

**MINUTES**  
**JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**BUSINESS MEETING**  
**County Government Center Board Room**  
**101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185**  
**April 26, 2022**  
**1:00 PM**

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**B. ROLL CALL**

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

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

**ADOPTED**

**MAY 24 2022**

**Board of Supervisors**  
**James City County, VA**

**C. PRESENTATION**

1. Proclaiming May 1-7, 2022 as Public Service Recognition Week in James City County

Mr. Stevens cited the Public Service Recognition Proclamation included in the Agenda Packet. Mr. Stevens expressed his gratitude to the Board for allowing recognition of County employees.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Mr. Stevens.

Mr. McGlennon mentioned various County public servants were in attendance, adding he would appreciate it if the Board would take a photo with those public servants in attendance.

2. Proclaiming May 1-7, 2022 as Resilience Week in James City County

Mr. McGlennon cited the Resilience Week Proclamation included in the Agenda Packet.

3. VDOT Project Pipeline

Mr. Chad Tucker, Program Manager of the Virginia Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment, addressed the Board noting for the past six to seven years he had managed the Commonwealth Transportation Board's (CTB) Smart Scale Program. Mr. Tucker mentioned about a year ago CTB requested he initiate the Project Pipeline study program. Mr. Tucker informed the Board he would provide an overview of the program as well as results from the pipeline study conducted along Route 199 on the PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Tucker stated every four years CTB through its Multi-Modal Transportation Plan established priorities and

needs. Mr. Tucker explained the purpose of the Project Pipeline was to provide technical assistance and resources to local governments and regional agencies. Mr. Tucker anticipated streamline project planning and improved project readiness for projects which compete for the Smart Scale program and other funding opportunities. Mr. Tucker noted CTB was able to utilize data sources to create dashboards to expedite diagnosis of issues. Mr. Tucker further noted Route 199 was on a high priority list for the Hampton Roads region, adding that the majority of the Route 199 corridor functions as a limited access roadway. Mr. Tucker explained there were some remaining signals which tended to be choke points, in addition to a few safety challenges. Mr. Tucker touched on CTB's performance-based planning process which was guided by the principles shown on the PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Tucker highlighted the principles: 1) if it is not broken, do not fix it; 2) if you can, prevent breakage from occurring preserve and to protect assets; 3) if it is broken, try fixing; and 4) if all attempts to try and fix the problem did not work, then consider replacement. Mr. Tucker spoke about the Project Pipeline timeline, adding there was a three-phase approach to the study. Mr. Tucker mentioned the Phase No. 1 was to diagnose the cause of the issue(s); Phase No. 2 which was the current phase, was to test, develop alternatives, and solicit feedback; and Phase No. 3 was to work with the local government to select a preferred alternative, identifying an investment strategy, and developing a good cost estimate to allow for funding opportunities. Mr. Tucker stated for this study the recommendation was to continue Phase No. 2 to allow for further public input. Mr. Tucker commented there was an abundance of feedback received from the community advising there were some concerns with the alternatives being considered. Mr. Tucker added once further public input was collected to better understand the concerns then the recommendations would be modified based on the feedback. Mr. Tucker highlighted the Route 199 Study overview on the PowerPoint presentation, adding the study was mainly focused on the areas of John Tyler Highway to the Brookwood Drive intersection with Jamestown Road intersection in the center as shown on the PowerPoint slide. Mr. Tucker stated the VTrans needs in this area focus specifically on improving bicycle access, capacity preservation, congestion mitigation, pedestrian access, and safety improvement. Mr. Tucker mentioned the highest priorities currently were the capacity preservation and safety improvement. Mr. Tucker reported in the past five years there had been approximately 113 injuries from vehicular accidents which had occurred at these three intersections. Mr. Tucker discussed the existing conditions of Route 199 in the three identified intersections indicated on the graph on the PowerPoint slide. Mr. Tucker stated in the AM peak trips the speeds start at over 40 miles per hour and essentially steadily decline throughout the day until after 5 p.m. Mr. Tucker mentioned the goal was to find a solution to allow Route 199 eastbound and westbound to be more efficient and reduce some of the delay. Mr. Tucker spoke about the safety overview, adding he believed a lot of the crashes occur due to the congestion. Mr. Tucker briefly spoke about the queues and signals. Mr. Tucker pinpointed areas of vehicle crashes on a map shown on the PowerPoint slide. Mr. Tucker also referenced angle accidents.

Ms. Larson asked what an angle accident was.

Mr. Tucker explained it was referred to as a T-bone accident.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Tucker for the clarification.

Mr. Tucker recognized the Kimley-Horn team which had conducted some of the field review over the past summer-fall timeframe along the Route 199 corridor providing photos of the congestion in multiple areas of the identified three intersections of Route 199 on the PowerPoint. Mr. Tucker presented the current Level of Service and delay data, in addition to what was predicted in the year 2045. Mr. Tucker anticipated as the area continued to grow, the delay would increase. Mr. Tucker mentioned in the past building interchanges was proposed at these signals; however, there had been some public pushback on that based on community impacts. Mr. Tucker noted the recommendations were mainly to improve efficiency

in the existing signalizations. Mr. Tucker spoke about the MetroQuest online survey program, which allowed it to target specific zip codes using social media, adding it was the most effective online survey to date. Mr. Tucker noted community feedback from the completed survey indicated concerns of relocation of some turns and turn restrictions that were being proposed. Mr. Tucker further noted based on the community feedback it was the best course of action to revisit Phase No. 2 to gather more public input to provide an improvement strategy supported by the community. Mr. Tucker anticipated coming back before the Board in four or five months after the additional community outreach data was collected and any revisions to the recommendations were made. Mr. Tucker concluded his presentation and welcomed any questions the Board might have.

Mr. McGlennon stated he had a few questions and indicated he lived in the area in which had access to Brookwood Drive. Mr. McGlennon noted it was the only access point in order to get out of the residential area which included businesses such as: the Williamsburg-James City County Airport, Williamsburg Landing, Williamsburg Winery, and for Laurel Lane Elementary School. Mr. McGlennon inquired about the public comment results Mr. Tucker had received from the survey which was conducted. Mr. McGlennon stated as he read over the online material that there would be a public meeting held, adding he was unaware of any public meeting which was held on this matter.

Mr. Tucker replied there was not a public meeting.

Mr. McGlennon stated right.

Mr. Tucker explained that approximately a year ago when the Project Pipeline initially began there was every intent to conduct a public hearing in Phase No. 1 after the diagnosis process to find out whether the community agreed with the observations and the data collected. However, there was some skepticism whether to have the public engagement in Phase No. 1 or Phase No. 2, adding this was also in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. Mr. Tucker expressed he felt this particular study would have benefited from the public engagement in Phase No. 1 as the community could address the performance related concerns and provide feedback on recommendations. Mr. Tucker expressed he felt there were some misunderstandings about what was being proposed at the Brookwood Drive intersection. Mr. Tucker explained there were two proposals which involved a through cut, where it would essentially prohibit the through movement from the side street; however, individuals coming from Brookwood Drive could still make a left or right turn on to Route 199, adding from Route 199 the access to turn left was still available at the intersection. Mr. Tucker mentioned it was the other side of Route 199 which would be prohibited. Mr. Tucker stated there were some variations that restricted left turns on to Route 199; however, the proposal which was being considered was the more traditional through cut which would have only prohibited the through movement across. Mr. Tucker stated the counts received for the through movement across showed little demand opposed to the right and left turn on to Route 199 as Mr. McGlennon mentioned which was the main access point for those communities. Mr. Tucker expressed the difficulty to provide precise detailed information through a survey opposed to an in-person approach to allow visuals and a more detailed understanding of the proposals.

Mr. McGlennon asked if there were also proposals to restrict left-turn lanes on Jamestown Road as well.

Mr. Tucker explained what was being proposed at the Jamestown Road intersection was a bowtie intersection which does not necessarily prohibit the left-turn, but it would relocate how the left-turn would occur.

Mr. McGlennon inquired if the traffic would turn right, go down about a quarter mile and then turn back towards Jamestown Road, adding then wait for the traffic signal to allow to cut

across.

Mr. Tucker replied essentially the proposal was to build a roundabout to the north and south of Jamestown Road. Mr. Tucker indicated in further detail on the map on the PowerPoint slide. Mr. Tucker mentioned this would reduce the number of accidents as well as reduce the traffic light delay for the left-turn. Mr. Tucker mentioned the surrounding communities in that area were opposed to having to go through the intersection twice; however, this method had been used in other states and found beneficial for both congestion and safety purposes. Mr. Tucker reiterated the ability to make a left just in a different manner.

Mr. McGlennon replied you would make a right and then a left.

Mr. Tucker responded you would go straight through and then turn left.

Mr. McGlennon stated he travels Jamestown Road approximately two to three round trips per day through the general area, adding in terms of congestion he believed there was about a half an hour in which the traffic was heavy, which resulted in waiting through two traffic light cycles to proceed. Mr. McGlennon commented in the afternoon, it was sometimes an hour. Mr. McGlennon mentioned he reviewed some of the data provided and the information indicated a 40-second improvement on the through flow traffic; however, those affected by the bowtie intersection would significantly increase their time to reach their destination.

Mr. Tucker replied the 40-second travel time savings was the average per vehicle for all the entering vehicles including the side street traffic. Mr. Tucker mentioned he believed in the peak hour trips there were approximately 5,000-6,000 vehicles entering the intersection, which would allow a 40-second reduced travel time per vehicle based on the simulation. Mr. Tucker noted the time savings may differ based on the approach; however, the average was 40 seconds.

Mr. McGlennon mentioned he had served on this Board for a fair period of time, adding when he first started on the Board, he dealt with issues at Jamestown Road, in addition he was also involved in the decision of widening Route 199. Mr. McGlennon stated there was a clear understanding that the section of Route 199 from John Tyler Highway to the eastern portion of Route 199 would continue to be signalized. Mr. McGlennon expressed his concern with potentially removing signalization.

Mr. Tucker replied all recommended proposals retained the signalizations. Mr. Tucker reiterated in the past there was discussions of building interchanges at these identified intersections. Mr. Tucker stated essentially these were signals along an otherwise limited access road which operated similar to an interstate, adding these signalization areas tend to become a chokepoint. Mr. Tucker mentioned there were ways to allow a traffic signal to operate more efficiently. Mr. Tucker reiterated all proposals presented on the MetroQuest survey retained at-grade access and the signalization, adding the objective was to reduce signal phasing and reduce conflict points to move traffic through more efficiently. Mr. Tucker reiterated based on the community feedback received from the survey that further evaluation was needed.

Mr. McGlennon replied he understood the objective; however, he had concerns with various principles such as increasing speeds at those identified intersections which had various activity including pedestrians, bicyclists, etc.

Mr. Tucker responded the objective was not to increase the speed but decrease delay and allow the existing capacity to operate more efficiently. Mr. Tucker displayed the VTrans slide on the PowerPoint, adding there were opportunities to enhance bicycle access and pedestrian access; however, the main focus currently was on the capacity preservation and safety



improvement components.

Mr. McGlennon asked about the online survey, adding he received a lot of feedback from County residents stating there was not an option on the survey for a no-build option.

Mr. Tucker confirmed it was not an option in this particular survey, adding for future surveys to include a no-build option. Mr. Tucker reiterated revisiting Phase No. 2 to better understand the community's concerns and desires to provide alternative recommendations which were favorable.

Mr. McGlennon mentioned he believed the Board recognized the capacity specifically at Jamestown Road, adding the area was well built out and there was limited opportunity for residential development. Mr. McGlennon expressed the roadways could not support additional traffic. Mr. McGlennon thanked Mr. Tucker for the presentation; however, based on the survey feedback reevaluation of the approach should be considered.

Mr. Tucker replied yes sir.

Ms. Larson expressed the capacity concern on Jamestown Road, adding she traveled this area daily and there were significant congestion concerns. Ms. Larson mentioned the public engagement piece, adding the data indicated improvements were needed. Ms. Larson recommended reevaluation.

Mr. McGlennon asked what response was received from the Williamsburg City Council.

Mr. Tucker replied the feedback was similar. He added the community was in agreement to further engagement opportunities, but there was a lot of nuisance in regard to the proposed recommendations. Mr. Tucker referred to Ms. Larson's point of the public in-person engagement component would have helped provide a better understanding of the proposed recommendations. Mr. Tucker mentioned over the next several months the focus was on in-person public engagement from various homeowners associations and surrounding communities to provide the necessary feedback to provide a more favorable approach to alternative improvements.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Mr. Tucker for the presentation.

#### **D. CONSENT CALENDAR**

A question arose pertaining to the number of items on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. Stevens confirmed there were only two items which were indicated on the Agenda Packet.

1. Contract Award - \$833,480 - Replacement Fire Pumper

A motion to Approve was made by Michael Hipple, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

2. Minutes Adoption

A motion to Approve was made by Michael Hipple, 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 meetings:

- March 8, 2022, Regular Meeting
- March 11, 2022, Joint Meeting
- March 12, 2022, Retreat Meeting
- March 22, 2022, Business Meeting

## **E. BOARD DISCUSSIONS**

### **1. Hampton Roads Alliance Update**

Mr. McGlennon welcomed Mr. Douglas Smith, President and CEO of the Hampton Roads Alliance (the Alliance).

Mr. Stevens provided a brief introduction to the Board noting a few years ago there was discussion on joining the Alliance, which at that time the City of Williamsburg, York County, and James City County, as a region chose not to join. Mr. Stevens recognized the continued efforts with the Greater Williamsburg Partnership (GWP). Mr. Stevens mentioned as of December 2021, the decision was made to rejoin the Alliance, adding the participation was incorporated into the budget. Mr. Stevens anticipated following the presentation the Board would be inclined to remain in the partnership, as he felt it had served the community in a positive manner. Mr. Stevens thanked Mr. Smith for the opportunity and for being in attendance.

Mr. Smith addressed the Board to provide a PowerPoint presentation on the organization. Mr. Smith recognized his colleague, Mr. Steve Harrison, Vice President of Business Intelligence and Communications. Mr. Smith acknowledged in the past there were some concerns in terms of the organization; however, the organization had reformed. Mr. Smith mentioned communication was pertinent. Mr. Smith informed the Board that a Vice President was assigned to each community, adding Mr. Harrison was assigned to the County. Mr. Smith discussed the mission of the Alliance was to grow traded-sector jobs in the region, adding the focus was to help grow the businesses already here. Mr. Smith spoke briefly about the vision and values on the PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Smith touched on the changes at the Alliance which included new personnel, new mission model, and new governance. Mr. Smith mentioned the organization used to have a 70-member Board which led to challenges, adding the Board was now a 13-member Board. Mr. Smith briefly recognized the Board members on the PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Smith mentioned there was interest in adding a Board member from the local community to join the Board. Mr. Smith moved on to discuss funding which was 50% public sector funding and 50% private sector funding. Mr. Smith stated the Alliance received approximately \$1.7 million from the private sector. Mr. Smith mentioned interest in businesses locally whom the Alliance should engage with for investment and support purposes. Mr. Smith reported eight companies invested \$100,000 annually to the Alliance, adding the Alliance changed from a 501(c)(6) status to a 501(c)(3) status to aid the investors in tax advantages for contributions. Mr. Smith discussed the Master Agreement for Regional Economic Development, which was a document negotiated by business leaders and city managers, unanimously approved by localities, which outlined obligations and roles of the Alliance and the localities. Mr. Smith recognized his predecessor, Mr. Rick Weddle, who brought in IBM and its site consulting group to study the region, to determine strengths and weaknesses, and operations. Mr. Smith explained the implementation of those recommendations had a positive impact on the Alliance over the past four years. Mr. Smith cited the four headline initiatives from the IBM study on the PowerPoint slide. Mr. Smith expressed the challenge as a region was how do we promote this region. Mr. Smith stated the

Alliance spends \$250,000 annually on this task. Mr. Smith touched on the role of the Alliance which included the following: to market Hampton Roads' business environment and talent, facilitate the decision process for companies considering Hampton Roads, assist existing businesses that are poised for growth, utilize research database to provide relevant, comprehensive, and impactful information to prospects and partners, and engage the region's top leaders to understand key trends and the region's economic competitiveness. Mr. Smith displayed the Master Agreement for Regional Economic Development priority sectors on the PowerPoint, adding Mr. Harrison would touch on that momentarily. Mr. Smith provided a brief overview of the lead generation data, adding the process was to reach out to businesses through different forms of communication, establish a meeting, and finalize the partnership. Mr. Smith mentioned the Alliance relied on the Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP) to assist with leads, adding vast majority of the leads were coming from VEDP; however, the objective was to generate leads without dependency and this year that was achieved. Mr. Smith referred to the PowerPoint slide to indicate the majority of the lead activity was due to the Offshore Wind industry, adding this industry was trending and could potentially become an \$80-\$100 billion industry for the East Coast. Mr. Smith displayed a PowerPoint slide which represented partnerships with various businesses in Hampton Roads. Mr. Smith referred to the Offshore Wind industry as the anticipation was to land the industry here in the Commonwealth of Virginia and apply this instance to alternative industries. Mr. Smith stated the Alliance opened an Offshore Landing, which essentially was a coworking space for these types of companies, adding there were 20 international companies which were members of the Offshore Landing. Mr. Smith spoke briefly about other services offered which included business retention and expansion opportunities, adding localities were reluctant on this particular service, so the Alliance had to ensure a delicate approach to ensure value and success. Mr. Smith recognized Ms. Toi Hunter, Vice President for Business Retention and Expansion, for her continued efforts. Mr. Smith highlighted the development of key business retention and expansion industries on the PowerPoint slide. Mr. Smith advised Mr. Harrison would be discussing the next few slides on the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Harrison addressed the Board reiterating his role at the Alliance. Mr. Harrison commented the business intelligence component was focused on research and data. Mr. Harrison noted the Alliance obtained data to determine what makes Hampton Roads a great place to do business, adding traditionally Economic Development organizations would only provide that information to prospects; however, the Alliance wanted this information to be available to partnered localities. Mr. Harrison stated the Alliance had approximately \$50,000 worth of subscriptions to economic impact, workforce, demographics, and software, etc. Mr. Harrison informed the Board the organization offered its services to the County's Economic Development Department in addition to any County government personnel as part of the County's investment. Mr. Harrison discussed the type of data which the organization had access to such as retail, real estate, lease expirations, etc. Mr. Harrison touched on the pertinence of marketing the region as the Hampton Roads brand was unknown. Mr. Harrison noted various discussions with Site Selection consultants and the feedback was that Hampton Roads did not have a negative brand perception; however, it did not have a brand perception whatsoever. Mr. Harrison informed the Board of the current campaign which was "Every Business Needs an Ally", adding this could be customized to accommodate any particular industry. Mr. Harrison displayed a visual representation on the PowerPoint slide which could be modified and sent to C-suite executives for that specific industry. Mr. Harrison mentioned collaborative efforts with magazines, traditionally the Alliance used print ads; however, it had transitioned to using digital advertisements and working with groups such as Site Selection Magazine for beneficial purposes. Mr. Harrison briefly spoke about the Hampton Roads Intelligence Report. Mr. Harrison concluded the PowerPoint presentation and turned it over to Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith welcomed any questions and/or comments the Board might have.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Mr. Smith and Mr. Harrison for being in attendance, adding he felt the presentation expressed a very passionate view of business development for the Hampton Roads area. Mr. McGlennon noted positive forward movement as well as an understanding of the concerns with a committed attitude to follow through.

Ms. Larson stated she did not have any specific questions; however, she expressed her concerns of the Economic Development challenges, the lack of Board members from the local area, and how the area was identified as a whole. Ms. Larson appreciated the efforts, passion, information, and hoped for collaborative efforts to include successful outcomes.

Mr. Smith mentioned he would provide a number of copies of the Hampton Roads Intelligence Report to the Board for insight and feedback purposes. Mr. Smith requested communication if there were ever any concerns and he would address it.

Ms. Sadler inquired as to the lack of local Board member from this area on the Alliance Board.

Mr. Smith replied the Board was voted in back in the November timeframe; however, he reiterated his earlier statement of the desire to add an additional Board member from this local area but did not want to add several members as the Board wanted to avoid a 70-member Board again.

Ms. Larson commented she was unsure of how anything got accomplished with a 70-member Board.

Ms. Sadler stated 12 was a push.

Mr. Smith requested the Board to consider recommendations for the new Board member.

Ms. Sadler thanked Mr. Smith and Mr. Harrison for being present. Ms. Sadler stated she sensed a positive shift regarding Economic Development. Ms. Sadler reiterated Ms. Larson's point of the challenges pertaining to Economic Development. Ms. Sadler recognized Mr. Christopher Johnson, Director of Economic Development, and his exceptional efforts, in addition to the new outlook the Alliance has presented. Ms. Sadler also expressed her concerns of how the region was identified as a whole, adding she felt a more appropriate term would be beneficial. Ms. Sadler expressed her gratitude for the collaborative efforts, adding the development of the new industrial area in the Stonehouse District would provide great opportunities and to provide a visual representation of what Economic Development looks like. Ms. Sadler thanked Mr. Smith and Mr. Harrison for the encouraging presentation.

Mr. Hipple agreed with the concern of how the region is identified as a whole, adding he desired a term which would encompass all the localities. Mr. Hipple asked if the organization targeted individual localities and classified them into specific categories based on various components to target certain individuals.

Mr. Harrison confirmed yes. Mr. Harrison mentioned a Target Industry Analysis for the City of Williamsburg, York County, and James City County was conducted, adding it came to the same conclusion as the IBM study that was also conducted. Mr. Harrison stated the data received from those studies were then incorporated into the Alliance's Strategic Plan. Mr. Harrison noted a variety of databases were utilized to look at location quotients, adding the organization was currently working on the back end to the website to allow local governments to access this information.

Mr. Hipple expressed his concern of how the quality of an organization could be impactful to the community if the standards did not correspond. Mr. Hipple asked if the organization

offered multiple locations to businesses based on the preferred area to relocate.

Mr. Smith replied he was unsure if that had ever been done; however, the target approach was to revisit the prospects which the organization was unable to secure. Mr. Smith anticipated some further connectivity to better understand the locality's objective, adding a monthly forum was held to allow for discussion opportunities.

Mr. Hipple asked if the organization had any discussion on the increase in violence in the Hampton Roads area. Mr. Hipple expressed the concern of it impacting prospects from relocating to this area.

Mr. Smith replied the Alliance stayed connected through Mr. Bob Crum, Executive Director of Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC), as a meeting was held monthly for discussion opportunities; however, as an organization itself there had not been discussions on it. Mr. Smith mentioned it was a very critical issue, amongst other factors such as, affordable housing, education, recycling, etc. which all tie into Economic Development.

Mr. Hipple replied thank you.

Mr. McGlennon expressed the opportunity to identify the community's strengths, adding he felt there were a number of successful Economic Development enterprises in the area such as, Coresix Precision Glass and O-I Glass, which allowed for value and outlets regarding creativity, land availability benefits, and as a locality to benefit from the machinery and tools taxes, resources, etc. Mr. McGlennon stated he looked forward to the collaborative efforts between the County's Economic Development Department and the Alliance to improve growth. Mr. McGlennon noted a consistent trend of Boards not necessarily including representatives from each locality; however, the importance was that the administrative leadership of that organization acknowledged it served a broader community. Mr. McGlennon mentioned a list of Boards as an example. Mr. McGlennon commented there were various factors to consider; however, there may be an opportunity for adjustment.

Mr. Smith recognized Ms. Mary Bunting, City Manager for the City of Hampton, and Board member of the Virginia Resources Authority. Mr. Smith indicated he and Ms. Bunting would host a forum this summer for engagement purposes, adding there was still some uncertainty on how often it would occur; however, he felt it would be beneficial.

## 2. Business investment Grant Program

Mr. McGlennon welcomed Mr. Christopher Johnson, Director of Economic Development, to the podium.

Mr. Johnson addressed the Board to discuss the proposal of a business investment program for consideration as a result of collaborative discussions with various County departments such as Economic Development, Community Development, and County Administration. Mr. Johnson highlighted various components small businesses and prospects tend to face such as: cost of compliance with County Ordinance codes, policies, potential legislative relief, or seeking funding assistance, etc. Mr. Johnson gave an overview of the memorandum included in the Agenda Packet. Mr. Johnson welcomed any questions the Board might have, adding Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Community Development and Planning, and Mr. Jason Purse, Assistant County Administrator, were involved in the internal discussions and were in attendance for any questions as well.

Ms. Larson stated she did not have any questions; however, she wanted to thank Mr. Johnson

as she felt this was extremely important. Ms. Larson remarked she would like to see more money invested into the program and for this to be an ongoing investment as time moved forward if it were to be approved. Ms. Larson mentioned the vacant spaces for potential businesses could be cost prohibitive. Ms. Larson expressed her support for this program, in addition to recognizing the investment businesses make into the community.

Mr. Johnson replied the figures put into the memorandum were simply an option as there was uncertainty on the exact amount which should be invested; however, upon Board discussion and determination the figures could be modified to the desired amount.

Ms. Sadler asked if the amount invested in the potential program could vary annually based on various factors.

Mr. Johnson replied yes; however, currently a two-year budget was in process of adoption, so this proposal was put together based on that budget, but it could certainly be accommodated.

Ms. Sadler thanked Mr. Johnson.

Mr. McGlennon recommended a set of principles to be implemented for operation purposes. Mr. McGlennon mentioned a prior funding program similar to this proposal focused on Community Character Corridors (CCC) which assisted with visual aesthetics of buildings. Mr. McGlennon stated if the discussion was based on County expectations/requirements that may become challenging. Mr. McGlennon suggested criteria to follow to determine eligibility.

Mr. Stevens stated the proposal was to introduce the idea, adding the intent was to remain competitive with surrounding localities as there were localities providing incentives to small businesses for reinvestment purposes. Mr. Stevens mentioned after discussion with staff, it was confirmed the County did not offer any program to assist with the rehabilitation of an existing site, adding in some cases it may be more cost effective to build a new site opposed to developing an existing site particularly if the intent was to change the use. Mr. Stevens confirmed the focus was on the CCCs and visual aesthetics, adding the County required this to an extent whether it was landscaping, sidewalks, façade improvements, etc. Mr. Stevens stated Mr. Johnson would collaborate with his team to produce a program to bring back before the Board for consideration. Mr. Stevens suggested a small amount be incorporated into the budget, so come July 1, 2022, a program would be presented to the Board and funding would be available.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Mr. Stevens.

### 3. Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Budget Business Meeting

A motion to reduce the County's tax rate from \$0.84 to \$0.83 and to ask Mr. Stevens to bring a budget reflecting his recommendations of the least impact for the County to achieve this was made by Sue Sadler, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

Mr. McGlennon welcomed Ms. Sharon Day, Director of Financial and Management Services (FMS) to the podium.

Ms. Day addressed the Board to discuss the Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-2024 budget. Ms. Day informed the Board FY23 was the only year which the funding was appropriated, adding the FY23 Proposed Budget was \$233.4 million, which was a 4% increase from current year's



budget. Ms. Day indicated the budget focused on three areas which included: 1) exceptional service to the community; 2) staff retention and recruitment; and 3) community appearance and capital needs. Ms. Day touched on the personnel portion of the operating budget. Ms. Day stated the County raised the minimum wage to \$13.36 per hour, adding this was done in a two-phased approach. Ms. Day mentioned funding also included \$1,500 and a 5% wage increase that was implemented in April 2022. Ms. Day indicated funding also created eight new full-time positions, four conversions of part-time to full-time positions, and 35 reclassifications of existing positions. Ms. Day moved on to discuss the capital side of the budget. Ms. Day advised the County restored the pay-as-you-go funding to the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) back to pre-pandemic levels, in addition to allocating 5% of the County's annual revenues to the pay-as-you go funding to reduce the overall debt burden. Ms. Day stated \$85 million was devoted to various County facility space needs which included new buildings and/or renovations to existing buildings. Ms. Day spoke about the General Fund indicating the FY23 Proposed Budget \$218.2 million, which was a 7.9% increase over the current year's budget. Ms. Day added FY23 was a reassessment year resulting in an 8.2% overall increase to total assessed value of real property including both residential and commercial properties. Ms. Day noted there were no proposed changes to the real estate tax rate. Ms. Day reported the County provided tax relief in reference to personal property tax by applying an assessment ratio of 75% to NADA values, adding that was a 25% reduction which ultimately saves the County citizens approximately \$9 million. Ms. Day stated the only fee change was to the Medic Transport Recovery Fees, adding this was to align the County's rates with the Medicare/Medicaid reimbursement rates. Ms. Day mentioned six of the eight new full-time positions created were funded through the General Fund, in addition to four conversions from part-time to full-time, and various reclassifications. Ms. Day remarked the estimated costs to provide the same level of services exceeded the revenue projection, adding there were additional requests primarily in personnel totaling \$3.4 million, which the County was not able to accommodate. Ms. Day provided a brief overview and display of the General Fund revenue summary on the PowerPoint slide. Ms. Day highlighted General Fund expenditure summary indicating 47% was allocated to the Williamsburg-James City School Division to support operations, 15% of the budget was allocated to the Fire Department, Police Department, Emergency Operations and Emergency Management, 16% of the budget was allocated to outside agencies which included the Williamsburg Regional Library (WRL), and non-profit organizations the County funds to provide services to County residents, debt service, and programs that are accounted for in other funds such as Housing and Social Services programs. Ms. Day indicated the remaining 22% of the budget was allocated to all other departments. Ms. Day highlighted important upcoming dates on the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Stevens advised that concluded Ms. Day's PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Stevens discussed three handouts which were provided to the Board. Mr. Stevens touched on the first handout which Chairman McGlennon had requested contained updated regional information, adding the handout included the conducted reassessments, current tax rates, and proposed tax changes. Mr. Stevens stated most of the surrounding localities recommended some type of tax rate decrease and the vast majority implemented a tax relief pertaining to personal property tax. Mr. Stevens discussed the bottom portion of the handout which pertained to tax exemptions for senior citizens and the criteria that must be met for eligibility. Mr. Stevens reported over the past five years the County had averaged approximately 500 properties with the total exemption equating to approximately \$474,000 annually. Mr. Stevens addressed a revision on the handout, adding New Kent County had proposed an \$0.11 decrease in revenue-neutral, in addition to a 25% decrease in the assessed value of personal property. Mr. Stevens informed the Board that the second handout was an overview of the \$3.4 million of which could not be funded for informative purposes. Mr. Stevens recognized County departments for their patience and understanding as the County does its best to accommodate requests and needs; however, the extent was based upon what the budget allowed. Mr. Stevens thanked County personnel for their continued efforts and services to the County



citizens. Mr. Stevens provided an overview of the third handout pertaining to the budget reduction consideration for \$0.01 tax rate reduction.

Ms. Sadler requested reiteration on the tax relief for personal property the County had offered.

Mr. Stevens replied the County provided tax relief for personal taxes by applying an assessment ratio of 75% to NADA values, adding that was a 25% reduction which saved County residents approximately \$9 million, Mr. Stevens indicated the statement would be sent out in May and would be due in June. Mr. Stevens expressed he felt that was a significant tax relief.

Ms. Sadler expressed the pertinence of the increased wages for County personnel. Ms. Sadler requested to make the motion to reduce the County's tax rate from \$0.84 to \$0.83 and asked Mr. Stevens to bring a budget reflecting his recommendations of the least impact for the County to achieve this.

Mr. Icenhour asked where the funds would come from in the budget to support the business investment proposal.

Mr. Stevens replied there was \$100,000 in the Capital Building Maintenance Miscellaneous category which was a placeholder as there were some items while at the end of their life cycle; however, were still currently functioning. Mr. Stevens recommended using some of those funds to support the business investment proposal if desired.

Mr. Icenhour asked how the figures were determined for the business investment proposal.

Mr. Stevens replied he and Mr. Johnson felt that was a likely figure; however, it could vary. Mr. Stevens noted if there were six or seven businesses; then the remaining two would potentially rollover to the next year or come before the Board to review the projects. Mr. Stevens explained the funds were simply to assist with the visual aesthetic piece as a goodwill as other localities provide incentives and benefit from that. Mr. Stevens advised he was often asked why the County did not offer any sort of aid to small businesses.

Mr. Icenhour stated he was in support of funding the proposal.

Mr. Hipple inquired about the reasoning for the \$0.11 decrease.

Mr. McGlennon replied the assessment showed a 24% increase, adding that was significant.

Ms. Sadler asked if that was their average increase.

Mr. McGlennon confirmed yes.

Ms. Sadler asked what the County's average was.

Mr. McGlennon replied 8.2%

Mr. Stevens pointed out while most localities were reducing the tax rate, their additional tax increase was significantly greater than the County's.

Mr. Hipple agreed and addressed that for public notification purposes. Mr. Hipple stated he supported the \$0.01 decrease in the tax rate.

Ms. Larson asked Ms. Day if the reimbursement the County received from the state for

Constitutional Officers was a 100%.

Ms. Day replied no, adding it varied depending on the office. Ms. Day stated for instance, in the Treasurer and Commissioner of the Revenue Offices the County received about a 50% reimbursement on the positions which were state funded and were reimbursed at the state salary amount. Ms. Day mentioned there were several positions within the Constitutional Officers which the state does not support and were 100% locally funded. Ms. Day added those positions were above the state's salary amount, so any difference the County was incurring was 100% of the cost.

Ms. Larson asked about the Sheriff's Office.

Ms. Day remarked it was the same scenario; however, the County was reimbursed 100% for the state funded positions and at the state salary amount. Ms. Day stated some positions were 100% locally funded and the Deputies made more than the state salary amount.

Ms. Larson inquired on future tax increases and projections for evaluation purposes.

Ms. Sadler added the next reassessments may also play a vital role in the evaluation process.

Ms. Day replied there was an abundance of speculation on this subject. Ms. Day mentioned several of the jurisdictions receiving significant increases assess annually and continue to have higher percentages than the County. Ms. Day indicated that the County reassessed every two years, adding there was a lot of speculation that this unrealized gain would be much smaller in the next reassessment period which would impact the generated revenue in real estate taxes. Ms. Day noted uncertainty regarding personal property tax and whether the values would decrease. Ms. Day further noted the inflation concerns and the impact to the CIPs for both the County and the School Division. Ms. Day advised FMS offered a 5-year summary in the budget for what is known currently; however, those CIP decisions will impact those figures and the uncertainty of what may happen in the housing market was a significant factor.

Ms. Larson replied right.

Mr. Stevens added after review of assessed values across the peninsula, he felt that the County real property values in terms of the assessments were undervalued. Mr. Stevens remarked most of the residents he had heard concerns from were addressing the tax increase, not the value increase. Mr. Stevens stated he spoke with the Real Estate Department and there were only three County residents which appealed the decision of the reassessment value to the Board of Equalization. Mr. Stevens mentioned various discussions with Ms. Day to provide staff with updated data and resources to help bring the County closer to market level values. Mr. Stevens noted if the housing market simply stabilized within the next two-year period and not take a sharp correction that the County may generate enough revenue to continue forward in the next two-year reassessment; however, there was still uncertainty regarding the economy. Mr. Stevens expressed he felt the County real property values were at a safe level if there was a sharp correction in the housing market.

Ms. Larson replied thank you.

Mr. McGlennon explained the calculation for the 75% NADA assessment ratio which equates to a \$130 savings. Mr. McGlennon moved on to discuss the savings in terms of the \$0.01 decrease in the tax rate which equates to \$30 annually. Mr. McGlennon expressed his concern of the tax rate relief due to the uncertainty of potential impacts associated with the decision.

Ms. Larson requested to ask Ms. Day two follow-up questions.

Mr. McGlennon replied yes.

Ms. Larson asked if the County acted too abruptly on the tax relief in relation to the personal property tax.

Ms. Day replied that may be a better question for Mr. Stevens; however, from a financial standpoint based on her discussions with Mr. Richard Bradshaw, Commissioner of the Revenue, who requested the adjustment to ensure it would be effective on the June statement. Ms. Day added Mr. Bradshaw had sufficient preliminary information from NADA to validate his decision.

Ms. Larson asked what measures the County would take if the tax rate decreased \$0.01 and then the possibility of the grocery tax being eliminated.

Ms. Day replied if the grocery tax were to be eliminated the direct loss of revenue to the County not including the School Division would be approximately \$2 million, adding that was a state estimate; however, that figure seemed rational based on information provided from the Commissioner of the Revenue Office. Ms. Day noted the potential of revisiting budget reductions or if a different approach was desired. Ms. Day further noted the long-term impact to the budget, unless there was further action from the General Assembly. Ms. Day mentioned the speculation was the first year would not be impactful; however, as time moved forward there was uncertainty in the effect it would have on the County, the possibility of additional tax relief in the future, and the uncertainty of the impact to the School Division as there was a possibility the School Division would seek assistance from the County to make up that difference.

Ms. Larson replied thank you.

#### **F. BOARD CONSIDERATION(S)**

None.

#### **G. BOARD REQUESTS AND DIRECTIVES**

Mr. Icenhour requested verbiage revision in the 2045 Comprehensive Plan pertaining to Land Use in relation to the Eastern State terminology specifically referring to the Eastern State - New Town language. Mr. Icenhour requested the Planning Department, revise the language to Eastern State Parcel C.

Ms. Sadler requested further discussion at a future meeting.

Mr. Stevens replied he would ensure the request was executed. Mr. Stevens stated the Board could choose to vote or not vote.

Mr. Hipple expressed his concern with a letter received from the Firefighter Union and some of the content in the letter. Mr. Hipple remarked in the letter from the Firefighter Union it requested donations, adding he wanted the public to be aware if donations were made to the Firefighter Union, the donations would not go to the local firefighters in the field. Mr. Hipple stated in the upper end of the County, there was a Volunteer Fire Department, which sent out letters for donation purposes, adding his concern was that citizens may get confused as to where their donations may be going.

Ms. Sadler asked if Mr. Hipple knew when the County Volunteer Fire Department would be sending its letter out.

Mr. Hipple replied he was unsure.

Ms. Sadler asked if the donations made to the County Volunteer Fire Department went directly to the volunteer firefighters.

Mr. Hipple confirmed yes.

Ms. Sadler inquired as to where the donations went in reference to the Firefighter Union.

Mr. Hipple replied he was uncertain of that; however, the donations made to the County Volunteer Fire Department went to supplies, equipment, etc.

Ms. Larson mentioned she attended the Greater Williamsburg Chamber of Commerce Post-Legislative forum last week with Chairman McGlennon and Mr. Stevens indicating it was very informative. Ms. Larson stated she attended the eXp Realty grand opening on Friday evening. Ms. Larson added she and Mr. Stevens attended the Habitat for Humanity ReStore business after hours last week. Ms. Larson stated she attended a Jamestown Rediscovery tour with Mr. McGlennon expressing it was very informative and fascinating. Ms. Larson stated there were some concerns with potential climate change and flooding at Jamestown Settlement, adding Mr. Stevens was working to address these concerns. Ms. Larson thanked the Board for its support due to her absence last meeting.

Mr. Hipple inquired if there was an agreement with Dominion Energy in reference to protecting the coast and funding some of those efforts.

Ms. Larson replied she was unsure; however, she would try and find out. Ms. Larson commented the corrections would be very costly.

Mr. Hipple recalled in the negotiating process with Dominion Energy that was one of the criteria in the agreement.

Mr. McGlennon stated he believed there were funds to promote tourism sites; however, he was unsure of the funding to that aspect.

Mr. Hipple replied he thought it was shoreline protection, adding he felt that should be checked into to validate.

Mr. Stevens confirmed he would investigate.

Ms. Sadler stated the following meetings were not held for the Virginia Peninsula Regional Jail Board and the Agricultural and Forestal District (AFD) Advisory Committee. Ms. Sadler mentioned she attended an Economic Development Authority (EDA) meeting, adding the Board approved a Community Development Block Grant for \$700,000 in March. Ms. Sadler remarked the grant program went live Friday, April 22, adding funding requests of over \$250,000 had been received.

Mr. McGlennon stated on Saturday, April 23, he attended an Earth/Arbor Day Tree Planting Ceremony at Freedom Park. Mr. McGlennon recognized the combined efforts of the Master Gardeners of James City County, Tree Stewards, and the James City Clean County Commission, which resulted in the planting of two American Chestnut trees. Mr. McGlennon remarked it was a nicely presented and a well-attended event.

Mr. McGlennon stated the Board was slated for a Closed Session; however, after consulting with the Board members it was determined the actions would take place in an Open Session pertaining to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission.

#### **H. REPORTS OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

Mr. Stevens provided a brief overview of the eligibility criteria for the COVID-19 Small Business Relief Program, adding information was available on the County's website and/or call 757-253-6607. Mr. Stevens anticipated all funds to be allocated in effort to support the County's small businesses. Mr. Stevens commended staff for seeking the funds and initiating the program. Mr. Stevens indicated the second topic of discussion he would turn over to Mr. Kinsman for the introduction.

Mr. Kinsman introduced Mr. Josh Everard, Assistant County Attorney, in the audience. Mr. Kinsman informed the Board Mr. Everard started last Monday, April 18. Mr. Kinsman briefly spoke about Mr. Everard's qualifications.

The Board welcomed Mr. Everard.

#### **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
2. Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission Appointments

A motion to Appoint Mr. Ivan Tabb to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission for a term to expire April 12, 2026, was made by Sue Sadler, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

A motion to Appoint Ms. Linda Knight to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission for a term to expire April 12, 2026, was made by Sue Sadler, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

A motion to Appoint Mr. Scott VanVorhees to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission for a term to expire April 12, 2026, was made by Sue Sadler, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

A motion to Appoint Mr. Larry Walk, Sr. to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission for a term to expire April 12, 2026, was made by Sue Sadler, 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 pm on May 10, 2022 for the Regular Meeting

A motion to Adjourn was made by Michael Hipple, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

At approximately 3:18 p.m., Mr. McGlennon adjourned the Board of Supervisors.

  
Deputy Clerk