



AT A WORKSHOP MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE VILLAGE BUILDING CONFERENCE ROOM, AT 3910 OLD BUCKINGHAM ROAD IN POWHATAN COUNTY, VIRGINIA, AND REMOTELY BY ELECTRONIC MEANS ON February 22, 2022, AT 6:30 PM.

Board of Supervisors Present: David T. Williams, District 1,
Steve W. McClung, District 2,
Mike W. Byerly, District 3, Chair
Bill L. Cox, District 4,
Karin M. Carmack, District 5, Vice-Chair

Board of Supervisors Absent: None

County Staff Present: Ned Smither, County Administrator
Bret Schardein, Assistant County Administrator
Tom Lacheney, County Attorney
Frank Hopkins, Planning Director

Constitutional Officers Present: Brad Nunnally, Sherriff

Guests Present:

1. Call to Order:

Chairman Byerly called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

- a. Identify Public Entity members physically and/or electronically present.

County Administration staff accepted emailed comments at administration@powhatanva.gov. Any comments received until 6:30 PM, February 22, 2022, were entered into the meeting minutes.

- b. Identify opportunities for the public to access the electronic meeting.

The public was able to participate in the meeting by <https://zoom.us/j/398095011> by computer. Phone access was possible by dialing US: 1-929-205-6099 or 1-312-626-6799. As always, the public could view the live feed from the County [website](#).

- c. Identify opportunities for the public to participate in the meeting live with the Zoom meeting link.

The public was able to view and participate in the meeting live with the Zoom meeting link. During the public comment period, members of the public could raise their hands using the Zoom controls on their screens, or press *9 on their phone.



2. Pledge of Allegiance:

Ms. Carmack led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Invocation:

Mr. Williams led the invocation.

4. Requests to Postpone Agenda Items and Additions, Deletions, or Changes in the Order of Presentation:

Mr. Cox requested to pull off January 24, 2022, minutes from the consent agenda.

Mr. Cox motioned to move the minutes from the consent agenda to before the workshop discussion making them item 8G. Mr. Williams seconded the motion.

Chairman Byerly, Steve W. McClung, and Karin M. Carmack voted NO. Bill L. Cox and David T. Williams voted AYE.

MOTION FAILED

3-2

Mr. Williams requested clarification on the process of taking something out of the agenda without discussion. Ms. Carmack explained that if a Board member wants to pull something out of the consent agenda, the request needs to be made by noon on the day of the meeting. Mr. Cox stated that part of the minutes is incorrect and, therefore, will be revisited and corrected at the next meeting.

5. Formal Approval of Agenda:

Ms. Carmack made a motion to formally approve the agenda. Chairman Byerly seconded the motion.

Chairman Byerly, Steve W. McClung, and Karin M. Carmack voted AYE. Bill L. Cox and David T. Williams voted NO.

MOTION PASSED

3-2

6. Public Comment Period: (time limit 3 minutes per individual/5 minutes per group, 30 minutes total time limit that can be extended by the Board)

Chairman Byerly opened the public comment period.

[Carl Schwendeman, 1727 Teresa Lane](#), asked the County Administrator to reach out to an electric car company about building a high-powered charging station within the county



because the low-powered ones are not effective. He specifically asked for this charging station to be located near the Village administration building.

[Debbie Weir, 1501 Page Road](#), expressed concerns about the fact that the county's GIS system is not being updated in a timely manner. She stated that the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, and developers depend on the information when discussing each zoning application. She went on to point out specific examples in which the system has not been updated in months.

Not seeing anyone else wishing to speak, Chairman Byerly closed the public comment period.

7. Consent Agenda:

- a. Minutes from January 24, 2022.

Vice Chair Carmack motioned to approve the agenda. Mr. McClung seconded the motion.

Chairman Byerly, Steve W. McClung, and Karin M. Carmack voted AYE. Bill L. Cox and David T. Williams voted NO.

MOTION PASSED

3-2

8. Workshop Discussion:

- a. **Firefly Progress Update (provided by staff):**

Mr. Smither gave an update on the Firefly Project, stating that it is in the process of entering into contact with the Commonwealth of Virginia to facilitate the Grant Award for the region. Once completed, individual contracts will be executed with each county. He went on to say that construction will most likely begin in the spring but will be underway with the USDA reconnect grant. He stated that Firefox plans to send out letters to residents benefiting from the broadband construction as the projects begin. For this reason, he anticipates firefighters contacting each resident directly as they start to come online. In addition, the grant funding for Firefly's footprint will be available soon and the same notification will be in place for everyone.

Mr. Cox stated that because of all of the entities and local, state, and federal grants, his understanding is that things are going to take a while. He asked if the spring is a realistic goal to begin construction. He also stated that it is his understanding that these things only pertain to Southside customers, if a customer is in the Dominion Energy area, then there is another set of hoops that need to be dealt with because state corporation needs to approve. He stated his approval of the work being done and praised the way that money, contractors, and supplies have been lined up.



Mr. Smither agreed that it is a lengthy process, but everyone is working hard. He stated that he did believe that spring is a reliable time estimate although federal grants can be more difficult to predict. He also agreed that Dominion will take longer than Southside, but he is just excited to see a shovel in the ground soon.

Chairman Byerly agreed that everyone is doing a nice job and is happy to see ten counties all working together to make it happen.

b. 4-H Extension Video Presentation provided by Cathy Howland (presented by staff):

The Unit Coordinator, Cathy Howland and Extension Agent, Rachel Henley provided a presentation on the Extension Office. The presentation started by providing a short video discussing gardening programs, environmental conservation efforts, and education services. It went on to explain that extension agents work both locally and regionally with programs that focus on a variety of things including agent and specialist training. Ms. Howland stated that this year she had been working with a program team focusing on agribusiness management and economics and that everyone is eager to help tackle the issue of farm succession. Next, the video discussed the 4-H program which focuses on giving children leadership and life skills to take with them throughout their adult years. The program does this through after-school events as well as camping programs.

Ms. Carmack asked for clarification of the structure of the extension office because it was her understanding that the office does not fall entirely under Powhatan County. She also asked if Virginia Property Extension was a state agency and how Virginia Tech correlates to the operation. Ms. Howland confirmed that Virginia Property Extension is a state agency and explained that part of their salaries come from the county and part comes from the state. The Virginia Department of Extension pays for school salaries and provides all technological, but individual salary dispersion depends on when exactly a staff member came on board. She also explained that Virginia Tech is a land grant university which means that all of their state offices are located on campus.

Chairman Byerly asked that Ms. Howland expand on Ms. Henderson's role. Ms. Howland explained that there is no full-time family consumer science person, but that Ms. Henderson's specialty is finance and nutrition. This means that she has helped train Habitat volunteers to work with new homeowners on their finances. She also works with free clinics and the Social Service Health Department to help do a variety of things.

c. Transportation Prioritization (provided by staff):

Mr. Smither presented the information on transportation prioritization, stating that there is funding available for certain transportation projects that have been anticipated



for a long time. He recognized Mr. Schardein for keeping track of said products and funding terms that go along with them. He stated that he would like a conversation to be started about which specific projects will take priority now that appropriate funding has been acquired. He presented a chart with the CVTA projects that the Board should discuss to make the process easier considering that exact funding (6.5 million) that will be available in June 2022. After this, the county is expecting another 2 million per year. The chart displays the estimated costs of each project. Mr. Schardein asked that the Board rank the different projects at hand in three different levels of urgency:

1. Smart Scale Round: regional funds from CVTA and long-term model analysis
2. Opening up for pre-application (5 initial applications due April 1st, top 4 due in August)

Chairman Byerly asked what the best approach was in terms of project size to get the most out of the funding provided.

Mr. Schardein referred to the Smartscale percentage, which accounts for different project information to produce a score of things that will benefit the public at the time. It then takes the cost of the project to produce a new score that gets ranked against all other localities that enrichment regions are applying. He recommended that the Board revisit the project value of phase two and listed several reasons why the cost of this project has gone down since they last applied. He also recommended Dorset Road/ Route 60/Patterson, Jude's Ferry, and Route 1360/Academy. He then encouraged the Board to consider completing a few low-cost projects as well.

Ms. Carmack stated that the Board seems to be in the driver's seat because even if they choose to take on a Smartscale project, it will still take a few years to be approved and by then there will be even more annual income coming in. This means that, in her opinion, the Board could use all 6.5 million dollars today and still take on certain Smartscale projects.

Chairman Byerly asked if there was any experience from other jurisdictions that they could refer to in order to see what percentages were used and if those percentages worked out. He also asked if the Smartscale information being presented were mere examples or actual staff recommendations.

Mr. Smither stated that, in the past, 20% has worked out best and Mr. Schardein explained that there is a way to calculate the difference between 25% and 30%. He also confirmed that the information being presented is staff recommendations.

Mr. McClung asked if the Holly Hills turn lane falls beneath the CVTA regional funds. Mr. Schardein confirmed this.

Mr. Williams asked when the awards will be announced. Mr. Schardein stated that in January the scores and VDOT's recommended funding scenario will be distributed. This means that the Board will know the VDOT rankings at the beginning of 2023



and can then adjust things. He also indicated that the scoring in which the county fell within the stratification of projects was not available at the current meeting but could be presented in the future.

Ms. Carmack pointed out that there is an opportunity to knock out multiple projects in the near future without using Smartscale because the Smartscale process can take years at a time. She asked Mr. Schardein which process he believed would get Powhatan County the biggest bang for its buck.

Mr. Schardein advised that the Board of Supervisors put some of the money toward Smartscale projects while also leveraging some of the money to hopefully increase funding over time. He stated that some things could be done quickly, and others could be done through Smartscale.

Mr. Byerly asked how many projects the Board has now that have already been approved by Smartscale. He also stated that he is in support of the Smartscale plan, but it would be good to get some construction going that citizens can actually see because they are the ones paying for it. Mr. Schardein stated that the 711 widening is partially Smartscale and partially STP, Ferry Road is in the design space at this time, and Jude's Ferry/Route 60 is supported by CVTA funds. He also clarified that CVTA funds are only available for transportation.

Chairman Byerly stated that speaking for District 3, he liked the 13/60/Academy project. He accredited this idea to the fact that it would be a quick project that could potentially draw more visitors to the area because it would reduce traffic.

Ms. Carmack asked if, going forward, each member of the Board could be given a matrix in order to put together their top three choices, then meet and vote on which projects will take place. Mr. Schardein stated that scores that were already calculated for the projects could be put into the matrix for the Board members as well to give them better decision-making information. Even though these scores seem to change annually, they are still considered to be a good guide.

Mr. Williams asked when they will have to have the matching plots if they get funded. Mr. Schardein explained that the exact number would have to be confirmed once the project goes to construction.

Mr. Williams then asked how the financial modeling would be done if the project is not set to go to construction for five years. He agreed with Ms. Carmack that they need to carefully choose the best combination of paying in installments and leveraging to get the most out of the funding.

Mr. Williams asked how long the Board has to communicate back to CVTA about what the project is going to be for their share of the previous funds. He also mentioned that the Board has not formally adopted a transportation plan as part of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Schardein explained that those funds will go untouched if the Board does not spend them.



Mr. Cox asked for clarification on the CVTA regional funds. Specifically, he wanted to know how they would turn Holly Hills into a regional project.

Mr. Schardein explained that although it is not stated, there are no strings attached to the 2.6 million. He also confirmed that the further East they go, the more money CVTA is likely to award. Mr. Schardein mentioned weighing the option of completing low-cost transportation projects, including a commuter lot in the vicinity of Route 60.

Ms. Carmack stated that she would not want to pursue a park and ride lot because, with the influx of remote jobs, she does not think those projects would be worth the expense. Instead, she would like to see the money go towards mitigating road issues/road improvements.

Mr. Williams agreed he would need more information before making that decision because of the nature of a rural area. He asked that Mr. Schardein provide more information before ruling anything out.

Chairman Byerly agreed that the goal is to cut down traffic as much as possible, the only question is what the best way to do that would be. He also asked if the CVTA regional funds would allow the public to be involved as they would be in Smartscale projects. Mr. Schardein stated that strategy for the CVTA regional funds has not been discussed yet.

Ms. Carmack stated would 50 spaces mitigate any kind of traffic on route 60 once it is looked at through the traffic volume per day.

Chairman Byerly stated that there would be open houses for different input from the public on the Smartscale projects. He also asked if the Park and Ride is in their list of projects, Mr. Schardein confirmed that it was not.

d. Discussion of Minutes taking process (requested by staff):

Mr. Smither noted changes being made within the minutes, including higher attention to detail and hyperlinks to each public comment period. He stated that this is the format they plan to move forward with if everyone is comfortable.

Mr. Williams, Mr. McClung, and Mr. Cox stated their approval for this format. Mr. Cox expressed some concern about some of the content. He pointed to page 10 of the January 24th minutes, stating that instead of stating main concerns, it should be stated that his concerns are not limited to what was stated. He then stated there are always going to be content concerns.

Ms. Carmack mentioned that, according to Robert's Rules, the job of the minute-taker is to record the actions of the meeting and not necessarily the actual detailed content of the meeting. She advised the Board to be careful not to fall outside of the scope of what meeting minutes are supposed to be.



Mr. McClung made a motion to move forward with the minutes in the format such as those from the Jan. 24th meeting. Mr. Williams seconded the motion.

Chairman Byerly, Karin M. Carmack, Steve W. McClung, Bill L. Cox, and David T. Williams voted AYE.

MOTION PASSED
5-0

e. Appointments and Reappointments to Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee (requested by Chairman Byerly):

Mr. Smither stated that the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee does not enjoy the benefit of staggered terms. The discussion proposed a staggered appointment date for each district. If the Board is comfortable, Mr. Smither stated that he would add the Parks and Rec. Advisory Committee Ballot changes to the February 28th meeting.

Mr. Cox stated that he would like to see what this would look like if it was approved. He also stated that a two-year term is too short, and he would like to see a longer term.

Mr. Williams how this plan would affect the current members of the Board and asked when exactly they would be up for reappointment. Chairman Byerly helped explain that both members had volunteered themselves to go up for reappointment.

Ms. Carter stated that May would be the month in which they would be up for reappointment.

Chairman Byerly argued that some people will not accept a position with a four-year term. He supported a two-year term.

Mr. Williams also expressed the concern that a two-year term would not be long enough for someone to learn the job. Mr. Schardein confirmed that three to four-year terms seem to be the most common.

Chairman Byerly made a motion that the Board approve this plan based upon the two-year term that can be renewed at any time, and do District 2 and District 4 in May of 2022, and District 1 and 3 in May of 2023.

Ms. Carmack seconded the motion.

Chairman Byerly, Karin M. Carmack, Steve W. McClung, Bill L. Cox, and David T. Williams voted AYE.

MOTION PASSED
5-0



f. Comprehensive Plan Update Clarification- Carryover Discussion on Comprehensive Plan Changes from 10/25/2021 (requested by Supervisor Cox):

Mr. Smither updated the public and the Board on the Comprehensive Plan, stating that the board met on the Comprehensive Plan nine times last year. It was finally approved on October 25th, 2021, after numerous edits.

Mr. Cox stated that not all of his questions had been answered. He stated that in the prior meeting it had been approved to include the entire Strategic Plan.

Mr. Schardein explained that although most of the Strategic Plan could be copied from the previous plan, there would need to be a few updates made.

Ms. Carmack asked Mr. Cox if he believed it would be better to include the Strategic Plan as an appendix.

Mr. Cox disapproved of this method because it would leave the Comprehensive Plan without visions and goals. He expressed how important it is for citizens and potential investors to understand the Board's exact goals.

Mr. Cox pointed to several issues within the Comprehensive Plan. He saw fundamental issues within the Comprehensive Plan that he believed should not have been passed in the past.

Mr. Williams clarified the order in which the process of converting the County's convenience center property from Gateway Center to industrial. Mr. Cox suggested changing the property back to what it was before.

Chairman Byerly asked how much time the staff has invested in reviewing the Comprehensive Plan. He also asked if there was a change made to the plan without Board approval. Mr. Schardein responded that each individual has spent several hours as well as meeting hours on the Comprehensive Plan. He also explained that there a change was only proposed by staff as a suggestion, but only the Board can actually amend the plan. This means that if the Strategic Plan is changed, the Comprehensive Plan will also need to be amended.

Chairman Byerly asked if the Comprehensive Plan was meant to be a word-for-word, structured document, or more of a guideline. Mr. Schardein stated that he classified the Comprehensive Plan as a guide.

Mr. Cox then stated that it's a combination of very specific items folded under a very general umbrella.

b. Public Comment Period: (time limit 3 minutes per individual/5 minutes per group, 30 minutes total time limit that can be extended by the Board)



Harry Markland, 3701 Hope Meadow Road, expressed his concern with the Board members and the Comprehensive plan. He asked that the Board come together to work as a team.

Carl Schwendeman, 1727 Theresa Lane, asked how much the refund from the Fall Line Trail was. He urged the Board to use this funding to expand the county's sidewalk system. He also asked if the Turn Lane would be funded this year. Lastly, he asked if the County could leverage the Smartscale funds to extend the sidewalks to the middle school or the post office because 40% of the money is coming from the developers.

Seeing no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Byerly closed the public comment period.

c. County Attorney Comments:

There are no County Attorney comments.

d. County Administrator Comments:

Mr. Smither gave an update on the convenience center, stating that they had requested proposals to get a public-private partnership started on the site. That information should be returned by April 22nd. This means there are hopes of further movement in the next two months.

e. Board Comments:

Mr. Cox congratulated Mr. Schwendaman for having a letter to the editor published in the Richmond Times Dispatch about his favorite sidewalks.

Chairman Byerly asked for a report for the GIS update to see if the issues could be resolved.

f. Adjournment:

Chairman Byerly adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:42 PM.

ATTEST:

Ned Smither, County Administrator
Powhatan County Board of Supervisors

Michael W. Byerly, Chairman
Powhatan County Board of Supervisors

Recorded Vote:

*POWHATAN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORKSHOP MEETING
FEBRUARY 22, 2022*



<i>David T. Williams</i>	AYE
<i>Steve W. McClung</i>	AYE
<i>Michael W. Byerly</i>	AYE
<i>Bill L. Cox</i>	AYE
<i>Karin M. Carmack</i>	AYE