

AGENDA
JAMES CITY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM
101 MOUNTS BAY ROAD, WILLIAMSBURG, VA 23185
March 18, 2024
6:00 PM

- A. CALL TO ORDER**
- B. ROLL CALL**
- C. ANNUAL ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING**
 - 1. Election of Officers
 - 2. Proposed Calendar for 2024-2025
- D. PUBLIC HEARING(S)**
 - 1. Fiscal Year 2025-2029 Capital Improvements Program
- E. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND REQUESTS**
- F. ADJOURNMENT**

James City County PC/Policy/DRC Meeting Schedule, 2024-2025

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 2024-2025 (6PM)

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

* Tentative

**One week later due to New Years Day

***Special Meeting (Organizational and CIP)

Planning Commission 2025-2026 (6PM)

- April 2
- May 7
- May 20 Joint Work Session w/ BOS (1pm)
- June 4
- July 2
- August 6
- September 3
- October 1
- November 5
- December 3
- January 7 (2026)
- February 4 (2026)
- March 4 (2026)
- March 16 (2026)*

*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 9 (2025)
- February 13 (2025)*
- February 20 (2025)*
- February 27 (2025)*
- March 6 (2025)*
- March 13 (2025)

*CIP Meetings

Policy Committee 2025-2026 (3PM)

- April 10
- May 8
- June 12
- July 10
- August 14
- September 11
- October 9
- November 13
- December 11
- January 8 (2026)
- February 12 (2026)*
- February 19 (2026)*
- February 26 (2026)*
- March 5 (2026)*
- March 12 (2026)

*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 18
- January 22 (2025)
- February 19 (2025)

* One week early due to Juneteenth Holiday

DRC 2025-2026 (4PM)

- March 26
- April 23
- May 21
- June 18
- July 23
- August 20
- September 17
- October 22
- November 19
- December 17
- January 21 (2026)
- February 18 (2026)

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 18, 2024

TO: The Planning Commission

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

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2025-2029 Capital Improvements Program

The Policy Committee annually reviews Capital Improvements Program (CIP) requests submitted by various County departments and external partners such as Williamsburg-James City County Schools and the Williamsburg Regional Library. 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 new CIP project requests for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-2029 are summarized in Attachment No. 1. Starting this year, the Policy Committee reviewed new applications or those with significant changes. This year there were five projects, all from James City County departments, submitted for consideration by the Policy Committee.

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 8, 2024](#), Policy Committee meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

After review of the new CIP projects, the Committee unanimously recommended forwarding the following FY 2025-2029 CIP priorities to serve as a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The projects selected are listed below in rank order:

1. Chickahominy Park Connector Road
2. Chickahominy Park Campground Improvements
3. Courthouse Architectural/Engineering Services
4. Classroom Facility at Police Firing Range
5. Warehouse (overall storage County-wide)

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

TC/PC/ap

FY25-29CIP-mem

Attachments:

1. Policy Committee CIP Summary Spreadsheet
2. Policy Committee CIP Ranking Criteria
3. Unapproved Policy Committee Minutes from February 8, 2024
4. Unapproved Policy Committee Minutes from February 22, 2024
5. James City County Departments' Responses to Committee's Questions

James City County															
Capital Projects Requests FY2025-FY2029															
	Department	Project Title	Brief Project Description (see application narratives for more detail)	Previously included in Adopted CIP Plan?	FY2024 Adopted (if applicable)	FY2025 Requested	FY2026 Requested	FY2027 Requested	FY2028 Requested	FY2029 Requested	Total Requested	Note	PC Score	Z-Score	PC Rank
C	Parks & Recreation	Chickahominy Park Connector Road	Construction of connector road as shown in the 2020 Shaping our Shores Master Plan. The new road way would divert traffic to the rowing/paddle craft area and RV storage from driving through heavily populated camping areas	No		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	Requested but not approved for review for the FY2024-2028 CIP plan	22.00	0.53	1
D	Parks & Recreation	Chickahominy Park Campground Improvements	Re-design loop road and provide utility connections for electric, water, and sewer to accommodate 15-20 full hook-up RV sites or cabins as shown on the 2020 Shaping Our Shores Master Plan.	No		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,500,000	Requested but not approved for review for the FY2024-2028 CIP plan	21.33	0.34	2
B	General Services	Courthouse Architectural/Engineering Services	Based on 2020 Space Needs Study, the Courthouse was identified as needing additional space for staff through 2040. This project request is for Architectural and engineering services to develop project scope, drawings, and provide construction cost to add 30,000 or more square foot addition to the Courthouse facility.	No		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	New Request - addition to the building	22.33	-0.06	3
E	Police	Classroom Facility at Police Firing Range	Plan, design, and build a classroom facility to accommodate 25 students.	No		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,472,806	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,472,806	New Request	20.83	-0.16	4
A	General Services	Warehouse (overall storage countywide)	Build a 5000+ square foot conditioned storage facility for all County departments to utilize.	No		\$ 50,000	\$ 3,728,480	\$ 294,361	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,072,841	New Request	14.33	-0.65	5
	Total				\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 3,728,480	\$ 1,767,167	\$ -	\$ 4,520,000	\$ 10,065,647				

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 8, 2024
3:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Jack Haldeman called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Policy Committee Members Present:

Tim O'Connor
Frank Polster
Jack Haldeman, Chair

Planning Commissioners Present:

Jay Everson

Staff Present:

Susan Istenes, Planning Director
Tammy Rosario, Assistant Director of Community Development
Josh Crump, Principal Planner
Tom Leininger, Principal Planner
Christy Parrish, Zoning Administrator
Paxon Condon, Deputy Zoning Administrator
Terry Costello, Senior Planner
Jose Ribeiro, Senior Landscape Planner II
Cheryl Holland, Financial and Management Specialist
Margo Zechman, Budget and Accounting Analyst

C. MINUTES

1. Minutes of the October 12, 2023, Regular Meeting

Mr. Polster made a motion to approve the Minutes.

On a voice vote, the Committee approved the Minutes of the October 12, 2023, Regular Meeting.

D. OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business to discuss.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Fiscal Year 2025-2029 Capital Improvements Program Review

Ms. Costello made a presentation to the Committee on the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) process. Ms. Costello noted that there are five new CIP applications for the Committee to rank. Ms. Costello stated that the Committee would submit questions about the individual applications by email and staff would work with the applicants to provide answers. Ms. Costello stated that this meeting was to address any questions the Committee

has about the process.

Ms. Holland described this year's evaluation process and how it would be different from that of prior years. The five projects, including a new warehouse, a space study for the courthouse, two projects for the Chickahominy River Park, and a Police firing range classroom will be evaluated separately from unfunded projects left over from prior years.

Mr. Polster provided a set of questions about how the projects would be prioritized and funded. Mr. Polster noted that he would be more comfortable with prioritizing previously submitted projects that were not funded, projects that should have been on the list, and then the new projects.

Mr. O'Connor inquired if the Committee could count on there being matching funds for transportation and stormwater projects.

Mr. Polster noted that the stormwater projects would be predicated on staffing. Mr. Polster noted that there is a proposal to add staff in General Services to address this problem.

Mr. Haldeman inquired if the Committee should begin ranking the project now.

Ms. Costello stated that the Committee could develop a preliminary ranking which would be finalized at a later meeting.

2. Utility-Scale Solar Farm Applications

Mr. Ribeiro gave an overview of the draft Ordinance and Policy.

Mr. Haldeman commented that the less than one megawatt facilities in residential districts can require four to six acres and be comprised of 5,000 panels. Mr. Haldeman stated that this seems to be a fairly intense use for a residential district.

Mr. Polster noted that a similar facility had been proposed with a potential development application to provide power to the homes. Mr. Polster stated that similar proposals should be centralized in the interior of the development or have the panels roof-mounted.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that a less than one megawatt facility is considered small-scale in the draft Policy. Mr. Ribeiro further stated that the Policy does set acreage restrictions.

Mr. Haldeman reiterated his concern that this use, even at just four to six acres, would be fairly intense in a residential district.

Mr. Polster noted that it would be difficult to adequately buffer the facility. Ms. Rosario stated that this particular use would require a Special Use Permit (SUP). Ms. Rosario further stated that it would be incumbent on the developer to show how it fits into the character of the residential neighborhood so that it is acceptable to the remainder of the community. Ms. Rosario stated that both the Ordinance and the Policy establish criteria that the developer would need to follow for buffering and screening. Ms. Rosario stated that it would be up to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors (BOS) whether the impacts were sufficiently mitigated to meet the Ordinance requirements and community expectations.

Mr. Polster stated that he is concerned about how the criteria would be applied and what the unintended consequences might be. Mr. Polster further stated that it should be clear why staff has determined how the proposal meets or does not meet specific criteria. Mr. Polster stated that some criteria are not clear as to intent and basis. Mr. Polster requested that staff consider whether the existing projects would have been approved if they had been subject to the proposed Ordinance criteria. Mr. Polster stated that he was struggling

with whether these were hard and fast rules or whether there is discretion based on context.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that some of the criteria are based on recommendations from the consultant as well as industry standards. Mr. Ribeiro noted that staff would certainly look at these items.

Mr. Polster stated that he had questions about the criteria applied to Public Lands outside of the Primary Service Area (PSA) and how they might be applied to projects that the County may pursue.

Mr. Polster further stated that he is concerned about putting an Ordinance in place that is so restrictive that a property owner may feel they have no other option than to sell the land for development. Mr. Polster suggested that the Policy or Ordinance call for a fiscal impact statement to outline the fiscal benefits of the project. Mr. Polster requested information on what a fiscal impact statement should include.

Ms. Rosario stated that there has been internal discussion on past cases and how that might fit in with the Policy considerations and the Ordinance requirements.

Mr. Polster commented that he wanted to understand the impetus behind the restrictions being developed outside of the conditions that were already proven to mitigate impacts.

Ms. Rosario noted that the criteria outlined in the Policy would have some room for discretion and interpretation.

Mr. Polster stated that the Policy and Ordinance criteria would be listed out in the staff report and be the basis for whether staff recommends for or against approval of the project.

Ms. Rosario noted that staff must consider the project based on the criteria; however, the Planning Commission and the BOS would have the discretion to weigh the project based on its context.

Mr. Polster stated that he was concerned about having a similar dilemma in interpreting Solar Farm Policy and Ordinance criteria that currently exist with short-term rentals.

Ms. Rosario noted that the goal of this discussion was to record the Committee's suggestions and carry forward the suggestions and recommendations to the Planning Commission discussion.

Ms. Rosario noted that if the Committee believes that the one-mile distance between solar farms or the requirement to be within two miles of the transmission mains is too restrictive, staff would bring that forward for discussion.

Mr. Polster stated that there was a lack of context. Mr. Polster noted that staff should plot out where the transmission lines would be for the project and take into account the location. Mr. Polster further noted that one of the proposed requirements would make the applicant responsible for the Dominion Energy lines. Mr. Polster stated that he found that to be unreasonable. Mr. Polster noted that the state had been struggling with developing legislation for solar farms. Mr. Polster further stated that it would not be prudent to adopt an ordinance that is more restrictive than what the state would allow.

Mr. Haldeman inquired why solar farms are excluded from the M-2 Zoning District. Mr. Haldeman noted that a solar farm would be a good use of some of those parcels.

Mr. Leininger stated that solar farms are specially permitted uses in the M-2 Zoning District.

Mr. Polster stated that those parcels are not in the PSA and would be restricted in size. Mr. Polster noted that the proposed criteria would not allow a good reuse of some of those properties.

Mr. O'Connor noted that there seems to be a conflict between Criteria No. 4 and No. 5 which he presumes to be for separate facilities. Mr. O'Connor noted that there should be some clarification in the event that two separate owners would work together to accommodate a larger project.

Mr. O'Connor inquired about the reason to stipulate that the facility be located within two miles of the transmission lines if the applicant would be required to bury the lines.

Mr. Polster noted that the issue was the definition of where the connection point is.

Mr. O'Connor inquired about Criteria No. 11 to require upgraded plans from the interconnection point to the switching stations and whether that would unduly influence the application.

Mr. Polster inquired about why this criteria was included since this is a Dominion Energy issue.

Mr. Polster inquired about the criteria limiting the facility to 60% of the property.

Ms. Rosario stated that this was incorporated to reflect the existing requirements related to impervious cover.

Mr. Polster stated that the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act (CBPA) allows for mitigation for greater amounts of impervious cover; however, those are not spelled out in the Ordinance or Policy.

Mr. Polster stated that this was also the issue with the stipulations regarding agricultural soils. Mr. Polster stated that he wanted clarification and concurrence that those agricultural soils were based on the James City County Agricultural Soils definitions.

Mr. Haldeman inquired if Mr. Everson had any comments.

Mr. Everson inquired if there was any stipulation in the Ordinance or Policy regarding traffic crossing railroad tracks.

Mr. Polster stated that this was not specifically included in the Ordinance or Policy; however, the stipulation about local roads covers disturbance to neighborhoods and subdivisions and defines what those local roads were.

Mr. Leininger stated that the Policy does state that access across railroad track would be unacceptable.

Mr. Polster inquired about the rationale for this stipulation.

Mr. Leininger stated that there were safety concerns.

Mr. O'Connor noted there had been concerns with prior applications about several sharp turns and steep grades that would be unsafe for the construction vehicles.

Mr. O'Connor inquired if it is anticipated that solar facilities will be considered a temporary use or a permanent facility.

Mr. Crump stated that there had been some discussion on this and that since SUPs run with the land, it could be considered permanent.

Mr. O'Connor stated that if it was a permanent use, then the stipulations on prime soils would be irrelevant.

Mr. Haldeman stated that if the alternative is housing; that is not good for prime soils either. Mr. Haldeman inquired about stockpiling soil for the reclamation process.

Mr. Polster noted that this was an SUP condition for one of the approved solar farms. Mr. O'Connor inquired about the siting agreement.

Ms. Rosario stated that the Ordinance defined it as an agreement between the County and the entity per Code of Virginia Section 15.2-2316.7. to allow for the mitigation of impacts and can include financial compensation to the host locality. Ms. Rosario stated that is akin to proffers. Ms. Rosario further stated that when the County signs a siting agreement, it is confirming that the facility is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan in lieu of a 2232 review.

Mr. O'Connor noted that he did not favor requiring neighborhood meetings as it can lead to a misunderstanding about what was requested and what was conditioned by the County.

Mr. Polster stated that he favored meetings between the developer and the individuals directly impacted by the development.

Mr. Polster inquired about the limitations on impervious surface.

Mr. Crump clarified that Criteria No. 6 had been revised to state: "The County considers solar panels to be impervious for the land cover calculation and stormwater management needs. Impervious cover on individual facility sites shall not exceed 60 percent as required by the County's Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance Section 23-9(b)(1)(b)."

Mr. Polster inquired about the mitigation strategies approved in the CBPA. Mr. Polster further inquired about the reference to parking lots.

Ms. Rosario noted that staff would check the Code section references.

Mr. O'Connor inquired if the impervious cover was calculated when the solar panel was flat.

Mr. Polster confirmed and stated that this was how the state had chosen to calculate the impervious area.

Mr. Everson inquired about remediation of groundwater contamination.

Ms. Rosario stated that solar farms are not known to contaminate groundwater; however, staff included this in an abundance of caution. Ms. Rosario noted that staff would follow up with Stormwater and Resource Protection for examples of such remediation strategies.

Mr. Polster noted that there have been studies done in North Carolina that address not only contamination but also occupational safety. Mr. Polster noted that these facilities seem to pose minimal concern to groundwater and were generally safe for the community and the workers.

Mr. Everson made a recommendation to include a stipulation for American-made products.

Mr. O'Connor inquired about the Ordinance language related to spill prevention and countermeasures and what a spill might entail.

Ms. Rosario stated that this was a provision Stormwater and Resource Protection

recommended; however, they did not provide any details on what a spill might be.

Mr. Polster noted that this could be related to the construction phase where there could be an oil spill from a construction vehicle. Mr. Polster further stated that having an emergency management plan in place made good sense.

Mr. O'Connor inquired if there is potential for battery storage facilities to be part of a solar farm in the future.

Ms. Rosario confirmed that this is possible; however, it has not been included in the Ordinance. Ms. Rosario stated that the County could amend the Ordinance later if it became necessary.

Mr. Polster recommended that staff look at this issue.

Mr. Polster commented on the requirement for wildlife corridors. Discussion ensued on what those corridors might look like.

Mr. Polster stated that staff should incorporate the need for a wildlife corridor in the plan review.

Mr. O'Connor stated that he recommended developing requirements for battery storage facilities sooner rather than later.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Polster made a motion to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:33 p.m.

Susan Istenes, Secretary

Jack Haldeman, Chair

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
BUILDING A LARGE CONFERENCE ROOM
101 MOUNTS BAY ROAD, WILLIAMSBURG, VA 23185
February 22, 2024
3:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Jack Haldeman called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Policy Committee Members Present:

Tim O'Connor

Frank Polster

Jack Haldeman, Chair

Planning Commissioners Present:

Jay Everson

Staff Present:

Josh Crump, Principal Planner

Terry Costello, Senior Planner

Cheryl Holland, Financial and Management Specialist

Margo Zechman, Budget and Accounting Analyst, III

C. MINUTES

There were no Minutes to approve

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. Fiscal Year 2025-2029 Capital Improvements Program Review

Ms. Costello stated that staff had responded to the questions submitted by the Committee and that those responses had been sent out to the Committee. Ms. Costello stated that the floor was open for discussion.

Mr. Haldeman inquired if the intent was to rank the applications as stand-alone projects.

Ms. Costello confirmed.

Mr. Haldeman noted that his rankings remained the same after seeing the responses from staff.

Ms. Costello inquired if there were any additional questions.

Mr. Polster inquired about the items currently being stored in the Jamestown Beach Event Park building and why the new building needed to be air-conditioned.

Ms. Costello stated that she would need to ask Parks & Recreation staff for more details.

Mr. Haldeman noted that the existing building is in rough shape.

Mr. Polster inquired about the need to store documents in that building when there were other options available.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the cost for the building averages at \$880 per square foot which seems excessive.

Mr. Polster further noted that he does not understand why it is necessary to fund design and build so quickly when there are other priorities.

Mr. Polster noted that he has concerns about potential safety issues with the classroom at the Police Department Firing Range and the potential for a solar farm on the property as well.

Mr. O'Connor inquired if staff had considered using a trailer for the classroom. Mr. O'Connor noted that this could be a cost-effective alternative that would have the same benefits.

Mr. Polster stated that his preliminary scores for these five projects were fairly low. Mr. Polster noted that previously reviewed but unfunded projects ranked much higher. Mr. Polster commented that he was not certain how this would be reconciled.

Discussion ensued on when and how the project scores should be submitted.

Discussion was also held on the revised Capital Improvements Program (CIP) process. The Committee expressed the desire that staff from the requesting divisions be available for in-person discussion. A recommendation was made to update the timeline to allow more time for questions and answers.

Mr. O'Connor noted that there could be better use of the Committee's time and expertise than checking the box for compliance with State Code.

Ms. Costello confirmed that the additional questions from the Committee were:

1. What is being stored in the proposed warehouse and what is driving the need for air conditioning.
2. What is the benefit of building versus renting in the short term to allow for a feasibility study.
3. What is the reason for the cost per square foot.
4. Is the ranking for the preliminary work, or does it include the construction as well.
5. Could a trailer be used for the classroom at the firing range.
6. How will safety be addressed for the solar farm if constructed adjacent to the firing range.
7. What is the rationale for the recommendation to construct the warehouse in quick succession to the General Services Building.

The Committee discussed the potential Agenda for the next meeting and whether it would be necessary to meet. Discussion ensued on the timeline and process of finalizing the ranking scores.

E. NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Polster made a motion to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:32 p.m.

Susan Istenes, Secretary

Jack Haldeman, Chair

Project ID A: Warehouse (overall storage countywide)

1. Please explain the relationship between this project and the General Services Building project. (Haldeman)

There is not a correlation between the General Services (GS) building project and a Countywide warehouse. These are two separate projects with different purposes. (General Services)

2. If the request for a 5,000 square foot or 10,000 square foot building? Is the total budget request for the 5,000 square foot or 10,000 square foot building? (Haldeman)

The facility cost was entered based on 5,000 square feet. However, GS expects to have further discussions with County Administration and departments to determine the type of storage needed (conditioned space versus unconditioned, etc.) and the quantity of items that departments are storing. Additional considerations are, do new facilities build in additional storage to accommodate existing plus future storage needs and what happens to the items currently stored at FS22, Jamestown Beach Event Park (JBEP). (General Services)

3. On page 1 of the application, it states that the location is "TBD". But on page 7, it states the building will be co-located on existing County property. Is there a location in mind with no acquisition cost? (Haldeman)

This remark refers to General Services being committed to focusing on land already owned by JCC as a potential site. (General Services)

4. Why a reference to the "James City County Facility Space Needs Analysis County Administration: when for the General Services section, the only warehouse needed is the Warhill Grounds Building, which also does not show a requirement for a 5,000/11,000 square foot warehouse? (Polster)

The warehouse is not intended just for the General Services Department. GS along with every other department will have the ability to store items in this warehouse. Within the space needs study, two warehouses (FS22 and JBEP) were identified for demolition sometime in the future (estimated in the next 1-3 years). However, the need still exists to store those items and then there are future needs to consider. (General Services)

5. Is the site work intended to be completed for a future expansion or is that just for 5000 square feet? (O'Connor)

This project is in the discovery and planning stage, and to garner understanding about future needs once the JBEP and FS22 warehouses are no longer available.

6. \$4MM seems a bit steep. There is currently 18,000 square feet for sale in the County for \$1.5 MM – would it be appropriate to rent space for the near term until there is a firm plan for General Services? (O'Connor)

General Services is asking for design funds in FY2025 (\$50k) to get current pricing and develop the scope of the project with each County department's needs in mind. (General Services)

Project ID B: Courthouse Architectural/Engineering Services

1. Will Williamsburg split the cost? Is \$200,000 the County's share? (Haldeman)

For projects related to joint activities (for example, the Courts or the Schools), funding is sought from all contributing parties unless an exception is made for a particular project. There are no exceptions for this Courthouse project at this time, so presumably Williamsburg would pay its proportionate share of costs. The costs noted in the project document reflect the full estimate—not the County's share. (FMS)

Project ID D: Chickahominy Park Campground Improvements

1. Will these sites replace existing sites? Will there be more sites after the project is completed? (Haldeman)

These sites will not replace any existing sites that are in operation today. The park did lose approximately 60 primitive sites during the shoreline restoration in 2020, but the majority of those sites were reserved at a low frequency compared to sites with amenities. This project will result in 18 new full hookup "premium" sites that are currently in high demand. (Parks and Recreation)

2. Why is the answer to No. 5 on page 3 "no"? (Haldeman)

That is a mistake - the answer to Question #5 "Does the project increase or enhance recreational opportunities and/or green space?" should have been yes – the additional campsites will enhance the recreational offerings at the park. (Parks and Recreation)

Project ID E: Classroom Facility at Police Firing Range

1. Is General Services still exploring a solar array farm at the Jolly Pond facility and if so what is the footprint relative to the firing range? (Polster)

At this time, General Services does not have any information that can be shared about a potential solar farm at Jolly Pond. (General Services)

A. Warehouse

What is going to be stored in the building? What items in the storage unit require the facility to have air-conditioning? (Polster)

The items stored in the facility would be from every County department. For example, some things that would require air-conditioning include the Fire Departments equipment that is currently stored at FS22 (Storage Facility at Fire Station #2). (General Services)

Was there any consideration of renting space instead of constructing a storage building? The amount of \$4,000,000 seemed to be high for a 5,000 square foot building. Is there an immediate need for storage or would it be possible to wait until the improvements at Jamestown Beach are completed? (O'Connor)

The option to rent was discussed during a recent budget meeting. The need for storage would coincide with the demolition of both FS22 and the current storage building at Jamestown Beach. (General Services)

In the application it states that the storage facility will be constructed on the heels of the General Services Building, yet it was stated (in the previous answers to the first round of questions) that there is no correlation between the GS building and this project, is that correct? (Haldeman)

That statement is in the application but refers to an opportunity that since General Services has forklifts other departments could utilize the GS forklift for more efficient storage management. (General Services)

E. Classroom Facility at Police Firing Range

Was there any consideration given to putting a modular structure with a foundation as opposed to constructing a facility? (O'Connor)

Consideration was given for a modular structure; however, that type of structure would not offer any expansion capabilities. (General Services)

Were all safety precautions considered when correlating the range at the landfall (direction of the firing, etc.), to also include the classroom facility? (Polster)

The range classroom will be located behind (180 degrees) any shooting of firearms and therefore not in the line of fire. (Police)

With safety in mind, will the location of the firing range and classroom facility prohibit the installation of solar panels? (Polster)

The planning / location for the solar panel project took into account the location of the firing range. The classroom will go at the back of the firing range and will not prohibit installation of solar panels (Police)