## AGENDA

## JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

## **READING FILE**

## **April 27, 2010**

## FOR YOUR INFORMATION

1. FY 2011-2016 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

## AGENDA

## JAMES CITY SERVICE AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

## **READING FILE**

## **April 27, 2010**

## FOR YOUR INFORMATION

1. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funding – Washing Machine (Clothes Washer) Rebate Program

042710bos\_bodrf\_age

#### MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 27, 2010

TO: The Board of Supervisors

FROM: Leanne Reidenbach, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: FY 2011-16 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

After a series of meetings to discuss and rank Capital Improvements Program (CIP) requests, the Planning Commission is forwarding its recommendations for the Fiscal Year 2011-16 CIP.

The Policy Committee of the Planning Commission has spent the past year revising the CIP process and developing a standardized set of ranking criteria for use to prioritize projects. As a result of the new ranking criteria, staff did not provide scores for each project as has been done in previous CIPs. The Policy Committee created seven criteria (quality of life, infrastructure, economic development, health/public safety, impact on operational budget, regulatory compliance, and timing/location) which are given scores from 1-10, weighted based on level of importance, and totaled to produce a numerical score between 10 and 100. The scores generated by individual Policy Committee members were then averaged to produce the Committee's final score and priority. The higher the generated score, the higher priority the project. The Committee also included a special consideration category where if a project fell under one or more of the three outlined scenarios, it would be moved to the top of the priority list. A sample ranking criteria sheet is attached for your reference (see Attachment 3). Spreadsheet A contains a summary of CIP project scores, rankings, and descriptions for all non-maintenance items.

Last year the Committee decided that all projects that were repair, maintenance, refurbishment, or replacement items would not be evaluated by the Policy Committee, and this parameter was carried through into this year. These projects have been separated into a different spreadsheet (see Spreadsheet B), which has also been provided for reference.

Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) Public Schools projects were broken up by the School Board into four tiers which categorize the projects as *Health and Safety Issues* (Tier I), *Growth and Maintenance* (Tier II), *Projects that Support and/or Enhance the Learning Process* (Tier III), or *Other Projects Important to the Mission of the Schools* (Tier IV). Many of the School Board projects received maintenance designations, as they called for refurbishments, repairs, or other maintenance or safety expenditures; but many projects were also evaluated by the Policy Committee and appear on Spreadsheet A.

James City Service Authority (JCSA) CIP project priorities have also been included in this packet to present a more complete view of the entire CIP. As these projects are self-funded, the Policy Committee did not review or rank JCSA projects. Likewise, the Committee has requested that the Virginia Department of Transportation's (VDOT) Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) also be included in this packet, but they would not be ranked by the Policy Committee. The information for the FY 10-15 SYIP was revised in December 2009 and this project listing can be found in Attachment 5. The FY 11 update is not anticipated to be approved until June 2010.

FY 2011-16 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) April 27, 2010 Page 2

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

On March 3, 2010, the Planning Commission voted 7-0 to approve the FY 11-16 CIP rankings as prepared by the Policy Committee and presented in this memorandum and attachments. For the purposes of assisting in the preparation of the budget, Planning staff, the Policy Committee, and the Planning Commission recommend that the Board of Supervisors consider the following CIP rankings and recommendations. Please note that the following list only represents projects requesting FY 11 funds. The attached Spreadsheet A includes rankings for projects requesting funds in outlying years.

- 1. New Horizons Contribution\*
- 2. Water Quality
- 3. D.J. Montague HVAC
- 4. School Security Card Access System
- 5. School Classroom Technology
- 6. Greenways
- 7. Jamestown Multipurpose Space
- 8. James Blair/Academy of Life and Learning Refurbishment
- 9. Grading New School Operations Property
- 10. Greenspace/Purchase of Development Rights
- 11. School Storage Sheds

\*Project was determined by the Policy Committee to meet Special Consideration Criteria A – "an immediate legislative, regulatory, or judicial mandate…"

Leanne Reidenbach

CONCUR:

Allen J. Murph

LR/nb CIPFY2011\_16\_mem

### Attachments

- 1. Policy Committee CIP rankings (Spreadsheet A)
- 2. Capital Maintenance Items (Spreadsheet B)
- 3. Policy Committee Ranking Criteria
- 4. JCSA CIP Summary
- 5. VDOT SYIP Projects (Revised December 2009)
- 6. Approved Planning Commission Minutes March 3, 2010

## **FY11 - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM RANKING SPREADSHEET**

Non-maintenance items

ID#:	Applying Agency:	Project Name:	FY11 Requested \$	FY12 Requested \$	FY13 Requested \$	FY14 Requested \$	FY15 Requested \$	Total Requested \$	Agency Ranking	Current PC Score (FY11):	Current PC Rank (FY11)
Group	I: New Projects	with FY11 Funds Requested									
VV	Schools	DJ Montague HVAC	T2**	57.5	3						
		Included as a capital maintenance item in previous fiscal years. Replace HVA	C system with ge	othermal and is p	art of division rep	placement cycle.					
UU	Schools	Blair/Academy of Life and Learning Refurbishment	\$2,215,680	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,215,680	T2	52.75	8
		Improvements to Blair Middle School to accommodate relocation of the Acade	my of Life and Le	arning, including	the potential for a	a geothermal syst	em.				
Α	Schools	Grading New School Operations Property	\$262,150	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$262,150	T2	49	9
		Expansion/grading of property adjacent to School Operations Center on Jolly R	ond Road to exp	and parking lot a	nd store mobile c	lassrooms.					
	TOTALS		\$5,077,830	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,077,830			
Group	II: Projects Alre	eady Approved for FY11 Funding in FY10 Adopted Budget									
G	Schools	New Horizons Contribution*	\$82,331	\$82,331	\$82,331	\$0	\$0	\$246,993	T3	100	1
		Assessment for WJCC's portion of facility improvements for regional vocational	al/technical educa	tion facility.							
С	General Svcs	Water Quality	\$2,365,000	\$2,310,000	\$2,271,500	\$2,354,000	\$2,290,000	\$11,590,500	1 of 2	80	2
		Supports 4 types of projects: new/retrofit BMPs, drainage system improvemen	ts, channel stabili	zation/stream res	storation, and floo	d mitigation.					
D	Schools	Security Card Access System	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$120,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$400,000	T1**	56.4	4
		Card access system at all major entry points for all schools done in conjunctio		refurbishments.							
Е	Schools	School Classroom Technology	\$1,339,790	\$192,000	\$705,000	\$767,000	\$647,000	\$3,650,790	T3	54.4	5
		Technology component includes installation of ITS (Instructional Technology S and student computing (laptops/desktops) in all classrooms.	Standard) such as	s projectors, wirel	ess equipment, s	ervers, digital me	edia systems, bacl	kground items,			
В	Parks & Rec	Greenways	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$250,000	11 of 21	52.8	6
		Planning, development, and improvement of trails and greenways consistent v	vith Greenways M	aster Plan.							
R	Schools	Jamestown Multi-Purpose Space	\$2,489,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,489,000	T2	52.8	7
		Add gym and storage space to the school to enhance both the physical educa	tion ans sports pr	ograms.							
Н	Other	Greenspace/PDR	\$7,000,000	\$0	\$7,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$14,000,000	NO APP	47.8	10
		Funding for greenspace acquisition and the Purchase of Development Rights	program.								
F	Schools	Storage Sheds	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	T4	40.4	11
		Provides needed custodial and maintenance storage space at identified school	ols.								
	TOTALS		\$13,446,121	\$2,754,331	\$10,228,831	\$3,241,000	\$3,057,000	\$32,727,283			
Group	III: Projects On	ly Requesting Funding in Outlying Fiscal Years (these have been reviewed	d by PC previous	sly)							
Κ	Parks & Rec	JCWCC Park - Parking Expansion/Closing of Asbury Road	\$0	\$0	\$629,167	\$0	\$0	\$629,167	1 of 21	58.8	

## **FY11 - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM RANKING SPREADSHEET**

Non-maintenance items

ID#:	Applying Agency:	Project Name:	FY11 Requested \$	FY12 Requested \$	FY13 Requested \$	FY14 Requested \$	FY15 Requested \$	Total Requested \$	Agency Ranking	Current PC Score (FY11):	Current PC Rank (FY11)
		Additional parking and lighting for facilities on Community Center park property	y.								
U	Schools	Lafayette Walkway to Warhill	yette Walkway to Warhill \$0 \$0 \$0								
		Provide link between Lafayette and Warhill Sports Complex to connect to exis	ting walking trail a	nd allow student	s access to sports	s fields.					
J	Parks & Rec	Freedom Park Trail	\$0	\$0	\$768,212	\$0	\$0	\$768,212	2 of 21	49.6	
		Hard surface trail (about 5550 linear feet) to connect Freedom Park to new scl	nools on Jolly Por	d Road.							
Т	Schools	Jamestown Field Lights	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$556,540	\$0	\$556,540	T4	46.4	
		Provide lighting for 4 existing sports fields to extend field usage for both the so	hools and commu	ınity.							
	Parks & Rec	Little Creek Boat Storage and Ramp	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$66,250	\$250,000	\$316,250	19 of 21	46	
		New concrete boat ramp to allow multiple boaters to access ramp concurrently	and facilty for re	ntal boats to prov	ride protection.						
S	Schools	Jamestown Enclose Cafeteria Courtyard	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	T3	45	
		Add 7,500 square feet of usable space and bring school more in line with avai	lable cafeteria/cor	nmons space at	Lafayette and Wa	rhill.					
Q	Schools	Toano Field Lighting	\$0	\$0			\$0	\$350,000	T4	44.4	
		Provide lighting for 3 existing sports fields to extend field usage for both the so	hools and commu	ınity.							
0	Schools	Stonehouse Sports Field Lighting	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$350,000	\$0	\$350,000	T4	44.2	
		Provide lighting for existing sports fields to extend field usage for both schools	and the commun	ity.							
N	Schools	Stonehouse Bus Canopy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$369,275	\$369,275	T2	43.8	
		Canopy requested by school staff to offer weather protection for students getti	ng on and off bus	es.							
Р	Schools	Cooley Turf/Field	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$800,000	\$800,000	T4	43.8	
		Purchase and install artificial turf field to extend playing time and make the fiel	d available to mo	re teams and spo	orts.						
V	Schools	Lafayette Science Pavilions	\$0	\$193,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$193,200	T4	43.6	
		Provides 2 science pavillions at rear marshy area between Lafayette and Warl	hill Sports Comple	x at the Powhata	n Creek headwat	ers for use with s	cience curriculum	).			
М	Schools	DJ Montague Additional Parking	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$126,000	\$0	\$126,000	T3	41.2	
		Expand parking to accommodate visitors and parents.	•								
L	Schools	Baker Parking	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$280,700	\$0	\$280,700	T3	40.8	
		Expand parking to accommodate visitors and parents.		`			·				
	TOTALS		\$0	\$193,200	\$1,397,379	\$1,729,490	\$3,294,275	\$6,614,344			
Grou	IV: New Project	s Only Requesting Funding in Outlying Fiscal Years (not previously revie	wed by PC)							•	
JJ		JCWCC Park -Restroom, Safety Netting, & Concession Pad	\$0	\$0	\$266,500	\$331,250		\$597,750	4 of 21	57.8	
		Restrooms to serve increasing number of participants and families using athle	tic fields and play	grounds. Safety			Community Cen	ter or surrounding	walking pat	h.	
Z	Fire	Fire Station 4 Renovations and Expansion	\$0	\$3,300,000	\$0					57.6	

## FY11 - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM RANKING SPREADSHEET

Non-maintenance items

ID#:	Applying Agency:	Project Name:	FY11 Requested \$	FY12 Requested \$	FY13 Requested \$	FY14 Requested \$	FY15 Requested \$	Total Requested \$	Agency Ranking	Current PC Score (FY11):	Current PC Rank (FY11)
		Proposal to construct new apparatus room next to existing facility and convert	the existing facili	ty to dormatories	, dayroom, offices	s, and other supp	ort functions.				
Χ	General Svcs	General Services Headquarters Building	\$0	\$0	\$5,007,640	\$0	\$0	\$5,007,640	1 of 1	54.4	
		New facility to replace existing old and energy ineffecient shops and garages of	on Tewning Road	(see feasiblity stu	udy for more infor	mation).					
RR	Parks & Rec	Warhill Sports Complex - Basketball Courts	\$0	\$0	\$188,750	\$0	\$0	\$188,750	3 of 21	50.2	
		Complete basketball court project with acrylic surfacing, lights, and picnic shel									
TT	Schools	Lafayette Multi-Purpose Space	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,738,000	\$2,738,000	T2	50.2	
		Add gym and storage space to the school to enhance phsyical education and	sports programs.								
Υ	Fire/Police	Mobile Command and Communications Vehicle	\$0	\$0	\$600,000	\$0	\$0	\$600,000	1 of 2	48.8	
		Coordinted Fire and Police command center that can be taken to incident scer	nes to manage op	erations and to c	ommunity events	to supplement e	ducational outread	ch.			
NN	Parks & Rec	Warhill Sports Complex - Phase 5	\$0	\$0	\$327,167	\$1,344,875	\$0	\$1,672,042	6 of 21	48.8	
		Completion of baseball area with 1 field, 2 picnic areas with shelters, restroom	s, and parking.								
CC	Parks & Rec	Shaping Our Shores - Pre-design Planning at JBC/CRP	\$0	\$0	\$245,000	\$0	\$0	\$245,000	10 of 21	47.8	
		Boundary and topo surveys, traffic analysis, rezoning/SUP preparations, and in	ntensive archaeol	ogical investigati	ons (Ph. II and III	to prepare for de	evelopment of the	JBC and CRP.			
KK	Parks & Rec	JCWCC Park - Phase 2 Improvements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$530,000	\$486,111	\$1,016,111	8 of 21	46.2	
		Former water tower site improvements including picnic shelters, sidewalk, play	ground, restroom	/concessions/sto	rage facility, and	expansion of curi	ent skatepark to i	nclude fencing ar	nd lighting.		
DD	Parks & Rec	Shaping Our Shores - Phase 2 Improvements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,469,000	\$2,650,000	\$4,119,000	21 of 21	45.4	
		Infrastructure, demolition, boat storage, rowing facility, floating dock & canoe/k	ayak launch, boa	t launch parking,	picnic pavilions,	Vermillion house	renovation, and e	vent tents and pa	rking.		
00	Parks & Rec	Warhill Sports Complex - Operations Facility	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$198,750	\$1,875,000	\$2,073,750	12 of 21	45.4	
		6,000 square foot visitor center/office/storage facility for park operations staff.	•								
LL	Parks & Rec	Warhill Sports Complex - Multi-Use Walking Paths	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,388,889	\$1,388,889	18 of 21	44.4	
		Create level and even surface paths for recreational walkers, runners, strollers	, etc in high use a	areas to increase	safety and after-	dark opportunities	using spill over f	ield lighting.			
MM	Parks & Rec	Warhill Sports Complex - Softball Complex	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,055,555	\$4,055,555	15 of 21	43.6	
		Development of 4 softball fields, restrooms, and infrastructure.									
EE	Parks & Rec	Freedom Park - Phase 3	\$0	\$0	\$1,510,000	\$4,240,000	\$0	\$5,750,000	5 of 21	42.8	
		Development of passive recreation facilities including amphitheater, 3 picnic a	reas, playground,	open meadow, t	rails, earthen dam	, loop road, and	picnic loop parkin	g.			
PP	Parks & Rec	Warhill Complex - Multipurpose Field Practice Complex	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,777,778	\$7,777,778	20 of 21	41	
		Multi-use lighted field area to accommodate 8 soccer/football-sized fields, rest	room/concession	facility, parking,	roadway, and oth	er infrastructure r	equirements.				
QQ	Parks & Rec	Warhill Complex - Field Hockey/Lacrosse Complex	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,541,667	\$2,541,667	13 of 21	40.8	
		Development of fields and infrastructure per approved master plan.									
НН	Parks & Rec	Freedom Park - 17th / 18th Century Historic Sites	\$0	\$0	\$188,750	\$1,987,500	\$0	\$2,176,250	7 of 21	40.2	
		Reconstruction of 1 large and 2 small structures, landscaping, and fencing tha	ht of entrance roa	nd.							

## FY11 - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM RANKING SPREADSHEET

Non-maintenance items

ID#:	Applying Agency:	Project Name:	FY11 Requested \$	FY12 Requested \$	FY13 Requested \$	FY14 Requested \$	FY15 Requested \$	Total Requested \$	Agency Ranking	Current PC Score (FY11):	Current PC Rank (FY11)
FF	Parks & Rec	Freedom Park - Phase 4	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,120,000	\$2,500,000	\$4,620,000	14 of 21	39.8	
		Development of active recreation facilities with support facilities including bask	etball/tennis cour	ts, water playgro	und/pool, parking	infrastructure, sto	orage, shelter, and	d restrooms.			
SS	Schools	Cooley Lighting	\$0	\$163,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$163,000	T2	39	
		Provide funds to purchase and install new field lighting for Cooley.									
GG	Parks & Rec	Freedom Park - Phase 5	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,944,444	\$2,944,444	16 of 21	38.6	
		Water based facilities with suport facilities, sand beach, fishing pier, playgroun	d, lakehouse/me	eting room, parkir	ng, and boat renta	al facility.					
BB	Parks & Rec	Upper County Park - Master Plan Improvements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000	17 of 21	37.6	
		General improvements associated with yet-to-be established master plan.									
П	Parks & Rec	Freedom Park - Environmental Education Center	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,650,000	\$0	\$2,650,000	9 of 21	36.4	
		Development of learning center for County and schools for science and enviro	nmental-based pr	ogramming.							
AA	Police	Firearms Range Classroom	\$0	\$0	\$375,000	\$0	\$0	\$375,000	2 of 2	36.2	
		To allow personnel to have quality classroom instruction on-site at the firing ra	nge which can be	used in conjunct	tion with practical	shooting exercise	es and qualification	ns.			
	TOTALS		\$0	\$3,463,000	\$8,708,807	\$14,871,375	\$29,457,444	\$56,500,626			

\*Project was determined to meet Special Consideration Criteria A so was moved to the top priority

**Summary of S	Schools "Tier" Rankings:
Tier 1 (T1)	Health and safety issues
Tier 2 (T2)	Growth and maintenance
Tier 3 (T3)	Projects that support and/or enhance the learning process
Tier 4 (T4)	Other projects important to the mission of our schools

## Spreadsheet B FY11 - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM RANKING SPREADSHEET

Maintenance/Replacement Items

	Applying		FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	Total
ID#:	Agency:	Project Name:	Requested \$	Requested \$	Requested \$	Requested \$	Requested \$	Requested \$
1	Gen. Svcs.	JCWCC Renovations	\$127,000	\$347,000	\$107,000	\$197,000	\$120,000	\$898,000
2	Gen. Svcs.	Government Center Building Exteriors	\$66,250	\$66,250				\$132,500
3	Public Safety	Fire Pumper Replacement	\$350,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$2,750,000
4	Gen. Svcs.	Building F HVAC/Controls	\$140,000					\$140,000
5	Gen. Svcs.	Building D Conceptual Design	\$50,000					\$50,000
6	Gen. Svcs.	Energy Upgrades	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$250,000
7	Gen. Svcs.	Demolish Building C		\$150,000				\$150,000
8	Public Safety	Ambulance Replacement		\$204,000	\$241,200		\$214,200	\$659,400
9	Parks and Rec	Mid County Park - Kidsburg/Building/Fences		\$1,771,278				\$1,771,278
10	Public Safety	Fire/Police C&C Vehicle			\$600,000			\$600,000
11	Gen. Svcs.	Building D Renovation			\$1,060,000			\$1,060,000
12	Gen. Svcs.	CRFP Well Replacement			\$500,000			\$500,000
13	Gen. Svcs.	Video Center HVAC			\$130,000			\$130,000
14	Gen. Svcs.	Overlay Parking Lots			\$160,000	\$280,000	\$250,000	\$690,000
15	Gen. Svcs.	Fleet Maintenance Center and EOC Roofs				\$150,000		\$150,000
16	Gen. Svcs.	Electrical - EOC HSC					\$100,000	\$100,000
17	Gen. Svcs.	EOC Generator Replacement					\$135,000	\$135,000
17	Gen. Svcs.	LOG Ocherator Replacement					φ100,000	ψ100,000
	OUNTY TOTAL		\$783,250	\$3,188,528	\$3,448,200	\$1,277,000	\$1,469,200	
			\$783,250	\$3,188,528	\$3,448,200	\$1,277,000		
	OUNTY TOTAL		<b>\$783,250</b> \$400,000	\$3,188,528	\$3,448,200	\$1,277,000		
С	OUNTY TOTAL	-S		<b>\$3,188,528</b> \$93,000	<b>\$3,448,200</b> \$90,000	<b>\$1,277,000</b> \$90,000		\$10,166,178
<b>C</b>	Schools	Berkeley HVAC	\$400,000				\$1,469,200	<b>\$10,166,178</b> \$400,000
18 19	Schools Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots	\$400,000 \$139,000				\$1,469,200	\$10,166,178 \$400,000 \$502,000
18 19 20	Schools Schools Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots James Blair HVAC	\$400,000 \$139,000 \$2,920,845				\$1,469,200	\$10,166,178 \$400,000 \$502,000 \$2,920,845
18 19 20 21	Schools Schools Schools Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots James Blair HVAC James River Sprinkler	\$400,000 \$139,000 \$2,920,845	\$93,000			\$1,469,200	\$400,000 \$502,000 \$2,920,845 \$585,000
18 19 20 21 22	Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots James Blair HVAC James River Sprinkler Toano Roof Replacement	\$400,000 \$139,000 \$2,920,845	\$93,000 \$722,500			\$1,469,200	\$10,166,178 \$400,000 \$502,000 \$2,920,845 \$585,000 \$722,500
18 19 20 21 22 23	Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots James Blair HVAC James River Sprinkler Toano Roof Replacement Lafayette Exterior Painting	\$400,000 \$139,000 \$2,920,845	\$93,000 \$722,500 \$175,000			\$1,469,200	\$400,000 \$502,000 \$2,920,845 \$585,000 \$722,500 \$175,000
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots James Blair HVAC James River Sprinkler Toano Roof Replacement Lafayette Exterior Painting DJ Montague Refurbishment	\$400,000 \$139,000 \$2,920,845	\$93,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864			\$1,469,200	\$400,000 \$502,000 \$2,920,845 \$585,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots James Blair HVAC James River Sprinkler Toano Roof Replacement Lafayette Exterior Painting DJ Montague Refurbishment James River HVAC	\$400,000 \$139,000 \$2,920,845	\$93,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900			\$1,469,200	\$400,000 \$502,000 \$2,920,845 \$585,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots James Blair HVAC James River Sprinkler Toano Roof Replacement Lafayette Exterior Painting DJ Montague Refurbishment James River HVAC Telephone System Upgrade	\$400,000 \$139,000 \$2,920,845	\$93,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900 \$360,000			\$1,469,200	\$10,166,178 \$400,000 \$502,000 \$2,920,845 \$585,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900 \$360,000
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots James Blair HVAC James River Sprinkler Toano Roof Replacement Lafayette Exterior Painting DJ Montague Refurbishment James River HVAC Telephone System Upgrade Operations HVAC	\$400,000 \$139,000 \$2,920,845	\$93,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900 \$360,000 \$875,600			\$1,469,200	\$10,166,178 \$400,000 \$502,000 \$2,920,845 \$585,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900 \$360,000 \$875,600
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots James Blair HVAC James River Sprinkler Toano Roof Replacement Lafayette Exterior Painting DJ Montague Refurbishment James River HVAC Telephone System Upgrade Operations HVAC Clara Byrd Baker Masonry Repairs	\$400,000 \$139,000 \$2,920,845	\$93,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900 \$360,000 \$875,600 \$300,000			\$1,469,200	\$400,000 \$502,000 \$2,920,845 \$585,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900 \$360,000 \$875,600 \$300,000
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots James Blair HVAC James River Sprinkler Toano Roof Replacement Lafayette Exterior Painting DJ Montague Refurbishment James River HVAC Telephone System Upgrade Operations HVAC Clara Byrd Baker Masonry Repairs Berkeley Field Improvements	\$400,000 \$139,000 \$2,920,845	\$93,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900 \$360,000 \$875,600 \$300,000 \$182,400			\$1,469,200	\$400,000 \$502,000 \$2,920,845 \$585,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900 \$360,000 \$875,600 \$300,000
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots James Blair HVAC James River Sprinkler Toano Roof Replacement Lafayette Exterior Painting DJ Montague Refurbishment James River HVAC Telephone System Upgrade Operations HVAC Clara Byrd Baker Masonry Repairs Berkeley Field Improvements Cooley Renovations	\$400,000 \$139,000 \$2,920,845	\$93,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900 \$360,000 \$875,600 \$300,000 \$182,400 \$606,000			\$1,469,200	\$10,166,178 \$400,000 \$502,000 \$2,920,845 \$585,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900 \$360,000 \$875,600 \$300,000 \$182,400 \$606,000
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Schools	Berkeley HVAC Division Resurface Parking Lots James Blair HVAC James River Sprinkler Toano Roof Replacement Lafayette Exterior Painting DJ Montague Refurbishment James River HVAC Telephone System Upgrade Operations HVAC Clara Byrd Baker Masonry Repairs Berkeley Field Improvements Cooley Renovations Toano HVAC	\$400,000 \$139,000 \$2,920,845	\$93,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900 \$360,000 \$875,600 \$300,000 \$182,400 \$606,000 \$2,876,500			\$1,469,200	\$10,166,178 \$400,000 \$502,000 \$2,920,845 \$585,000 \$722,500 \$175,000 \$1,292,864 \$3,089,900 \$360,000 \$875,600 \$300,000 \$182,400 \$606,000 \$2,876,500

## Spreadsheet B FY11 - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM RANKING SPREADSHEET

Maintenance/Replacement Items

ID#:	Applying Agency:	Project Name:	FY11 Requested \$	FY12 Requested \$	FY13 Requested \$	FY14 Requested \$	FY15 Requested \$	Total Requested \$
35	Schools	James Blair Kitchen Renovation			\$560,000			\$560,000
36	Schools	Lafayette Field Refurbishment			\$400,800			\$400,800
37	Schools	Lafayette HVAC			\$2,566,600			\$2,566,600
38	Schools	Toano Pkg/Outfall			\$322,000			\$322,000
39	Schools	Jamestown Refurbishment			\$1,644,908	\$1,644,908		\$3,289,816
40	Schools	Clara Byrd Baker Roof			\$74,000			\$74,000
41	Schools	James River Refurbishment				\$1,752,800		\$1,752,800
42	Schools	Clara Byrd Baker Parking				\$280,700		\$280,700
43	Schools	Stonehouse Refurbishment				\$1,556,006		\$1,556,006
44	Schools	Jamestown Locker Rooms				\$258,870		\$258,870
45	Schools	DJ Montague Parking				\$126,000		\$126,000
46	Schools	Blair Field Irrigation					\$175,500	\$175,500
47	Schools	Cooley Fence/Gates					\$70,000	\$70,000
48	Schools	Toano Refurbishment					\$1,882,567	\$1,882,567
49	Schools	Clara Byrd Baker Refurbishment					\$1,292,864	\$1,292,864
50	Schools	Fuel Pumps					\$70,000	\$70,000
SCI	HOOLS TOTA	ALS	\$4,044,845	\$12,417,222	\$7,856,232	\$5,709,284	\$3,580,931	\$33,608,514
OV	ERALL TOTA	ALS	\$4,828,095	\$15,605,750	\$11,304,432	\$6,986,284	\$5,050,131	\$43,774,692

# CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM RANKING CRITERIA James City County Planning Commission

### **SUMMARY**

The Capital Improvement Program ("CIP") is the process for evaluating, planning, scheduling, and implementing capital projects. The CIP supports the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan through the sizing, timing, and location of public facilities such as buildings, roads, schools, park and recreation facilities, water, and sewer facilities. While each capital project may meet a specific need identified in the Comprehensive Plan or other department or agency plan, all capital plans must compete with other projects for limited resources, receive funding in accordance with a priority rating system and be formally adopted as an integral part of the biannual budget. Set forth below are the steps related to the evaluation, ranking, and prioritization of capital projects.

#### A. DEFINITION

The CIP is a multi-year flexible plan outlining the goals and objectives regarding public capital improvements for James City County ("JCC" or the "County"). This plan includes the development, modernization, or replacement of physical infrastructure facilities, including those related to new technology. Generally a capital project such as roads, utilities, technology improvements, and county facilities is nonrecurring (though it may be paid for or implemented in stages over a period of years), provides long term benefit and is an addition to the County's fixed assets. Only those capital projects with a total project cost of \$50,000 or more will be ranked. Capital maintenance and repair projects will be evaluated by departments and will not be ranked by the Policy Committee.

#### **B. PURPOSE**

The purpose of the CIP ranking system is to establish priorities for the 5-year CIP plan ("CIP plan"), which outlines the projected capital project needs. This CIP plan will include a summary of the projects, estimated costs, schedule and recommended source of funding for each project where appropriate. The CIP plan will prioritize the ranked projects in each year of the CIP plan. However, because the County's goals and resources are constantly changing, this CIP plan is designed to be re-assessed in full bi-annually, with only new projects evaluated in exception years, and to reprioritize the CIP plan annually.

#### C. RANKINGS

Capital projects, as defined in paragraph A, will be evaluated according the CIP Ranking Criteria. A project's overall score will be determined by calculating its score against each criterion. The scores of all projects will then be compared in order to provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. The components of the criteria and scoring scale will be included with the recommendation.

#### D. FUNDING LIMITS

On an annual basis, funds for capital projects will be limited based on the County's financial resources including tax and other revenues, grants and debt limitations, and other principles set forth in the Board of Supervisors' Statement of Fiscal Goals:

- general obligation debt and lease revenue debt may not exceed 3% of the assessed valuation of property,

- debt service costs are not to exceed 10-12% of total operation revenues, including school revenue, and
- debt per capita income is not to exceed \$2,000 and debt as a percentage of income is not to exceed 7.5%.

Such limits are subject to restatement by the Board of Supervisors at their discretion. Projects identified in the CIP plan will be evaluated for the source or sources of funding available, and to protect the County's credit rating to minimize the cost of borrowing.

### E. SCHEDULING OF PROJECTS

The CIP plan schedules will be developed based on the available funding and project ranking and will determine where each project fits in the 5 year plan.

# CIP RANKING CRITERIA Project Ranking By Areas of Emphasis

- **1. Quality of Life (20%) -** Quality of life is a characteristic that makes the County a desirable place to live and work. For example, public parks, water amenities, multi-use trails, open space, and preservation of community character enhance the quality of life for citizens. A County maintenance building is an example of a project that may not directly affect the citizen's quality of life. The score will be based on the considerations, such as:
  - A. Is the project in conformance with and supportive of the goals, strategies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan?
  - B. Does the project support objectives addressed in a County sponsored service plans, master plans, or studies?
  - C. Does the project relate to the results of the citizen survey, Board of Supervisors policy, or appointed committee or board?
  - D. Does the project increase or enhance educational opportunities?
  - E. Does the project increase or enhance recreational opportunities and/or green space?
  - F. Will the project mitigate blight?
  - G. Does the project target the quality of life of all citizens or does it target one demographic? Is one population affected positively and another negatively?
  - H. Does the project preserve or improve the historical, archeological and/or natural heritage of the County? Is it consistent with established Community Character?
  - I. Does the project affect traffic positively or negatively?
  - J. Does the project improve, mitigate, and / or prevent degradation of environmental quality (e.g. water quality, protect endangered species, improve or reduce pollution including noise and/or light pollution)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The project does not				The project will have					The project will have
affect or has a				some positive impact					a large positive
negative affect on the				on quality of life.					impact on the quality
quality of life in JCC.									of life in JCC.

- **2. Infrastructure** (20%) This element relates to infrastructure needs such as schools, waterlines, sewer lines, waste water or storm water treatment, street and other transportation facilities, and County service facilities. High speed, broadband or wireless communication capabilities would also be included in this element. Constructing a facility in excess of facility or service standards would score low in this category. The score will be based on considerations such as:
  - A. Is the project in conformance with and supportive of the goals, strategies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan?
  - B. Does the project support objectives addressed in a County sponsored service plan, master plan, or study?
  - C. Does the project relate to the results of a citizen survey, Board of Supervisors policy, or appointed committee or board?
  - D. Is there a facility being replaced that has exceeded its useful life and to what extent?
  - E. Do resources spent on maintenance of an existing facility justify replacement?
  - F. Does this replace an outdated system?

- G. Does the facility/system represent new technology that will provide enhance service?
- H. Does the project extend service for desired economic growth?

**Scoring Scale:** 

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The level of need is low				There is a moderate level of need					The level of need is high, existing facility is no longer functional, or there is no facility to serve the need

- **3. Economic Development (15%)** Economic development considerations relate to projects that foster the development, re-development, or expansion of a diversified business/industrial base that will provide quality jobs and generate a positive financial contribution to the County. Providing the needed infrastructure to encourage redevelopment of a shopping center would score high in this category. Reconstructing a storm drain line through a residential neighborhood would likely score low in the economic development category. The score will be based on considerations such as:
  - A. Is the project in conformance with and supportive of the goals, strategies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan?
  - B. Does the project support objectives addressed in a County sponsored service plan, master plan, or study?
  - C. Does the project relate to the results of a citizen survey, Board of Supervisors policy, or appointed committee or board?
  - D. Does the project have the potential to promote economic development in areas where growth is desired?
  - E. Will the project continue to promote economic development in an already developed area?
  - F. Is the net impact of the project positive? (total projected tax revenues of economic development less costs of providing services)
  - G. Will the project produce desirable jobs in the County?
  - H. Will the project rejuvenate an area that needs assistance?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Project will				Neutral or will					Project will have a positive
not aid				have some aid					impact on economic
economic				to economic					development
development				development					

- **4. Health/Public Safety (15%) -** Health/public safety includes fire service, police service, safe roads, safe drinking water, fire flow demand, sanitary sewer systems and flood control. A health clinic, fire station or police station would directly impact the health and safety of citizens, scoring high in this category. Adding concession stands to an existing facility would score low in this category. The score will be based on considerations such as:
  - A. Is the project in conformance with and supportive of the goals, strategies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan?
  - B. Does the project support objectives addressed in a County sponsored service plan, master plan, or study?

- C. Does the project relate to the results of a citizen survey, Board of Supervisors policy, or appointed committee or board?
- D. Does the project directly reduce risks to people or property (i.e. flood control)?
- E. Does the project directly promote improved health or safety?
- F. Does the project mitigate an immediate risk?

**Scoring Scale:** 

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Project has no or minimal impact on health/safety				Project has some positive impact on health/safety					Project has a significant positive impact on health/safety

- **5. Impact on Operational Budget (10%) –** Some projects may affect the operating budget for the next few years or for the life of the facility. A fire station must be staffed and supplied; therefore it has an impact on the operational budget for the life of the facility. Replacing a waterline will not require any additional resources from the operational budget. The score will be based on considerations such as:
  - A. Is the project in conformance with and supportive of the goals, strategies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan?
  - B. Does the project support objectives addressed in a County sponsored service plan, master plan, or study?
  - C. Does the project relate to the results of a citizen survey, Board of Supervisors policy, or appointed committee or board?
  - D. Will the new facility require additional personnel to operate?
  - E. Will the project lead to a reduction in personnel or maintenance costs or increased productivity?
  - F. Will the new facility require significant annual maintenance?
  - G. Will the new facility require additional equipment not included in the project budget?
  - H. Will the new facility reduce time and resources of city staff maintaining current outdated systems? This would free up staff and resources, having a positive effect on the operational budget.
  - I. Will the efficiency of the project save money?
  - J. Is there a revenue generating opportunity (e.g. user fees)?
  - K. Does the project minimize life-cycle costs?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Project will have				Project will have neutral impact on					Project will have positive
a negative impact on budget				budget					impact on budget or life- cycle costs minimized

- **6. Regulatory Compliance (10%) –** This criterion includes regulatory mandates such as sewer line capacity, fire flow/pressure demands, storm water/creek flooding problems, schools or prisons. The score will be based on considerations such as:
  - A. Does the project addresses a legislative, regulatory or court-ordered mandate? (0- 5 years)
  - B. Will the future project impact foreseeable regulatory issues? (5-10years)

- C. Does the project promote long-term regulatory compliance (>10 years)
- D. Will there be a serious negative impact on the county if compliance is not achieved?
- E. Are there other ways to mitigate the regulatory concern?

**Scoring Scale:** 

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Project serves no regulatory need				Project serves some regulatory need or serves a long-term need					Project serves an immediate regulatory need

- **7. Timing/Location (10%) -** Timing and location are important aspects of a project. If the project is not needed for many years it would score low in this category. If the project is close in proximity to many other projects and/or if a project may need to be completed before another one can be started it would score high in this category. The score will should be based on considerations such as:
  - A. Is the project in conformance with and supportive of the goals, strategies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan?
  - B. Does the project support objectives addressed in a County sponsored service plan, master plan, or study?
  - C. Does the project relate to the results of a citizen survey, Board of Supervisors policy, or appointed committee or board?
  - D. When is the project needed?
  - E. Do other projects require this one to be completed first?
  - F. Does this project require others to be completed first? If so, what is magnitude of potential delays (acquisition of land, funding, and regulatory approvals)?
  - G. Can this project be done in conjunction with other projects? (E.g. waterline/sanitary sewer/paving improvements all within one street)
  - H. Will it be more economical to build multiple projects together (reduced construction costs)?
  - I. Will it help in reducing repeated neighborhood disruptions?
  - J. Will there be a negative impact of the construction and if so, can this be mitigated?
  - K. Will any populations be positively/negatively impacted, either by construction or the location (e.g. placement of garbage dump, jail)?
  - L. Are there inter-jurisdictional considerations?
  - M. Does the project conform to Primary Service Area policies?
  - N. Does the project use an existing County-owned or controlled site or facility?
  - O. Does the project preserve the only potentially available/most appropriate, non-County owned site or facility for project's future use?
  - P. Does the project use external funding or is a partnership where funds will be lost if not constructed.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
No critical timing or location				Project timing OR location is					Both project timing AND location are important
issues				important					

8. Special Consideration (no weighting- if one of the below categories applies, project should be given special funding priority) – Some projects will have features that may require that the County undertake the project immediately or in the very near future. Special considerations may include the following (check all applicable statement(s)):

A.	Is there an immediate legislative, regulatory, or judicial mandate which, if unmet, will result in serious detriment to the County, and there is no alternative to the project?	
B.	Is the project required to protect against an immediate health, safety, or general welfare hazard/threat to the County?	
C.	Is there a significant external source of funding that can only be used for this project and/or which will be lost if not used immediately (examples are developer funding, grants through various federal or state initiatives, and private donations)?	

# JAMES CITY SERVICE AUTHORITY FY 2011 - 2015 Capital Improvements Program

BUDGET CODE	DESCRIPTION	Balance FY10	Projected FY11	Projected FY12	Projected FY13	Projected FY14	Projected FY15	Total FY11-15	Priority
105-100	WATER SUPPLY					KARAMATAN		1111-13	rifolity
2003 XXXX	Water Supply Debt Service Desalination Plant Membrane Replacement	1,648,000	1,646,000	1,645,000	1,648,000 215,000	1,645,000	1,646,000	8,230,000 430,000	1 6
	Water Supply Subtotal	1,648,000	1,646,000	1,645,000	1,863,000	1,860,000	1,646,000	8,660,000	0
105-150	SEWER IMPROVEMENTS								too Markey 1 Acres 1
2300	Sewer Systems Overflow Report Preparation	537,785	800,000	545,000	45,000			1,390,000	2
2475	DEQ Consent Order Sewer System Improvements	1,359,812	32,600	778,600	1,060,600	1,108,600	1.322.600	4,303,000	3
	Sewer Improvements Subtotal	1,897,597	832,600	1,323,600	1,105,600	1,108,600	1,322,600	5,693,000	Ŭ
105-160	OTHER PROJECTS				40.25				A Company
3005	Tewning Road Expansion	2,303,460	200.000		18- 1111-8-			200.000	4
3085	Heavy Equipment/Other	99,161	290,000					290,000	<del>4</del> 5
	Other Projects Subtotal	2,402,621	490,000	0	0	0	0	490,000	5
	GRAND TOTAL	5,948,218	2,968,600	2,968,600	2,968,600	2,968,600	2,968,600	14,843,000	

## VDOT Six-Year Improvement Program (revised Dec. 2009)

UPC#:	Ducinet Name	Previous	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	Total \$
UPC#:	Project Name:	Allocations	Allocated \$	Total \$					
55051	Rte 5- Virginia Capital Trail - Eastern Section	\$5,051,000	\$0	\$0	\$0		Ŧ -	\$0	\$5,051,000
67637	Rte 5- Install Pedestrian X-ing and Curbcut Ramps	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,000
71883	Rte 5- Bridge Replacement	\$3,478,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,478,000
	Rte 5- Install Right Turn Lane from NB Rte 615 onto								
77065	EB Rte 5	\$500,000	\$300,000	\$0	\$0				+ /
13496	Rte 60- Relocation and Upgrading	\$18,732,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,732,000
	Rte 199- Jamestown Corridor- Parallel Lane Segment								
65191	1	\$16,412,000	\$0	\$0	\$0			¥ -	+ -, ,
65273	Rte 199- Parallel Lane Segment 2	\$10,221,000	\$0	\$0				\$0	\$10,221,000
65275	Rte 199- Intersection Improvement (Segment 3)	\$3,789,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,789,000
	Add Left and Right Turn Lanes on Monticello Ave,								
82961	Ironbound Rd.	\$200,000	\$660,000	\$0	\$0				. ,
17633	Bikeway/Pedestrian Rte 60 and Croaker Rd.	\$278,000	\$930,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,208,000
87944	Mooretown Rd. Bikeway (Airport Rd to Raintree Way)	\$0	\$512,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$512,000
13719	Rte 612/Longhill Rd Trail (Centerville Rd. to Rte 199)	\$960,000	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$960,000
71617	Rte 612- Paved Shoulder along Longhill Rd.	\$226,000	\$0	\$0			+ -	Ŧ -	\$226,000
50057	Rte 615- Reconstruct Ironbound Rd to 4 Lanes	\$13,768,000	\$444,000	\$1,795,000	\$214,000	\$214,000	\$214,000	\$214,000	\$16,863,000
	Rte 615- Paved Shoulder along Ironbound Rd and Rte								
71616	681	\$3,114,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,114,000
	Construct Shoulder Bikeway along Airport Rd.								
83462	(Richmond Rd. to Mooretown Rd.)	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
16463	Signage for Bikeway Network (with York Co)	\$34,000						\$0	
T193	JCC Transit Shopping Circulator	\$277,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$277,000
	Increase Service Frequency and Add Sunday Service,								
T4224	Ph 1 (JCC, York, and Newport News)	\$2,836,000	\$0	\$0				\$0	\$2,836,000
T4222	Newport News/JCC Employee Connection, Ph 1	\$184,000	\$0	\$0	\$0			\$0	\$184,000
T4223	Newport News/JCC Employee Connection, Ph 2	\$98,000	\$0	\$0				\$0	\$98,000
85554	Jamestown 2007 Transportation System	\$1,334,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,334,000
	Purchase Land for Ferry Security Station & Traffic								
77399	Queue	\$672,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$672,000
	Transportation Improvements to Historic Jamestown								
93059	2007	\$5,553,000	\$294,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,847,000
93060	Infrastructure Improvements for Jamestown 2007	\$438,000	\$23,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$461,000

# Approved minutes from the March 3, 2010 Planning Commission meeting FY2011-2016 Capital Improvements Program

Mr. Peck opened the public hearing.

Ms. Leanne Reidenbach stated the Policy Committee was forwarding its FY2011-FY2016 Capital Improvements Projects (CIP). The Committee has adopted a new standardized set of evaluation criteria to prioritize projects. Criteria include quality of life, health and public safety, economic development, and regulatory compliance. These topics are weighted, scored, and averaged. Of the 47 projects reviewed, 11 requested funding in FY11. Those 11 projects were ranked and will be forwarded to the Board.

Mr. Peck closed the public hearing.

Mr. Krapf moved to approve the CIP rankings.

In a unanimous roll call vote, the Commission approved the rankings (7-0).