

Questions and concerns from Town Hall Meeting on February 18, 2019.

1. Can the County provide more information on why the project was rejected by Chesapeake? **Based on media reports we have determined that Chesapeake chose not to host the facility.**
2. Was any type of feasibility study done for the facility? **No**
3. Was any type of risk assessment done for locating the facility in Isle of Wight? **No risks identified (see Police Chief letter, e.g.)**
4. What is in place to protect the community and make them aware in the event of an escape? **If appropriate, the county has the ability to alert the community via its instant alert system.**
5. Are there any anticipated costs for the local first responders/law enforcement to be prepared to respond to any incidents at the facility? **State Police are the first responders in conjunction with local law enforcement personnel. Very few EMS calls from similar types of facilities. Bon Air had 3 EMS calls in 2018, 1 staff illness, 1 resident illness and 1 staff injury – sports related.**
6. Can the County/State provide more information about the planned treatment plans and options for the proposed facility? **DJJ can provide more information on this matter.**
7. Will local applicants be given preference for jobs at the facility? **The County and appropriate agencies will conduct job fairs and market the opportunity to residents. The DJJ has indicated they would like to hire as many local residents as possible.**
8. Has a traffic impact analysis been done for the facility? If so, how will the impacts be mitigated? If not, will one be done? **VDOT would determine whether a TIA would be triggered or if there are other requirements relative to traffic impacts (such as turn lanes).**
9. What roles and responsibilities will IOW schools have regarding students in the facility? **DJJ provides educational services independent of local schools.**
10. Will the students in the facility count towards IOW student statistics? **No**
11. What other communities did the State consider for this facility? **Chesapeake only**
12. Can the State/County provide a breakdown of the number of/types of employees and if they anticipate them being hired locally or transferred from other locations? **The County has asked for and is awaiting specific job type information from the DJJ. See Question #9's answer for related answer on preferences.**
13. Are local resources sufficient to supply the needs of the facility's workforce? **Unclear as to what this question is referring**
14. Is the project a done deal? **Not until the BOS votes to transfer the property for this specific purpose, which will set into motion negotiations on terms. Until agreement on terms is achieved, it is not a "done deal."**
15. Will the Board be responsive to citizen input at the public hearing? **The Board and/or staff will attempt to answer questions and concerns expressed by citizens before and after the public hearing but will not interject during the public hearing itself.**
16. At what point does economic growth outweigh public safety and the wants of the public? **Impacts on public safety are a consideration in any economic development project and**

there are significant safeguards (including technology, fencing, staffing, etc.) that will be implemented as part of this project.

17. Would the Board still be supportive of this project if it were located in Smithfield/the northern end of the County? The Board is supportive of the project because of the anticipated jobs and the potential positive impact on the County's economic development efforts. The site in STH Intermodal Park was chosen because the County is focusing its ED efforts there on publicly controlled lands.
18. Why did the County EDA hold a second vote if it was voted down once? The EDA's first vote on January 8, 2019, was a decision to "not transfer the land to either the County or to the State at this time". Therefore, it was not voted down, but effectively deferred.
19. Why would the County want to build a prison on road frontage of the main North/South route through the County? The facility is not a prison. It will be appropriately screened with a vegetative buffer and fencing. Adequate roadways and accessibility are important relative to supplies and services provided to the facility. This also addresses earlier concerns expressed about the inadequacy of Buckhorn Drive.
20. Why not locate the facility in one of the localities that produce a majority of the inmates? The residents will come from communities all over Hampton Roads, including Isle of Wight County. DJJ is looking for a site that is easily accessible for families throughout the entire region.
21. Why was the Walters facility closed? The contract between the Commonwealth, the City of Richmond, and the third-party provider ended. The program was not funded to continue.
22. How will a new facility do anything different than the previous Walters facility? This is a state-of-the-art juvenile detention facility, not a prison. The programs/services offered within the facility are very different.
23. What are the plans for the property/facility if the facility is shut down? The State would have to determine if it has other needs for the property. If none, the County could potentially negotiate a return of the property to the County for its use or as a site for another user.
24. How has the State handled the closure of other facilities? DJJ
25. Has an economic impact study been done to determine the impact to the County and surrounding areas? No
26. Is there a conflict of interest between the Board's role on the Wester Tidewater Regional Jail Board and the related contractors? No, the WTRJ is jointly owned by Franklin, Suffolk, and Isle of Wight and any potential contracts would be with the State. They would be subject to public procurement policies and totally separate from WTRJ.
27. Can the County/State provide data to show the impact on adjacent property values and resales? The County has researched assessed valuations of properties within a half mile radius of Bon Air and WTRJ. Avg. assessed values are \$244,000 around Bon Air and \$264,500 around WTRJ.
28. Why isn't it preferable to locate the facility further away from a center of population? Proximity to the families/communities where the juveniles are from is important to their success and family connectivity.

29. Is there a mutual aid plan in place in the event of an incident at the facility? **Yes**
30. What other possibilities are there for economic development on the property?
Possibilities are extremely limited at this site due to the lack of water and sewer utilities.
31. Does the County retain any control over the use of the land once it is turned over to the State? **The County does not have control over the State once the property is transferred, but it will be able to negotiate the terms prior to the transfer of the property.**
32. What amount of due diligence has been done before making this decision? **The County has spent over a year researching and studying this project and has been collecting feedback from citizens, especially in the Town of Windsor.**
33. Has the land been offered to any other buyers at a reduced rate?
No, the County has been actively marketing and showing this property to prospective businesses for several years and no viable offers have been made to date.



WINDSOR POLICE DEPARTMENT
56 EAST WINDSOR BOULEVARD, P.O. BOX 307, WINDSOR, VIRGINIA 23487
PHONE: 757.242.6799 FAX: 757.242.0328



To: M. Stallings, Town Manager
C. Richardson, Mayor of Windsor
Members of Town Council

From: R.D. Riddle, Chief of Police 

Date: 7/21/2018

Ref: *Memorandum on the Impact of the proposed JCC on the Windsor Police Department*

Background:

As all of you are well aware Isle of Wight County and the Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice are proposing to build a 60 bed Juvenile Corrections Center on 20 acres of the roughly 1000 acres that compose the third phase of the Shirley T. Holland Intermodal Park. During a recent intergovernmental meeting between Isle of Wight and Windsor officials, preliminary site maps indicated the potential for the project to possibly be constructed within the incorporated limits of Windsor. Construction of the JCC within the incorporated limits would place the Windsor Police Department as the primary law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the JCC. This fact posed an immediate question as to what, if any impact the proposed facility would have on the police department's resources and its ability to deliver services to residents of the town.

I reached out to Ms. Dana Schrad the Executive Director of the Virginia Association of Chiefs of Police to begin researching the impacts that juvenile detention/correction facilities have on local law enforcement agencies throughout the state. Ms. Schrad provided me with a list of all locally and state run facilities throughout the Commonwealth and contacts for the Chiefs of Police in the jurisdictions that housed these facilities. Ms. Schrad also advised that during her tenure with VACP she was not aware of any law enforcement agency that had been negatively impacted by a juvenile correction/detention facility within its jurisdiction.

Note: It should be noted that it is impossible to conduct an apples to apples comparison of this facility as it would be a first of its kind in the state. The Commonwealth of Virginia currently operates only one facility, the Bon Air Correctional Center in Chesterfield County. The rest of the facilities located throughout the Commonwealth are locally run facilities that are managed by the local governments, however they each receive funding from DJJ.

WINDSOR POLICE DEPARTMENT
56 EAST WINDSOR BOULEVARD, P.O. BOX 307, WINDSOR, VIRGINIA 23487
PHONE: 757.242.6799 FAX: 757.242.0328

Research:

Prince George County, VA

Facility: Crater Youth Care Commission, Disputanta, VA
LE Agency: Prince George County Police Department, Chief K. Early

Chief Early was contacted in regard to the facility in his jurisdiction, he deferred to his Deputy Chief who has been with the agency for over 20 years. They stated that in regards to day to day operations the facility has little to no impact on their operations. Deputy Chief Young did advise that over the years there have been several major incidents at the detention center. He provided the following information; in the late 90's there was a riot inside the facility that required a significant response from PGPD. Deputy Chief Young advised that it was primarily a result of overcrowding and that the facility has addressed the issue. In addition he stated that he recalled between six to eight escapes of inmates from the facility over the years, several resulted in inmates stealing cars and PGPD becoming involved in vehicle pursuits as result. Most recently Deputy Chief Young stated that within the last five to six years there was a successful escape of three inmates who broke into a local unoccupied residence and barricaded themselves in the house before being taken into custody without incident. Deputy Chief Young further stated that the facility has undergone significant changes recently to include physical security upgrades and a new director and that there have not been any major incidents at the facility since then. Chief Early also stated that there was a Memorandum of Understanding in place between PGPD and the facility for providing criminal investigative services in regards to sexual assaults that occurred within the facility. PGPD provided WPD with a copy of the MOU. Chief Early stated that the MOU with facility had not resulted in an increased case load for his investigative unit.

Albemarle County, VA

Facility: Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention, Charlottesville, VA
LE Agency: Albemarle County Police Department, Chief R. Lantz

Chief Lantz was contacted in regard to the facility in his jurisdiction and provided the following feedback. Chief Lantz provided some overview of the dentition center stating that it was a locally run facility by the county government, but that it received a significant amount of funding from the state. Chief Lantz provided call for service data over the last two years for the facility with the following results: 8 total calls for service with following breakdown: 6 warrant service calls, 1 assault call and 1 narcotics recovery call. Chief Lantz also stated that in reviewing calls for service to the facility of the previous 5 years that calls for service were rare and that they were primarily warrant services and medical assist type calls. Chief Lantz also stated that ACPD has a MOU in

WINDSOR POLICE DEPARTMENT

56 EAST WINDSOR BOULEVARD, P.O. BOX 307, WINDSOR, VIRGINIA 23487
PHONE: 757.242.6799 FAX: 757.242.0328

place with the facility in regards to sexual assaults and that the investigative case load as a result of that MOU were minimal. Chief Lantz provided WPD with a copy of the MOU. In regards to escapes and major incidents, Chief Lantz deferred to a Deputy Chief who has been with the agency for over 26 years and he could not recall any successful escapes from the facility or remember any major incidents.

Chesterfield County, VA

Facility: Bon Air Juvenile Correction Center, Chesterfield, VA

LE Agency: Chesterfield County Police Department, Deputy Chief D. Kelly

Deputy Chief Kelly of the Chesterfield County Police Department was contacted in regards to the Bon Air Correctional Center in his jurisdiction. Deputy Chief Kelly stated that the center did not have any major impact on CCPD operations and resources. Deputy Chief Kelly advised that CCPD did not have an MOU with the facility in regards to sexual assault investigations and that the Virginia State Police handled all the criminal investigations within the facility because it is a state run center. Deputy Chief Kelly further provided data on CCPD calls for service at the Bon Air JCC over a five and a half year period, with a total of 20 calls for service with following breakdown: 1 police assistance call, 1 high water call, 2 missing person calls, 6 traffic accident calls, 1 disabled vehicle call, 3 police assist Fire Department calls, 3 general police service calls, 1 suspicious person call and 2 suspicious vehicle calls. Deputy Chief Kelly stated they simply do not get many calls for service to the facility and it was not a major consumer of police services. Deputy Chief Kelly further stated that he could not remember any successful escapes by inmates or any major incidents at the facility over the last 20 years.

City of Chesapeake, VA

Facility: Chesapeake Juvenile Services, Chesapeake, VA

LE Agency: Chesapeake Police Department, Chief K. Wright

Chief K. Wright was contacted in regards to the juvenile dentition center within the City of Chesapeake. As of the time this memorandum was written his office has not replied to my request for information. I was however able to speak with several professional contacts within the Chesapeake Police Department who are mid-level supervisors with over 25 years of service. These contacts were of the general opinion that the facility does not burden the day to day operations of police department. They all stated that calls for service at the facility were few and far between and mostly minor in nature. None of them could recall any escapes from the facility or any type of major incident. These contacts did confirm that CPD has an MOU in place with facility in regards to providing criminal investigations into sexual assaults. However they said the MOU had not placed any burden on the Special Victims Unit investigators. This memorandum will be updated when a reply is received from Chief Wright's office.

WINDSOR POLICE DEPARTMENT
56 EAST WINDSOR BOULEVARD, P.O. BOX 307, WINDSOR, VIRGINIA 23487
PHONE: 757.242.6799 FAX: 757.242.0328

Conclusion:

Based on the information received from other law enforcement agencies in surrounding jurisdictions that have juvenile detention / correction facilities within their areas of operation the impact that the proposed JCC would have on WPD operations is deemed to be minimal. None of these jurisdictions indicated that there were any significant increases in calls for service at these types of facilities. There was no indication that these facilities were large consumers of police services either by way of calls for service or excessive investigative caseloads. No surrounding agency indicated any strain on personnel or other law enforcement resources. All three jurisdictions that housed locally run facilities indicated that they had MOU's in place to provide police services for criminal investigations into sexual assaults as required by the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) however the state run facility did not have a MOU in place with the local law enforcement agency, they indicated that those incidents were the responsibility of the Virginia State Police. The proposed JCC would be a state run facility and it appears that any MOU would be entered into with VSP and not WPD in regards to sexual assault investigations. It would seem to reason that the proposed JCC would not significantly impact the citizens of Windsor's access to police services from the standpoint of increased response times, police personnel shortages, reduced police patrols and or an increased investigative caseload.

From a public safety perspective the incidents that were reported to have occurred at the Prince George County detention facility are concerning. These are serious incidents that required a large law enforcement response and consumed significant police resources. While these incidents appear to occur infrequently they require a response that would strain WPD resources, especially in the area of personnel and specialized equipment. If the proposed JCC is built within the incorporated town limits WPD would have to acquire new equipment and training to be prepared to respond to these types of events should they occur. WPD would have to rely on mutual aid agreements in place with the Isle of Wight Sheriff's Office, Suffolk Police Department, Smithfield Police Department and other area law enforcement agencies for immediate personnel support and additional specialized equipment in the event of an inmate escape or major incident within the facility. It should be understood that WPD and other agencies would be acting as first responder's to the incident and that ultimately once Virginia State Police arrived on scene the bulk of the operation would become their responsibility.

Note: No information or statements in this memorandum should be construed as to the Windsor Police Department advocating a position of support or opposition to the proposed facility. WPD felt it was necessary to examine the potential impact on the agency to deliver police services to the citizens of Windsor if the proposed facility was built within the jurisdiction. WPD believes that this is simply due diligence on its behalf and felt it was necessary to provide this information to elected officials tasked with evaluating this proposal.