Richmond	\$0.7	\$0			
36	Scott	\$1	\$2			
37	Southampton	\$32	\$0.8			
38	Spotsylvania	\$19	\$40			
39	Stafford	\$22	\$56			
40	Wise	\$5.9	\$6.1			
41	Wythe	\$1.9	\$14.3			

Note: A blank entry in indicates no response on that item from the locality

TABLE 8

## TOTAL INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS AND PER CAPITA NEEDS FOR 1989-1994

Counties	1989-1994 5 Year Total (in millions)	Per Capita Needs (actual dollars)	Cities	1989-1994 5 Year Total (in millions)	Per Capita Needs (actual dollars)
1 Fairfax County	\$2,603	\$3,430	Norfolk	\$900	\$3,093
2 Prince William	\$1,277	\$6,549	Virginia Beach	\$712	\$1,956
3 Chesterfield	\$618	\$3,305	Chesapeake	\$701	\$4,769
4 Arlington	\$366	\$2,302	Richmond	\$440	\$2,047
5 Henrico	\$345	\$1,683	Lynchburg	\$380	\$5,429
6 Stafford	\$224	\$4,007	Newport News	\$315	\$1,933
7 Spotsylvania	\$220	\$5,000	Portsmouth	\$236	\$2,126
8 Mecklenburg	\$146	\$4,867	Hampton	\$123	\$946
9 Frederick	\$136	\$3,400	Alexandria	\$119	\$1,102
10 Albemarle	\$125	\$1,984	Roanoke	\$115	\$1,162
11 Fauquier	\$116	\$2,522	Danville	\$95	\$1,759
12 Hanover	\$104	\$1,763	Winchester	\$76	\$3,304
13 Gloucester	\$69	\$2,300	Fredericksburg	\$75	\$3,409
14 James City	\$68	\$2,061	Petersburg	\$70	\$1,707
15 Pittsylvania	\$48	\$873	Manassas	\$61	\$2,652
16 Wise	\$48	\$1,116	Falls Church	\$42	\$4,200
17 Montgomery	\$48	\$716	Bedford	\$29	\$4,833
18 Wythe	\$45	\$1,731	Martinsville	\$27	\$1,500
19 Rockingham	\$46	\$821	Manassas Park	\$26	\$3,714
20 Russell	\$42	\$1,355	Fairfax City	\$23	\$1,150
21 Buchanan	\$37	\$1,088	Colonial Heights	\$21	\$1,167
22 Orange	\$24	\$1,143	Poquoson	\$20	\$1,818
23 Fappahannock	\$23	\$3,286	Charlottesville	\$20	\$476
24 Warren	\$22	\$880	Norton	\$15	\$3,333
25 Dinwiddie	\$21	\$1,000	Hopewell	\$13	\$542
26 Southampton	\$20	\$1,111	Franklin	\$12	\$1,500
27 Prince George	\$17	\$630	Galax	\$11	\$1,571
28 Floyd	\$14	\$1,167	Williamsburg	\$9	\$750
29 Botetourt	\$13	\$520	South Boston	\$4	\$571
30 Carroll	\$13	\$464			
31 Halifax	\$11	\$374			
32 Greensville	\$11	\$2,750			
33 Charles City	\$10	\$1,429			
34 Alleghany	\$9	\$692			
35 Goochland	\$9	\$643			
36 Scott	\$9	\$360			
37 Essex	\$8	\$889			
38 Lancaster	\$8	\$727			
39 Prince Edward	\$4.8	\$294			
40 Appomattox	\$4	\$333			
41 Richmond County	\$2	\$270			
42 Nelson	\$1.9	\$158			

TABLE 9

## TOTAL INFRASTRUCTURE GAP FOR SELECTED LOCALITIES, 1989-1994

Counties	1989-1994 5 Year Total (in millions)	Per Capita Gap (actual dollars)	Percentage Gap
1 Fairfax County	\$1,051	\$1,385	40.9%
2 Prince William	\$406	\$2,982	31.0%
3 Chesterfield	\$232	\$1,241	37.0%
4 Henrico	\$53	\$283	16.7%
5 Frederick	\$24	\$600	17.6%
6 Mecklenburg	\$0	\$0	0.0%
7 Fauquier	\$0.5	\$9	7.0%
8 Spotsylvania	\$10	\$227	9.7%
9 Montgomery	\$41	\$612	30.0%
10 Scott	\$0	\$320	87.2%
Cities			
1 Norfolk	\$12	\$2,447	65.2%
2 Chesapeake	\$791	\$1,769	30.0%
3 Virginia Beach	\$277	\$61	43.0%
4 Richmond	\$104	\$484	23.6%
5 Lynchburg	\$380	\$5,429	91.4%
6 Newport News	\$36	\$223	11.4%
7 Portsmouth	\$144	\$1,295	61.0%
8 Hampton	\$47	\$360	38.0%
9 Martinsville	\$0	\$0	0.0%

TABLE 10

## COMPARISON OF INFRASTRUCTURE GAP, LOCAL REVENUE, AND DEBT CAPACITY FOR SELECTED LOCALITIES

Counties	1989-1994	Total	5 Year Gap	Remaining
	5 Year Total Gap	Revenue 1988-89	As a % Of Total Rev. (gap/rev.)	Debt Capacity
1 Fairfax County	\$1,051	\$1,189	88.4%	\$779.3
2 Prince William	\$406	\$216	185.6%	n/a
3 Chesterfield	\$232	\$169	137.5%	\$457.0 (for 1991-99)
4 Henrico	\$58	\$192	30.3%	n/a
5 Frederick	\$24	\$25	96.4%	n/a
6 Mecklenburg	\$0	\$8	0.0%	\$58.0
7 Fauquier	\$0.5	\$32	0.0%	\$2.0
8 Spotsylvania	\$10	\$34	29.8%	n/a
9 Montgomery	\$41	\$23	180.0%	n/a
10 Scott	\$8	\$6	131.4%	n/a
Cities				
1 Norfolk	\$712	\$209	340.7%	\$338.0
2 Chesapeake	\$279	\$124	225.0%	\$0.5
3 Virginia Beach	\$277	\$316	87.7%	\$1,210.0
4 Richmond	\$104	\$271	38.3%	\$464.2
5 Lynchburg	\$420	\$53	798.5%	\$79.5
6 Newport News	\$36	\$130	27.9%	\$356.4
7 Portsmouth	\$144	\$80	180.4%	\$174.9
8 Hampton	\$47	\$99	47.4%	\$296.1
9 Martinsville	\$0	\$11	0.0%	\$73.0

TABLE 11  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, FAIRFAX COUNTY  
(1988-89 Actual = \$389,908,000)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
<i>(In Thousands of Dollars)</i>							
EDUCATION:	\$95,300	\$122,100	\$91,000	\$78,200	\$85,500	\$475,100	18.3%
ROADS:	\$246,800	\$214,000	\$214,000	\$214,000	\$214,000	\$1,102,800	42.4%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$65,100	\$42,600	\$42,600	\$42,600	\$42,600	\$235,500	9.0%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$13,300	\$10,600	\$13,000	\$13,200	\$11,000	\$61,100	2.3%
Sewer	\$33,500	\$51,200	\$40,900	\$44,300	\$30,700	\$199,600	7.3%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.0%
Solid Waste	\$9,200					\$9,200	0.4%
Drainage	\$4,800	\$13,800	\$3,400	\$3,600	\$7,000	\$42,600	1.6%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement		\$26,600				\$26,600	1.0%
Fire/Rescue	\$7,400	\$13,500	\$200	\$200	\$1,100	\$22,400	0.9%
Jails	\$5,200		\$70,900			\$76,100	2.9%
Courts		\$200				\$200	0.0%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services	\$3,500	\$18,000	\$9,300			\$30,800	1.2%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$11,200	\$27,600	\$24,000	\$5,100	\$3,100	\$69,000	2.7%
Parks/Rec.	\$7,200	\$24,700	\$19,400	\$14,700	\$14,700	\$80,700	3.1%
Libraries	\$10,700	\$22,400	\$200			\$33,300	1.3%
OTHER:	\$35,900	\$31,000	\$30,300	\$25,900	\$23,800	\$146,900	5.6%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$549,100</b>	<b>\$618,300</b>	<b>\$664,200</b>	<b>\$437,800</b>	<b>\$433,500</b>	<b>\$2,602,900</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:

\$2,603,000

2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:

\$1,551,800

3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:

\$1,051,200

40.9% of infrastructure needs will go unfunded

TABLE 12  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH  
(1988-89 Actual = \$130,172,574)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
<i>(In Thousands of Dollars)</i>							
EDUCATION:	\$69,261	\$5,305	\$7,274	\$61,102	\$6,634	\$149,576	19.5%
ROADS:	\$32,184	\$140,016	\$182,091	\$29,387	\$27,723	\$411,401	53.6%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$323	\$339	\$320	\$160	\$151	\$1,293	0.2%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$11,736	\$3,458	\$9,262	\$8,960	\$8,953	\$47,369	6.2%
Sewer	\$11,185	\$18,165	\$10,816	\$9,123	\$5,798	\$55,087	7.2%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.0%
Solid Waste	\$1,741	\$172	\$98			\$2,311	0.3%
Drainage	\$5,040	\$3,065	\$7,329	\$12,706	\$9,383	\$42,523	5.5%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement	\$136	\$358	\$1,549	\$1,665	\$107	\$4,115	0.5%
Fire/Rescue	\$2,505	\$166	\$2,025		\$524	\$5,220	0.7%
Jails	\$1,560			\$84		\$1,644	0.2%
Courts	\$1,600	\$1,673				\$3,273	0.4%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services	\$357	\$674				\$1,031	0.1%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$914	\$27	\$544	\$3,213	\$1,365	\$6,063	0.8%
Parks/Rec.	\$2,481	\$1,862	\$1,017	\$2,178	\$2,055	\$12,593	1.6%
Libraries	\$126	\$107	\$824	\$204	\$914	\$2,475	0.3%
OTHER:	\$1,189	\$1,292	\$1,309	\$1,308	\$1,363	\$21,461	2.8%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$145,638</b>	<b>\$189,979</b>	<b>\$230,458</b>	<b>\$133,090</b>	<b>\$68,270</b>	<b>\$767,435</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$767,435					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$435,527					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$331,908	43.1% of infrastructure needs will go unfunded				



TABLE 13  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, CITY OF NORFOLK  
(1988-89 Actual - \$55,256,000)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$18,500	\$18,500	\$18,500	\$18,500	\$18,500	\$92,500	10.3%
ROADS:	\$67,100	\$67,100	\$67,100	\$67,100	\$67,100	\$335,500	37.3%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$10,500	\$10,500	\$10,500	\$10,500	\$10,500	\$52,500	5.8%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$20,000	\$23,600	\$22,200	\$14,800	\$10,000	\$90,600	10.1%
Sewer	\$6,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$26,000	2.9%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.0%
Solid Waste	\$1,000	\$750	\$750			\$2,500	0.3%
Drainage	\$2,400	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$18,400	2.0%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement	\$500					\$500	0.1%
Fire/Rescue	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$5,000	0.6%
Jails	\$39,100	\$5,320	\$5,320	\$5,320	\$5,320	\$60,380	6.7%
Courts						\$0	0.0%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$12,500	1.4%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$5,700	\$5,700	\$5,700	\$5,700	\$5,700	\$33,500	3.7%
Parks/Rec.	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$5,800	\$34,000	3.8%
Libraries	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$5,500	0.6%
OTHER:	\$24,000	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$27,000	\$28,000	\$131,000	14.5%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$207,200</b>	<b>\$177,870</b>	<b>\$176,470</b>	<b>\$171,320</b>	<b>\$167,520</b>	<b>\$900,380</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$900,380					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$179,475					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$720,905	57.8% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded				

TABLE 14  
 1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, CITY OF LYNCHBURG  
 (1988-89 Actual - \$9, 639, 000)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$3, 264	\$3, 023	\$3, 034	\$3, 094	\$3, 439	\$15, 854	4.17%
ROADS	\$16, 000	\$16, 000	\$16, 000	\$16, 000	\$16, 000	\$80, 000	21.03%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$500	\$325	\$100	\$1, 100	\$100	\$2, 125	0.56%
PUBLIC WORKS							
Water	\$4, 814	\$3, 750	\$4, 836	\$3, 350	\$3, 250	\$20, 000	5.26%
Sewer	\$30, 300	\$26, 500	\$26, 500	\$27, 740	\$38, 800	\$149, 840	39.39%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste	\$500	\$7, 500	\$7, 500		\$5, 000	\$20, 600	5.42%
Drainage	\$2, 500	\$2, 500	\$2, 500	\$2, 500	\$2, 500	\$12, 500	3.29%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement				\$1, 000	\$5, 000	\$6, 000	1.58%
Fire/Rescue	\$620	\$580	\$500	\$589	\$881	\$3, 370	0.89%
Jails	\$500	\$2, 500	\$2, 500	\$2, 500	\$2, 700	\$10, 700	2.81%
Courts		\$1, 000	\$2, 000	\$2, 000	\$500	\$5, 500	1.45%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services	\$500	\$2, 500	\$2, 500	\$2, 500	\$2, 500	\$10, 500	2.76%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$1, 500	\$1, 500	\$1, 500	\$2, 250	\$1, 500	\$8, 250	2.17%
Parks/Rec.	\$2, 680	\$2, 754	\$2, 681	\$2, 673	\$2, 585	\$13, 373	3.52%
Libraries					\$500	\$500	0.13%
OTHER	\$3, 399	\$1, 878	\$1, 500	\$1, 500	\$7, 000	\$21, 277	5.59%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$67, 377</b>	<b>\$72, 310</b>	<b>\$76, 651</b>	<b>\$71, 796</b>	<b>\$92, 255</b>	<b>\$380, 389</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$380, 389					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$39, 524					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$340, 865					

89.61% of all infrastructure projects will go unfunded

TABLE 15  
 1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, CHESTERFIELD COUNTY  
 (1988-89 Actual - \$60,994,893)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$39,600	\$50,800	\$65,400	\$18,700	\$15,400	\$219,900	35.58%
ROADS	\$29,200	\$33,750	\$31,550	\$30,550	\$30,850	\$155,900	25.22%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:		\$780	\$780	\$780	\$780	\$3,120	0.50%
PUBLIC WORKS							
Water	\$12,156	\$27,894	\$5,218	\$4,850	\$1,670	\$54,788	8.86%
Sewer	\$12,054	\$52,553	\$12,715	\$1,300	\$1,700	\$86,322	13.97%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste		\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000		\$3,000	0.49%
Drainage	\$100	\$100	\$200	\$200	\$3,200	\$3,800	0.61%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement	\$3,737	\$1,898	\$720		\$1,098	\$11,453	1.85%
Fire/Rescue	\$161	\$1,856		\$2,969	\$2,759	\$8,048	1.30%
Jails	\$200		\$996		\$14,220	\$15,416	2.49%
Courts						\$0	0.00%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services	\$1,555	\$19,140				\$20,695	3.35%
Other Gen. Govt.		\$8,000		\$1,000	\$1,000	\$10,000	1.62%
Parks/Rec.	\$4,736	\$315	\$257	\$7,574	\$2,569	\$12,981	2.10%
Libraries	\$3,517	\$3,225	\$2,042	\$2,163	\$1,402	\$12,379	2.00%
OTHER		\$10		\$286		\$326	0.05%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$194,349</b>	<b>\$203,881</b>	<b>\$120,878</b>	<b>\$24,372</b>	<b>\$114,648</b>	<b>\$618,128</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$618,128					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$385,700					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$232,420	37% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded				

TABLE 16  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, CITY OF PORTSMOUTH  
(1988-89 Actual - \$9,999,740)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$3,860	\$5,975				\$9,835	4.17%
ROADS	\$2,520	\$87,600	\$3,870	\$3,440	\$2,580	\$100,010	42.43%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$220	\$50	\$100	\$650	\$1,050	\$2,270	0.96%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$400	\$1,940	\$20,440	\$5,830	\$3,220	\$31,900	13.53%
Sewer	\$1,560	\$300	\$1,800	\$300	\$300	\$4,260	1.81%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste		\$1,150	\$1,150	\$1,150	\$1,000	\$4,450	1.89%
Drainage	\$100	\$1,400	\$1,750	\$1,400	\$300	\$5,250	2.23%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement			\$3,000			\$3,000	3.39%
Fire/Rescue	\$250	\$1,249	\$7	\$225	\$242	\$2,013	0.85%
Jails	\$75		\$26,000			\$26,075	11.06%
Courts			\$19,000			\$19,000	8.06%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services						\$0	0.00%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$590	\$520	\$1,780	\$990	\$990	\$7,870	3.34%
Parks/Recreation	\$710	\$710	\$710	\$710	\$710	\$3,550	1.51%
Libraries				\$100	\$100	\$500	0.21%
OTHER:	\$1,750	\$2,825	\$1,753	\$2,700	\$1,700	\$10,728	4.55%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$12,435</b>	<b>\$103,689</b>	<b>\$39,400</b>	<b>\$17,995</b>	<b>\$12,192</b>	<b>\$235,711</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$235,711					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$91,905					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$143,806					

61.0% of all infrastructure projects will go unfunded

TABLE 17  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY  
(1988-89 Actual = \$15,410,472)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$16,072	\$16,807	\$66,424	\$11,547	\$25,751	\$166,601	13.0%
ROADS:	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	35.2%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$1,800	\$6,175	\$6,401	\$182	\$186	\$14,744	1.2%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$11,889	\$6,823	\$9,805	\$12,642	\$13,106	\$54,265	4.2%
Sewer	\$4,725	\$20,070	\$17,500	\$14,919	\$14,087	\$91,301	7.1%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.0%
Solid Waste	\$20,500	\$16,000	\$13,000	\$210,000	\$6,000	\$265,500	20.8%
Drainage	\$720	\$2,451	\$1,656	\$2,457	\$2,377	\$11,661	0.9%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement	\$1,475		\$2,717	\$1,524		\$3,716	0.7%
Fire/Rescue	\$1,275	\$1,255		\$7,710	\$6,285	\$18,525	1.5%
Jails	\$1,300	\$9,800	\$16,293	\$1,195	\$17,236	\$78,824	6.2%
Courts			\$28,742			\$28,742	2.3%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services		\$240	\$2,981	\$925	\$1,777	\$5,923	0.5%
Other Gen. Govt.		\$1,300	\$2,604	\$2,464	\$1,758	\$11,126	2.4%
Parks/Rec.	\$1,255	\$2,050	\$17,604	\$2,919	\$15,505	\$39,333	3.1%
Libraries	\$6,350	\$630	\$5,919			\$11,829	0.9%
OTHER:						\$0	0.0%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$182,361</b>	<b>\$173,501</b>	<b>\$283,676</b>	<b>\$111,481</b>	<b>\$226,068</b>	<b>\$1,277,090</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$1,277,090					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$871,339					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$405,751	31.7% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded				

**TABLE 18**  
**1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS (CITY OF RICHMOND)**  
 (1988-89 Actual - \$23,131,379)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
<i>(In Thousands of Dollars)</i>							
EDUCATION:	\$7,713	\$7,432	\$12,034	\$9,337	\$10,090	\$46,606	10.55%
ROADS	\$3,041	\$1,805	\$3,135	\$2,836	\$2,686	\$13,503	3.06%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$1,888	\$1,910	\$1,511	\$546	\$1,581	\$7,469	1.69%
<b>PUBLIC WORKS</b>							
Water	\$18,112	\$20,865	\$21,344	\$17,257	\$9,260	\$89,838	20.31%
Sewer	\$760	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,100	\$5,010	1.13%
Other Utilities	\$58,725	\$30,865	\$33,065	\$27,726	\$27,737	\$178,118	40.31%
Solid Waste					\$2,000	\$2,000	0.45%
Drainage	\$2,900	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$6,900	1.56%
<b>PUBLIC SAFETY:</b>							
Law Enforcement	\$1,670				\$70	\$1,740	1.07%
Fire/Rescue	\$1,250	\$1,350	\$1,110			\$3,710	0.84%
Jails	\$2,603	\$56			\$8,135	\$11,294	2.56%
Courts	\$1,340	\$11,272				\$12,612	2.86%
<b>GENERAL GOVERNMENT:</b>							
Human Services	\$919	\$610	\$3,169	\$199		\$4,888	1.11%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$1,529	\$1,780	\$2,316	\$2,538	\$2,810	\$13,973	3.30%
Parks/Rec.	\$2,147	\$2,925	\$2,022	\$1,250	\$650	\$8,994	2.04%
Libraries	\$1,095	\$667	\$511	\$675	\$100	\$5,078	1.38%
OTHER	\$3,132	\$6,738	\$7,950	\$1,092	\$1,918	\$20,860	4.72%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$119,815</b>	<b>\$93,825</b>	<b>\$93,280</b>	<b>\$65,506</b>	<b>\$69,167</b>	<b>\$441,593</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:

\$441,593

2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:

\$337,402

3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:

\$104,191

23.6% of all infrastructure projects will go unfunded

TABLE 19  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, CITY OF CHESAPEAKE  
(1988-89 Actual = \$31,681,000)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
<hr/>							
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$56,652	\$31,127	\$19,574	\$44,290	\$8,913	\$160,556	22.89%
ROADS:	\$68,677	\$68,677	\$68,677	\$68,677	\$68,677	\$343,385	48.96%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$7,441	\$36,079	\$17,887	\$14,540	\$5,043	\$80,990	11.55%
Sewer	\$11,511	\$114	\$2,457	\$650	\$135	\$15,467	2.21%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste						\$0	0.00%
Drainage	\$1,915	\$2,228	\$2,776	\$626	\$494	\$8,039	1.15%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement	\$149	\$1,399	\$109			\$1,957	0.28%
Fire/Rescue	\$649	\$3,482	\$2,962	\$1,133	\$1,408	\$12,634	1.80%
Jails	\$775					\$775	0.11%
Courts					\$2,246	\$2,246	0.32%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services		\$11,600				\$11,600	1.65%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$1,663	\$3,316	\$3,991	\$6,388	\$1,672	\$25,060	3.57%
Parks/Rec.	\$3,617	\$1,728	\$3,067	\$1,717	\$3,160	\$18,319	2.61%
Libraries		\$10,650			\$2,000	\$12,650	1.80%
OTHER:	\$2,423	\$1,292	\$1,316	\$1,342	\$1,369	\$7,742	1.10%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$158,802</b>	<b>\$172,022</b>	<b>\$132,816</b>	<b>\$139,363</b>	<b>\$98,417</b>	<b>\$701,420</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$701,420					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$422,318					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$279,102					

39.8% of all infrastructure projects will go unfunded

TABLE 20  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, HENRICO COUNTY  
(1988-89 Actual - \$64,031,356)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
<hr/>							
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$10,707	\$2,144				\$12,851	12.41%
ROADS:	\$33,667	\$6,131	\$5,034	\$1,654	\$5,680	\$55,166	15.97%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$15,924	\$19,958	\$1,390	\$1,390	\$2,391	\$71,053	20.57%
Sewer	\$23,139	\$8,345	\$845	\$845	\$5,817	\$58,991	17.08%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste	\$11,745	\$2,502		\$2,107		\$16,354	4.73%
Drainage	\$3,416	\$5,496	\$6,234	\$6,385	\$3,027	\$29,558	8.56%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement	\$575		\$1,618			\$5,193	1.50%
Fire/Rescue	\$1,766	\$1,077	\$1,623		\$234	\$8,700	2.52%
Jails	\$25	\$85	\$15			\$1,225	0.35%
Courts	\$2,159	\$1,920	\$98			\$1,177	1.21%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services	\$1,814	\$197	\$382	\$103	\$125	\$6,521	1.89%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$2,516	\$1,661	\$715	\$234		\$5,126	1.48%
Parks/Rec.	\$3,272	\$5,284	\$6,938	\$1,413	\$7,526	\$32,433	9.39%
Libraries	\$1,192	\$1,254				\$1,446	1.29%
OTHER:	\$3,619					\$3,619	1.05%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$187,536</b>	<b>\$78,854</b>	<b>\$28,492</b>	<b>\$20,431</b>	<b>\$30,100</b>	<b>\$345,413</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$345,413					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$287,697	16.7% of all infrastructure projects will go unfunded				
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$57,716					



TABLE 21  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, CITY OF HAMPTON  
(1988-89 Actual - \$18,262,700)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$1,650	\$1,680	\$1,675	\$1,550	\$1,250	\$7,805	6.32%
ROADS	\$3,010	\$6,990	\$2,000	\$2,400	\$5,800	\$15,200	36.63%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS							
Water	\$221		\$21		\$133	\$375	0.30%
Sewer	\$2,080					\$2,080	1.69%
Other Utilities	\$35					\$35	0.07%
Solid Waste						\$0	0.00%
Drainage						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement	\$350		\$517			\$867	0.70%
Fire/Rescue	\$741	\$801	\$1,015	\$953	\$930	\$4,443	3.60%
Jails	\$180			\$75	\$675	\$930	0.75%
Courts	\$5,850			\$65	\$287	\$6,202	5.03%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT							
Human Services	\$68					\$68	0.06%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$355	\$1,749	\$799	\$590	\$180	\$4,173	3.38%
Parks/Rec.	\$5,810	\$3,895	\$5,218	\$1,326	\$1,091	\$27,370	22.18%
Libraries	\$30					\$30	0.06%
OTHER	\$5,780	\$1,947	\$5,131	\$5,017	\$1,851	\$23,726	19.23%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$32,763</b>	<b>\$15,062</b>	<b>\$18,406</b>	<b>\$14,976</b>	<b>\$12,197</b>	<b>\$123,404</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$123,404					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$76,559					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$46,845					

38.0% of all infrastructure projects will go unfunded

TABLE 22  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS - CITY OF NEWPORT NEWS  
(1988-89 Actual = \$63,552,277)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$12,463	\$1,470	\$0,724	\$50,657	15.94%
ROADS:	\$3,900	\$7,850	\$7,300	\$7,000	\$1,000	\$37,050	11.66%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$1,500	\$1,000	\$1,600	\$1,800	\$1,000	\$6,900	2.17%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$18,423	\$22,100	\$21,775	\$25,130	\$12,440	\$129,868	40.87%
Sewer	\$2,250	\$2,115	\$3,225	\$3,975	\$2,810	\$14,405	4.53%
Other Utilities	\$500	\$2,600	\$1,700	\$500	\$500	\$5,800	1.83%
Solid Waste	\$0,375	\$550	\$500	\$550	\$1,300	\$15,375	4.81%
Drainage	\$1,800	\$1,000	\$3,600	\$3,525	\$1,800	\$11,725	3.69%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement					\$1,400	\$1,400	0.44%
Fire/Rescue	\$100	\$1,100	\$000	\$175		\$2,275	0.72%
Jails	\$500	\$500				\$1,300	0.41%
Courts	\$1,500	\$500	\$200			\$2,300	0.72%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services	\$230			\$500	\$500	\$1,230	0.39%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$2,390	\$2,075	\$2,350	\$1,500	\$2,235	\$10,550	3.32%
Parks/Rec.	\$2,375	\$500	\$1,500	\$000	\$1,900	\$7,175	2.26%
Libraries			\$500	\$1,200	\$600	\$2,800	0.88%
OTHER:	\$635	\$1,750	\$3,200	\$5,060	\$5,300	\$16,945	5.33%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$60,478</b>	<b>\$64,170</b>	<b>\$61,113</b>	<b>\$61,285</b>	<b>\$80,709</b>	<b>\$317,755</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$317,755					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$281,460					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$36,295					

11.4% of all infrastructure projects will go unfunded

TABLE 23  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, MONTGOMERY COUNTY  
(1988-89 Actual - \$2,732,664)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
<i>(In Thousands of Dollars)</i>							
EDUCATION:	\$1,989	\$5,706	\$1,038	\$2,462	\$1,815	\$20,010	42.81%
ROADS:	\$1,500	\$1,512	\$2,598	\$2,255	\$2,010	\$9,875	21.13%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$101	\$522	\$857	\$114	\$147	\$2,041	4.37%
Sewer	\$302	\$1,170	\$501	\$2,495	\$242	\$5,110	10.93%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste	\$14		\$500			\$514	1.31%
Drainage						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement						\$0	0.00%
Fire/Rescue	\$400		\$500		\$500	\$1,300	2.78%
Jails	\$26			\$20		\$46	0.10%
Courts						\$0	0.00%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services				\$1,900		\$1,900	4.07%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$520	\$8	\$228	\$1,008	\$8	\$1,772	3.79%
Parks/Rec.	\$100	\$100	\$1,900	\$150	\$100	\$2,950	6.31%
Libraries	\$18		\$1,101			\$1,119	2.39%
OTHER:						\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$5,170</b>	<b>\$9,618</b>	<b>\$16,423</b>	<b>\$10,404</b>	<b>\$5,122</b>	<b>\$46,737</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$16,737					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$4,845					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$12,017	90% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded				

TABLE 24  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, FREDERICK COUNTY  
(1988-89 Actual = \$3,797,519)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
<hr/>							
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$6,500	\$3,550	\$7,900	\$13,200	\$16,100	\$52,250	38.37%
ROADS:	\$9,893	\$12,600	\$11,383	\$11,455	\$13,523	\$58,859	43.22%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$100	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$300	0.22%
Sewer	\$100	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$300	0.22%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste						\$0	0.00%
Drainage						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement						\$0	0.00%
Fire/Rescue		\$35	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$125	0.09%
Jails	\$15,600					\$15,600	11.46%
Courts						\$0	0.00%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services						\$0	0.00%
Other Gen. Govt.		\$1,750	\$2,000			\$3,750	2.75%
Parks/Rec.		\$780	\$880	\$1,770	\$1,360	\$4,790	3.52%
Libraries				\$100	\$100	\$200	0.15%
OTHER:						\$0	0.00%
 TOTAL:	 \$32,198	 \$18,815	 \$22,293	 \$31,655	 \$31,213	 \$136,174	 100.00%
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$136,174					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$112,174	17.6% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded				
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$24,000					

TABLE 25  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, SPOTSYLVANIA COUNTY  
(1988-89 Actual = \$19,052,886)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$9,759	\$11,138	\$19,907	\$21,740	\$12,785	\$75,329	34.24%
ROADS	\$16,755	\$16,755	\$16,755	\$16,755	\$16,755	\$83,775	38.07%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$9,335	\$6,203	\$6,475	\$6,150	\$6,825	\$33,988	15.45%
Sewer						\$0	0.00%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste	\$1,445	\$2,982	\$2,940	\$2,050	\$1,840	\$11,257	5.12%
Drainage						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement						\$0	0.00%
Fire/Rescue	\$390	\$387	\$1,278	\$650	\$570	\$3,775	1.72%
Jails						\$0	0.00%
Courts	\$1,000	\$3,000	\$1,500			\$5,500	2.50%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services						\$0	0.00%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$382	\$656	\$50		\$1,000	\$2,088	0.95%
Parks/Rec.	\$738	\$137	\$659	\$638	\$750	\$2,822	1.28%
Libraries	\$360	\$150	\$1,050			\$1,500	0.68%
OTHER:						\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$40,404</b>	<b>\$41,908</b>	<b>\$49,614</b>	<b>\$47,883</b>	<b>\$40,525</b>	<b>\$220,034</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$220,034					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$118,070					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$101,964	46.1% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded				

TABLE 26  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, SCOTT COUNTY  
(1988-89 Actual - \$884, 996)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$295	\$1, 817	\$240	\$150	\$90	\$2, 592	29.97%
ROADS:						\$0	0.00%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$1, 280		\$1, 200			\$2, 480	28.67%
Sewer					\$2, 500	\$2, 500	28.90%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste		\$45	\$100	\$500		\$645	7.46%
Drainage:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement						\$0	0.00%
Fire/Rescue						\$0	0.00%
Jails		\$50	\$50			\$100	1.16%
Courts						\$0	0.00%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services	\$13	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$80	\$333	3.85%
Other Gen. Govt.						\$0	0.00%
Parks/Rec.						\$0	0.00%
Libraries						\$0	0.00%
OTHER:						\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$1, 588</b>	<b>\$1, 992</b>	<b>\$1, 670</b>	<b>\$730</b>	<b>\$2, 670</b>	<b>\$8, 650</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$3, 650					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$1, 100					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$7, 550	87.2% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded				

TABLE 27  
 1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, FAUQUIER COUNTY  
 (1988-89 Actual = \$1,917,000)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
<hr/>							
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$6,000	\$27,500				\$33,500	28.85%
ROADS:						\$0	0.00%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$648	\$1,000	\$2,500	\$2,000	\$7,000	\$16,148	13.91%
Sewer	\$156	\$6,500	\$1,000	\$2,500	\$30,000	\$40,456	34.84%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste		\$1,500	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$7,500	6.46%
Drainage						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement				\$1,500	\$1,000	\$2,500	2.15%
Fire/Rescue						\$0	0.00%
Jails			\$3,000	\$3,000		\$6,000	5.17%
Courts						\$0	0.00%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services	\$6,500					\$6,500	5.60%
Other Gen. Govt.		\$1,000		\$1,000	\$1,000	\$3,000	2.58%
Parks/Rec.						\$0	0.00%
Libraries			\$500			\$500	0.43%
OTHER:						\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$13,604</b>	<b>\$40,500</b>	<b>\$9,000</b>	<b>\$12,000</b>	<b>\$11,000</b>	<b>\$116,104</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$116,104					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$67,500					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$48,604					

41.9% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded

TABLE 28  
 1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, MECKLENBURG COUNTY  
 (1988-89 Actual = \$27,154,756)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
<hr/>							
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$20,937	\$21,240	\$22,514	\$23,865	\$25,297	\$112,953	77.43%
ROADS						\$0	0.00%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS							
Water						\$0	0.00%
Sewer						\$0	0.00%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste	\$401	\$425	\$451	\$478	\$506	\$2,261	1.55%
Drainage						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement	\$855	\$907	\$961	\$1,019	\$1,080	\$4,822	3.31%
Fire/Rescue	\$234	\$248	\$263	\$279	\$296	\$1,320	0.90%
Jails	\$520	\$552	\$585	\$620	\$657	\$2,934	2.01%
Courts	\$23	\$24	\$26	\$28	\$29	\$130	0.09%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services	\$1,437	\$1,524	\$1,615	\$1,712	\$1,815	\$8,103	5.55%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$2,256	\$2,392	\$2,535	\$2,687	\$2,849	\$12,719	8.72%
Parks/Rec.						\$0	0.00%
Libraries	\$112	\$119	\$126	\$134	\$142	\$633	0.43%
OTHER:						\$0	0.00%
TOTAL:	\$25,875	\$27,431	\$29,076	\$30,822	\$32,671	\$145,875	100.00%
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$145,875					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$145,875	Will be able to fund all of its infrastructure needs				
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$0					



TABLE 29  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS - CITY OF MARTINSVILLE  
(1988-89 Actual = \$1, 838, 402)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$995	\$1, 195	\$1, 395	\$1, 595	\$1, 650	\$6, 830	25.53%
ROADS:	\$1, 250	\$1, 300	\$1, 325	\$1, 325	\$1, 325	\$6, 525	24.39%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$1, 135	\$660	\$660	\$660	\$660	\$3, 775	14.11%
Sewer	\$1, 760	\$3, 590	\$25	\$25	\$25	\$6, 925	25.88%
Other Utilities	\$250		\$250	\$250	\$250	\$1, 000	3.74%
Solid Waste	\$50	\$100	\$250	\$100	\$500	\$1, 300	4.86%
Drainage						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement	\$65	\$30				\$95	0.36%
Fire/Rescue				\$300		\$300	1.12%
Jails						\$0	0.00%
Courts						\$0	0.00%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services						\$0	0.00%
Other Gen. Govt.						\$0	0.00%
Parks/Rec.			\$7			\$7	0.03%
Libraries						\$0	0.00%
OTHER:						\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$5, 505</b>	<b>\$6, 875</b>	<b>\$1, 412</b>	<b>\$3, 055</b>	<b>\$4, 910</b>	<b>\$26, 757</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$26, 757					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$26, 757	Will be able to fund all of its infrastructure projects				
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$0					

TABLE 30  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, STAFFORD COUNTY  
(1988-89 Actual = \$22,026,128)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$14,698	\$12,807	\$19,566	\$13,665	\$6,591	\$67,327	30.09%
ROADS	\$3,178	\$10,599		\$255		\$14,032	6.27%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$664	\$1,185	\$596	\$707	\$634	\$3,786	1.69%
PUBLIC WORKS							
Water	\$6,867	\$10,209	\$5,860	\$628	\$10,663	\$34,227	15.30%
Sewer	\$18,799	\$7,249	\$5,752	\$7,050	\$200	\$39,050	17.45%
Other Utilities	\$80	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$150	\$389	0.17%
Solid Waste	\$838	\$3,450	\$247	\$2,546		\$7,081	3.16%
Drainage						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement						\$0	0.00%
Fire/Rescue						\$0	0.00%
Jails		\$3,800				\$3,800	1.70%
Courts			\$4,000			\$4,000	1.79%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services		\$211				\$211	0.09%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$10,206					\$10,206	4.56%
Parks/Rec.	\$561	\$440	\$1,905	\$2,327	\$1,203	\$6,436	2.88%
Libraries		\$3,000		\$800		\$3,800	1.70%
OTHER					\$29,404	\$29,404	13.14%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$55,900</b>	<b>\$53,000</b>	<b>\$37,976</b>	<b>\$28,028</b>	<b>\$48,845</b>	<b>\$223,749</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$223,749					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$193,682					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$30,067					13.4% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded

TABLE 31  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, CITY OF ROANOKE  
(1988-89 Actual = \$12, 447, 958)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$2,735	\$2,640	\$2,460	\$3,200	\$1,500	\$12,535	10.95%
ROADS	\$1,083	\$12,057	\$10,092	\$10,092		\$34,224	29.90%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS							
Water	\$1,610					\$1,610	1.41%
Sewer	\$122					\$122	0.37%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste						\$0	0.00%
Drainage	\$3,052	\$9,962	\$27,179	\$3,976		\$44,169	38.59%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement						\$0	0.00%
Fire/Rescue	\$130					\$130	0.38%
Jails						\$0	0.00%
Courts						\$0	0.00%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services	\$2					\$2	0.00%
Other Gen. Govt.						\$0	0.00%
Parks/Rec.	\$83	\$230	\$367			\$680	0.59%
Libraries						\$0	0.00%
OTHER	\$2,169	\$902	\$16,618	\$700		\$20,389	17.81%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$11,586</b>	<b>\$26,691</b>	<b>\$56,716</b>	<b>\$17,968</b>	<b>\$1,500</b>	<b>\$114,461</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$114,461					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$114,461					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$0					0.0% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded

TABLE 33  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, JAMES CITY COUNTY  
(1988-89 Actual = \$17,070,409)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
<hr/>							
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$22,316	\$13,733	\$727	\$218	\$1,501	\$38,495	56.87%
ROADS	\$280	\$301	\$294	\$324	\$366	\$1,565	2.31%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS:							
Water	\$2,416	\$1,520	\$3,023	\$2,120	\$1,937	\$11,016	16.27%
Sewer	\$565	\$1,750	\$175	\$135	\$75	\$2,900	4.28%
Other Utilities						\$0	0.00%
Solid Waste		\$400		\$180	\$530	\$1,110	1.64%
Drainage						\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement	\$120				\$250	\$370	0.55%
Fire/Rescue					\$250	\$250	0.37%
Jails						\$0	0.00%
Courts		\$100	\$3,000	\$300		\$3,400	5.02%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services						\$0	0.00%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$231					\$231	0.34%
Parks/Rec.	\$202	\$790	\$171	\$3,321	\$825	\$5,309	7.84%
Libraries	\$145	\$180	\$2,248			\$2,873	4.24%
OTHER	\$170					\$170	0.25%
TOTAL:	\$26,445	\$19,074	\$9,838	\$6,598	\$5,734	\$67,689	100.00%
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$67,689					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$67,688					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$1					0.0% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded

TABLE 34  
1989-94 INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, CITY OF DANVILLE  
(1988-89 Actual = \$12,244,986)

	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	5 Year Total	% OF TOTAL
<hr/>							
(In Thousands of Dollars)							
EDUCATION:	\$8,000					\$8,000	8.41%
ROADS	\$5,656	\$5,965	\$7,840	\$9,565	\$7,809	\$36,835	38.75%
OTHER TRANSPORTATION:	\$209	\$200	\$364	\$381		\$1,154	1.21%
PUBLIC WORKS							
Water	\$3,203	\$1,984	\$1,511	\$1,915	\$1,592	\$10,205	10.73%
Sewer	\$2,430	\$12,103	\$2,481	\$1,046	\$967	\$19,027	20.01%
Other Utilities	\$629	\$264	\$731	\$1,433	\$160	\$3,517	3.70%
Solid Waste	\$100	\$1,215	\$786	\$100	\$100	\$2,301	2.42%
Drainage	\$415	\$450	\$150	\$250	\$250	\$1,515	1.59%
PUBLIC SAFETY:							
Law Enforcement						\$0	0.00%
Fire/Rescue	\$362	\$277	\$120	\$140		\$899	0.95%
Jails						\$0	0.00%
Courts	\$130					\$130	0.14%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT:							
Human Services						\$0	0.00%
Other Gen. Govt.	\$707	\$671	\$673	\$776	\$850	\$3,677	3.87%
Parks/Rec.	\$404	\$546	\$264	\$240	\$750	\$2,204	2.32%
Libraries				\$72		\$72	0.08%
OTHER:	\$1,538	\$1,795	\$1,550	\$300	\$350	\$5,533	5.82%
TOTAL:	\$23,783	\$25,470	\$16,470	\$16,218	\$13,128	\$95,069	100.00%
1) TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED:		\$95,069					
2) AMOUNT THEY ARE ABLE TO SPEND:		\$76,187					
3) INFRASTRUCTURE GAP:		\$18,882		19.9% of all infrastructure needs will go unfunded			

## **APPENDIX F**

### **Infrastructure Data According to Type of Locality**

TABLE A

## I. High Growth Localities

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>VIRGINIA BEACH</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	43%
Population:	346,300
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	N/A
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.98
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.78
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Roads: \$214 million
Second Largest:	Drainage: \$27 million
Third Largest:	Sewer: \$19.9 million
Fourth Largest:	Water: \$15 million
Largest Four Total:	\$275.9 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$277 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	99.5%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$364 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$1,210 million</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AA</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>FAIRFAX COUNTY</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	40.9%
Population:	759,300
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	2.2%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	1.19
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	1.02
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Roads: \$895.9 million
Second Largest:	Other Transportation: \$95.5 million
Third Largest:	Other General Government: \$41 million
Fourth Largest:	OTHER: \$18.1 million
Largest Four Total:	\$1050.5 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$1051.2 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	99.9%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$774 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$779 million; no debt ceiling; determined by referendum</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AAA</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>CHESTERFIELD COUNTY</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	37%
Population:	187,100
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	4%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	1.04
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.89
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Roads: \$140.4 million
Second Largest:	Education: \$60.22 million
Third Largest:	Jails: \$15.2 million
Fourth Largest:	Human Services: \$15 million
Largest Four Total:	\$230.82 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$232.4 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	99%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$320 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AAA</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	31%
Population:	226,375
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	3.2%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	1.38
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	1.26
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Roads: \$326.7 million
Second Largest:	Solid Waste: \$32 million
Third Largest:	Courts: \$28.4 million
Fourth Largest:	Libraries: \$7.6 million
Largest Four Total:	\$394.7 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$405.8 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	97%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$150 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AA</b>

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>CHESAPEAKE</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	30%
Population:	147,100
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	N/A
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	1.23
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.89
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Roads: \$218.3 million
Second Largest:	Parks/Recreation: \$16 million
Third Largest:	Other General Government: \$15.9 million
Fourth Largest:	Fire/Rescue: \$9.7 million
Largest Four Total:	\$259.9 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$279.1 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	93%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$134 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$449 million</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AA</b>

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>HENRICO COUNTY</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	3%
Population:	205,200
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	7.2%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.98
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.80
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Law Enforcement: \$12.6 million
Second Largest:	Libraries: \$2.2 million
Third Largest:	Roads: \$1 million
Fourth Largest:	N/A
Largest Four Total:	\$15.8 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$15.8 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	100%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$176 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AAA</b>



---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>SPOTSYLVANIA COUNTY</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	46%
Population:	44,000
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	5%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.80
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.58
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Roads: \$83.8 million
Second Largest:	Education: \$9.7 million
Third Largest:	Water: \$7.7 million
Fourth Largest:	Solid Waste: \$.4 million
Largest Four Total:	\$101.6 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$101.9 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	99.7%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$58 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>A</b>

---

## II. Central City / County

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>NORFOLK</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	57.8%
Population:	290,900
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	.9%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	1.35
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	1.03
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Roads: \$221.8 million
Second Largest:	OTHER: \$81.4 million
Third Largest:	Education: \$42.4 million
Fourth Largest:	Other Transportation: \$34.3 million
Largest Four Total:	\$307.9 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$520.9 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	59%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$259 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$338 million</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AA</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>LYNCHBURG</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	90%
Population:	69,900
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	4%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	1.18
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	1.04
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Sewer: \$140 million
Second Largest:	Roads: \$53.5 million
Third Largest:	Solid Waste: \$20.3 million
Fourth Largest:	OTHER: \$15.9 million
Largest Four Total:	\$229.7 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$340.9 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	67%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$74.6 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$79.5 million</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AA</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>PORTSMOUTH</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	61%
Population:	110,500
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	2.7%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	1.32
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	1.04
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Roads: \$86 million
Second Largest:	Jails: \$26 million
Third Largest:	Courts: \$19 million
Fourth Largest:	Law Enforcement: \$6 million
Largest Four Total:	\$137 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$144 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	95%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$110 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$175 million</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>A 1</b>

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>RICHMOND</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	24%
Population:	214,500
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	-.05
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	1.53
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	1.35
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Other Utilities: \$46 million
Second Largest:	Water: \$23 million
Third Largest:	Education: \$22.4 million
Fourth Largest:	Other General Government: \$8 million
Largest Four Total:	\$99.4 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$104 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	96%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$144 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$464 million</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AA</b>

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>MARTINSVILLE</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	0%
Population:	18,000
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	2%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.76
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.61
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	N/A
Second Largest:	N/A
Third Largest:	N/A
Fourth Largest:	N/A
Largest Four Total:	N/A
TOTAL GAP:	\$ 0
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	N/A
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$1.6 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$73.2 million</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>A</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>CITY OF ROANOKE</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	0%
Population:	98,600
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	0%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	1.25
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	1.10
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	N/A
Second Largest:	N/A
Third Largest:	N/A
Fourth Largest:	N/A
Largest Four Total:	N/A
TOTAL GAP:	\$ 0
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	N/A
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$58 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$167 million</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AA</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>ARLINGTON</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	41%
Population:	59,000
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	.4%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.78
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.70
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Education: \$82 million
Second Largest:	Sewer: \$42.2 million
Third Largest:	Courts: \$38.8 million
Fourth Largest:	Roads: \$20 million
Largest Four Total:	\$183 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$218 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	84%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$154 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AAA</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>DANVILLE</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	20%
Population:	53,700
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	1.2%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.86
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.73
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Sewer: \$9.5 million
Second Largest:	Education: \$8 million
Third Largest:	Other Transportation: \$1.2 million
Fourth Largest:	Parks/Recreation: \$.19 million
Largest Four Total:	\$18.9 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$18.9 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	100%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$29.8 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$66.3 million</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>A</b>

---

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>HAMPTON</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	58%
Population:	129,700
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	1%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	1.17
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	1.01
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Roads: \$26 million
Second Largest:	Parks/Recreation: \$13 million
Third Largest:	Fire/Rescue: 4 million
Fourth Largest:	OTHER: \$4 million
Largest Four Total:	\$46 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$46.8 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	98%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$88.4 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$291 million</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AA</b>

---

### III. Suburban

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>MONTGOMERY</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	90%
Population:	67,000
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	1%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.76
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.62
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Education: \$15.3 million
Second Largest:	Roads: \$9.8 million
Third Largest:	Sewer: \$4.6 million
Fourth Largest:	Parks/Recreation: \$2 million
Largest Four Total:	\$31.7 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$32 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	99%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$10.4 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>A</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>FREDERICK</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	18%
Population:	39,900
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	2.5% - 3.5%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.66
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.41
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Roads: \$19.4 million
Second Largest:	Parks/Recreation: \$4.3 million
Third Largest:	Libraries: \$.2 million
Fourth Largest:	Fire/Rescue: \$.1 million
Largest Four Total:	\$24 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$24 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	100%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$15 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AA</b>

---

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>STAFFORD</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	13%
Population:	55,900
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	5%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	1.25
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.88
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	OTHER: \$27.45 million
Second Largest:	Roads: \$1.4 million
Third Largest:	Jails: \$.8 million
Fourth Largest:	Parks/Recreation: \$.45 million
Largest Four Total:	\$30.1 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$30.1 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	100%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$53.75 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AAA</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>JAMES CITY COUNTY</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	0%
Population:	32,800
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	N/A
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.66
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.63
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	N/A
Second Largest:	N/A
Third Largest:	N/A
Fourth Largest:	N/A
Largest Four Total:	N/A
TOTAL GAP:	\$ 0
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	N/A
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$12 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AA</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>NEWPORT NEWS [GROWING CITY]</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	11%
Population:	162,800
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	1.5%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	1.15
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.99
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Roads: \$12.5 million
Second Largest:	Sewer: \$4.8 million
Third Largest:	Drainage: \$4.2 million
Fourth Largest:	Other General Government: \$3.4 million
Largest Four Total:	\$24.9 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$36 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	69%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$219 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$357 million</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>AA</b>

---

#### IV. Rural

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>MECKLENBURG</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	0%
Population:	29,700
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	0%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.42
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.29
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	N/A
Second Largest:	N/A
Third Largest:	N/A
Fourth Largest:	N/A
Largest Four Total:	N/A
TOTAL GAP:	\$ 0
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	N/A
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$4.1 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>\$58 million</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>NR</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>SCOTT</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	87%
Population:	25,100
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	.2%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.75
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.67
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Education: \$2.6 million
Second Largest:	Water: \$2.5 million
Third Largest:	Sewer: \$2.5 million
Fourth Largest:	Jails: \$0.5 million
Largest Four Total:	\$7.65 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$8 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	96%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$6.5 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>NR</b>

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>FAUQUIER</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	42%
Population:	46,100
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	3%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.62
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.53
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Sewer: \$40 million
Second Largest:	Water: \$8 million
Third Largest:	Jails: \$.6 million
Fourth Largest:	N/A
Largest Four Total:	\$48.6 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$48.6 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	100%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$24 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>NR</b>

---

---

<b>LOCALITY:</b>	<b>FLOYD</b>
Infrastructure Gap:	27%
Population:	12,000
Est. Annual Population Growth for 1990s:	3%
Real Estate Tax Rate: (1989)	.75
Effective Real Estate Tax Rate: (1988)	.51
Largest Area Gap (area/amount):	Roads: \$2.1 million
Second Largest:	Solid Waste: \$1.5 million
Third Largest:	Parks/Recreation: \$.78 million
Fourth Largest:	Education: \$.47 million
Largest Four Total:	\$4.85 million
TOTAL GAP:	\$10 million
Four Largest as a Percentage of Total:	49%
<b>CURRENT DEBT:</b>	<b>\$3.3 million</b>
<b>AVAILABLE DEBT:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>BOND RATING:</b>	<b>NR</b>

---