

AT A WORK SESSION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF JAMES CITY,  
VIRGINIA, HELD ON THE 24TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2013, AT 4:00 P.M. IN THE COUNTY  
GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM, 101 MOUNTS BAY ROAD, JAMES CITY COUNTY,  
VIRGINIA.

**ADOPTED**

OCT 08 2013

Board of Supervisors  
James City County, VA

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**B. ROLL CALL**

John J. McGlennon, Chairman, Roberts District  
Mary K. Jones, Vice Chairman, Berkeley District  
James G. Kennedy, Stonehouse District - **Absent**  
James O. Icenhour, Jr., Jamestown District  
M. Anderson Bradshaw, Powhatan District

Doug Powell, Assistant County Administrator  
Leo P. Rogers, County Attorney

**C. BOARD DISCUSSIONS**

1. Measurement of Tourism Programs

Mr. Doug Powell, Assistant County Administrator, introduced Mr. Richard Schreiber, President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Greater Williamsburg Chamber and Tourism Alliance and stated that Mr. Schreiber would be reviewing data and results from recent tourism programs in the area.

Mr. Schreiber introduced Mr. Bob Singley who will become the Chairman of the Alliance the following week. He also introduced Mr. Bob Harris, Senior Vice President of Tourism.

Mr. Schreiber gave a presentation of the Measurement of Tourism Programs report included in the Agenda Packet.

Mr. McGlennon stated for clarification that the baseline used on the charts is an average number of visitors, not the actual number of attending visitors.

Mr. Schreiber stated that was correct.

Mr. McGlennon stated that it is interesting to note that the different attractions show similar trends in ups and downs. He stated that he would like to thank the Alliance and all the organizations that have gotten involved and provided funding for these marketing campaigns. He stated that it is important to note that much of the increased revenue and attendance is driven by new products and attractions. He stated it is important for the organizations and attractions already here to reimagine themselves and continue to come up with new ideas.

Mr. Schreiber stated that the “arts months” have not begun to achieve what is possible yet, because the area does not have the major performing arts weekends that people will drive hundreds of miles to be a part of. He stated that we, as a community, need to find a way to attract some of performing arts events. He stated that he believes a long-term master plan for the arts could provide the community with nine months of attractions.

As the Board had no other questions, Mr. McGlennon thanked Mr. Schreiber and his colleagues for their presentation and continued efforts to help the tourism industry grow in the community.

2. Open Town Hall

Ms. Jody Puckett, Director of Communications, gave a presentation highlighting the information contained in the memorandum in the Agenda Packet.

Mr. Powell stated that he spoke to Mr. Kennedy who had several questions about this program and asked that the Board consider deferring action. However, Mr. Powell said that the staff was not seeking action from the Board on this item.

Ms. Jones asked who would be monitoring the comments. She stated that she is very supportive of citizen involvement and there are numerous ways for citizens to interact with the Board at the present time.

Ms. Puckett stated that the only thing that the software company, Peak Democracy, would be monitoring is the inappropriate use guidelines that the County develops in conjunction with the County Attorney’s Office. She stated that citizens’ addresses are geo-coded and stored in a database for the mapping tool.

Mr. Icenhour asked for clarification on the citizen’s address. He stated that in order to participate in the Open Town Hall a citizen would have to give their name, address, and email, but they could restrict their address from being seen by others participating.

Ms. Puckett stated their address and email will never be displayed to be seen by others and staff can give the citizens the option of whether or not to display their name.

Mr. Icenhour stated that the program is very intriguing to him and it has elements that are not even part of public comment. He stated that this program would allow for participation in almost real-time. He stated that he believes that it would generate a lot more useful cross-talk and dialogue in the community that the County does not currently have, especially with the younger generation. He stated with the changing demographics of our community, the County needs to adapt the way the County communicates with its citizens.

Mr. Bradshaw agreed that the program would probably bring a different demographic into the public conversations. He asked if there were limitations on the length of comments.

Ms. Puckett stated not to her knowledge, but she would double-check. She stated that a citizen can make one comment per topic, but cannot comment on the posts of other citizens.

Mr. Bradshaw asked if staff knew the experience of the other surrounding jurisdictions which currently use this program, in regard to the monitoring.

Ms. Puckett stated that in the jurisdictions that staff has spoken with, not one has had an issue with inappropriate use.

Mr. McGlennon asked for clarification regarding questions posed by citizens. He stated that if a citizen posts a question, will the discussion be monitored to the point that someone would see the question and make sure a response is given.

Ms. Puckett stated that staff would have to follow up with those questions. She stated that Ms. Latara Branch, Civic Engagement Coordinator, would be the liaison for the program and would have access to the citizen's information and could follow up with them.

Mr. McGlennon stated that if a factual question is being asked, he would want staff to be able to respond and everyone else in the discussion be able to see the answer.

Mr. Icenhour stated that if there is confusion or lack of information in a particular topic, then staff should be allowed to go back in to the topic area and give more information. However, if a citizen can only comment once per topic, then they would not be able to comment again on the new information given.

Mr. McGlennon asked if there would be a point where the topic becomes closed so that the Board could review the comments and receive the value of the feedback prior to hearing a particular case.

Ms. Puckett stated that other jurisdictions are leaving topics open for 30 days and then closing them to allow staff and Boards to review them. She stated that once the topic was closed, staff could generate a report as a PDF file that could then be given to all Board members for consideration prior to a case.

Ms. Jones asked if the current staff can handle the monitoring of the discussions. She also stated that these new technologies tend to remove people from engaging one on one. She stated that there is a value to knowing who it is you are hearing from, not just having an anonymous discussion. She stated that she would be hesitant to move forward with this program since there are multiple avenues available to citizens already and the time and cost does not seem to outweigh the value.

Mr. Bradshaw stated that the cost seems modest to him to try a new way of achieving more public input and bringing in the younger demographic.

Mr. McGlennon stated that he is not sure of the value, but he would definitely be willing to try it, especially considering that the Board and staff are going into a Comprehensive Plan review. He stated that he did have concerns over the time constraints and trying to utilize this program for feedback for a public hearing. He stated that there would not be a lot of time available for citizens to comment.

As there were no other questions or comments, Mr. McGlennon thanked Ms. Puckett for the presentation.

#### **D. CLOSED SESSION**

Mr. Bradshaw made a motion to go into Closed Session at 5:18 p.m.

1. Consideration of a personnel matter(s), the appointment of individuals to County boards and/or commissions pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A)(1) of the Code of Virginia
  - a. Chesapeake Bay Board/Wetlands Board
  - b. Williamsburg Regional Library Board of Trustees

Mr. Bradshaw made a motion to certify the Closed Session at 5:23p.m.

On a roll call vote, the vote was: AYE: Mr. Icenhour, Mr. Bradshaw, Ms. Jones, Mr. McGlennon (4). NAY: (0). ABSENT: Mr. Kennedy (1).

Mr. Icenhour made a motion to reappoint Mr. Charles Roadley, Mr. Roger Schmidt as 1st alternate, and Mr. Louis Bott as 2nd alternate to the Chesapeake Bay/Wetlands Board for terms beginning on October 1, 2013, and expiring on October 1, 2018.

On a roll call vote, the vote was: AYE: Mr. Icenhour, Mr. Bradshaw, Ms. Jones, Mr. McGlennon (4). NAY: (0). ABSENT: Mr. Kennedy (1).

## **RESOLUTION**

### **CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED MEETING**

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, (Board) has convened a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3711 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Board that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge: i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies; and ii) only such public business matters were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board as were identified in the motion, Section 2.2-3711(A)(1), to consider personnel matters, the appointment of individuals to County boards and/or commissions.

### **E. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board recessed at 5:24 p.m. until their Regular Meeting at 7 p.m.

  
Robert C. Middaugh  
Clerk to the Board