



## REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Economic Development Authority (EDA), of Stafford County, Virginia, was held at the George L. Gordon Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Rd, Stafford, VA 22554 with a virtual option on Friday, August 23, 2024.

### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Hagerman, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:02 AM on August 23, emphasizing the necessity for all members and staff to declare any conflicts of interest with the agenda items.

A quorum was present and accounted for.

#### **Members**

Heather Hagerman, Vice Chairman  
Jack Rowley, Treasurer  
Price Jett  
Jeff Roosa  
Marlon Wilson  
Janette Holland

#### **ED/EDA Staff Present**

Liz Barber  
Savannah Wimbush  
Christine Mulrooney  
Linzy Browne

#### **Also Present**

Jen Morgan, RioT  
Paul Santay

### **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Ms. Hagerman entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the July 12 meeting. Ms. Barber pointed out an error regarding the misidentification of Mr. Roberts as Mr. Curry in the document. Mr. Rowley made a motion to accept the amended minutes, with was and seconded by Mr. Roosa, passing unanimously.

### **APPROVED 6-0**

### **3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**

- a. RioT Update- Ms. Morgan provided an update on the successful closeout of a capacity-building grant from GO Virginia, noting that the final remittance of \$70,000 had been submitted. Mr. Rowley complimented the meticulous preparation and detailed documentation associated with the grant process; a sentiment echoed by Ms. Hagerman who thanked the team for their professionalism.
- b. Stafford County Economic Development Update- Ms. Barber discussed operational matters, including updates to the member binders and the challenges with the legibility of



the Virginia code within them. She mentioned steps to remedy this and highlighted upcoming activities with Retail Strategies, a company contracted to assess potential retail properties. She detailed their upcoming planned visit to better understand local retail landscapes through direct assessment.

In staffing updates, Ms. Barber shared the challenges in filling the Economic Development Specialist position after a candidate retracted their acceptance. She also mentioned the open position for Business Development Manager, which is currently posted to be filled.

Ms. Barber discussed a potential new bond initiative brought forth by an inquiry from Joseph + Brown Development Associates, which Ms. Barber had detailed in the meeting package. Mr. Roosa asked how this project might strategically align with Stafford County's 2040 plan and the broader economic development goals. Mr. Rowley noted the significant financial returns from previous bonds and suggested no liability on the EDA's part, with fees structured as a percentage of the gross bond amount. The discussion underscored the need for a detailed presentation by the bond applicant to fully understand the potential impacts and benefits of the proposed projects. Ms. Barber reassured the committee of her coordination efforts for the next steps, including scheduling a detailed presentation on the bond initiative.

She concluded her updates by discussing the productive partnership with the FRA, defending its value amid regional political skepticism. Mr. Rowley requested that Ms. Barber schedule an FRA update by Mr. Curry Roberts at the next scheduled meeting.

#### **4. TREASURER'S REPORT**

- a. Mr. Rowley presented the Treasurer's Report, which provided an overview of the financial status of the organization. He began by acknowledging a typographical error on the financial statement cover page that listed the same date for two different months.

Mr. Rowley elaborated on the organization's financial health, noting that the primary operating account was well-funded. He mentioned reviewing the financial statements and confirmed that all seemed to be in order. He highlighted a recent transaction involving a \$3500 check, which was a reimbursement from AWS for the EDA's legal fees.

During the report, Mr. Roosa raised a query about a noticeable \$32,000 drop in cash on hand, as indicated in the summary of accounts. Mr. Rowley responded that the decrease was due to bills that had been paid, suggesting that the specifics of these transactions could be better detailed in future reports to enhance clarity. The discussion prompted further discussion of the organization's liabilities, which Mr. Rowley confirmed had decreased by \$22,000, aligning with the reduction in cash reserves. This was part of the ongoing financial adjustments and allocations that regularly occur within the organization.

Ms. Hagerman entertained a motion to accept the Treasurers Report. Mr. Rowley moved to accept the Treasurer's Report and Mr. Roosa seconded, passing unanimously.



## **APPROVED 6-0**

Mr. Rowley addressed the meeting with updates on administrative processes and financial oversight. He began by discussing a procedural enhancement involving the bookkeeper's reconciliation reports. Historically, these reports had not been directly accessible to the board or filed systematically. To improve transparency and record-keeping, Mr. Rowley requested that going forward, the reconciliation reports be compiled by the contracted bookkeeper and sent monthly to the Treasurer and Economic Development Director, ensuring they are included in the organization's files.

Mr. Rowley shifted the discussion to the management of investment accounts. Mr. Rowley explained that currently, only he and Mr. Owen (a former EDA member) have the authority to execute transactions from these accounts. He proposed granting limited, view-only access to both the county staff and the bookkeepers to enhance operational efficiency. This access would allow them to view the account statements without going through him or another intermediary, which he believed would streamline the financial management processes.

Mr. Rowley also provided an update on the ongoing audit, noting that it was progressing well with no adverse feedback received thus far. He indicated that a meeting with the auditor is likely forthcoming in September to discuss next steps.

## **5. SECRETARY'S REPORT**

- a. Marketing & Events Update- Ms. Browne presented the Secretary's Report, updating on recent and upcoming events. She noted the success of the last Beer & Business gathering, held at Highmark Brewery with over 108 registrations and about 70 attendees. She highlighted the next event scheduled for November 6 at Adventure Brewing, sponsored by Aquia Realty. Ms. Browne sought a volunteer to serve as moderator or speaker for the next Beer & Business event, to which Ms. Hagerman volunteered.

Further, Ms. Browne detailed the Veterans Business Boot Camp slated for November 13 at the UMW Jepson Center, from 8:30am to 12:30pm. She also emphasized the partnership with the Small Business Development Center (SBDC) to make the event a regional effort. The boot camp will feature awards and presentations, including a financial talk by a representative from Charleston Bank and a session on government contracting by someone from the Virginia Department of Small Business & Supplier Diversity (SBSD).

Ms. Browne also mentioned plans to invite Veteran Affairs to discuss mentorship programs and resources, expressing excitement about securing the Jepson Center for the event.

Mr. Rowley inquired about the EDA's participation in the event, and Ms. Browne encouraged attendance, particularly during the opening session for networking and the award ceremony. She confirmed she would add the event to the calendars of those interested.

Ms. Hagerman commended Ms. Browne for her thorough update and organizational efforts.



## **6. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

- a. AWS legal fee reimbursement – Mr. Rowley mentioned that this item was previously covered during the Treasurer's Report.

## **7. COMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS**

- a. Loan Committee- Ms. Barber initiated the Loan Committee discussion updating on current loan activities, referring to the July loan payment report. She highlighted two specific loans that are delinquent Santana Holdings and Next Level Mosaic.

For Santana Holdings, a demand letter by Hirschler had been issued due to default but was undeliverable both via email and certified mail to the Virginia locations, raising concerns about the recipient's responsiveness. Ms. Brunette, legal counsel to the EDA representing Hirschler, confirmed the delivery issues and noted that the demand had to be served directly at the homeowner's residence in Maryland. Mr. Rowley inquired about the possibility of securing a lien against the property, considering the borrower's non-compliance, which Ms. Brunette stated could be feasible and promised to confirm after the meeting.

Ms. Barber addressed the status of the Next Level Mosaic loan, highlighting that their loan payment report indicates a late charge. She clarified that although they made their August payment, they missed the June and July payments, leaving them two months behind. Despite the borrower's consistent communication, issues such as possible theft within the organization and involvement of the sheriff's office have complicated the situation. Ms. Barber requested the Board's direction on how to proceed, noting that while promises were made to catch up on payments, only one of the three missed payments has been made.

Ms. Hagerman asked if there were broader lessons to be learned from these delinquencies, suggesting that issues might provide insights into improving loan management practices. Ms. Barber proposed that transitioning to a new loan servicing partner might address some underlying issues, as the current servicer, Locus Capital, was exiting the loan servicing business. She mentioned that an alternative service provider, Bridging Virginia, had been identified and was being considered to take over these responsibilities.

She explained that Locus Capital, the current loan servicer, would no longer be providing loan servicing, She and Mr. Rowley have had a call with the potential new provider, Bridging Virginia, that offers both loan servicing and underwriting services, which could provide an impartial review of loan packages before they are presented to the loan committee. She expressed confidence that having a third party involved could improve the process.

Mr. Rowley reflected on the borrower's sincerity, noting that the borrower had previously indicated that his partners had misappropriated the funds. However, Mr. Rowley acknowledged the difficulty in determining the next steps, particularly since there is uncertainty about the property's condition and whether the EDA would want to take ownership of it.

Mr. Roosa expressed his support for leveraging Ms. Hagerman's expertise in this matter.



Ms. Hagerman offered to inspect the property and explore ways to potentially monetize it and recover some of the funds. She mentioned she could visit the property.

Ms. Brunette indicated that she would need to review the agreement to ensure that such an inspection would not constitute trespassing.

Mr. Roosa concurred with this approach, stating that it would be appropriate for Ms. Hagerman to inspect the property with the borrower if he was open to it.

Ms. Holland raised a concern about potential conflicts of interest, given that Ms. Hagerman is a commercial real estate broker.

Ms. Hagerman clarified that, as a commercial real estate broker, she would not be monetizing the property or benefiting financially from the inspection. Ms. Brunette confirmed that there would be no conflict of interest since she would not receive any financial gain from the EDA property.

Ms. Barber then suggested sending a formal demand letter from Hirschler to the borrower, which might prompt them to address the overdue payments. She emphasized that being two months behind is significant and warrants a more serious approach.

Mr. Roosa agreed, advocating for a firm stance moving forward, given the substantial amount of money involved.

Ms. Barber and Mr. Rowley agreed that a formal letter should be sent while also pursuing the property inspection.

Ms. Barber shifted the discussion to Locus Capital's decision to cease loan servicing, noting that Locus had introduced the EDA to a nonprofit organization called Bridging Virginia, which specializes in loan servicing and underwriting. She mentioned that Bridging Virginia's services would come at the same cost as Locus, and they also offer underwriting services at an additional charge. She also noted that REDCO, a non-profit commercial lender, could potentially provide underwriting services at no cost to the EDA.

Mr. Rowley added that Bridging Virginia appears to be the best option, though they are awaiting a draft contract and references from the organization. He also mentioned that REDCO could potentially take over the underwriting responsibilities previously handled by Josh.

Ms. Hagerman inquired about how REDCO is funded, given that they offer their services at no cost. Ms. Barber responded that REDCO is funded by the state or SBA, and they provide these services as part of their funding agreements. She clarified that REDCO's involvement would not require any additional payments from the EDA.

Mr. Roosa sought clarification on whether there might be any expectations from REDCO for donations or other forms of compensation. Ms. Barber reassured him that there are no hidden costs or expectations for additional payments, explaining that REDCO's services are covered by their funding sources.



Mr. Rowley highlighted that communication with REDCO had been challenging, as multiple emails had gone unanswered until recently. Ms. Barber confirmed that after a brief lapse in communication, she managed to connect with Joe, REDCO's Executive Director, who acknowledged the delay and committed to addressing the EDA's needs.

Mr. Rowley indicated that they were still in the process of gathering more information and would likely present formalized agreements and proposals at the next meeting. Mr. Roosa added that the EDA should avoid any appearance of kickbacks or coercion in their dealings.

Mr. Rowley acknowledged that the situation with REDCO might work out, but they are still in the evaluation phase.

- b. Business Resource Committee- Ms. Barber concluded that no applications were received since the last meeting. Mr. Rowley confirmed the same.
- c. Property Group- Ms. Hagerman provided a brief history of the committee for those who might not have been present during its inception. She explained that the committee started approximately six years ago when the county allocated a piece of property to the EDA to help generate funds. Ms. Hagerman and Mr. Rowley worked closely on the first project, which involved improving and selling a challenging property to raise money for the EDA. Mr. Rowley referred to the Thompson Street property, who acknowledged the hard work but emphasized the importance of these efforts in generating significant funds.

Ms. Hagerman then called for volunteers to serve on the committee, stressing the importance of this role. Ms. Barber suggested that given the recent changes within the EDA, it might be wise to reassess all committee assignments at the next meeting. She noted that with staff departures and the absence of Mr., Owen, she used the loan committee as an example, which now consisted solely of Mr. Rowley. The goal, she explained, is to ensure that all seven members of the EDA are engaged by sitting on at least one of the four committees, with no more than 2 EDA members on each committee to avoid FOIA complications.

Ms. Hagerman and Mr. Rowley both agreed that this was a good idea, particularly with the recent addition of a new member, Mr. Frank Porcelli (who was not in attendance at this meeting). The discussion concluded with an agreement to revisit committee assignments at the next meeting.

- d. Technology Committee- During the Technology Committee update, Mr. Roosa began by referring to a previous discussion and an email update from Ms. Barber concerning the FRA potentially taking over the Testbed. The FRA is awaiting a DHS grant application. He noted that the FRA had completed its second round of comments on the grant in mid-June and was awaiting funding confirmation, likely expected by late summer or early fall. Once funding is secured, the next steps would include obtaining approval from the Board of Supervisors for a lease agreement for the Testbed space, which would be managed by the FRA, funded either by the grant or capital campaign funds. Mr. Roosa emphasized that while



the grant status remained in limbo, there was still an expectation that the Stafford EDA would have representation on the testbed board.

Ms. Barber confirmed this expectation, explaining that Stafford EDA's involvement had been communicated as a priority from the outset. However, she noted that the decisions were pending as the grant process unfolded.

Mr. Roosa inquired about Andrew Spence's, Stafford County's Chief Director of Information Services, continued involvement, noting that he and Mr. Wilson had last met with him months ago and had not received any updates since. Ms. Barber clarified that Mr. Spence is still the designated person to oversee the Testbed. She explained that this shift occurred after the project was recognized as a broader county initiative, moving beyond its initial scope under John Holden's leadership, a previous Economic Development Director. Mr. Spence now plays a role, especially as the testbed leads continue to come through the economic development office.

Mr. Rowley expressed concern about the possibility of losing the Testbed to another locality, such as Fredericksburg, especially considering the significant efforts and visibility the project had brought to Stafford. He recalled the attention the Testbed garnered, including speeches and statewide interest, and expressed a desire to keep it in Stafford.

Ms. Barber responded that the eventual relocation might be inevitable due to planned infrastructure changes that would reduce parking at the current site. She mentioned that while the FRA intended to keep the Testbed in Stafford for as long as possible, a future move would likely involve a bid or process to determine the best location. Stafford could still be in the running to host the Testbed.

Ms. Browne provided additional context, emphasizing that the Testbed was much more than just a physical space; it was a significant asset for the entire state of Virginia. She explained that the Testbed serves as a hub for smart technology initiatives across the state, facilitating the deployment of technologies such as flood sensors and broadband connectivity. She likened its impact to having a major corporation, like GEICO, choose to base its operations in Stafford, highlighting the prestige and economic benefits that could come from being the Testbed's home. Ms. Browne stressed that while it would be great to keep the Testbed in Stafford, its scope had grown far beyond a single locality, impacting smart community initiatives throughout Virginia.

Ms. Morgan added to the conversation by discussing the leadership and organizational challenges surrounding the Testbed. She noted that the Testbed was not yet a formal organization with its own structure, which was a critical issue that the FRA needed to address. The FRA would need to decide whether to establish the Testbed as its own nonprofit entity or maintain it under a different framework. Ms. Morgan highlighted the importance of having a diverse board overseeing the Testbed, including local government representatives, EDA members, and experts from various sectors such as transportation and VDOT. This diverse leadership would ensure that the Testbed projects, like deploying





flood sensors, were aligned with broader governmental and community needs, ultimately benefiting businesses that developed and implemented these technologies.

Mr. Jett raised a question about the Testbed's mission, asking whether it was limited to smart cities and similar technologies or if it could encompass other areas like regenerative AI. Ms. Morgan responded that the Testbed was not confined to any single type of technology. She provided an example involving natural language processing applications that could streamline interactions between residents and local government offices, illustrating the broad potential of the testbed to support various innovative technologies.

Mr. Roosa suggested rebranding the testbed as a "Technology Center of Excellence" to better capture its broad scope and appeal, especially as it relates to economic development and attracting businesses to Stafford. He expressed concern that the current focus on smart cities might limit understanding of the Testbed's potential, both within and outside the industry.

Ms. Morgan agreed, noting that the Testbed's communications might benefit from a broader, more inclusive description of its mission. She emphasized that the Testbed serves as a convening organization where small entrepreneurs can showcase their technologies and where critical conversations about technology deployment can take place. This makes the Testbed an essential asset not just for Stafford, but for the entire state.

Ms. Browne closed the discussion by noting that the Testbed's mission and vision have evolved rapidly, driven by the fast pace of technological change. She pointed out that the information currently available about the Testbed might need updating to reflect its broader role and the wide range of technologies it supports. She emphasized the importance of having an entity dedicated to regularly reviewing and aligning the Testbed's mission with its activities, ensuring that it remains relevant and effective.

## **8. OLD BUSINESS**

a. Elect Slate of Officers- Ms. Hagerman acknowledging this was her first time overseeing the election process, and sought guidance from Ms. Barber, who recommended handling each position individually to ensure clarity in the motions.

For the position of Chair, Ms. Hagerman nominated Mr. Rowley, with Mr. Jett seconding the motion. The nomination was approved unanimously.

## **APPROVED 6-0**

Ms. Holland inquired about the frequency of elections, to which Ms. Barber clarified that according to the bylaws, elections are held every July. However, they were delayed this year due to the request of the previous Chair, Mr. Owen. She also mentioned that members could continue to serve if re-elected, with no term limits, though reappointment and re-sworn procedures occur every four years.

Mr. Rowley nominated Ms. Hagerman as Vice Chair, acknowledging the possibility that she might soon be replaced due to her tenuous tenure, pending new appointments by





Supervisor Pam Young. Despite this, Mr. Rowley emphasized that Ms. Hagerman had done an excellent job and suggested that if she were replaced, a new Vice Chair could be elected at that time.

Mr. Roosa raised concerns about continuity, suggesting it might make sense to initiate a transition by appointing someone else, such as Mr. Wilson, while Ms. Hagerman remained involved in an advisory capacity.

Ms. Brunette advised that according to the bylaws, if Ms. Hagerman were elected as Vice Chair and later replaced, a new election would indeed be required.

Ms. Hagerman nominated Mr. Wilson as Vice Chair, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Roosa and approved unanimously.

#### **APPROVED 6-0**

For the role of Treasurer, Mr. Jett volunteered, with the understanding that Mr. Rowley would assist for continuity. Ms. Hagerman nominated Mr. Jett as Treasurer, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Rowley and approved unanimously.

#### **APPROVED 6-0**

Mr. Roosa accepted the role of Secretary after clarifying that while he would be responsible for reviewing the minutes, and the actual drafting responsibilities would be handled with support of the staff. Mr. Rowley nominated Mr. Roosa as Secretary, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Jett and approved unanimously.

#### **APPROVED 6-0**

Mr. Jett referenced Mr. Roosa's earlier comments, expressing a need for individuals interested in the roles of assistant or co-treasurer. He encouraged collaboration with those willing to take on these responsibilities. Mr. Rowley suggested waiting for Mr. Porcelli's arrival to further discuss the matter, noting his own availability to help as needed in the interim.

Ms. Holland highlighted the benefits for newcomers like herself and Mr. Porcelli, suggesting that shadowing various positions would be advantageous for learning and transitioning into their new roles.

Ms. Barber reminded the group that the bylaws allowed for non-members to fill the roles of Treasurer or Secretary, should they want to involve someone with specialized expertise, such as a bank representative or CPA. This was noted for consideration, though no immediate action was taken.

- b. EDA MOU Division of Duties- Ms. Barber introduced the topic of the EDA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) concerning the division of duties. She provided the committee members with a larger print version of the document and mentioned that there was also a



one-page handout in their meeting package, highlighting the modifications that were tabled at the last meeting.

Mr. Rowley clarified the changes he proposed in the highlighted areas, particularly where he recommended that the third-party bookkeeper and the Economic Development (ED) Director have "view-only" access to the investment accounts. This suggestion was well-received.

Ms. Barber further proposed eliminating the term "passwords" from the MOU to prevent potential issues, suggesting instead that it could say, "the third-party bookkeeper and the County ED Director or staff will have view-only access to bank accounts". The committee discussed ensuring the MOU language was future proof, with Ms. Hagerman suggesting that the wording be generalized to "accounts" rather than specifically "bank accounts" to cover both bank and investment accounts. Mr. Rowley agreed that he would be comfortable with that change.

After detailed discussions, the following changes were suggested. The first item was the removal of bolded text in the first highlighted item. The committee agreed to reword the item in this section to read: "Contracted bookkeeper has requisite access to relevant accounts for banking and accounting purposes."

The second item concerned developing a standard operating procedure (SOP) for the chain of custody and use of all usernames and passwords, which was reworded to add "will collaborate to..."

For the third item, the committee decided to remove the reference to the County Economic Development staff from the responsibility of maintaining passwords and instead assigned this duty to the EDA treasurer and bookkeeper.

They further clarified that the third-party bookkeeper and the County ED Director would have view-only access to the accounts.

Mr. Jett raised a concern about the security of giving the bookkeeper full access to the passwords, suggesting that it might pose a risk. After some discussion, the committee agreed to adjust the language to reflect that the bookkeeper would have "requisite access" rather than full control over the passwords, ensuring redundancy and security.

Ms. Barber requested a formal motion to approve the MOU with the agreed-upon modifications as previously stated. Mr. Rowley moved to accept the MOU with the modifications, and Ms. Hagerman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **APPROVED 6-0**

- c. Letter of Support for Falmouth Bridge- Ms. Hagerman moved to the next agenda item, the letter of support for the Falmouth Bridge bike and pedestrian lanes. This request came from Beth Black, Chair of the City of Fredericksburg's EDA, seeking the Stafford EDA's support for the Falmouth Bridge reconstruction project.



Mr. Roosa questioned the exact nature of the support requested, suggesting that a letter from the EDA might be redundant since the county had already written one. However, Ms. Barber noted that additional letters could add weight to the project's consideration, especially from an economic development perspective.

Mr. Roosa suggested that any letter from the EDA should be high-level and aligned with their mission, emphasizing regionalism and economic development. Ms. Barber offered to draft a letter that kept the focus on these areas and proposed getting consensus from the committee, allowing Jack to sign off on the final version. Mr. Roosa also states he would like to work with Ms. Barber on drafting the letter.

Mr. Rowley supported the idea, noting the current safety concerns with the Falmouth Bridge and the importance of making it safer for pedestrians and cyclists. He reiterated that adding another letter to the file could only help the cause.

The committee agreed to allow Ms. Barber and Mr. Roosa to collaborate on drafting the letter, with Mr. Rowley having the authority to sign it once completed. Mr. Jett moved to approve this course of action, and the motion was seconded by Ms. Hagerman and passed unanimously.

## **APPROVED 6-0**

### **9. NEW BUSINESS**

- a. Trunk or Treat Concept- Ms. Holland expressed her excitement about the idea, which she envisioned as a way for the Economic Development Authority (EDA) to support local businesses and engage the community during the holiday season. Drawing inspiration from the success of National Night Out, she proposed that local businesses could host a space at trunk or treat event, where they would promote their businesses while providing a safe environment for children to trick or treat. She suggested potential locations like the Target area or the new Publix parking lot and mentioned that the EDA could benefit from this event by offsetting some costs through business contributions. She also suggested including politicians in the event, as it could be an opportunity for them to connect with the community.

Mr. Wilson raised concerns about involving politicians, emphasizing that the EDA should remain independent and avoid political affiliations. Ms. Holland acknowledged his concerns but explained her intention of fostering a community spirit that includes businesses, politicians, and local government.

Ms. Hagerman then voiced her concern about the EDA's capacity to organize such an event, given their limited staff of the Economic Development department, and the event's focus on economic development. Mr. Roosa echoed her sentiments, noting the potential overlap with the county's Christmas event and the risk of diluting business participation. He suggested that it might be more appropriate to align this idea with the Christmas event or seek input from marketing experts.



Ms. Browne added that there are already several trunk or treat events in the community and suggested that the EDA might consider partnering with an existing event rather than organizing a new one. She also mentioned that she would be unavailable to support this event, as she would be out of town during that time. Ms. Barber also noted that she, too, would be unavailable the week of Halloween.

Mr. Roosa questioned whether the county had any expectations for upcoming holiday events and suggested that the EDA should seek guidance from the Board of Supervisors on what types of events would be beneficial. He then moved to table Ms. Holland's recommendation, which was seconded by Ms. Hagerman.

Mr. Rowley reminded the group that the EDA members are all volunteers with full-time jobs, which limits their capacity to organize events like this. Ms. Holland agreed to revisit the idea next year when there might be more staff support and possibly align it with the budget.

- b. Joint Board of Supervisors/EDA Meeting- Ms. Barber provided potential dates, with November 12th being the preferred date. She also discussed the importance of preparing for the meeting, bringing forth some suggested topics to include the MOU, funding, and future properties. Mr. Roosa suggested finalizing the agenda by the end of September to ensure a well-prepared discussion in November.

Ms. Barber offers to keep a running list of ideas between this meeting and the next so Board members can send their thoughts directly to her via email whenever they have suggestions or points to add. This centralized approach allows for efficient compilation of feedback, which Ms. Barber will then present at the next meeting.

Mr. Roosa recommends that emails sent to Ms. Barber should have a specific subject line, such as "joint meeting," to ensure they are easily identifiable and organized. He further suggests that this method will allow the board to review all contributions collectively at the September meeting, enabling them to finalize, refine, and prepare a robust draft for submission. This method ensures clarity, avoids redundancy, and enhances the effectiveness of the board's collaborative efforts.

Mr. Jett emphasized the importance of having a clear, overarching theme for the meeting, which should focus on ensuring strategic alignment between the EDA, the economic development team, and the Board of Supervisors. He stressed that the tone of the meeting should be one of partnership, where strategies, approaches, and business goals for the county are aligned. Mr. Jett added that the EDA should demonstrate its commitment to collaboration and unified strategic intent, even if the details of the strategic plan are not yet finalized.

Ms. Barber informed the group that the county's economic development strategic plan was currently out for RFP, with the goal of aligning it with the EDA's objectives. She mentioned that the finalized plan would be presented in April, but there might be limited traction before the November meeting due to the timing of the RFP process.



Mr. Roosa inquired further about the strategic plan, expressing surprise at the outsourcing approach. Ms. Barber explained that an external facilitator would be brought in to gather input from all relevant stakeholders, including the EDA, to ensure a comprehensive and aligned strategic plan.

Mr. Jett suggested that during the November meeting, the EDA should explicitly express its desire for cooperation, collaboration, and strategic alignment. He emphasized the importance of showing that the EDA is driving hard towards unified goals for the benefit of the county and highlighted the need to ensure all parties are moving in the same direction.

The group agreed to continue refining their agenda and topics for discussion in preparation for the joint meeting, with Ms. Barber offering to compile and consolidate any suggestions submitted by the members.

#### **10. CLOSED SESSION**

The group agreed there were no topics for closed session.

#### **11. ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Hagerman concluded the discussion by thanking everyone for their valuable input. Ms. Hagerman then formally adjourned the session. Ms. Hagerman made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Roosa seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **APPROVED 6-0**

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jeff Roosa". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Jeff Roosa,

EDA Secretary