

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, VIRGINIA, IN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM AT 4:00 P.M. ON THE 13TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, NINETEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIVE.

1. ROLL CALL

Mr. Kenneth Axtell, Chairman
Mr. C. Hammond Branch
Mr. Paul Dresser
Mr. Harold Poulsen

OTHERS:

Mr. John E. McDonald, Secretary/Treasurer

2. MINUTES

On a motion by Mr. Branch, seconded by Mr. Dresser, the minutes of the meeting of November 14, 1984 were approved. On a motion by Mr. Branch, seconded by Mr. Axtell, the minutes of December 12, 1984 were approved as amended. The amendment, as presented by Mr. Dresser, clarified Mr. Dresser's remarks in response to Mr. Jolly's comments on the creation of the IDA. The amendment indicated that Mr. Dresser had specified that the IDA had been created to serve all the citizens of the Commonwealth and specifically the citizens of James City County. Mr. Dresser requested a copy of the minutes, as amended.

3. 1985 EXECUTIVE ORDER

Mr. McDonald explained to the Board the elements of the Governor's Executive Order relating to the allocation of funds to both the localities and the State Reserve for the years 1985 and 1986. In his explanation, Mr. McDonald indicated that in the event of competition for funds, projects would be graded out on a points schedule that the State had put into place for fund requests from the State Reserve. Mr. McDonald indicated that projects would be graded higher and would be more competitive for funding at the State level if the local government had returned its monies to the State and acted on each local application with the requests from the State Reserve. Mr. McDonald suggested that the Board may wish to review its role under these circumstances in processing applications for Industrial Revenue Bonds.

Mr. Axtell indicated that he did not want to return monies to the State and he felt the local decision-making process was a better one as it related to local businesses. Mr. Poulsen indicated that if the IDA were to withdraw from the process by which applications were considered and reviewed, then there would be no local determination of acceptability and that the Board of Supervisors would then become the first local contact and the first point of local discussion of a specific application. Mr. Poulsen indicated that the Board had reacted favorably to a Citizen Review Committee that took it upon

themselves to eliminate any proposals it found unacceptable, therefore eliminating that task from the Board's agenda.

Mr. Dresser indicated that he was struck by the quote that the James City County Industrial Development Authority was one of the 20 most active in the Commonwealth. He indicated that he liked the point system established by the State, that the point system was similar to the one that the local IDA had been using, but that he would prefer to make the decisions based on local preferences. Mr. Dresser further indicated that he particularly appreciated Part F of the Criteria which indicated the percentage of non-bond financing for a project. He thought the State guidelines were excellent in providing benchmarks.

Mr. McDonald commented on the response from Mr. Axtell, and indicated that the staff would recommend that the IDA continue as an active body for the purposes of reviewing and approving applications for Industrial Revenue Bond financing. Mr. McDonald indicated that he thought it would be important to have local public hearings and to maintain local options rather than delegate this responsibility to the State.

Mr. Axtell then indicated that as Chairman he sensed the consensus of the members present that the Secretary be authorized to prepare the paperwork requesting from the State the appropriate local allocation and requested the Secretary to have such documentation prepared and ready for the Board's consideration at its next meeting.

4. BOARD REPORTS

Mr. Axtell reported to the Board on his representation at the December 15, 1984 Future of Hampton Roads meeting. He indicated that on a warm Saturday in December 300 people had gathered in 14 operating groups to discuss mutual interests and concerns for the Hampton Roads area. He commented that the group was impressed by the convergence of interest of the various jurisdictions in the Sports Opportunity Group, as related to the Stadium Feasibility, and in the Cultural Group, as related to the Cultural Corridor from Williamsburg to Norfolk and Virginia Beach. Mr. Axtell indicated that the future of Hampton Roads Committee was halfway through a three-year term and seemed to be progressing very nicely. The luncheon speaker was Governor Robb who provided a very up-beat challenge to the group to coalesce the interests of the jurisdictions on both sides of Hampton Roads.

Mr. Poulsen indicated that as the Board's representative on the Skiffes Creek development project, he had no additional meetings on the Skiffes Creek plans. He did indicate a concern that in the presentations and discussions by the Consultant on the project that no community views had been solicited. He thought the Grove Community was not familiar with the Skiffes Creek Program and would have concerns on traffic and the types of industrial development that may occur in the Skiffes Creek area. Mr. Poulsen made the comment that several citizens in Grove did not want to see another HRSD-type plant.

Mr. Dresser agreed with Mr. Poulsen in that the report was devoid of a consideration of the community as it related to recommendation for medium to heavy industry with little or no commercial development. He did point out that Skiffes Creek and the development area were made up of about 34% wetlands, which would be unuseable in any industrial development, and that the biggest challenge of the report related to a fairly weak presentation on the Highway issues. He indicated that the objectives of the report were to reduce the vehicular conflict raised by the residents, by the tourists, and by the industrial uses. He did not see that objective satisfied in the Skiffes Creek Report.

Mr. Poulsen indicated that he thought there would be no four-lane road through Grove and that if any four-laning was done it would be in the area between Ball and Fort Eustis, possibly in conjunction with the Oakland Industrial Park.

5. PRESENTATION OF THE AUDIT

Mr. Axtell indicated that he had reviewed the audit and found it acceptable with the stipulation that there should be an effort to clean up some of the outstanding inducements. When asked the status, Mr. McDonald indicated that the only outstanding inducement that had not expired or been formerly withdrawn was that of United Methodist Homes. He would attempt to contact United Methodist Homes for something in writing on the status of the project and would have a resolution withdrawing the Resolution of Inducement for the Board at its next meeting. There being no further comments, Mr. Dresser, on a second by Mr. Poulsen, moved the Board accept the audit and the motion passed on a 4-0 vote.

6. BOARD REQUESTS AND DIRECTIVES

Mr. Axtell indicated that the next meeting date was the regularly scheduled date of March 13, 1985. He suggested that the time be changed to 4:00 p.m. Mr. Dresser indicated that he would be out of town.

Mr. McDonald then indicated to the Board that he had provided them with some material on the economic future and the future business growth in the County. Board members were invited to provide to Mr. McDonald any comments they had on the reports.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 4:50 p.m.

John E. McDonald
Secretary

Kenneth Axtell
Chairman

JMcD/bkh
10690