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 20, 2023
6:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. ANNUAL ORGANIZATION MEETING

1. Election of Officers
2. Proposed Calendar for 2023-2024

D. PUBLIC COMMENT

E. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Fiscal Year 2024-2028 Capital Improvements Program

F. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND REQUESTS

G. ADJOURNMENT

AGENDA ITEM NO. C.1.

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE:	3/20/2023
TO:	The Planning Commission
FROM:	Paul D. Holt, III, Secretary
SUBJECT:	Election of Officers

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/13/2023 - 9:20 AM
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/13/2023 - 9:21 AM
Publication Management	Daniel, Martha	Approved	3/13/2023 - 9:22 AM
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/13/2023 - 9:42 AM

AGENDA ITEM NO. C.2.

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE:	3/20/2023
TO:	The Planning Commission
FROM:	Paul D. Holt, III, Secretary
SUBJECT:	Planning Annual Organizational Meeting - Proposed Calendar for 2023-2024

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Type
🗋	Proposed Calendar for 2023-2024	Exhibit

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/6/2023 - 8:04 AM
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/6/2023 - 8:04 AM
Publication Management	Pobiak, Amanda	Approved	3/6/2023 - 8:11 AM
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/6/2023 - 8:34 AM

James City County PC/Policy/DRC Meeting Schedule, 2023-2024

Meeting locations, unless otherwise noted: Planning Commission (PC) - Government Center Board Room, 101-F Mounts Bay Rd.
Policy Committee and Development Review Committee (DRC) - Government Center Building A Conference Room, 101-A Mounts Bay Rd.

Planning Commission 2023-2024 (6PM)
- April 5
- May 3
- May 23 Joint Work Session w/ BOS (1pm)
- June 7
- July 5
- August 2
- September 6
- October 4
- November 1
- December 6
- January 3 (2024)
- February 7 (2024)
- March 6 (2024)
- March 18 (2024)*

*Special Meeting (Organizational and CIP)

Policy Committee 2023-2024 (3PM)
- April 13
- May 11
- June 8
- July 13
- August 10
- September 14
- October 12
- November 9
- December 14
- January 11 (2024)
- February 8 (2024)**
- February 15 (2024)**
- February 22 (2024)**
- February 29 (2024)**
- March 14 (2024)

**CIP Meetings

DRC 2023-2024 (4PM)
- March 29
- April 19
- May 24
- June 21
- July 19
- August 23
- September 20
- October 18
- November 15
- December 13
- January 24 (2024)
- February 21 (2024)

Planning Commission 2024-2025 (6PM)
- April 3
- May 1
- May 28 Joint Work Session w/ BOS (1pm)
- June 5
- July 3
- August 7
- September 4
- October 2
- November 6
- December 4
- January 8 (2025)
- February 5 (2025)
- March 5 (2025)
- March 17 (2025)*

*Special Meeting (Organizational and CIP)

Policy Committee 2024-2025 (3PM)
- April 11
- May 9
- June 13
- July 11
- August 8
- September 12
- October 10
- November 14
- December 12
- January 16 (2025)
- February 13 (2025)**
- February 20 (2025)**
- February 27 (2025)**
- March 6 (2025)**
- March 13 (2025)

**CIP Meetings

DRC 2024-2025 (4PM)
- March 27
- April 17
- May 22
- June 12***
- July 24
- August 21
- September 18
- October 23
- November 20
- December 11
- January 22 (2025)
- February 19 (2025)

******* One week early due to Juneteenth Holiday

2023-2024 Calendar Year: March 21, 2023 - March 18, 2024
2024-2025 Calendar Year: March 19, 2024 - March 18, 2025 (2024-2025 Calendar provided for reference only)

Revision date: 3/3/2023

AGENDA ITEM NO. E.1.

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 3/20/2023

TO: The Planning Commission

FROM: Terry Costello, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2024-2028 Capital Improvements Program

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Type
🗋	Staff Memo	Staff Report
🗋	Policy Committee CIP Summary Spreadsheet	Exhibit
🗋	Policy Committee CIP Ranking Criteria	Backup Material
🗋	Unapproved Policy Committee minutes from February 16, 2023	Minutes
🗋	Unapproved Policy Committee Minutes from February 9, 2023	Minutes
🗋	Unapproved Policy Committee Minutes from February23, 2023	Minutes
🗋	WJCC Schools Responses to Committee Questions	Backup Material

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/13/2023 - 8:37 AM
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/13/2023 - 8:37 AM
Publication Management	Daniel, Martha	Approved	3/13/2023 - 8:42 AM
Planning Commission	Holt, Paul	Approved	3/13/2023 - 8:44 AM

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 20, 2023

TO: The Planning Commission

FROM: Terry Costello, Senior Planner
Paxton Condon, Deputy Zoning Administrator/Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2024-2028 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 2045 Comprehensive Plan, the Committee is forwarding its recommendations to the Planning Commission for consideration.

As described in the Code of Virginia, the CIP is one of the methods of implementing the Comprehensive Plan and is of equal importance to methods like the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances, official maps, and transportation plans. The Policy Committee uses a set of ranking criteria to prioritize projects. Committee members evaluated each request for funding against the ranking criteria and produced a numerical score between 10 and 100. The scores generated by individual Committee members were then averaged and standardized through a Z-score process to produce a prioritized list for discussion and finalization. The Committee's ranking criteria is attached for reference (Attachment No. 2).

All CIP project requests for Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2028 are summarized in Attachment No. 1. This year there were 32 projects submitted for consideration by the Policy Committee - 24 from James City County departments, four from the Williamsburg Regional Library (WRL), and four from WJCC Schools. Of the 32 projects submitted, 17 County, three School, and three Library projects were included in the previous five-year CIP adopted by the Board of Supervisors; however, estimates and completion timelines may have been amended.

Attachment No. 1 also identifies the Committee's ranked priorities for these projects and 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 9, 2023,[i] Policy Committee meeting.

The Committee also requested that the following notes be included in this memorandum:

- For the New James City County Library Branch/Alternate New Jointly Funded Library application, the Committee recognized that there is a need for expansion, but the location is not decided right now and will be determined by the Board and other parties.

- The Committee noted that there might be some efficiency and financial advantages to consolidating projects, such as some of the Parks and Recreation projects, that are similar in nature or are located in close proximity.

- The Committee recommended that Fire Station 6, a CIP application that had been submitted in previous years, be included in the FY 2024-2028 CIP, and noted that there is likely a need for the services it would provide.

- The Committee expressed appreciation for the thoroughness of the WJCC Schools' responses to the Committee's questions and asked that the responses be attached to this memorandum for reference (Attachment No. 6).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

At its February 23, 2023, meeting, the Committee unanimously recommended forwarding the following FY 2024-2028 CIP priorities to serve as a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The projects selected are listed below in rank order:

1. Stormwater Neighborhood Drainage Improvements*
2. Fire Station 3 Replacement
3. Transportation Match*
4. Lower County Park*
5. New Grove Area Library
6. Human Services Renovations*
7. Open Space Match*
8. Grove Convenience Center*
9. Pre-K Space*
10. Warhill Sports Complex Softball/Baseball Complex
11. Brickyard Landing Improvements
12. Consolidated County Campus*
13. Warhill Sports Complex Multiuse Field Expansion
14. General Services Administration Building*
15. James City County Marina Parking Area*
16. Business Ready Sites Program*
17. Jamestown Beach Event Park Improvements
18. Chickahominy Riverfront Park Paddlecraft Area
19. FY24 Firing Range Expansion*
20. Upper County Park Splash Pad*
21. Chickahominy Riverfront Park Multiuse Trail
22. Veterans Park Phase 2 Improvements*
23. Jamestown High School Cafeteria School Expansion*
24. Lafayette High School Expansion*
25. Freedom Park Phase IV - Active Recreation Facilities
26. James City County Library Theatre - 7770 Croaker Road
27. Greensprings Interpretive Trail Restrooms
28. Warhill Sports Complex Connector Road
29. Skate Park
30. James City County Library Playground (Friends of WRL Funded)*
31. Williamsburg-James City County Schools Centralized Storage Facility
32. New James City County Library Branch/Alternate New Jointly Funded Library

* *These projects are requesting funding for FY24.*

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

TC/PC/md
FY2024-28CIP-mem

Attachments:
1. Policy Committee CIP Summary Spreadsheet
2. Policy Committee CIP Ranking Criteria
3. Unapproved Policy Committee Minutes from February 9, 2023
4. Unapproved Policy Committee Minutes from February 16, 2023
5. Unapproved Policy Committee Minutes from February 23, 2023
6. WJCC Schools Response to Committee Questions

[i] The application for the Office of Economic Development has been updated since February 9 to include clarified language.

ID	Department/Agency	Project Title	Brief Project Description (see application narratives for more detail)	FY2024 Requested	FY2025 Requested	FY2026 Requested	FY2027 Requested	FY2028 Requested	Total Requested	Agency Priority	Out of	PC Score	Z Score	PC Rank
G	General Services	Stormwater Capital Improvement Program	Various projects to address undersized and failing drainage systems, restore eroded channels and install new facilities to treat runoff pollution.	2,634,000	2,493,000	2,613,000	2,204,000	2,600,000	12,544,000	2	3	85.13	1.83	1
E	Fire	Fire Station 3 Replacement	The Fire Department is requesting funding for the design and engineering for either a major renovation and expansion of the existing facility or a replacement of Fire Station 3. Due to the age of the facility and increasing maintenance costs, we recommend a full replacement.	-	-	-	-	2,000,000	2,000,000	1	1	74.33	1.46	2
B	Community Development	Transportation Match	Various transportation projects improvements and implementation as identified in the Six Year Improvement Plan	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	-	12,000,000	1	2	76.38	1.68	3
I	Parks & Recreation	Lower County Park	Acquire property, design and construct a park that includes a walking trail, picnic shelter, swimming pool with water features, restrooms and all releated infrastructure to support.	220,000	-	1,113,200	6,122,600	-	7,455,800	1	14	70.88	1.12	4
FF	Williamsburg Regional Library	New Grove Area Library	A 10,000 SF library facility conveniently located would offer vital services for many residents in the Grove area.					6,093,360	6,093,360	4	4	66.25	0.98	5
BB	Social Services	Human Services Center Renovations	The proposed project includes renovation of the Olde Towne Medical and Dental Center space as well as the remainder of the HSC building to align better with the Space Needs Study, a total of 29,138 GSF.	11,356,552	15,159,861	-	-	-	26,516,413	1	1	61.25	0.66	6
C	Community Development	Open Space Match	Local match funding for greenspace acquisition program	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	6,250,000	2	2	66.25	0.47	7
H	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.	532,525					532,525	3	3	56.38	0.46	8
X	Schools	Pre-K Space*	Build dedicated PreK Classroom space on current elementary school sites. WJCCPS has tentatively selected the Clara Byrd Baker and Norge Elementary School campuses for the Pre-K buildings. Each site will have a capacity for approximately 250 students.	35,857,000					35,857,000	1	4	55.75	0.4	9
K	Parks & Recreation	Warhill Softball/Baseball Complex	Design and construction of two lighted synthetic turf softball/multi-use fields, two lighted synthetic turf fullsized baseball field, and associated infrastructure as shown in the 2021 Warhill Sports Complex Master Plan Update		1,200,000	-	9,610,000	-	10,810,000	3	19	52.63	0.25	10
T	Parks & Recreation	Brickyard Landing Improvements	Create a passive water access park on 119 acres to include: 20,000 sq. foot gravel boat trailer parking lot for 30 spaces; 8,000 sq. foot asphalt parking lot with 25 spots; .25 mile ADA accessible asphalt multi-use 8 foot wide path with connections to picnic shelters, parking, restrooms and boat ramp.		-	-	-	1,800,000	1,800,000	12	14	54	0.19	11
A	Administration	Consolidated County Campus	In order to address the County's short and long-term needs, the Board has directed staff to move forward with a consolidated County complex at 5231 Longhill Road. This will include approximately 227,341 sq. ft. of new construction, as well as other necessary site improvements such as parking and road redesign.	10,000,000	2,273,413	96,740,459			109,013,872	1	1	50	0.11	12
V	Parks & Recreation	Warhill Sports Complex Multi-Use Field Expansion	Design and construct four additional multi-use synthetic turf rectangular fields as shown as area "F" on the 2021 Warhill Sports Complex Master Plan Update				1,500,000	12,800,000	14,300,000	14	14	48.13	-0.04	13
F	General Services	General Services Administration Bldg.	Construct new 469,000 GSF building to house General Services Administration & Operations	33,498,500	-	-	-	-	33,498,500	1	3	49.38	-0.07	14
J	Parks & Recreation	JCC Marina Parking Area	Construct asphalt parking area to accommodate 150 parking spaces parking area as shown in the 2020 Shaping Our Shores Master Plan.	550,000	-	-	-	-	550,000	2	14	45.13	-0.13	15
D	Economic Development	Business Ready Sites Program	This project would provide funding (100% for the County-owned parcel and up to 50% for the parcels in private ownership as a match grant) to conduct the necessary engineering studies to determine construction readiness.	98,000	135,000	169,000	-	-	402,000	1	1	44.63	-0.14	16
Q	Parks & Recreation	Chickahominy Park Paddlecraft Area	Development of park based on the 2020 Shaping our Shores Master plan to include design and construction of ADA accessible paddlecraft area and additional parking and road improvements. **Plans include an additional boathouse (approximately $540,000), to be funded by the Williamsburg Boat Club.**	-	-	-	536,000	3,185,000	3,721,000	9	14	48.38	-0.16	17

ID	Department/Agency	Project Title	Brief Project Description (see application narratives for more detail)	FY2024 Requested	FY2025 Requested	FY2026 Requested	FY2027 Requested	FY2028 Requested	Total Requested	Agency Priority	Out of	PC Score	Z Score	PC Rank
S	Parks & Recreation	Jamestown Beach Event Park Improvements	Install additional restroom facility to support beach, realignment and paving of park roads, install permanent parking in existing grass parking area for 200 spaces, event venue with stage/performance area and restroom facilities, boat storage facility to support marina operations, park maintenance building	-	-	-		1,832,000	1,832,000	11	14	48.5	-0.16	18
W	Police	FY24 Firing Range Expanison	The requested change in FY24 is for an additional $142,450 in order to be able to complete this project.	142,450	-	-	-	-	142,450	1	1	41.13	-0.17	19
L	Parks & Recreation	Upper County Park Splash Pad	Replace the existing baby pool with ADA accessible splash pad and water features	135,000	780,000	-	-	-	915,000	4	19	45.5	-0.22	20
M	Parks & Recreation	Veterans Park Phase 2 Improvements	Complete phase 2 improvements at Veterans Park: splash pad, pump room, parking lot additions, sidewalk connections and outdoor workout equipment.	335,000	1,933,000	-	-	-	2,268,000	5	14	43.63	-0.31	21
P	Parks & Recreation	Chickahominy Park Multi-Use Trail	Construct multi-use trail at Chickahominy Riverfront Park as shown on the 2020 Shaping Our Shores Master Plan.	-	-	435,000	2,780,000	-	3,215,000	8	14	45.38	-0.31	22
Z	Schools	JHS Cafeteria School Expansion*	This project increases the core/cafeteria space at JHS to alleviate overcrowding.	2,490,000					2,490,000	3	4	43.13	-0.33	23
Y	Schools	LHS School Renovations*	Add instructional space to Lafayette High School	4,290,000					4,290,000	2	4	41.88	-0.35	24
R	Parks & Recreation	Freedom Park Phase IV - Active Recreation Facilities	Develop active recreational amenities at Freedom Park according to the approved Master Plan, including basketball, tennis, swimming pool/splash pad, picnic shelter and playground	-	-	-	1,335,000	7,900,000	9,235,000	10	19	43.13	-0.42	25
EE	Williamsburg Regional Library	James City County Library Theatre	Add a Theatre space to the James City County Library	-	-	-	-	4,000,000	4,000,000	3	4	48.38	-0.43	26
O	Parks & Recreation	Greensprings Interpretive Trail Restrooms	Construct permanent ADA accessible restroom facility at trail head	-	-	330,000	-	-	330,000	7	14	41.63	-0.46	27
U	Parks & Recreation	Warhill Sports Complex Connector Rd.	Construct new connector road to VDOT standards to be adopted into the state secondary road system for state maintenance.	-	-	-	-	6,770,000	6,770,000	13	14	38.38	-0.51	28
N	Parks & Recreation	Skate Park	Construct a new skate park, including expanded features, at the Warhill Sports Complex	-	150,000	1,000,000	-	-	1,150,000	6	14	34.38	-0.83	29
DD	Williamsburg Regional Library	James City County Library Playground	Proposal for a playground at the James City County Library site funded through a partnership with the Friends of WRL Foundation.	50,000	-	-	-	-	50,000	2	4	27.5	-1.2	30
AA	Schools	Centralized Storage Facility*	WJCCPS is requesting to build a storage facility on land adjacent to the Operations Center on Jolly Pond Road. The land is currently owned by the Division.					1,460,000	1,460,000	4	4	26.88	-1.44	31
CC	Williamsburg Regional Library	New James City County Library and Community Theatre /New Joint Library	Construction/Renovation of new library building per architectural assessment completed in May 2018.			3,764,880	16,102,410	19,798,410	39,665,700	1	4	17.75	-1.62	32
Total				**106,439,027**	**28,374,274**	**110,415,539**	**44,440,010**	**71,488,770**	**361,157,620**					
	* Dollar amounts shown are JCC portion only													

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)?	

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 16, 2023
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
Tim O'Connor
Frank Polster

Absent: Richard Krapf

Staff:
Terry Costello, Senior Planner
Paxton Condon, Deputy Zoning Administrator/Senior Planner
Andrea Case, Community Development Assistant
Ryan Ashe, Chief of Fire Department
Betsy Fowler, Director of Williamsburg Regional Library
Alister Perkinson, Parks Administrator
Joanna Ripley, Assistant Director of General Services
Shawn Gordon, Chief Civil Engineer
Chris Johnson, Director of Economic Development
Margo Zechman, Senior Budget and Accounting Analyst
Cheryl Holland, Budget Manager, Financial and Management Services

C. MINUTES

There were no minutes.

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. FY2024 - FY2028 Capital Improvements Program Review

Ms. Terry Costello thanked everyone for being present. She stated that as part of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Review process, there were five departments/divisions present to answer questions that the Committee had during its initial review. Ms. Costello introduced Ms. Fowler who is the Director of the Williamsburg Regional Library.

Ms. Fowler thanked the Committee for having her. She addressed the questions concerning the New Library application. She stated that the current one would continue to operate. Currently, James City County is significantly behind in the number of square feet per capita of Virginia State Standards for Virginia Public Libraries. There is a need for additional library space to meet state standards but also to meet the need of a growing population. Ms. Fowler stated that there has not been any new library space added since 1996. There are two options that are being considered. One would be to have a smaller branch at the current location within the City of Williamsburg and a new facility within James City County, or a joint venture with the City of Williamsburg and James City County for a larger facility in that location. She stated that the City of Williamsburg is committed to having a library in the current location within its city limits. Ms. Fowler stated that currently each locality is responsible for the construction and maintenance of that facility within each respective jurisdiction.

Mr. O'Connor asked what portion York County contributes.

She stated that York County's contribution to the maintenance costs is 10% of the annual budget, City of Williamsburg is 12%, with James City County at 78%. These numbers are based on checkouts by residents. Ms. Fowler stated that the City of Williamsburg City Manager has stated that the current site within the city limits is the only location they are willing to consider for a location. James City County Administration is deferring to the Board of Supervisors with respect to location.

Ms. Fowler stated that with regards to the New Library Theatre, the Kitzinger meeting room will stay. The theater location has not been determined yet, but the site is 14 acres and there is some flexibility.

Mr. Polster asked who was funding the new theater.

Ms. Fowler answered that James City County is funding the project.

Ms. Fowler stated that there is no location yet for the Grove Library. One option is to be able to have some long-term use of the Abram Frink Jr. Community Center. The Library has increased its outreach programs and are currently using the Abram Frink Jr. Community Center. She stated that there is a demand for usage in that area.

Mr. Polster asked if there was any discussion about co-locating with a new facility for Parks & Recreation.

Mr. Perkinson answered that the Lower County Park project is on hold for the time being. Only one location out of three were viable for a new facility, but there was no community support for that one location. He stated that the challenge now is to find property for a new facility that is supported by the community. Mr. Perkinson stated that he would have further discussion with his Department regarding co-location with library facilities.

Mr. Polster asked what the cost of the library facility would be.

Ms. Fowler answered that the money requested was for a 10,000-square -foot facility. The request was for FY28 due to having to stagger the applications to try and serve the greatest number of citizens. She stated that there might be opportunities to co-locate depending on the site and whether there was enough space. She also stated that Grove Christian Outreach Center is allowing them to utilize its facilities for some of their programs.

Mr. O'Connor asked whether the City of Williamsburg was willing to consider other locations such as that near the James City County Recreation Center and James Blair Middle School.

Ms. Fowler stated that the City of Williamsburg is very committed to the current site that utilizes the site and other services around that site.

Mr. O'Connor asked how the applications would change if each locality had its own site.

Ms. Fowler answered that there would be a lot of redundancy in the projects because some of the spaces and personnel would be duplicated.

Mr. Polster asked about the funding for the Library playground project.

Ms. Fowler answered that the Friends of Williamsburg Regional Library have begun to fundraise for the project and will be paying for the entire project. The County will be responsible for the project once constructed.

Mr. Polster stated that he thought this was a change from last year.

Ms. Holland answered that this was not a change from last year. This project is being reviewed not for the funding source, but how it relates to the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Fowler added that they include it in the CIP review since County staff time will be involved with the project.

Mr. Polster asked what the cost would be to General Services should this project go forward.

Mr. O'Connor stated that he believed it was the Policy Committee's responsibility to determine its consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and to rank its priority based on the understating that staff time would be involved during the project phase as well as for maintenance.

Ms. Fowler added that there would not be any other costs to General Services except for staff time.

Mr. Haldeman stated that there would be no capital costs to the County.

Ms. Holland added that the capital costs last year were in the amount of $180,000. This year it increased to $200,000. The approximate cost for maintenance that was part of this request was $1,500, and this would be annually.

Ms. Ripley stated that the $1,500 would be taken from the operating budget of General Services.

Ms. Holland stated that this project was being reviewed this year because it is an ongoing project and priorities are reevaluated each year.

Fire Chief Ryan Ashe described the project for the replacement of Fire Station 3. He stated that the replacement could happen without moving Fire Administration, but it would be dependent on the New County Complex Building. There are some discussions about moving Fire Administration to the New County Complex, but the training section would remain at the fire station due to its space needs.

The Committee questioned what the new building would look like and would there still be a need for a 90 degree turn for the fire trucks. Chief Ashe responded the design of the building is still in discussion. The current vision is that the trucks would come directly out onto John Tyler Highwyay. There are some height issues with the current building. The current building was built in 1979 when the County had less personnel, vehicles, and equipment. Chief Ashe stated that the additional space is needed for the larger trucks and to accommodate more personnel since Fire Station 3 is one of the busiest in the County. He stated that one of the goals in the County's Strategic Plan is to have another ambulance at this location. Chief Ashe explained what Basic Life Support and Advanced Life Support Services are and how revenue is collected for these services.

Chief Ashe then spoke about the previous submitted CIP request for Fire Station 6 since the Committee questioned why the application was not submitted this year but had been in previous years. He stated that the need is still there but that one of the goals of the Strategic

Plan was to replace or rehabilitate Fire Station 3 before a new fire station is built. He also stated that Fire Station 6 would be outside the five-year CIP plan for this review.

Mr. Polster stated that the data shows there is a need now for Fire Station 6.

Chief Ashe answered that due to priorities changing that the goal is to start with the Fire Station 3 project and then Fire Station 6 should proceed. He further stated that they did hire positions when Fire Station 6 was proposed. Chief Ashe also stated that County Administration has allowed them to retain these positions and they have been allowed to fully staff their stations.

Mr. O'Connor asked how the new County Complex would affect the training space needed, knowing that Fire Administration may or may not be located there.

Chief Ashe explained what they believe their training needs are and will be, and what other locations may be considered.

Ms. Costello then asked the Committee if it received the answers to its initial questions concerning the General Services projects.

Mr. Polster stated that Ms. Grace Boone, Director of General Services, had answered some of his questions concerning another project, the Consolidated County Campus.

Mr. Haldeman asked what would happen with 107 and 113 Tewning Road once the new General Services Building is built. These are two buildings that house County staff but are on property owned by James City Service Authority (JCSA).

Ms. Ripley answered that plans for those two buildings are still not known. She further stated that these buildings have been there since the 1970's, and the space is small and does not meet the needs of the current General Services staff.

Mr. Gordon stated that the Master Plan for the JCSA Tewning Road Complex indicates that once General Services vacates the buildings, these buildings will be demolished.

Ms. Ripley also stated that staff appreciated these questions ahead of time so that they had time to collect information and prepare their answers.

Mr. O'Connor asked if there was any thought to have any drive-thru services with the new County Complex design.

Ms. Ripley answered that they will make note of that for future discussions.

Mr. Polster stated that Ms. Boone answered his question concerning the renewable energy sources for some of the new buildings proposed. Mr. Polster asked if the WJCC Schools had any plans for solar panels at any of the school sites.

Ms. Ripley answered that the County is reviewing options for solar at County facilities. As part of LEED certification there is a process of reviewing for renewable energy. There has not been anything established yet.

Mr. Polster asked about the WJCC Schools.

Ms. Ripley answered that the County does not have any purview over the WJCC Schools projects as they manage their own CIP projects.

Mr. Polster stated that there would be benefits to the County and WJCC Schools to partner with regards to renewable energy in both entities' CIP projects.

Ms. Toni Small, Director of Stormwater and Resource Protection, then spoke on the question concerning undersized and failing drainage systems. She stated that undersized and failing drainage systems include those that were designed under older stormwater standards and specifications. She further stated that some of the projects included in the five-year CIP application address stormwater runoff resulting from developments that were designed and constructed prior to current standards. These projects include stream restoration and/or Best Management Practice retrofits. Ms. Small gave examples of these projects which include the Brookhaven neighborhood, Ware Creek Manor neighborhood, and the Grove neighborhood.

Mr. Haldeman expressed his concerns over reviewing systems based on current impact as opposed to reviewing for current and cumulative impacts.

Ms. Small noted that there are two points being discussed by the Committee. One being that some of these CIP projects are fixing and improving systems that were built previously, and the other is staff review of current and future projects considering cumulative impacts of development.

Mr. Polster expressed his concerns over the impacts on the County's watersheds.

Mr. Perkinson then spoke about Lower County Park and the challenge of finding land to build the facility. He stated that the project is still the top priority for the Parks & Recreation Department. He stated that the project will also include pedestrian and multiuse routes. Mr. Perkinson also addressed the question of costs for the Greensprings Trail Restroom. He stated that one-third of the cost was to run utilities to the facility. He also stated the cost was high due to installing quite a few items in a small space.

Mr. Perkinson then spoke on the Chickahominy Riverfront Park multiuse trail. He stated that the project is for a 0.8-mile trail, bridge, and parking area to include picnic and rest areas. He stated that this trail would connect to the Virginia Capital Trail.

Mr. Haldeman asked whether there could be any cost savings by combining similar projects.

Mr. Perkinson answered that there probably could be some cost savings especially with the paving projects.

Mr. Polster asked about including the bike trail at Chickahominy Riverfront Park as part of the multiuse trail.

Mr. Perkinson answered it would be an opportunity to move the bike path at the same time as the multiuse trail project.

Mr. Polster stated that it was a safety issue at the point where the bike path crosses the park entrance road and that the cars tend not to stop.

Mr. Perkinson stated that the funds requested for the multiuse trail do include stormwater improvements. He also answered the question that portions of the trail would be inside the Resource Protection Area. A free-standing bridge would also be included.

Mr. Perkinson then spoke on the Warhill Sports Complex Connector Road project. He showed on the master plan where the road is located. He stated that this road is a service road which requires constant maintenance. He stated that the road needs to be updated to be included in the Virginia Department of Transportation's (VDOT) road system. Mr. Perkinson said that part of the road is VDOT maintained, but the plan was to have the entire road part of its maintenance.

Mr. Perkinson then spoke on the Warhill Sport Multi-Use Field Expansion. He stated that there are eight synthetic turf fields currently with a large grass area. This project is to add additional synthetic turf fields, parking, and concessions. The goal is to be able to increase the tournaments that could be scheduled there. Mr. Perkinson also stated that the design costs are typically calculated at 15% of the construction costs.

Mr. Chris Johnson, Director of the Office of Economic Development, then spoke on the Business Ready Sites CIP application. He stated that this was the second year of this project, the first being FY23. Originally there were four properties in the program, with one being a County owned site. He stated that the County property has been sold this past year. He stated that there are three properties currently in the program. Mr. Johnson stated that anytime the County can reduce construction readiness time for an outside entity, it would increase the chance of a business entity coming to the County. He stated the funding would help change the rankings from a Tier 1 to a 2 to possibly a 3, with the higher being more desirable. He stated the higher tiers make a difference to larger firms with a capital interest. Mr. Johnson stated the importance of properties being "shovel ready" or near "shovel ready." He stated that the return on investment for the County really depends on the business coming in. The money that the County would be investing would be for the County to be given a chance to be competitive with other sites.

Mr. Haldeman asked if the County invested money with these properties, would the property value increase.

Mr. Johnson answered that the property value would not increase. This program was a tool to increase the chances of a business locating in the County.

Mr. O'Connor stated that increasing the tier level for these properties makes the properties more attractive to prospective businesses.

Mr. Johnson addressed the question of the commitment of the private owners of the properties. There would be agreements done if a business prospect would come through. Staff had a successful grant application announced last month with the Hazelwood Farms Property. Mr. Johnson stated that that particular property is now under contract to an industrial developer.

Mr. Polster stated that his question concerned the matching funds, and whether the owners agreed to the matching funds, and are the previous owners of the Hazelwood Farms property still a part of the matching funds request.

Mr. Johnson answered that the way that staff put forth the application was that for the site owned by the County the funding would be used to raise it to a certain tier level, and for the sites that are privately owned, the funding would be used for doing due diligence work.

Mr. Polster asked about the Barhamsville property, noting the budgeted amount was to include work to get the property to a Tier 3, and the Hornsbys' have not agreed to a matching agreement.

Mr. Johnson answered that the money budgeted in the outlying years was for properties most likely to move forward.

Mr. Polster asked which property the FY23 funds were budgeted for.

Mr. Johnson answered that the property was under private ownership with no industrial development at the time of the grant application. He stated that if those conditions existed today and the grant application was currently being done, a performance agreement between the State and the County, and an agreement between the County and the landowner would be required. He also stated that the grant money received for the Virginia Business Ready Sites Program was only enough money to perform the due diligence (design work) with no money for construction. Mr. Johnson added that with the money in CIP and the grant funds there is enough money to do the entirety of the due diligence work for the Hazelwood Farms property. There are no funds available yet for the Hornsby property.

Mr. Polster asked for clarification as to what FY23 funds were used for.

Mr. Johnson answered that the money represented 50% of the estimated cost to do the due diligence work and the design work to extend water and sewer to the property.

Mr. Polster asked what the advantage to the County was of doing the due diligence for the water and sewer. He stated that he was trying to understand more about the CIP application which would help him prioritize the CIP projects as part of the Committee's review.

Mr. Johnson stated that the application that was submitted as part of last year's review, and going forward, is to do the due diligence work to get the tiering level from whatever it may be today, to increase by one level. He stated that many things have changed with the Hazelwood Farms property over the last year. This included the rezoning, the marketing of the property, a grant application submitted in the middle of the year, and a developer already doing some work. He also stated that the grant is a reimbursable grant. Mr. Johnson explained that the County would contract the work, gets reimbursed by the state, and then determine where the money is allocated. Any work that was done by the owner or developer prior to the grant award, is ineligible for reimbursement. He stated that the CIP application before the Committee was under the assumption that of the four properties, the Hazelwood Farms property was the one most likely to move forward first. He stated that the number represented 50% of the estimate provided by the State for what that would cost.

Mr. Polster asked what would be required to get the Hazelwood property to a Tier 3 which is what the application calls for.

Mr. Johnson answered that it was $296,000. He further stated that the grant application that was approved in January is not part of this CIP review. The grant application that was provided outlines what each due diligence cost would be as part of that program.

Mr. Polster expressed his concern that he still did not understand the application and the costs associated with that application.

Mr. O'Connor stated that he reviewed the CIP application as if it were for the matching funds.

Mr. Polster expressed his concerns in looking at the budget with the work proposed that there would not be enough funds.

Mr. Johnson answered that funds are also available in the Economic Development operating budget and the Economic Development Authority grant program. He further stated that these funds will be used to close that gap and do more than doing the studies to increase it one tier level. The funds will also be used for the design work for the water and sewer service. Mr. Johnson then proceeded to address other questions concerning the Comprehensive Plan designation and rezoning of the Hornsby property. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan designation is Mixed Use, and the property could be rezoned, but it would depend on what type of business would locate there. He stated that the Zoning Ordinance would dictate that.

Mr. Polster expressed his appreciation to Mr. Johnson for the successful submittal of the grant application.

Mr. Johnson answered the last question posed for this CIP application, stating that there were no grant proposals for 9131 and 9200 Barhamsville Road or Stonehouse parcels. He also stated that localities were encouraged to only submit one application to the grant program. He stated that 21 out of 50 applications submitted were funded.

Ms. Costello addressed the question concerning the transportation match. She stated that the Pocahontas Trail project has not been fully funded due to rising cost estimates. Staff is working with VDOT to look to amend the scope of work to reduce the overall cost of the project and is currently pursuing various funding applications to secure the remaining gap funding needed. Should funding be secured, project construction is expected to start in FY28. Unfortunately, the Blow Flats Road location is outside of the project area and scope of work. Staff would need to first study the roadway through a consultant and then pursue funds based on the road study.

E. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Polster made a motion to Adjourn.

The motion passed 3-0 (Krapf absent).

Mr. Haldeman adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:55 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 9, 2023
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
Tim O'Connor
Frank Polster

Staff:
Ellen Cook, Principal Planner
Jose Ribeiro, Senior Planner II/Landscape Planner
Suzanne Yeats, Planner
Terry Costello, Senior Planner
Andrea Case, Community Development Assistant
Liz Parman, Deputy County Attorney
Margo Zechman, Senior Budget and Accounting Analyst
Cheryl Holland, Budget Manager, Financial and Management Services
Christopher Johnson, Director of Economic Development
Tammy Rosario, Assistant Director of Community Development

C. MINUTES

There were no minutes.

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. ORD-22-0004. Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance Regarding Community Recreation Facilities in Residential Districts

Ms. Yeats presented the staff report, stating that staff had addressed questions from the Policy Committee meeting on December 8, 2022. These questions included how widespread the problem was; how the new Ordinance would be enforced; what specific activities would be addressed by the language; what conditions would be included in special use permits (SUPs); and whether there are different ways to address concerns. Ms. Yeats summarized the information presented in the staff report.

Mr. Haldeman asked a question about enforcement authority if a neighborhood facility is used by citizens who live outside a neighborhood, in a circumstance where there is no homeowners association (HOA).

Ms. Yeats stated that if the neighborhood had a recreation association, that would likely be a matter for them.

Mr. Haldeman, Mr. Krapf, and Ms. Yeats discussed the possibility of this being considered trespassing and if police would be able to assist in this situation., with Ms. Yeats also noting that some neighborhoods have their own police or security arrangements.

Mr. Haldeman stated that the matter before them was a situation where an outside group had been given permission to use a facility on a recurring basis.

Ms. Yeats confirmed.

Mr. Krapf asked for more information about staff's response to the Policy Committee's question about what conditions would apply to a potential SUP and expressed concern about the amount of work that would be involved in developing appropriate conditions, particularly when there are a number of existing regulations that address many of the potential issues.

Mr. Krapf, Ms. Yeats, and Ms. Cook discussed that the conditions would depend on whether the Ordinance moved forward, and if it did, then the conditions would depend on the specifics of the case and the analysis and studies done for the SUP - for example, one facility might trigger the need for roadway improvements, while another might not.

Mr. Krapf asked for confirmation that there had been a total of one complaint.

Ms. Yeats confirmed.

Mr. Krapf stated that a response to the Board could be that the Policy Committee had examined this issue and a draft approach to address it, should it become a more frequent issue, but that at this point in time it appears to be a rare and isolated issue and the Committee would not recommend making an Ordinance change at this point.

Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Polster concurred.

Mr. Polster stated that the swim club in Kingswood involved in the complaint had been a 501(c) since 1971. Mr. Polster stated that membership in this group was open for anyone to join, and that their calendar was posted. He stated that he did not think that the concerns related to swim meets, such as some parking on adjacent streets or noise, were significant issues as they would happen infrequently.

Mr. O'Connor noted that there are a number of similar swim clubs in the County. He questioned how, in circumstances where the club is open to the community or to a group of neighborhoods (as in the case of Kingswood), the County could define 50% of a neighborhood as specified in the draft Ordinance language. He stated his concern that this approach was overreaching by telling HOAs how to manage their recreation facilities.

Mr. Haldeman summarized the discussion, stating that the Committee had reviewed the information provided by staff and found that the issue was a very infrequent problem and would require substantial staff oversight. He stated that the Committee would recommend not moving forward with an Ordinance amendment unless the problem became more frequent.

The Committee concurred.

Mr. O'Connor added his strong concern that if the Ordinance is adopted, the County would end up in the middle of internal HOA strife.

Ms. Cook advised the Committee that at the Planning Commission stage, staff would attach draft Ordinance language. The Committee's recommendation to not move forward with Ordinance adoption would be in the staff report, but the language would be available, should the Commission or Board of Supervisors wish to move forward.

The Committee and staff discussed next steps for this item.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Fiscal Year 2024-2028 Capital Improvements Program Review

Ms. Costello presented the staff report, stating the number of applications submitted by the various departments. Ms. Costello provided an overview of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) review process.

Mr. Polster asked about how the process the Committee is going through relates to the list of CIP projects included in budget document from last year, since staff and the Board had already made decisions about items moving forward. He noted that the General Services building has funding shown for FY23 and FY24, as an example, and asked why the Committee would be including this project in the prioritization process.

Ms. Holland described the budget process the County uses, noting that the first year is adopted, while the second year is a framework year and items may be reconsidered.

Mr. Polster stated that it seemed that if a project was funded in FY23, that the County would certainly fund it in FY24. In addition, if there is already a plan for floating a bond for certain projects, and he questioned whether there is a purpose in revisiting those projects.

Ms. Holland stated that depending on input on the projects from the Committee in relation to Comprehensive Plan consistency, paired with updated information on funding resources and other considerations, there could still be changes to what had been planned, if directed by the Board.

Mr. Polster noted that the Board made the final decision on what projects are funded, and that projects may be funded by the Board that are at the bottom of the Committee's prioritization.

Ms. Holland stated that another factor was the availability of General Services Department staff to administer the projects.

Mr. Polster asked about the CIP projects included in the budget that were not reviewed by the Policy Committee and questioned the prioritization process if not all projects are included.

Ms. Holland asked if he was referring to the capital maintenance items.

Mr. Polster confirmed. He stated that his point was to ask why they were ranking repeat or already funded projects versus just the new ones.

Ms. Holland stated that would be a change in the process but could be considered.

Ms. Cook noted that a larger change in the process would likely be a discussion for a future year.

Mr. Krapf asked if the capital maintenance projects had been included in previous years, and if the Committee at some point had decided not to review them.

Ms. Cook and Ms. Holland confirmed.

Mr. Haldeman asked about the expected facility life for several projects and whether it would be appropriate for the ones with the longer facility life be handled through bonds. He noted this would relate the use of the facility to the people who are in the community using it. He noted the low interest rates and the benefit of front-loading projects, as well as the economies of scale that could be achieved by consolidating projects.

Ms. Holland described the process Financial and Management Services Department goes through in consulting with financial advisors on especially the larger and more expensive projects.

Mr. Haldeman and Ms. Holland discussed the County's debt load.

Mr. Krapf asked about American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds and its use for capital projects.

Ms. Holland stated that all ARPA funds have been allocated by the Board. Ms. Holland stated that the items included in the CIP list are items that are not fully funded by ARPA, although some of the projects included may have a piece or a phase funded by ARPA.

Mr. Polster asked about Brickyard Landing.

Ms. Holland stated that Parks & Recreation has been reprioritizing its projects. She stated that some projects may have been shown as funded in FY23 with ARPA funds; however, there have been discussions about whether to continue to move forward with those Parks & Recreation projects that had been previously selected, or whether to switch to other projects in order to meet ARPA timeline requirements (the need to complete projects by 2026), and that some changes had been made.

Mr. Polster and Ms. Holland further discussed the ARPA funds and how it related to the CIP projects on the list.

Ms. Cook asked the Committee for the feedback on whether it had questions for the various Departments that had submitted applications. Ms. Cook asked about whether there were questions for County Administration for the consolidated campus application.

Mr. Haldeman confirmed and stated he would send his questions to staff.

Mr. Polster stated that he had a question for this application as well as some of the General Services applications regarding the inclusion of solar energy in the design of County and Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) Schools facilities. He recommended that the County include sustainability and renewable energy considerations in facility designs. He recommended considering a solar farm on the 504 acres at the County landfill for sustainability reasons and financial reasons.

Ms. Cook stated that these questions could be passed along to the Departments and asked if there were other questions for Administration.

Mr. Haldeman stated that he had sent questions to Mr. Jason Purse, Assistant County Administrator, via email.

Mr. O'Connor stated he had questions that were partially for Administration and partially for General Services regarding the need for office and other spaces described in the applications. Mr. O'Connor suggested efficient consolidation of services to best serve County citizens, such as Chesterfield County. Mr. O'Connor asked about co-locating a library at the planned consolidated campus in order to create a walkable community with good transportation access.

Ms. Cook stated that Mr. Purse may be able to address considerations for the consolidated campus, including any possibly library co-location. Ms. Cook asked if the Committee had questions for Community Development staff, either for transportation or open space.

In relation to the transportation match application, Mr. Haldeman recommended considering widening Blow Flats Road at the same time that improvements are made to Pocahontas Trail. Mr. Haldeman noted that he would share the responses he received from Ms. Rosario on the open space application with the other Committee members.

Ms. Cook asked if there were questions on the Economic Development application.

Mr. Polster stated that he had two questions, one about the matching funding for one of the projects, and one about the Tier ranking status. Mr. Polster stated that it appeared that the Stonehouse project had received FY23 funding.

Ms. Cook asked if there were questions for the Fire Department application.

Mr. Haldeman stated that he had several, which he had sent to staff and would forward to the Committee. Mr. Haldeman stated that one of his questions was about the entrance design for the new station.

Mr. Polster noted that the older station had very low clearance for the ladder trucks, which can slow them down as they are leaving.

Mr. Haldeman asked about the status of Fire Station 6.

Ms. Costello confirmed with Mr. Krapf that he had a question for the Fire Department as well.

Ms. Cook asked about the General Services applications, stating that some questions for General Services had already been discussed, and asking if there were any additional questions.

Mr. Haldeman asked if the architectural study from 2014 was still valid or needed to be updated.

Mr. O'Connor asked, in relation to the stormwater applications, if the County owned the dam in Mirror Lakes.

Mr. Polster confirmed and described the history of that project.

Mr. Polster discussed the General Services building application, noting that renewable energy needs to be part of the initial design and engineering considerations for County facilities, as the feasibility to include this component is decreased or eliminated if considered later. Mr. Polster noted that renewable energy and sustainability considerations are part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Costello referred to a question that Mr. Krapf had sent asking if the General Services building could be included in the new consolidated campus.

Mr. Krapf confirmed that he wondered if that was possible or if there would be reasons these facilities could not be located together and recalled that there had been some feedback from General Services that operational needs would not be compatible. He asked for some additional information on what the adverse impacts would be to General Services if they were to be located within the campus.

Ms. Cook asked if there were questions on the Parks & Recreation applications.

Mr. Polster stated that he would like more information about funding for the various Parks and Recreation projects. He expressed support for the Lower County Park application.

Mr. Haldeman asked why the Lower County Park project needed to wait until the Pocahontas Trail project moves forward, as stated in the application. He noted his concerns about equity of access to parks within the County.

Mr. Polster asked what the use of the Abram Frink Jr. Community Center would be after Lower County Park is in place, and whether it would become a library. He noted that there was a separate application for a lower County library.

Ms. Cook asked if the Committee had questions for the Police firing range application.

Mr. Haldeman asked for an update on what has been done so far.

Ms. Holland stated that the additional fund request may be due to cost increases associated with inflation.

Ms. Cook asked if there were questions on the WJCC Schools applications.

Mr. Polster stated his questions regarding the Bright Beginnings program, the implications for school classroom usage, bus times, and overall capacity issues in the elementary schools. He asked for updated documentation. He also asked for information about the plans for cafeteria expansion and how that matched or did not match redistricting plans and considering a bond.

Ms. Cook asked if there were questions on the Social Services application.

The Committee did not have questions.

Ms. Cook asked if the Committee had questions on the Library applications.

Mr. Haldeman stated he did not have questions, and that he was unable to rank the project until a decision has been made on the location.

Mr. Polster asked what the County Administrator and officials in the City of Williamsburg decided. Mr. Polster stated that it was his understanding that the City of Williamsburg was planning to put the library in the old Police building and that funding had already been allocated. He stated that he felt the City of Williamsburg had indicated its direction, and that inclusion of funds in the out years of the County's CIP was puzzling since the location is unknown and no decision has been made.

Mr. O'Connor stated that unless the Library has an update on a decided location, the situation remains the same as in past years and he is not able to rank it either.

Ms. Cook asked if the Committee had questions on the other Library applications.

Mr. Polster stated that he did have questions about the other Library applications, including the plan for the lower County.

Ms. Costello asked the Committee to forward questions to her as soon as possible and she will provide them to the Departments in advance.

Mr. Polster noted that Mr. Krapf would not be in attendance at upcoming CIP meetings and asked if he was comfortable with the rankings he had provided.

Mr. Krapf confirmed, stating that he was familiar with many of the projects from previous years. Mr. Krapf stated that he respected the Committee's judgement and any adjustments to the final order that the Committee might deem appropriate.

The Committee concluded discussion of the CIP agenda item.

Mr. Krapf asked to return to discussion of the Community Recreation Facilities Agenda item. Mr. Krapf asked for clarification from Mr. O'Connor about this desired next step for this item.

Mr. O'Connor stated that his desire was that the item not move forward from the Committee to the full Planning Commission but acknowledged that the staff needed to address the Board's Initiating Resolution. He stated that he would not support this Ordinance change at the Commission level and that, given the Committee concerns, it seemed like a wasted effort on staff's part, should the Board eventually reconsider.

The Committee discussed concerns with enforcing the Ordinance and the staff time that would be involved, as well as impacts to the overall community if there are restrictions on recreation facility uses.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Polster made a motion to Adjourn.

The motion passed 4-0.

Mr. Haldeman adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:14 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 23, 2023
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
Tim O'Connor
Frank Polster

Staff:
Ellen Cook, Principal Planner
Terry Costello, Senior Planner
Paxton Condon, Deputy Zoning Administrator/Planner
Liz Parman, Deputy County Attorney
Sharon McCarthy, Director of Financial Management Services
Cheryl Holland, Budget Manager, Financial and Management Services
Margo Zechman, Senior Budget and Accounting Analyst

C. MINUTES

There was no new business.

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. FY2024 - FY2028 Capital Improvements Program Review

Ms. Costello thanked everyone for being present. She stated that this meeting is to confirm the final scoring and ranking recommendations of the Committee.

Mr. Haldeman stated staff had answered questions via email and no questions for staff remained. He stated weightings and Z-scores by all four Committee members were complete. Mr. Haldeman opened the topic for discussion.

Mr. Polster stated this process was used last year and that Z-scores normalize scores to account for individual weighting preferences and the process was continued for this year. He stated the 32 CIP projects presented are ranked in highest to lowest order.

Ms. McCarthy asked if the ranking was based on the average score.

Mr. Polster stated that was correct.

Mr. Haldeman stated he would have liked to see the Brickyard Landing Parks and Recreation application a little higher, but that he agreed with the current ranking.

Mr. O'Connor stated he was okay with the Brickyard project. Mr. O'Connor asked if the Police firing range expansion project and Office of Economic Development projects should be moved up in the ranking.

Mr. Polster stated he believed the firing range expansion would be funded regardless of whether the ranking was changed. He asked if the firing range and business-ready projects were going to be funded.

Ms. Cheryl Holland stated the budget plan was established last year but the funding has not been appropriated for FY24. She stated the priorities will be taken to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) to decide. She stated Mr. Polster was correct that the projects had been funded in the past.

Mr. Haldeman stated the funding appropriation for the firing range was an addition to a previously funded amount to complete the project.

Ms. Cheryl Holland confirmed this was correct.

Mr. Polster stated he would like to see the firing range project completed. He stated he had asked if installing a solar facility at the landfill would impact the firing range and that Ms. Grace Boone, General Services Director, stated solar panels would not impact the range.

Mr. Polster made a motion to approve the FY24-28 CIP ranking list and recommendations.

The motion passed 3-0.

Mr. Polster asked if County Administration provided any feedback on adding Fire Station 6 to the list.

Ms. Costello replied no, stating that the issue had not been addressed with County Administration at this time.

Mr. Polster stated he would like the Policy Committee to recommend the BOS consider adding Fire Station 6 to the current CIP listing.

Mr. Haldeman and Mr. O'Connor agreed with the recommendation.

Mr. Haldeman stated he would like to see projects consolidated for efficiency. He stated Chickahominy Riverfront Park has two project applications for paving and one may be considered. Mr. Haldeman stated for the transportation match project and Pocahontas Trail, he would like to see Blow Flats Road added to the scope of work.

Mr. Polster stated the responses received from Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) Schools were excellent. He stated Mr. Daniel Keever, Chief Operating Officer for WJCC Schools, was consistent regarding space concerns at Lafayette High School and possible rezoning as well as forthright for the Pre-K and kindergarten projects. He stated it was important for the BOS to know that relieving capacity issues in the elementary school still required classroom renovation. He stated fixing the issue requires renovations as well as staffing. He stated these reasons are why the project is highly rated. Mr. Polster asked that the notes from WJCC Schools be made available to the BOS.

Ms. Cook suggested that the answers from WJCC Schools be included as an attachment to the memorandum, to address Mr. Polster's recommendation.

Mr. O'Connor asked if the Committee wanted to send any notes to the Planning Commission and BOS regarding the library.

Mr. Polster stated this was done last year.

Mr. O'Connor agreed and stated the same challenge continues. He stated the project ranking is due to uncertainty regarding the location and funding.

Mr. Haldeman stated it is impossible to rank a new library without that information.

Mr. O'Connor and Mr. Polster agreed.

Mr. O'Connor stated that project also may be impacted if an auditorium is added to the James City County (JCC) Library.

Mr. Polster noted the previous Committee suggestion that an auditorium could be part of the new JCC government complex.

Mr. O'Connor stated conversations during the Comprehensive Plan development regarding complete communities and increasing accessibility can be applied here by locating the new government complex by the JCC Recreation Center.

Mr. Polster stated staff and Ms. Boone should be commended for the Request for Information for the landfill solar project. He stated General Services is exploring renewable energy and solar on parking garages for potential sites. He stated this will assist with the new government complex or other new buildings and relates to the Comprehensive Plan Goals, Strategies and Actions. Mr. Polster stated this was a significant step forward for sustainability.

Mr. Haldeman asked if the Committee should comment on financing.

Mr. Polster stated he believed it would be up to the BOS. He also stated that any potential inclusion of solar would need to be explored as part of design work for County facilities.

Mr. Haldeman confirmed comments regarding Fire Station 6, consolidating projects where possible, and the library would be included.

E. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Polster made a motion to Adjourn.

The motion passed 3-0.

Mr. Haldeman adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:20 p.m.

Mr. Jack Haldeman, Chair

Mr. Paul Holt, Secretary

Attachment 6. WJCC Schools Response to Committee Questions

Questions regarding the application for Pre-K Space (two buildings at Norge and Clara Byrd Baker Elementary School):

1. What was done with the $3.2 mm allocated last year?
   Monies allocated by funding partners in 2021-2022 is being used for design of the PreK buildings. Currently, school staff is working with JCC procurement to complete the RFP process with respect to selecting a design firm.

2. Will this eliminate trailers?
   While we do project the dedicated PreK space will allow for creation of additional elementary school classroom space, we are unable to guarantee the elimination of all classroom trailers at elementary schools.

3. Is the location at CBB & Norge Tentative?
   Based on the feasibility study completed by RRMM last year, we believe that Norge ES and Clara Byrd Baker ES are the most appropriate sites for building the PreK additions.

4. Each site will have a capacity for approximately 250 students. The Anlar Report, October 21, states that are 231 children additional PreK students in our community who we are unable to be served and estimates that an additional 10 classrooms, at a minimum, would be needed. Question - with a capacity of 250 students how may Pre-K classrooms does the equate to for both schools?
   18 classrooms (250 students) for each of the two sites will be able to serve 500 PreK students. Currently, there are 395 seats allocated for PreK across 5 schools. The program would shift from five locations to two. It is also important to note that WJCC will need to reconfigure the attendance zones across elementary schools to maximize the space created when PreK is consolidated on two school campuses. The plan allows for WJCC to serve an additional 105 PreK students. Using the data from the Anlar Report, this is 126 less than the 231 estimated.

5. Will the former PreK Classrooms in both schools increase the Elementary School student capacity and how many in Elementary classrooms will result in each school?
   Yes, there will be an increase of capacity across elementary schools with the opening of dedicated PreK buildings. Rezoning will also be a component of any plan to maximize the increased capacity. Tentatively, the number of additional elementary classroom space includes: 22-24 general education classrooms for 440-480 students and 5-7 self-contained classrooms for 50-70 students.

6. How will this address the 90% capacity issue for Blayton and Montague and the overcapacity issue at Mathew Whaley?
   There will be an increase in elementary school capacity and a need to rezone students in order to maximize the space.

7. Is there an updated set of documents for the 2021-22 school year with projections with and without Pre-K?
   Information was shared during the December 2, 2022 Joint Meeting that included WJCC School Board, Williamsburg City Council, James City County Board of Supervisors. Here is a link to the agenda item and document package: http://go.boarddocs.com/vsba/wjcc/Board.nsf/goto?open&id=CL8NNL5DC3D5

Questions regarding the application for Lafayette High School Renovation:

1. What specifically is being done? New construction or solely renovation?
   The 900 Building will undergo renovations that will allow for additional classroom space to be constructed.

2. What about more maintenance and administrative staff?
   Not anticipated at this time.

3. How much added capacity? How many more kids?
   Currently, there is the plan to add 6 to 8 classrooms. The total number of students will vary based on classroom use and programming needs.

4. Will Williamsburg pay part?
   Based on the funding structure of the localities, Williamsburg is also asked to consider this item as part of their CIP discussion.

Questions regarding the application for the Jamestown High School Cafeteria:

1. Is there a Future Think 2022 report?
   See above for a link to December 2, 2022 Joint Meeting agenda and document package.

2. If the 8 additional classrooms were built at LHS and the available capacity of all three high schools for Most Likely and Low projections is below the 100% capacity level, and redistricting is a consideration based on WJCC comments at last year's CIP discussions, why is this project required or programed as a FY 24 Bond issue?
   Enrollment across the three high schools – in the most likely scenario – is projected to increase. With additional classroom space available at Lafayette, there is a possibility for rezoning. That said, without the rezoning, Lafayette is projected to see enrollment increases. Jamestown needs additional cafeteria/multi-purpose space and this CIP request addresses the long-standing need.

Questions regarding the application for the Centralized Storage Facility:

1. Will Williamsburg pay part?
   Based on the funding structure of the localities, Williamsburg is also asked to consider this item as part of their CIP discussion.