

WORKING PAPER

Two Changes on the James City County Board of Supervisors

A Longitudinal Cohort Analysis, 2010–2026

Tommy N. Turner

Williamsburg, Virginia

ORCID 0009-0005-7422-9881

June 9, 2026

Abstract

The James City County Board of Supervisors changed how it makes decisions twice between 2010 and 2026. The two changes happened on different timelines and need separate explanations. Beginning in 2016, the Board began voting to approve cases its own staff or Planning Commission had recommended denying. The pattern emerged after Larson and Sadler replaced Jones and Kennedy and gave Hipple, Sadler, and Onizuk a three-vote override majority. It has sustained across cohorts 4, 5, and 6 with stable density (0.50-0.58 contradictions per flagged meeting) but with a shift from contested 3-2 votes to consensus 5-0 unanimities. Beginning in 2018, average public-comment attendance at flagged meetings dropped from 12.8 (cohort 4) to 8.2 (cohort 5). The drop predates COVID; pre-pandemic 2018-2019 averaged 7.6 speakers per flagged meeting. Cohort 6 (2024-2026) shows a partial rebound to 14.4, anchored on Consolidated Government Center mobilization. The 2016 inflection mechanism (cohort math) is reasonably established. The 2018 inflection mechanism is open; case-type composition, chair tenure, channel substitution, and selective withdrawal are candidate explanations. The paper documents what changed, when, and how, drawing from a unified vote register of 3,136 votes joined to packet sidecars for staff and Planning Commission recommendations.

Related publications (same corpus). Parent corpus: *Regional Government Records Corpus* (DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20088874). Companion analytical paper: *The Working Majority: Public Dissent and Decision-Making on the James City County Board of Supervisors, 2010–2026* (DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20089173). Companion teaching cases: *Public Participation and Representative Judgment in James City County* (DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20089607) and *Representative Judgment After Public Opposition* (DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20089898).

License: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0).

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Methods and data	3
3. Cohort 1: 2010-2011	5
4. Cohort 2: 2012-2013	7
5. Cohort 3: 2013-2015	9
6. Cohort 4: 2016-2017	11
7. Cohort 5: 2018-2023	13
8. Cohort 6: 2024-2026	16
9. Discussion	18
The 2016 inflection	18
The 2018 inflection	19
Theoretical conversations the case speaks to	19
10. Conclusion	21
11. Caveats and methodology appendix	23
References	25

1. Introduction

The James City County Board of Supervisors changed how it makes decisions twice between 2010 and 2026. The two changes did not happen at the same time, and they need separate explanations.

The first change happened in 2016. Through 2015, the Board almost never voted to approve a land-use case its own staff or Planning Commission had recommended denying. That kind of override appeared once across cohorts of supervisors covering 2010 through 2015. Beginning January 2016, after Ruth Larson and Sue Sadler joined the Board, the override pattern emerged sharply. The first verified instance is the July 2017 Skiffes Creek Switching Station vote. Override frequency has remained roughly stable across the three cohorts that follow.

The second change happened in 2018. The Board kept overriding staff at about the same rate, but fewer citizens came to argue at the meetings where it happened. Average attendance at flagged meetings (those with a recorded split or contradiction) fell from 12.8 speakers in cohort 4 (2016-2017) to 8.2 in cohort 5 (2018-2023). Pre-pandemic 2018-2019 averaged 7.6. The drop predates COVID by two years and recovers only partially after it, with a partial rebound to 14.4 in cohort 6 (2024-2026) anchored on a few high-attendance Government Center meetings.

Earlier framings — including this paper's own prior drafts — combined the two events into a single "post-2018" story of board-public divergence. The unified vote register built directly from 376 OCR'd minutes (3,136 votes joined to packet sidecars and Planning Commission recommendation extraction) shows two boundaries on different timelines. The cohort-by-cohort method makes the sequence visible.

The case speaks to three live conversations.

The first is principal-agent theory as it applies to elected boards versus their professional staff. Local-government discretion is structured by Dillon's Rule (Briffault on local government law) and conditioned by the political economy of small jurisdictions (Frug on city power). What this paper documents is one elected body's empirical pattern of overriding staff and Planning Commission recommendations across sixteen years and six supervisor cohorts. The pattern emerges sharply with a roster change, sustains across subsequent rosters, and shifts in voting style (from contested 3-2 splits to consensus 5-0 unanimities) by cohort 6. The agent's recommendations and the principal's votes diverge under specifiable conditions.

The second is public participation. Arnstein's 1969 ladder, dated as the canonical reference is, still names the question: when citizens turn out at hearings, what is the participation actually doing? Fung's typology of mini-publics, Innes and Booher on collaborative governance, and the broader question of channel substitution (citizens shifting from in-person testimony to petitions, online mobilization, lawsuits, electoral action) all bear on the 2018 floor drop. The drop is not a story about the Board changing the channel; the formal hearing remained available. It is a story about citizens choosing to use that channel less. The 2024-2026 partial rebound, when citizens did show up again, was anchored on issues large enough to overcome whatever made the routine contested case feel not worth contesting.

The third is issue salience. The corpus shows 47-speaker meetings (2014 supervisor uniform terms), 42-speaker meetings (2013 Greenspace Easement program), 32-speaker meetings (2017 Skiffes Creek), 29-speaker meetings (2022 Hazelwood Farms, 2025 Cypress Drive STR), and meetings with one or zero speakers across the same window. Citizens still mobilize. What changes is the threshold of importance at which they mobilize.

The paper's empirical scope is JCC only. The unified register covers 2010-2026, all 376 BoS regular and business meetings, with packet-sidecar joining for staff and PC recommendations. Pre-2017 contradictions are independently verified by both a patched parser pass on packet text and a minutes-based scan with hand-verified candidates. Cohorts 5 and 6 contradiction counts are post-verified against minutes to remove duplicate captures and wrong-anchor false positives. The paper does not extend to the WJCC School Board or the Williamsburg City Council. Those comparators belong to a separate paper.

The paper is descriptive. It documents what changed, when, and how. It does not argue that the changes are good or bad. It identifies the cohort-math mechanism for the 2016 inflection and acknowledges that the 2018 engagement drop is undertheorized; possible mechanisms include emergence of new case categories, chair tenure effects, and channel substitution. Confidence on the 2016 mechanism is reasonably high. Confidence on the 2018 mechanism is open.

What follows is methods, then six cohort sections from 2010 forward, then discussion, conclusion, and a methodology appendix. Each cohort section anchors on one or two cases. The two changes — 2016 contradiction emergence and 2018 attendance drop — are described in the cohorts where they happen and synthesized in Section 08.

2. Methods and data

The unified vote register is built directly from 376 OCR'd Board of Supervisors meeting minutes covering 2010-01-04 through 2026-02-10. Each minutes file is parsed for vote tallies in the JCC roll-call format, with item-level identifiers extracted where present and preceding-item text retained for items without explicit IDs. The resulting register holds 3,136 votes. Across all six cohorts the register holds 29 verified staff-or-Planning-Commission contradictions under vote-as-unit coding (cohort totals 0, 0, 1, 8, 13, and 7); the figure is 30 if the Skiffes Creek rezoning and special-use-permit companion votes are counted as two contradictions rather than one case. This is the count the companion paper *The Working Majority* references as "29 verified contradictions under the vote-as-unit coding"; its own case-as-application coding collapses the same record to roughly fourteen cases, the difference being multi-vote cases (Skiffes Creek, Taylor Farm, Hertzler) counted once.

Each vote is joined to its corresponding agenda packet sidecar (extracted .txt files with `===PAGE N===` markers preserving original packet pagination). Item-ID matching runs in three modes: forward (vote item-ID found in packet), bidirectional (packet item-ID found in vote text), and a manual_override layer for cases the auto-anchor cannot resolve. Each vote then carries a staff_recommendation field (approve / deny / no_recommendation), a pc_recommendation field (with the JCC-specific "motion for approval failed by a vote of N-N" idiom built into the parser), a board_outcome field, and an is_contradiction flag set when the Board outcome runs opposite to the staff or PC recommendation.

Cohort definitions group supervisors by who else served alongside them. Six cohorts result. Cohort 1 (2010-01-04 through 2011-12-13): Kennedy, Jones, Icenhour, Goodson, McGlennon. Cohort 2 (2012-03-27 through 2013-10-22): Kennedy, Jones, Icenhour, McGlennon, with Kale and Bradshaw filling appointed seats during transitions. Cohort 3 (2013-11-12 through 2015-12-08): Kennedy, Jones, McGlennon, Onizuk, Hipple. Cohort 4 (2016-01-04 through 2017-12-12): Larson, Sadler, McGlennon, Onizuk, Hipple. Cohort 5 (2018-01-02 through 2023-12-13): Icenhour, Larson, Sadler, McGlennon, Hipple. Cohort 6 (2024-01-02 through the corpus end): Icenhour, Larson, Null, McGlennon, with Hipple's seat transitioning to Wainwright in early 2026.

Three measures sit on top of the register. Splits are votes where supervisors disagreed (3-2 or 4-1). Contradictions are votes where the Board approved over a staff or PC recommendation to deny, or where the Board denied over a recommendation to approve. Public-comment speakers are counted at meetings

flagged for at least one split or contradiction; the speaker counts come from the public-hearing rosters in minutes.

Pre-2017 contradiction counts use two independent verification methods. The patched parser pass on packet sidecars catches contradictions where staff or PC recommendation text appears in the packet. The minutes-based scanner runs forward through OCR'd minutes looking for the JCC roll-call vote signature plus a preceding-item recommendation context, hand-verifying candidate hits. Both methods produce one or fewer contradictions across cohorts 1-3. The earliest verified contradiction is Skiffes Creek (2017-07-11).

Cohorts 5 and 6 contradiction counts are post-verified by hand against minutes and packets. Two parser issues affect cohort 5 and 6 raw counts at roughly 5-10% of tagged items: duplicate vote captures (the same item recorded multiple times when its packet text appears across multiple references) and wrong-item-anchor false positives (staff_rec_text pulled from a different item in the same packet). The October 2024 Scenic Roadway Protection ordinance vote, for instance, generates four duplicate contradiction tags in the raw register from the same single 5-0 approval. Hand verification collapses these to one.

The unified register is at

`regional\_corpus/jcc/joins/unified\_vote\_register\_with\_recs\_2026-05-09.jsonl`.

The cohort-level summary and flagged-meeting roster are at

`longitudinal\_findings\_v10\_2026-05-09.md` and

`longitudinal\_contested\_cases\_v10\_2026-05-09.jsonl`. The cohort 5 and 6

verification samples are at `cohort5\_contradiction\_sample\_2026-05-09.md` and

`cohort6\_contradiction\_sample\_2026-05-09.md`. Pre-2017 verification provenance is at `contradiction\_candidates\_minutes\_v2\_2026-05-09.md`.

Vote tallies always cite minutes, not auto-caption transcripts. Supervisor Null's roll-call responses are clipped in audio and break auto-captioning; minutes are authoritative for her votes specifically and for vote tallies generally. Auto-caption transcripts are used only for verbatim deliberation language quoted in case briefs, never for vote outcomes.

Press citations supplement case-study sections. Two or three citations per named case, drawn from non-paywalled outlets: WYDaily, the Williamsburg Independent, WHRO Public Media, Williamsburg Watch, Bay Journal, the Virginia Mercury, and The Virginia Gazette. Press is for chronology and broader context. Vote tallies and direct supervisor quotes always come from minutes.

3. Cohort 1: 2010-2011

The 2010-2011 Board comprised Kennedy, Jones, Icenhour, Goodson, and McGlennon. Across 19 contested meetings — meetings flagged for at least one split or contradiction — the Board produced 42 split votes (3-2 or 4-1), zero contradictions of staff or Planning Commission recommendations, and an average of 9.9 public-comment speakers per meeting.

Cohort 1 holds the highest split rate in the corpus: 2.21 splits per contested meeting. No subsequent cohort comes close. Cohorts 2 through 4 averaged 1.83 splits per contested meeting; cohorts 5 and 6 averaged 1.03. The 2010-2011 Board fought internally about more cases than any later iteration.

Cohort 1 also has the highest internal-disagreement-to-attendance ratio. The 9.9 average attendance is below the cohort 5 floor by less than two speakers, despite contestation rates more than double cohort 5's. The 2011-05-10 meeting illustrates the pattern: the Board produced two split votes on Longhill Road improvement — McGlennon and Icenhour voting one way, Kennedy, Goodson, and Jones the other way — without a single staff or PC recommendation override and without a notable speaker turnout. The Board fought; the public did not show up to argue.

The corpus's three highest-attendance cohort 1 meetings (2011-09-13 with 25 speakers, 2011-04-26 with 20, 2011-12-13 with 18) all generated splits without contradictions. Disagreement on the Board did not translate into citizens organizing to contest decisions.

The 2010-2011 docket is part of the explanation. The minutes record budget items, procurement decisions, FEMA grant award resolutions, personnel policy revisions, and tax-rate framing during the post-recession recovery, alongside routine land-use cases. Budget and procedural cases produce internal-Board disagreement about how to spend constrained dollars, but the disagreements do not give citizens a clear stake to contest. Land-use cases that draw substantial public turnout require either a project of substantial scale (large rezonings, major utility projects) or a procedural-charter question that touches every voter (uniform terms, redistricting). Cohort 1 had relatively few of either category.

Cohort 1's zero-contradictions count is independently verified. The patched parser pass on packet sidecars produces zero hits across the cohort. The minutes-based scanner produces two high-confidence candidate hits at the 2011-05-10 meeting (vote #5 and vote #6, both Longhill Road), but on review these are board-internal splits with staff approval, not staff overrides. The Board majority denied a staff-recommended improvement; that is the inverse

direction from the cohort 5 typical contradiction. The candidates do not change the cohort 1 verified count.

The cohort presents an anomaly relative to the spine's two-changes thesis. The 2018 attendance drop's average is 8.2 speakers; the cohort 1 average is 9.9, only slightly above the post-2018 floor. If the 2018 drop is read as a participation collapse, cohort 1's 9.9 is barely above that collapse, despite no override pattern and no organized public opposition. The mechanisms that produce 9.9-speaker average attendance in 2010-2011 are not the same mechanisms that produce 8.2 in 2018-2023, but the resulting numbers look similar.

One reading of the cohort 1 anomaly: cohort 1 is a baseline. The 9.9 average reflects routine public participation in JCC government when no large land-use case and no charter question is on the docket. Cohort 2 (20.6 average) and cohort 3 (15.7) are elevated by docket composition — large rezonings, the Greenspace Easement program, the uniform terms ordinance — rather than by structural shifts in participation. Cohort 5's 8.2 represents a fall back to roughly the cohort 1 baseline despite contradictions accumulating, which could mean the 2018 drop is less a collapse than a return to a structural floor that the high-engagement years had temporarily lifted above.

This reading is hypothesis, not finding. The cohort 1 data is consistent with it but does not establish it. The longer pattern visible across cohorts 2-4 includes too many cases where citizens did mobilize at scale to make a "structural floor" argument cleanly. The discussion section returns to the question.

Cohort 1's transition into cohort 2 (2011-12 to 2012-03) involved one supervisor change at the Powhatan District seat (Kennedy retained; Jones, Icenhour, Goodson, McGlennon retained; appointed-seat transitions through Kale and Bradshaw fill the gap before the next election). The Board roster largely held. The dynamics shifted anyway: 2012-2013 attendance jumped to 20.6 average and split rate fell to 1.74 per meeting. The change was not roster-driven. It was docket-driven.

4. Cohort 2: 2012-2013

The 2012-2013 Board kept Kennedy, Jones, Icenhour, and McGlennon from cohort 1, with Kale and Bradshaw filling the fifth seat through transitions. Across 19 contested meetings, the Board produced 33 splits, zero contradictions, and the highest average attendance in the corpus: 20.6 speakers per flagged meeting.

Five cohort 2 meetings drew 30 or more public-comment speakers. The June 25, 2013 meeting on the Greenspace Easement program drew 42, the corpus high-water mark for cohort 2. The March 12, 2013 meeting drew 37. The August 13, 2013 meeting drew 36. The September 10, 2013 meeting drew 35. The October 9, 2012 meeting drew 33. Five of cohort 2's nineteen contested meetings — more than a quarter — exceeded 30 speakers.

Two facts hold in this period: zero staff overrides and consistently strong public turnout. Citizens engaged at scale; the Board worked through internal disagreement; staff and Planning Commission recommendations stood. The 33 splits across 19 meetings is below cohort 1's 42, but the relevant ratio is splits-per-meeting. Cohort 2's 1.74 is meaningfully below cohort 1's 2.21. The Board fought less and engaged citizens more.

The Greenspace Easement program (2013-06-25) is the cohort's anchor case in scale of public engagement. The program's structure (fee-simple acquisition or easement purchase to preserve rural character against incremental rezoning) made it the kind of question that drew citizens across the county. Forty-two speakers represents not just one neighborhood mobilization but a county-wide one. The program passed; staff and PC recommendations aligned with the Board majority.

The cohort 2 docket explains the elevated attendance. Three patterns are visible. Land-use cases at substantial scale (rezonings, large-development proffers) consistently drew 25 or more speakers. Conservation and procedural items connected to broad citizen interests (Greenspace, county priorities) drew the same. The remaining contested meetings — the ones with fewer speakers — concentrated on smaller-scale land-use applications and fiscal items. Cohort 2's docket composition skewed toward issues that mobilized.

Direction of contestation in cohort 2 is also distinct. The 33 splits frequently aligned along consistent fault lines: McGlennon and Icenhour pulling one direction, Kennedy and Jones the other, with the fifth seat (Kale, then Bradshaw) variable. The Board internally contested cases the public was watching closely. The combination produced no overrides because the staff/PC

alignment held majority support — and the public-side mobilization tended to align with whichever subset the staff/PC recommendations supported.

Verification provenance for the zero-contradiction count: the parser pass on cohort 2 packet sidecars produced zero hits. The minutes-based scanner produced one candidate hit (2012-01-10, vote #8, an EDA tourism zone vote) on review classified as a 3-1 split with staff approval rather than a contradiction; the candidate does not survive verification. Both methods converge.

The Greenspace Easement vote and the related cohort 2 cases illustrate the cohort 1-vs-cohort-2 contrast in stark form. Same five-supervisor structure with one shifting fifth seat; same decade context; same OCR'd minute conventions. The cohort 1 average of 9.9 speakers per contested meeting and cohort 2's 20.6 differ by more than a factor of two. The roster did not change much. What changed was what the Board took up.

The cohort 2 record argues against any reading of public-participation patterns as a function of supervisor identity alone. The same Board (minus one shifting seat) produced cohort 1's quiet 2010-2011 and cohort 2's high-engagement 2012-2013. Issue salience and docket composition shaped attendance more than supervisor disposition did.

This matters for the rest of the paper. The 2018 attendance drop is sometimes read as evidence that one or another individual supervisor's tenure suppressed engagement. The cohort 1 / cohort 2 contrast suggests the explanation is more likely structural — about what kinds of cases reach the Board, when, and at what frequency — than about who is sitting in the chairs.

Cohort 2 transitioned to cohort 3 in November 2013 with the elections that brought Onizuk and Hipple onto the Board. Goodson did not stand for re-election; Kennedy was succeeded by Onizuk in 2013-11. Jones and McGlennon held seats. The new lineup carried into a year (2014) that would feature both the highest single-meeting attendance in the corpus (47 speakers, January 14 uniform terms) and a continuing high cohort average. The transition between cohorts is procedural; the engagement pattern carries forward.

5. Cohort 3: 2013-2015

The 2013-2015 Board comprised Kennedy, Jones, McGlennon, Onizuk, and Hipple. Across 23 contested meetings, the Board produced 48 split votes, 1 contradiction, and an average of 15.7 speakers per flagged meeting.

The single contradiction is Candle Station Rezoning and Master Plan Amendment, June 23, 2015 (vote #17). Tally: 4-1 in favor, with McGlennon dissenting. Staff had recommended denial; the Board approved. The case appears in both the patched parser pass and the minutes-based scan, with hand verification confirming the staff_recommendation field. This is the earliest verified staff-vs-Board contradiction in the corpus.

Candle Station is best read as a precursor rather than a pattern. The 4-1 vote with McGlennon as the lone dissenter does not match the cohort 4 contradiction signature (3-2 votes, Larson and McGlennon dissenting, Hipple-Sadler-Onizuk in the majority). The cohort 3 lineup did not produce a sustained override pattern; one case in 23 contested meetings is statistically and substantively a single-case event rather than a structural shift. The structural shift comes after Larson and Sadler join the Board in January 2016.

The cohort 3 attendance average of 15.7 places it second in the corpus behind cohort 2. Five cohort 3 meetings drew 20 or more speakers, with the January 14, 2014 uniform-terms meeting drawing 47 (the corpus single-meeting high). The 2014 ordinance vote (4-1, with McGlennon as the lone dissenter, 13 speakers in the item-specific public hearing) produced a procedural-charter outcome the spine has anchored on as illustrative. The Board exercised internal disagreement on a substantive question that drew county-wide engagement and resolved it without overriding any staff recommendation; the question was procedural, not land-use, and staff did not have a position to override.

The cohort 3 split rate of 2.09 splits per contested meeting is high — second only to cohort 1's 2.21. The Board contested cases at scale. McGlennon dissented frequently. Hipple, Onizuk, and Kennedy clustered together more often than not. Jones moved across alignments by case. The voting pattern shows a Board working through substantive land-use questions and procedural-charter questions on parallel tracks.

Verification provenance for the 1-contradiction count: the parser pass produced 1 high-confidence hit (Candle Station, 2015-06-23). The minutes-based scan produced the same hit plus several "other candidates" requiring human review (2014-07-08 votes #3 and #4 with PC approval but no staff position; 2015-02-10 vote #5 with staff approval; 2015-06-23 vote #14 with staff denial but unanimous board denial that aligned with staff). The other candidates do not

survive review as contradictions. Both methods agree the cohort holds 1 verified contradiction.

The cohort 3 era is the era the spine describes as "near-zero contradictions." The phrase is accurate but the framing requires precision: pre-2017 was not zero overrides; it was 1 override across 65 contested meetings spanning cohorts 1, 2, and 3. The cohort 3 Candle Station case alone falls inside that count. The fourteen-fold jump between cohort 3 and cohort 4 is the structural inflection because cohort 4 produces 9 contradictions in 16 contested meetings (the override paper temporal extension memo's count). Cohort 3 sits on the floor side of that boundary.

A related cohort 3 fact: 48 splits across 23 meetings. The Board fought internally about a great many cases. The fights resolved without overrides. The Board members talked through their differences on the record (the uniform-terms minutes are particularly demonstrative; McGlennon's dissent traces three substantive grounds at length, and Onizuk's vote in favor cites his change of position over the prior year). The cohort 3 record illustrates a Board that disagreed about cases in front of it but did not disagree with the professional staff and Planning Commission about the broader frameworks that produced staff recommendations. By cohort 4 that alignment fractures.

Cohort 3 transitions to cohort 4 with the November 2015 elections. Larson and Sadler win the seats Jones and Kennedy held. Larson takes the Berkeley District; Sadler takes Stonehouse. Hipple, Onizuk, and McGlennon hold their seats. The substitution is two-for-two: two long-tenured supervisors out, two newcomers in, with three holdovers. The cohort change makes a structural difference the Board's prior cohort changes did not. The contradiction count jumps from 1 in 23 meetings (cohort 3) to 9 in 16 meetings (cohort 4) — a fourteen-fold increase in density.

What the cohort 3 record secures empirically is the floor side of the 2016 inflection. Whatever happens at cohort 4 happens against an established baseline of substantive Board internal contestation without staff override.

6. Cohort 4: 2016-2017

The 2016-2017 Board comprised Larson, Sadler, McGlennon, Onizuk, and Hipple. Across 16 contested meetings, the Board produced 25 splits, 9 contradictions, and an average of 12.8 speakers per flagged meeting.

Cohort 4 is the first inflection point. The contradiction count of 9 in 16 contested meetings produces a density of 0.56 per meeting — fourteen times cohort 3's 0.04 (1 contradiction in 23 contested meetings). Cohorts 5 and 6 sustain similar densities (0.50 and 0.58 respectively). The 2016 emergence is not a transitional anomaly; it is the new floor the next ten years sit on.

The mechanism is roster-driven. Larson and Sadler replaced Jones and Kennedy in January 2016. The new five-person Board could not produce overrides through the cohort 1-3 lineups: McGlennon's frequent dissent against any majority position made him a de facto blocking vote on cases where he aligned with staff or PC denials. After the cohort change, Hipple, Sadler, and Onizuk together formed a three-vote majority that could and did approve cases the staff or PC had recommended denying. Larson and McGlennon became the consistent dissenters on contradiction votes.

The cohort 4 contradiction inflection produces an internally contested override pattern. Three of the eight cohort 4 contradictions (per the dedupe pass; the spine reports nine, with the difference traceable to one Skiffes Creek companion vote) pass on 3-2 splits with Larson and McGlennon dissenting. Two pass 4-1. Two pass 5-0. One passes 4-0 with one supervisor absent. Compared to cohort 5's 10-of-13 unanimous and cohort 6's 8-of-9 unanimous, the cohort 4 distribution shows a Board that fought its own overrides at the time. The internal contestation visible in cohorts 1-3 carried into the new override pattern initially, before being absorbed into the cohort 5 consensus norm.

The anchor case is Skiffes Creek (July 11, 2017). Two substantive Skiffes Creek items appeared on the docket: Z-0003-2015 (rezoning) and SUP-0002-2015 (special-use permit) for the Dominion Energy Skiffes Creek Switching Station. Both passed 3-2. Hipple, Sadler, and Onizuk voted yes. Larson and McGlennon voted no. The Planning Commission had voted 4-2 to recommend denial in August 2015, twenty-three months earlier. By the July 2017 hearing the case had become a multi-year national-level controversy: the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Preservation Virginia, the National Parks Conservation Association, and Scenic Virginia all formally objected at the public hearing, citing the proposed transmission-line corridor's impact on Jamestown and Carter's Grove. The Board approved anyway.

Two months earlier, in May 2017, James City County had withdrawn from the federal Memorandum of Agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers governing Section 106 mitigation for the project. The county remained a consulting party but declined the chief-party role. Coverage by WYDaily and Bay Journal confirms the withdrawal sequence and the federal-process context.

Skiffes Creek carries every element of the override signature visible across cohorts 5 and 6: PC denial, multi-year applicant pressure, BoS approval over substantial public-tier opposition, named-coalition mobilization (Save the James Alliance, organized speakers from preservation NGOs). Thirty speakers came to the public hearing for Item No. 4. The vote produced the corpus's first verified staff override that combined organized opposition with a 3-2 contested split — the canonical cohort 4 form.

The cohort 4 attendance average of 12.8 sits between cohort 3's 15.7 and cohort 5's 8.2. The contraction has begun. The 32-speaker peak at Skiffes Creek (or 30 in the formal public-hearing roster) demonstrates that engagement at scale was still available, but the routine contested case in cohort 4 drew measurably fewer citizens than in cohort 3. The drift toward the post-2018 floor begins inside cohort 4, before the structural drop of cohort 5.

Other notable cohort 4 contradictions include LU-0002-2014 (Taylor Farm Land Use Designation Change), which produced a 4-1 contradiction in March 2017 and a contested 3-2 re-vote in May 2017; the 2016-06-14 Two Drummers Smokehouse SUP and the 100 Lake Drive Rental of Rooms (the corpus's earliest STR-SUP contradiction); and Z-0002-2017 / MP-0002-2017 (The Parke at Ford's Colony, December 2017) on a 4-1 split. The case-type distribution in cohort 4 is heterogeneous.

Cohort 4 transitions to cohort 5 in January 2018. Onizuk leaves the Board; Icenhour returns. Larson, Sadler, McGlennon, and Hipple hold seats. The cohort change is one-for-one: Onizuk out, Icenhour in. The override pattern carries forward. The internal contestation does not.

7. Cohort 5: 2018-2023

The 2018-2023 Board comprised Icenhour, Larson, Sadler, McGlennon, and Hipple. Across 26 contested meetings, the Board produced 30 splits, 13 verified contradictions, and an average of 8.2 speakers per flagged meeting.

Cohort 5 is the second inflection point. The contradiction count holds: 13 in 26 contested meetings produces a density of 0.50 per flagged meeting, consistent with cohort 4's 0.56. The override pattern that emerged with the 2016 roster change continues through the cohort 5 lineup. What changed is who attended and how the Board voted on those overrides.

The attendance drop is the structural finding. Cohort 4's average of 12.8 falls to 8.2 in cohort 5. The drop is not pandemic-driven. The pre-COVID 2018-2019 stretch averaged 7.6 speakers per flagged meeting across seven meetings — below even the cohort 5 overall average. The COVID-era window (March 2020 through December 2021) saw further compression, with six meetings averaging 4.7 speakers; two of those meetings drew zero or one speaker. Post-COVID 2022-2023 averaged 10.2 across thirteen meetings, a partial recovery within cohort 5 itself before cohort 6 began. Stripping the COVID window from the cohort 5 calculation produces a recomputed average of 9.3.

The 2018 boundary stands. The mechanism behind the floor drop is open. Three candidate explanations bear on it.

Case-type composition: cohort 5 saw the emergence of short-term-rental SUPs (Tourist Home cases beginning in 2023 with Rochambeau, Chickahominy, and Lake Powell Drive) and Public Service Authority utility tie-in cases (which surface as cohort 6 contradictions but whose pipeline begins earlier). Coding the 13 cohort 5 contradictions by item type yields three STR-SUPs, zero PSA tie-ins, two rezonings, one ordinance amendment, six other SUPs, and one parser-failed item. STR plus PSA accounts for 23% of the contradiction universe. The pre-set threshold for treating docket-composition as the dominant explanation was 7 of 13. Cohort 5 falls well below that threshold.

Channel substitution: the cohort 5 era saw the rise of online petitions (the Government Center mobilization that anchors cohort 6 produced petitions of 900-1,000 signatures by 2025; the precursor petition channels formed earlier). Citizens may have shifted from in-person testimony to online channels during the cohort 5 window, with the in-person hearing remaining available but feeling not worth the time for routine contested cases.

Hipple chair tenure: Hipple held the chair across substantial parts of cohort 5, replacing the cohort 4 Onizuk and McGlennon chairmanships. The chair role

shapes meeting tempo, public-comment time allocation, and the climate citizens encounter when they speak. The paper does not have direct evidence that Hipple's chairmanship suppressed engagement; the temporal correlation is suggestive.

The anchor case for cohort 5 attendance is Hazelwood Farms (February 8, 2022): rezoning of approximately 328 acres from agricultural and business to economic-opportunity classification, with proffers allowing up to 3,220,000 square feet of warehouse and industrial use. The Board approved 3-2 (Hipple, Larson, Sadler in favor; Icenhour and McGlennon dissenting). Twenty-seven enumerated public-hearing speakers, with two additional presenters bringing the meeting total to 29 — the highest cohort 5 attendance.

Important: Hazelwood is a split, not a contradiction. Both staff and the Planning Commission recommended approval; the Board approved with internal dissent. The case appears in the override paper's matched contested-opposed universe under a different selection criterion (named-coalition organized opposition, anchored on Save Rural James City County). The longitudinal paper treats Hazelwood as evidence of cohort 5's residual engagement capacity, the residual deliberative texture (a 3-2 vote in a cohort dominated by 5-0), and the precursor to the cohort 6 organized-opposition pattern.

The cohort 5 contradiction pattern dominates by 5-0 unanimity. Ten of thirteen verified contradictions pass 5-0; one passes 4-0 (one supervisor absent); one passes 4-1; one passes 3-2 (the Hertzler clearing-and-grading SUP re-vote of October 2023 after a procedural challenge to an earlier April approval). The contested-overrides texture of cohort 4 is essentially gone by cohort 5. The Board overrides staff with internal consensus.

Three additional cohort 5 cases bear naming. The Continuing Care Proffer and Master Plan Amendment (January 11, 2022) passed 5-0 with staff explicitly recommending denial on comp-plan grounds. The Williamsburg Crossing Greenwood Christian Academy Expansion (September 13, 2022) passed 5-0 over staff denial. The Chickahominy and Lake Powell Tourist Home cases (June 13, 2023, both 5-0) emerged at the start of the STR-SUP wave that anticipates cohort 6's PSA tie-in pattern. None drew more than 14 public-comment speakers.

The cohort 5 record is the empirical core of the override-paper temporal extension memo's broader contradiction universe. The override paper's matched contested-opposed sample of six cases concentrated in 2022 and 2025 represents a public-mobilization-selected subset of the larger 13-case cohort 5 universe. The other seven cases generated 5-0 overrides on cases where

opposition was structural (zoning incompatibility, comp-plan inconsistency) rather than mobilized.

Cohort 5 transitions to cohort 6 in January 2024 with the entry of Null and the departure of Sadler. Icenhour, Larson, McGlennon, and Hipple hold seats. The cohort change introduces a new dissent voice (Null becomes the consistent contrarian on cohort 6 splits) and prefigures the cohort 6 public mobilization that the next section addresses.

8. Cohort 6: 2024-2026

The 2024-2026 Board comprised Icenhour, Larson, Null, McGlennon, and Hipple, with Hipple's seat transitioning to Wainwright in early 2026. Across 12 contested meetings through February 2026, the Board produced 9 splits, 7 verified contradictions, and an average of 14.4 speakers per flagged meeting.

Cohort 6 produces three patterns the paper treats as fragile but substantive. The contradiction pattern continues at cohort 5 density (0.58 per flagged meeting, the highest in the corpus). The contradictions are entirely consensus: 8 of 9 raw captures (or 7 of 7 after wrong-anchor deduplication) are 5-0 unanimous, with one 4-0 reflecting an absent supervisor. Internal contestation on overrides is gone. The Board moved together.

The attendance pattern partially rebounds. The 14.4 cohort average exceeds cohort 5's 8.2 by 75%. Three meetings drove most of the rebound: 2025-05-13 with 29 speakers (Cypress Drive Rental of Rooms 4-1 split), 2026-01-13 with 24 speakers (Fenton Mill Road Contractor's Office contradiction), and 2025-10-14 with 21 speakers (Government Center plat vacation and Early Site Work Package). One additional meeting drew 20: 2025-06-10, the Government Center master plan SUP. Three of the top four cohort 6 attendance meetings concern the Consolidated Government Center project.

The Consolidated Government Center is the cohort 6 mobilization driver. The project consolidates twelve county functions into a single building at Longhill Road and DePue Drive, replacing facilities at Mounts Bay Road. The cost cap referenced in 2025 BoS deliberations is \$179 million, excluding interest and furnishings. The June 2025 SUP vote passed 4-1 with Null dissenting. The October 2025 plat vacation and early site work package votes passed 4-1 with one dissent. Petition-channel mobilization grew across 2025; speakers at the October 14 meeting referenced a petition with "more than 900" and "nearly 1,000" signatures opposing the project.

The 2026 lawsuit filed by attorney Christopher Woodfin sought to halt the project pending a referendum. The judge denied the effort to halt work on grounds that the 30-day statute of limitations for challenging the BoS vote had expired. WHRO Public Media and WAVY-TV cover the litigation sequence. The Board approved up to \$46 million in December 2025 for plumbing, electrical, HVAC, concrete, and steel pre-order, advancing the project in the face of continuing opposition. The 2026 lawsuit is referenced by the spine as anchoring rebound context; the corpus minutes through 2026-02-10 do not contain direct litigation discussion items, with the project continuing to draw mobilization through the litigation period.

The cohort 6 contradictions divide by case type into three groups. Two are PSA tie-in cases (Westport Subdivision and Liberty Ridge Subdivision Tie-In to JCSA, both February 13, 2024, both 5-0 over staff denial). Three are STR or institutional SUPs (Williamsburg Montessori 2024-11-13, the Druid Drive and Arlington Island items also 2024-11-13; with two of these flagged as likely wrong-anchor false positives in cohort 6 verification). One is the Monticello Avenue Shops case (Z-23-0001/SUP-23-0031, September 10, 2024, 5-0 over PC 6-0 denial). One is the Scenic Roadway Protection ordinance (October 8, 2024, 5-0 over PC 7-0 denial). One is the Fenton Mill Road Contractor's Office (January 13, 2026, 5-0 deny over staff approval, the inverse direction).

The PSA tie-in pattern is significant. Westport and Liberty Ridge both involved extending James City Service Authority public utilities outside the Public Service Area, which staff identified as inconsistent with the Land Use Goals, Strategies, and Actions of the Comprehensive Plan and the Public Utilities Policy. Both passed 5-0 with no internal dissent. PSA tie-ins are a category that grew with cohort 6's docket; they did not appear as contradictions in earlier cohorts.

The Monticello Avenue Shops case (September 2024) carries a clean override signature: PC voted 6-0 to deny; staff recommended approval; Board approved 5-0. The PC and Board diverged sharply. The case typifies the cohort 6 form: substantive divergence between the Planning Commission and the Board's own decision, with staff aligned with the Board.

Cohort 6 fragility deserves explicit framing. Twelve flagged meetings is a small base. The 14.4 average rebound depends on the four high-attendance meetings; if they are removed, the cohort average falls. The 7 contradictions in 12 meetings produces a high density, but the 12-meeting base means single-meeting additions or removals shift the cohort numbers materially. Through 2026-02-10, the cohort is still being built; subsequent BoS meetings (April 2026 budget hearing with 60+ attendees, 17 speakers against the budget, per Williamsburg Watch press coverage) will continue to populate the cohort.

The cohort 6 closes the chronology with the Government Center mobilization, the 2026 budget fights, and the lawsuit context all live and unresolved. The pattern visible across cohorts 4, 5, and 6 — staff override at sustained density across roster changes — does not show signs of reversal. The pattern visible from 2018 through 2023 — citizens absent from routine contested meetings — has partially reversed, anchored on cases substantial enough to mobilize.

9. Discussion

The two changes need separate explanations because the timing makes a single explanation impossible. The 2016 contradiction emergence and the 2018 attendance drop are two years apart. Whatever caused the first cannot, by simple chronology, have caused the second.

The 2016 inflection

The cohort-math explanation is the strongest available. In January 2016, Larson and Sadler replaced Jones and Kennedy. The new five-person Board had three supervisors (Hipple, Sadler, Onizuk) willing to approve cases the staff or Planning Commission had recommended denying. The blocking position McGlennon held in cohort 3 against any potential override majority no longer commanded the votes to block.

The cohort 4 contradiction count of 9 in 16 contested meetings (versus cohort 3's 1 in 23) is a fourteen-fold density jump. Cohorts 5 and 6 sustain similar densities (0.50 and 0.58 per flagged meeting respectively) across two further roster changes (Onizuk out / Icenhour in for cohort 5; Sadler out / Null in for cohort 6). The pattern does not depend on any single supervisor; it depends on the structural condition that three or more supervisors are willing to override staff together.

Docket composition modifies the cohort-math explanation but does not displace it. The cohort 5 case-type coding produces 23% short-term-rental and PSA tie-in cases. The pre-set threshold for treating docket composition as the dominant explanation was 7 of 13 cohort 5 contradictions. Cohort 5 falls well below threshold. Skiffes Creek and Hertzler in cohorts 4 and 5 are not STR or PSA cases; they are large-scale projects (a transmission switching station, an extensive land-disturbance permit) on which the override pattern emerges through the same cohort-math mechanism. The new case categories matter for cohort 6 (where Westport and Liberty Ridge PSA tie-ins do appear) but did not drive the 2016 inflection.

A vote-margin shift sits underneath the contradiction-density continuity. Cohort 4's contradictions ran 5 of 8 contested (3-2 or 4-1 splits). Cohort 5's ran 2 of 13 contested. Cohort 6's ran 0 of 9 contested. The Board moved from contesting its own overrides to acting on them with internal consensus, even as the override frequency held. By cohort 6 the Board is uniformly approving (or in three cases uniformly denying) cases where staff or the Planning Commission recommended the opposite. This shift is independent of the cohort-math explanation for contradiction frequency. It points at a separate process — the

absorption of the override pattern into the Board's normal-business norm — that the 2016 cohort entry only initiated.

The 2018 inflection

The 2018 engagement drop is harder. Three candidate mechanisms bear on it; none is fully established by the data.

PSA tie-in case category emergence: short-term-rental SUPs and PSA tie-ins are case types that surface in cohort 5 (with PSA tie-ins becoming common in cohort 6). The hypothesis is that cohort 5's docket included case types citizens did not historically mobilize around. The cohort 5 case-type coding is consistent with this only weakly: STR plus PSA in cohort 5 is 23% of contradictions and a small share of all flagged-meeting items. The case-type story does not carry the floor drop on its own.

Hipple chair tenure: the chair role shapes meeting tempo and public-comment time allocation. Hipple held the chair across substantial parts of cohort 5. The temporal correlation is suggestive; direct mechanism evidence would require chair-tenure mapping against meeting-by-meeting attendance, which the data assembled here does not pursue.

Channel substitution: citizens may have shifted from in-person testimony to petitions, online mobilization, and lawsuit channels during 2018-2023. The cohort 6 record shows organized petition channels operating at scale (the 2025 Government Center petition with 900-1,000 signatures, the 2026 lawsuit). Whether the cohort 5 floor drop reflects citizens choosing those channels instead of in-person hearings is consistent with the cohort 6 data but is not directly testable from the corpus this paper assembles.

A fourth mechanism worth flagging is selective withdrawal. Citizens who came to cohort 4 hearings and watched 3-2 votes go against staff and PC recommendations may have judged the in-person hearing as not worth the time when the Board would override regardless. The cohort 5 5-0 unanimity pattern reinforces that judgment: a unanimous Board signals citizens cannot move the outcome by speaking. The selective-withdrawal mechanism does not require citizens to give up on civic engagement; it requires only that they redirect it. The cohort 6 partial rebound, anchored on cases where the project's scale may have promised either decisive outcomes or substantial procedural recourse, fits this reading.

Theoretical conversations the case speaks to

Principal-agent theory applied to local government finds an empirical instance here. The Board overrides its professional staff and Planning Commission with

sustained density across multiple cohorts. The override pattern is structured by political composition (cohort math). The override style shifts toward consensus voting (the cohort 5-6 5-0 pattern) without changing the underlying frequency. The tension between professional recommendation and political decision-making is not a malfunction; it is a designed feature of the elected-board form. The case shows how that feature operates over sixteen years.

Public participation theory finds a participation question in the 2018 floor drop. The classical Arnstein frame would treat the floor drop as evidence of disengagement. Fung's typology and the channel-substitution literature complicate that reading: citizens may have shifted channels rather than withdrawn from politics. Issue salience theory reads the cohort 6 partial rebound as evidence that mobilization remains available when issues are large enough. The sub-question (what made cohort 5's routine contested case feel not worth contesting?) is open and does not resolve from the data the paper assembles.

The findings are descriptive. The mechanisms are partial.

10. Conclusion

The James City County Board of Supervisors changed twice between 2010 and 2026. The first change was the emergence of the staff-vs-Board contradiction pattern in 2016, driven by a roster substitution that gave the Board a three-vote override majority. The pattern has sustained across three subsequent cohorts and absorbed into the Board's ordinary business through a shift from contested to consensus voting on overrides. The second change was the drop in public-comment attendance at contested meetings beginning in 2018, two years after the first change. The mechanism for the second change is undertheorized; case-type composition, chair tenure, and channel substitution are candidate explanations.

What the paper does not claim. The two changes are not framed as good or bad. The mechanism for the 2016 inflection (cohort math) is identified with reasonable confidence, but the mechanism for the 2018 drop is open. The pattern visible in JCC is not asserted to generalize: the paper is single-jurisdiction. The paper does not claim that any individual supervisor caused the changes; the pattern is structural and survives multiple roster substitutions.

The paper covers contested meetings — meetings flagged for at least one split or contradiction. Attendance baselines at non-contested meetings are not measured. A complete public-engagement picture would include the full BoS meeting roster, with counts at routine business meetings where consent agendas pass without speakers and ceremonial proclamations draw families and one-off citizens. The contested-meetings frame captures the meetings most relevant to the override pattern but undercounts cohort 6 mobilization on items (like the 2025-04-08 budget hearing with 24 speakers and a 5-0 budget approval) that draw substantial public interest without producing a flagged split or contradiction.

Open questions for the next round. Apply the same method to the WJCC School Board and the Williamsburg City Council records. A regional comparator would test whether the 2016 contradiction emergence is JCC-specific or visible across local boards in the broader Williamsburg area. Code the cohort 5 and 6 contradiction universe on the same dimensions the override paper used for its matched contested-opposed sample. The 6 matched cases plus the 23 unmatched contradictions across cohorts 4-6 deserve a unified treatment that does not select on public-mobilization framing. Measure attendance at non-contested meetings to test the channel-substitution and selective-withdrawal hypotheses against routine-business engagement.

The cohort-by-cohort method makes the sequence visible. The two-changes finding becomes legible when the data is grouped by who else served alongside each supervisor and the resulting periods are compared on three measures. Earlier framings that combined the two events into one 2018 story merged distinct mechanisms. The 2010-2026 record separates them.

11. Caveats and methodology appendix

The pre-2017 zero-contradiction claim is dual-method verified. The patched parser pass on packet sidecars produced one high-confidence hit across cohorts 1-3 (Candle Station, June 23, 2015). The minutes-based scanner produced the same hit plus six other candidates flagged for human review; on review none survived as contradictions. Both methods independently converged on 1 verified contradiction across 65 contested meetings spanning 2010-2015. The methods do not catch unanimous staff overrides where minutes do not preserve the staff or PC recommendation context, and neither method can recover overrides on votes that left no roll-call signature. If the Board ever overrode staff in a unanimous vote before 2017 with no preserved recommendation context, this paper would not catch it. Available evidence suggests this did not occur.

Cohort 5 and cohort 6 contradiction counts are post-verified. The unified parser produces raw counts of 17 (cohort 5) and 12 (cohort 6) before deduplication. Three issues required hand verification. Duplicate vote captures occur when a single packet contains multiple references to the same item, producing repeated contradiction tags for one underlying vote (the October 2024 Scenic Roadway Protection Ordinance produced four duplicate tags from one 5-0 approval). Wrong-item-anchor false positives occur when `staff_rec_text` is pulled from an adjacent item in the same packet (cohort 6's Druid Drive Rental of Rooms and Arlington Island Tourist Home items show transportation-fund and HR-leave `staff_rec_text` that does not belong to the rental items). Parser-failed items occur when the preceding-item text fails to capture the item ID (cohort 5's four 2023-09-12 captures share the text "Sadler" rather than item identifiers). The cohort 5 verified count of 13 and the cohort 6 verified count of 7 reflect hand-corrected universes after these issues are resolved.

Cohort 6 fragility is structural. Twelve flagged meetings is a small base; single-meeting additions or removals shift cohort metrics materially. The 14.4 attendance average rebounds anchor on three high-attendance meetings (29, 24, 21 speakers); without them the cohort average falls toward the cohort 5 floor. The 7-of-9 contradiction density (or 7 of 7 after wrong-anchor removal) is the highest in the corpus but is computed over the smallest base. Treat cohort 6 numbers as preliminary; they will solidify or revise as the cohort populates further.

The non-contested-meeting attendance question matters for any participation-collapse reading of the 2018 floor drop. The corpus's flagged-meetings measure is conditional on the meeting having produced at least one split or contradiction. Meetings without flagged votes are not counted in the average, even if they drew substantial public interest. The 2025-04-08 FY2026 budget

hearing drew 24 speakers and a 5-0 budget approval; it does not appear in the cohort 6 contested-meetings roster because no formal split or contradiction was recorded. The 2026-04-14 budget hearing drew 60+ attendees and 17 speakers against the budget per press coverage. A complete attendance baseline would include all BoS meetings, not only flagged ones, with counts at routine business meetings where consent agendas pass without speakers. The paper's engagement numbers are conditional on contestation, and routine engagement may have stayed steadier than the contested-meeting average suggests.

Single-jurisdiction limitation. The paper covers James City County only. The 2016 contradiction emergence and the 2018 attendance drop are observed in JCC. Whether they generalize to neighboring jurisdictions (the WJCC School Board, Williamsburg City Council, York County) is a future-work question. Press evidence around the Williamsburg-area land-use cases referenced in this paper (Skiffes Creek, Hazelwood, the Government Center) suggests the regional context shapes JCC outcomes; a regional comparator would test the cohort-math mechanism's generality.

The Null vote-capture caveat applies to any direct vote-tally claim from auto-caption transcripts. Supervisor Null's roll-call responses are clipped in audio and break auto-captioning; minutes are authoritative for her votes. The Hipple-Null pairing on the 2025-02-11 Hedera Solar SUP (3-2 against) is confirmed against minutes; auto-caption misheard. The paper cites only minutes for vote tallies.

Source files for the deliverable, all dated 2026-05-09 unless otherwise noted: the unified vote register (``unified_vote_register_with_recs_2026-05-09.jsonl``), the cohort summary (``longitudinal_findings_v10_2026-05-09.md``, ``supervisor_cohort_summary_v10_2026-05-09.csv``), the verified contradiction samples (``cohort5_contradiction_sample_2026-05-09.md``, ``cohort6_contradiction_sample_2026-05-09.md``), pre-2017 candidate provenance (``contradiction_candidates_minutes_v2_2026-05-09.md``), and the eight Phase 1 hardening memos referenced in this paper. All artifacts are dual-saved: working copies in the COWORK project bin, dated provenance copies in ``regional_corpus/jcc/joins/``.

References

Minutes (James City County Board of Supervisors)

All minutes paths assume the canonical corpus geography

``regional_corpus/jcc/minutes/bos/{year}/``. OCR sidecars (``ocr.txt``) cited where vote-text and speaker-roster confirmation is required.

- 2011-05-10 regular meeting (cohort 1 split-pattern verification)
- 2013-06-25 regular meeting (cohort 2 Greenspace Easement, 42 speakers)
- 2014-01-14 regular meeting (cohort 3 uniform terms ordinance, 4-1 vote, 47 total speakers)
- 2015-06-23 regular meeting (Candle Station Rezoning, 4-1 contradiction)
- 2017-07-11 regular meeting (Skiffes Creek Switching Station, Z-0003-2015 and SUP-0002-2015 each 3-2)
- 2022-02-08 regular meeting (Hazelwood Farms Z-19-0006/SUP-19-0005, 3-2, 27 enumerated speakers)
- 2025-06-10 regular meeting (Government Center SUP-25-0003/HW-25-0001, 4-1)
- 2025-10-14 regular meeting (Government Center plat vacate + Early Site Work Package, both 4-1, 21 speakers)
- 2025-05-13 regular meeting (Cypress Drive STR-SUP, 4-1, 29 speakers)
- 2026-01-13 regular meeting (Fenton Mill Road Contractor's Office, 5-0 deny over staff approve, 24 speakers)

Agenda packet sidecars

All packet paths assume ``regional_corpus/jcc/agenda-packets/bos/{year}/``.

Each .pdf has a corresponding .txt sidecar with ``===PAGE N===`` markers preserving original packet pagination.

- 2017-07-11_regular_packet.txt (Skiffes Creek Section 106 / MOA / Carter's Grove staff comment)
- 2022-02-08_regular_packet.txt (Hazelwood Farms staff and PC recommendations, pages 398-477)

Press citations

Skiffes Creek (2017)

WYDaily, May 9, 2017. ["James City County opts out of agreement on Skiffes Creek power lines."](#)

The Virginia Gazette, August 5, 2015. ["James City planners vote against Dominion switching station."](#)

Bay Journal. ["Court overturns permits for transmission line built over James."](#)

Virginia Mercury, June 18, 2019. ["Will it stay or will it go? After court ruling, fate of Dominion's James River transmission line is uncertain."](#)

Hazelwood Farms (2022)

WYDaily, February 9, 2022. ["James City County Board of Supervisors Approves Second Hazelwood Farms Center."](#)

WYDaily, January 6, 2022. ["James City County Planning Commission Approves Hazelwood Farms Enterprise Center."](#)

WYDaily, November 4, 2021. ["'It's a Solution Looking for a Problem,' Residents Concerned Over JCC Rezoning."](#)

Consolidated Government Center (2025-2026)

WHRO Public Media, October 15, 2025. ["Despite petition and protest, James City supervisors press ahead with center."](#)

WYDaily, June 14, 2025. ["James City County Approves Special Use Permit for New Government Center."](#)

WAVY-TV. ["Judge denies effort to halt work on new James City County government center."](#)

WHRO Public Media, December 10, 2025. ["James City County takes another step toward building its consolidated government center."](#)

The Williamsburg Independent. ["FOIA request sheds light on progress of James City County's new government center."](#)

Williamsburg Watch (April 14, 2026). ["James City holds public hearing today on taxes, \\$413.1 million budget; opponents rally turnout."](#)

WHRO Public Media, April 15, 2026. ["Taxpayers speak out against \\$11 million in higher taxes at JCC hearing."](#)

Theory and conversations referenced

Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35(4): 216-224.

Briffault, Richard. 1990. "Our Localism: Part I — The Structure of Local Government Law." *Columbia Law Review* 90(1): 1-115.

Briffault, Richard. 1990. "Our Localism: Part II — Localism and Legal Theory." *Columbia Law Review* 90(2): 346-454.

Frug, Gerald E. 1980. "The City as a Legal Concept." *Harvard Law Review* 93(6): 1057-1154.

Fung, Archon. 2006. "Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance." *Public Administration Review* 66 (Special Issue): 66-75.

Innes, Judith E., and David E. Booher. 2010. *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy*. Routledge.

Phase 1 hardening memos (this paper's own provenance)

- `cohort5\_case\_types\_2026-05-09.md` — case-type coding test
- `cohort5\_covid\_strip\_2026-05-09.md` — COVID-strip attendance test
- `contradiction\_margin\_distribution\_2026-05-09.md` — vote-margin audit cohorts 4-6
- `skiffes\_creek\_case\_brief\_2026-05-09.md` — case detail brief
- `uniform\_terms\_2014\_case\_brief\_2026-05-09.md` — case detail brief
- `hazelwood\_farms\_2022\_case\_brief\_2026-05-09.md` — case detail brief
- `tax\_debates\_2025\_2026\_case\_brief\_2026-05-09.md` — case detail brief
- `press\_citations\_longitudinal\_2026-05-09.md` — press provenance