

AGENDA
JAMES CITY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 21, 2016 – 6:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

2. ANNUAL ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

- A. Election of Officers*
- B. Adoption of 2016 Calendar

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

4. PUBLIC HEARING

- A. Review of the FY 2017–FY 2021 Capital Improvement Program

5. COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND REQUESTS

6. ADJOURNMENT

- * Per the adopted Planning Commission Bylaws, the newly elected officers shall preside beginning at the next regular meeting (April 6, 2016). Committee appointments will be made by the new chair at that time as well.

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 21, 2016

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Jose Ribeiro, Senior Planner II
Leanne Pollock, Senior Planner II

SUBJECT: FY17-FY21 Capital Improvement Program

The Policy Committee annually reviews Capital Improvement Program (CIP) requests submitted by various County agencies. The purpose of this review is to provide guidance and a list of prioritized projects to the Board of Supervisors for its consideration during the budget process. After a series of meetings to discuss and rank CIP requests and to evaluate the projects for consistency with the adopted 2035 Comprehensive Plan, the Committee is forwarding its recommendations to the Planning Commission for consideration.

As described in the Code of Virginia, the CIP is one of the methods of implementing the Comprehensive Plan and is of equal importance to methods like the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances, official maps and transportation plans. The Policy Committee uses a standardized set of ranking criteria to prioritize projects. Committee members evaluated each request for funding and produced a numerical score between 10 and 100. The scores generated by individual Committee members were then averaged to produce the Committee's final score and priority. The Committee's ranking criteria are attached for reference (Attachment No. 1).

In Attachment No. 2, the CIP project requests from County agencies and Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) Schools are summarized. The only proposed County project that has been previously included in the Board's five-year CIP is the Stormwater Division request. Some of the improvements proposed by WJCC Schools were included in prior CIPs; however, estimates and completion timelines have been amended. The projects are listed from highest to lowest. Attachment No. 2 is the document that is forwarded to the Board showing the Commission's priorities. Staff received more detailed applications for each project; however, rather than provide every application in the meeting packet, staff has included a brief summary for each project in Attachment No. 2. If there is any specific project in which a Commissioner is interested in having more detailed information, please refer to the CIP materials posted on line at <http://jamestowncity.novusagenda.com/AgendaPublic/CoverSheet.aspx?ItemID=1204&MeetingID=177>.

Staff Recommendation:

At its March 3, 2016 meeting, the Committee unanimously recommended forwarding the following FY17-21 CIP priorities to serve as a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The projects selected are listed below in rank order (*note: projects that had tie scores from the Policy Committee share the same project rank number*):

1. Stormwater neighborhood drainage (a)
2. Transportation match (a)
3. Jamestown Beach Event Park improvements
4. James City County Marina
5. Jamestown High School entrance redesign
6. Norge Elementary School entrance redesign
6. D.J. Montague Elementary School entrance redesign
8. Berkeley Middle School entrance redesign
8. Lafayette High School entrance redesign

FY17-FY21 Capital Improvements Program

March 21, 2016

Page 2

10. Toano Middle School entrance redesign
10. Stonehouse Elementary School entrance redesign
12. Stonehouse Elementary School bus canopy (a)
13. Chickahominy Riverfront Park splash pad (a)(b)
14. Lafayette High School auxiliary gym (a)(c)
15. Lafayette High School walkway

(a) Indicates that the project has requested funds in FY17.

(b) Ms. Bledsoe noted that she felt that the Lafayette High School auxiliary gym should be ranked higher than the Chickahominy Riverfront Park splash pad, but deferred to the overall final Committee rankings.

(c) Mr. O'Connor also expressed via email that WJCC Schools should look at parity among the schools and consider an auxiliary gym at Warhill in addition to the auxiliary gym at Lafayette, versus the walkway. Mr. O'Connor noted that the funds should be used for projects that will serve the greater community. For the school applications in general, Mr. O'Connor noted via email that he feels student safety should be a paramount concern and WJCC Schools should make those improvements as soon as possible. Mr. O'Connor noted that this was the reason for his ranking those applications evenly.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward these priorities to the Board of Supervisors for consideration during the budget process.

JR/LP/ab

FY17-FY21CIP-mem

Attachments:

1. Policy Committee ranking criteria
2. Policy Committee CIP summary spreadsheet
3. Approved Policy Committee minutes from February 11, 2016
4. Unapproved Policy Committee minutes from March 3, 2016

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 bi-annual 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 to 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)?

Scoring Scale:

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

Scoring Scale:

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

Scoring Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Project will have a negative impact on budget				Project will have neutral impact on budget					Project will have positive 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.

Scoring Scale:

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

FY17 - 21 - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM RANKING SPREADSHEET

Applying Agency	Project Title	Brief Project Description (see application narratives for more detail)	FY17 Requested \$	FY18 Requested \$	FY19 Requested \$	FY20 Requested \$	FY21 Requested \$	Total Requested \$	Agency Ranking	FY 17 Policy Committee Score:	Special Considerations	Priority	Other notes
General Svcs.	Stormwater Neighborhood Drainage Improvement and Water Quality Improvements	Projects involving drainage improvements installation or upgrading pipe and ditch systems. Utilizing natural channel design techniques for stream restoration projects.	\$2,703,000	\$2,634,000	\$2,493,000	\$2,510,000	\$2,204,000	\$12,544,000	1 of 1	78	Y, A	1	This project has requested funds in FY17.
Planning	Transportation Match	Improvements to the segment of Longhill Road between Route 199 and west of the OldeTown Road/Longhill intersection.	\$1,500,000	\$2,485,250	\$2,485,260	\$4,599,000	\$1,944,500	\$13,014,010	1 of 1	75	Y, C	2	This project has requested funds in FY17.
Parks & Rec	Jamestown Beach Event Park Improvements	Installation of restroom facilities, providing electrical power to event area, paving of roads and drop off areas and installation of picnic areas.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,633,000	\$1,633,000	1 of 3	65		3	
Parks & Rec	James City County Marina	Replacement of bukheads with vegetated shoreline and floating docks and replacement of a fuel tank.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$880,000	\$1,340,000	\$2,220,000	2 of 3	59	Y	4	
WJCC Schools	Jamestown High School Entrance Redesign	Redesigning the entrance so pedestrian traffic entering the school building must funnel through the front office.	\$0	\$159,650	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$159,650	1 of 10	52		5	
WJCC Schools.	Norge Elementary School Entrance Redesign	Redesigning the entrance so pedestrian traffic entering the school building must funnel through the front office.	\$0	\$85,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$85,000	3 of 10	51.1		6	
WJCC Schools	D.J. Montague Elementary School Entrance Redesign	Redesigning the entrance so pedestrian traffic entering the school building must funnel through the front office.	\$0	\$120,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$120,000	2 of 10	51.1		6	
WJCC Schools	Lafayette High School Entrance Redesign	Redesigning the entrance so pedestrian traffic entering the school building must funnel through the front office.	\$0	\$0	\$90,177	\$0	\$0	\$90,177	6 of 10	50.9		8	
WJCC Schools	Berkeley Middle School Entrance Redesign	Redesigning the entrance so pedestrian traffic entering the school building must funnel through the front office.	\$0	\$0	\$90,176	\$0	\$0	\$90,176	7 of 10	50.9		8	
WJCC Schools	Toano Middle School Entrance Redesign	Redesigning the entrance so pedestrian traffic entering the school building must funnel through the front office.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$92,882	\$0	\$92,882	8 of 10	50.7		10	
WJCC Schools.	Stonehouse Elementary School Entrance Redesign	Redesigning the entrance so pedestrian traffic entering the school building must funnel through the front office.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$142,055	\$0	\$142,055	9 of 10	50.7		10	
WJCC Schools	Stonehouse Elementary School Bus Canopy	Installation of canopy over the bus loop walkway	\$258,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$258,000	4 of 10	41		12	This project has requested funds in FY17.
Parks & Rec	Chickahominy Riverfront Park Splash Pad	Installation of a splash pad at Chickahominy Park in the area of the recently demolished small pool	\$175,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$175,000	3 of 3	37		13	This project has requested funds in FY17. Ms. Bledsoe noted that she felt that the Lafayette High School gym should be ranked higher than the Chickahominy Riverfront Park splash pad but deferred to the overall final Committee rankings.
WJCC Schools	Lafayette High School Auxiliary Gymnasium	Building new space for additional recreational and instructional use.	\$2,450,679	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,450,679	5 of 10	35		14	This project has requested funds in FY17. Mr. O'Connor expressed via email that WJCC Schools should look at parity among the schools and consider an auxiliary gym at Warhill in addition to the auxiliary gym at Lafayette, versus the walkway. Mr. O'Connor noted that the funds should be used for projects that will serve the greater community. For the school applications in general, Mr. O'Connor noted via email that he feels student safety should be a paramount concern and WJCC Schools should make those improvements as soon as possible. Mr. O'Connor noted that this was the reason for his ranking those applications evenly.
WJCC Schools.	Lafayette High School Walkway	Construction of an ADA compliant walkway to the sports fields at the Warhill Sports Complex	\$0	\$0	\$1,177,184	\$0	\$0	\$1,177,184	10 of 10	21		15	

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Building A Large Conference Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
February 11, 2016
4:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. John Wright called the meeting to order on Thursday, February 11th, 2016 at 4:33 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Commissioners:

Mr. John Wright
Ms. Robin Bledsoe
Mr. Rich Krapf
Mr. Tim O'Connor
Mr. Heath Richardson

Staff:

Mr. Paul Holt, Planning Director
Ms. Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner
Mr. José Ribeiro, Senior Planner II
Ms. Leanne Pollock, Senior Planner II
Ms. Ellen Cook, Senior Planner II
Ms. Savannah Pietrowski, Planner
Mr. John Carnifax, Director of Parks and Recreation
Ms. Tara Woodruff, Director Budget and Accounting
Mr. John Horne, Director of General Services
Ms. Fran Geissler, Director Stormwater Division
Mr. Marcellus Snipes, Senior Director for Operations
Mr. Alan Robertson, Facilities Management Coordinator
Ms. Nancy Ellis, Parks Administrator
Mr. Alex Baruch, Development Management Assistant

C. MINUTES

1. January 14, 2016 Minutes

Ms. Robin Bledsoe moved to approve the January 14, 2016 minutes.

D. OLD BUSINESS**E. NEW BUSINESS****1. FY17-FY21 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

Mr. Jose Ribeiro, Senior Planner, gave a presentation on the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) stating that the Planning Division received five non-school and 10 school applications for CIP funding. Mr. Ribeiro stated that the application materials were submitted to the Policy Committee members to review and rank based on the Comprehensive Plan. The final rankings will then be forward to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for final consideration.

The Policy Committee began their discussion with the Parks and Recreation applications.

Mr. John Wright asked why the application concerning the Jamestown Beach shows a time horizon of FY21 to begin renovations for the restroom facilities and support services when it seems that the beach is being use for more events each year.

Mr. John Carnifax stated that the projected revenue in the budget will not be there until FY21.

Mr. Carnifax gave an overview of improvements to the Jamestown Beach that have been completed recently including changes to restrooms, walkways, parking areas and special event facilities.

Ms. Robin Bledsoe asked if Parks and Recreation has had to turn possible events away due to the limited facilities at Jamestown Beach.

Ms. Nancy Ellis stated that they have not had to turn any special event away at this point.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that she is very happy that citizens have Jamestown Beach as a resource.

Mr. Carnifax stated that he thinks some special events have not approached them because they do not have the infrastructure to do the larger scale events; however, those are the changes that will be made once the revenue has been saved up.

Mr. Rich Krapf stated that when he was deciding which project to give the higher priority he ranked the Marina higher because of some of the potential stormwater issues. Mr. Krapf asked if staff could elaborate on why they ranked the Jamestown Beach application higher than the Marina.

Mr. Carnifax stated that the Economic Development Authority (EDA) is looking into some potential Public Private Partnerships to operate the Marina and ancillary facilities. Mr. Carnifax stated that they are not sure how much that business would be willing to fix up as a part of that agreement and if it would be the Marina, the buildings or both. Mr. Carnifax stated that we know that the beach is going to be staying with the County so by focusing on that, there can be tremendous use.

Mr. Tim O'Connor asked what the difference in traffic is between the beach and the

Marina.

Mr. Carnifax stated that the beach gets thousands of people over the summer and the Marina has 68 slips plus a boat ramp from which citizens launch their boats. Overall the Marina has a significantly lower amount of traffic.

Mr. Wright asked what the potential exposure would be from the Federal or State level if the Marina does not come into compliance with stormwater regulations.

Ms. Fran Geissler stated that the Marina is owned by the County and is covered under the municipal stormwater permit; however, because of the way the census determines an urbanized area the Marina is not in the regulated portion of the County. Ms. Geissler stated that most likely it would not be a real issue in the short term but could be after FY19.

Ms. Bledsoe asked about if that area gets developed quickly could that change the FY19 projection.

Ms. Geissler stated the area would have to grow much faster than the projected rate and as an example stated that Busch Gardens is not in a regulated area because no one lives there.

Mr. Wright stated the he weighted the Marina higher than the Jamestown Beach because of the stormwater issues and asked Mr. Carnifax which of the two projects he rated as more important.

Mr. Carnifax stated that he would rank the Jamestown Beach project as an immediate higher priority than the Marina.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that if the Marina is not addressed sooner won't the expense be astronomical to the point where there won't be any interest to rent/purchase and fix it up.

Mr. Carnifax stated that was correct, depending on the severity of potential storms and other factors the Marina could be impacted.

Ms. Bledsoe asked if the EDA has looked at the CIP application numbers.

Mr. Carnifax stated that he did not know; however, similar numbers were in the Shaping Our Shores Master Plan which they did review.

Mr. O'Connor asked if Parks and Recreation has started to fix up the borings on the bulk heads and asked if the County knows how much it will take to replace it.

Mr. Carnifax stated that the County has cost estimates on how much it would cost per linear foot; however, no borings have been replaced.

Mr. Wright continued the discussion to the third application from Parks and Recreation concerning the installation of a splash pad.

Mr. Carnifax stated that at Chickahominy Campgrounds there used to be two swimming pools. One had been leaking over the past few years so the decision was made to close the pool and fill it. Mr. Carnifax stated that the next best use of that area

would be a spray ground/splash pad to be installed in that area.

Ms. Ellis stated that the ongoing cost of maintaining a splash pad is significantly less than maintaining a pool. It is also a revenue stream because there isn't a public splash pad available in Williamsburg which makes it a unique feature.

Mr. Wright stated that there was no more discussion on the three Parks and Recreation applications so they would move on to the next application.

Ms. Ellen Cook gave a presentation discussing the revenue sharing application for the intersection of Olde Towne Rd. and Longhill Rd. that the Planning Division put forward for consideration.

Mr. Paul Holt stated that the Rev Share is a 50/50 match so every dollar the County brings to the table Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) will match.

Mr. Wright asked if the dollar amounts shown for FY 17-21 are the matching amounts.

Mr. Holt stated that they were.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the funds being discussed for revenue sharing were approved last year for this type of project.

Mr. Holt stated that was correct and last year there were no funds for FY 16, the funds start in FY 17 and work their way forward which is consistent with a five-year plan.

Mr. Wright stated that once it is approved and we start building there is a commitment to continue funding the project.

Mr. Holt stated that was correct and that there are more projects in the queue that should be addressed.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the Rev Share should help with that because it shows a commitment from the County.

Mr. Wright asked how much we have in the funds currently.

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that there isn't any funding at this point; this application would start the implementation of Mr. Bryan Hill's vision for funding.

Mr. O'Connor asked if there will be five years of construction that go along with this application or is this just the funding mechanism.

Mr. Holt stated that it was the funding mechanism.

Ms. Rosario stated that the intersection project would not take five years of construction; this is just reflecting five years of applications.

Mr. Holt stated that the project itself takes five to six years including engineering, relocating utilities, all of the work in the right-of-way, and then the construction could take two years.

Mr. Krapf asked if a more important project comes along and bumps this out of the way

could we have a half-completed project on our hands.

Mr. Holt stated that in order to receive the Rev Share from VDOT you have to be able to complete the project in full.

Mr. Wright thanked staff for the information and moved onto the Stormwater application.

Mr. Krapf asked if staff had heard anything about a grant application that was submitted in December.

Ms. Geissler stated that the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is still working through the applications and their timeline states that a decision will be made by February or March.

Mr. Krapf stated that he put a mark next to that application because similar to the Rev Share matching funds there are potential grant funds available for this application.

Mr. John Horne stated that the Stormwater Division has been successful for two years in receiving these funds; however, the number of applications have grown over the past two years so it is much more competitive.

Mr. Wright asked if the stormwater projects that are being taken on are outside of Home Owner Associations (HOA) and neighborhoods that have a funding mechanism.

Ms. Geissler stated that they are projects outside the purview of an HOA, they are stream restoration projects which give the County reduced pollution in our waterways. Ms. Geissler stated that the Grove, Toano and Forrest Glen projects are longstanding, no organized drainage systems which frequently create localized flooding issues.

Ms. Bledsoe inquired regarding the quality of life in the Grove area and how great the impact of not having an organized drainage system is to the Grove residence.

Ms. Geissler stated that it is pretty pervasive, particularly in the Whiting and Jackson intersection. Ms. Geissler stated that there are photos included in the application that show how grave the situation is in that area because the water just sits; it does not have anywhere to go.

Mr. Horne stated that even if you can get the water moving along the roadway ditches the whole neighborhood suffers from not having a neighborhood outfall where the water can go to be stored. Mr. Horne stated that a part of this project will be to look at how the drainage of the neighborhood can be organized differently to make it better.

Ms. Bledsoe asked how realistic it is to think that with this funding we will be able to see some significant changes in the Grove area.

Ms. Geissler stated that they just received the final version of a proposal to work on this project and are ready to submit a purchase order to start the data collection aspect.

Mr. Wright asked if there is an EPA criteria associated with these expenditures.

Ms. Geissler stated that there are; however, these projects address local issues regardless of what the state wants us to do. For example, in the Skiffes Creek area

there has to be an action plan for Skiffes Creek to reduce bacteria much like we had to do for the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. O'Connor stated that he had it marked down as a special consideration.

Mr. Horne stated that one thing he believes will be important moving forward is that the funding is coming from the Board of Supervisor's allocated funds from increased revenue to handle these types of projects.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that these projects are not going to get less expensive, they are only going to get more expensive.

Mr. Wright stated that there was no additional discussion on the stormwater plans and the school's applications were up next.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that he wanted to thank the schools and Policy Committee for working together to align the CIP timelines so they could occur concurrently.

Mr. Krapf asked about the Lafayette High School Accessibility Path and what the rationale was for ranking it ten out of ten applications.

Mr. Alan Robertson stated that if it is built then it would need to be built to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, we are not obligated to have the path to meet ADA compliance.

Mr. Wright stated that it appears that the majority of the applications have to do with entrance re-designs for schools. Mr. Wright stated that he is not sure where the rankings come from because they all look to be similar projects just at different locations.

Mr. Marcellus Snipes stated that the rankings are being done to meet the requirements of the CIP application and were done by the Superintendent.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the rankings are important to the Policy Committee because it helps us know what you would like to prioritize based off limited dollars.

Mr. Robertson stated that all of the new school entrances are designed so when you come in the front door a visitor is forced to go through the main office to sign in, whereas in the older schools a visitor would be buzzed in and could go anywhere in the school. The reason the costs are different is because the construction in the different schools would have to be different to meet the architectural elements of the entryway.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that this is a safety issue and is curious if the assumption can be made that Jamestown High School's security is more of an issue than some of the other schools on the list based off the ranking.

Mr. Robertson stated that more of the projects are economical if you combine them and are doing construction when there is other work being done to the school. Therefore timing also contributes to where the applications are ranked.

Mr. O'Connor stated that because it is a safety concern he ranked them all equally however, he is concerned with the ease of egress out of the building once more walls are put up.

Mr. Robertson stated that Hornsby has the ability to pop a door open as long as someone is monitoring people coming in and out for an athletic event or concert.

Mr. Wright asked if emergency personnel would have easy access to get in and out when the new entrances are built.

Mr. Snipes and Mr. Robertson stated that they have a lock box with a key that will still open the doors to gain access.

Mr. Wright asked about the bus canopy and if the Policy Committee could receive an overview on their use.

Mr. Snipes stated that the Stonehouse Bus Canopy has been in the CIP for a number of years, originally requested by the Principal. Mr. Snipes stated that the canopy would be over the walkway into school from the bus circle to shield the students from the elements.

Mr. Robertson stated that typically the new schools have canopies from when they were built however the older schools do not.

Mr. Wright asked why the schools could not build the canopies out of current operating funds.

Mr. Robertson stated that it is typically more expensive than what you would put in operating funds. It is also a site change that would need to go through the Planning Division for site plan approval.

Ms. Bledsoe asked if Mr. Snipes could elaborate on the auxiliary gymnasium.

Mr. Snipes stated that the auxiliary gym was placed back into the CIP based on citizen input from parents and other community members.

Mr. Robertson discussed some of the previous plans for auxiliary gymnasiums in the community and the history behind additional auxiliary gym requests in the past.

Mr. Snipes stated that the gyms are used all the time for various events, not just for sports.

Mr. Wright asked what was driving the need for the auxiliary gym.

Mr. Snipes stated that it was based on the school and what type of events are taking place at the school in the gyms.

Mr. O'Connor stated that at Warhill High School some of the sports will practice in the Commons.

Mr. Robertson stated that there are too many activities to fit inside the space available at the school

Mr. Wright asked if they were all school sponsored activities.

Mr. Robertson stated that they were. Mr. Robertson also stated that the auxiliary gyms

are just large gymnasiums with the space for bleachers cut off the sides, perfect for practicing sports or other activities.

Mr. Krapf stated that Mr. Snipes mentioned that principals were typically the driving force behind many of these projects. This could lead to a problem if a principal leaves to go to another school district and the next principal is not on board with the project. What happens in that situation?

Mr. Robertson stated that the CIP process starts in two places, either the maintenance operations staff sees an issue or the principal at the school and their staff suggest improvements and it boils up. Mr. Robertson stated that any project under \$50,000 are typically funded through the operating budget and anything over would go through this process.

Mr. Wright stated that school aged students are only increasing here not decreasing.

Mr. Robertson stated that the outside demand is unbelievable for space seven days a week at almost every school.

Ms. Bledsoe asked why they feels that we are unique in the community demand for our school gymnasium space?

Mr. Snipes stated that Parks and Recreation in other localities typically have dedicated facilities that can handle the community events around the community but we are very efficient in combining those resources.

Mr. Robertson stated that the kids now are not just in one activity they are in multiple activities which increases the demand throughout the community.

Mr. Wright asked if the instructional use of the gym is only for sports or is it multi-purpose.

Mr. Robertson stated that there are multiple classes going on in the gym at one time during the day and afterschool meetings take place in the gym along with other non-sport activities/events.

Mr. O'Connor asked what the alternative to building the accessibility path is.

Mr. Snipes stated that students could take the sidewalk to walk around however, it does take longer.

Mr. Wright asked what feature there is to prevent going across the area currently.

Mr. Robertson stated that there is currently a ravine that is very steep where students can cut through to get to Warhill Sports Complex however, it is not sanctioned by the school because it is not safe. Mr. Robertson stated that at the edge of the track area at Lafayette would be where the path would start but the grade from one side to the other if you go straight across would not meet ADA's standards because the slope would be too steep.

Mr. O'Connor asked if there is access and benefit to Seasons Trace and other communities close by for them to use the path.

Mr. Robertson stated that it would be a benefit to them.

Mr. O'Connor asked about some of the safety concerns regarding the bridge such as if it would be open all the time and if it would be lit.

Mr. Robertson stated that the rest of the track in that area is not lit at the moment but the safety concerns are apparent.

Mr. Wright asked if there was a way to meet the ADA compliance in a different way to build the path the less expensive route.

Mr. Robertson stated that there are alternatives to a walkway that have been discussed internally however if a walkway is going to be put in it would have to be in that location and comply with ADA regulations.

Mr. Wright asked if there is a way to continue to give the option for students to take the bus or use the sidewalk to get to Warhill Sports Complex and build the non ADA compliant path.

Mr. Robertson stated it would be discrimination if we tell one student that they would have to go a longer route than another student who is not handicap.

Mr. Snipes stated that all students have to have equal access to what the other students are able to use.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the schools have come up with this route as the safest way to get students where they need to be that is ADA compliant.

Mr. Snipes stated that was correct.

Ms. Bledsoe asked if they should be called auxiliary gyms or if they should really be called multi-purpose rooms.

Mr. Snipes said that the terminology is interchangeable.

Mr. Wright asked if the School Board has looked at these applications.

Mr. Snipes stated that they approved the applications on December 15th.

Mr. Robertson stated his appreciation to the Planning Division for all the help they provide through the process.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that the follow up meeting will occur on March 3rd at 4:00 p.m.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Bledsoe made a motion to adjourn. It was approved 4-0.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:21 p.m.

Unapproved Minutes of the March 3, 2016 Policy Committee Meeting

Capital Improvement Program FY17-FY21

Mr. José Ribeiro, Senior Planner II, stated that purpose of this meeting is to look at the combined scores to see how the Policy Committee ranked the different Capital Improvement Projects. Mr. Ribeiro stated that the individual scores were also available if anyone wanted to see how they ranked a specific project. Mr. Ribeiro stated that the top and bottom rankings are highlighted in the spreadsheet. Mr. Ribeiro stated that there were some tie scores..

Mr. Rich Krapf stated that he thought many of the school entry redesign projects were grouped together because while Williamsburg-James City County Schools (Schools) ranked them, they were all the same basic project.

Ms. Robin Bledsoe asked where the Jamestown High School Redesign project ranked on the list.

Mr. Krapf stated that it ranked fifth on the list, which was good because it was the Schools' number one priority.

Mr. Heath Richardson stated that it looked like most everyone ranked the Jamestown High School project higher on their list.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that it seemed like the Jamestown High School project already had a few pieces in place and would save money if the projects were done at the same time.

Mr. Richardson stated that in Mr. Tim O'Connor's email, he mentioned that the front entrance redesign at the schools should take priority.

Mr. Krapf stated that the Schools ranked the walkway the lowest of all the projects, ten out of ten, which is why it was helpful to have the Schools' representatives at the last meeting to clarify the reason each project was being done.

Mr. Richardson stated that he ranked the school projects lower because of the ranking criteria.

Mr. Krapf stated that everyone approaches the ranking process differently.

Ms. Bledsoe asked Mr. Ribeiro to show the original rankings submitted by the departments.

Mr. John Wright stated that he used the rankings as guidance to make sure their rankings fell similarly to where his ended up.

Mr. Richardson asked if this was the first time the County got such robust feedback from the schools in the CIP process.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that it has been a process throughout the years and the biggest hurdle that we overcame this year was the scheduling of when the CIP applications could come to the County for review.

Mr. Paul Holt stated that with all of the projects that were submitted this year the process has been fairly smooth.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that extending the timing of the process has been beneficial.

Ms. Leanne Pollock stated that the Schools used to have their own format for submitting CIP projects and last year was the first year that they filled out the County's application so the Policy Committee could compare apples to apples and have the same information from the Schools and the County projects.

Mr. Richardson stated that the School Board should be pretty stable over the next few years with the additions to the Board in the last election. Mr. Richardson asked what the process moving forward with CIP would be with the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that on March 21st at the Planning Commission special meeting, the CIP will be up for a vote as a public hearing and then the recommendation will move on to the Board of Supervisors as a reading file item.

Mr. Wright asked if the applicants would be at the Planning Commission meeting to give presentations on their CIP applications.

Mr. Holt stated that they usually do not show up; however, if there is a question before the meeting or a need for an applicant to be there, then a representative could be available.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the recommendation from the Policy Committee will be forwarded to the Planning Commission which gives members of the Planning Commission who are not on the Policy Committee an opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. Krapf stated that the next step for the Policy Committee would be to see if the Committee agrees with how the rankings aggregated. Mr. Krapf stated that the top five were consistent with his rankings so he did not have any amendments.

Ms. Pollock stated that the special consideration column was in the weighting spreadsheet so that, if a project dropped lower than members wanted, then they could factor in a special consideration to the score.

Mr. Krapf stated that he had added a special conservation to the marina because of the potential for a public-private partnership that could be coming in the near future.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the marina project is important to her because it is deteriorating so quickly.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that she was surprised that the auxiliary gym ranked lower than the Chickahominy Riverfront Park splash pad and that she did not mean to rank the splash pad higher than the auxiliary gym.

Mr. Richardson stated that the auxiliary gym was ranked five out of their ten projects.

Mr. Krapf stated that he rated the auxiliary gym lower because he thought it was more of a nice-to-have than a necessity.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that Mr. O'Connor ranked the auxiliary gym much higher and would like for him to have an opportunity to speak to that ranking. Ms. Bledsoe stated that she would like to amend her score for the auxiliary gym to make it a higher priority.

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that in Mr. O'Connor's email in the second bullet point he discussed school parity which may be why the auxiliary gym rose higher on his list.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that her concern was not why Mr. O'Connor's score was higher but why everyone else's was lower and because of those scores the auxiliary gym would be ranked lower than a splash pad at Chickahominy Riverfront Park.

Mr. Richardson stated that he tried to enter the most objective scores as possible.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that where the auxiliary gym ended up being ranked mattered to her.

Mr. Krapf stated that there was a difference in his scoring of the splash pad being five points higher than the auxiliary gym because the Parks and Recreation staff made a good point about the impact if the splash pad does not go in with respect to overcrowding in the big pool and a few other concerns.

Mr. Richardson stated that those impacts also caused his scores in quality of life and impacts to be higher and asked if at the Planning Commission meeting there could be a re-ranking of the projects.

Ms. Pollock stated that in the past the Policy Commission has forwarded their recommended rankings to the Planning Commission; however, if the Commission would like to attach certain notes to the bottom of the ranking to ensure the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors are aware of certain discussion items staff can add those notes to their memo. Ms. Pollock stated that if there is a consensus within the Policy Committee to change the order that is within the Committee's right.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that she is in the minority in thinking the auxiliary gym should be higher than the splash pad and that she would defer to her peers.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any budget numbers for the CIP funding to know how many projects the money could fund.

Ms. Tara Woodruff stated that she did not have that information.

Mr. Wright stated that he is pretty sure the County does not have the funding to make all of the 2017 CIP projects possible.

Ms. Pollock stated that the Board of Supervisors would primarily deal with the financial side of the CIP funding whereas the Policy Committee and Planning Commission are looking at the projects from more of a Comprehensive Plan consistency aspect.

Mr. Richardson asked if at the end of this process when the Board of Supervisors is looking at the recommendation from the Planning Commission do they know that the Commission looks at the criteria in that way without the financials.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that they do and are very plugged into the process of how we get to these numbers. Ms. Bledsoe stated that most of the Commissioners are very close in their rankings.

Mr. Krapf made a motion to approve the rank order as stated in the aggregated ranking sheet with a note stating Ms. Bledsoe's opinion about the auxiliary gym and the splash pad.

On a voice vote to recommend approval of the CIP ranking with Ms. Bledsoe's amendment, the motion carried (4-0, Mr. O'Connor being absent).