

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 16, 2020
6:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. ANNUAL ORGANIZATION MEETING

1. Election of Officers
2. Proposed Calendar for 2020-2021

D. PUBLIC COMMENT

E. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Fiscal Year 2021-2025 Capital Improvements Program

F. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND REQUESTS

G. ADJOURNMENT

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 3/16/2020

TO: The Planning Commission

FROM: Paul D. Holt, III, Secretary

SUBJECT: Election of Officers

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/6/2020 - 1:23 PM
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/6/2020 - 1:24 PM
Publication Management	Daniel, Martha	Approved	3/6/2020 - 1:26 PM
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/6/2020 - 1:29 PM

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 3/16/2020

TO: The Planning Commission

FROM: Paul D. Holt, III, Secretary

SUBJECT: Proposed Calendar for 2020-2021

The proposed meeting calendar for 2020-2021 is attached.

Staff recommends adoption of the Planning Commission, Development Review Committee (DRC), and Policy Committee meeting dates and times through March 15, 2021, as shown.

Meeting dates and times shown after March 15, 2021 are placeholder dates.

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Type
☐	Proposed Calendar for 2020-2021	Exhibit

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/6/2020 - 1:23 PM
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/6/2020 - 1:23 PM
Publication Management	Daniel, Martha	Approved	3/6/2020 - 1:26 PM
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/6/2020 - 1:29 PM

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 16
- May 14
- June 11
- July 9
- August 13
- September 10
- October 15
- 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)

PCWG 2020/21 (4PM)

- April 6
- April 13
- September 14
- September 28
- October 5
- October 19
- November 9
- November 23
- December 7
- December 21

Planning Commission 2021/22 (6PM)

- April 7
- May 5
- April 27 Joint Work Session w/ BOS (4pm)
- June 2
- July 7
- August 4
- September 1
- October 6
- November 3
- December 1
- January 5 (2022)
- February 2 (2022)
- March 2 (2022)
- March 14 (2022)*

*Special Meeting (Organizational and CIP)

Policy Committee 2021/22 (4PM)

- April 15
- May 13
- June 10
- July 15
- August 12
- September 9
- October 14
- November 10
- December 9
- January 13 (2022)
- February 10 (2022)**
- February 17 (2022)**
- February 24 (2022)**
- March 3 (2022)**
- March 10 (2022)

**CIP Meetings

DRC 2021/22 (4PM)

- March 31
- April 21
- May 19
- June 23
- July 21
- August 18
- September 22
- October 20
- November 17
- December 15
- January 19 (2022)
- February 16 (2022)

PCWG 2021/22 (4PM)

- January 5
- January 20
- February 8
- February 22
- March 8
- March 22
- April 5
- April 19

2020/21 Calendar Year: March 17, 2020 – March 15, 2021

2021/22 Calendar Year: March 16, 2021 – March 14, 2022 (2021/22 Calendar provided for reference only)

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 3/16/2020

TO: The Planning Commission

FROM: Tori Haynes, Planner and Terry Costello, Deputy Zoning Administrator/Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2021-2025 Capital Improvements Program

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Type
☐	Memorandum	Cover Memo
☐	Attachment 1. FY 2021-2025 CIP Summary Spreadsheet	Backup Material
☐	Attachment 2. CIP Ranking Criteria	Backup Material
☐	Attachment 3. Approved Policy Committee Minutes from Feb. 13, 2020	Backup Material
☐	Attachment 4. Unapproved Policy Committee Minutes from Feb. 20, 2020	Minutes
☐	Attachment 5. Unapproved Policy Committee Minutes from Feb. 27, 2020	Minutes

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/10/2020 - 8:15 AM
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/10/2020 - 8:15 AM
Publication Management	Daniel, Martha	Approved	3/10/2020 - 8:23 AM
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/10/2020 - 8:25 AM

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 16, 2020

TO: The Planning Commission

FROM: Tori Haynes, Planner
Terry Costello, Deputy Zoning Administrator/Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2021-2025 Capital Improvements Program

The Policy Committee annually reviews Capital Improvements Program (CIP) requests submitted by various County agencies 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 is attached for reference (Attachment No. 2).

All CIP project requests for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-2025 are summarized in Attachment No. 1. Of the 28 submitted applications (20 County, two library, and six WJCC Schools applications), 12 County and four Schools projects were included in the previous five-year CIP adopted by the Board of Supervisors; however, estimates and completion timelines may have been amended. These previous applications include:

- Transportation Match
- Jamestown Corridor - Amblers House Utilities
- Fire Station 6
- Grove Convenience Center
- Stormwater Capital Improvements Program
- Lower County Park
- Chickahominy Riverfront Park New Restroom and Concession Building
- Chickahominy Riverfront Park Phase III
- James City County Marina Phase II
- Jamestown Beach Event Park Improvements
- Veterans Park Phase II Improvements
- Warhill Sports Complex Baseball Field Expansion
- New Elementary School
- Lafayette High School Renovation
- Jamestown High School Expansion
- Warhill High School Expansion

Attachment No. 1 also identifies the Committee's ranked priorities from highest to lowest and includes a brief summary of each project. The full set CIP project applications and supporting documents can be found in the packet materials [posted online](#) for the February 13, 2020 Policy Committee meeting.

Recommendation:

At its March 5, 2020 meeting, the Policy Committee unanimously voted to recommend the following CIP projects for FY 2021-2025, ranked below in order of priority:

1. Stormwater Capital Improvements Program
2. Transportation Match
3. Lower County Park
4. Fire Station 6
5. Grove Convenience Center
6. Police Firing Range Expansion
7. Warhill High School Auxiliary Gym/Emergency Shelter
8. Covered Parking for Specialty Police Vehicles and Trailers
9. Jamestown Corridor - Amblers House Utilities
10. Jamestown Beach Event Park Improvements
11. Chickahominy Riverfront Park Phase III Improvements
12. Chickahominy Riverfront Park - New Restroom and Concession Building
13. Jamestown Corridor - Marina New Building
14. James City County Marina Land Improvements
15. James City County Marina Phase 2
16. Lafayette High School Renovation
17. New School Site in Stonehouse: Site Preparation and Environmental Remediation
18. Jolly Pond Road at the Dam Termini Construction
19. New James City County Library Branch
20. Jamestown High School Expansion ^a
20. Warhill High School Expansion ^a
21. Warhill Sports Complex Baseball Field Expansion
22. Upper County Park Improvements
23. Freedom Park Phase IV - Active Recreation Facilities
24. Veterans Park Phase 2 Improvements
25. New Elementary School
26. James City County Library Playground
27. Buses for New 10th Elementary School

(a) These projects received equal scores.

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

Fiscal Year 2021-2025 Capital Improvements Program

March 16, 2020

Page 3

TH/TC/nb

FY21-25CIP-mem

Attachments:

1. Policy Committee FY 2021-2025 CIP Summary Spreadsheet
2. Policy Committee CIP Ranking Criteria
3. Approved Policy Committee Minutes from February 13, 2020
4. Unapproved Policy Committee Minutes from February 20, 2020
5. Unapproved Policy Committee Minutes from February 27, 2020

FY 2021 - 2025 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM RANKING SPREADSHEET

ID	Agency	Project Title	Brief Project Description (see application narratives for more detail)	FY 2021 Requested	FY 2022 Requested	FY 2023 Requested	FY 2024 Requested	FY 2025 Requested	Total Requested	Agency Priority	Out of	Special Considerations	PC Score	PC Rank	Other Notes
H	General Services	Stormwater Capital Improvement Program	Stormwater projects to address undersized and failing drainage systems, restore eroded channels, and install new facilities to treat runoff pollution.	\$2,204,000.00	\$2,600,000.00	\$2,634,000.00	\$2,493,000.00	\$2,613,000.00	\$12,544,000.00	3	3	Yes	85.6	1	
A	Community Dev.	Transportation Match	Matches for various transportation projects (e.g. Longhill Rd., Croaker Rd., Pocahontas Tr., Skiffes Creek Connector, and Clara Byrd Baker E.S.)	\$1,500,000.00	\$1,500,000.00	\$3,000,000.00	\$3,000,000.00	\$3,000,000.00	\$12,000,000.00	1	2	Yes	82.0	2	
I	Parks & Rec.	Lower County Park	Acquire property, design, and construct a park in the Lower County area that includes a walking trail, picnic shelter, swimming pool with water features, restrooms, and all related infrastructure.	\$250,000.00	\$732,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,364,000.00	\$0.00	\$6,346,000.00	1	10		66.8	3	
E	Fire	Fire Station 6	Construction of new fire station to increase six-minute coverage within the PSA.	\$0.00	\$8,230,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8,230,000.00	1	1		61.4	4	
G	General Services	Grove Convenience Center	Construction of new convenience center in the Grove area. Exact location will be determined based on additional data analysis and opportunities for suitable building sites.	\$596,600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$596,600.00	2	3		59.5	5	
S	Police	Firing Range Expansion	Extend the existing 25-yard firing range to accommodate training needs at 100 yards. Includes clearing/grading of approx. 15,000 SF, relocating existing range control house and storage trailer, demolishing existing range shelter and rebuilding a range shelter on a new concrete pad to be used for students during training, and associated utility extensions.	\$70,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$70,000.00	1	2		56.1	6	
Y	WJCC Schools	Warhill HS Auxiliary Gym/Emergency Shelter	Add auxiliary gym to Warhill HS that can also be used as an emergency shelter.	\$3,384,271.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,384,271.00	3	6		53.3	7	
T	Police	Covered Parking for Specialty Vehicles and Trailers	Construction of covered parking structure that will provide overhead, side, and rear protection for a number of specialty vehicles and trailers.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$217,000.00	\$0.00	\$217,000.00	2	2		51.9	8	
C	Economic Dev.	Jamestown Corridor - Amblers House Utilities	Utility improvements that would begin to implement some of the recommendations from the Shaping our Shores Master Plan.	\$739,286.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$739,286.75	1	2		51.5	9	
N	Parks & Rec.	Jamestown Beach Event Park Improvements	Construction of additional restroom facility to support beach, event venue with stage/performance area and restroom facilities, boat storage facility to support marina operations, and park maintenance building, plus conversion of grass parking area to permanent permeable parking area for 200 spaces.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,349,000.00	\$0.00	\$8,993,000.00	\$10,342,000.00	6	10		49.3	10	
K	Parks & Rec.	Chickahominy Riverfront Park Phase III Improvements	Improvements to the park per the Shaping Our Shores Master Plan, to include design and construction of ADA-accessible paddlecraft area, additional parking/road improvements, relocation of dry storage area, public access trail on shoreline, and boat ramp repairs. Also includes development of Stormwater Master Plan per the SUP conditions.	\$300,000.00	\$1,800,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,100,000.00	3	10		48.8	11	
J	Parks & Rec.	Chickahominy Riverfront Park - New Restroom and Concession Building	New building of approx. 900 SF with additional urinals, stalls, changing room, and larger concession area to meet existing health department and building code requirements.	\$563,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$563,000.00	2	10		48.6	12	

FY 2021 - 2025 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM RANKING SPREADSHEET

ID	Agency	Project Title	Brief Project Description (see application narratives for more detail)	FY 2021 Requested	FY 2022 Requested	FY 2023 Requested	FY 2024 Requested	FY 2025 Requested	Total Requested	Agency Priority	Out of	Special Considerations	PC Score	PC Rank	Other Notes
D	Economic Dev.	Jamestown Corridor - Marina New Building	Construction of new building that would relocate the brewery tenant's taproom so that the existing building can be demolished. The existing building is located in the floodplain and the cost of repairs exceeds the value of the building.	\$500,000.00	\$3,500,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,000,000.00	2	2		52.1	13	
M	Parks & Rec.	James City County Marina Land Improvements	New marina facility to support park operations and marine repair services, including restroom/shower facilities, office/meeting space, 200 space parking lot, and overflow parking area for boat trailers.	\$415,000.00	\$0.00	\$3,043,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,458,000.00	5	10		51.3	14	
L	Parks & Rec.	James City County Marina Phase 2	Relocate existing boat ramp, provide additional parking for marina and ramp visitors, replace both covered boat houses, and add third section of open slips.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,300,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,300,000.00	4	10		49.4	15	
X	WJCC Schools	Lafayette HS Renovation	Add instructional space to Lafayette HS.	\$246,825.00	\$0.00	\$2,945,881.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,192,706.00	2	6		43.3	16	
B	Community Dev.	New School Site in Stonehouse: Site Preparation and Environmental Remediation	As part of the recent proffer and master plan amendments for Stonehouse, a new school site was proffered. The developer will prepare and remediate the site, but the County will need to rely on outside consultants for this highly specialized and technical work, including licensed geotechnical engineers and licensed environmental engineers.	\$125,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$125,000.00	2	2		47.9	17	
F	General Services	Jolly Pond Road at the Dam Termini Construction	Following the BOS's abandonment of the R/W over Jolly Pond Dam, construction of termini on either side of the dam is required to make a safe area for vehicles to turn around.	\$145,800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$145,800.00	1	3	Yes	41.1	18	
U	Williamsburg Regional Library	New James City County Library Branch	Construction of new 40,000 SF public library facility.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,125,000.00	\$8,187,500.00	\$11,187,500.00	\$20,500,000.00	1	2		40.6	19	
Z	WJCC Schools	Jamestown HS Expansion	Add instructional space to Jamestown HS.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,015,000.00	\$9,291,700.00	\$0.00	\$10,306,700.00	4	6		38.8	20	Projects Z and AA received equal scores/rankings.
AA	WJCC Schools	Warhill HS Expansion	Add instruction space to Warhill HS.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,343,680.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,343,680.00	5	6		38.8	20	Projects Z and AA received equal scores/rankings.
Q	Parks & Rec.	Warhill Sports Complex Baseball Field Expansion	Construction of two lighted turf baseball fields, 200 new parking spaces, restrooms, and field fencing.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$584,000.00	\$4,283,000.00	\$4,867,000.00	9	10		35.9	21	
P	Parks & Rec.	Upper County Park Improvements	Improvements to Upper County Park including demo of existing baby pool, construction of splash pad, and paving of gravel parking lot and multiuse trail.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$105,000.00	\$0.00	\$765,000.00	\$870,000.00	8	10		33.1	22	
R	Parks & Rec.	Freedom Park Phase IV - Active Recreation Facilities	Develop active recreation amenities at Freedom Park according to the approved Master Plan, including basketball, tennis, swimming pool/splash pad, picnic shelter, and playground.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$804,000.00	\$5,358,000.00	\$6,162,000.00	10	10		35.1	23	
O	Parks & Rec.	Veterans Park Phase 2 Improvements	Construction of splash pad, pump room, eastern parking lot addition, bus parking addition, sidewalk connections, and outdoor workout equipment.	\$0.00	\$190,000.00	\$1,391,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,581,000.00	7	10		35.0	24	
W	WJCC Schools	New Elementary School	Construction of new elementary school of approx. 106,000 SF to house 700 students.	\$2,900,000.00	\$26,100,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$29,000,000.00	1	6		34.0	25	
V	Williamsburg Regional Library	James City County Library Playground	Construction of natural playground at the James City County Library on Croaker Road.	\$0.00	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$100,000.00	2	2		27.0	26	
BB	WJCC Schools	Buses for New 11th Elem. School	Purchase of six additional buses to transport students.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$620,000.00	\$620,000.00	6	6		30.8	27	
TOTAL:				\$13,939,783	\$44,752,000	\$29,251,561	\$29,941,200	\$36,819,500	\$154,704,044						

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)?	

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Building A Large Conference Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
February 13, 2020
4:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Julia Leverenz called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Present:

Julia Leverenz, Chair

Jack Haldeman

Tim O'Connor

Absent:

Rich Krapf

Staff:

Paul Holt, Director of Community Development

Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner

Ellen Cook, Principal Planner

Terry Costello, Deputy Zoning Administrator

Tori Haynes, Planner

Tom Leininger, Planner

John Risinger, Community Development Assistant

Max Hlavin, Deputy County Attorney

Jeff Wiggins, Senior Budget and Accounting Analyst

Margo Zechman, Senior Budget and Accounting Analyst

C. MINUTES

There were no minutes.

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. ZO-0011-2016. Proposed Ordinance Amendments to Address Code of Virginia Changes Regarding Wireless Communication Facilities, Stage III

Mr. Tom Leininger stated that in 2017 and 2018, the General Assembly passed legislation requiring changes to how local Zoning Ordinances may treat applications for wireless communications facilities. He stated that staff drafted Ordinance language for Section 24-2, Division 6, and the use lists within Zoning Districts. He stated that the Ordinance amendments included two new application types, small cell facilities, and Administrative review eligible projects (AREPs), for wireless communication facilities. He stated that the use lists of the Zoning Districts would indicate if an application type was permitted or specially permitted in that Zoning District. He stated that staff recommends that the Policy Committee recommend approval of the proposed Ordinance amendments to the Planning Commission. He asked if there were any questions or comments from the Policy Committee.

Ms. Leverenz asked if AREPs should be defined in Section 24-2.

Mr. Leininger stated that a definition for AREPs was included in the proposed Ordinance amendments. He stated that staff received questions and suggestions from the Policy Committee. He stated that staff received a question about having a definition for Communication Facilities, Antennas, Towers, and Support Structures (CATS). He stated that each item covered within CATS was defined individually. He asked if the Policy Committee would like to have a definition for CATS that explicitly listed the included items.

Ms. Leverenz confirmed.

Mr. Leininger stated that staff received a question about the language of the definition for micro-wireless facilities. He stated that the definition was consistent with the Code of Virginia and that staff did not recommend making any edits. He stated that staff received a suggestion to change the word “person” to “entity” in the definitions of wireless infrastructure providers and wireless service providers. He stated that Section 1-2 of the County Code defined person to include entities. He stated that staff received a suggestion to the proposed amendments for Section 24-122 where the language says, “as defined”.

Ms. Leverenz stated that the language should state “as defined in Support Structure”. She stated that this would provide additional clarity.

Mr. Max Hlavin stated that, if a definition was created for CATS, the language could reference CATS which would then reference Support Structures.

Ms. Leverenz stated that the definitions should be consistent between Section 24-2 and Division 6.

Mr. Leininger stated that staff received a suggestion to edit the proposed language for Section 24-128 (a) (1) a) to state “within a six-foot perimeter of communication facilities” instead of “within a six-foot perimeter with communication facilities”.

Mr. Hlavin stated that the language was intentionally crafted to qualify the distance and the type of facilities.

Mr. Leininger stated that staff agreed with many of the suggested minor edits.

Ms. Leverenz asked if there was a motion to approve the draft amendments.

Mr. Hlavin stated that House Bill (HB) 554 was passed in the Virginia House of Delegates which allows localities to deny applications AREPs if the applicant did not notify adjacent property owners within 15 days. He stated that the bill would have to be passed by the Senate of Virginia before it could be incorporated into the County Code. He stated that the Policy Committee could choose to make a motion that would allow staff to make the necessary changes if the Senate passes the bill. He stated that, if passed, the bill would not go into effect until July 1, 2020, or later.

Ms. Ellen Cook stated that the proposed Ordinance amendments would likely be presented during a Planning Commission meeting before July 1, 2020. She stated that proposed Ordinance amendments would then be presented during a Board of Supervisors (BOS) meeting which could possibly be after July 1, 2020.

Mr. Tim O'Connor made a motion to Approve the proposed Ordinance amendments pending the approval of HB554.

The motion passed 3-0.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. FY 2021-2025 Capital Improvements Program Review

Ms. Tammy Rosario asked if the Policy Committee would allow Ms. Tori Haynes to participate in the meeting remotely.

Ms. Leverenz confirmed.

Ms. Haynes joined the meeting remotely.

Ms. Terry Costello stated that it was the first meeting for the Policy Committee's review of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-2025 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) requests. She stated that the Policy Committee would each request in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and provide a list of its priorities to the BOS. She stated that 22 requests were received from County departments and agencies and six requests were received from the Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools (WJCC Schools). She stated that the Policy Committee could ask broad questions and identify questions for departments regarding their CIP requests. She stated that departments would be invited to the February 20, 2020, and the February 27, 2020, meetings of the Policy Committee to answer questions. She stated that an additional meeting could be held on March 5, 2020 for the Policy Committee to finalize its ranking of CIP requests. She stated that staff would compile the finalized ranking to present at the March 16, 2020, meeting of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Leverenz invited members of the public to address the Policy Committee.

Mr. Jay Everson, 103 Branscome Boulevard, stated that the Future Think Enrollment Projections for WJCC Schools do not show a large increase in enrollment. He stated that WJCC Schools should invest in facilities for the Bright Beginnings program instead of adding classrooms at existing schools.

Ms. Leverenz stated that WJCC Schools should be invited to attend one of the next meetings to discuss its requests.

Ms. Costello stated that members of the Policy Committee had submitted questions for Community Development, Economic Development, General Services, Parks and Recreation, and the Williamsburg Regional Library. She stated that WJCC Schools would be invited to attend the February 27, 2020, meeting of the Policy Committee.

Ms. Leverenz asked if questions were received regarding the requests for the James City County Marina and the Amblers House.

Ms. Costello confirmed.

Mr. Haldeman stated that nine requests were received for restroom facilities. He stated that the requests had a wide range of projected costs. He asked to have the difference in projected costs explained at one of the next Policy Committee meetings. He stated that multiple requests were received for projects at the James City County Marina. He stated that it might be more efficient to construct the projects at the same time. He stated that the Transportation Match request included widening Croaker Road, widening Pocahontas Trail, and constructing the Skiffes Creek Connector. He asked if widening Croaker Road addressed a goal of the Strategic Plan. He asked how much of the projected costs for the Transportation Match request would go to the Pocahontas Trail widening and the Skiffes Creek Connector.

Mr. Tim O'Connor stated that many projects have been divided into smaller scale requests

that are submitted over time. He stated that having more small-scale requests might result in increased overall costs when the project is completed. He stated that he would like to understand the overall timeline for completion for requests. He stated that departments should consider completing multiple projects in the same CIP requests when possible. He asked if General Services would be attending a meeting in the future.

Ms. Costello confirmed.

Ms. Rosario asked if any departments had not been identified to attend one of the coming meetings.

Ms. Costello stated that staff did not receive any questions for the Fire Department or the Police Department.

Mr. Haldeman suggested that the Police Department consider installing solar panels on the roof of the proposed covered parking structure.

Ms. Rosario stated that staff would forward the suggestion to the Police Department.

Ms. Leverenz asked if Mr. Rich Krapf had submitted any questions.

Ms. Costello confirmed.

Ms. Leverenz asked if there were any further questions.

There were none.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to Adjourn. The motion passed 3-0.

Ms. Leverenz adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:30 p.m.

Ms. Julia Leverenz, Chair

Mr. Paul Holt, Secretary

DRAFT MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING
Building A Large Conference Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
February 20, 2020
4:00 p.m.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Julia Leverenz called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Present:

Julia Leverenz, Chair

Jack Haldeman

Tim O'Connor

Absent:

Rich Krapf

Staff:

Paul Holt, Director of Community Development

Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner

Terry Costello, Deputy Zoning Administrator

Tori Haynes, Planner

John Risinger, Community Development Assistant

Sharon Day, Director of Financial and Management Services

Cheryl Cochet, Assistant Director of Financial and Management Services

Jeff Wiggins, Senior Budget and Accounting Analyst

Margo Zechman, Senior Budget and Accounting Analyst

Alister Perkinson, Parks Administrator

Grace Boone, Director of General Services

Shawn Gordon, Capital Project Management Chief Engineer

Chris Johnson, Director of Economic Development

Kate Sipes, Assistant Director of Economic Development

Laura Messer, Tourism and Marketing Coordinator

Toni Small, Director of Stormwater and Resource Protection

Darryl Cook, Assistant Director of Stormwater and Resource Protection

C. MINUTES

There were no minutes.

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. FY 2021-2025 Capital Improvements Program Review

Ms. Tori Haynes stated that representatives from the Office of Economic Development (OED), the Stormwater and Resource Protection Division, the Department of Parks and Recreation, the Department of General Services, and the Williamsburg Regional Library were present to answer questions about their CIP requests.

Ms. Leverenz invited representatives from OED to discuss their CIP requests.

Ms. Laura Messer stated that staff from OED had provided answers by email to questions received from the Policy Committee. She asked if the Committee had any additional questions.

Mr. Jack Haldeman stated that the CIP request for the Ambler's House referenced cabins. He asked what the idea for the cabins was.

Ms. Messer stated that the cabins were part of the proposed revisions to the Shaping Our Shores master plan.

Mr. Haldeman asked what the cost would be for construction and operation of the cabins.

Mr. Alister Perkinson stated that the County received a proposal from a vendor to operate cabins at the Jamestown Beach Event Park as a public-private partnership.

Mr. Tim O'Connor asked if the Ambler's House had additional projects that needed to be completed before it would be operational.

Ms. Messer stated that the CIP request was to provide utilities to the Ambler's House. She stated that it was the last County-led project that needed to be completed before the Ambler's House could be operated as a public-private partnership. She stated that the County had completed all of the necessary projects for the exterior of the Ambler's House as well as removing asbestos from the interior. She stated that the tenant would complete any interior renovations that were desired.

Ms. Leverenz asked if staff from OED had a sense for how much demand from the public there was for the Ambler's House.

Ms. Messer stated that the Ambler's House had historical significance and that the James City County Historical Commission would like the building to be open to the public. She stated that public-private partnership would operate the Ambler's House as a wedding facility. She stated that a private vendor has indicated that there is a demand for wedding facilities in the region.

Ms. Leverenz asked if the vendor would be responsible for marketing the Ambler's House as a wedding facility.

Ms. Messer confirmed. She asked if the Committee had any questions about the CIP request for the new building at the James City County Marina.

There were none.

Ms. Leverenz invited representatives from the Department of Parks and Recreation to discuss its CIP requests.

Mr. Perkinson stated that the County has not determined a location for the proposed Lower County Park. He stated that the County is in discussion with the owner of the Carter's Grove property regarding acquiring property for the park.

Mr. Haldeman asked if the Policy Committee could recommend funding the CIP request for Lower County Park contingent on acquiring property or if the request should be

entered in the future after a location has been determined.

Mr. Perkinson stated that if the County could not acquire property from the Carter's Grove parcel, the other option would be utilizing a portion of the property at James River Elementary School. He stated that staff would have to coordinate with Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools to ensure that the park would be available to the public at all times.

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that having the CIP request approved would facilitate the acquisition of property if a deal were reached with the property owner.

Mr. Perkinson stated that the CIP request to replace the restroom at Chickahominy Riverfront Park would meet the current demand for the facility. He stated that the building would also house concessions.

Ms. Leverenz asked how old the current restroom building was.

Mr. Perkinson stated that the building existed when the County purchased the property.

Mr. Haldeman asked why the different requests for restroom facilities had high costs.

Mr. Perkinson stated that the costs of proposed restrooms varied depending on the sites and if the restroom building would also house showers or concessions. He stated that the costs of restrooms assumed that the cost would be a minimum of \$500 per square foot. He stated that the cost was based on the costs of the Jamestown Beach Event Park concession building.

Mr. O'Connor asked if the proposed concession area at Chickahominy Riverfront Park would include a cooking area.

Mr. Perkinson confirmed. He stated that the current concessions area only had enough room for an ice cream freezer. He stated that the proposed concessions area would allow hot foods to be served such as hot dogs and pizza. He stated that the next set of questions was for the CIP request for Chickahominy Riverfront Park Phase III. He stated that the shoreline stabilization project was separate from the CIP request and was already underway. He stated that the projects included in Phase III were chosen to increase the efficiency of construction. He stated that a large part of Phase III was to construct a second boathouse for the Williamsburg Boat Club. He stated that the boathouse would also house rental equipment such as paddleboards. He stated that the Williamsburg Boat Club would fund the construction of the boathouse. He stated that the County would construct the parking area regardless of if the boathouse were constructed.

Mr. Haldeman asked if Phase III was the final phase of improvements to Chickahominy Riverfront Park.

Mr. Perkinson stated that it was not the last phase. He stated that the revisions to the Shaping Our Shores master plan would result in projects in addition to the other projects after Phase III.

Ms. Leverenz asked why the requests for the James City County Marina were separated.

Mr. Perkinson stated that the request for James City County Marina Phase II improvements included new boat slips. He stated that the second request would be constructing a new building to house the Parks and Recreation office. He stated that the

building that currently holds the office is in the floodplain. He stated that the second project would also include constructing a new parking lot. He stated that there would be cost efficiencies and less downtime for the Marina if both projects were completed at the same time. He stated that the CIP requests for the Marina had high costs that would be difficult to fund in the same fiscal year.

Ms. Leverenz stated that the CIP requests indicated that the proposed restroom facility at the Marina had to be constructed before parts of Phase II were completed.

Mr. Perkinson confirmed. He stated that the Virginia Department of Health had restroom requirements for marinas that were based on the number of boat slips. He stated that the restrooms would need to be constructed before Phase II or parts of the Phase II improvements would have to be halted until the restrooms were built.

Ms. Leverenz asked why the restrooms were not included in the CIP request for Phase II.

Mr. Perkinson stated that the Shaping Our Shores master plan revisions were not finalized when the Phase II improvements were developed. He stated that the location of the new restroom facility was shown on the revisions to the Shaping Our Shores master plan. He stated that the CIP request for the Jamestown Beach Event Park included a parking area made with pervious pavers. He stated that 54,000 vehicles visited the park which resulted in poor conditions in the grass parking area. He stated that staff would apply for available grants to assist with funding. He stated that he received a question regarding the operation costs of the pool at Upper County Park. He stated that Upper County Park had \$40,000 in operational costs, and \$77,000 for part time staff. He stated that Upper County Park generated about \$70,000 in revenue. He stated that other maintenance costs were incurred by the Department of General Services. He stated that the CIP request included replacing the baby pool with a splash pad. He stated that the CIP request for Veterans Park Phase II included a splash pad.

Mr. Haldeman asked if the CIP request for Veterans Park would be the last project for the park.

Mr. Perkinson stated that he would check and forward the answer to the Policy Committee.

Ms. Leverenz asked why Upper County Park would have a paved parking lot instead of pervious pavers.

Mr. Perkinson stated that Upper County Park already had a gravel parking lot. He stated that gravel parking lots are considered to be impervious area. He stated that the last question he received was regarding the size of the proposed restroom facility at the Warhill Sports Complex. He stated that the restroom facility would be across from the baseball fields and would also house a concessions area.

Mr. O'Connor asked if the Department of Parks and Recreation had any news regarding the proposed running center.

Mr. Perkinson stated that the revisions to the Shaping Our Shores master plan show the running facility being located at Jamestown Beach Event Park.

Ms. Leverenz asked if there were any other questions.

There were none.

Ms. Leverenz invited representatives from the Stormwater and Resource Protection Division to discuss its CIP request.

Ms. Toni Small stated that she received three questions from the Policy Committee regarding the CIP request for the Stormwater Capital Improvement Program. She stated that the costs did not include state or federal funding. She stated that staff would apply for grants.

Mr. Haldeman asked if grants could reduce the actual costs listed in the CIP request.

Ms. Small confirmed. She stated that the grants have a competitive application process so it would be difficult to estimate the funding that would be generated by grants.

Ms. Leverenz asked if staff had been successful at applying for grants in the past.

Mr. Darryl Cook confirmed. He stated that staff has received 15 grants from the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality's Stormwater Local Assistance Fund.

Mr. Haldeman asked if any excess funding would be returned to the general fund.

Ms. Sharon Day stated that grants have been appropriated by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) in the past.

Ms. Small stated that the pattern of funding for the Stormwater Capital Improvement Program was that 5 years of funding would add up to \$12,544,000. She stated that she received a question regarding the level of mercury in Diascund Creek. She stated that DEQ confirmed that tests in 2010 and 2012 showed that fish in Diascund Creek had mercury in their tissue. She stated that part of the CIP request would go to studying the Diascund Creek Watershed which might determine a source for the mercury contamination.

Mr. Cook stated that part of the watershed was in New Kent County.

Ms. Small asked if there were any other questions.

There were none.

Ms. Leverenz invited representatives from the Williamsburg Regional Library to discuss its CIP requests.

Ms. Betsy Fowler, Library Director, Williamsburg Regional Library (WRL), stated that the existing contract between the County and the City of Williamsburg stated that each locality is responsible for its own capital improvement projects. She stated that the contract would have to be renegotiated in order for a new library to be a joint facility. She stated that the operational costs are split between the counties based on the residences of users. She stated that a new library facility would require about 10 acres of land.

Mr. Haldeman asked if the library in the City of Williamsburg could be expanded with the limited amount of land it has. He asked if a third library would need to be constructed if it was expanded.

Ms. Fowler stated that the library would likely need to be replaced entirely. She stated that a third library would not be needed if that were the case. She stated that a consultant

had conducted a survey of library users that indicated that the downtown Williamsburg library was very popular. She stated that the current downtown library did not have enough area to increase the size of the parking lot.

Ms. Leverenz asked if building a new joint library would result in having the library closed for the length of construction.

Ms. Fowler stated that a temporary location could be opened while the new facility was constructed.

Mr. O'Connor asked if Ms. Fowler had any recommendation regarding having a third library or a new joint facility with the City of Williamsburg. He asked if the City of Williamsburg would be responsible for operating costs of the downtown library if the County built a third library.

Ms. Fowler stated that the majority of the users at the downtown library live in the County. She stated that the County would continue to share operating costs unless the contract was renegotiated. She stated that having two libraries would be more sustainable than three libraries. She stated that the current location in downtown Williamsburg was preferred by the City of Williamsburg. She stated that a new library at the downtown Williamsburg location could be up to three stories tall. She stated that a solution for the parking would have to be determined.

Mr. Haldeman stated that the downtown Williamsburg library would still need to be renovated if a third library was built in the County.

Ms. Fowler confirmed.

Mr. O'Connor asked what the floor area was for the downtown Williamsburg.

Ms. Fowler stated that the library had about 30,000 square feet of usable space.

Ms. Leverenz asked if the costs of the CIP request would be lower for building a joint library with the City of Williamsburg.

Ms. Fowler confirmed.

Mr. O'Connor stated that Freedom Park had been intended as an educational park. He asked if the WRL considered locating the proposed playground at Freedom Park.

Ms. Fowler stated that a children's playroom had been built at the Croaker Road library. She stated that the proposed playground would be an extension of that playroom. She stated that the playground would focus on natural landscapes instead of playground equipment. She stated that the Friends of Williamsburg Regional Library would fundraise some of the costs of the playground. She stated that the Department of Parks and Recreation would take over the maintenance and safety inspections of the playground after it was constructed. She asked if there were any other questions.

There were none.

Ms. Leverenz invited representatives from the Department of Community Development to discuss its CIP requests.

Mr. Paul Holt stated that the Transportation Match CIP request had started in FY17. He

stated that transportation projects in the County that are currently in process account for \$146 million in funding. He stated that the Skiffes Creek Connector did not require any local sources of funding or funding from the Transportation Match CIP. He stated that the BOS committed to fund the undergrounding of utilities along Pocahontas Trail. He stated that the next large transportation project to be funded was the Pocahontas Trail Multimodal Corridor project. He stated that the project needed to be fully funded before the Virginia Department of Transportation would begin any work. He stated that holding off on funding the project would result in additional inflation costs. He stated that staff would continue to seek additional funding from the State of Virginia. He stated that the Skiffes Creek Connector and the Croaker Road Widening would be the next projects to start construction.

Mr. Haldeman stated that the Skiffes Creek Connector would be a substantial benefit to the County.

Mr. Holt stated that a portion of the Transportation Match funding from FY20 was directed to an extension of the Green Mount Parkway. He stated that having Green Mount Parkway cross Skiffes Creek was cost prohibitive. He stated that the extending the road would create vehicular access for a large area of land that had economic development potential. He stated that the CIP request for the site preparation of the Stonehouse school site. He stated that having the soil remediation completed would not require funding the CIP for the new elementary school.

Mr. O'Connor asked why the burden was not on the developer to complete. He stated that the proffers required the developer to have the site ready. He asked if the required geotechnical approval would suffice.

Mr. Holt stated that it is important for the County to independently verify the work that the developer completed. He stated that ensuring the soil remediation and compaction was completed correctly could save time and reduce costs when the school was constructed. He stated that the County does not have staff with the technical expertise to review the geotechnical reports for the site.

Ms. Leverenz asked what types of contaminants were present at the school site.

Mr. Holt stated that it was unknown if any contaminants were at the site.

Ms. Leverenz asked if it was the developer's responsibility to test the soil for contaminants.

Mr. Holt confirmed. He stated that the CIP request was to have a consultant independently verify the developers study.

Ms. Leverenz asked if there were any other questions.

There were none.

E. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to Adjourn. The motion passed 3-0.

Ms. Leverenz adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:00 p.m.

DRAFT MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING
Building A Large Conference Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
February 27, 2020
4:00 p.m.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Julia Leverenz called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Present:

Julia Leverenz, Chair

Jack Haldeman

Absent:

Rich Krapf

Tim O'Connor

Staff:

Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner

Terry Costello, Deputy Zoning Administrator

Tori Haynes, Planner

John Risinger, Community Development Assistant

Sharon Day, Director of Financial and Management Services

Cheryl Cochet, Assistant Director of Financial and Management Services

Jeff Wiggins, Senior Budget and Accounting Analyst

Margo Zechman, Senior Budget and Accounting Analyst

Grace Boone, Director of General Services

Shawn Gordon, Capital Project Management Chief Engineer

Rick Koehl, Capital Projects Coordinator

C. MINUTES

There were no minutes.

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. FY 2021-2025 Capital Improvements Program Review

Ms. Tori Haynes stated that staff members from the Department of General Services and the Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools (WJCC Schools) were present at the meeting to answer questions related to Capital Improvement Program (CIP) requests. She stated that the March 5, 2020, meeting of the Policy Committee could be used to finalize the Committee's ranking of CIP requests.

Ms. Leverenz invited staff from the Department of General Services to discuss their CIP requests.

Ms. Grace Boone stated that the Committee had submitted a question about revenue that would be generated from the Grove Convenience Center. She stated that revenue from the

Toano Convenience Center was about \$68,400. She stated that the County is working on acquiring property for the Grove Convenience Center. She stated that the Board of Supervisors (BOS) has supported establishing the Grove Convenience Center. She stated that all of the County's convenience centers allow credit card payments.

Ms. Leverenz asked if the credit card readers were used more often than coupons.

Ms. Boone stated that the credit card payments were very popular with citizens. She stated that she could forward statistics to the Committee. She stated that the cost of the credit card reader was included within the furniture and equipment costs.

Ms. Leverenz asked if the furniture and equipment cost included the necessary utilities such as electrical connections.

Ms. Boone stated that the furniture and equipment costs included internet infrastructure but not electrical connections.

Mr. Shawn Gordon stated that the cost of furniture and equipment includes items for the pollution prevention plan.

Ms. Leverenz asked if there were any other questions related to the Grove Convenience Center.

There were none.

Mr. Rick Koehl stated that General Services received questions related to the CIP request to construct termini on Jolly Pond Road near the dam. He stated that the County has gained access rights near Jolly Pond Dam. He stated that County staff would meet with engineers to determine how to construct the termini. He stated that the proposed design would be reviewed by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and the property owners.

Ms. Leverenz asked if General Services knew how many vehicles were driven the entire way to Jolly Pond Dam where Jolly Pond Road was abandoned.

Mr. Koehl stated that there were about 240 vehicles passing the dam every day before that section of the road was abandoned. He stated that signage was posted along Jolly Pond Road to inform drivers that Jolly Pond Road had dead ends near the dam.

Ms. Boone stated that the signs were posted in sports to give drivers enough time to find a safe place to turn around.

Ms. Leverenz asked if General Services had noticed any signs of vehicles trying to turn around at the ends of Jolly Pond Road near the dam.

Mr. Koehl stated that there were no visible signs of vehicles turning around. He stated that one side of the dam had a small gravel turn around area. He stated that the other side of the dam had the road blocked near a driveway for vehicles to turn around. He stated that the property owner had agreed to allow vehicles to turn around in their driveway while a more permanent solution was developed. He stated that discussions with VDOT and the property owner led to the proposed location of the terminus on the southern end of the dam being moved to a steeper area which resulted in an increase in project costs. He stated that the property owner had concerns about unauthorized access to the dam.

Mr. Jack Haldeman asked if the southern terminus would be close to the dam.

Mr. Koehl stated that the terminus would be a distance away from the dam. He stated that a portion of the road leading to the dam would remain so that construction vehicles could access the dam for repairs. He stated that a gate would be installed where the remaining road connects to the terminus.

Ms. Leverenz asked if there would be gates on both sides of the dam.

Mr. Koehl confirmed. He stated that the construction costs would be finalized after the engineers determined the amount and method of grading that was necessary for the terminus.

Ms. Leverenz asked if there were any other questions.

There were none.

Ms. Leverenz invited staff from WJCC Schools to discuss their CIP requests.

Mr. Marcellus Snipes, Senior Director for Operations, WJCC Schools, stated that staff from WJCC Schools provided answers to the Committees questions by email. He asked if the Committee had any additional questions.

Mr. Haldeman asked if the recent Stonehouse rezoning was accounted for in the enrollment projections. He stated that the Stonehouse subdivision would have 1,100 less single-family homes because of the rezoning.

Ms. Rene Ewing, Chief Financial Officer, WJCC Schools, stated that the Future Think projections consider the number of issued building permits and not planned developments.

Mr. Haldeman stated that WJCC Schools had stated that there were 395 students in 31 classrooms for the Bright Beginnings program. He stated that there was an average class size of 13 students.

Mr. Snipes stated that Bright Beginnings included students with special needs. He stated that class sizes had to be smaller when they included special needs students.

Mr. Haldeman asked why WJCC Schools submitted a request for a new elementary school instead of expanding existing elementary schools.

Mr. Snipes stated that elementary schools have a recommended optimal size of about 700 students.

Mr. Haldeman stated that two elementary schools had enrollment capacities that were less than 700 students. He asked if those schools could be expanded.

Mr. Snipes stated that an architect reviewed the school sites to determine where classroom space could be added. He stated that the elementary schools with less than 700 students did not have enough space for additions.

Mr. Haldeman asked why the CIP request for Lafayette High School was described as a renovation instead of an expansion.

Mr. Snipes stated that the proposal for Lafayette High School was to repurpose space from a former auto shop and a kiln to add about eight classrooms. He stated that no new space would be added. He stated that multiple presentations at School Board meetings had discussed the various factors for expanding the high schools and building a new elementary school. He stated that the presentations from the School Board meetings were available on the WJCC Schools website.

Ms. Ewing stated that the current Future Think enrollment projections were available on the WJCC Schools website.

Mr. Haldeman asked if there was a demand for additional classrooms for the Bright Beginnings program.

Mr. Snipes stated that there is a waiting list of 100 to 200 students each year for Bright Beginnings.

Mr. Haldeman asked how long the Bright Beginnings program has been operating.

Mr. Snipes stated that the program started as the Needs Center at Norge Elementary School in the 1976.

Ms. Leverenz asked how many elementary schools have classrooms for Bright Beginnings.

Mr. Snipes stated that five elementary schools had Bright Beginnings classrooms in the current school year.

Ms. Leverenz asked if the new elementary school would include classrooms for Bright Beginnings.

Mr. Snipes stated that it depends on where there is a demand for classrooms. He stated that the design of classrooms for Bright Beginnings was mostly the same as elementary school classrooms.

Ms. Leverenz stated that the WJCC School Board had determined that there were compelling reasons to not consolidate the Bright Beginnings program at one location.

Mr. Snipes stated that having a separate facility would increase the length of bus routes. He stated that building a separate facility would result in administrative costs for staff and a cafeteria.

Ms. Leverenz asked if there were any other questions.

There were none.

Ms. Leverenz stated that the Committee could finalize its' ranking at the March 5, 2020, meeting.

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that the Committee members could forward their individual rankings to staff in advance of the March 5, 2020, meeting.

Ms. Tori Haynes stated that after the March 5, 2020 Policy Committee Meeting, the finalized CIP ranking would be included in the packet for the March 16, 2020, Planning Commission Organizational Meeting.

Ms. Leverenz asked if there were any other questions.

There were none.

E. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Haldeman made a motion to Adjourn. The motion passed 2-0.

Ms. Leverenz adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:30 p.m.