

A G E N D A
JAMES CITY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
County Government Center Board Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
March 18, 2019
6:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. ANNUAL ORGANIZATION MEETING

1. Election of Officers
2. Proposed Calendar for 2019-2020

D. PUBLIC COMMENT

E. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Fiscal Year 2020-2024 Capital Improvements Program

F. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND REQUESTS

G. ADJOURNMENT

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 3/18/2019

TO: The Planning Commission

FROM: Paul D. Holt, III, Secretary

SUBJECT: Election of Officers

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Planning Commission	ComSecretary, Planning	Approved	3/11/2019 - 5:00 PM

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 3/18/2019

TO: The Planning Commission

FROM: Paul D. Holt, III, Secretary

SUBJECT: Proposed Calendar for 2019-2020

The proposed meeting calendar for 2019-2020 is attached.

Staff recommends adoption of the Planning Commission, Development Review Committee (DRC), and Policy Committee meeting dates and times through March 16, 2020, as shown.

Meeting dates and times shown after March 16, 2020 are placeholder dates.

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Type
	Proposed Calendar for 2019-2020	Exhibit

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Planning Commission	ComSecretary, Planning	Approved	3/11/2019 - 5:00 PM

Proposed PC Schedule 2019 2020 (DRAFT)

Planning Commission 2019/20 (6PM)

- April 3
- May 1
- June 5
- June 25 Joint Work Session w/BOS (4pm)
- July 3
- August 7
- September 4
- October 2
- November 6
- December 4
- January 8 (2020)
- February 5 (2020)
- March 4 (2020)
- March 16 (2020)*

*Special Meeting (Organizational and CIP)

Policy Committee 2019/20 (4PM)

- April 11
- May 9
- June 13
- July 11
- August 8
- September 12
- October 10
- November 14
- December 12
- January 9 (2020)
- February 13 (2020)**
- February 20 (2020)**
- February 27 (2020)**
- March 5 (2020)**
- March 12 (2020)

**CIP Meetings

DRC 2019/20 (4PM)

- March 27
- April 17
- May 22
- June 19
- July 24
- August 21
- September 18
- October 23
- November 20
- December 18
- January 22 (2020)
- February 19 (2020)

Planning Commission 2020/21 (6PM)

- April 1
- May 6
- May 26 Joint Work Session w/BOS (4pm)
- June 3
- July 1
- August 5
- September 2
- October 7
- November 4
- December 2
- January 6 (2021)
- February 3 (2021)
- March 3 (2021)
- March 15 (2021)*

*Special Meeting (Organizational and CIP)

Policy Committee 2020/21 (4PM)

- April 9
- May 14
- June 11
- July 9
- August 13
- September 10
- October 8
- November 12
- December 10
- January 14 (2021)
- February 11 (2021)**
- February 18 (2021)**
- February 25 (2021)**
- March 4 (2021)**
- March 11 (2021)

**CIP Meetings

DRC 2020/21 (4PM)

- March 25
- April 22
- May 20
- June 17
- July 22
- August 19
- September 23
- October 21
- November 18
- December 16
- January 20 (2021)
- February 17 (2021)

2019/20 Calendar Year = March 19, 2019 – March 16, 2020

2020/21 Calendar Year = March 17, 2020 – March 15, 2021 (2020/21 Calendar provided for reference only)

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 3/18/2019

TO: The Planning Commission

FROM: Jose Ribeiro, Senior Planner II

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2020-2024 Capital Improvements Program

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Type
☐	Memorandum	Cover Memo
☐	Attachment No.1. Policy Committee CIP ranking criteria	Backup Material
☐	Attachment No. 2. Policy Committee CIP summary spreadsheet	Backup Material
☐	Attachment No. 3. Approved Policy Committee minutes from February 14, 2019	Backup Material
☐	Attachment No. 4. Approved Policy Committee minutes from February 21, 2019	Backup Material
☐	Attachment No. 5. Approved Policy Committee minutes from February 28, 2019	Backup Material
☐	Attachment No. 6. Citizen's correspondence	Backup Material

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Planning Commission	ComSecretary, Planning	Approved	3/11/2019 - 5:00 PM

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 18, 2019

TO: The Planning Commission

FROM: Jose Ribeiro, Senior Planner II
Tori Haynes, Planner
Terry Costello, Deputy Zoning Administrator

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2020-2024 Capital Improvements Program

The Policy Committee annually reviews Capital Improvements Program (CIP) requests submitted by various County departments and Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) Schools. 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 the CIP requests and to evaluate the projects for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, *"Toward 2035: Leading the Way,"* 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 departments and WJCC Schools are summarized. This year there was a total of 20 projects submitted for consideration by the Policy Committee - 16 from James City County departments and four from WJCC Schools. The projects total \$114.47 million, with \$13.96 million of that total identified for Fiscal Year (FY) 20. Nine of the proposed County projects have been previously included in the Board's five-year CIP: the Stormwater Improvements and Transportation match applications, the new Fire Station No. 6, improvements to Columbia Drive, as well as applications from Parks and Recreation for the James City County Marina (Phases I and II), Jamestown Beach Event Park improvements, new restrooms and concession building at the Chickahominy Riverfront Park, and Veterans Park improvements (Phase II). Three of the four CIP applications submitted by the WJCC Schools were included in prior CIPs; however, estimates and completion timelines have been amended.

Attachment No. 2 also identifies the Committee's ranked priorities for these projects and includes a brief summary for each. The projects are listed from highest to lowest. This is the document that will also be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors showing the Commission's priorities. The full set of materials provided with each application can be found in the CIP materials posted online for the [February 14](#) Policy Committee meeting.

Staff Recommendation:

At its March 7, 2019 meeting, the Committee unanimously voted to recommend forwarding the following FY 2020-2024 CIP priorities to serve as a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The projects selected are listed below in rank order. Please note that some of these projects received tied rankings.

Following discussion at the Policy Committee meetings, special considerations and/or supplemental information has been provided for several of these projects, as noted:

1. Stormwater Capital Improvement Program*
2. Transportation Match*
3. Fire Station No. 6 *
4. Columbia Drive*
5. Lower County Park* (a)
6. James City County Marina Phase I* (b)
7. Grove Convenience Center* (a)
8. Jamestown Beach Event Park Improvements*
9. New Restroom and Concession Building at Chickahominy Riverfront Park
10. Warhill High School Expansion* (c)
11. Jamestown Corridor-Ambler House Utilities*
12. James City County Marina Phase II
13. Chickahominy Riverfront Park Improvements Phase III
14. New Elementary School*
15. Lafayette High School Expansion
16. Jamestown High School Expansion*
17. Pickleball Courts at Warhill Sports Complex
18. Veterans Park Phase 2 Improvements
19. Baseball Field Expansion at Warhill Sports Complex
20. Demolition of Baby Pool and Replacement with Splashing Pad at Upper County Park

* *These projects are requesting funding in FY 2020:*

- (a) *The Policy Committee indicated that the acquisition of land should be the priority for these CIP applications.*
- (b) *The Policy Committee indicated that the replacement and stabilization of the bulkheads should also be of higher priority.*
- (c) *The Policy Committee identified the addition of an auxiliary gym as a priority over the expansion of classrooms.*

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

JR/TH/TC/md

FY20-24CIP-mem

Attachments:

1. Policy Committee CIP ranking criteria
2. Policy Committee CIP summary spreadsheet
3. Approved Policy Committee minutes from February 14, 2019
4. Approved Policy Committee minutes from February 21, 2019
5. Approved Policy Committee minutes from February 28, 2019
6. Citizen's correspondence

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)?	

FY 20 - 24 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM RANKING SPREADSHEET

ID	Agency	Project Title	Brief Project Description (see application narratives for more detail)	FY 2020 Requested	FY 2021 Requested	FY 2022 Requested	FY 2023 Requested	FY 2024 Requested	Total Requested	Priority	Out of	Special Consideration	PC Score	Rank
R	Stormwater	Stormwater Capital Improvement Program	Various projects to address undersized and failing drainage systems, restore eroded channels and install new facilities to treat runoff pollution.	\$2,613,000.00	\$2,204,000.00	\$2,600,000.00	\$2,634,000.00	\$2,493,000.00	\$12,544,000.00	1	1	Yes	80.6	1
S	Planning	Transportation Match	Various transportation projects, including Croaker Road, Longhill Road, Richmond Road and Grove Roadways.	\$1,500,000.00	\$1,500,000.00	\$1,500,000.00	\$1,500,000.00	\$1,500,000.00	\$7,500,000.00	1	1	Yes	74.1	2
E	Fire	Fire Station 6	Begin the process to fund additional fire stations to increase six minute coverage in the Primary Service Area.	\$1,410,000.00	\$6,215,000.00	\$1,285,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8,910,000.00	1	1		64.1	3
C	Econ. Dev.	Columbia Drive	Road improvements to Columbia Drive to allow acceptance into VDOT public road system.	\$125,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$125,000.00	1	2	Yes	57.9	4
K	Parks & Rec.	Lower County Park	Acquire property, design, and construct a park that includes a walking trail, picnic shelter, swimming pool, restrooms, and all related infrastructure to support.	\$550,000.00	\$0.00	\$450,000.00	\$0.00	\$4,500,000.00	\$5,500,000.00	6	10	Yes	58.6	5
H	Parks & Rec.	James City County Marina Phase I	Replace existing bulkhead and expand, replace, uncovered floating dock system, relocate gas tank/system, install green shoreline in appropriate areas.	\$1,720,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,720,000.00	1	10	Yes	54.6	6
F	General Services	Grove Convenience Center	Construct a convenience center in the Grove area to provide residents with the ability to dispose of household trash, recyclables and other items.	\$146,000.00	\$484,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$630,000.00	1	1	Yes	53.9	7
I	Parks & Rec.	Jamestown Beach Event Park Improvements	Install one additional restroom facility to support beach and possibly event area; paving of existing entrance road, drop off areas and handicap parking; install permanent parking in existing grass parking area for 100-200 spaces, 5 shade structures and concrete walkways to connect parking lot to beach.	\$333,000.00	\$1,300,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,633,000.00	2	10		45.8	8
M	Parks & Rec.	New Restroom and Concession Building - Chickahominy Riverfront Park	New building with additional urinals, stalls, changing room and larger concession area to meeting existing Health Department and Building Code requirements.	\$0.00	\$350,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$350,000.00	4	10		47.6	9
P	WJCC Schools	School Expansion - Warhill H.S.	Add instructional space.	\$890,332.00	\$0.00	\$11,348,180.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$12,238,512.00	2	4		43	10
J	Econ. Dev.	Amblers House Utilities	Utility improvements that would begin to implement some of the recommendations from the Shaping our Shores Master Plan.	\$185,104.00	\$729,286.75	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$924,390.75	2	2	Yes	40.3	11
G	Parks & Rec.	James City County Marina Phase 2	Relocate existing boat ramp from its current location to alleviate the congestion in front of the existing building, provide additional parking for marina and ramp visitors, replace both covered boat houses and add the third section of open slips.	\$0.00	\$200,000.00	\$3,300,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,500,000.00	3	10		35.5	12
B	Parks & Rec.	Chickahominy Riverfront Park Phase III Improvements	Development of Master Stormwater Plan per Special Use Permit Conditions. Development of park based on Shaping our Shores Master Plan.	\$0.00	\$300,000.00	\$1,800,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,100,000.00	5	10	Yes	34.8	13

FY 20 - 24 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM RANKING SPREADSHEET

ID	Agency	Project Title	Brief Project Description (see application narratives for more detail)	FY 2020 Requested	FY 2021 Requested	FY 2022 Requested	FY 2023 Requested	FY 2024 Requested	Total Requested	Priority	Out of	Special Consideration	PC Score	Rank
L	WJCC Schools	New Elementary School	Construct a new school which will house 700 students and be approximately 106,000 square feet.	\$3,533,221.00	\$35,000,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$38,533,221.00	1	4		34.6	14
O	WJCC Schools	School Expansion - Lafayette H.S.	Add instructional space.	\$0.00	\$246,825.00	\$2,860,079.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,106,904.00	3	4		31.5	15
Q	WJCC Schools	School Expansion - Jamestown H.S.	Expand the cafeteria space and addition of instructional space.	\$956,743.00	\$10,974,113.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$11,930,856.00	4	4		31.5	15
N	Parks & Rec.	Pickleball Courts	Construct up to six dedicated pickleball courts	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$275,000.00	8	10		27.4	17
T	Parks & Rec.	Veterans Park Phase 2 Improvements	Complete phase 2 improvements at Veterans Park (splash pad, eastern parking lot addition, bus parking addition, sidewalk connections).	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$50,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$0.00	\$550,000.00	7	10		25.4	18
A	Parks & Rec.	Baseball Field Expansion at Warhill Sports Complex	Construct two lighted turf baseball fields, additional parking and restroom facilities.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,100,000.00	\$2,100,000.00	9	10		25.3	19
D	Parks & Rec.	Demo existing Baby Pool and Replace with Splash Pad	Demo existing baby pool and replace with splash pad.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$300,000.00	\$300,000.00	10	10		23.9	20
TOTAL:				\$13,962,400.00	\$59,503,224.75	\$25,203,259.00	\$4,659,000.00	\$11,143,000.00	\$114,470,883.75					

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Building A Large Conference Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
February 14, 2019
4:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Jack Haldeman called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Present:

Jack Haldeman, Chair

Rich Krapf

Julia Leverenz

Tim O'Connor

Staff:

Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner

Jose Ribeiro, Senior Planner

Tori Haynes, Planner

Terry Costello, Deputy Zoning Administrator

John Risinger, Community Development Assistant

Sue Mellen, Director of Financial and Management Services

Sharon Day, Assistant Director of Financial and Management Services

Jeffrey Wiggins, Budget and Accounting Analyst

C. MINUTES

1. January 10, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Rich Krapf made a motion to approve the January 10, 2018, meeting minutes as amended.

The motion passed 4-0.

D. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

E. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Haldeman opened the meeting for public comment.

Mr. Jay Everson, 103 Branscome Boulevard, stated that he has concerns with the Future Think methodology for school enrollment projections. He stated that high school enrollment is projected to stay within the current capacity for the next 10 years. He stated that moving the Bright Beginnings program to it's own facilities could free up needed space within the elementary schools.

1. FY 2020-2024 Capital Improvements Program Review

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that the Code of Virginia provides for the Planning Commission to provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for capital improvement projects. She

stated that the Policy Committee may review the applications based on it's consistency with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Jose Ribeiro stated that 20 applications were received for the Fiscal Year 2020-2024 Capital Improvements Program. He stated that County departments submitted 16 applications and Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools (WJCC) submitted four applications. He stated that staff could help address questions and coordinate with the County departments and WJCC to arrange for representatives to be present at the coming meetings. He stated that the Policy Committee's final rankings will be presented to the Planning Commission on March 18, 2019 and then to the Board of Supervisors at a later date.

Mr. Haldeman asked how the two revenue sections for the Ambler House application were determined. He asked if the total revenue in 2024 would be \$925,000.

Mr. Jeffrey Wiggins stated that the second entry in the revenue section should not be on the application. He stated that an older version of the proposal had additional methods of revenue.

Mr. Haldeman asked if the total revenue in 2024 would be \$125,000.

Mr. Wiggins confirmed.

Mr. Haldeman stated the Columbia Drive, Lower County Park and replacement of the bulkheads in the James City County Marina Phase I application were high priorities in his rankings.

Mr. Krapf stated that he had questions regarding how the design fees were estimated for the Fire Station 6 application and the new elementary school application. He stated that the Stormwater Capital Improvements Program and Transportation Match applications were the highest priorities in his rankings. He stated the Columbia Drive, Fire Station 6 and the Grove Convenience Center were also high priorities in his rankings. He stated that potential grant funding should not be listed as a special consideration in the application if there is no guarantee of receiving the funding.

Ms. Julia Leverenz agreed. She stated that applications for the Grove area could provide better service for the residents of that area. She stated that those applications were high priorities in her rankings. She stated that the Stormwater Capital Improvements Program and the Transportation Match applications were the highest in her rankings. She stated that the Fire Station 6, James City County Marina Phase I, and Columbia Drive were also high on her list. She asked if the data and estimates submitted with the WJCC applications are verified by County staff.

Ms. Rosario stated that representatives from WJCC would be able to answer questions regarding their estimates in a future meeting.

Ms. Leverenz asked why the Bright Beginnings program is integrated with the elementary schools. She stated that there may be advantages to creating separate facilities for the program. She stated that the estimated design costs may be impacted when a site is chosen.

Mr. Haldeman stated that the costs listed in the application do not include items such as furniture and buses.

Ms. Leverenz stated that the application does not list future administrative costs.

Mr. Haldeman asked if the estimates in the application include the City of Williamsburg's share.

Mr. Wiggins stated that the estimates listed in the application are the total costs for the project. He stated that the County's share of the project is 90.52%.

Mr. Tim O'Connor stated that he would like to have more information about how WJCC estimated the costs for its projects. He stated that eight elementary schools were constructed in Virginia throughout 2018 with total costs ranging from \$18 to \$40 million. He stated that the estimated costs are above the state averages in 2018.

Mr. Krapf stated that creating a separate facility for the Bright Beginnings program could delay the necessity of building a new elementary school.

Mr. O'Connor asked if a site had been identified for Fire Station 6.

Ms. Sue Mellen stated that they are working on acquiring land.

Mr. Krapf stated that he was interested in the potential training collaborations between the proposed Fire Station 6 and Thomas Nelson Community College.

Mr. Haldeman stated that the Fire Station 6 application helps expand the area of the County that is within the six minute response time coverage.

Ms. Leverenz stated that the online ranking system was working well.

Mr. Krapf agreed.

Mr. O'Connor asked if the elementary school application had been listed in previous plans for WJCC.

Ms. Mellen stated that WJCC used a 10-year Capital Improvements Program plan. She stated that the application had been previously submitted in Fiscal Year 2018. She stated that the new application had been listed as a higher priority.

Ms. Rosario asked Ms. Terry Costello to summarize the questions the Commissioners had for the departments.

Ms. Costello stated the questions for WJCC involved their cost projections, design fees, and the Bright Beginnings. She stated that the question for the Fire Department was in reference to the design fees for Fire Station 6.

Ms. Leverenz stated that another question for WJCC was about construction costs.

Ms. Rosario asked if there was a question about the urgency of building Fire Station 6.

Mr. Haldeman confirmed.

Ms. Leverenz stated that there was a question earlier in the meeting regarding the safety of the bulkheads at the marina.

Ms. Mellen asked if there was a question about revenue projections for the Ambler House application.

Mr. Haldeman stated that his question had been answered.

Ms. Mellen asked if more information was needed in regards to land acquisition for the Lower

County Park application.

Mr. Haldeman stated that the question was not a high priority for the purpose of CIP rankings.

Ms. Leverenz asked to have WJCC address if a site had been chosen for the new elementary school.

Ms. Rosario stated that another question for the Parks and Recreation Department was in regards to the grants listed under the special considerations section of their application.

Ms. Mellen stated that the Commissioners could ask for specific grants to be listed for that section of the application.

Ms. Leverenz stated that grant must have been already awarded to be a special consideration.

Ms. Sharon Day stated that the special considerations section of the application could have additional instructions for applicants in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Ribeiro asked Ms. Costello to list the updated questions.

Ms. Costello stated that questions for WJCC included cost projections, design fees, Bright Beginnings program, construction fees and if a site had been chosen for the new elementary school. She stated that questions for the Fire Department regarded design fees for Fire Station 6 and if it was an urgent need to improve response times. She stated that questions for the Parks and Recreation Department included the safety of the bulkheads at the marina and if any grant funds had been obtained for their projects.

Ms. Mellen asked if the questions for WJCC were mostly directed towards the elementary school application.

Ms. Leverenz confirmed.

Ms. Rosario stated that the next meeting would be with representatives from the Fire Department and the Parks and Recreation Department. She stated the following meeting would be with representatives from WJCC.

Mr. Krapf asked when meeting minutes would be available for the meetings with the department representatives.

Mr. John Risinger stated that unapproved minutes could be forwarded to the Commissioners before completing the internal review stages.

Ms. Leverenz asked if this meeting's minute would be available in the following week or if it would only be for the meetings with department representatives.

Ms. Rosario stated that internal review of meeting minutes typically takes longer than a week to complete. She stated that staff would develop a plan to allow the Commissioners to review the unapproved minutes in a timely manner.

Mr. Krapf stated that the minutes for the meetings with the department representatives were the most important. He stated that the minutes would help to understand the discussions that took place at the meeting.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that the next meeting would be on February 21 with the Fire Department and Parks and Recreation Department.

Mr. Haldeman asked if there was any further discussion.

There was none.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Leverenz made a motion to adjourn. The motion passed 4-0.

Mr. Haldeman adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:45 p.m.

Mr. Jack Haldeman, Chair

Mr. Paul Holt, Secretary

M I N U T E S
JAMES CITY COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Building A Large Conference Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
February 21, 2019
4:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Jack Haldeman called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Present:

Jack Haldeman, Chair

Julia Leverenz

Tim O'Connor

Staff:

Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner

Jose Ribeiro, Senior Planner

Tori Haynes, Planner

Terry Costello, Deputy Zoning Administrator

John Risinger, Community Development Assistant

Jeffrey Wiggins, Budget and Accounting Analyst

Ryan Ashe, Fire Chief

Tristan Aiken, Assistant Fire Chief

John Carnifax, Director of Parks and Recreation

Alister Perkinson, Parks Administrator

C. MINUTES

There were no minutes.

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. FY 2020-2024 Capital Improvements Program Review

Mr. Jose Ribeiro stated that representatives from the Fire Department and the Parks and Recreation Department could answer questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Haldeman invited Chief Ryan Ashe and Assistant Chief Tristan Aiken to address the questions about the Fire Station 6 application.

Mr. Ashe stated that the design costs for the Fire Station 6 application were estimated with help from the General Services department. He stated that the location of the proposed fire station was not known when estimating the design cost. He stated that they have since identified land near the Law Enforcement Center to be acquired for the fire station. He stated that costs associated with the site topography have not been determined.

Mr. Haldeman asked if there was any expectation for when a seventh and eighth fire station would be built.

Mr. Ashe stated that he did not know a timeline for when a seventh and eighth fire station would be built. He stated that Fire Station 3 and Fire Station 4 are the busiest fire stations in

the County. He stated that they decided to locate Fire Station 6 in an area that could reduce the number of calls going to Fire Station 3 and Fire Station 4, along with reducing the number of calls to the City of Williamsburg Fire Department. He stated that they considered locations for the station that helped achieve the 6-minute response time goal set by the County. He stated that they categorized calls based on response time. He stated that they found that the Ford's Colony and Lightfoot areas had over 600 calls in the slowest category and the Kingsmill area was approaching 350 calls in the slowest category. He stated that they weighed adding additional units to Fire Station 3 and Fire Station 4 against adding a new station. He stated that adding a new fire station would help address the volume of calls along with expanding the 6-minute response coverage area. He stated that building a fire station in Ford's Colony would improve the response times in that area but not be as helpful to surrounding fire stations. He stated that a study was conducted in 1993 which proposed a fire station near the County Government Center. He stated that this proposed station would improve the response times to the Kingsmill area; however, the Kingsmill area has not reached the threshold to initiate plans for a new fire station.

Mr. Ribeiro asked if there were any further questions for the Fire Department.

Mr. Haldeman stated that the application listed that there was no imminent threat to health, safety and general welfare of the County. He asked if the need for the station addressed only policy requirements.

Mr. Ashe stated that because calls in the Lightfoot area are being answered currently, they did not list it as an imminent threat to the health, safety and general welfare of the County.

Mr. Haldeman asked if slow response times could be an imminent threat to health and safety.

Mr. Ashe stated that the American Heart Association states permanent brain damage would occur if the brain is deprived of oxygen for four to six minutes. He stated that a fire can double in size every 30 seconds.

Ms. Leverenz stated that faster response times can save lives and property so it should be considered an immediate need for health and safety.

Mr. O'Connor asked how equipment would be allocated to the new fire station.

Mr. Ashe stated that equipment is located in stations that have the most need for that type of equipment. He stated that they do not plan on reallocating equipment from existing stations to the Fire Station 6.

Mr. O'Connor asked if the road access for Fire Station 6 would be through the Law Enforcement Center or onto Opportunity Way.

Mr. Ashe stated that Fire Station 6 would have road access onto Opportunity Way.

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that a question from the previous meeting was if a standard building design could be used for greater efficiency in design costs.

Mr. Ashe stated that it would utilize a similar layout as the existing Fire Station 4. He stated that they would modify the living area to allow for expansion in the future.

Ms. Leverenz asked if utilizing similar designs was accounted for in the design cost.

Mr. Ashe confirmed. He stated that improving the safety of living conditions for the firefighters would result in changes from the past design.

Mr. Ribeiro asked if there were any further questions.

There were none.

Mr. Haldeman invited Mr. John Carnifax and Mr. Alister Perkinson to address the questions for their applications.

Mr. Carnifax stated that concerns of the safety of the James City County Marina were raised. He stated that safety concerns at the parks are addressed by closing off areas and repairing areas as needed. He stated that the bulkhead is at risk of failure in the case of a large storm.

Mr. Haldeman asked if it would be better to complete the work at the marina in one phase instead of two.

Mr. Carnifax stated that it would and there would be cost savings from completing the work at the same time. He stated that separating the improvements into two phases spreads out the required funding. He stated that the improvements listed in the Phase I application are immediate needs for the safety of citizens utilizing the marina.

Ms. Leverenz asked if the County was insured in the event of a storm damaging the parks.

Mr. Carnifax confirmed.

Mr. Haldeman stated that it is more expensive to replace a failed bulkhead then it is to replace a functional bulkhead.

Mr. Carnifax stated that most of the bulkhead would be replaced with a living shoreline.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that a question asked in the previous meeting was if any grants had been awarded to the project.

Mr. Carnifax stated that they have not received any grants. He stated that the Parks and Recreation Department continues to apply for grants for the marina project.

Mr. O'Connor asked if there were plans for a stormwater master plan for Chickahominy Riverfront Park.

Mr. Carnifax confirmed. He stated that more information would be presented to the Planning Commission in the future.

Mr. Haldeman asked how many phases are anticipated for Chickahominy Riverfront Park.

Mr. Carnifax stated that there are three phases currently but more may be added for activities including rowing and small boating. He stated that he would like to continue a relationship with the College of William and Mary Rowing Club and the Williamsburg Boat Club at the park.

Mr. Haldeman asked if a site had been selected for the proposed Lower County Park.

Mr. Carnifax stated that they have narrowed their search down to a few locations. He stated that the application for the Lower County Park is for the land acquisition. He stated that once land has been acquired, they would apply again for the design phase once the costs had been estimated.

Ms. Rosario asked if the grants they were applying to required matching funds from the

County.

Mr. Carnifax stated that they apply to a number of grants that have different requirements. He stated that matching funds could be acquired if the applications require it.

Mr. O'Connor asked if the Running Center plan was still being pursued.

Mr. Carnifax stated that the proposed location has changed to the Jamestown Beach Event Park and is still in the planning stage.

Mr. Haldeman asked if there were any further questions.

There were none.

E. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Leverenz made a motion to adjourn. The motion passed 3-0.

Mr. Haldeman adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:45 p.m.

Mr. Jack Haldeman, Chair

Mr. Paul Holt, Secretary

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Building A Large Conference Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
February 28, 2019
1:00 AM

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Jack Haldeman called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Present:

Jack Haldeman, Chair

Julia Leverenz

Tim O'Connor

Staff:

Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner

Jose Ribeiro, Senior Planner

Tori Haynes, Planner

Terry Costello, Deputy Zoning Administrator

John Risinger, Community Development Assistant

Sue Mellen, Director of Financial and Management Services

Sharon Day, Assistant Director of Financial and Management Services

Jeffrey Wiggins, Budget and Accounting Analyst

C. MINUTES

There were no minutes.

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. FY 2020-2024 Capital Improvements Program Review

Mr. Marcellus Snipes, Senior Director for Operations, Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools (WJCC), presented the Committee with information about WJCC's Capital Improvements Program (CIP). He stated that a site has not been currently identified for the new elementary school. He stated that further discussions would be held with the County and the City of Williamsburg before a site is determined. He stated that Grimm and Parker Architecture, Inc. estimated the construction costs listed on the application. He stated that the new elementary school would be around 106,000 square feet. He stated that using the FY 2018 Virginia averages for construction cost, construction of the new elementary school would cost approximately \$22 million. He stated that the new elementary school would cost approximately \$28 million including soft costs.

Mr. Haldeman asked what is included in soft costs.

Mr. Jim Falzone, Supervisor of Facilities and Capital Projects, WJCC, said that soft costs include design and architecture costs.

Mr. Snipes stated that the estimated costs are within the range of construction costs of schools built in Virginia during FY 2018.

Mr. Tim O'Connor asked if having high estimated construction costs would result in contractors submitting high bids.

Mr. Snipes stated that, on the contrary, WJCC's experience has been that the competitive bidding process has resulted in construction bids under the estimated construction cost.

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that there had been a question during the February 14, 2019, Policy Committee meeting about utilizing existing school designs to reduce costs.

Mr. Snipes stated that school designs change as teaching methods change. He stated that current teaching methods benefit from having flexible learning spaces. He stated that Grimm and Parker Architecture, Inc. might have estimated the construction costs with flexible learning spaces in mind. He stated that the next question he received was in regards to how the Future Think projections are created. He stated that the projections are based on a number of factors including birth rates to project the enrollment in kindergarten classes.

Ms. Julia Leverenz asked if the projections account for people moving to the County.

Mr. Snipes confirmed. He stated that another question he received was about moving the Bright Beginnings program from the elementary schools. He stated that WJCC had discussions about moving the Bright Beginnings program to its own facilities. He stated the WJCC School Board School Liaison Committee's guidelines state that when an existing school is at 85% enrollment capacity, needs are evaluated and potential solutions are considered. He stated that a plan of action is put in place when a school is at 90% enrollment capacity. He stated that many variables determine if WJCC will construct a new school or expand an existing school.

Mr. Haldeman stated that the new elementary school application only lists additional personnel costs during FY 2022. He asked if these costs would continue each year.

Mr. Snipes confirmed.

Ms. Leverenz asked if new buses would be required regardless of whether the Bright Beginnings program is moved to its own facilities.

Mr. Snipes stated that current capacity of school buses vary between schools. He stated that moving the Bright Beginnings program to its own facilities would require additional buses.

Mr. Haldeman asked how many additional students would be accommodated at the high schools with the proposed expansions.

Mr. Snipes stated that the expansions would add capacity for about 200 additional students at each high school.

Mr. Falzone stated that constructing a new high school would create greater demand for school facilities such as sports fields. He stated that expanding current high schools would raise the student capacity while adding less demand for facilities.

Mr. Haldeman asked how much land area is needed to build an elementary school.

Mr. Snipes stated that the Virginia Department of Education requires four acres plus one acre for every 100 students for an elementary school.

Ms. Rosario stated that the standard is 27 developable acres for a school with a capacity of 500 to 700 students.

Mr. Haldeman asked why the new elementary school application was moved to an earlier Fiscal Year compared to the last application.

Mr. Snipes stated that the previous timeframe was a placeholder.

Mr. O'Connor asked if the Warhill High School application includes the fields and auxiliary gym.

Mr. Snipes confirmed.

Mr. O'Connor asked how long the extra capacity from the high school expansions would suffice.

Mr. Snipes stated that the high schools should have enough capacity through 2028.

Mr. Haldeman stated that the enrollment projections have consistently been too high. He stated that in 2011, the projection for elementary school enrollment in 2021 was 5,396 students. He stated that the current projection for 2021 is 5,186 students. He stated that in 2013, the projection for 2023 was 5,522 students while the current projection is 5,200 students. He stated that in 2017, the projection for 2027 was 5,371 students while the current projection is 5,265 students. He stated that the total enrollment projections were similarly too high. He stated that the enrollment projections may be misleading when looking at constructing new schools.

Ms. Leverenz asked if the projections declining was due to declining population or birth rate.

Ms. Rosario stated that although population growth has been strong, the growth rate in the County has slowed down since 2008. She stated that birth rates have been declining nationally.

Mr. Haldeman stated that birth rates are at an all-time low nationally.

Ms. Leverenz asked if the County's demographics have shifted to having more growth in the older population compared to the younger population.

Mr. Jose Ribeiro stated that projections from the Comprehensive Plan show that people 65 or older will be the largest age group by 2040.

Ms. Rosario stated that Greg Grootendorst, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, presented demographics information to the Board of Supervisors on February 26, 2019. She stated that the presentation showed that the County's average age is a decade greater than the rest of the Hampton Roads area.

Mr. Snipes stated that the WJCC CIP plan is updated based on the most current enrollment projections at the time. He stated that they have recently been using the "Low Projection" from the Future Think methodology instead of the "Most Likely Projection."

Ms. Rosario stated that the Comprehensive Plan shows that in 2010, people ages 19 and younger were 23% of the population. She stated that the 2040 projections show ages 19 and younger as 20% of the population. She stated that while the proportion has decreased, the total number of people ages 19 and younger is projected to increase due to continued population growth.

Mr. O'Connor asked how WJCC determines when a building no longer satisfactorily meets the students' needs and teaching standards. He stated that older schools might not have the

same quality of learning spaces or sufficient capacity for school functions.

Mr. Snipes stated that feasibility studies are conducted at each school to understand the condition and how to best address any issues. He stated that the decision is made based on a variety of information including the community's opinions.

Mr. O'Connor stated that it might make more sense to start planning to replace older schools instead of investing money into expansions or renovations.

Mr. Snipes stated those decisions need support from the community, the County, the City of Williamsburg, and the WJCC School Board.

Mr. Haldeman opened the meeting for public comment.

Mr. Jay Everson, 103 Branscome Boulevard, stated that new facilities for the Bright Beginnings program could potentially be built on land at existing elementary schools without increasing the number of school buses needed. He stated that the Future Think methodology uses building permit statistics as part of the calculation. He stated that the projections are higher due to including building permits from age-restricted communities.

Mr. Haldeman closed the public comment.

Mr. Snipes stated that the community might prefer having the Bright Beginnings program distributed across the County instead of at one site.

Mr. O'Connor stated that he has concerns with the expansion at Warhill High School in addition to Fire Station 6 adding additional traffic on Opportunity Way. He stated that WJCC should work with the Fire Department to address traffic issues on Opportunity Way.

Mr. Snipes stated that WJCC has looked into the possibility of adding a turn lane on Opportunity Way to improve the traffic flow into Warhill High School.

Mr. Haldeman asked if there were any further questions.

There were none.

E. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Leverenz made a motion to adjourn. The motion passed 3-0.

Mr. Haldeman adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Jack Haldeman, Chair

Mr. Paul Holt, Secretary

2/6/19

TO: James City County Planning Commission

FROM: Jay H. Everson
103 Branscome Blvd.
Williamsburg, VA 23185
757-880-1851



RE: W-JCC CIP FY 2020—Increased Capacity Elementary/High Schools

The W-JCC Central Office is proposing \$66,318,743 for classroom expansion at the Elementary and High School levels over the next 5 years. There are two factors that need to be considered: Existing School Capacity & Projected Enrollment

I will stipulate that the Existing School Capacity and how it has been computed is accurate and reasonable. So the question is: Is W-JCC's existing capacity sufficient for anticipated future growth in our school age population?

Since last year the governing bodies and the School Board have agreed to use the Future Think Low Enrollment Projection. However, even with the Low Enrollment Projections when the future becomes present the number of children showing up for school is less than projected (see Exhibit A). In all cases the number of enrolled children is less than the identified school capacities.

First, let's start with the High School Projections & Capacity chart. For the next 6 years the projected high school enrollment is actually declining. Ten years out the projected enrollment is still less than capacity. The High Schools have a student distribution problem not a capacity problem.

Now to the Elementary School Projections & Capacity chart. For the first time the enrollment numbers both current and projected include Bright Beginnings. This program currently occupies 30 Elementary School classrooms. It has been proposed that separate facilities for Bright Beginnings could be built on existing elementary school sites. W-JCC Central Office has indicated that said facilities could be built for \$4.5 Million & would house 180 students. Current enrollment in the program is 340+/- . But even if we were to do nothing, 10-years hence ES enrollment would exceed capacity by only 37 children.

In closing, High School classroom expansion is not justified. The Elementary School situation is quite different. The inclusion of Bright Beginnings enrollment needs to be thoroughly vetted. Classroom configurations are typically different for children between 2-pre-K years old particularly when children with disabilities are factored in. Separate facilities may be appropriate. As an aside, I remain concerned with the Future Think methodology. I would recommend that the JCC Planning Division provide the enrollment projections (Exhibit C).

Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools

Over the past ten years, student enrollment in the Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools has increased by 958 students in grades K–12. Total enrollment for the 2018-19 school year is 11,461, a decrease of 16 students (or less than 1%) from the previous school year.

The following table and graphs illustrate the Division's enrollment history from 2009-10 through 2018-19.

**Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools
Historical Enrollment**

Grade	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
K	732	682	797	770	778	751	760	813	770	807
1	734	755	747	796	831	809	810	792	863	791
2	750	774	771	786	828	851	832	808	808	886
3	802	778	793	795	804	839	865	860	828	825
4	801	811	795	816	821	824	871	868	868	840
5	856	821	809	815	841	838	841	887	881	875
K - 5 Total	4,675	4,621	4,712	4,778	4,903	4,912	4,979	5,028	5,018	5,024
6	787	862	845	821	853	852	887	879	857	897
7	783	814	880	826	839	860	859	886	876	872
8	780	778	835	905	854	855	873	863	907	872
6 - 8 Total	2,350	2,454	2,560	2,552	2,546	2,567	2,619	2,628	2,640	2,641
9	940	889	850	923	1,021	980	953	1,008	931	989
10	940	904	871	851	908	986	976	965	1,035	948
11	848	853	833	828	806	875	939	918	959	958
12	750	828	845	816	814	796	837	884	894	901
9 - 12 Total	3,478	3,474	3,399	3,418	3,549	3,637	3,705	3,775	3,819	3,796
K - 12 Total	10,503	10,549	10,671	10,748	10,998	11,116	11,303	11,431	11,477	11,461

Source: Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools, 9/30/18 Count



Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools

The following table illustrates the Division's enrollment history by school from 2009-10 through 2018-19. During that time, three new schools opened.

**Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools
Historical Enrollment by School**

School	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Baker Elementary	551	480	509	500	500	524	536	528	513	515
Laurel Lane Elementary	510	467	461	447	432	429	482	487	486	465
Montague Elementary	581	453	431	423	443	445	438	461	482	503
Norge Elementary	592	517	535	561	572	578	610	591	583	583
Whaley Elementary	456	427	471	472	532	521	512	489	480	541
James River Elementary	466	466	493	550	512	503	492	502	498	448
Stonehouse Elementary	831	676	647	665	720	719	714	727	723	745
Matoaka Elementary	688	715	732	711	745	723	721	730	754	745
Blayton Elementary		420	433	449	447	470	474	513	499	479
Berkeley Middle	848	886	936	942	902	908	880	860	881	596
Toano Middle	859	678	705	693	733	756	803	826	816	701
Hornsby Middle		890	919	917	911	903	936	942	943	794
James Blair Middle	643									550
Lafayette High	1,114	1,108	1,077	1,098	1,158	1,160	1,209	1,152	1,130	1,112
Jamestown High	1,232	1,217	1,186	1,211	1,263	1,313	1,308	1,328	1,317	1,296
Warhill High	1,132	1,149	1,136	1,109	1,128	1,164	1,188	1,295	1,372	1,388
Total	10,503	10,549	10,671	10,748	10,998	11,116	11,303	11,431	11,477	11,461

Source: Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools, 9/30/18 Count

OCTOBER 2010, NOVEMBER 2013 AND NOVEMBER 2016 LOW PROJECTIONS WITH 2018 ACTUAL ENROLLMENT
COMPARISON BETWEEN

	FUTURETHINK OCTOBER 2010	FUTURETHINK NOVEMBER 2013	FUTURETHINK NOVEMBER 2016	FUTURETHINK NOVEMBER 2018	CAPACITY			
SCHOOLS	2017-18 LOW PROJECTION	2017-18 LOW PROJECTION	2017-18 LOW PROJECTION	2018-19 ACTUAL ENROLLMENT	FY19-20 SUPERINTENDENTS PROPOSED CIP BUDGET			
<u>ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS</u>								
CLARA BYRD BAKER	539	535	522	515	550			
LAUREL LANE/RAWLS BYRD	526	506	484	465	500			
MONTAGUE	508	516	457	503	590			
NORGE	582	659	586	583	695			
WHALEY	480	584	485	541	490			
JAMES RIVER	521	605	497	448	580			
STONEHOUSE	754	673	721	745	765			
MATOAKA	797	730	723	745	760			
BLAYTON	471	508	509	479	540			
TOTAL ELEMENTARY	5,178	5,316	4,984	5,024	5,470			
<u>MIDDLE SCHOOLS</u>								
BERKELEY	983	990	896	596	779	50 REDUCTION TO CAF EXPANSION		
TOANO	750	784	860	701	790			
HORNSBY	987	950	981	794	952			
BLAIR				550	608			
TOTAL MIDDLE	2,720	2,724	2,737	2,641	3,129		2,521	
<u>HIGH SCHOOLS</u>								
JAMESTOWN	1,349	1,294	1,329	1,296	1,208			
LAFAVETTE	1,233	1,191	1,154	1,112	1,314			
WARHILL	1,273	1,199	1,297	1,388	1,441			
TOTAL HIGH SCHOOLS	3,855	3,684	3,780	3,796	3,963			
TOTAL WJCC SCHOOLS	11,753	11,724	11,501	11,461	12,562			

13

Proposed Projects FY 2020-24

Fiscal Year	Total Proposed CIP Projects
FY 2020	7,456,718
FY 2021	54,145,968
FY 2022	18,198,383
FY 2023	7,664,419
FY 2024	7,042,773
Total	\$94,508,261

Facilities – New Construction

\$66,318,743 or 70% of Total Five-Year CIP

Facilities
New Elementary School
High School Capacity Expansions/Renovations

Projected Enrollment vs. Capacity: High Schools*

	Capacity Effective Sept. 2013	90% Capacity	85% Capacity	Enrollment 9/30/2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028
High Schools														
Lafayette	1,314	1,183	1,117	1,112	1,096	1,081	1,096	1,101	1,105	1,105	1,125	1,120	1,133	1,149
Jamestown	1,208	1,087	1,027	1,296	1,278	1,261	1,280	1,284	1,288	1,288	1,312	1,306	1,321	1,339
Warhill	1,441	1,297	1,225	1,388	1,368	1,350	1,369	1,374	1,379	1,379	1,405	1,399	1,415	1,434
High School Total	3,963	3,567	3,369	3,796	3,742	3,692	3,745	3,759	3,772	3,772	3,842	3,825	3,869	3,922
Available Capacity				167	221	271	218	204	191	191	121	138	94	41
Capacity Percentage				96%	94%	93%	94%	95%	95%	95%	97%	97%	98%	99%

at or above 100% capacity

at or above 90% capacity

at or above 85% capacity

* FutureThink "Low" Projection

Modifications to FY2020

- **New Elementary School –**
 - Total enrollment of the elementary schools, including the Pre-K > 98%
 - By FY2028 - Enrollment projected >100%
 - Previously presented as needing completion in FY27-28 at a higher cost.
- **Proposed:** Based on the enrollment trends and forecast for continued growth this project is necessary to alleviate overcrowding.
- **Impact:** The estimated cost for the construction of the new school is \$38,533,221

Projected Enrollment vs. Capacity: Elementary

	Capacity Effective Sept. 2013	90% Capacity	85% Capacity	Enrollment 9/30/2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028
Elementary														
Clara Byrd Baker	550	495	468	585	589	590	592	586	588	586	585	587	592	598
Laurel Lane	500	450	425	545	547	550	552	545	547	544	545	548	554	559
DJ Montague	590	531	502	503	507	508	510	504	506	504	503	505	510	516
Norge	695	626	591	699	702	705	707	700	703	700	698	701	710	716
Matthew Whaley	490 *	441	417	541	544	547	548	541	543	541	540	543	551	557
James River	580	522	493	448	450	452	454	448	450	449	449	450	456	461
Stonehouse	765	689	650	745	749	753	754	745	749	746	746	750	757	765
Matoaka	760	684	646	745	749	753	754	745	749	746	746	750	757	765
Blayton	540	486	459	557	560	563	563	556	559	558	558	560	564	570
Elementary Total	5,470	4,923	4,650	5,368	5,397	5,421	5,434	5,370	5,394	5,374	5,370	5,394	5,451	5,507
Available Capacity				102	73	49	36	100	76	96	100	76	19	(37)
Capacity Percentage				98.1%	98.7%	99.1%	99.3%	98.2%	98.6%	98.2%	98.2%	98.6%	99.7%	100.7%

at or above 100% capacity
 at or above 90% capacity
 at or above 85% capacity

FutureThink "Low" Projection
 Includes Pre-K
 *Does not include Matthew Whaley trailer (50 students)

Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools

