

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BUSINESS MEETING
County Government Center Board Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
September 28, 2021
1:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

P. Sue Sadler, Vice Chairman, Stonehouse District - via phone
James O. Icenhour, Jr., Jamestown District
Ruth M. Larson, Berkeley District
John J. McGlennon, Roberts District
Michael J. Hipple, Chairman, Powhatan District

Scott A. Stevens, County Administrator
Adam R. Kinsman, County Attorney

Mr. Hipple requested a motion for Ms. Sadler to participate remotely due to a medical issue that prevented her from attending.

A motion to allow Ms. Sadler to participate remotely was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 4 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 1
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour, Jr, Larson, McGlennon
Absent: Sadler

ADOPTED

OCT 26 2021

Board of Supervisors
James City County, VA

C. PRESENTATION

1. Retiree Recognition – Karrie D. Lee

The presentation did not occur.

2. Retiree Recognition – Joan M. Etchberger

Mr. John Carnifax, Director of Parks and Recreation, came forward to make the retiree recognition for Ms. Etchberger. He noted Ms. Etchberger was hired in 1984, adding she had worked for the County for several years. He noted some of her career highlights included her role in 1985 as the first Board of Supervisors Secretary. Mr. Carnifax further noted Ms. Etchberger had worked as a Building Permit Technician, then as an Environmental Technician, and then in 2007, she joined Parks and Recreation. He noted her work on the management and rentals of Legacy Hall and the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission. Mr. Carnifax thanked Ms. Etchberger for her years of service to Parks and Recreation and to James City County.

Ms. Etchberger noted it had been a great adventure working for the citizens of James City County.

Mr. Hipple presented a certificate of service to Ms. Etchberger for her 37 years of service. He thanked her for her service and dedication to the County.

3. 2021 VACo Achievement Award

Ms. Toni Small, Director of Stormwater and Resource Protection Division, addressed the Board with an introduction of Ms. Phyllis Errico, General Counsel for the Virginia Association of Counties (VACo).

Ms. Errico noted she was present to celebrate one of James City County's premiere programs. She further noted VACo, in existence since 1934, had been serving and supporting County officials' efforts through advocacy, education, member service, and communication efforts. Ms. Errico noted VACo established the achievement award program in 2003 to recognize counties which adopted innovative programs providing public service. She further noted these programs served as models for other counties. Ms. Errico stated this year's program, its 19th year, 102 entries were received with 19 winning counties. She noted James City County has won this achievement award eight times in those 19 years. Ms. Errico gave a brief history on the judges, citing their time serving local governments, and listed the four criteria for eligibility. Ms. Errico noted James City County's entry met all four criteria with the Clean Water Heritage Grant Program.

Ms. Small noted the County's Stormwater and Resource Protection Division managed the Clean Water Heritage Grant Program. She further noted the program promoted maintenance of privately owned neighborhood drainage systems and private stormwater facilities or Best Management Practices (BMPs) in a manner that best supports the safety and general welfare of all County residents. Ms. Small noted the history of the program, which supported homeowner associations (HOAs) with matching grant funds for assistance with inventory, inspection, maintenance, and repair of their respective stormwater system components and facilities. She further noted funding was allocated from the Stormwater Division's general operating budget, with approximately 20 projects funded annually. Ms. Small added a key component to the program's success was the partnership and coordination between County staff and the individual HOAs. She noted the program was primarily coordinated by Mr. John Fuqua, Stormwater Coordinator/Watershed Planner.

Ms. Errico presented the award to Ms. Small and the Board of Supervisors.

4. National Night Out Proclamation

Mr. Hipple welcomed Police Chief Eric Peterson. Mr. Hipple read the proclamation addressing October 5, 2021 as National Night Out, an annual program promoting a strong police-community partnership for safer and more caring neighborhoods.

Chief Peterson noted this year's event would be different and would take place at the Law Enforcement Center, a centralized location. He further noted he looked forward to everyone attending the event.

5. Clean County Commission Annual Report

The presentation did not occur.

6. VDOT Quarterly Update

Mr. Rossie Carroll, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Williamsburg Residency Administrator, addressed the Board with an update for June 1, 2021-August 31, 2021. He noted 650 work orders were received with 516 completed, adding the outstanding ones were drainage, roadway vegetation, and some traffic engineering. Mr. Carroll further noted some

quarterly highlights included: 67 drop-in repairs, 21 lane miles of sweeping, completion of 2.5 miles of roadway ditching, roadway patching with 72 tons of asphalt, and completion of the most recent primary and secondary mowing cycle on September 10, 2021. He stated a primary mowing and litter pickup will begin October 11 with the season's final mowing and litter pickup on November 8, 2021, which will include primary and secondary routes within the County. Mr. Carroll continued the update noting the Interstate 64 Segment Three project work, adding it was on schedule for completion in December 2021. He noted some daytime flagging operations on the Longhill Road widening project, adding project completion was slated in approximately two months. Mr. Carroll further noted the Olde Towne/Longhill Road share project was also slated for completion in two months. Mr. Carroll stated the first two phases of the Skiffes Creek connector project were under construction. He noted an update to the plant mix schedule in the Agenda Packet. Mr. Carroll continued his update addressing on-call pipe rehabilitation and maintenance projects, drainage work, Route 60 roadway sweeping, and pipe repair. He noted several upcoming projects included the widening of Croaker Road from the James City County Library to Route 60, sidewalks and bike ways on Route 60 from Croaker Road to Old Church Road, Pocahontas Trail, Virginia Capital Trail Phases A and B, SmartScale projects, and speed studies throughout the County.

Mr. Icenhour asked about the work near Brookhaven.

Mr. Carroll noted the pipe joints were separated and causing the drainage issue. He further noted repairs to the joints would occur and the ditch had been cleared.

Ms. Larson noted the Commonwealth of Virginia had noted a revenue surplus. She asked if there was any mention of the surplus in relation to VDOT, particularly with moving projects forward or additional mowing.

Mr. Carroll stated he did not know at this time, but would provide updates as he knew more.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Mr. Carroll and expressed appreciation for the sweeping on Pocahontas Trail. He asked if public input on the Pocahontas Trail was upcoming.

Mr. Carroll noted not at this time.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Mr. Carroll for the paving work on Neck-O-Land Road and Lake Powell Road. He noted his August meeting with Mr. Carroll concerning the Rolling Woods neighborhood and asked about a possible schedule.

Mr. Carroll noted a patching award he was pursuing at the time of their meeting had been pushed out, but he was awaiting the award to address the patching work needed.

Mr. McGlennon asked about the light timing at Brookwood Drive and Route 199.

Mr. Carroll noted communication on that area was being addressed, adding a fiber optic project on Route 199 was forthcoming. He further noted upcoming studies and coordinating projects.

Mr. McGlennon asked if school traffic was an impact or if there was a general increase in traffic.

Mr. Carroll noted the impacts he had received focused on concerns at the intersections at the schools. He further noted with more students in school, there was also a higher rate of peak morning and evening traffic. Mr. Carroll stated review of those intersections to make adjustments or improvements for traffic concerns.

Mr. McGlennon noted the lack of school bus drivers and more parents driving their children to school in the County. He asked if traffic control could be managed through the police or VDOT.

Mr. Carroll noted each school was distinctive with many having specific school zones identified for speed reduction times or traffic guards. He further noted the location of the school was also a factor. Mr. Carroll added the infrastructure was critical at these locations, specifically proper sight distance and driver awareness.

Ms. Sadler noted she had received complaints from parents in the area in front of Stonehouse Elementary School. She further noted this was an ongoing issue. Ms. Sadler stated residents were asking for stoplights in the area. She noted her thanks in addition to those of residents to Mr. Carroll for the speed reduction zone heading into Barhamsville.

Mr. Carroll thanked her. He noted the Regional Safety Analysis (RSA) which had been done at Schoolhouse Road, Rochambeau Drive, and Old Stage Road. Mr. Carroll further noted with both Williamsburg Christian Academy and Stonehouse Elementary School fully operational with in-house students, the RSA committee was going to reconvene in October to evaluate possible timely improvements.

Mr. Hipple noted schools had sent notification to parents requesting they drive their children to school in the absence of bus drivers. He further noted the possibility of less traffic as more bus drivers were sought. Mr. Hipple referenced the classroom addition at Crosswalk Community Church on John Tyler Highway that was discussed at the Board's September 14, 2021 meeting. He noted one speaker had asked if a slow school zone could be placed there for traffic control.

Mr. Carroll asked about the school.

Mr. Hipple noted the school was pre-school to eighth grade. He further noted the school was on both sides of John Tyler Highway and some classes would relocate with the addition, adding the younger students would stay on the church campus side of the road.

Mr. Carroll responded to give his name and number as a contact point to the school.

Ms. Larson asked Mr. Carroll if he would keep the Board updated on that point. She noted the current congestion in that area.

Mr. Carroll noted he thought it would qualify as a school zone, but he would research the area.

Mr. Hipple noted the grass growth in the Norge area was over the curb.

Mr. Carroll noted Toano had already been trimmed and Norge was next.

Mr. Hipple noted a hole in the road near the Candle Factory in Norge with a cone next to the curb. He asked Mr. Carroll to check that situation.

Mr. Carroll noted it was a sinkhole.

Mr. Hipple noted he had received numerous calls about the Wawa at the James City County-York County line and the turn, particularly for the nearby neighborhood on Mooretown Road. Mr. Hipple thanked Mr. Carroll for his work.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Hipple asked if any Board member wished to pull any items.

No Board Supervisor wished to pull any items.

1. Minutes Adoption

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

The minutes Approved for Adoption included the following minutes:

-June 22, 2021, Business Meeting

-July 13, 2021, Regular Meeting

-July 27, 2021, Business Meeting

2. Authorization for Two Emergency Communication Officer Over-Hire Positions

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

3. Grant Award - Virginia E-911 Services Board Public Safety Answering Point - \$3,000

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

4. Grant Award- Virginia Fire Programs Fund - \$271,218

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

5. Grant Award - Four-for-Life - Return to Localities Fund - \$69,309

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

6. Grant Award - Radiological Emergency Preparedness - \$30,000

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

7. Grant Award - Department of Motor Vehicles - Speed Enforcement - \$29,866

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

8. Grant Award - Department of Motor Vehicles - Occupant Protection - \$6,424

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

9. Grant Award - Department of Motor Vehicles - Alcohol Enforcement - \$24,485

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

10. Grant Award - Commonwealth Attorney - Virginia Domestic Violence Victim Fund - \$41,030

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

11. Grant Award - Commonwealth Attorney - Victim Witness Assistance Program - \$183,260

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

12. Grant Award – Moses Lane Project Planning Community Development Block Grant - \$50,000

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

13. Grant Award - 2021 Scattered Site Housing Rehabilitation Community Development Block Grant - \$720,500

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

14. Board Appropriation - Surety Funding - Landfall at Jamestown - Phase 2B - \$21,000

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

15. Contract Award - Jamestown Beach Event Park Paving Project - \$118,560

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

16. 2021 Scattered Site Housing Rehabilitation - Community Development Block Grant - Adoption of Required Fair Housing Certification

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

17. 2021 Scattered Site Housing Rehabilitation - Community Development Block Grant - Adoption of Required Section 504 Grievance Procedure for Disability Nondiscrimination

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

18. 2021 Scattered Site Housing Rehabilitation - Community Development Block Grant - Adoption of Required Housing Rehabilitation Program Design and Residential AntiDisplacement and Relocation Plan

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

19. Community Development Block Grant Local Business and Employment Plan

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

E. BOARD DISCUSSIONS

1. Discussion of Regional Indoor Sports Complex

Mr. Doug Pons, Mayor of the City of Williamsburg, addressed the Board noting he was joined by Mr. Andrew Trivette, City Manager, and Mr. Robbi Hutton, Director of Parks and Recreation. He noted a representative from Victus would be joining the meeting online. Mr. Pons further noted this discussion was an opportunity to work collectively and incorporate the sports tourism component to the area. He noted sports tourism was a growing industry, adding the City of Williamsburg had created a Tourism Product Fund to address most of the project's funding. Mr. Pons stated the City's group was present to seek collaboration and request funding to support the project.

Mr. Trivette addressed the Board highlighting the sports complex project began in 2014 for the City of Williamsburg, James City County, and York County. He noted continued discussion on the project since that time. Mr. Trivette further noted in 2019 a decision was made to either pursue the project for the region or dismiss it as a non-viable regional option. He stated the decision to pursue the option was worthwhile, and he hoped the County felt the same way. Mr. Trivette explained the current option was the product of an application from the Williamsburg Hotel Motel Association to the City's Tourism Product Fund requesting funding for construction of a regional sports facility. He noted the City allocated half of the expected funding needed for capital construction, which prompted the City to move forward on the project. Mr. Trivette further noted the formation of a regional task force, the Historic Triangle Sports Advisory Committee (HTSAC), which was comprised of members from both James City County and York County, the respective County Administrators, Parks and Recreation Directors, Economic Development Directors, and the Executive Director of the Williamsburg Hotel Motel Association. He stated discussion focused on the economic development model, market competitiveness component, and location. Mr. Trivette noted the Committee met and determined the best site was the current Colonial Williamsburg Visitor Center location, adding the property was over 100 acres. He further noted the Visitor Center would remain, but building on the campus and utilizing existing parking and some buildings. Mr. Trivette added this project would create a regional draw, the location was central to all three jurisdictions, and would benefit the three localities. He noted a letter had been sent to the Board highlighting the potential financial model that would be used. Mr. Trivette further noted a request that the Board consider entering into an authority with the City of Williamsburg and York County, adding it would be called the Historic Triangle Recreational Authority. He stated the Authority would govern the site at the Visitor Center, ensuring construction and management of the facility upon opening. Mr. Trivette noted Mr. Walter Franco of Victus Advisors would join the

meeting remotely to discuss the market analysis component of the HTSAC's work.

Mr. Franco noted he was the Director of Research for the Facility Market Study which took place last year. He further noted the Study goals in his presentation to the Board, in addition to recommendations and economic impact analysis. Mr. Franco noted a strong local presence was necessary in maintaining such a facility. He further noted this was events such as local practices, rentals, and local Parks and Recreation planning for a sustained period of time, typically Monday through Thursday. Mr. Franco stated this primary draw was usually from within a 30-minute drive radius of the City, while the secondary draw was within a 60-minute drive radius of the City. He noted the 30-minute drive time encompassed most Parks and Recreation events and local recreational teams, adding some of that was accounted for in the 60-minute radius also. Mr. Franco stated he would address the weekend component which included regional and multi-day use later in the presentation. He continued the presentation highlighting data from local users on their needs, usage, and interest based on amenities and such if a regional sports facility was built. Mr. Franco noted zero of 12 interviewees indicated they would not use the facility, eight indicated likely or definitely use, and four indicated possible use, adding these numbers represented positive feedback for a regional sports complex. He further noted with such a complex, expansion of existing programs frequently occurred in addition to new organizations developed to use the facility. Mr. Franco noted the economic impacts associated with weeklong use for tournaments in this type of regional sports complex. He further noted in his presentation the importance of youth and amateur sports tourism as economic drivers. Mr. Franco indicated the mega-stadium, such as those used for professional or collegiate football, did not generate the economic impact such as a youth or amateur sports facility. He added the indoor facility, in particular, allowed year-round use, adding weekend events had the potential to host multiple events where overnight accommodations and dining options would be needed for families. Mr. Franco continued the presentation highlighting the annual growth in sports tourism over the past several years. He noted this growth sparked interest within communities to be part of the trend, adding not all communities had the necessary strengths to accomplish that goal. Mr. Franco further noted Williamsburg was poised to capitalize on the trend. He continued his presentation highlighting local and national levels of participation categorized by sports, both indoor and outdoor. Mr. Franco identified the four key factors that identify a site for sports tourism: quality of sports venues, proximity and access, hotels and amenities, and reputation and brand. He noted Williamsburg as a potential site had no indoor sports tourism venues, but did have the other three factors as highlighted in the presentation. Mr. Franco highlighted the regional tournament drive-time zones for two and a half to five hours from Williamsburg. He continued the presentation highlighting a map of comparable sports facility locations throughout the Mid-Atlantic region. He noted not all of the facilities were located in communities with the same amenities that Williamsburg had to offer. Mr. Franco further noted the indoor sports center recommendations were 12 basketball courts (which could be converted to 24 volleyball courts), a facility of a minimum 150,000 square feet with portable bleachers, and a hybrid local-regional approach for mixed use with local use for weekdays and sports tourism use for weekends. He noted these numbers were based on demographics and need. Mr. Franco continued the presentation highlighting the potential construction costs based on regional sports facilities of similar size that were built within the last 10 years. He noted potential cost increase due to inflation was likely. Mr. Franco continued the presentation highlighting the estimated annual utilization by facility hours, adding Parks and Recreation constituted a majority of use per the supplied chart. He noted the balance between local use and regional use as an economic impact. Mr. Franco continued the presentation highlighting estimated out-of-market visitation use with the weekday and weekend breakdown. He noted approximately 76% cost recovery in a stabilized year of operations using a financial formula for the complex. Mr. Franco noted this was typical of a publicly owned facility, which embraced a balance between community benefit and sports tourism. He further noted a privately owned facility focused on profit and revenue as the only objectives with a concentration on rentals and other factors. Mr. Franco highlighted the estimated monthly usage for the facility.

Mr. McGlennon asked about the financial impact to James City County. He questioned continuation of funding toward the Greater Williamsburg Chamber and Tourism Alliance, which would be allocated into the Sports Authority Fund to facilitate costs. He asked if approximately \$500,000 to a cap of \$750,000 from other County revenue sources would be required as additional funding.

Mr. Stevens noted that was the request from the City of Williamsburg for the Authority to be successful and the facility operational. He further noted the facility operational deficit was expected, adding the return on investment per specific locality was difficult to determine. Mr. Stevens added the meals tax was not included. He noted the view of the project overall as positive cash flow did not appear so in terms of the facility, adding it did serve as a plus for the community.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the facility would serve as an offset to new community recreation facilities.

Mr. Stevens confirmed yes, adding the continued need for indoor gym space. He noted discussion with the Williamsburg-James City County School Division on a short-term plan, adding if the facility request did not move forward, a Capital Improvements Program request would come before the Board for more gym space. Mr. Stevens further noted it would be smaller scale than the projected facility, but also without the generated revenue or sports tourism draw.

Mr. Trivette confirmed yes. He noted three documents were required to move forward on project construction. He further noted one was a lease of Colonial Williamsburg, another was formation of the Authority, and the third was a Memorandum of Agreement addressing financial contributions, which would come later. Mr. Trivette noted the operational piece of the project was vague pending the Authority's decision on whether the operational management would be handled in-house or from an outside hire.

Mr. McGlennon questioned the cap of \$750,000 if the deficit exceed \$1.5 million.

Mr. Trivette noted the Authority would need to address that loss in such a case. He further noted the possibility of redirection of maintenance money to the Authority as a revenue stream outside of additional contributions from the three localities. Mr. Trivette noted the surplus that would grow annually to address a possible deficit year.

Ms. Larson noted the question of who would operate the complex. She further noted both the City and the County had outstanding Parks and Recreation Departments. Ms. Larson noted the need to attract national tournaments to the local area and questioned if Victus Advisors had information on in-house versus outside management.

Mr. Trivette noted the City and the two counties could operate the facility in terms of local programming and maintenance. He further noted the aspect of attracting sports tourism to the facility was not within the local realm, adding his recommendation was to review an outside firm to handle the national attraction aspect, but also the local programming and maintenance. Mr. Trivette added incorporation of those components created an incentive for success of the facility, in addition to management of the local and regional sports aspects.

Mr. Franco noted the aspect of hiring a private operator, typically an expert in the field with the expanded national reach, can sometimes be cost prohibitive in terms of fees. He further noted the fee management range was \$150,000 to over \$200,000 annually. Mr. Franco stated additional costs for the operator to attend national conventions and networking events. He noted some localities, in forming an authority, will create a sports commission board and

designate a member as a sales manager to attract and book events for an annual calendar. Mr. Franco further noted possible friction between a private operator at a public facility when local events are bypassed for national sports events and maintaining balance between community and economic benefit.

Mr. Hipple asked Mr. Trivette if the three localities would be considered equal partners.

Mr. Trivette noted that was his proposal. He further noted the City and the County were in similar situations if the proposal was not accepted, then City Council, like the Board of Supervisors, would need to consider other options such as expansion to the Quarterpath Recreation Center to meet the needs of City residents. Mr. Trivette noted York County had its population split with amenities for the lower part of York County. He further noted the development growth in the upper part of York County and inclusion in the project to address possible needs there. Mr. Trivette said equal use among the localities aided in negotiation if situations arose.

Mr. Hipple asked about the reference in the presentation to the eight basketball courts needed for the City of Williamsburg with a total of 12 courts. He inquired if eight was the number for everyone.

Mr. Trivette confirmed eight was for all localities. He noted the City of Williamsburg had paid Victus Advisors for its work. Mr. Trivette further noted the HTSAC, which was comprised of representatives from each locality, had been charged with determining the local programming need for all three entities. He stated that collective information was then supplied to Victus for comparison to determine what was needed to attract sports tourism. Mr. Trivette confirmed the data in the report matched the programming needs for all three jurisdictions.

Mr. Hipple noted the \$481,000 loss depicted in the presentation. He further noted watching that amount over time, adding revenue should be gained from hotels, retail, and tourism within the jurisdiction. Mr. Hipple questioned the sports tourism rate for Virginia as shown in the presentation.

Mr. Franco noted that rate was national, not state.

Mr. Hipple noted he was curious what the local growth rate would be. He further noted Monday-Thursday represented weekday use with Friday-Sunday for weekend use and sports tourism. Mr. Hipple asked about that schedule if a team wanted the Sunday-Tuesday timeframe.

Mr. Trivette noted that component would be the most challenging in the facility operation. He further noted the prioritization component between the two uses and seeking assistance from Parks and Recreation Directors for finding an alternative facility for the weekday use for that particular event. Mr. Trivette added it was unusual for a sports tourism event during the week.

Mr. Hipple asked if James City County was using four courts on average, was the payment based on that four-court usage.

Mr. Stevens noted some of the specifics were still being addressed. He further noted he envisioned if James City County was using the facility for its Parks and Recreation usage, then the County would not pay. Mr. Stevens said the County would have a set schedule for a specific number of courts for community use with Parks and Recreation coordinating that use. He noted the additional four courts set aside could potentially be rented for travel team or sport league practices. Mr. Stevens further noted the possibility of a workout room in the facility to complement the sports tourism and for community use. He added additional discussion points could be addressed at the facility's detail design, in addition to possibly

charging a membership fee, and other points.

Mr. McGlennon asked if youth versus adult was the predominant group for the activities in the sports tourism aspect.

Mr. Franco noted 70% or more were youth in reviewing the use of indoor sports facilities. He further noted outdoor use included adult soccer and adult softball tournaments. Mr. Franco noted an increase in adult indoor use for pickleball tournaments.

Mr. McGlennon noted the use of youth programs and coordination of those programs.

Mr. Trivette noted the coordination of the various sports offered without service duplication by the respective Parks and Recreation Departments.

Mr. Icenhour noted reference to a 10-acre facility within the 100-acre Colonial Williamsburg site. He asked if the facility would be located separately from the Visitor Center at a different location, adding he initially thought the facility would replace the Visitor Center.

Mr. Trivette answered yes and no. He noted the lease was still being finalized with Colonial Williamsburg for consideration by the Authority upon its formation. Mr. Trivette further noted three potential project sites had been identified on the property, consisting of approximately 69 acres. He stated as each project site was activated, a new lease would be initiated for that project and each locality would determine the extent of its involvement per each site. Mr. Trivette noted the question on the Visitor Center depended on Colonial Williamsburg, adding its recognition for a large visitor reception area had passed since its inception in the 1970s. He further noted the technological changes of buying tickets via smartphones as opposed to purchasing them on-site at the Visitor Center. Mr. Trivette added he felt the building could potentially become available to the Authority over time.

Mr. Icenhour noted a potential 75-year lease reference in the paperwork supplied to the Board. He further noted concern for that timeframe with the desire for a potentially shorter lease term.

Mr. Trivette confirmed it would be a shorter term.

Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Stevens about the direction, noting the need for a decision today or a resolution to be presented at a later date.

Mr. Stevens noted today's presentation was informational for the Board and to determine if there was opposition to the project. He further noted obtaining the Board's indication to pursue ongoing discussion on the project, but a vote was not required. Mr. Stevens noted the next steps would involve working with the City of Williamsburg on the documents to form the Authority for presentation at the November 9, 2021 meeting's public hearing. He further noted following that meeting, the Authority would be formed and the project would begin.

Mr. Icenhour noted there were several aspects to address and work through the objectives such as one partner withdrawing in the future and a clearer view of construction and operation costs.

Mr. Hipple noted for the Authority, he would like elected officials to be voting members on that group. He further noted additional members would be included, but would like to see elected officials as voting members due to the financial aspect.

Mr. Stevens noted the County Administrators were open to the direction of the respective Boards. He further noted the initial details involved County Administrators, City Manager,

Parks and Recreation Directors, and Economic Development Directors, adding after the Authority's formation, more answers and details would be available to share with the Boards at the next phase for the long-term commitment. Mr. Stevens noted that if the Board wanted elected officials initially, that could be worked into the plan.

Mr. Hipple noted he understood working through the details, but emphasized when finances were involved, the elected officials needed to be involved as well. He further noted elected officials were responsible for how and where the money was spent.

Ms. Sadler noted she had no questions as they had previously been answered.

Ms. Larson noted the Tourism Council had not met yet to discuss the change to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). She further noted the COVID-19 pandemic had reiterated the community's reliance on tourism, adding a new product was needed. Ms. Larson expressed her enthusiasm for the project, citing the growth of sports tourism as a business. She noted the continued need for a sports facility and the local use component. Ms. Larson further noted the investment for the facility and the connection to the promotion of tourism. She expressed her appreciation to all involved with the project.

Mr. Trivette noted a similar presentation would be made to York County next week. He further noted a November schedule for organization of the Authority as presented to James City County.

Mr. Hipple thanked Mr. Pons and Mr. Trivette.

F. BOARD CONSIDERATION(S)

1. 2021 Redistricting

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

Ms. Liz Parman, Assistant County Attorney, addressed the Board stating the County was required to redistrict every 10 years following release of the decennial population data from the United States Census Bureau. She noted the County had received Census population data in August 2021. Ms. Parman presented a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the data showing an overall population increase in all the County's districts, adding the growth was not even across the districts. She noted Stonehouse was now the largest district with a population of 17,770 and Roberts was now the smallest district with a population of 14,414. Ms. Parman further noted the growth percentage for the other three districts in the presentation. She stated in reviewing redistricting, consideration must include local electoral districts, must be contiguous and compact, have near equal resident population, and have clearly defined and observable boundaries per the Virginia Code. Ms. Parman noted the ideal district size in the County was 15,650. She further noted staff recommended consensus on a district-level map, adding precincts would present more challenge based on the General Assembly's decision on its maps. Ms. Parman noted after the General Assembly's decision, the County would need to ensure it had no split precincts. She added split districts were permitted. Ms. Parman stated the County would submit its proposed map and redistricting Ordinance to the Attorney General for certification per the new Rights of Voters Act, legislation passed in 2021. She noted public advertisement and adoption would occur on the new map and Ordinance. Ms. Parman further noted tonight's presentation was the first step in the process, adding staff recommended the Board review the map information and reach a district-level consensus.

Ms. Larson asked if Ms. Parman had reviewed other counties similar in size to James City County and the number of districts within those counties.

Ms. Parman noted she did not have overall information. She further noted five was a standard number. Ms. Parman stated she would research that topic.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. Parman. She asked Ms. Parman if there had been consideration of additional districts.

Ms. Parman replied no, but indicated that could be reviewed if the Board chose that option.

Mr. Jason Purse, Assistant County Administrator, replied to Ms. Larson noting that option had not been pursued as staff had requested basic guidance from the Board. He noted the Board's response then had been to maintain the districts as they currently existed. Mr. Purse further noted as this was the beginning of the process, changes could be made. He noted the existing districts and color-coded Census blocks in the PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Purse added the Census blocks were not allowed to be split per guidelines on the map creation. He noted the options for redistricting, adding the least number of people was 3,403 to move between districts for the redistricting process to work. Mr. Purse further noted that number in relation to the approximately 15,000 per district referenced previously by Ms. Parman. He stated the Roberts District was the smallest and it bordered the Berkeley District, which did not require change; however, a number of residents were required to be pulled from Berkeley for compliance with the criteria. Mr. Purse continued the PowerPoint presentation highlighting the district shifts to accommodate the number adjustments. He noted there were several other options for addressing the resident equalization across the districts. He further noted the second map option was not recommended, adding while it would move each district within 200 people of the 15,060 count per district, it would ultimately move 9,500 people across districts. Mr. Purse added these changes particularly impacted the Jamestown and Powhatan Districts. He noted, as Ms. Parman had indicated, the Board's general endorsement of the process to date for work with the Voter Registrar and the precincts. Mr. Purse added finalization of the state map was pending.

Mr. Icenhour noted the outstanding job done. He asked about consensus on the redistricting proposal, which would go to the Attorney General, and while under review, staff would address the precinct level.

Mr. Purse confirmed yes.

Ms. Parman noted that was the plan, adding this was a new process and staff was awaiting more direction from the Attorney General.

Mr. Icenhour noted currently four districts had four precincts with one district having three precincts. He further noted some of the precincts were small. Mr. Icenhour added early voting and discussion with the Voter Registrar and the possibility of three precincts per district, adding he would like staff to look into that point. He noted it could be a cost saver for the County's Voter Registrar and election operations.

Ms. Parman acknowledged that point, adding the Registrar had indicated that point to County Administration. She noted that point would be considered.

Ms. Larson asked if the Board would decide on option one at this meeting.

Ms. Parman noted that could be done or further discussion could take place. She further noted tonight's option allowed staff to continue the process and get the proposed map to the Attorney General.

Ms. Larson noted concerns regarding precincts in schools. She further noted the safety factor, adding churches were currently used. Ms. Larson asked if other options were being considered.

Mr. Purse noted Ms. Dianna Moorman, Director of Voter Registration and Election, had been working with staff. He further noted she was proactive in reviewing locations and options.

Mr. McGlennon thanked staff for its work on the proposal. He noted his openness to a reduction in the precinct number, adding smaller precincts were sometimes representative of geographical isolation. Mr. McGlennon further noted Precinct C in the Roberts District was such a precinct. He acknowledged a tentative approval of the plan would assist in addressing the redistricting map. He noted the first option was a better choice.

Ms. Sadler thanked Ms. Parman and Mr. Purse for their work. She noted she was in agreement with Mr. McGlennon on the first option.

Mr. Hipple noted consensus was for option one.

Mr. McGlennon asked about an endorsing resolution for that option.

Ms. Parman noted it was in the Agenda Packet.

At approximately 2:51 p.m., the Board recessed for a short break.

At approximately 2:58 p.m., the Board reconvened.

2. Consideration of the James City County Comprehensive Plan, Our County, Our Shared Future: James City County 2045 Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Ellen Cook, Principal Planner, noted the County's draft 2045 Comprehensive Plan was before the Board for consideration. She further noted a public hearing on the Plan had been held on July 13, 2021. Ms. Cook stated a review of the Plan in conjunction with direction received from the Board at the May 25, 2021 Work Session. She highlighted these items in a PowerPoint presentation noting the removal of Mooretown Road and language drafts moved forward on the Rural Lands Policies and Economic Opportunity Land Use Designation. Ms. Cook added the Future Land Use (LU) Map considerations included: LU-20-0020 parcels be re-designated to Mixed Use, LU-20-0028 land use changes move forward, and LU-20-0017 parcels be re-designated to Low Density Residential. She noted the Board's discussion of four Goals, Strategies, and Actions (GSAs) with the following results: GSA Public Facilities 4.7 (which addressed 100% carbon free power by 2045) was removed, GSA Environment 1.17 (which addressed County watershed management plans) was retained, GSA Environment 3.7.1 (which addressed carbon sequestration) was retained following the Board's receipt of additional information with no Board direction to remove it, and GSA Environment 4.6, Sub-actions 4.6.1/4.6.2 (which addressed Ordinances or SUPs to support alternative energy production) was retained following the Board's receipt of additional information with no Board direction to remove it. Ms. Cook highlighted two other items for possible Board discussion: LU-20-0002 Eastern State - New Town Addition and LU-20-0003 Eastern State - Mixed Use Community. She noted staff was available for questions or further discussion on any items.

Mr. McGlennon noted two areas for discussion. He further noted the Board's decision to change the designation along the Croaker Road area and removal from the Primary Service Area (PSA) and the designation of the land held in the conservation easement by the Historic

Virginia Land Conservancy. Mr. McGlennon stated the Conservancy's concern over the land designation of open space/recreation and possible limitation of the land use for agricultural purposes.

Ms. Tammy Rosario, Assistant Director of Community Development and Planning, stated she had spoken with Ms. Sadler about properties owned by the Conservancy with preservation restrictions. She noted the various uses that were allowed under the preservation restrictions, adding those uses were consistent with the property use considerations.

Ms. Sadler asked Ms. Rosario to clarify the particular Sadler to whom she had spoken.

Ms. Rosario noted she had spoken with Ms. Patrice Sadler, the Executive Director at the Historic Virginia Land Conservancy.

Mr. McGlennon noted any proposals would not restrict the Conservancy from meeting the deed conditions, while still maintaining open space use designation.

Ms. Rosario confirmed yes. She noted one property allowed for alternative energy structures, adding consideration to scale for any such structure would be required if implemented.

Mr. McGlennon noted communication on the Hankins property in that area and if proper notification about removal from the PSA had been sent. He further noted concern from the landowners regarding prior plans with a developer covering costs of the PSA extension.

Ms. Rosario noted either Ms. Cook or Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Community Development and Planning, could address that point.

Ms. Cook noted that after the Board's discussion at the May 25, 2021 meeting, notices were sent to the property owners.

Mr. Holt noted if the Board wished to discuss Mr. McGlennon's point, it could be added as a third point.

Mr. McGlennon noted receipt of communication from the landowners' representative, Mr. Tim Trant of Kaufman & Canoles, PC.

Mr. Hipple noted each point could be discussed. He further noted several conversations with different groups on the land use, adding 7-Eleven had spoken with him on its land use expansion. Mr. Hipple noted the Hankins had supposedly secured a right-of-way under the interstate to acquire water and sewer at their cost, not the County's. He further noted retaining that property in the PSA as the plan would be reviewed again in five years and that would allow time for implementation under the interstate. Mr. Hipple added retaining the PSA designation and seeing how that would impact 7-Eleven and others' plans. He noted if any of those plans were not moving forward in five years, that designation could be addressed. Mr. Hipple noted he wanted the property to stay within the PSA to explore potential options for water and sewer in the future.

Mr. McGlennon noted he had addressed this point for removing the area from the PSA since the County would not be financing this extension.

Mr. Hipple noted the County would not be financing the extension. He further noted several hurdles remained to be addressed, but that was not the County's responsibility.

Mr. Icenhour noted water and sewer were available within the PSA on the other side of Interstate 64 (I-64). He asked Mr. Holt how that was achieved and what historical details

were involved.

Mr. Holt noted he knew of the main extension within Stonehouse. He further noted Stonehouse had built its own extension for internal development initially.

Mr. Icenhour noted this connection did not exist within the PSA from the other side.

Mr. Holt replied Stonehouse began with its own extension on that side.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Hipple noted he was fine with retaining the property in the PSA.

Mr. Icenhour asked if that was all the properties.

Mr. Hipple confirmed yes to all of the properties currently in the PSA.

Mr. Icenhour asked if that would include the Conservancy property.

Mr. Hipple confirmed yes. He noted reviewing it in five years to see what changes may or may not have been made.

Mr. McGlennon noted reviewing the other items for discussion and holding a decision.

Mr. Hipple noted he was hoping to discuss each one and make a decision on each item.

Ms. Larson asked if discussion on this item would continue and make a decision.

Mr. Icenhour noted one property owner wanted the land put into the PSA and the question if all should be included. He further noted concern if the Conservancy and the Kiskiack Golf Club Course needed to be in the PSA.

Mr. Hipple noted those situations would be addressed as they were presented to the Board.

Mr. Holt referenced the slide in the PowerPoint presentation showing the original PSA line. He noted the designations for the surrounding properties.

Mr. Icenhour questioned which parcel was getting the sewer and if it was the parcel closest to I-64 on the other side.

Mr. Holt highlighted the Hankins property in the presentation.

Mr. Hipple questioned the entire area or just a parcel, adding with the expense it seemed to be the entire area.

Mr. Icenhour noted two parcels were Conservancy property.

Mr. Holt noted extension of public water and sewer facilities required an SUP brought before the Board. He further noted some by-right development potential and prior previously adopted legislative plans.

Ms. Larson asked if this would only impact 8220 Croaker Road or would all the parcels need to be included. She asked Mr. Holt's recommendation.

Mr. Holt noted the difficulty in jumping over a property.

Discussion ensued on the parcels as represented in the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. McGlennon indicated his inclination to keep the current zoning for the five-year duration.

Ms. Larson noted she was fine with retaining it.

Mr. Hipple concurred.

Mr. Holt questioned the phrase “leaving it in” for clarification and staff direction. He noted for the minutes, resolution, and publication that the PSA would remain as it was currently presented in the PowerPoint, which reflected no change from the currently adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Hipple confirmed yes.

Mr. McGlennon questioned the 8220 Croaker Road parcel.

Ms. Larson asked if there were any objection to retaining the 8220 Croaker Road parcel.

Mr. Hipple noted if everything remained as it was, nothing would need to be changed.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple noted his motion would be to leave the designation as it was currently.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the Low Residential Density area with the 7-Eleven would remain in the PSA.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes. He recommended a straw vote.

Ms. Cook clarified the language would show Mixed Use.

Mr. Hipple asked about the use in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Cook noted some revisions to the language.

Mr. Icenhour suggested having staff make the revisions, present to the Board, and then have the Board confirm the necessary revisions were represented. He noted Mr. Hipple’s motion could then be addressed at the October 26, 2021, Business Meeting.

Ms. Larson noted she was in agreement with the language regarding the Conservancy pieces.

Mr. Hipple asked about the Conservancy pieces.

Mr. Holt noted his understanding of the motion was no changes be made to the Comprehensive Plan or the Future Land Use Map for the discussed side of I-64, adding the amended text as displayed in the PowerPoint presentation would not be applicable as no changes were being made. He further noted the land use designation would remain as presented on the PowerPoint screen and the two Conservancy parcels would remain as Mixed Use.

Mr. Hipple asked if changes were made later then they would be presented to the Board.

Mr. Holt noted that could be an applicant request for the next Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the PSA could remain in its current form, with the Hankins property retained as Mixed Use, but the two Conservancy parcels be changed to a new designation other than Mixed Use.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes, adding there had been some consideration for the new designation to occur within the PSA.

Mr. Icenhour noted the need to protect the Conservancy parcels and allow them flexibility to do as they needed with the parcels. He further noted this allowed staff time to review the language in addressing those points. Mr. Icenhour stated retaining the land within the PSA, but re-designating the two Conservancy parcels with a different land use that the Board could review the changes.

Ms. Larson asked if the resolution would be amended for staff to return with changes.

Mr. Holt noted two elements were involved. He further noted one focused on amended language with the second one focused on a land use designation change for the Conservancy parcels to one other than Mixed Use.

Mr. Hipple asked if the Conservancy, which owned the parcels, wanted the land use change. He noted he was not in favor of keeping the Conservancy from having the ability to do something else later.

Mr. Icenhour noted staff could rework the language and provide comments before Board consideration.

Ms. Larson noted the Conservancy correspondence addressed a desire to alter Planning's zoning recommendation from Open Space Parks to Rural Lands.

Mr. McGlennon noted that was not the current zoning.

Mr. Hipple asked about the current zoning.

Mr. Holt noted Mixed Use was the Future Land Use Map designation.

Mr. Hipple asked if the Conservancy owned the two properties outright.

Mr. Holt noted he would need to confirm if there was an easement interest or if they were owned outright.

Ms. Rosario noted the Conservancy owned the two properties outright. She further noted there were restrictions on the property also.

Mr. Hipple noted with the current zoning designation on the property, Mixed Use would not be allowed on the property.

Ms. Rosario noted the zoning on the front portion, and possibly for the back portion, was M-1, Limited Business/Industrial District and A-1, Agricultural District. She further noted the discussion centered on the land designation which was Mixed Use. Ms. Rosario stated the proposal would be to change the designation to Community Character Conservation or Rural Lands, adding there had been no discussion to date in the process on the property being Rural Lands. She noted that change could be another possibility for discussion.

Mr. Hipple noted the property would still not be able to be used for Mixed Use.

Ms. Rosario confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple noted the land designation change would impact the Conservancy and its plans for the property.

Mr. Holt noted Ms. Rosario's comment that per the Comprehensive Plan designation, a change would not pose a conflict. He further noted zoning was still a factor, adding if M-1 use with some agricultural base occurred, then consistency with zoning would still need to be adhered to for those uses. Mr. Holt added zoning was not today's consideration by the Board.

Mr. Hipple noted the concern was maintaining the current PSA line with possible zoning adjustments made at a later time.

Mr. Holt confirmed those changes would be separate applications.

Mr. Hipple noted future discussion with the Conservancy on what zoning designation they wanted.

Mr. Icenhour addressed the point of zoning and land use designation. He noted rather than leaving the Comprehensive Land Use designation as Mixed Use on the two parcels, staff would work with the Conservancy on what they wanted to do with the property with the current restrictions on the parcels. Mr. Icenhour further noted the zoning would not change, but the need to change the Land Use designation from Mixed Use could be more beneficial for the Conservancy. He stated he wanted to know what the Conservancy thought of the options and talk with staff.

Mr. Hipple noted the PSA would remain, but staff would discuss the land use with the Conservancy for its future plans. He further noted he could rescind his motion with the Board's consensus the PSA would remain while addressing the two parcels owned by the Conservancy. Mr. Hipple added staff would readdress the Board at the next meeting regarding the Conservancy's plans for the two parcels.

Mr. Holt noted for record clarification that Mr. Hipple rescinded his motion. He further noted staff was being directed to contact the Conservancy on its two parcels, of which it has an interest, for its recommendation on the best fit.

Mr. Icenhour added best fit considering it was inside the PSA.

Mr. Holt noted determining if a two-week or 30-day timeline for the follow-up discussion was required.

Mr. Hipple asked Ms. Sadler if she had any comments.

Ms. Sadler noted no.

Mr. Hipple noted the next discussion was Mooretown Road.

A motion to Keep Mooretown Road in the Comprehensive Plan was made by Michael Hipple, the motion result was Passed. AYES: 3 NAYS: 2 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Larson, Sadler
Nays: Icenhour Jr, McGlennon

Mr. Hipple noted the next topic was discussion on Mooretown Road. He further noted he felt strongly that the Mooretown Road project should remain in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr.

Hipple stated Mooretown Road served as an emergency road and an alternate route to ease congestion in the Lightfoot area, adding more development was coming into York County. He noted the need for an alternate route to get around Route 60 and this was a viable option and the importance of retaining Mooretown Road in the Comprehensive Plan as a placeholder for possibility over time.

Ms. Sadler concurred with Mr. Hipple's comments. She noted the traffic congestion, adding a placeholder was critical for potential evacuation routes and other traffic issues. Ms. Sadler further noted the current traffic concerns and preparation regarding more development.

Mr. McGlennon noted he felt the project did not solve the problem. He further noted retaining the Mooretown Road project in the Comprehensive Plan was realistic since the road would not be built for several decades. Mr. McGlennon added a large part of the land this project served was a solar farm, which would remain as such for 30 years. He noted the traffic congestion in the area, but did not feel this project served to alleviate the pressure.

Discussion ensued on traffic congestion and alternative routes.

Ms. Sadler noted staff's recommendation for Mooretown Road as a possible evacuation route. She further noted the widening of Croaker Road would aid with traffic flow.

Mr. Icenhour noted Mr. McGlennon's comments were well articulated.

Ms. Larson noted she previously was a no on this project, but was changing to a yes as there was no answer regarding the development taking place in that area. She further noted she had asked the neighboring county for discussion on the traffic issues, but had received no response. Ms. Larson added this project was not going to happen before five years, but moving forward and prior to the next Comprehensive Plan, she wanted staff to work with York County to potentially alleviate some of James City County's pressure and consider alternatives for the future.

Ms. Sadler thanked Ms. Larson and addressed bordering localities that allow "traffic dumps" from one locality to another. She noted the burden of neighboring localities in some cases. Ms. Sadler further noted anticipation of discussion with the County's neighbors on traffic concerns.

Mr. Holt noted a point of clarification on Mr. Hipple's motion involved three components to putting Mooretown Road back into the Comprehensive Plan. He further noted those points included depiction of the roadway on the Future Land Use Map as a proposed roadway, a text update to include the corridor vision paragraph as indicated in the PowerPoint presentation with a note regarding private funding for the roadway, and Table T-4 in the Transportation Chapter, which listed all the County's roadway improvements. Mr. Holt added this would ensure consistency across all the affected components.

Mr. Icenhour asked what the funding source and project cost were in Table T-4.

Mr. Holt noted in the table for consistency with the corridor vision, it would be shown as privately funded. He further noted To Be Determined or TBD was not as this project cost was currently unknown. Mr. Holt added that three distinct corridors were part of the adopted corridor study, with each dependent on what comprised the Master Plan.

Mr. Hipple noted Rural Lands Policy was the next item for discussion.

Mr. Holt noted the Board may choose not to address each of the listed points. He further noted the full list had been presented earlier by Ms. Cook for the Board's reference.

Mr. Hipple noted the other items on the list and if there was discussion on any of them.

Mr. Holt noted the Future Land Use Map and Croaker Road Interchange and PSA Adjustment/Rural Lands would be addressed later.

Mr. Hipple noted the parcels across from WindsorMeade Marketplace. He asked Mr. Icenhour about that one.

A motion to Leave the Parcels across from WindsorMeade Marketplace as Neighborhood/Commercial was made by James Icenhour, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 4 NAYS: 1 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, Sadler
Nays: McGlennon

Mr. Icenhour stated he had spoken with representatives for some of those property owners regarding the property remaining Neighborhood/Commercial. He noted he had stressed the problem of consistently intense proposals for use on those properties. Mr. Icenhour further noted those proposals were inconsistent with the Board and the community's view and acceptance. He added the difficulty of accessing Monticello Avenue from the property. Mr. Icenhour expressed his concern for proposals with less intense use if development was to occur under Neighborhood/Commercial and that evaluation would be determined case-by-case.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Icenhour for his conversation with the representatives. She noted discussion regarding the traffic on Monticello Avenue. Ms. Larson further noted keeping something in that area and the cost implications to landowners. She asked Mr. Icenhour if discussion would continue.

Mr. Icenhour indicated that was his hope. He noted continual proposals with intense development or traffic impacts will likely result in the Board's rejection of the proposals. Mr. Icenhour further noted two of the four parcels was undeveloped, adding one or both of the other parcels with structures would possibly be for sale with access on the Ironbound Road side.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Icenhour.

Mr. McGlennon noted he was not supportive of retaining the current zoning. He further noted he did not feel it would improve the traffic concerns on Monticello Avenue. Mr. McGlennon also felt the property could lend itself to some affordable housing, while also utilizing the back exit of the property instead of Monticello Avenue.

Ms. Sadler noted she was still in support of retaining the Neighborhood/Commercial designation.

Mr. Holt asked Mr. Icenhour if that designation was for all four parcels.

Mr. Icenhour confirmed yes.

Mr. Holt noted the next discussion point focused on the GSA language in GSA Environment 3.7.1 and 4.6, sub-actions 4.6.1/4.6.2. He further noted the Board's previous direction was noted in Slide Nos. 3 and 4 in the PowerPoint Presentation.

Ms. Larson noted this was an area of concern for her. She further noted the importance of history and waterways to the area. Ms. Larson added she felt the discussion had become more political, which she did not want, adding she was aware some aspects could happen that

way in current times. She referenced the carbon sequestration GSA language in Environment 3.7.1 regarding the State Code. Ms. Larson questioned how the County would do the sequestration in terms of staff availability or the possibility of an unfunded mandate as factors to consider. She noted some language changes had been added. Ms. Larson further noted the need for the Board to explore the environmental piece of where the County was heading. She added climate change and the environment were important to the County's citizens. Ms. Larson noted revisiting this point to have language that was in agreement with everyone.

Mr. McGlennon referenced the State Code Section 15.2-4901, adding it was a broad statement of the powers of local governments. He noted little guidance on carbon sequestration was provided. Mr. McGlennon further noted he agreed with recognizing and determining limitations and abilities. He expressed his concern with language from the state for direction, adding often the state provided no direction to the County, but the consequences of those actions impacted the County. Mr. McGlennon used the example of solar farms and noted the state did not give direction, but the applications for solar farms came before the Board for a County decision. He further noted the state was not giving direction, but the Board needed to address action on such items. Mr. McGlennon added this particular GSA was probably not needed in the Comprehensive Plan. He noted the language which addressed watershed management studies and the County's investment in those studies. Mr. McGlennon further noted removal of the language addressing exploration of inclusion of the ecosystem services, adding he was unsure what that language referenced. He noted revised language as a goal which regarded precipitation changes and its effects of the County's watershed.

Ms. Sadler asked Mr. McGlennon if he was discussing GSA 1.17.

Mr. McGlennon confirmed yes.

Discussion ensued on the revisions to the GSA Environment 1.17.

Ms. Sadler asked if the carbon sequestration was GSA Environment 3.7.1.

Mr. McGlennon confirmed yes.

Ms. Larson noted there was a motion to strike that language.

Mr. Hipple confirmed the removal of GSA Environment 3.7.1.

A motion to Strike GSA Environment 3.7.1 was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

A motion to Accept the Changes to GSA Environment 1.17 was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

Mr. Holt reiterated the changes for GSA Environment 1.17: first sentence remained the same; deletion of the second sentence and replacement which states "include in those studies, a study of the change in precipitation events in the watershed."

Mr. McGlennon noted "an evaluation of the change" should be incorporated.

Mr. Holt read back the changes.

Mr. McGlennon clarified “an evaluation of the impact of change in precipitation events.”

Ms. Sadler asked if the motion reflected what Mr. Holt had just read.

Mr. Hipple confirmed yes.

Mr. McGlennon referenced GSA Environment 4.5 and its wording. He asked if sub-development proposals encouraged utilization of water conservation practices.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes. He noted rain barrels and solar panels were already noted in current Ordinances.

Mr. McGlennon noted residential concerns regarding new technology and the language on wind turbines on a residential scale.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes.

Mr. McGlennon noted solar panels were currently permitted in the County.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes.

Mr. McGlennon asked if residential scale wind turbines were currently allowed.

Mr. Holt noted that topic had not been addressed on a large scale basis. He further noted this GSA was more proactive in its wording that when Ordinances are updated, they would proactively encourage the use in residential areas. Mr. Holt added each zoning district had height limits, with residential areas being mostly 35 feet, adding Mixed Use was 60 feet. He noted he was not aware of anywhere in the County this use had occurred to date.

Mr. McGlennon suggested removing the examples from the language. He noted some uses were already allowed. Mr. McGlennon further noted a possible tie-in to the next discussion point regarding Ordinance amendment to address alternative energy production and SUPs which address alternative energy sites. Mr. McGlennon cautioned about wording that suggested particular water conservation or alternative energy uses, adding preparation was needed to address future questions on the possibility of carbon sequestration and other factors. He noted the need to gather the necessary information to make informed choices for the County.

Ms. Larson asked Mr. McGlennon to incorporate all three aspects into wording.

Mr. McGlennon noted he would.

Ms. Sadler agreed that if items were already addressed, then do not include in the wording. She noted the biggest citizen concern she heard expressed was windmills, adding no windmills in open space, along the James River, or in neighborhoods.

Mr. McGlennon noted preparation to address these concerns and issues in the future.

Mr. Hipple addressed changes to the language of GSA Environmental 4.5 and 4.6. He noted removal of Land Use 1.6.

Mr. McGlennon noted he liked Land Use 1.6’s reference to intention for protection of the County’s unique rural character, preservation of natural resources, and mitigation of impacts to neighboring properties.

Discussion on language revision ensued.

Mr. Icenhour asked staff if there was any Comprehensive Plan language that compelled the County to commit funding to anything.

Mr. Holt noted committed funding had always been a specific action of the Board.

Mr. Icenhour noted that was his point. He further noted the Comprehensive Plan was a vision document. Mr. Icenhour added when it was time for action, funding was limited. He noted staff time to research items, followed by the Board's decision to fund projects or studies. Mr. Icenhour further noted the decision came at a later time after exploration and research took place and a decision could be reached on funding and investment.

Mr. Hipple noted the use of "exploring emerging technologies" in the GSA language.

Mr. Icenhour concurred.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Hipple asked for a motion on GSA Environmental 4.5 to remove the parenthetical language.

A motion to Remove the language in the parentheses in GSA Environment 4.5 was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

Mr. Hipple noted the wording changes to GSA Land Use 1.6 as discussed previously.

A motion to Amend the language in GSA Environment 1.6 was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

Mr. Hipple noted the discussion would return to GSA Environmental 4.6.

Ms. Larson noted the language had been changed to "to investigate ways to amend the County Ordinances to address alternative energy production and to amend Ordinances or include SUP conditions that protect and enhance natural resources on alternative energy production sites."

Mr. Holt noted "to support" would become "to address" as the only change.

Ms. Larson and Mr. Hipple confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple asked about the next item for discussion.

A motion to Pull and Postpone consideration of Case Number LU20-02, the Eastern State New Town Addition, and Case Number LU20-03, the Eastern State Mixed Use Community, for six months or until such time staff receives a rezoning application for the properties involved and to further direct staff to consider such rezoning against the draft Mixed Use language contained in the draft 2045 Comprehensive Plan was made by James Icenhour, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 3 NAYS: 2 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon

Nays: Hipple, Sadler

Mr. Holt replied New Town, specifically Eastern State. He noted the first five slides of the PowerPoint presentation represented items from the Board's list. He further noted additional discussion on other points if the Board had other comments.

The Board agreed the earlier points of discussion were done and it was ready for discussion on the New Town-Eastern State items.

Ms. Sadler asked for clarification on the two items.

Mr. Hipple noted both were Eastern State, Mixed Use and New Town.

Mr. Icenhour noted he was uncomfortable taking action on these items at this time. He further noted deferment on consideration of the project until the developer presented a specific development plan. Mr. Icenhour added there were concerns from the state for consideration such as the medical campus. He noted the potential for a County site on the property. Mr. Icenhour cautioned a blanket Mixed Use designation for the property without knowing the development proposals.

At approximately 4:23 p.m., Mr. McGlennon left the meeting.

At approximately 4:26 p.m., Mr. McGlennon returned to the meeting.

Ms. Larson asked if no action was taken, would that state be on hold regarding the property.

Mr. Holt replied no, adding the state was continuing its evaluation selection process. He noted with the completion of that process, a developer would be selected. Mr. Holt further noted state's expectation for the developer to quickly continue the local entitlement and legislative process.

Ms. Sadler asked if there had been discussion or dialogue with state representatives on the property.

Mr. Icenhour responded yes that Mr. McGlennon had spoken with the Honorable Senator Monty Mason earlier in the day. He noted concern for a County decision that could impact the potential for the medical campus there. Mr. Icenhour further noted assurance to that point as the Board was awaiting the developer's proposal and establishing a compatible land use. He added additional discussion would ensue following the selection of a bidder.

Ms. Sadler asked if a bid would go in prior to knowing the Board's decision.

Mr. Icenhour noted the bid was currently underway. Ms. Sadler asked about a timeline for the response. Mr. Icenhour replied he was unsure, adding it could be in several weeks or months.

Mr. Hipple asked if Mr. Icenhour wanted to pull these two items.

Mr. Icenhour noted it would be a deferral on action until a later date with receipt of an application for rezoning.

Mr. Hipple noted regardless of the development plan and the Board rezoned the land, an application would still need to come before the Board.

Mr. Icenhour noted that point, adding concern if the plan was incompatible with Mixed Use. He further noted the possibility of Board negotiations with the successful applicant on the

property.

Mr. Hipple expressed concern about pulling this item and the impact to potential buyers. He noted his understanding of Mr. Icenhour's viewpoint. Mr. Hipple further noted the property was within the PSA, but the designation would move it to Mixed Use and move it from Public Lands. Mr. Holt replied federal, state lands. Mr. Hipple noted sending the right message to developers. He further noted the importance of the medical facility also.

Mr. McGlennon concurred with Mr. Icenhour on retaining the property as Public Lands. He noted the County could monitor as the state talked with developers and see future plans. Mr. McGlennon further noted revision of the current Comprehensive Plan language if Eastern State remained as Public Lands, adding the language would reflect expectations for development on the Eastern State property. He noted the language would include the behavioral and physical health component and Hope Village. Mr. McGlennon stated the need to balance those community-based services with economically sustainable development and sending a message to the state that identified the County's direction and purpose for the property while recognizing the developer making money from it also.

Ms. Sadler asked if the state's primary interest was the behavioral health aspect and how the state viewed plans for Eastern State.

Mr. McGlennon noted state sale of surplus property generated resources to assist mental health programs. He further noted ensuring state legislators were aware the Colonial Behavioral Health System was an integral component of this development.

Ms. Larson noted reference to Olde Towne Medical and Dental Center (OTMDC). She further noted she was not aware of OTMDC moving to the Eastern State property and cautioned that point of inclusion.

Mr. Icenhour noted staff incorporating language that included Mr. McGlennon's points regarding the Board's expectations. Mr. Icenhour further noted community concern for the property was paramount. He stated the County had standards, adding the property was an integral piece and the core of the County's urban area. Mr. Icenhour noted how that property would be developed was crucial to the County and its residents. He further noted the Mixed Use approach was not the right way.

Ms. Sadler asked if the developer would have to come before the Board.

Mr. Icenhour noted yes, adding the Board would have control over rezoning. He further noted if the property was designated Mixed Use with no clear intent on the expectations for the property, it served to undermine potential negotiations.

Ms. Sadler asked if staff, Mr. Stevens, or other Board members had any discussion with the state legislators. She noted she had not had any discussion.

Mr. Holt noted in terms of expectations from the state, three bidders were in final offers. He further noted language in the current State Code, Budget section, regarding expectations for this property's sale with state, County, and developer working together with Colonial Behavioral Health and Hope Family Village. Mr. Holt stated that language has been in the State Code for several years and was an expectation.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the language indicated the state's priority.

Mr. Holt noted additional language could be added to the Comprehensive Plan as an interim placeholder. He further noted the draft language in the current plan was specific to each Mixed

Use area. Mr. Holt stated the Planning Commission had spent considerable time addressing specific text to both parcels. He noted that specific language had also been shared with the three companies putting bids in to the state. Mr. Holt further noted the specificity included traffic accommodations and environmental concerns. He stated two possible options included revised language for the Board's review with the second one, as part of the motion, a postponement on action on the land use applications for these two parcels. Mr. Holt noted with the second option when the rezoning was readdressed, staff would evaluate the rezoning application based on draft 2045 Comprehensive Plan language currently cited. Mr. Holt further noted highlighting the revised language for the Mixed Use in the PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Sadler asked about the timeline on a possible postponement or deferral.

Mr. Holt noted a postponement could not be done indefinitely. He further noted the possibility of postponement on these two land use cases for 12 months or at the time staff received a new zoning application.

Ms. Larson asked if these two cases would not go into the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Holt noted the Board would pull and postpone consideration of the Land Use cases LU-20-002 and LU-20-003 for 12 months or until the time that staff received a rezoning application for the involved properties and to further direct staff to consider such rezoning against the draft Mixed Use language as contained in the draft Comprehensive Plan. He further noted until that time, the use would remain as federal and state land as currently designated. Discussion ensued on the language.

Mr. McGlennon referenced Mr. Icenhour's earlier mention of the proposal with a -\$5 million annual cost to the County. He noted language to include an expectation of economic viability with no burden on taxpayers.

Mr. Hipple asked if the plan presented had been from one of the three bidders.

Mr. Holt noted it was a high-level conceptual plan from only one of the bidders. He further noted the plan was not based on any rezoning application. Mr. Holt added most residential developments in general are not fiscally positive at any level. He noted staff could craft language based on the Board's consensus regarding the economic viability piece.

Ms. Larson asked if this language also alleviated concern from the New Town residents.

Mr. Icenhour noted that point was less for New Town as a proposal was already in place. He further noted the developer had already addressed the two primary concerns there which focused on access through Discovery Boulevard and no forced homeowners association for residents. Mr. Icenhour stated the density and traffic intensity would be subject to the Board's decision on the appropriate zoning for the area. He added concern regarding a connector between the two Eastern State parcels, adding he did not think that was economically or logically viable. Mr. Icenhour noted he would not support a connector.

Ms. Larson noted her support, but stressed language that reflected the opportunity for development.

Ms. Sadler noted the expectation of development, but without the \$5 million cost to the County.

Ms. Larson asked if Mr. Holt would come back before the Board.

Mr. Holt noted he could if additional language was needed. He further noted it could be incorporated into Mr. Icenhour's motion. Mr. Holt noted language which conveyed to applicants regarding the ultimate fiscal impact, which required demonstration and mitigation as part of their final applications. He further noted the components of the master plan and those impacts.

Mr. Hipple noted he was not in support of the motion and felt moving forward was necessary. He asked Mr. Holt to restate the motion to ensure everyone was okay with the motion's wording.

Mr. Holt reiterated the motion made by Mr. Icenhour. He noted pulling and postponing consideration of Case Number LU20-02, the Eastern State New Town Addition, and Case Number LU20-03, the Eastern State Mixed Use Community, for 12 months or until such time staff receives a rezoning application for the properties involved and to further direct staff to consider such rezoning against the draft Mixed Use language contained in the draft 2045 Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Larson asked if the timeframe could be amended to six months.

Mr. Holt noted yes. He further noted if the rezoning applications were not in within six months, the Board would need to have them back on its agenda.

Ms. Larson noted her acceptance of the six-month timeframe.

Mr. Icenhour noted an amendment to the motion for six months.

Mr. Holt noted the addendum list as noted in the PowerPoint presentation. He further noted discussion on Rural Lands if the Board desired.

Mr. McGlennon referenced the three highlighted words and the openness of their meaning. He asked if a specific level of density was considered for an increase.

Mr. Holt noted no. He further noted the one to 20 acres in the larger Rural Lands piece, while clustering would be less than that range. Mr. Holt added drafting some of the Ordinances would still need the Board's review.

Mr. Hipple noted clustering worked well in some instances. He further noted the need for conservation easements with some property, adding taxes were smaller on the cluster property. Mr. Hipple noted the disproportionate rate of the larger lots covering the taxes for the smaller cluster properties and the conservation easements. He questioned how the County captured the lost revenue with clustering.

Mr. McGlennon recognized the importance of Mr. Hipple's point. He further noted a counterpoint was the tax rate was determined by the value of the property, not the acreage. Mr. McGlennon added some residents may prefer the smaller lots.

Mr. Hipple noted he was not against clustering, but wanted to be sure there was no loss there.

Ms. Larson questioned the tax aspect.

Mr. Icenhour noted the language reflected the intent of clustering within the Comprehensive Plan. He further noted when a cluster Ordinance was done, the Board had the ability to offer a particular reduced credit. Mr. Icenhour agreed with Mr. McGlennon's reference to the open-ended use of "higher" in the language. He noted his preference to retain the current language.

Mr. Hipple noted being mindful of future possibilities. He further noted fairness to taxpayers.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Holt thanked the Board for its input and direction.

Mr. McGlennon noted the correspondence on the property adjacent to Oakland Farms. He asked about the varying number of units during development of the two sites.

Mr. Holt noted reference to the Comprehensive Plan language to provide recommendations on the densities between Low Density Residential (LDR) and Moderate Density. He further noted the frontage strip was the varying point between the two designations.

Mr. McGlennon noted a 9- to 10-acre designation.

Mr. Holt noted the main road at Oakland Farms split that area on both sides. He further noted there were multiples variables involved.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the rendering under Moderate Density Residential, Level Two, was a multi-story apartment building. He noted multi-story meaning more than three levels, and its density impact.

Mr. Holt noted currently Mixed Use allowed for a maximum of five stories and 60 feet. He further noted language changes would be required at the Ordinance level to address height.

Mr. Icenhour noted his thoughts on the same chart referenced by Mr. McGlennon. He further noted concern on those heights and questioned if changes would be required by Ordinance.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour referenced the residential designations on Chart 2, Item 2, Level 2 with Moderate Level Density Level 1 and Level 2. He noted Level 2 was essentially High Density. Mr. Icenhour asked his fellow Board members to revisit Point No. 18 at the next Board meeting and noted he would send an email on his proposed changes.

Mr. Stevens asked about the timeline to review the proposed changes.

Mr. Holt noted two issues remained with one being the Land Conservancy parcels and the second being further Board discussion regarding edits to Chart 2, Item 2. He further noted a two-week timeline should work provided the Land Conservancy was available for discussion.

Mr. Stevens noted the October 26, 2021, Business Meeting as a viable option.

Mr. Holt confirmed adoption of the Comprehensive Plan by mid-November per State Code.

Mr. McGlennon noted citizens may want to publicly address some of the Comprehensive Plan changes at the November 9, 2021, Regular Meeting.

Mr. Hipple asked about the postponement date.

Mr. Stevens confirmed October 21, 2021.

Mr. Hipple thanked Mr. Holt.

G. BOARD REQUESTS AND DIRECTIVES

Ms. Sadler noted the County had received another award. She further noted at the annual conference of the Southern Economic Development Council (SEDC), the 2021 Community and Economic Development Award recipients were recognized. Ms. Sadler stated the SEDC was a 17-state association that annually recognized outstanding communities for their efforts in advancement of their communities' economic viability. She cited James City County had been an award recipient from the Virginia Economic Development Association in March 2021 for its business retention and community involvement efforts in establishing a partnership with the Greater Williamsburg Partnership, Williamsburg Community Foundation, and the Virginia 30-Day Fund. Ms. Sadler noted this was the first locality partnership which offered forgivable loans to small businesses. She further noted James City County was the winner in the category of community population of 40,000-100,000. Ms. Sadler thanked her Board peers for their support of the funding for this program with support to 125 small local businesses. She also thanked staff for its efforts and extended her congratulations to the Office of Economic Development for the award. The Board extended its congratulations. Ms. Sadler noted her attendance at the luncheon for the Owens-Illinois Glass recycling project. She further noted taking glass to the recycling center where the purple bins are located as part of this recycling program. She thanked staff and Mr. Stevens for their participation.

Ms. Larson asked if the labels were to be removed from the bottles as part of the recycling program.

Ms. Sadler noted rinsing the bottles.

Mr. Stevens noted he would confirm if labels could remain on the bottles.

Mr. Icenhour noted attendance with Ms. Larson and Mr. McGlennon at the Historic Virginia Land Conservancy celebration at the Church on the Main. He further noted the County had an unidentified soldier buried there. Mr. Icenhour stated that was a James City County fact he had been unaware of, adding the remains were confirmed to be a soldier from the Battle of Greensprings. He noted the County had its own unknown soldier tomb from the Revolutionary War at the Church on the Main. Mr. Icenhour further noted the significance to veteran organizations.

Ms. Larson noted it was an incredible experience.

Ms. Sadler asked the location.

Mr. Icenhour noted the Church on the Main, near Mainland Farm.

Mr. McGlennon noted it was The Pointe at Jamestown community.

Ms. Larson noted the work of local Boy Scouts in maintaining the area. She further noted the important history lesson there. Ms. Larson added the remains were identified as those of a patriot whose diet consisted of corn not wheat. She noted attending the Tourism Council meeting the previous week. Ms. Larson further noted a slight dip in tourism due to the Delta variant and students returning to school, adding a strong recovery toward 2019 levels. She noted neither business travel nor school groups had resumed normal levels. Ms. Larson stated the ongoing local employment issue. She noted her attendance with Mr. Icenhour and Mr. McGlennon at a reception on Jamestown Island. Ms. Larson stated she participated in Elected Officials Day at the food bank and acknowledged the food bank's work in the community. She noted her work with the Weekend Backpack Program, which currently serves 200 students in the Williamsburg-James City County School system. She added her recent attendance at the Olde Towne Medical meeting.

Mr. McGlennon noted his attendance at the two events referenced by Ms. Larson and Mr. Icenhour. He expressed the Board's condolences to Mr. Bruce Goodson, a former James City County Board Supervisor, and the Goodson family at the loss of his father.

H. REPORTS OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Stevens thanked Ms. Parman and Mr. Purse for their work on the redistricting. He extended his thanks to Ms. Kim Hazelwood, Supervisor of the Geographic Information System (GIS) Division, for her behind-the-scenes work on the maps.

I. CLOSED SESSION

1. Consideration of a personnel matter, the appointment of individuals to County boards and/or commissions, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(1) of the Code of Virginia and pertaining to the Stormwater Program Advisory Commission

A motion to Enter a Closed Session was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

At approximately 5:14 p.m., the Board entered Closed Session.

At approximately 5:26 p.m., the Board re-entered Open Session.

A motion to Certify the Board only spoke about those items indicated that it would speak about in Closed Session was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

A motion to Appoint to serve on the Stormwater Program Advisory Committee the following individuals: Mr. Philip Doggett, Mr. Anthony Loubier, Mr. Frank Polster, Mr. Richard Powell, and Ms. Wendy Ruffle to continue on the Board with terms expiring June 30, 2025, and to add Leslie Bowie, Shirley Livingston, and Jason Knight for terms that will expire on June 30, 2025, was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

J. ADJOURNMENT

1. Adjourn until 5 p.m. on October 12, 2021 for the Regular Meeting

A motion to Adjourn was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

At approximately 5:27 p.m., Mr. Hipple adjourned the Board of Supervisors.


Deputy Clerk