



# GLOUCESTER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AGENDA

Tuesday, May 20, 2025, 6:00 p.m.

Colonial Courthouse

6504 Main Street

Gloucester, VA 23061

---

	Pages
1. Call to Order and Roll Call	
2. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance– Kenneth W. Gibson – Petsworth District Representative	
3. Approval of the Minutes - March 4, March 17, and March 18, 2025	2
4. Adoption of the Agenda	
5. Approval of the Consent Agenda - no consent agenda items	
6. Matters Presented by the Board	
7. County Administrator Items	
8. Public Comment Period - (limited to topics on the Work Session agenda only) (Speakers should provide 10 copies of handouts if any)	
9. Work Session Agenda	
a. Resolution to Approve Transportation Alternatives Grant Application for Tyndall's Point Park to Gloucester Point Beach Connector – Brian Lewis – Director of Engineering Services	40
b. Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Appointments	47
10. Supervisors Discussion	
11. Closed Meeting - no closed meeting	
12. Adjournment	

**AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE GLOUCESTER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD ON TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2025, AT 6:00 P.M. IN THE COLONIAL COURTHOUSE, 6504 MAIN STREET, GLOUCESTER, VIRGINIA:**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Mr. Smith called the meeting to order, and Ms. Steele took roll call.

**THERE WERE PRESENT:** Kevin M. Smith, Chair  
Ashley C. Chriscoe, Vice Chair  
Phillip N. Bazzani  
Christopher A. Hutson  
Kenneth W. Gibson  
Michael A. Nicosia  
Robert J. Orth

**THERE WERE ABSENT:** None

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Edwin "Ted" Wilmot, County Attorney  
Carol Steele, County Administrator

**2. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance – Reverend McKibbon – New Freedom Worship Center and Devyn Hurling - Peasley Middle School**

Reverend McKibbon of New Freedom Worship Center gave an invocation.

Devyn Hurling, an eighth grade student at Peasley Middle School then led all in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

**3. Approval of the Minutes - January 21, 2025**

Mr. Hutson moved, seconded by Mr. Chriscoe, to approve the minutes of the January 21, 2025, meeting as presented. The motion carried and was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

**4. Adoption of the Agenda**

Mr. Chriscoe moved, seconded by Dr. Orth, to adopt the agenda. The motion carried and was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

**5. Approval of the Consent Agenda**

Mr. Hutson moved, seconded by Dr. Orth, to approve the consent agenda. The motion carried and was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

**a. Resolution Proclaiming March 9-15, 2025, as Flood Awareness Week in Gloucester County – Quinton B. Sheppard – Community Engagement & Public Information Director**

**RESOLUTION PROCLAIMING MARCH 9-15, 2025, AS FLOOD AWARENESS WEEK IN GLOUCESTER COUNTY**

**WHEREAS**, Gloucester County is a coastal community that has experienced severe weather in the past in the form of extreme rainfall or tropical system events resulting in flooding in low-lying areas of the County; and

**WHEREAS**, this flooding has caused damage and flood losses to homes and buildings in all areas whether they are high-risk special flood zone hazard areas or low to moderate risk flood zones; and

**WHEREAS**, Gloucester County is a voluntary participant in the National Flood Insurance Program that provides residents with the opportunity to protect themselves against flood loss through the purchase of flood insurance at reduced insurance premium rates as well as setting higher regulatory standards to reduce the flood risk and potential flood damage to their property; and

**WHEREAS**, the reduction of life and property damage can be achieved when appropriate flood preparedness, control, and mitigation measures are taken before a flood; and

**WHEREAS**, public education and awareness of potential weather hazards and methods of protection are critical to the health, safety and welfare of residents, per guidance of the Virginia Floodplain Management Association and the U.S. National Weather Service, Gloucester County has declared March 9-15, 2025 as Flood Awareness Week to promote awareness and increase knowledge of flood risk, the availability of flood insurance, flood protection methods, and how to prepare for emergencies.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** this 4<sup>th</sup> day of March 2025, by the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors, Gloucester County, Virginia, undersigned, declares March 9-15 as Flood Awareness Week in Gloucester County, Virginia. Residents are encouraged to know their security risks by determining their flood zone and taking necessary steps to protect personal property.

**6. Matters Presented by the Board**

Dr. Orth stated that a gentleman had expressed concern at an earlier Board meeting about the water quality at his house. This was a condition that the utilities staff needed to address. He advised that staff started to dig on Friday to address it. He reviewed the work that was completed. He noted that he hoped the Board would now have good news from that citizen. He stated that the staff worked all day long, they were professional, and ensured that there were no leaks. He noted that we should be thankful for the dedicated staff in utilities. He thanked Ms. Legg for her great staff.

**7. County Administrator Items**

Ms. Steele reminded everyone that it was restaurant week in Gloucester. She stated that Clean Gloucester Day was coming up on March 29. Prior to that, every resident would be receiving a flood awareness guide. March 9-15 was Flood Awareness Week. She noted that Gloucester was a CRS (Community Rating System) Class 5 rated community with 25% discount on flood insurance for any citizens who have that insurance. The awareness guide provided continuing education to the public which was one of the factors that contributed to the County's rating through CRS.

**8. Scheduled Presentations**

**a. Mid-Year Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2025 (Unaudited) – Maria Calloway – Chief Financial Officer**

Ms. Calloway stated that she was presenting the mid-year unaudited financial report and noted that a full copy of the financial statements was in the packet. She began her review with real estate tax revenue. She reviewed that as the real estate tax revenue target had been missed in FY23 and FY24, the budget for FY25 had been

reduced to ensure that the target would be met. She noted that as of mid-year 49% of the taxes had been collected. She reviewed personal property tax revenue. She noted that it was at 44% of collection so it was lagging slightly from last year. She stated that the values of the vehicles were what drove revenues. She showed the vehicle value trend from 2021-2024. She advised that the increasing exemptions for veterans were also impacting this revenue number. She then reviewed other local taxes, noting the percentage of those taxes that had been collected to date. She showed a graph indicating the leveling off of the percentage of growth for the lodging, meals, and sales taxes. She then discussed interest revenue, noting that until interest rates spiked, that had not been a revenue source. She reviewed the spike in FY24 and noted that interest rates were also leveling off. She reviewed the general fund revenue sources. She showed a comparison of revenue sources from FY15 and FY25. She then discussed general fund expenditures. She noted in total that the budget was about 46% spent. The general government administration line was over 50% spent. She advised that this line included the County insurance which was paid upfront at the beginning of the fiscal year. She reviewed the current General Fund savings in vacancies and health insurance. She discussed that in more detail. She then moved to unassigned fund balance. She noted that the projected excess over the fund balance policy was \$3.2 million. She then reviewed the school sales tax fund.

Dr. Orth asked where the school sales tax fund was held.

Ms. Calloway stated that this was more of a Treasurer matter. However, she did know that the County banked with Chesapeake Bank. The County was limited on where it could invest funds. There was an investment pool that was available, but Chesapeake Bank would generally match the interest rate. She then continued her presentation. She provided a look forward. She advised that the revenue lines were leveling off and real estate growth was decreasing. On the expenditure side, inflation was increasing. Under personnel costs, she advised that the initial estimate for the health insurance increase was 26.1%, and it was now down to a 12.5% increase. Still a substantial increase, but not as high as originally projected. She noted other personnel issues that could increase expenditures. She reviewed items that would provide no or minimal negative impacts to include the smaller than expected increase in property and workers compensation insurance, potential increases in state funding for schools, and the anticipated positive fund balance at the end of FY25. Finally, she reviewed the next steps.

Dr. Orth asked what was causing the taxes to level off.

Ms. Calloway stated that COVID had the unexpected spending frenzy that no one anticipated. She also noted some of the trends in lodging. She stated that generally when there was a spike in growth, there was a dip back to a more consistent level.

## **9. Public Comment Period**

**FRANK ZOLL - ZOLL VINEYARD**

Mr. Zoll stated that he owned Zoll Vineyard. He noted that he had tried to participate in the Daffodil Festival for several years and was told that it was on County property and no alcohol could be served. He noted that he would love to see the Board consider allowing the sale of alcohol on county property during special events. He noted that there was a lot of tourism potential from those outside of the County that want to come to Gloucester. He felt that if the Board was willing to consider that it would allow the County a lot of opportunities that do not currently exist. He stated that they had different opportunities as a farm winery than a brewery. He reviewed the differences. He asked the Board to consider the change.

#### **DIANE JONES - WARE DISTRICT**

Ms. Jones stated that there was a pool of water in her backyard, and she had not had any response from utilities. She said someone came out several months ago and said it was the fault of the water company, but no one had come out to fix it. She asked the Board to look into it as well. She stated that if the Board oversaw the school system, she was hoping they would get rid of DEI (Diversity, Equity and Inclusion), and CRT (Critical Race Theory) programs in the school and concentrate on teaching students to read, write, do math, and to write in cursive. She noted that there were a lot of positive things going on in the schools and she hoped the Board would look into not continuing those other destructive things.

The following comment was submitted through the alternate submission methods and was read by the Deputy Clerk.

#### **KENNY HOGGE – GLOUCESTER POINT DISTRICT**

Mr. Hogge stated that the use of the water treatment plant will continue to grow as will the sludge from the treatment process. He encouraged the Board to consider replacing the current lagoon sludge drying method with a solar sludge drying method. He stated that if not, the only other option to address violations would be to construct a sewer pumping station at the plant with a force main line to the pump station near Home Depot. He recommended a complete asset management inventory of Utilities. He stated that a plan of action, including additional staff, for maintenance of the utilities assets, was needed. He noted that the old GIS (Geographic Information System) had a good map of water and sewer assets, but the new one was lacking.

#### **10. Public Hearings - 6:00 p.m.**

##### **a. Public Hearing to Consider a Conditional Use Permit Application for a Working Waterfront Marina – Anne Ducey-Ortiz, AICP, CZA – Director of Planning, Zoning & Environmental Programs**

Ms. Ducey-Ortiz stated that this was a conditional use permit (CUP) application for a working waterfront marina at the end of Aberdeen Creek Road. She reviewed that the location was currently a vacant seafood processing plant. In 2013 commercial watermen asked about using the site to access the water only and that was allowed without establishing a use. She reviewed the surrounding land uses. She

advised that the proposed use would be for a working waterfront marina with three floating piers and a total of 34 boat slips. The owner planned to rebuild the bulkhead and boat launch, and to construct a rip rap structure and living shoreline. She reviewed other features of the plan. She stated that the site users would not be those utilizing a traditional marina but would be commercial watermen. She showed the list of conditions for the CUP. She reviewed that the property was in the single family (SF-1) zoning district. One of the solutions for this property was to allow the working waterfront marina by CUP. She reviewed the Comp Plan guidance. She advised that the Comp Plan also focused on working waterfronts and encouraged traditional uses to be continued.

Ms. Ducey-Ortiz then reviewed the traffic impacts. She advised that the site was located at the end of Aberdeen Creek Road and there was generally not a lot of traffic on the road except seasonally when the working watermen were out working on the dock. The applicant felt that most using the marina would be the watermen currently utilizing the County dock next to the site. She reviewed that the fiscal impact was positive. The site had been vacant so it would increase in value once it was developed. She noted that one of the conditions of use proposed by the owner was to allow emergency access to the water from the site. In addition, the owner proposed allowing a 25 foot wide dredging area around the site. This was related to the proposed dredging of Aberdeen Creek. She reviewed the environmental impacts and advised that the improvements would need to be reviewed by the Wetlands Board and VMRC (Virginia Marine Resources Commission). She continued her review of the impacts. She then advised that the purpose of the conditional use permits was to provide for certain uses that were not generally permitted in a zoning district. She stated that it allowed for uses to be reviewed on a case by case basis and to be evaluated on specific criteria. She showed the approval criteria. She stated that based on that review, staff recommended, and the Planning Commission supported, a recommendation for approval. She advised that the Board had the opportunity to revise the proposed conditions that were recommended by the Planning Commission and agreed to by the applicant. She stated that at the Planning Commission public hearing, one neighbor across the water spoke in favor of the project. She then reviewed the conditions.

Mr. Smith opened the public hearing for public comment.

As there were no speakers for the public hearing, Mr. Smith closed the public hearing and turned the matter over to the Board.

Dr. Orth stated that this was a great use of the property. He felt that the applicant would be very good at bringing the property back to a good use. He did ask for clarification on the access ramp for emergency vehicles.

Ms. Ducey-Ortiz agreed there would be a ramp.

Mr. Gibson echoed Dr. Orth's comments and stated that this was a great opportunity for the community and to support the watermen. He noted that he appreciated the hard work of the applicant and staff on this project.

Mr. Hutson moved to approve the resolution approving the conditional use permit, Dr. Orth seconded the motion. The motion carried and was approved by the following roll call vote: Mr. Bazzani, Mr. Chriscoe, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hutson, Mr. Nicosia, Dr. Orth, and Mr. Smith - yes.

**A RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT  
FOR A WORKING WATERFRONT MARINA- APPLICATION CUP-24-02**

**WHEREAS**, a Conditional Use Permit application (CUP-24-02) has been submitted to permit the establishment of a Working Waterfront Marina by Aberdene Aquatic, LLC, property owner of Tax Map Parcel 37-49, identified as RPC No. 12871; and

**WHEREAS**, the Gloucester County Planning Commission held a public hearing on the application on February 6, 2025; and

**WHEREAS**, at its Public Hearing, the Gloucester County Planning Commission determined that the application for a CUP met the approval criteria outlined in Section 14-3(6) of the Zoning Ordinance; and

**WHEREAS**, at its Public Hearing, the Gloucester County Planning Commission voted 6-0 (1 absent) to forward application CUP-24-02 to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval with a set of conditions of use; and

**WHEREAS**, the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors has held a duly advertised public hearing; and

**WHEREAS**, the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors finds that the proposed CUP in accompaniment with the following conditions of use promotes an industry (Working Waterfront Marina) that is culturally and historically significant by preserving Gloucester's cultural, historical, and natural resources; and

**WHEREAS**, the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors finds that the application in accompaniment with the following conditions of use encourages and promotes the adaptive reuse of historically or culturally significant buildings and structures; and

**WHEREAS**, the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors finds that the proposed CUP in accompaniment with the following conditions of use discourages the loss of historically or culturally significant structures through "benign neglect" or natural causes by encouraging the repair and maintenance of these structures in a stable and secure condition; and

**WHEREAS**, the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors further finds that the proposed CUP in accompaniment with the following conditions of use works to ensure that development and redevelopment results in minimal negative impact on road systems and traffic patterns within the County.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors that application CUP-24-02 is hereby approved with the following Conditions of Approval:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with a site plan approved pursuant to Chapter 15.5 of the County Code, which shall occur prior to issuance of a Zoning Permit for the improvement listed in Phase 2 of Condition 3. The Conceptual Plan included with this CUP application is a

preliminary rendering of the Project and does not include all of the features described in the applicant's narrative.

2. The use of the property shall be classified as a "Working Waterfront Marina", which shall permit the uses detailed in the definitions of "Marina" and "Aquaculture Facility" in Section 2-2 of the Zoning Ordinance. The following components of a "Marina" use (as defined in Section 2-2 of the Zoning Ordinance) shall not be permitted: boat and boat motor sales or rental, boat repairs and/or construction, marine fuel and lubricant sales, marine supplies sales, and restaurants or refreshment facilities. Although storage of aquatic organisms is permitted within structures on the site, the processing (preparing, altering, and/or packing) of seafood (defined as "Seafood Processing" in Section 2-2 of the Zoning Ordinance) shall not be permitted.
3. The project may be developed in one or more phases based on an approved site plan. The Phasing Schedule is as follows:
  - a. Phase 1: Repair of existing bulkheads and boat launch and addition of floating docks.
  - b. Phase 2: Repair of the existing building.

Approval of the CUP application does not supersede the requirement for approval from any other Boards or Commissions for improvements listed in Phases 1 or 2. Development of the improvement listed in Phase 2 may occur concurrent with or following the improvements listed in Phase 1 as long as any improvements are properly permitted by all appropriate departments, Boards, or Commissions for all applicable local, state, or federal entities.

4. Prior to site plan approval and use of the site as a working waterfront marina (as defined in Condition 2), the applicant shall demonstrate that all private wells and drainfields are appropriately sized to serve the uses on the property.
5. Permanent toilet facilities shall be provided on site in accordance with the requirements of the Gloucester County Building Department and Virginia Department of Health prior to the establishment of the use of the property as a working waterfront marina (as defined in Condition 2). Upon completion of repair of the existing building (as detailed in Phase 2 of Condition 3), at no time shall temporary toilet facilities be used to satisfy the requirements for permanent toilet facilities.
6. Construction activities shall only occur between the hours of 7 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Saturday.
7. The following hours of operation shall apply to the property's use as working waterfront marina (as defined in Condition 2):
  - a. Weekdays: 7 AM to 7 PM
  - b. Weekends: 7 AM to 7 PM

However, vehicles (including motor and boating vehicles) are exempt from these hours of operation, provided the vehicles comply with the applicable sections of Chapter 11 (Noise Control) of the Gloucester County Code.

8. The components of the use within Aberdeen Creek shall contain no more than 34 boat slips and 3 floating piers, subject to approval by the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) and the Gloucester County Wetlands Board.
9. The applicant shall be responsible for maintaining a 25-foot dredging buffer around the project site, including any structures within waterways. All dredging within the 25-foot buffer shall be the sole responsibility of the applicant and shall not be the responsibility of Gloucester County or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.



10. Dumpsters and other types of waste receptacles shall not be visible from adjacent properties and shall provide screening from view from adjacent properties if visible from adjacent properties without screening.
11. The property shall be screened from adjacent residentially used properties pursuant to Article 9C of the Zoning Ordinance.
12. No lighting from this property shall trespass onto adjacent properties or properties across any waterways. Lighting on structures, docks, and piers shall be fitted with opaque shields to prevent direct visibility of the lamp to persons on public waters or adjacent lands more than 50 feet beyond the structure.
13. The applicant shall allow VMRC, local law enforcement, and the local Fire & Rescue services to access waterways through their property for emergency services. The applicant will work with these agencies to provide access to the property during and after all hours of operation. A statement to this effect shall be included on the approved site plan.
14. Prior to any site development, the applicant shall receive approval from all appropriate departments, Boards, or Commissions for all applicable local, state, or federal entities. Prior to any Final Certificate of Occupancy, the development shall be designed and constructed in a manner that meets all applicable local, state, or federal regulations.
15. Where there is a conflict between the Conditional Use Permit's written conditions or other local, state, or federal regulations, the most stringent condition shall apply.
16. The site may continue to be used for loading and offloading of aquatic organisms caught offsite. Establishment of the use on the site, as required by Section 14-3(14) of the Zoning Ordinance, shall commence upon issuance of a Zoning Permit for the improvement detailed in Phase 2 of Condition 3. This improvement shall begin within 24 months of approval of the site plan required by Condition 1, which may be extended by not more than 6 months subject to the requirements of Section 14-16(a) of the Zoning Ordinance. This improvement shall be completed within the time frame specified in Section 15-4 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Working Waterfront Marina shall be established through a Zoning Permit for the improvement detailed in Phase 2 of Condition 3 issued within twenty-four months of approval of a site plan, as specified in Condition 16.

**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the granting of a conditional use permit does not exempt the applicant from obtaining a Building Permit, a Certificate of Occupancy, or complying with all other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance or any applicable County, state or federal law, as detailed in Section 14-3(10) of the Zoning Ordinance.

**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that amendments to this Conditional Use Permit shall occur in the manner specified in Section 14-3(14) of the Zoning Ordinance.

**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this Conditional Use Permit may be immediately revoked at any time pursuant to Section 14-3(15) of the Zoning Ordinance.

#### **11. Regular Agenda**

Mr. Wilmot noted that although it was out of order, there was an individual who tried to speak during the public hearing on a different topic and asked if the Board wanted to consider allowing her to speak.

The Board agreed by consensus to allow the comment.

**JOANNE HAMLIN - PETSWORTH**

Ms. Hamlin stated that she was advocating for an off leash dog park. She noted that it was needed now and not five years from now. Ark Park had two back fields. Brown Park and Beaverdam also had areas that could work. She noted that she had visited off leash dog parks in Williamsburg. She noted that those locations had requirements and rules in place. Both parks had separate park space for dogs of various sizes. She stated that off leash dog parks were good for dogs, dog owners, and were attractive to visitors who come to the County.

**a. Draft Consent Order for VPDES Permit DEQ VA0078778 – Ted Wilmot – County Attorney and Katey Legg – Director of Public Utilities**

Mr. Wilmot stated that this was the opportunity for the Board to decide whether to agree to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) consent order regarding the notice of violation issued to the County in May 2024. He advised that DEQ alleged that the County exceeded its permitted amount of chloride emission levels. He stated that the consent order sought to resolve that violation. He advised that the Board was not required to accept the consent order, but it was an attempt to resolve the situation between the County and DEQ. The order called for payment by the County of a civil penalty for the three months that the County was alleged to have exceeded the chloride level. He noted that the order called for the County to address the situation and to make efforts to comply with the permit. There were three options for the path to comply. He stated that the County had tried to negotiate the terms of the order with DEQ, however, they were not amendable to revisions. He advised that his goal was to protect the County and to ensure that the consent order addressed all of the chloride emission violations either perceived or real. DEQ was not of a mind to do that. However, they did say that they would not cite the County with another chloride violation if the County was diligently pursuing the actions under the consent order. If the Board chooses not to approve, then DEQ could pursue the violations administratively or judicially. He advised that his recommendation was to accept the order, but only if there was a comfort level that the County could do what was required.

Ms. Legg stated that she believed the County could comply. She noted that the first seven or eight pages of the consent order contained boiler plate language and then there was a schedule of compliance in very general terms. She reviewed the schedule. She noted that within 180 days after full execution of the consent order, the County had to provide one of three options to DEQ for the chloride mitigation project. She noted that the goal of all of the options was to demonstrate long term durable compliance with the permit levels. In response to a question about the outfall, she advised that the sampling point for outfall 001 was changed immediately with the approval of DEQ. She stated that the chloride level at the new sampling point was lower but not much lower. She continued her review of the options. She

stated that the third option was the one staff was most interested in and felt confident that the County could comply. She advised that an interim mitigation plan had to be provided within 30 days. She noted that staff had begun that already. She reviewed the connector project that would allow staff to monitor in real time the flow over the spillway and the chloride coming from the outfall so that staff could automatically adjust how the reverse osmosis plant was being used. She advised that the spillway project would be the next step in the interim mitigation plan. Her hope was that they could provide the concept engineering report to DEQ on this interim plan to make this the long term durable compliance plan. She advised that there were other options and steps that could be taken but they were costly.

Ms. Steele noted that one of the other things that was discussed was that legislative assistance could be requested if necessary.

Dr. Orth asked Ms. Legg to go over the amounts of the projects.

Ms. Legg reviewed the connector project. She stated that outside of this issue, utilities had to abandon well number two and outfall 003. In addition, they have to abandon outfall 002. Everything that went to outfall 002 would go to 001. That project was happening now at a cost of about \$125,000. She stated that the next piece for the interim but potentially long term solution would be to add the spillway project. That would add the flow meter and chloride meter connected to SCADA (supervisory control and data acquisition) to allow real time monitoring of the chloride level. If the chloride level was too high and not enough water was coming over the spillway, the RO (reverse osmosis) plant would not be used. That project would be an additional \$250,000-\$300,000. She stated that this project was already budgeted for this year. The next potential step could be drawing in raw water from the reservoir and potentially mixing before going to the outfall. That cost could be another \$800,000-\$900,000.

There was a brief discussion on the penalties, chloride exceedance levels, and the timing of the violations.

After the discussion, Mr. Chriscoe moved, seconded by Mr. Bazzani, to approve the resolution approving the consent order. The motion carried and was approved by the following roll call vote: Mr. Bazzani, Mr. Chriscoe, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hutson, Mr. Nicosia, Dr. Orth, and Mr. Smith - yes.

**A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO  
EXECUTE AN ORDER BY CONSENT WITH THE VIRGINIA  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY IN REFERENCE TO  
VPDES PERMIT NO. VA0078778**

**WHEREAS**, Gloucester County owns and operates a water treatment plant to produce potable water to serve Gloucester County citizens; and

**WHEREAS**, Gloucester County is required to maintain a Virginia Pollution Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) permit to discharge unused treatment water within permitted limitations and such permit was issued December 2019; and

**WHEREAS**, Gloucester County received Warning Notices in January, February and March 2024 for allegedly exceeding permit limitations, resulting in a Notice of Violation in May 2024; and

**WHEREAS**, Va. Code § 62.1-44.23 of the State Water Control Law provides for an injunction for any violation of the State Water Control Law, any State Water Control Board rule or regulation, order, permit condition, standard or any certificate requirement or provision; and

**WHEREAS**, the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality is authorized by Va. Code § 62.1-44.15 to issue orders to any person to comply with the State Water Control Law and regulations, including the imposition of a civil penalty; and

**WHEREAS**, the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality has issued an order by consent to Gloucester County for the Gloucester County Water Treatment Plant; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Supervisors deems the terms of the Order by Consent to be an acceptable resolution of the matters it covers.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors that the County Administrator is authorized to execute the Order by Consent, substantially as attached hereto, and to take all necessary and appropriate actions on behalf of the County with reference to the Order.

(Remainder of this page intentionally left blank)



Commonwealth of Virginia

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

www.deq.virginia.gov

Stefanie K. Taillon  
Acting Secretary of Natural and Historical Resources

Michael S. Rolband, PE, PWD, PWS Emeritus  
Director

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

ENFORCEMENT ACTION - ORDER by CONSENT

ISSUED to

Gloucester County

FOR

Gloucester County Water Treatment Plant

VPDES PERMIT No.

VA0078778

SECTION A: Purpose

This is a Consent Order issued under the authority of Va. Code § 62.1-44.15 for the purpose of resolving certain violations of the State Water Control Law and the applicable permit and/or regulations.

SECTION B: Definitions

Unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, the terms used in this Consent Order have the meanings assigned to them in Va. Code § 62.1-44.2 *et seq.* and 10.1-1182 *et seq.*

SECTION C: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Responsible Party:	Gloucester County		Facility:	Gloucester County Water Treatment Plant	
Facility Address	Street Address:		8214 Reservoir Ridge Road		
	City:	Gloucester County	VA	Zip Code:	23061
Inspection Date(s):	February 15, 2024	Receiving Water Information:	Beaverdam Swamp, Beaverdam Swamp Reservoir, and UT to Beaverdam Swamp Chesapeake Bay Small Coastals		
Warning Letter(s) and Notice(s) of Violation:	Notice of Violation No. W2024-05-P-0001 (May 15, 2024)				
Permit Issuance and Expiration Information:	Issued: December 1, 2019 Expired: November 30, 2024 (Administratively Continued)				

(Remainder of this page intentionally left blank)

Va. Code § 62.1-44.5 and 9VAC25-31-50 state: Except in compliance with a certificate issued by the Department, it shall be unlawful for any person to discharge into state waters sewage, industrial wastes, other wastes, or any noxious or deleterious substances.
The Responsible Party is a “person” within the meaning of Va. Code § 62.1-44.3.
The Permit authorizes the Responsible Party to discharge to the receiving water in strict compliance with the terms and conditions of the Permit.
Va. Code § 62.1-44.15(5a) states that a VPDES permit is a “certificate” under the statute.
The receiving water is a surface water located wholly or partially within the Commonwealth and is a “state water” under State Water Control Law.

Violation	Observations and Legal Requirements	Civil Charge			Subtotal
✓	In submitting its DMRs, as required by the Permit, the Responsible Party has indicated that it exceeded the discharge limits contained in Part(s) I(A)(1 &2) of the Permit as described in the table below.	Serious	# of Occurrences	Serious Subtotal	\$ 7,938
		\$ 1,323	6	\$ 7,938	
		Moderate	# of Occurrences	Moderate Subtotal	
		\$ 712		\$ 0	
		Marginal	# of Occurrences	Marginal Subtotal	
		\$ 305		\$ 0	

Parameter & Outfall #	Observations - DMR Monitoring Period and Relevant Reported Monitoring Results									Legal Req. *
	Jan 2024	Feb 2024	Mar 2024							
Outfall 001- 145- Chlorides- Avg. Conc (mg/L)	3,648	3,204	2,976							390
Outfall 001- 145- Chlorides- Max. Conc (mg/L)	3,648	3,204	2,976							390

(Remainder of this page intentionally left blank)

Violation	Observations and Legal Requirements	Civil Charge		Subtotal
	Failure to submit Discharge Monitoring Report(s). <b>Permit Part(s)</b>	\$ 0		\$ 0
		# of Occurrences		
	Failure to submit Discharge Monitoring Report(s) on time. <b>Permit Part(s)</b>	\$ 0		\$ 0
		# of Occurrences		
	Failure to follow the sampling and/or monitoring requirements in the Permit. <b>Permit Part(s)</b>	\$ 0		\$ 0
		# of Occurrences		
	Failure to submit a report as required by the Permit. <b>Permit Part(s)</b>	\$ 0		\$ 0
		# of Occurrences		
✓	Failure to properly operate and maintain the Facility and systems of treatment and control. <b>Permit Part(s)</b> II(Q)	\$ 305		\$ 305
		# of Occurrences	1	
	Failure to develop and maintain an operations and maintenance manual that meets all the requirements of the Permit. <b>Permit Part(s)</b>	\$ 0		\$ 0
		# of Occurrences		
	Failure to implement provision(s) of the operations and maintenance manual. <b>Permit Part(s)</b>	\$ 0		\$ 0
		# of Occurrences		
✓	Unauthorized discharge into state waters. <b>Va. Code § 62.1-44.5(A)</b> <b>9 VAC 25-31-50(B)</b>	\$ 1,323		\$ 1,323
		# of Occurrences	1	
	Failure to report a discharge into state waters to the Department or the coordinator of emergency services appointed for the political subdivision. <b>Va. Code § 62.1-44.5(B)</b> <b>9VAC25-31-50(B)</b>	\$ 0		\$ 0
		# of Occurrences		
Violation Component Civil Charge Subtotal		\$ 9,566		

(Remainder of this page intentionally left blank)

Aggravating Factors		
	Additional Civil Charge Assessment	Subtotal
Major Facility	No	\$ 0.00
Consent Order in another media Program within 36 months	No	\$ 0.00
Consent Order in the same media program within 36 months	No	\$ 0.00
Degree of Culpability	Moderate	\$ 2,391.50
Aggravating Factors Subtotal		\$ 2,391.50
Civil Charge Subtotal and Aggravating Factor Subtotal		\$ 11,957.50
Flow Reduction Factor	No	\$ 0.00
Gravity Based Component Subtotal		\$ 11,957.50
Cooperativeness and Quick Settlement	30%	-\$ 3,587.25
Economic Benefit of Noncompliance	Yes	
In accordance with 62.1-44.15(8d), the Responsible Party's Ability to Pay was evaluated and it was determined that there is an ability to pay.	Yes	
Total Civil Charge		\$ 8,370.25
Based on the results of staff observations, the Department concludes that the Responsible Party has violated the Va. Code and Regulations as identified herein.		

SECTION D: Agreement and Order

Accordingly, by virtue of the authority granted it in Va. Code §§ 62.1-44.15, the Department orders the Responsible Party, and the Responsible Party agrees to:

- ☒ Perform the actions described in Appendix A of this Order if this box is checked and
- Pay the total civil charge of \$      \$ 8,370.25      in settlement of the violations cited in this Order in accordance with the following:
- ☐ Within 30 days of the effective date of the Order, or
- ☐ In accordance with the following payment schedule:

(Remainder of this page intentionally left blank)



Due Date	Amount

If the Department fails to receive a civil charge payment pursuant to the schedule described above, the payment shall be deemed late. If any payment is late by 30 days or more, the entire remaining balance of the civil charge shall become immediately due and owing under this Order, and the Department may demand in writing full payment by Responsible Party. Within 15 days of receipt of such letter, Responsible Party shall pay the remaining balance of the civil charge. Any acceptance by the Department of a late payment or of any payment of less than the remaining balance shall not act as a waiver of the acceleration of the remaining balance under this Order.

Payment shall be made by either credit card at [www.deq.virginia.gov](http://www.deq.virginia.gov) or check, certified check, money order or cashier’s check payable to the “Treasurer of Virginia,” and delivered to:

Receipts Control  
Department of Environmental Quality  
Post Office Box 1104  
Richmond, VA 23218

The Responsible Party shall include its Federal Employer Identification Number (FEIN) with the civil charge payment and shall indicate that the payment is being made in accordance with the requirements of this Order for deposit into the Virginia Environmental Emergency Response Fund (VEERF). If the Department has to refer collection of moneys due under this Order to the Department of Law, Responsible Party shall be liable for attorneys’ fees of 30% of the amount outstanding.

**SECTION E: Administrative Provisions**

1. The Department may modify, rewrite, or amend this Order with the consent of the Responsible Party for good cause shown by the Responsible Party, or on its own motion pursuant to the Administrative Process Act, Va. Code § 2.2-4000 *et seq.*, after notice and opportunity to be heard.
2. This Order addresses and resolves only those violations specifically identified in Section C of this Order. This Order shall not preclude the Department or the Director from taking any action authorized by law, including but not limited to: (1) taking any action authorized by law regarding any additional, subsequent, or subsequently discovered violations; (2) seeking subsequent remediation of the facility; or (3) taking subsequent action to enforce the Order.
3. For purposes of this Order and subsequent actions with respect to this Order only, the Responsible Party admits the jurisdictional allegations, and agrees not to contest, but neither admits nor denies, the findings of fact and conclusions of law in this Order.
4. The Responsible Party consents to venue in the Circuit Court of the City of Richmond for any civil action taken to enforce the terms of this Order.
5. The Responsible Party declares it has received fair and due process under the Administrative Process Act and the State Water Control Law and it waives the right to any hearing or other administrative proceeding

(Remainder of this page intentionally left blank)

authorized or required by law or regulation, and to any judicial review of any issue of fact or law contained herein. Nothing herein shall be construed as a waiver of the right to any administrative proceeding for, or to judicial review of, any action taken by the Department to modify, rewrite, amend, or enforce this Order.

6. Failure by the Responsible Party to comply with any of the terms of this Order shall constitute a violation of an order of the Department. Nothing herein shall waive the initiation of appropriate enforcement actions or the issuance of additional orders as appropriate by the Department or the Director as a result of such violations. Nothing herein shall affect appropriate enforcement actions by any other federal, state, or local regulatory authority.
7. If any provision of this Order is found to be unenforceable for any reason, the remainder of the Order shall remain in full force and effect.
8. The Responsible Party shall be responsible for failure to comply with any of the terms and conditions of this Order unless compliance is made impossible by earthquake, flood, other acts of God, war, strike, or such other unforeseeable circumstances beyond its control and not due to a lack of good faith or diligence on its part. The Responsible Party shall demonstrate that such circumstances were beyond its control and not due to a lack of good faith or diligence on its part. The Responsible Party shall notify the DEQ Regional Director verbally within 24 hours and in writing within three business days when circumstances are anticipated to occur, are occurring, or have occurred that may delay compliance or cause noncompliance with any requirement of the Order. Such notice shall set forth:
  - a. the reasons for the delay or noncompliance;
  - b. the projected duration of any such delay or noncompliance;
  - c. the measures taken and to be taken to prevent or minimize such delay or noncompliance; and
  - d. the timetable by which such measures will be implemented and the date full compliance will be achieved.

Failure to so notify the Regional Director verbally within 24 hours and in writing within three business days, of learning of any condition above, which the parties intend to assert will result in the impossibility of compliance, shall constitute a waiver of any claim to inability to comply with a requirement of this Order.

9. This Order is binding on the parties hereto and any successors in interest, designees and assigns, jointly and severally.
10. This Order shall become effective upon execution by both the Director or his designee and The Responsible Party. Nevertheless, the Responsible Party agrees to be bound by any compliance date which precedes the effective date of this Order.
11. This Order shall continue in effect until:
  - a. The Director or his designee terminates the Order after the Responsible Party has completed all of the requirements of the Order;

(Remainder of this page intentionally left blank)

- b. The Responsible Party petitions the Director or his designee to terminate the Order after it has completed all of the requirements of the Order and the Director or his designee approves the termination of the Order;  
or
- c. The Director or Department terminates the Order in his or its sole discretion upon 30 days’ written notice to Responsible Party.

Termination of this Order, or any obligation imposed in this Order, shall not operate to relieve the Responsible Party from its obligation to comply with any statute, regulation, permit condition, other order, certificate, certification, standard, or requirement otherwise applicable.

12. Any plans, reports, schedules or specifications attached hereto or submitted by the Responsible Party and approved by the Department pursuant to this Order are incorporated into this Order. Any non-compliance with such approved documents shall be considered a violation of this Order.
13. The undersigned representative of the Responsible Party certifies that he or she is a responsible official or officer authorized to enter into the terms and conditions of this Order and to execute and legally bind the Responsible Party to this document. Any documents to be submitted pursuant to this Order shall also be submitted by a responsible official of Responsible Party.
14. This Order constitutes the entire agreement and understanding of the parties concerning settlement of the violations identified in Section C of this Order, and there are no representations, warranties, covenants, terms or conditions agreed upon between the parties other than those expressed in this Order.
15. By its signature below, the Responsible Party voluntarily agrees to the issuance of this Order.

And it is so ORDERED.

DEQ Signee Signature

Date

Jerome A. Brooks

DEQ Signee Name

Regional Director

Title

I hereby certify that I am the Responsible Party or duly appointed representative/officer of the Responsible Party.

RP Signee Signature

Date

Carol E. Steele

RP Signee Name

County Administrator

Title

(Remainder of this page intentionally left blank)



Commonwealth of Virginia

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

www.deq.virginia.gov

Stefanie K. Taillon  
Acting Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources

Michael S. Rolband, PE, PWD, PWS Emeritus  
Director

In re:	Gloucester County
	6489 Main Street
	Gloucester, VA 23601
	Facility Name: Gloucester County Water Treatment Plant
NOV No.	W2024-05-P-0001 (May 15, 2024)

EA No. PR24-0512  
Reg. No. VPDES VA0078778

APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE OF COMPLIANCE

This Schedule of Compliance (“SOC”) is developed to identify certain requirements necessary to address violations of the Virginia State Water Control Law, including violations of Va. Code § 62.1-44.5(A), 9 VAC 25-31-50 and Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. VA0078778. The SOC is also developed to promote Gloucester County’s (Gloucester) independent evaluation of long-term, durable compliance. Gloucester and the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) agree that in order for Gloucester to achieve long-term, durable compliance, it is necessary for Gloucester to complete a Water Treatment Plant Chloride Mitigation Project capable of meeting the requirements of Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. VA0078778.

Gloucester shall take the following actions:

- 1. **Conventional Water Treatment Process Utilization.** Immediately upon the effective date of this Order, Gloucester Water Treatment Plant shall maximize use of the conventional water treatment process (i.e. surface water plant) and minimize use of the reverse osmosis system. Maximizing the conventional water treatment process will mitigate chloride concentrations discharged to receiving waters. Gloucester shall keep a daily log of the Water Treatment Plant’s use of each treatment process in gallons per day. This daily log shall be made available to DEQ upon request.
- 2. **Water Treatment Plant Chloride Mitigation Project.** Within 180 days of the effective date of this Order, Gloucester shall submit to DEQ either:
  - a) An approvable Concept Engineering Report (CER) of upgrades/ expansion of the Water Treatment Plant’s conventional water treatment process and/or reverse osmosis

(Remainder of this page intentionally left blank)



- process which demonstrates that Gloucester can achieve long-term durable compliance with VPDES Permit No. VA0078778; or
- b) An approvable CER of construction for a new outfall which would allow Gloucester to discharge to brackish/ salt waters (salinity greater than 1.0 parts per thousand) and demonstrates long-term durable compliance with VPDES Permit No. VA0078778, applicable regulations, and State Water Control Law; or
  - c) An approvable CER which demonstrates Gloucester can achieve long-term durable compliance with VPDES Permit No. VA0078778, applicable regulations, and State Water Control Law.

The approved CER will become an enforceable provision of this Order.

- 3. **Water Treatment Plant Chloride Mitigation Project Schedule.** Within 30 days of receiving approval of a CER by DEQ, Gloucester shall complete and submit to DEQ, a Water Treatment Plant Chloride Mitigation Project Schedule (Project Schedule). The Project Schedule shall include, but shall not be limited to a line-item description of:
  - a) Task Description,
  - b) Status,
  - c) Start Date,
  - d) End Date,
  - e) Anticipated Duration, and
  - d) Comments.
- 4. **Interim Chloride Mitigation Plan.** Within 30 days upon the effective date of this Order, Gloucester shall submit an approvable Interim Chloride Mitigation Plan to DEQ to mitigate potential effects of chloride on Beaverdam Swamp throughout the duration of this Order or until such time that the final compliance project is complete and operational. Upon DEQ’s approval, Gloucester shall immediately implement the Interim Chloride Mitigation Plan through the duration of this Order.
- 5. **Water Treatment Plant Chloride Mitigation Project Quarterly Reporting.** Gloucester shall complete a Project Schedule Quarterly Report that includes the information described in SOC Number 3. Gloucester shall submit such Project Schedule Quarterly Report to DEQ for review and coordination on or before the first day of January, April, July, and October for each year the Order is effective. The report must provide reasonable and sufficient professional information to determine compliance with SOC Number 3, Water Treatment Plant Chloride Mitigation Project Schedule.
- 6. **Water Treatment Plant Chloride Mitigation Project Completion.** Within 1,200 days of effective date of this Order, Gloucester shall complete the Water Treatment Plant Chloride Mitigation Project and conduct the necessary staff training to achieve long-term durable compliance with VPDES Permit No. VA0078778, applicable regulations, and State Water Control Law.
- 7. **DEQ Contact.** Unless otherwise specified in this Order, all documents and other information required by this Order shall be submitted to:

Matt Richardson  
DEQ-PRO/Enforcement Office  
4949-A Cox Road  
Glen Allen, Virginia 23060  
EM: Matthew.Richardson@DEQ.Virginia.gov

Mr. Chriscoe thanked Ms. Legg for her hard work, for keeping the Board informed, and for keeping the water flowing. He asked her to thank her staff as well.

**b. Board Appointments**

**COMMUNITY POLICY & MANAGEMENT TEAM**

Mr. Hutson moved, seconded by Mr. Chriscoe, to reappoint Ms. Pritchett to the Community Policy & Management team. The motion carried and was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

**COMMUNITY POLICY AND MANAGEMENT TEAM**

**WHEREAS**, the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors has previously appointed the Community Policy and Management Team to administer the Children’s Services Act in Gloucester County; and

**WHEREAS**, the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors has learned that an appointment is necessary on the Community Policy and Management Team; and

**WHEREAS**, the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors is now prepared to make this appointment to the Community Policy and Management Team.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors that the following individual be hereby reappointed to the Gloucester Community Policy and Management Team as the private provider representative for a term which shall expire on April 30, 2027.

Jenny Pritchett  
Private Provider

**TOURISM COMMITTEE**

Mr. Gibson moved, seconded by Mr. Chriscoe, to appoint Sarah Burney as the Chamber of Commerce representative to the Tourism Committee. The motion carried and was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

**TOURISM COMMITTEE**

**WHEREAS**, the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors has created the Tourism Advisory Committee to advise the Board concerning the development of tourism in our community; and

**WHEREAS**, the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors is the appointing authority for said committee; and

**WHEREAS**, the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors has learned of an appointment that is needed to this Committee.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors that the following individual be hereby appointed to the Gloucester County Tourism Committee as the Chamber of Commerce representative for a term which shall begin immediately and shall expire February 28, 2028.

Sarah Burney  
Chamber of Commerce Representative

**12. County Attorney Items**

There were no County Attorney items.

**13. Boards and Commissions Reports**

There were no board or commission reports.

**14. Supervisors Discussion**

Dr. Orth brought up the comments made by Mr. Zoll. He asked if this was something the Board wanted to address.

Mr. Wilmot stated that the Board should have received Mr. Zoll's letter and his response to the Board. He noted that the history of the Daffodil Festival had been that no alcohol sales had been allowed at the event. He stated that this decision had been made by administration with the Board of Supervisors' consent. This had gone very well over the years and it was a practice that the Board should consider carefully before dictating a change. He appreciated Mr. Zoll's business and his efforts to expand his business. He noted that the Daffodil Festival was held primarily on County property and portions were held on State owned property.

Mr. Chriscoe asked when the application process for vendors opened for the Daffodil Festival. He noted that there was no way the Board could make this change in time for this year's Daffodil Festival. If the Board wanted to contemplate a change, then a conversation needed to be held in time for next year's event.

Ms. Legg stated that applications usually opened in September/October with final selections made in the middle of January.

Ms. Steele stated that some years ago there was discussion in the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee about bringing a possible ordinance change to the Board to consider allowing alcohol in parks for events. She thought that if the Board wanted to consider something, it may be best to think beyond just the Daffodil Festival. She reviewed some of the things that the Board may want to consider.

Mr. Wilmot stated that the only thing he would add was that there was an ordinance about prohibiting alcohol in County parks, but the Daffodil Festival was not a park and fell under the County Administrator's purview in facility use.

Mr. Chriscoe stated that he wanted to make sure that if the Board wanted to consider this that it did so in a timely fashion.

There was a brief discussion on options and a consensus to consider this in the future.

**16. Adjournment**

Mr. Chriscoe moved, seconded by Dr. Orth, to adjourn. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 7:26 p.m. by a unanimous voice vote.

---

Kevin M. Smith, Chair

---

Carol E. Steele, County Administrator

**AT A MEETING OF THE GLOUCESTER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD ON MONDAY, MARCH 17, 2025, AT 6:00 P.M. IN THE COLONIAL COURTHOUSE, 6504 MAIN STREET, GLOUCESTER, VIRGINIA:**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Mr. Smith called the meeting to order, and Ms. Steele took roll call.

**THERE WERE PRESENT:** Kevin M. Smith, Chair  
Ashley C. Chriscoe, Vice Chair  
Christopher A. Hutson  
Kenneth W. Gibson  
Robert J. Orth

**THERE WERE ABSENT:** Phillip N. Bazzani  
Michael A. Nicosia [arrived at 6:04 p.m.]

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Edwin "Ted" Wilmot, County Attorney  
Carol Steele, County Administrator

**2. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance - M.A. Tony Nicosia - Supervisor, Ware District**

Mr. Hutson gave an invocation and then all in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

**3. Public Comment Period**

There were no public comments.

**4. Regular Agenda**

**a. Presentation of FY 2026 County Administrator's Proposed Budget - Carol Steele - County Administrator**

Ms. Steele thanked everyone who assisted in getting the budget together. She informed the Board that an appendix was included in case they wanted additional details. She began her presentation with the proposed budget highlights which included a 3% COLA (cost of living adjustment), a 4.3 cent tax increase, and a 12.5% increase in healthcare costs, among other items. Ms. Steele stated that the FY26 proposed general fund expenditure budget totaled \$88,356,943, which was 2% higher than the amended FY25 budget. She briefly listed items that were not included in the budget such as new position requests, additional school funding, CIP (capital improvement projects) requested funds, and 41% of FMRR (facilities maintenance, repair and replacement) requests.

Ms. Steele then reviewed organizational concerns such as almost \$993,072 FY26 PayGo requests that were not included in the proposed budget, capital projects funded based on what was left from last year's budget, a lack of funds for economic development, reliance on grants to fund capital projects, and the postponement of funds for quality-of-life related services and facilities.

Ms. Steele showed a table of assessment years and changes in tax rates. She noted that the budget was balanced on a \$0.626 real estate tax rate. She noted that



as house values went up, tax rates decreased, which was in-line with similar localities. She showed the tax rates for other localities and noted that Gloucester was the lowest. She pointed out however, that neighboring areas provide some services that Gloucester did not. Ms. Steele noted that a penny increase on the real estate tax rate was worth an additional \$568,845 in revenue.

Regarding personal property tax, Ms. Steele informed the Board that Gloucester was still at the second lowest rate in the region. A penny increase would generate \$46,178. She explained that the veterans tax relief program had grown by 238% since 2016 and was estimated to be \$1.58 million in 2025. She noted that state laws changed which required relief, but no additional funding was given to support the loss in revenue. She stated that the projected revenue for FY26 incorporated \$2,469,281 in real estate revenue that would be generated from a 4.3 cent tax increase.

Ms. Steele then moved to compensation and the proposed personnel changes in the general fund. She briefly noted the items in the proposed budget that included the 3% COLA, one new Sheriff's office position, partial implementation of the results from a salary study, career ladder adjustments, and health insurance increases. She explained that vacancy savings increased by \$200,000 to balance the additional expenses leading to a total impact of about \$1.7 million. She briefly noted that the budget included a \$600 increase in pay for each Board member.

Ms. Steele then gave an explanation of the general fund budget which showed that there was over \$42 million in transfers to other funds. She then pointed out that the top five expenditures included schools, Sheriff Office & jail, fire and rescue, debt, and capital transfers which added up to 69% of the budget. She stated that the budget requests for FMRR projects totaled to about \$1.6 million and the proposed budget did not include \$670,342 of that amount.

Ms. Steele explained that grants and special programs were placed into a separate fund and that due to required matches, \$396,418 in general fund transfers were needed to support grant funded initiatives. For education funds, she stated that there she proposed level funding and noted that the general fund supporting school operation and debt service was \$33,626,228. She noted that this does not include the school's HVAC (heating, ventilation, air conditioning) system or buses. Ms. Steele briefly went over funds for Social Services, the Children Services Act, and opioid abatement. She went over the debt service fund and explained that it did not include the debt payment for Gloucester Volunteer Fire and Rescue Station 1 or the debt payment for the school's HVAC system. They would be borrowed in FY26 with the first payments due in FY27.

Ms. Steele showed the list of recommended capital improvement projects for FY26 through debt financing and PayGo which included grants. She stated that the proposed budget had two possible options for funding the fire department but there were other options the Board could consider as well. She proposed the first option

which required a \$0.005 tax increase in both FY27 and FY28. The second option, she continued, postponed the tax increase until FY28 but would cost approximately \$270,000 more. Both options assumed the general fund continued to transfer to debt service approximately \$4.1 million annually.

Ms. Steele moved on to the capital fund which included \$17,389,796 for Gloucester Volunteer Fire and Rescue to be debt financed, \$4,970,196 for School HVAC to be financed with debt and collected school sales tax, as well as \$4,093,877 in transfers. She went over the highlights of the Utilities budget and noted that it incorporated an anticipated 8% revenue growth from AMI (automated metering infrastructure), 10% revenue growth generated from proposed rate increases, and a proposed borrowing to support the first year of the capital plan. She showed that the Utilities' budget was 3 million less than FY25 due to the number of capital projects in FY25, but that a portion of that would likely be carried over into FY26. She briefly went over the capital plan projects that would begin in FY26 with the request of \$2,095,635. She showed the Board the proposed rate increases to be considered at the public hearing on April 1, 2025. The FY26 rate increase of 14% would generate approximately 10% in additional revenue. She noted that the rate increase would build the fund balance by year two, which was important because the fund balance was currently depleted. That meant Utilities had no funds for emergencies. Additionally, she continued, there would be no general fund impact in FY26. However, she noted that the five-year increase would raise rates by 70% amounting to an additional \$21.91 per month in five years. Ms. Steele stated an alternative would be to use development fund money to pay off existing debt which would lower expenses in year one. She noted that this would allow for a reduction in FY26 from a 14% increase to a 4% increase to generate an approximate 3% increase in revenue. Ms. Steele stated that it would change the five-year customer impact from 70% to 44%. She noted that an issue with the plan was that it required a general fund contribution of \$813,256 for four years to pay back the development fund.

Ms. Steele stated that additional funds requested by civic organizations were not included in the budget and new requests from civic organizations were not funded, but partnership requests were included. She noted that Abingdon Volunteer Fire and Rescue requested additional funds and Gloucester Volunteer Fire and Rescue requested the same funds as FY25 with both being accounted for in the budget.

Ms. Steele showed the Board an overview of how the budget would be balanced. She noted that a real estate tax increase would help with budget requests and declining revenue. Additionally, she noted that other taxes such as the sales tax, meals tax, and lodging tax would be pushed as far as possible. She explained that it also would be balanced through the use of fund balance, limited additions to the budget, and budget reductions based on FY24 actual expenses.

Ms. Steele explained her “B” budget that included her priorities if additional funding became available which included full funding of the compensation study results, additional personnel, FMRR funding, full funding of work as required salaries, additional capital projects, additional support for non-profit group requests, and the economic development fund. She noted that the schools were not included. She recommended that the Board advertise a 6 cent real estate tax increase which would give an additional \$967,000 of funding but did not include \$500,000 requested from the schools or Utilities from the general fund. She briefly went over the appendix that included expanded information from the presentation and additional information for the Board to review.

Mr. Gibson asked when construction would start on the fire station, given an alternative to borrowing which would postpone a tax increase until FY28.

Ms. Steele explained that the project would start as soon as possible either later this year or early next year but would cost an additional \$270,000 because payments would be postponed.

Regarding Utilities, Mr. Gibson then asked about the current balance of the development fund.

Ms. Steele replied that it was \$1.3 million. She explained that it would only be used in the first year and the next four years would be the general fund.

Dr. Orth stated that the compensation issue was very important in Utilities because the County needed experienced and knowledgeable staff. He continued and stated that it was difficult to keep the best employees because they obtain experience in Gloucester and then leave for better jobs elsewhere. He stated that with Utilities in its current condition, having experienced people who know what to do in the situations that arise was vital so that issues did not have to be fixed multiple times due to employees with a lack of experience.

Mr. Chriscoe asked what the 12.5% increase in health insurance costs the County.

Ms. Calloway stated that it was \$634,714 in the general fund and \$56,147 for Utilities.

Mr. Hutson asked what the average use of water was in gallons for residential homes.

Ms. Legg stated that 90% of residential use was 5,000 gallons or less. She noted, however, that some were apartments or mobile homes, and one meter did not show how much water went to each unit. Ms. Legg informed the Board that there are 3,300 water customers in the County and 1,700 used 2,000 gallons or less. She noted that this information was based on data from FY24 that used old meters.

Mr. Hutson asked to see the average usage rather than the minimum and it was noted that the information would be provided.

Mr. Nicosia asked what kind of dwellings used less than 2,000 gallons.

Ms. Legg stated that it could be a single person, or they charged the minimum

because they had access but were not hooked up.

Mr. Hutson clarified that Ms. Steele had not proposed a personal property tax increase. He then asked if she proposed any use of fund balance to equalize the budget other than for capital

Ms. Steele confirmed that no personal property tax increase was proposed, and fund balance was only proposed for capital.

Mr. Hutson asked how much the Comp Board paid toward the 3% COLA.

Ms. Calloway stated that she would provide that information to the Board.

Ms. Steele stated that the HVAC for the schools was completely covered by the schools' sales tax, and in response to a question, clarified that it would be covered by debt and the debt service would be covered by the sales tax.

Mr. Chriscoe noticed that there was an increase in debt service of \$31,000 and asked about that figure.

Ms. Calloway answered and stated that payments could fluctuate and that there was more general fund impact this year. She also noted that it looked like there was an increase in the debt fund this year, but she misread a FY2025 figure in the budget which could have contributed to the increase in the debt service figure.

Mr. Chriscoe wanted to see if they could get what the local tax rate of 91 cents in revenue would be versus the \$0.583 cent in a dollar amount.

Dr. Orth stated that when the County changed assessments, rates had to be equalized, and he asked if it had to generate no more than 1% of additional revenue and other Board members stated that he was correct.

Mr. Smith noticed that earlier Ms. Steele had stated that Gloucester-Mathews Humane Society received level funding, but she had also mentioned other involvement.

Ms. Steele stated that in Animal Control's departmental budget, there were contracted services with Gloucester-Mathews Humane Society. She noted that they had a kennel cleaning contract and the funds were insufficient because there were more animals than they previously covered. That funding was raised. Additionally, she explained that Gloucester-Mathews Humane Society charged the County a reduced rate for spaying and neutering, but that cost had also gone up. In response to an additional question, she explained that it was level funding for the contribution to their operating budget, but the County also hired them at the same time.

Mr. Chriscoe stated that the Board should look at breaking out the money from the operating budget and use it as a funding mechanism rather than a contribution so that it would show better to the public. He then stated that the proposed budget was balanced on a 4.3 cent tax increase, and he asked what the tax implication would be if everything the County needed was funded. He noted that Ms. Steele had mentioned to the Board the need for an 11-cent increase. He stated that he wanted to be transparent with the public because the proposed budget is half of what the County needed.

Ms. Steele stated that she would provide that information.

Mr. Hutson stated that the real estate property tax had a proposed increase of 4.3 cents and 3.5 cents for personal property would be \$461,000. He stated that he had a problem with concentrating on real property instead of personal property tax and it needed to be considered this year. He continued and stated that the Board should consider both real property and personal property taxes.

Ms. Steele explained that she was concerned about a personal property tax increase because in the past, citizens often complained about how their cars were valued higher than they could be sold for.

Mr. Chriscoe agreed with Mr. Hutson and stated that they should keep the personal property tax increase as an option in case it needed to be used.

**5. Adjournment**

Mr. Hutson moved, seconded by Mr. Chriscoe to adjourn. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 7:21 p.m. by a unanimous voice vote.

---

Kevin M. Smith, Chair

---

Carol E. Steele, County Administrator

AT A JOINT MEETING OF THE GLOUCESTER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND SCHOOL BOARD, HELD ON TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 2025, AT 6:00 P.M., IN THE THOMAS CALHOUN WALKER EDUCATION CENTER, 6099 T. C. WALKER ROAD, GLOUCESTER, VA 23061:

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Mr. Smith called the meeting to order, and Ms. Steele took roll call for the Board of Supervisors.

**THERE WERE PRESENT:** Kevin M. Smith, Chair  
Ashley C. Chriscoe, Vice Chair  
Phillip N. Bazzani  
Christopher A. Hutson  
Kenneth W. Gibson  
Michael A. Nicosia  
Robert J. Orth

**THERE WERE ABSENT:** None

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Edwin "Ted" Wilmot, County Attorney  
Carol Steele, County Administrator

Ms. Arsenovic welcomed everyone on behalf of the School Board which had been in recess since 5:39 p.m. Ms. Parker then moved, seconded by Ms. Scruggs, for the School Board to reconvene in open session and to certify that the Gloucester County School Board, while in closed session, discussed only public matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements provided in Subsection A of Section 2.2-3711 and that only public business matters that were identified in the motion convening the closed session were heard, discussed or considered. The motion carried and was approved by the following roll call vote: Mr. Drew, Ms. Parker, Mr. Andersen, Ms. Saulman, Ms. Scruggs, and Ms. Arsenovic - yes.

2. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance - Dr. Robert J. Orth - Supervisor, Abingdon District and David Washington - Peasley Middle School

Dr. Orth gave an invocation and then David Washington, Peasley Middle School student, led all in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

Ms. Parker stated that David was an 8th grade student from Peasley and a member of the Peasley Student Council Association. He played piano, was an avid reader and loved to write his own short stories. She shared that he loved learning, was a model student, and his teachers shared that he had really blossomed as an 8th grade student this year. All in attendance gave David a round of applause.

3. Approval of the Minutes - no minutes available for adoption

4. Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. Chriscoe moved, seconded by Dr. Orth, to adopt the agenda for the Board of Supervisors. The motion carried and was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Andersen moved, seconded by Ms. Parker, to adopt the agenda for the School Board. The motion carried and was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

**5. Approval of the Consent Agenda**

There were no consent agenda items.

**6. Matters Presented by the Board**

There were no matters for discussion.

**7. County Administrator / Superintendent Items**

Ms. Steele reminded the public that the Board of Supervisors would hold its first budget work session on Monday, March 24 at 6 p.m. in the Colonial Courthouse, and a budget town hall on Wednesday, March 26. Clean Gloucester Day was coming up on March 29.

Dr. Vladu stated that the Gloucester Educational Foundation annual race supporting public education was this Saturday, March 22 at 8:30 a.m.

**8. Public Comment Period**

**HOWARD MOWRY - YORK DISTRICT**

Mr. Mowry stated that he loved the nights with the two government entities sparring over funding for a county that was financially insolvent. He recommended for agenda item d [high school renovation and contingency update] that the one cent sales tax be used to pay for change orders 1-17. In item e [capital improvement update], he hoped that this evening additional information could be provided. In item I [decision on tax rate advertising], the County was being presented the annual tax increase and stated that 85% of the budget was to support salaries and benefits. He noted there was an annual discrimination of water and land. Water pays zero tax while land pays millions. Ten years ago, the Commissioner was to present information on whether businesses show an increase in revenue due to the zero-based tax operation [for boats]. No answer had been forthcoming. With a broke county, what justification could be presented to continue?

**LARRY COHEN - YORK DISTRICT**

Mr. Cohen stated that he notified the School Board of their violation of State Code section 24.2-228 by attempting to make an interim appointment of a School Board member. He further stated that the School Board was required to provide a list of candidates and resumes to the public at least seven days prior to making an appointment, and they were required to seek stakeholder comments. This law was violated by the School Board for many years. Whether they sought counsel on it or not, was to be determined. He noted that stakeholders had a right to comment on the candidates prior to appointment by the School Board. He noted that State Code Section 2.2-3707 governed how the notice was to be posted and reviewed those provisions. He stated that the meeting on the candidates should have been postponed and that the School Board was breaking the law.

**DIANE JONES - WARE DISTRICT**

Ms. Jones stated that the last time she spoke, she recommended that the Administrator balance the budget. She noted that there were many ways to do that. Volunteer groups could be put together to do things instead of hiring a contractor. Volunteers would be more than willing to spruce up Beaverdam Park. Students could learn landscaping by working around the high school. She stated that the School Board minimally fulfilled its obligation to notify the public about the candidates for the School Board replacement and did not meet the requirement of transparency.

**9. Work Session Agenda**

**a. Oratorical Award Winners Recognition - Dr. Diron Ford - Director of Secondary Education**

Dr. Ford presented information on the second annual oratorical competition. He stated that the art of oratory pertained to public speaking. He reviewed the structure of the competition. He began with a short video with highlights from the competition that took place on March 7. He then noted that student voice was very important. He advised that in putting the competition together, they looked at ways to connect to curriculum. He showed those areas in the curriculum that were supported through the competition. He then announced the winners: Paula Ochoa-Zapeda, 1st Place; Kaelyn Southworth, 2nd Place; and David Washington, 3rd Place. Ms. Ochoa-Zapeda and Ms. Southworth were not able to attend. Dr. Diron presented Mr. Washington with a plaque.

All in attendance gave Mr. Washington a round of applause.

Dr. Diron also presented a plaque to Ms. Carter-Mayo, one of the staff liaisons. He then stated that the competition could not have taken place without the support of the community and noted the support from the Woodville-Rosenwald School Foundation, the NAACP, and the Fine Arts Museum. He asked several representatives to speak.

Dr. Parker, Ms. Armstead, and Dr. White Brown individually thanked the teachers, and all those who assisted the students in participating.

Ms. Carter-May then thanked all the sponsors for making the opportunity available to the students. She also thanked the families for supporting their students in this competition.

**b. Presentation on Work Based Learning - Eugene Schoeck - Work Based Learning Coordinator**

Mr. Schoeck reviewed the information in the instruction and academic achievement strategic goal. He showed some pictures of students in the different types of career and technical education classes to include carpentry, health sciences, culinary, and auto mechanics. He discussed the leadership event that was sponsored in the fall. He reviewed the goals for work based learning to include bridging the gap between high school and high-demand, high-skill careers, building on classroom-based instruction to develop employability skills, and providing exposure to professional work settings. He reviewed enrollment in the top five courses and the



types of learning opportunities. He invited several students to speak about their experiences.

Ms. Nester discussed her position as a nurse aide at Dockside.

Ms. Penn stated that she had been working at Gloucester House as a nurse aide for about a year and relayed some of her experiences.

Mr. Shelton stated that he was in the automotive technology program and had started to work at the Gazette Journal as a press mechanic learning to operate the press.

Mr. Schoeck stated that they received a lot of support from local businesses. He reviewed upcoming events to include a hiring event, signing day, and the summer skilled trades boot camp. He noted the next steps for the program included optimizing career and academic planning in middle school, increasing the number of learning experiences by 10 percent, and expanding the program to add welding and HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) as new courses.

Mr. Bazzani asked whether a degree was required to teach CTE (career, technical education) courses.

Mr. Schoeck stated that he was not an expert but most just needed an industry certification.

Dr. Vladu clarified that they were turning to industry professionals for some of these. However, they needed to develop teacher support and mentoring programs for those professionals. He noted that there was a difference between teaching fifteen students versus one.

Mr. Nicosia stated that he worked closely with Mr. Schoeck. He invited anyone who wanted to see what the kids were doing outside of the core subjects to come and visit. He advised that the CTE teachers requested things not to stockpile, but to invest in the students.

Ms. Arsenovic thanked Mr. Schoeck for what he was doing and all the business partners in the County who helped to make the program strong.

**c. Opioid Settlement Funds FY2026 Expenditure Recommendations - Quinton Sheppard - Community Engagement and Public Information Director**

Mr. Sheppard stated that he was presenting on behalf of Mr. Wright. He was requesting approval to continue four of the five initial opioid abatement projects and to add two new projects for FY26. He reviewed the current projects and noted that the prevention and treatment specialist at the high school was one of the most successful ventures. He reviewed the other programs. He stated that it was recommended to include subsidized residential/inpatient bed fees and peer support certification training in FY26.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Chriscoe moved, seconded by Mr. Hutson, to approve the FY2026 opioid settlement fund spending plan. The motion carried and was approved by the following roll call vote: Mr. Bazzani, Mr. Chriscoe, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hutson, Mr. Nicosia, Dr. Orth, and Mr. Smith - yes.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE FY 2026 OPIOID SETTLEMENT FUND  
SPENDING PLAN

**WHEREAS**, the Commonwealth of Virginia is expected to receive opioid-related settlement funds by the settlement administrators each year until at least 2039;

**WHEREAS**, the Opioid Abatement Authority (OAA) was established by the Virginia General Assembly in 2021 as an independent entity to abate and remediate the opioid epidemic in the Commonwealth through financial support from the Virginia Opioid Abatement Fund in the form of grants, donations, or other assistance, for efforts to treat, prevent, and reduce opioid use disorder and the misuse of opioids in the Commonwealth; and

**WHEREAS**, and 55% of each settlement is to be sent to the OAA to be distributed in accordance with Code of Virginia §2.2-2374; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Supervisors adopted an initial spending plan for use of opioid settlement funds at its September 5, 2023, meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, based on outcomes of the initial projects and additional stakeholder input, an updated spending plan for FY26 has been developed that will be funded with direct opioid settlement funds as well as funds from the OAA; and

**WHEREAS**, the recommended plan would continue support for the Prevention and Treatment Specialist position, access to transportation for medication assisted treatment and therapeutic counseling, subsidization of costs for medication assisted treatment locally and through the Northern Neck Regional Jail Medication Assisted Treatment program, and production of a comprehensive resource guide; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed spending plan incorporates subsidized residential/inpatient rehabilitation bed fees and scholarships for peer support certification training as new projects; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors does hereby approve the attached FY2026 Opioid Settlement Fund Spending Plan.

FY26 Plan for Gloucester

Recommended Initiative	Estimated Cost
Prevention and Treatment Specialist (GCPS)	\$32,225.00
Comprehensive Resource Guide for Mid Pen Region	\$1,000.00
Ride to Recovery (subsidized transportation to therapeutic counseling/MAT)	\$40,000.00
Subsidizing MOUD/MAT locally and through Northern Neck Regional Jail	\$267,005.00
Subsidized Residential/Inpatient Rehab Bed Fees	\$15,000.00
Peer Support Certification Training Scholarships	\$5,000.00

Project Contingency	\$5,000.00
FY 2026 Proposed Budget Total	\$365,230.00

d. **Gloucester High School Renovation and Contingency Fund Update - Bryan Hartley - Deputy Superintendent**

Mr. Hartley provided an update on the high school renovation work. He reviewed the work on the stormwater system lines that was not originally anticipated. He showed pictures of that work and the ductile iron pipes that were originally in the ground. He showed a picture of the kitchen floor and noted that all of the electrical and plumbing had to be replaced, which was not expected. He discussed those issues in more detail.

Mr. Bazzani asked why the contractor had not identified the issues originally.

Mr. Hartley noted that Moseley Architects did the design and put together the information for the bid process. He stated that it was likely that the pipes under "C" hall would look the same as those under "A" hall. He continued his review showing some of the finished areas to include the chorus, band, and drama rooms. He reviewed the use of the contingency fund and stated that there was approximately \$1.3 million left. The project had about six more months before it would be completed.

There was additional discussion on the underground piping.

Mr. Andersen stated that this was an expected circumstance. He noted that Moseley had made it clear that it would be expected to find issues when the layers were peeled back and that the best scope would not be perfect.

Mr. Nicosia expressed a sincere thank you to ET Gresham. He stated that the group working on the renovation were very nice. They went out of their way to make sure that instructional time was not impacted and that they were not in the way of students or staff. He stated that it was very important for the public to know that the company doing the work was working well with the school staff.

Mr. Hartley agreed that it had been a very good working relationship.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Chriscoe asked if the piping on "C" hall was part of the original budget and for the cost for the remainder of the terrazzo flooring in the cafeteria.

Mr. Hartley stated that part of the pipe work on "C" hall was in the original budget. He advised that he would provide the information on the flooring cost to the boards.

Ms. Steele reminded the Board that the in previous discussions on the contingency, the Board had approved the use of any remainder for the outside area. She asked if there is any expectation that contingency funds would be left at the end to help with the extra terrazo or the outside improvements.

Mr. Hartley stated that they had hoped to have more contingency at this point than they had. He noted that the site work had been divided into east and west

sections. He advised that the priority would be the east side. He noted that project would move the student parking lot over and away from the bus loop.

**e. Update on Capital Improvement Projects - Bryan Hartley - Deputy Superintendent**

Mr. Hartley stated that the high school renovation was not the only project that had been in progress. He provided an update on the Peasley HVAC and Gloucester High School fieldhouse projects.

**f. Presentation of School Board's Proposed FY2026 Budget and FY2026-FY2030 Capital Improvement Plan - Dr. Anthony Vladu - Superintendent of Schools & Cabinet**

Dr. Vladu stated that he was grateful to present the needs of the almost 5,000 students, their families, and 800 teachers. He would be remiss if he did not recognize the team that had crunched these numbers and to thank the County's finance team. He noted that the budget should never be created in a vacuum and input from stakeholders was very important. He reviewed in general the types and numbers of community input sessions. He reviewed the things that made an effective school division. He showed how Gloucester compared to the other divisions related to the percent of students in poverty and the performance ranking. In the region 2 and 3 ranking, Gloucester was a top ranking school. He reviewed the average daily membership trend projecting steady to declining enrollment through FY28. He showed the local composite index trend. He thanked the boards for fully funding transportation last year to increase the safety and readiness of the bus fleet. He stated that one of the new requests was for the fleet vehicles. He reviewed the characteristics of those vehicles. He noted that there were 26 vehicles with an average age of 15.6 years. He stated that the fleet vehicles were used to transport students and reviewed when that was needed. He stated that by using the fleet vehicles for those transports, there was a cost savings from not having to use a bus. Also, the driver of a fleet vehicle did not have to have a CDL (commercial driver's license).

There was a brief discussion on the opportunity for auto tech students to have training at the bus garage.

Dr. Vladu reviewed the five strategic goals, and the amount of increased funding requested to support each one. He discussed the increased need in Goal 1 - Instruction and Academic Achievement. He reviewed the totals for the compensation increase, health insurance increase, and other items.

Mr. Chriscoe asked for the separate amounts for the COLA (cost of living adjustment) and the step.

Dr. Vladu noted that information would be provided. He then continued his review with Goal 3 - Efficiency of Operations, Fiscal Responsibility, Transportation and Human Resources. He reviewed the items to include signage, fleet vehicle needs, maintenance parts and supplies, and food services support. Goal 4 - Ensuring Safe Schools and Secure Transportation included an additional amount for the compensation for bus drivers. He then reviewed the items in Goal 5 - Promoting

## **Draft 3/18/2025 Board of Supervisors and School Board Joint Meeting**

Mental Health & Wellness including three elementary behavior interventionists and two school-based social workers. He reviewed the total of resources that could be allocated in FY26 were expected to be \$2.3 million. He noted items that contributed to that revenue amount to include staff reductions through attrition and non-payroll adjustments. In addition, it was expected that the division would receive an additional \$1.1 million in State funding. He then showed the overall FY26 budget outlook summary. He noted again that the additional requests as he had reviewed amounted to \$5.5 million in additional expenditures. The \$2.3 million revenue plus \$1.1 million from the State totaled \$3.5 million funding available leaving a gap of \$2.037 million for an increase to the local transfer request.

There were questions from Board members about the bus driver increase and staff attrition.

Dr. Vladu clarified that the compensation amount for the bus drivers was proposed to increase to \$20 per hour which was the 4.5% proposed COLA plus an additional \$0.28 per hour. Regarding staff attrition, he noted that they were not making changes to course offerings but looking at master scheduling efficiency. He advised that they were making sure that class sizes were appropriate.

There was additional discussion.

Mr. Nicosia asked if the decreases in staff positions would be on the positions posted but not filled.

Dr. Vladu stated that their analysis was on attrition only. Each year there were between 45-60 resignations and retirements. He advised that some of those positions would not be replaced. He stated that he did not want staff to be concerned about losing their positions.

Mr. Durin then provided an overall look at the FY26 budget request. He reviewed the anticipated federal, state and local funding for an overall total decrease of 0.37% from the FY25 budget. He advised that they would be setting up a grants fund. The total overall FY26 budget request was \$83,530,279. He reviewed the expected federal, state, and local grant revenues in more detail. He then discussed food services. He advised that given the uncertainty at the federal level they calculated funding based on worst, likely, and best case scenarios.

There was additional discussion on the free and reduced lunch program, declining enrollment, and possible future virtual learning.

After the discussion, Mr. Andersen moved, seconded by Ms. Scruggs, to adopt the FY26 recommended budget as presented. The motion carried and was approved by the following roll call vote: Mr. Drew, Ms. Parker, Mr. Andersen, Ms. Saulman, Ms. Scruggs, and Ms. Arsenovic - yes.

### **g. Supervisors / School Board Discussion**

Mr. Hutson stated that he had been hearing questions about what happened to the money for the fire station. He asked that at the Board of Supervisors meeting on

## **Draft 3/18/2025 Board of Supervisors and School Board Joint Meeting**

Monday, staff provide a presentation on where the money was and what happened as a starting point for the Board's budget discussion.

### **h. School Board Adjournment**

As there were no other items for the School Board, Mr. Andersen moved, seconded by Ms. Scruggs, to adjourn. The motion carried and the School Board adjourned at 8:19 p.m. by a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Smith called for a brief recess for the Board of Supervisors.

### **i. Decision on Tax Rates for Advertising and Authorization to Set Public Hearing - Carol Steele - County Administrator**

After the recess, Ms. Steele stated that she had been notified that there was an issue with the video streaming again. Staff will be checking into the issue, but the backup video will be converted and will replace the affected video tomorrow. She then stated that the Board had the information on the possible tax rates for advertising. The proposed budget would create the need for a 4.3 cent real estate tax increase. She stated that she was suggesting that the Board advertise an additional 6 cents on the real estate tax rate and a 10 cent increase on the personal property tax rate. She noted that with the budget that the School Board just adopted the increase would be an additional 3.6 cents above the 4.3 cents needed for the current proposed budget.

Mr. Chriscoe stated that the rate for advertising needed to be at 66.2 cents or the whole meeting tonight was a waste.

Dr. Orth asked whether the federal funding numbers for the schools were solid given information from Washington.

Ms. Steele stated that they were as solid as they could be at this point.

There was discussion on the value of 10 cents on the personal property tax rate and where the real estate advertising should be set.

Mr. Chriscoe stated that the State budget may contain language requiring a match from the locality for state funding. He noted that he had asked for the breakdown of the step and cost of living from the schools. He also noted that most businesses were giving a 2% salary increase. He stated that he was not sure where he would end up, but he did not want to lock himself into not being able to fund school items.

Dr. Orth noted the advertised rate was important because the Board could not go higher but could go lower.

Mr. Hutson reminded the Board that last year, fund balance was used to balance the budget. He noted that for easier calculation, 67 cents would be best.

Mr. Chriscoe agreed and moved to set the advertised rate at \$0.67 for real estate, manufactured homes and public service corporations and \$3.10 for the tangible personal property with the other rates staying the same. Mr. Hutson seconded the motion.

After a brief discussion, Ms. Steele polled the Board on the motion on the floor. The motion carried and was approved by the following roll call vote: Mr. Chriscoe, Mr. Hutson, Mr. Nicosia, Dr. Orth, Mr. Smith – yes; Mr. Bazzani and Mr. Gibson – no.

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO  
ADVERTISE FOR PUBLIC HEARING THE FY 2026 PROPOSED COUNTY  
BUDGET AND CY 2025 REAL ESTATE TAX LEVIES AND OTHER  
PROPOSED TAX LEVIES**

**WHEREAS**, the County Administrator has submitted to the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors a proposed annual budget for the County for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2026, as required by Section 15.2-1541 of the State Code; and

**WHEREAS**, a brief synopsis of the budget is to be published and a public hearing to be held as required by the provisions of Section 15.2-2506 of the State Code; and

**WHEREAS**, a notice to establish the real estate and other tax levies for calendar year 2025 is required to be published and a public hearing to be held; and

**WHEREAS**, it is the wish of the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors that calendar year 2025 tax levies be advertised as \$0.67 for Real Estate, \$0.67 for Public Service Corporation Property; \$0.67 for Manufactured Homes, \$3.10 for Tangible Personal Property not otherwise set out; \$0.0000000000000001 for one motor vehicle owned or leased by a member of a volunteer fire department as specified in State Code 58.1-3506 (A)(15); and \$0.0000000000000001 for Boats; and

**WHEREAS**, it is also the wish of the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors that calendar year 2025 Ad Valorem tax rates be advertised as \$0.01 for the special service districts.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors that the County Administrator is authorized to advertise for public hearing the FY 2026 Proposed County Budget and the suggested calendar year 2025 Proposed Tax Levies.

There was additional discussion on philosophy for setting the advertised tax rates with Board members noting the work on the budget that was ahead.

**10. Adjournment**

Mr. Hutson moved, seconded by Mr. Bazzani, to adjourn. The motion carried and the Board of Supervisors adjourned at 8:50 p.m. by a unanimous voice vote.

---

Kevin M. Smith, Chair

Carol E. Steele, County Administrator



**GLOUCESTER COUNTY**  
**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**MEETING DATE:** May 20, 2025

**AGENDA ITEM #:** IX – A

## **BOARD AGENDA ITEM**

---

**TYPE OF AGENDA ITEM:**

- ☐ CONSENT
- ☐ PRESENTATION
- ☒ REGULAR
- ☐ PUBLIC HEARING
- ☐ Duly Advertised

**PURPOSE OF ITEM:**

- ☐ INFORMATION / DISCUSSION
- ☒ DISCUSSION AND / OR DECISION
  - ☒ Resolution
  - ☐ Ordinance
  - ☐ Motion

**PRESENTER:** Brian Lewis

**TITLE:** Engineering Services Director

**AGENDA TITLE:** Resolution to Approve Transportation Alternatives Grant Application for Tyndall's Point Park to Gloucester Point Beach Connector

**BACKGROUND / SUMMARY:** The County is interested in submitting an application to VDOT's Transportation Alternatives Program for funding of the Tyndall's Point Park to Gloucester Point Beach Connector (project). The project will provide a connection between Tyndall's Point Park and Gloucester Point Beach, making the entire area more accessible to the public. The project will begin at Tyndall's Point Park, continuing down the bluff adjacent to the Coleman Bridge, then underneath the Coleman Bridge to Greate Road at the Gloucester Point Beach. This connection will then tie into the Greate Road Pedestrian Improvements project, which will improve access for pedestrians from the Gloucester Point Beach along Greate Road to Lafayette Heights Drive.

The project is included in the 5-year Capital Improvement Plan for FY2028. The estimated cost of the project is \$3.0 million. If successful, this grant will cover 80% of the project cost, up to a maximum of \$2.5 million with the County providing a minimum match of 20%.

The program requires submission of a pre-application by May 31, 2025. If the pre-application is deemed viable, VDOT will notify the County that a full application may be submitted by September 15 for final consideration. Award determinations are expected in 2026. If successful, the funding would be available beginning in FY2027 and construction would need to begin within four years.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Proposed resolution  
Transportation Alternatives Program Guidelines  
Capital Improvement Plan – Project Submission Sheets

**REQUESTED ACTION:** ☐ NO ACTION REQUESTED

Consider adoption of proposed resolution.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION:**

Name: Brian Lewis

Phone: 804-693-5480

Email: [blewis@gloucesterva.info](mailto:blewis@gloucesterva.info)



**AT A MEETING OF THE GLOUCESTER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, HELD ON TUESDAY, MAY 20, 2025, AT 6:00 P.M., IN THE COLONIAL COURTHOUSE AT 6504 MAIN STREET, GLOUCESTER, VIRGINIA ON A MOTION MADE BY \_\_\_\_\_, AND SECONDED BY \_\_\_\_\_, THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:**

Phillip N. Bazzani, \_\_\_\_;  
Ashley C. Chriscoe, \_\_\_\_;  
Kenneth W. Gibson, \_\_\_\_;  
Christopher A. Hutson, \_\_\_\_;  
Michael A. Nicosia, \_\_\_\_;  
Robert J. Orth, \_\_\_\_;  
Kevin M. Smith, \_\_\_\_;

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SUBMISSION OF A GRANT APPLICATION WITH THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR A TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM PROJECT**

**WHEREAS,** the Virginia Department of Transportation's (VDOT) Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is a federal reimbursement program intended to improve non-motorized transportation, enhance the public's travel experience, revitalize communities, and improve quality of life; and

**WHEREAS,** the TAP program is a federal reimbursement program providing 80% of funding for an approved project and requiring a local match of 20%; and

**WHEREAS,** the capital improvement plan includes a project in FY2028 to construct a new trail from Tyndall's Point Park to Gloucester Point Beach to make the whole area more accessible to the public with the goal of funding with TAP grant funds; and

**WHEREAS,** the Transportation Alternatives Program has a biennial funding cycle and the pre-application period for the FY2027/FY2028 cycle is now open; and

**WHEREAS,** the pre-applications are screened by VDOT for eligibility and may be screened in to move to a full application; and

**WHEREAS,** if moved to a full application, public input will be solicited and a formal resolution by the Board will be requested at a future meeting.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors supports the submission of the Transportation Alternatives Program grant pre-application.

A Copy Teste:

---

Carol Steele, County Administrator

# 1 PROGRAM OVERVIEW

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

This manual provides programmatic guidance on the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) as administered by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). This document supplements and interprets guidance provided by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in its [Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Implementation Guidance of March 2022](#).

This information is provided as a supplement to the information found in VDOT's Locally Administered Projects Manual ([LAP Manual](#)), which is the primary source for guidance regarding project development and delivery, and should be utilized as the primary reference for any locality administering a VDOT- or FHWA-funded project, including TAP. Further, additional state and federal rules and regulations, including those promulgated by VDOT and FHWA, may supersede the information provided in this guide.

TAP aids Local Public Agencies (LPAs) in funding community-based projects that expand non-motorized and multimodal travel choices and enhance the transportation experience. Such projects improve the cultural, historical, and environmental aspects of transportation infrastructure. The Program does not fund traditional roadway facility or maintenance projects. Instead, it emphasizes constructing and expanding active transportation facilities that provide equitable accommodations for all users. Outcomes of the supported projects lead to quality-of-life benefits for residents, alternative mode accessibility, safety, reductions in pollutants and emissions, and the expansion of recreational facilities.

## 1.2 BACKGROUND

### 1.2.1 Program History

TAP is a subset of the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) of the most recent federal transportation bill, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) (Pub. L. 117-58), also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) (23 U.S.C. 133(h)). Eligibility for these set-aside funds include all activities that were previously eligible under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act and Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act (MAP-21).

The Transportation Enhancement (TE) program, which later evolved to the current Transportation Alternatives Program, was established in 1991 under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and continued through the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) and Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). TAP was established in 2012 under MAP-21. TAP modified the former TE eligible categories and consolidated these with Safe Routes to School (SRTS). The Recreational Trails program is administered by the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation.

### 1.2.2 Program Intent

TAP expands non-motorized travel choices, strengthens local economies, improves safety and quality of life, and protects the environment. Funds may be awarded to eligible entities for eligible projects through a competitive application process. TAP's focus is on providing pedestrian and bicycle facilities and community improvements, and it is a key program for helping to build Complete Streets, which are safe for all users and provide safe, connected, and equitable on- and off-road networks.



The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) encourages the use of funding to upgrade the conditions of streets, highways, and bridges to make them safe for all users, while also modernizing the network to be accessible for all users, provide better choices, accommodate technological advances, and be sustainable, resilient, and equitable.

---

### 1.3 CONTACT INFORMATION


---

The nine VDOT District Offices have designated staff working on TAP projects. These staff are the first points of contact for additional information and clarifications, where needed. District staff coordinate with Central Office staff for guidance and policy direction when needed.

A directory of current District staff contacts is available on [VDOT's TAP webpage](#).

VDOT also provides a list of localities served by each [District Office](#) as well as general District contact information.



Select if Revised	Tyndall's Point Park To GPB Connector					Date:	10/22/2024
Describe revision, if applicable	New Project					Year of First Submittal:	2026
Project Overview:	This project would fund a new trail at Tyndall's Point Park that would connect to Gloucester Point Beach, making the whole area more accessible to the public. The grant award is expected to be up to 2.5M with a 20% County match (\$500,00) for a total cost of \$3M.						
Requesting Department	Park Operations	Est. Useful Life	+30 Years				
Location (address)	1376 Vernon Street Gloucester Point, VA 23062	Start Year	2028				
Magisterial District	Gloucester Point	Est. Completion Year	2028				
Annual Recurring Cost	+\$1,001 to +\$10,000	Category	Construction of New Facilities				
Number of Residents Served	ALL	Primary Board Priority	Natural and Recreational Resources				
Expenditure Description	Total Project Request	Budget Year	5-Year CIP				Beyond 5 Years
		FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030	FY only
Land Acquisition	\$ -						
A&E	100,000			100,000			
Construction	2,900,000			2,900,000			
Equipment	-						
Other	-						
Total Proposed Capital Costs	\$ 3,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Source of Funding	Total Funding	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030	Beyond 5 Years
Grant	\$ 2,500,000			\$ 2,500,000			
Donations	-						
Fund Balance-Committed	-						
County Funds	500,000			500,000			
Total Capital Funding	\$ 3,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Describe Funding Sources (If Not County Funds)	Potential TAP (Transportation Alternatives Program) Grant through VDOT that will fund up to 2.M for this project. This grant requires a 20% county match.					
	Describe Annual Recurring Costs	Minor trail maintenance will be needed to maintain this trail (cleaning debris, power washing, etc.)					





**GLOUCESTER COUNTY**  
**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**MEETING DATE:** May 20, 2025

**AGENDA ITEM #:** IX – B

## **BOARD AGENDA ITEM**

---

**TYPE OF AGENDA ITEM:**

- ☐ CONSENT
- ☐ PRESENTATION
- ☒ REGULAR
- ☐ PUBLIC HEARING
- ☐ Duly Advertised

**PURPOSE OF ITEM:**

- ☐ INFORMATION / DISCUSSION
- ☒ DISCUSSION AND / OR DECISION
  - ☒ Resolution
  - ☐ Ordinance
  - ☐ Motion

**PRESENTER:** Carol Steele

**TITLE:** County Administrator

**AGENDA TITLE:** Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Appointments

**BACKGROUND / SUMMARY:** As recommended by the Planning Commission, the Board is appointing a five member Comprehensive Plan steering committee to assist the Planning Commission in developing recommendations to be discussed with the Board in August. One member from each of the five magisterial districts is needed. At the Board's May 6 meeting, appointments were made for the Gloucester Point, Ware and York districts. Appointments for Petsworth and Abingdon are needed.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Resolution

**REQUESTED ACTION:** ☐ NO ACTION REQUESTED

If ready, consider appointments to the steering committee.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION:**

Name: Carol Steele

Phone: 804-693-4042

Email: county.administrator@gloucesterva.info

**AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE GLOUCESTER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, HELD ON TUESDAY, MAY 20, 2025, AT 6:00 P.M., IN THE COLONIAL COURTHOUSE AT 6504 MAIN STREET, GLOUCESTER, VIRGINIA ON A MOTION MADE BY \_\_\_\_\_, AND SECONDED BY \_\_\_\_\_, THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:**

Phillip N. Bazzani, \_\_\_\_;  
Ashley C. Chriscoe, \_\_\_\_;  
Kenneth W. Gibson, \_\_\_\_;  
Christopher A. Hutson, \_\_\_\_;  
Michael A. Nicosia, \_\_\_\_;  
Robert J. Orth, \_\_\_\_;  
Kevin M. Smith, \_\_\_\_;

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE**

**WHEREAS**, Gloucester County has started the process to update the County's Comprehensive Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission has recommended that a steering committee consisting of one representative from each magisterial district be appointed to assist the Commission in its review of the Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Supervisors has considered applicants for the committee and is now ready to make the needed appointments.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Gloucester County Board of Supervisors that the following individual(s) are hereby appointed to the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee for an appointment that shall begin immediately and shall expire April 30, 2026.

A Copy Teste:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Carol E. Steele, County Administrator