

**MINUTES**  
**JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**BUSINESS MEETING**  
**County Government Center Board Room**  
**101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185**  
**May 24, 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

Mr. McGlennon requested a motion to Amend the Agenda to add a Closed Session item for the purpose of a discussion of property disposition.

A motion to Amend the Agenda 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

**C. PRESENTATION**

None.

**D. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Mr. McGlennon asked if any Board member wished to pull any items from the Consent Calendar or to make a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

1. Appropriation - \$112,800 - COVID-19 Cost Recovery

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

2. Contract Award - \$370,226 - Warhill Sports Complex Basketball Court Replacement

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

3. Heritage Humane Society Contract for Animal Shelter Management Services

**ADOPTED**

**JUN 28 2022**

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

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

4. Minutes Adoption

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr, 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:

-April 12, 2022, Regular Meeting  
-April 26, 2022, Business Meeting

5. Public Housing Agency Plan

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

**E. BOARD DISCUSSIONS**

Mr. McGlennon noted a few items for discussion and the Planning Commission was in attendance to address those items. Mr. McGlennon welcomed Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Community Development and Planning, to the podium.

1. Joint Work Session with the Planning Commission: Planning Division Work Program

Mr. Holt called the roll to convene the Planning Commission.

**ROLL CALL**

**Planning Commissioners Present:**

Stephen Rodgers  
Barbara Null  
Rob Rose  
Frank Polster  
Jack Haldeman  
Rich Krapf  
Tim O'Connor

Mr. Holt indicated a physical quorum present, adding he would turn it over to Mr. Tim O'Connor, Chairman of the Planning Commission.

Mr. O'Connor thanked the Board for the opportunity to be in attendance and thanked the Planning staff for all its efforts in relation to the Comprehensive Plan update. Mr. O'Connor stated the Work Session today would cover the Planning Division Work Program for Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 and discuss anticipated program items for future years. Mr. O'Connor

welcomed any questions the Board might have during the discussions. Mr. O'Connor advised Mr. Haldeman would begin the discussion.

Mr. Haldeman addressed the Board to discuss Ordinance amendments for FY23. Mr. Haldeman displayed the Ordinance amendments on the PowerPoint presentation which included the following: 1) Scenic Roadway Protection; 2) Lot sizes in the A-1/R-8 Zoning Districts; 3) Residential Density Calculation; 4) Community Recreation Facilities; and 5) Use List of the General Business District, B-1. Mr. Haldeman stated the Policy Committee reviewed the Ordinance process and the public input approach, adding the anticipated process would include staff presenting its findings to the Policy Committee for discussion and guidance. Mr. Haldeman indicated up to three Policy Committee meetings would be scheduled for each item. Mr. Haldeman noted this process would continue through FY23 to include periodic discussions with the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Haldeman further noted the anticipated timeframe for Item No. 1 Scenic Roadway Protection Ordinance amendment would begin immediately with the Board's approval, adding a Policy Committee meeting would be held in August and a meeting with the Board of Supervisors in September. Mr. Haldeman moved on to discuss the anticipated timeframe for Item No. 2 Lot sizes in the A-1/R-8 Zoning Districts which included a Policy Committee review in August, adding the remaining three Ordinance amendment items would be reviewed by the Policy Committee in the ensuing months. Mr. Haldeman remarked the Committee welcomed any feedback from the Board on these items. Mr. Haldeman concluded the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Holt addressed the Board to discuss Item No. 2 Lot sizes in the A-1/R-8 Zoning Districts noting in the Zoning Ordinance there was only one minimum lot size set for the R-8 District while the A-1 District had six different minimum lot standards depending on the land use and other various factors. Mr. Holt stated there were minimum lot standards for single-family dwellings, multifamily dwellings, non-residential uses, family subdivisions, cluster housing, in addition to a grandfathering provision which allowed a subdivision of six acres or less for parcels in existence prior to 1989. Mr. Holt indicated staff would update minimum lot sizes for residential use types but keep the minimum lot standards the same for non-residential uses and family subdivisions unless the Board had a different approach. Mr. Holt mentioned the Ordinance amendment would be reviewed by the Policy Committee, a public hearing with the Planning Commission, and then it would come before the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Holt expressed he felt there was adequate guidance from the Board and the adopted Initiating Resolution to proceed specifically to the provision of eliminating central well system requirements for subdivisions with the new minimum lot size of 20 acres. Mr. Holt indicated the resolution grandfathers lots of 25 acres or less and could yield up to eight lots with the old lot size standard of three acres. Mr. Holt mentioned staff proposed to develop an Ordinance that would ultimately eliminate the central well requirement and would collaborate with James City Service Authority (JCSA) for logistic purposes.

Ms. Sadler asked if the grandfathering of the 25 acres or less would remain one to three acres.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes.

Mr. Holt turned the meeting over to Mr. O'Connor.

Mr. O'Connor addressed the Board noting in the adopted 2045 Comprehensive Plan, the Implementation Chapter had categories of Goals, Strategies, and Actions (GSAs) that were Regulatory and Guidelines Updates. Mr. O'Connor added the list could be utilized for updating portions of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances in future fiscal years. Mr. O'Connor adverted to the memorandum in the Board's Agenda Packet in which staff had identified certain GSAs from the list to update. Mr. O'Connor briefly spoke about other work program items which included routine duties such as administrative and legislative plan review. Mr. O'Connor added it was a renewal year for the Agricultural and Forestal Districts (AFDs),

so the Planning Division and Commission would review the districts this summer in preparation for the Board's consideration in late summer/early fall timeframe. Mr. O'Connor stated staff would continue to work on the Comprehensive Plan "leave-behind model" tools to help assess future fiscal transportation and land use impacts. Mr. O'Connor concluded the presentation and welcomed any questions the Board might have.

Mr. McGlennon asked if any of the Board members had any questions and/or comments for the Planning Commission.

Mr. Icenhour inquired on the process and timeframe specifically for Item Nos. 1 and 2.

Mr. Holt replied the timeline was based upon the Policy Committee meeting which would be held in August and as a periodic check-in could provide the findings to the Board in September; however, the process in place was to allow up to three Policy Committee meetings based on outstanding questions the Committee had prior to recommending approval of the Ordinance to the Planning Commission. Mr. Holt did not want to commit to a deadline until further information was available. Mr. Holt anticipated Item No. 2 would come before the Board sooner than Item No. 1.

Mr. Icenhour thanked Mr. Holt.

Ms. Larson asked if there was a public viewing opportunity for the Policy Committee meeting. Mr. Holt replied the Policy Committee was a working group and not typically televised; however, the meetings were publicized and the public had the opportunity to attend. Mr. Holt mentioned once the Policy Committee recommended approval to the Planning Commission a public hearing would be organized and at that point it would then be televised, and citizens would have an opportunity to speak if desired.

Ms. Sadler remarked with the increased interest in preserving the rural lands she recommended implementing alternatives to working with larger landowners. Ms. Sadler stated she knew of other jurisdictions that offered other options to allow the land to remain viable. Ms. Sadler expressed her interest in seeking other opportunities.

Mr. Holt mentioned staff developed a decision tree which would be utilized to assist landowners based on the objective, timeline preservation, etc. that would allow for alternative options to accommodate the landowner's intent with the tools available. Mr. Holt stated the decision tree would be showcased with the Board as the next segment.

Ms. Sadler asked if there were other options other than what was already in place.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes, adding there were other tools with regard to the Comprehensive Plan to aid in implementing desired results which he would address with the Board in the next segment of the Business meeting.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the Planning Commission had a list of Ordinance amendments that may need to be prioritized and/or considered.

Mr. McGlennon remarked the Planning Commission reviewed these circumstances daily and if there were any instances that may require consideration.

Mr. O'Connor stated he would ask Mr. Haldeman to weigh in on the subject as he was not present for the last Policy Committee meeting; however, he felt all the items which had Initiating Resolutions at this time were pertinent, in addition to the central well development, which was relevant to various cases recently. Mr. O'Connor expressed the challenges of how the County defined rural lands and whether it was located inside the Primary Service Area

(PSA) or outside of the PSA. Mr. O'Connor invited Mr. Krapf and Mr. Polster to comment on the subject if they desired.

Mr. Haldeman mentioned at the last Policy Committee meeting the Committee suggested consideration of Design Guidelines for the B-1, General Business District. Mr. Haldeman anticipated hearing several suggestions from the Committee subject to the Board's approval.

Mr. Polster expressed the concerns with potential impacts to the landowners. Mr. Polster reported approximately 81 properties out of the 125 properties which would be reviewed were in the AFDs. Mr. Polster remarked to Ms. Sadler's point what were the alternative options, communication to those landowners, etc. Mr. Polster noted Ms. Tammy Rosario, Assistant Director of Community Development, would be making a presentation in which he believed one of her points to be made was to determine a location in the County and the specific preservations. Mr. Polster questioned alternative tools that would be available to reimburse landowners for the value of their property, but still retain it. Mr. Polster commented on the timeframe of these initiatives creating a significant amount of Board consideration on these matters.

Mr. McGlennon offered the opportunity to allow any additional members of the Planning Commission who would like to speak to do so. Mr. McGlennon remarked the Board depended on the Planning Commission's guidance for various circumstances.

Mr. O'Connor asked if there were any further questions.

Mr. Hipple expressed the beneficial aspect of alternative programs to allow preservation of land, adding he thanked the Planning Commission for its efforts.

Mr. O'Connor expressed he felt the Planning Commission did a good job of preserving the character in the various mixed-use districts based on several components. Mr. O'Connor believed there was a significant amount of protection for both the landowners and the community.

Mr. Hipple commented once land was sold, it could not be reclaimed. Mr. Hipple added it was critical to utilize the land in the most beneficial way.

Mr. McGlennon asked Mr. O'Connor if he wanted to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. O'Connor confirmed yes; however, the Commission intended on staying in attendance for Ms. Rosario's presentation. Mr. O'Connor requested a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Krapf made a motion to adjourn.

At approximately 1:27 p.m., the Planning Commission adjourned on a unanimous voice vote.

## 2. Overview of Open Space Preservation Programs and Update on the Natural and Cultural Assets Plan Effort

Ms. Rosario addressed the Board to provide a brief introduction on the overview of the presentation. Ms. Rosario mentioned the County had a long history of public support for conservation and open space preservation. Ms. Rosario highlighted various tools utilized to conserve the County's natural and cultural resources on the PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Rosario added the tools were used to help support a wide range of circumstances for both the

landowner and County. Ms. Rosario discussed and displayed the County's main tools used which included the following: 1) Use Value Taxation and AFDs; 2) County Policies and Ordinances; 3) Greenspace Program; and 4) Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) Program on the PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Rosario mentioned staff developed a decision tree displayed on the PowerPoint slide to assist landowners in selecting the right tool for the property's future. Ms. Rosario spoke about the options such as: taxing incentives which included temporary benefits to both the landowner and the County, in addition to funding opportunities through the Greenspace Program and/or PDR Program, which were more permanent solutions. Ms. Rosario stated Tool No. 1 Use Value Taxations and AFDs were best for temporary protection and deferring development, in addition, it encouraged farming and forestry uses. Ms. Rosario discussed the eligibility criteria for this program was 5 acres or more for agriculture/horticulture land and with forestry, a minimum of 20 acres or more was required. Ms. Rosario explained this program was funded through reduced tax assessments and taxes. Ms. Rosario indicated this program was essential for continuation of the PDR Program.

Ms. Larson asked about the duration of reduced taxes.

Ms. Rosario replied it was for the term of the AFD, adding for most areas in the County it was a four-year term. Ms. Rosario remarked some jurisdictions offered the reduced taxes for up to 10 years. Ms. Rosario continued the PowerPoint presentation touching on the Greenspace Program in more detail noting it was best for more strategic situations needing flexibility in size, location, ownership, etc. Ms. Rosario mentioned the funding opportunities such as real estate taxes, bonds, competitive state matching grants, donations, sales, and partnerships. Ms. Rosario indicated this program required ongoing stewardship and required active review of building permits, conceptual plans, etc. which required the County to review the deeds of easement and other obligations to ensure the grant terms were adhered to, in addition to a regular monitoring process. Ms. Rosario spoke about the PDR Program in more depth noting the program was best for permanent protection which the landowner desired to retain ownership. Ms. Rosario mentioned the funding opportunities which included real estate taxes, bonds, Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (VDACS) matching reimbursement grants, and donations. Ms. Rosario stated this program also required the ongoing stewardship. Ms. Rosario noted both the Greenspace and PDR Programs were initiated through the Virginia Open-Space Land Act, adding this allowed the County to acquire property or easements for various purposes; however, any acquisition must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Rosario explained should there be an open application period for these programs it would require review of the PDR Ordinance to ensure it was up-to-date and reflected best practices, in addition to reappointments for the PDR Committee. Ms. Rosario touched on recent County efforts which included conducting upgrades to the PermitLink system for greater involvement in new development and active communication with landowners. Ms. Rosario discussed updates on the Natural and Cultural Assets Plan which included the completion of the natural and cultural assets maps which identify habitat cores, agricultural and forestal lands, lands that contribute to water quality, etc. Ms. Rosario noted a public survey was conducted in February with implementation of citizen feedback on the maps. Ms. Rosario mentioned the next step was to map the risk factors in relation to the natural assets and develop strategies to mitigate risk factors. Ms. Rosario informed the Board the maps would be presented to the public at a Community Open House on June 29, 2022, from 4-7 p.m. at the James City County Recreation Center, adding there would also be online opportunities to view information and share ideas. Ms. Rosario concluded the presentation and welcomed any questions the Board might have.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Ms. Rosario for the presentation, adding for citizens interested in further information on the subject to refer to the memorandum in the Agenda Packet.

Mr. Icenhour asked if there were any properties outside of the AFDs which could qualify for

the Use Value Taxation.

Ms. Rosario replied she believed that there were lands which could qualify outside of the AFDs for agricultural and horticulture use; however, in order to qualify for forestry, the property must be in an AFD.

Mr. Icenhour thanked Ms. Rosario for the clarification.

Mr. Hipple mentioned the verbiage “as staff time permits” which was in the PowerPoint presentation several times. Mr. Hipple expressed his concern of the County being understaffed and the heavy workload on current staff. Mr. Hipple mentioned a prior Board discussion to potentially initiate a new position in the future to address these specific concerns, adding he felt it was pertinent and recommended Board consideration on the matter. Mr. Hipple recommended communication with larger landowners to provide information on County offered programs to aid with relief.

Ms. Rosario stated the County did fund the position to oversee the Open Space programs, and which she had taken the role. Ms. Rosario mentioned communication opportunities to landowners now that the funding of these programs was at a sufficient level. Ms. Rosario noted considerations on potentially extending AFDs for longer terms, in addition to providing landowners information on Open Space Preservation programs. Ms. Rosario indicated she received a number of calls for interest in these programs, adding she felt more public outreach would be beneficial.

Ms. Larson inquired if there were landowners who were interested in longer terms for the AFDs.

Ms. Rosario replied she felt the landowners who reached out to her were more interested in potential acquisition of easement concerns. Ms. Rosario stated she believed based on the outcome of the survey that landowners did not desire extending the term, but to remain the current term length.

Ms. Larson expressed the challenges in protecting rural lands or lands which were designated for other uses. Ms. Larson stated it was about balance and other factors; however, she felt the public outreach was making a positive impact. Ms. Larson appreciated the efforts on this matter.

Ms. Sadler thanked Ms. Rosario for the presentation. Ms. Sadler suggested being open-minded on alternative programs. Ms. Sadler agreed to Ms. Larson’s point that it was about balance. Ms. Sadler recommended the continued public outreach and publication to eliminate confusion and misunderstandings.

Mr. McGlennon inquired if there were considerations of potentially combining both programs together for simplicity purposes.

Ms. Rosario replied in some respects it may be more beneficial to streamline for management purposes or to focus on one program versus the other.

Mr. McGlennon stated he was curious as to whether there was a beneficial aspect of combining the programs. Mr. McGlennon inquired about the challenges and length of the AFD terms.

Ms. Rosario replied she was unsure; however, she deferred the question to Mr. Holt.

Mr. Holt stated staff would come back before the Board in September for the AFD renewals

in which the survey results would be included for the Board's review; however, he felt it was the uncertainty concern for most.

Mr. McGlennon remarked from what he understood there were some funding opportunities for addressing water quality issues which may correlate with open space and land preservation. Mr. McGlennon inquired if staff considered looking into pursuing these grants or utilize a consultant to assist with identifying potential funding sources.

Ms. Rosario replied she found that those specific grants were complex and consumed a lot of staff time to ensure preliminary work was completed. Ms. Rosario commented there were resources in the budget to allow for grant application assistance.

Mr. McGlennon inquired if staff had considered thoughts on reforestation. Mr. McGlennon added there were some beneficial opportunities to help reduce erosion, lower temperatures to some degree, and other factors. Mr. McGlennon remarked he believed that there were some funding opportunities there.

Ms. Rosario replied not to date; however, the ideas presented would be documented and utilized through the mapping efforts and strategies to determine which items were most feasible. Ms. Rosario explained landowners could benefit from reforestation as it could create additional values to the property. Ms. Rosario commented the Natural and Cultural Assets Plan would allow further guidance to landowners and the opportunities available.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Ms. Rosario.

Mr. Hipple reiterated the understaffed concern.

Mr. McGlennon replied a potential internship would help alleviate some of those concerns and for future recruitment opportunities.

Ms. Larson stated she was going to send Ms. Rosario an email as she was interested in gathering additional information about reforestation.

Mr. McGlennon stated there were several local organizations such as the Master Gardeners, Master Naturalists, and Tree Stewards who would be resourceful.

Ms. Rosario mentioned an instance a couple of years ago that the Board of Supervisors acted on to reforest a portion of the land and to allow fencing to protect the reforestation. Ms. Rosario remarked the Department of Forestry could provide advice and additional guidance to landowners as well.

### 3. Building Consolidation Study

Mr. Jason Purse, Assistant County Administrator, addressed the Board providing a brief introduction. Mr. Purse touched on the conducted Space Needs Study which determined inadequate personnel space which led to the next phase of the project, the County Facilities Master Plan. Mr. Purse noted the County Facilities Master Plan allowed for review to determine whether to buildout or to build new facilities. Mr. Purse mentioned the General Services Building as an instance of inability to buildout, adding the Master Plan assisted with that determination. Mr. Purse stated that this presentation was the culmination of both studies. Mr. Purse informed the Board that GuernseyTingle would be presenting the PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Purse added it was the same information which was presented at the Board of Supervisors Retreat; however, this was the final version. Mr. Purse remarked this was to



allow further opportunity for consideration.

Mr. McGlennon welcomed Mr. Tingle.

Mr. Tom Tingle, President of GuemseyTingle, addressed the Board to discuss the County Facility Consolidation Impact Analysis. Mr. Tingle noted the focus was on two scenarios. The first scenario was to remain in existing facilities and expand to accommodate current space deficiencies. Mr. Tingle stated the second scenario was to consolidate the facilities to one location, preferably an accessible location for citizens and businesses. Mr. Tingle remarked that would then allow the sale of those buildings if desired, which would create additional income for the County. Mr. Tingle indicated the study included capital costs for renovations, expansions, new construction, in addition to operational costs. Mr. Tingle recognized collaborative efforts with RKG Associates who conducted the modeling scenarios and the fiscal impact study. Mr. Tingle commented he would introduce the President of RKG Associates momentarily. Mr. Tingle acknowledged RJS & Associates Inc. would assist with market evaluations of the County's real estate assets that could be vacated and sold if desired. Mr. Tingle recognized Mr. Bob Singley, President of RJS & Associates Inc. in attendance. Mr. Tingle mentioned Clark Nexsen who assisted with model energy usage and operational usage for a potential consolidated facility. Mr. Tingle also recognized County staff, Ms. Grace Boone, Director of General Services, and Mr. Shawn Gordon, Capital Project Management Engineer, for their efforts in gathering an abundance of information on operational costs, energy costs, maintenance reserve forecasts, etc. Mr. Tingle turned the presentation over to Mr. Kyle Talente, President of RKG Associates to discuss the findings.

Mr. Talente addressed the Board to reiterate the concern of County space deficiency for the needs today, much less for the next 40 years based on the projection of growth in the community. Mr. Talente highlighted the facilities to be considered for the consolidation effort on the PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Talente briefly reiterated the capital costs and operational costs and the data collected from County personnel was to provide a more precise evaluation and analysis for the community. Mr. Talente remarked additional considerations were taken into account such as travel time/mileage, staff time, etc. to provide a comprehensive look at the difference in both scenarios. Mr. Talente touched on the asset valuation for a few of the County-owned buildings to determine property uses and market value to allow for cash infusion to reduce costs of construction and considerations of economic and fiscal impacts. Mr. Talente displayed the Existing Facilities on the PowerPoint slide which consisted of the needed future square footage of each building and whether it could be renovated, or additional buildout was needed for the existing facility and/or whether the property could be sold. Mr. Talente moved on to discuss the Consolidation Scenario displayed on the PowerPoint slide. Mr. Talente indicated this scenario consisted of one facility, adding the footprint with regard to the future square footage was reduced due to the ability to create efficiency with the shared space. Mr. Talente explained by co-locating the facilities the number of data storage rooms and conference rooms could be reduced as it was not pertinent to have for each specific department as those rooms were not utilized full-time resulting in space savings. Mr. Talente highlighted the County-owned facilities which could be sold if desired. Mr. Talente touched on the potential process moving forward once a determination was made. Mr. Talente mentioned the renovation and new construction would start in 2024 and the work would take approximately two years to complete. Mr. Talente indicated in 2027 the facilities not utilized would be available for potential sale as the construction and relocation would be completed. Mr. Talente expressed the pertinence of the timeline as it was based on a longitudinal period which factored in time value of monies to provide a clear comparison of value. Mr. Talente added the County Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) had to be factored in as well, adding based on the decision made on this matter would dictate whether those investments for the next five years were made or not. Mr. Talente stated cost factors were held in 2022 dollars for comparison purposes. Mr. Talente explained another part of the analysis was looking at land use efficiency for the consolidated facility which would include a structured parking area for

50% of the parking. Mr. Talente remarked the cost of a structured parking space was substantially greater than the cost of a surface lot space which did increase the cost of construction; however, there were various benefits to a structured parking space. Mr. Talente indicated the design of the facility would ensure integrity of use and access as requested by County Department heads, in addition to retaining the existing level of services. Mr. Talente moved on to discuss energy efficiency and the findings of the analysis reported a 20% improvement in utility costs in a new facility over current operations. Mr. Talente commented renovations to existing facilities would improve efficiency; however, not to the extent of the new construction. Mr. Talente stated water usage would decrease substantially by approximately 70%-80% due to new standards with regards to a new facility. Mr. Talente spoke about the reduction in vehicle usage for a consolidated facility would reduce vehicle miles traveled by approximately 15%, adding this was not part of the analysis; however, it was useful information to consider. Mr. Talente displayed and discussed the financial costs for both scenarios on the PowerPoint slide. Mr. Talente stated for the existing facilities scenario the cost was approximately \$65 million, adding the operational costs would increase after expansion. Mr. Talente reported the cost for the consolidation scenario was approximately \$99 million, adding there was a cost differential based on rehabilitation costs per square foot as opposed to building new per square foot. Mr. Talente mentioned the sale of the County-owned facilities would help alleviate some of those costs and would create additional annual net fiscal benefits. Mr. Talente added the operational costs for the consolidated scenario would remain close to the current operational costs due to the efficiencies of the new construction. Mr. Talente highlighted the non-fiscal benefits of the consolidation scenario which included approximately \$5 million in locally captured retail sales and an estimated 800-1,000 office jobs would be created if County-owned facilities were sold to the private sector. Mr. Talente reiterated the benefits to a consolidated facility scenario. Mr. Talente concluded the PowerPoint presentation and welcomed any questions the Board might have.

Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Talente if he could go back to the scenario comparison slide. Mr. Icenhour inquired if the annual existing operational costs and annual expanded operational costs were annual figures for a 30-year projection and adjusted for inflation costs in 2022 dollars.

Mr. Talente confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the reversion value was for the County facilities sold.

Mr. Talente replied correct.

Mr. Icenhour inquired on the projections for the annual net fiscal benefits.

Mr. Talente stated the projections included three properties: Mounts Bay Road Government Complex, Human Services Office, and Ironbound Village Office using the County's fiscal impact model and plugged-in values specific to this area. Mr. Talente explained there were other various factors which were considered in order to create the fiscal impact analysis such as the values of homes built in the area and the average student generational rate. Mr. Talente reported in the community there was a slightly lower generation rate than the County average, in addition to a higher per unit value rate which did impact the calculations. Mr. Talente reiterated the objective was to provide a precise evaluation and analysis for this specific community.

Mr. Icenhour replied thank you.

Mr. Hipple commented based on the data regardless of which scenario was chosen the costs were relatively close. Mr. Hipple mentioned the convenience factor of a consolidated facility, in addition to reducing the travel time and mileage.

Mr. Talente replied there were calculations conducted on travel time/mileage pertaining to County vehicles as it was a common occurrence to have to drive to another location for a meeting or to meet an individual in a different department.

Mr. Hipple remarked on the engagement benefits of being in a consolidated facility.

Mr. Talente agreed.

Mr. Hipple stated from a citizen's standpoint the consolidated facility would be more convenient and would eliminate traveling to multiple destinations.

Mr. Talente agreed.

Ms. Larson stated she looked forward to future discussions on this matter.

Mr. McGlennon expressed there were some beneficial factors to a consolidated facility; however, there would be some facilities which would remain dispersed. Mr. McGlennon questioned if the consolidated facility would accommodate the space needs for the next 50 years based on community growth and increased services.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) School Administration was included in the potential centralized location.

Mr. Talente confirmed yes.

Ms. Larson remarked it made sense; however, she was curious as to how the WJCC School System felt about the potential relocation.

Mr. Stevens expressed he believed the WJCC School System would support the relocation if it was an accessible location. Mr. Stevens added the demand for a School Administration building was in its 5-10-year CIP.

Mr. Hipple inquired if the Board should provide direction on this matter now.

Mr. McGlennon expressed he felt there should be further discussion prior to making a definitive decision as there were various factors to consider. Mr. McGlennon recommended public outreach for feedback purposes.

Mr. Hipple remarked he felt if a decision was made now, it would allow direction for staff. Mr. Hipple added staff could assist with the additional details.

Mr. Stevens stated the decision was up to the Board, adding the decision did not have to be made immediately; however, considerations should be made within a reasonable timeframe. Mr. Stevens explained significant delay could create various impacts such as cost savings. Mr. Stevens added there was approximately \$600,000 in maintenance costs which were deferred in the budget due to the uncertainty of possible relocation, so the decision timeline was critical for future actions. Mr. Stevens informed the Board if a decision were made today, it would not be a final decision; however, it would initiate the process.

Ms. Larson expressed her concern of deciding based upon an unknown location and other various factors. Ms. Larson commented both options were costly; however, it was critical to have further details to support the determination.

Ms. Sadler asked if the Board could decide today without knowing the location of the

consolidated facility and at a future meeting discuss the potential location opportunities.

Mr. Icenhour expressed his concern of the unknown location aspect as well, adding he was reluctant to decide without further details.

Ms. Sadler asked if the Board would need to select a location first for the consolidated facility.

Mr. Icenhour remarked options for the location should be considered and then narrowed down in a timely manner.

Ms. Sadler agreed, adding the costs would continue to increase.

Mr. Hipple remarked he disagreed, adding the Board first needed to decide what route to take and allow the professionals to assist with guidance and further action. Mr. Hipple provided an instance of a preferred chosen location for the consolidated facility and the professionals determine the facility would not fit in that desired location, the process would then be delayed again. Mr. Hipple mentioned various components could be decided collectively as a Board as time moves forward; however, this would provide staff a direction and would initiate the process.

Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Stevens if a decision were made today, what would the timeframe be to come back before the Board with potential site opportunities, costs, footprints, etc.

Mr. Stevens replied once a decision had been made then more specifics would become available and potentially hire a consultant to ensure proper layout guidance. Mr. Stevens mentioned developing high-level estimates for each potential site for comparison purposes, in addition to other various factors. Mr. Stevens reiterated if the Board decided today, it would not be a final decision; however, it would initiate the process.

Mr. McGlennon stated what he gathered from the Board discussion on this matter was that consolidation may be the most rational decision, but it was heavily dependent on the location.

Mr. Icenhour stated from his understanding the structured parking was approximately \$16 million, correct.

Mr. Talente confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour replied surface lot parking throughout the consolidated facility would be more cost-effective.

Ms. Sadler asked if there would be more room for growth with the consolidated facility.

Mr. Stevens replied any potential facility would need to accommodate future growth.

Mr. Icenhour recommended that should be factored into the site analysis.

Ms. Larson pointed out Mr. Tingle who stood up in the boardroom; she wanted to give him an opportunity to speak if desired.

Mr. Tingle mentioned a test fit was conducted for structured parking advising it takes approximately 10 acres or if the decision were to create all surface parking that would require approximately 15-16 acres.

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

1. Contract with WJCC Schools and the City of Williamsburg

A motion to Amend the School Contract 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. Stevens addressed the Board to discuss a joint school contract between the County and the City of Williamsburg. Mr. Stevens stated the last contract was for a period from FY 2017 to the end of FY 2022. Mr. Stevens informed the Board that the new negotiated contract would use the previous five-year period contract for the joint operation of the schools to include a few modifications which included the following: 1) establishing a future school use account in which each locality would deposit 90% of the Unexpended Funds, except in emergency situations, these funds would be discussed and appropriated during the normal budget process; 2) the State Sales Tax for Education would be a direct distribution to the school division from the State; and 3) approval of the annual budget, capital improvement projects, and the hiring of the superintendent would require the affirmative vote of five of the seven members of the School Board. Mr. Stevens informed the Board the City Council had adopted the new contract. Mr. Stevens stated the contract would be effective July 1, 2022, and valid through the end of June 2027. Mr. Stevens recommended adoption to the Board, welcoming any questions.

Ms. Larson inquired on the School Board voting role and potential circumstances if the requirement was not met.

Mr. Stevens replied communication may be needed to ensure the School Board honors the requirement; however, the Board of Supervisors ultimately controls the funding source of majority of its budget.

Ms. Larson understood; however, she wanted to ensure that the School Board was aware of the recent changes.

Mr. Stevens stated he would communicate that with Dr. Olwen Herron, WJCC Superintendent, and provide the new contract for reference to share the revisions with the School Board members.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Stevens.

**G. BOARD REQUESTS AND DIRECTIVES**

Mr. Icenhour stated he would be reachable primarily through email or text. Mr. Icenhour mentioned he was boarding a flight tomorrow and would return June 11.

Mr. Hipple stated he had nothing to report.

Ms. Larson stated she attended the VACo Regions 2 and 3 meeting with Chairman McGlennon and Mr. Stevens. Ms. Larson spoke about a fatal car accident that occurred this past weekend at the intersection of Greensprings Road and The Maine of Williamsburg. Ms. Larson extended her deepest sympathies to the families involved. Ms. Larson mentioned numerous requests for a speed limit reduction on Greensprings Road where the speed limit was currently 45 miles per hour. Ms. Larson remarked that the Virginia Department of

Transportation (VDOT) was unwilling to change the speed limit in the past. Ms. Larson expressed the visibility issues on Greensprings Road and requested contact with VDOT to obtain an updated accident report for the road and to see what options there were to mitigate these concerns.

Ms. Sadler stated the Economic Development Authority meeting was canceled. Ms. Sadler recognized Mr. Christopher Williams, Video Production Administrator, and the Information Technology Department for all their efforts.

Mr. McGlennon stated on Sunday he attended the WJCC Education Foundation Scholarship Award Ceremony, adding many students were recognized for their academic excellence and received scholarships from a variety of funding sources. Mr. McGlennon mentioned the VACo meeting he attended with Ms. Larson and Mr. Stevens. Mr. McGlennon added he and Mr. Stevens also attended the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization and Hampton Roads Planning District Commission meetings.

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

Mr. Stevens noted he had no report.

#### **I. CLOSED SESSION**

A motion to Enter a Close Session 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

At approximately 3:09 p.m., the Board entered Closed Session.

At approximately 3:23 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 Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

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. Appointment - Williamsburg Regional Library Board of Trustees
3. Appointment - Economic Development Authority

#### **J. ADJOURNMENT**

1. Adjourn until 5 pm on June 14, 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 3:24 p.m., Mr. McGlennon adjourned the Board of Supervisors.

  
Deputy Clerk