AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, VIRGINIA, HELD ON THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF JANUARY, NINETEEN HUNDRED EIGHTY-ONE AT 3:00 P.M. IN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM, 101 MOUNTS BAY ROAD, JAMES CITY COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

A. ROLL CALL

Jack D. Edwards, Chairman, Berkeley District Abram Frink, Jr., Vice-Chairman, Roberts District (arrived at 5:05 P.M.) Gilbert A. Bartlett, Jamestown District Perry M. DePue, Powhatan District Stewart U. Taylor, Stonehouse District

James B. Oliver, Jr., County Administrator John E. McDonald, Assistant to the County Administrator

Mr. Edwards stated that any controversial items would not be discussed until Mr. Frink's arrival.

B MINUTES

AAJ927

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the Minutes of January 12, 1981 as submitted. The motion carried by a 4-0 roll call vote.

C. HIGHWAY MATTERS

Mr. Frank N. Hall, Resident Engineer for Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation, addressed the Board on two issues. He stated that in response to Mr. Bartlett's question in November about a donated right-of-way easement regarding Old Forege Road, he had not received a response yet, but letters have been sent to each of the property owners to solicit their comments as to whether or not they would be willing to donate an easement, therefore, he should have a response in about thirty or thirty-five days. He also stated that the Highway Department received bids on a logo project on the interstate system where the Highway Department erects the logos of various businesses adjacent to the interstate. Mr. Hall indicated that the logo project would probably be constructed this summer.

Mr. Taylor asked if all businesses who are eligible will be notified.

Mr. Hall answered that he was informed that this matter is handled by the traffic and safety persons in Richmond and all businesses that are eligible have been contacted and agreements are being discussed.

Mr. Edwards asked how close specific businesses have to be to the interchange to qualify.

Mr. Hall answered that for gasoline, restaurant, and motel businesses its within one mile. He said that campgrounds can go up to five miles, but someone placing a business closer to the interchange could eliminate another business' eligibility.

Mr. Edwards asked Mr. Hall about the light at Route 199 and Route 5. He said that when persons are arriving west on Route 199 and enter into the left turn lane, the light does not turn green.

Mr. Hall commented that he wasn't sure if a detector is in that lane, or if so, it could be faulty. He said that he would check into the matter.

| D. | PUBLI | С | HEAR | I NG |
|----|-------|---|------|------|
| | | | | |

Motor Vehicle Ordinance - an ordinance to amend and reordain <u>Chapter 11, Motor Vehicles and Traffic, of the Code of the</u> County of James City.

Mr. John E. McDonald, Assistant to the County Administrator, presented this item to the Board. He stated that there are five proposed revisions to certain sections of the Motor Vehicle Code. They are as follows: (1) to broaden the definition for those required to obtain licenses; (2) to allow residents two extra weeks to purchase decals; (3) to insure that decals are placed one quarter of an inch of the inspection sticker; (4) to allow the County Treasurer to prorate the fee to onequarter of the original fee for the last three months of the year, and (5) to increase transfer and replacement fees to reflect their actual cost. He asked the Board to consider adopting the ordinance as amended.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing, no one chose to speak, and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Taylor expressed concern about the rigid requirement to place the decal one-quarter of an inch of the inspection sticker. He commented that it is difficult enough to place the decals one-half inch.

Mr. McDonald stated that if the decal is not on properly, an Inspection Station can legally tear it off and the staff is proposing this change merely to put the county in line with State requirements.

Mr. Bartlett asked if the ordinance could be reworded so that it would be in line with State requirements.

Mr. McDonald suggested that Section 11-55 of the ordinance be changed to read: ...Such license decal shall be affixed to the windshield under such regulations as are prepared and enforced by the State Police, under authority of the Code of Virginia."

Mr. Bartlett moved to approve the ordinance with the additional amendment to Section 11-55. The motion carried by a 4-0 roll call vote.

WE GOUL

ORDINANCE NO. 66A-7

VIEC VIA

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN CHAPTER 11, MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC, OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, BY AMENDING THE FOLLOWING DIVISIONS OF ARTICLE IV, VEHICLE LICENSES: SECTION 11-53, PERSONS SUBJECT TO LICENSE TAX; SECTION 11-54, VEHICLES WHICH REQUIRE LICENSE; LICENSE FEES; WHEN LICENSE YEAR BEGINS; SECTION 11-55, ISSUANCE OF LICENSE AND NUMBER DECAL; REQUIRED DISPLAY OF DECAL ON LICENSED VEHICLE; SECTION 11-56, WHEN LICENSE DECALS OFFERED FOR SALE; EXPIRATION OF LICENSE DECALS; SECTION 11-57, WHEN LICENSE FEE_PRORATABLE; SECTION 11-59, TRANSFER AND REPLACEMENT FEES.

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of James City County that Chapter 11, Motor Vehicles and Traffic, of the Code of the County of James City be and the same is, hereby, amended and reordained by amending the following divisions of Article IV, Vehicle Licenses: Section 11-53, Persons Subject to License Tax; Section 11-54, Vehicles Which Require License; License Fees; When License Year Begins; Section 11-55, Issuance of License and Number Decal; Required Display of Decal on Licensed Vehicles; Section 11-56, When License Decals Offered for Sale; Expiration of License Decals; Section 11-57, When License Fee Proratable; Section 11-59, Transfer and Replacement Fees, to read as follows:

MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC

Article IV. Vehicle Licenses

Section 11-53, Persons subject to license tax.

AAU927

Every person living in the County for a period of sixty days or more and owning or having in possession a moter vehicle, as defined in Section 46.1-1 (15) of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, including, but not limited to, trailer or semitrailer, and every person owning or having in possession a motor vehicle, motorcycle, motorbike, mini-bike, trailer or semitrailer, from other states and using the streets of the County regularly for business purposes shall be subject to the license tax herein provided.

Section 11-54, Vehicles which require license; license fees; when license year begins.

(a) On and after March 1st of each year the owner of each passenger motor vehicle (except motorcycles, motorbikes and mini-bikes), and the owner of each truck, owned or garaged in the County, shall make application to the County Treasurer for a license, and shall pay an annual license fee of ten dollars (\$10.00).

(b) On and after March 1st of each year the owner of any trailer or semitrailer owned or garaged in the County, shall make application to the County Treasurer for a license, and shall pay an annual license fee of three dollars (\$3.00). This section specifically excludes mobile homes.

(c) On and after March 1st of each year the owner of any motorcycle, motorbike or mini-bike, owned or garaged in the County, shall make application to the County Treasurer for a license, and shall pay an annual fee of two dollars (\$2.00).

Section 11-55, Issuance of license and number decal; required display of decal on licensed vehicle.

Upon payment of license fees as specified in Section 11-54, the County Treasurer shall issue the license and number decal for each vehicle. Such license decal shall be affixed to the windshield under such regulations as are prepared and enforced by the State Police, under authority of the Code of Virginia.

Section 11-56, When license decals offered for sale; expiration of license decals.

The County Treasurer shall place County motor vehicle license decals on sale on the first day of March of each year, for the current license year then beginning. Every license issued hereunder shall expire on the fifteenth day of April of the year following the year for which it was issued unless the fifteenth day of April shall fall on a Saturday, Sunday or legal holiday in which instance the license issued hereunder shall expire on the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday or legal holiday.

Section 11-57, When license fee proratable.

One-half of the annual fee prescribed by this article shall be collected whenever any license is issued during the period beginning on the first day of October and ending on the thirty-first day of December in the same license year; one quarter of the annual fee prescribed by this article shall be collected whenever any license is issued during the period beginning the first day of January and ending on the first day of March in the same license year.

Section 11-59, Transfer and replacement fees.

Vehicle owner shall pay a license fee of two dollars (\$2.00) for a license transfer and two dollars (\$2.00) for replacement of a license.

This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from the date of its adoption.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Edwards moved to approve the items on the Consent Calendar. The motion carried by a 4-0 roll call vote.

1. Certification of Warrants

RESOLUTION

CERTIFICATION OF WARRANTS

- WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of James City County must certify warrants under the Code of Virginia;
- THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that on a motion made by <u>Mr. Fdwards</u> and carried by a majority roll-call vote, the Board of Supervisors of James City County hereby certifies the following warrants for the month of December, 1980:

| GENERAL FUND | Checks Totalling | 12559-12904 \$664,671.69 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| GENERAL FUND PAYROLL | Checks Totalling | 25054-25568 \$197,359.36 |
| SANITARY DISTRICT NO. I | Checks Totalling | 99-100 \$8,196.01 |
| SANITARY DISTRICT NO. 2 | Checks Totalling | 210-223 \$51,577.04 |
| SANITARY DISTRICT NO. 3 | | Account Closed |
| SUBDIVISION ESCROW | | -0- |
| COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT | Checks Totalling | 263-292 \$125,883.95 |
| REVENUE SHARING | Checks Totalling | 699-705 \$18,061.24 |
| | | |

JCC BOND SINKING FUND

2. Domestic Animal Claim - Ms. Judith Rorer

RESOLUTION

-0-

DOMESTIC ANIMAL CLAIM

WHEREAS, the domestic animal claim of Ms. Judith Rorer has been investigated and, found to be valid; and

WHEREAS, the value of the domestic animals destroyed has been estimated to be;

9 rabbits at \$6.00 = \$54.00

by the VPI & SU Extension Agent;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors hereby reimburses Ms. Judith Rorer \$54.00 for domestic animals destroyed.

F. BOARD CONSIDERATIONS

AAU927

1. Change in Insurance Carrier for Workmen's Compensation Insurance

John E. McDonald, Assistant to the County Administrator, presented this matter to the Board. He stated that the Virginia Municipal League in cooperation with the Virginia Association of Counties has come up with a plan for group insurance for local governments patterned after a cooperative program available in several states. He said that the original plan began in 1980, and since its operation, twenty-four other members have joined the Association including the Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools. Mr. McDonald also stated that the staff feels this change would be a significant savings and would like for the Board to authorize the change as of the expiration date of the current policy.

Mr. DePue stated that he became interested in the program about a year ago and had an opportunity to discuss it at the VACO meeting last fall and was satisfied that it would be a good program for the County to save money, adding that it is a well-run and well-managed organization. He urged the staff to continue to look at self insurance wherever possible and said that he would support the change.

Mr. Bartlett stated that he shared Mr. DePue's feelings about this program, but he wonders if the plan is part of the County's general Risk Management program and if the Board will have an annual update of the county's participation in the program (or more frequently if necessary) to see how it fits into the county's total risk management program. He added that it could be a first step toward self insurance which could either have a positive or negative effect.

Mr. McDonald said that experiences in much larger organizations, both private and public, have shown that in certain areas selfinsurance will provide savings with a well managed risk management safety program. He said the county would have to consider a pool arrangement on Workmen's Compensation to be the beginning of our process to evaluate other pooling opportunities. He further stated that the Virginia Municipal League is now looking at general liability insurance, particularly law enforcement liability insurance, and public officials liability insurance and other areas. The county will look very seriously at each proposal.

Mr. Bartlett asked if this move will mean that the county will become self-insuring at least with the risk being spread over a small group of participants. He asked that with the presumptions that accrue to firemen and policemen concerning heart attacks, if this changes the requirements for these two classes of employees to have physicals.

Mr. McDonald stated that the county is evaluating physicals beyond the entry level for those two classes of employees and is currently attempting to formalize a policy for firemen, policemen, and bus drivers to take a physical every two years as part of the risk management process. He also stated that Workmen's Compensation rating is done by the State Insurance Commission and whether the county is insured by a private or pool arrangement all claims are reviewed by the Commission and their claims are used to set our rates.

Mr. DePue commented that one of the advantages is the incentive for the risk management group. He added that the auto area appeals to him most, particularly property insurance for vehicles.

Mr. DePue moved to approve the resolution. The motion carried by a 4-0 roll call vote.

RESOLUTION

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION INSURANCE

- WHEREAS, Workmen's Compensation rates are a source of increasing cost to James City County; and
- WHEREAS, several Virginia localities and school boards have formed the Virginia Municipal Group Self Insurance Association in a cooperative effort to lower their Workmen's Compensation Insurance costs; and
- WHEREAS, participation by James City County in the Virginia Municipal Group Self Insurance Association offers the potential for reducing the County's Workmen's Compensation rates by means of a return premium based upon the Association's profits at year-end,
- NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to execute whatever documents are necessary to effect membership by James City County in the Virginia Municipal Group Self Insurance Association effective July 1, 1981

| 2. | A Resolution | in Support | of the | Creation | of | <u>a (</u> | ommissi | on on |
|----|---------------|------------|--------|----------|----|------------|---------|-------|
| | the Future of | Virginia | | | | | | |

Mr. William C. Porter, Jr., Director of Planning, addressed the Board on this issue. He asked the Board to adopt a resolution in support of the creation of a Commission of the Future of Virginia which was outlined in House Joint Resolution 114 in February 1980 which will provide for a study of such issues as: long-range impacts on growth and development patterns of current demographic, economic, social, environmental, energy and resource-related factors; current federal, state, local and private policies and programs which may affect growth and development patterns; and policies the state should pursue to achieve major goals concerning population, economy, environment, natural resources, energy, land-use, transportation, housing and urbanization in Virginia. Mr. Porter pointed out that any state goal or policy on any of the issues mentioned could have a direct impact on James City County, therefore, it would be wise for the County and the State to conduct their planning within a framework of state-wide and regional intergovernmental cooperation.

Mr. Edwards asked Mr. Porter the importance of the Board of Supervisors passing a resolution on this topic.

Mr. Porter stated that area planning directors have been asked to gain the support of local governments.

Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Porter who appoints the members to the Commission.

Mr. Porter answered that there will be fifteen members on the Commission who will be appointed by the Governor and the House of Delegates.

Mr. DePue commented that he respected Mr. Porter's interest and support of this matter and moved to approve the resolution. The motion carried by a 4-0 roll call vote.

RESOLUTION

COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF VIRGINIA

- WHEREAS, growth and development are prevalent throughout the Commonwealth, region, and more particularly James City County; and
- WHEREAS, James City County is committed to the concept of long-range planning within the framework, and as part of, both Statewide and regional intergovernmental cooperation; and
- WHEREAS, it has been brought to the attention of this Board that a proposal exists for the creation of a Commission on the Future of Virginia as outlined in House Joint Resolution 114, offered February 1, 1980; and
- WHEREAS, the James City County Board of Supervisors concurs with the basic tenets of this proposal which would provide for the cooperative study of such issues as:

Current demographic, economic, cultural, social, environmental, energy, and resource-related factors which may have long-range impacts on growth and development patterns; and

Current Federal, State, local and private policies and programs which also may have long-range impacts on growth and development patterns; and

Major goals of Virginia with respect to population patterns, economy, environment, natural resources, energy, land use, transportation, housing and urbanization and the policies which the State should pursue in order to achieve those goals.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the James City County Board of Supervisors that the Board does hereby indicate its support of the concept of the creation of a Commission on the Future of Virginia, and of the scope of the proposed studies which such Committee, if constituted, would undertake.

3. Forest Glen Community Development Grant

AAJ927

Mr. James B. Oliver, Jr., County Administrator, addressed the Board on this matter. He stated that several months ago the Board authorized the staff to apply for funds from the United States Department of Urban Development to do improvements in the Forest Glen area. He said that the staff was notified informally during October 1980 that over \$600,000 had been awarded and the staff began making final applications. He also said that the county has received final approval from HUD during the last several weeks, therefore, he asked the Board to adopt a resolution appropriating the funds to begin improvements in Forest Glen. He added that the resolution reaffirmed the County Administrator's authority to enter into contracts.

Mr. Bartlett asked if this project would be handled in a similar manner as the Carriage Road Project.

Mr. Oliver said that it would be handled in a similar manner and the staff will provide the Board with an update at their next meeting.

Mr. DePue expressed concern about this matter. He said that the resolution would be delegating to the staff the authority to execute contracts and he's concerned about the approach the county should take regarding whether or not the county would hire a private contractor to do the street improvements, and water and sewer improvements or whether the county would do the improvements. He stated that the Board should have the opportunity to review the manner of any work to be done in Forest Glen. Mr. Oliver stated that normally the Board does not review the actual contracts and the appropriations on the resolution are those that were submitted in the application. He said that the staff will give the Board a detailed review of what's in the actual Forest Glen application at their next meeting.

Mr. DePue moved to approve the resolution with the understanding that the Board is informed of the staff's approach on the matter. The motion carried by a 4-0 roll call vote.

RESOLUTION

FOREST GLEN PROJECT

- WHEREAS, the Department of Housing and Urban Development of the United States Government has awarded James City County two grants totalling \$633,000 for community development in the Forest Glen area;
- NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the \$633,000 be appropriated as Community Development revenue for the Forest Glen project and that expenditures of \$633,000 be appropriated as follows:

| Administration | \$ 57,000.00 |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Street Improvement | 152,000.00 |
| Drainage Improvement | 73,000.00 |
| Water Improvement | 73,000.00 |
| Sewer Improvement | 214,000.00 |
| Recreation | 16,000.00 |
| Rehabilitation | <u>48,000.00</u> \$633,000.00 |

- BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, that the County Administrator is hereby authorized to execute the necessary agreements and contracts to carry out eligible Community Development activities under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1977, as amended.
 - 4. Recreation Coordinator

The Board decided to defer this matter until Mr. Frink's arrival.

5. Law Enforcement Building

TTT.

Mrs. Darlene L. Burcham, Assistant to the County Administrator, presented this matter to the Board stating that the Law Enforcement Building had been a source of discussion on several occasions and she would not go into too much detail. She said that the final design and bidding stage will be completed within the next two months and in order to expedite construction of the building and advance the occupancy date, the staff is requesting that \$394,795, be appropriated from contingency at this time. She informed the Board that Sheriff Archie Brenegan was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Bartlett asked if the plans for the law enforcement building had been accepted.

Mrs. Burcham said that they had not been accepted, but she and Sheriff Brenegan had met with the architects on Friday, January 23, 1981 to discuss questions Board members had and the architects are making the modifications requested and the plans should be available shortly. Mrs. Burcham said that the \$758,795 includes the land acquisition, moving dispatch equipment, furnishings and basically the overall total project.

Mr. DePue questioned the \$401,000 that was first proposed to the Board for the law enforcement building versus the \$758,795 now being appropriated.

Mrs. Burcham explained that when the law enforcement building was first put into the Capital Improvements Program it was an initial planning effort on the staff's part, and they alloted 5,000 square feet for the building at \$50.00 per square foot. Because it was a new area to the staff a consultant was hired and it was decided that a larger building would better serve the county's law enforcement needs for now as well as in the future which raised the costs of the building.

 $\ensuremath{\mbox{Mr}}$. Edwards asked if more than \$364,000 will be spent this fiscal year.

Mr. Oliver explained that the \$364,000 would allow the architects and staff to go out to bid, then the matter would come before the Board again for discussion which will take about sixty days. He stated that, in essence, the staff is suggesting that the Board allow the staff to move the project ahead since it is long overdue and is going so well.

AAJ927

Mr. DePue commented that he has no doubts as to moving the project ahead, but he has a philosophical problem with approving funds this fiscal year. He said that the money being appropriated is excess revenues and he feels the amount is too large and the county has spent enough this year and the project will not fall through if funds are carried over into next year.

Mr. Bartlett stated that he feit the Board should go ahead and take advantage of any economies available now.

Mr. Taylor stated that since the money is available now he didn't see why the project should be delayed.

A brief discussion followed concerning whether or not the project should move ahead using the surplus funds from the contingency account.

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the resolution. The motion carried by a 3-1 roll call vote with Mr. DePue voting no.

RESOLUTION

LAW ENFORCEMENT BUILDING

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of James City County has previously authorized the construction of a law enforcement building, and

WHEREAS, the current Capital Improvement Program appropriation is not sufficient to cover the cost of this project, and contingency funds are available,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County authorizes a transfer of \$394,795 from contingency as follows:

To: Law Enforcement Building CIP \$394,795

From: Contingency \$394,795

6. Landfill Ordinance Amendment

This item was withdrawn at the staff's request and the Board's concurrence.

G. MATTERS OF SPECIAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. Edwards asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the Board on any matter.

No one wished to speak.

H. REPORTS OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

1. Budgeting for Tax Deferral - Forestry

This item gave the Board a report on forestry tax deferrals. The report stated that forestry land-use provisions in James City County poses a threat to broader based tax reductions and without forestry landuse the County could reduce real estate taxes to 77 cents and still have a revenue growth of 12.7 percent for FY 82.

2. Follow-up to Board of Supervisors Pre-budget Public Hearing

This item summed up the events of the pre-budget public hearing at which time citizen comments and suggestions were received in the following areas: <u>Budget Targets</u> - this procedure was suggested and the staff has discussed this matter with major agencies; <u>Surplus</u> - it was suggested that the county's surplus be well-displayed and this was accomplished in last year's budget; <u>Tax Rate</u> - the staff's target will remain the same unless there are dramatic changes in revenue estimates up or down, or Board of Supervisors policy change - up or down; <u>Capital</u> <u>Improvement Projects</u> - the Planning Commission is a citizen review body who is currently reviewing each project and will forward their findings to the Board of Supervisors in several weeks; <u>New Public</u> <u>Employees</u> - it was suggested that 32 employees were hired last year--actually only 20 were hired (10 funded with non-local tax funds). This year's requests are not known yet.

1. BOARD REQUESTS AND DIRECTIVES

Mr. Edwards moved to go into executive session to discuss a personnel matter and legal matter pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (a) (1) (6) of the Code of Virginia, 1950 as amended. The motion carried by a 4-0 roll call vote.

The Board convened into executive session at 4:35 P.M. and reconvened into public session at 5:05 P.M. at which time Mr. Frink was in attendance.

Discussion - Recreation Coordinator

Mrs. Darlene L. Burcham, Assistant to the County Administrator, presented this matter to the Board. She stated that the Master Recreation Plan recommends that the County staff a position to meet the County's recreational needs such as designing and supervising programs not provided by the City (summer mini-park program) and to interact with City Parks and Recreation Departments on services which it does provide. She asked the Board to adopt a resolution authorizing the establishment of a recreation coordinator for James City County.

Mr. Taylor asked who is now doing the recreation work.

Mrs. Burcham answered that she is currently doing so, inadequately, adding that she needs assistance to address both large and small issues. Mr. Bartlett commented that the position and recreation study are a package and that the study should come first, and that the recreation plan is not a feasible program at this time. He said that City and private recreation programs fulfill needs of persons in major areas of the County, the present City contract is satisfactory, therefore, he sees no immediate need for new County staff or new County programs.

Mr. DePue said that he will support the personnel position although his position is not an endorsement of the current recreation plan. He stated that the plan asks more questions than it answers. Mr. DePue further stated that the County needs recreation for non-team residents' passive recreation programs; regional cooperative programs; improved summer programs; land acquisition and hands-on coordination with the community.

Mr. Frink stated that he intends to support the position, stating that the present summer recreation programs are not adequate or comprehensive enough to affect most citizens in the County. He added that he felt the county needs organization and expansion.

Mr. Taylor said that he does not like to approve new employees outside the budget process. He said that someone currently on the staff should be able to pick up the programs, on a remedial level, until some tough budget issues are addressed.

Mr. Edwards stated that the county needs a better, broader recreation program to supplement the efforts of the City of Williamsburg's Recreation Department.

Mr. DePue moved to approve the resolution. The motion carried by a 3-2 roll call vote with Mr. Bartlett and Mr. Taylor voting no.

RESOLUTION

RECREATION COORDINATOR

- WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of James City County acknowledges the need for additional recreational facilities and services for County residents, and
- WHEREAS, unbudgeted receipts are available through the indirect cost plan for Social Services due to a reversal of State action limiting such receipts,
- NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County authorizes the establishment of a recreation coordinator position to oversee the development of recreational and leisure time services and appropriates \$10,000 of revenue as follows:

306-0650 Public Assistance + \$10,000

| | Recreation Office: | | |
|------|--------------------|---|----------|
| 0110 | Salaries | + | \$ 6,333 |
| 0150 | Employee Costs | + | \$ 1,253 |
| 0399 | Other | + | \$ 2,413 |

BOARD AND COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

AAJ927

Mr. DePue moved to appoint Mr. Russ Lowry to the Peninsula Emergency Medical Services Council to replace Mr. James B. Oliver, Jr., County Administrator. The motion carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

RESOLUTION

PENINSULA EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE COUNCIL REPRESENTATION

- WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of James City County supports the goals of the Peninsula Emergency Medical Service Council, and
- WHEREAS, James City County is entitled to membership on the Peninsula Emergency Medical Service Council,
- NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County appoints Russell Lowry, Emergency Medical Service Coordinator for James City County, as its representative on the Peninsula Emergency Medical Service Council.

Mr. Frink moved to reappoint members of the Joint Recreation Study Committee until June 30, 1981. The motion carried by a unanimous roll call vote. The following persons were reappointed:

> Mr. Harry Knight Mr. Stuart Williams Mr. Otto Beckhoff Mr. William C. Porter, Jr. Ms. Darlene Burcham (replaced Anthony Conyers)

Mr. Edwards moved to go into executive session to discuss a personnel matter pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (a) (6) of the Code of Virginia, 1950 as amended. The motion carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

The Board convened into executive session at 5:20 P.M. and returned to public session at 5:40 P.M. Mr. Edwards moved approval of the Board members to the following Boards and Commissions:

| Mr. Bartlett: | Advisory Council - Ninth Judicial Service Unit (1/15/82) |
|---------------|---|
| | Community Action Agency (no definite term) |
| | Courthouse Committee (1/15/82) |
| | Planning Commission (1/15/85) |
| | Sanitary District No. 1 Board (1/15/82) |
| Mr. DePue: | Chamber of Commerce (1/15/82) |
| | Hampton Roads Area-wide Committee (no definite term |

Hampton Roads Area-wide Committee (no definite term) Peninsula Planning District Commission (1/15/82) Social Services Board (1/15/85) Welfare Board (1/14/84) (replaced Mr. Bartlett)

Mr. Frink:Community Action Agency (no definite term)
Courthouse Committee (1/15/82)
Sanitary District No. 1 Board (1/15/82)

<u>Mr. Taylor:</u> Farmers Advisory Committee (1/15/82) Highway Safety Commission (no definite term)

<u>Mr. Edwards:</u> Peninsula Planning District Commission (1/15/82)

The above appointments were approved by a unanimous roll call vote.

Mr. Edwards moved to recess until 6:00 P.M. The Board reconvened at 6:00 P.M. for a general work session. The Board ended that work session at 7:00 P.M. for a public hearing on the Cable TV proposals.

PUBLIC HEARING - PRESENTATIONS - CABLE TELEVISION PROPOSALS

Mr. Edwards asked each of the cable applicants to limit their presentations to twenty minutes and also allow Board members to ask specific questions during that time. He informed the audience that he would open the public hearing after the presentations had been heard. He noted that another public hearing will be held on this matter, therefore a final decision would not be made tonight. Mr. Edwards asked Mr. Allen A. Turnbull, Administrative Analyst to introduce representatives from each cable company.

Mr. Turnbull introduced the following persons:

Continental Cable Company - Mr. Buz Goodall and Alvin Anderson, Attorney

Hampton Roads Cablevision - Mr. Ron Roe, General Manager and Mr. Herb Kelley, Corporate Manager

Warner Cable - Mr. Bill Day, Manager and Mr. Vernon Geddy, Attorney

Commonwealth Enterprises - Mr. George Strimel and Mr. Ken Leader

CONTINENTAL CABLE

AAJ927

Mr. Buz Goodall, representing Continental Cable, stated that the company was formed in 1963, and their only business is seeking cable franchises. He said that presently they serve 630,000 subscribers and their philosophy is one of decentralization. He also said that the company was awarded a franchise in Henrico County in 1977 and they have a system in Richmond. He added that they deal locally as much as possible and will attempt to hire their cable staffers from James City County. Mr. Goodall stated that Continental Cable's proposal for James City County is one that allows for expansion because the county is growing. He further stated that they plan to construct their own cable franchise office to house customer service, technicians and access programming. He said that they are proposing 40 channels and that when the need arises, a separate system would be constructed for the northern end of the county. He pointed out that the proposal also contains an emergency override feature that will announce tornadoes, hurricanes, etc. He concluded that Continental Cable would like to serve James City County.

Mr. Taylor asked why their proposal is offering more area coverage that the other companies.

 $$\ensuremath{\mathsf{Mr}}$. Goodall answered that their proposal is based on the data that was provided to them on James City County which showed much future growth in the area.$

Mr. Harold Poulsen, resident of James City County, asked Mr. Goodall to expand on the company's plan for a studio.

Mr. Goodall stated that they would have a studio at their office, and that it might be possible to share some facilities with CenTeX.

HAMPTON ROADS

Mr. Ron Roe, General Manager of Hampton Roads Cablevision, presented their proposal to the Board. He said that their company has proven experience in Virginia in Danville, Chatham, Pittsylvania County, and Newport News a total of 35,000 subscribers. He said that one of the highlights will be a 55 channel capacity with community programs, regional interconnection, regular TV channels, Richmond stations, all Norfolk stations and super stations such as Atlanta, Chicago, and New York. Mr. Roe also said that they plan to offer channels for community programs such as Board of Supervisors meetings and school programs. Mr. Roe commented that a \$135,000 of studio equipment would be given to CenTeX to help local programs. He indicated that they also plan to develop a tourism information channel that will be in operation on a 24hour basis in addition to special networks for The College of William and Mary, and Community Hospital at no additional cost to the county. They will have a variety of features for residents to choose from such as Home Box Office, Home Theater Network, Cinemax, Show Time, and The Movie Channel. Mr. Roe said that the connection fee will be \$15.00 and the basic monthly fee will be \$7.95 and the cost of other features will range from \$4.00 to \$9.00. He added that the rates would not rise during the first four years of service. Mr. Roe pointed out that he is a resident of James City County, therefore, he has a vested interest in insuring that the county will have the best service available to its residents and hoped that the Board would choose Hampton Roads Cablevision.

COMMONWEALTH ENTERPRISES

Mr. George Strimel, representing Commonwealth Enterprises, showed a video tape that described the company. Commonwealth Enterprises is affiliated with Commonwealth Telephone Enterpises and they are a member of Commonwealth Telephone Technical Corporation, a member of Sterling Telecommunications, Supplies Company and have close relations to Commonwealth Information Services Company. The tape illustrated that Commonwealth is involved in developing technology to lay cable, and likes to insure that service and system operations are satisfactory to all subscribers. Mr. Strimel said that he felt they were offering a very unique proposal in that it will offer eight access channels free of charge. In addition, they offer various programming features such as security, fire protection, sports and local programming. He said that they offer twenty-six channels for \$7.45 per month.

WARNER CABLE

Mr. Bill Day, Manager of Warner Cable, presented their proposal to the Board. He said that Cable TV is capital intensive and a company must have a good return on their investment otherwise both the company and the residents will lose because it is very difficult and expensive to correct any mistakes. Mr. Day said that their company has researched James City County and they propose a 50 channel capability at a cost of \$1.8 million. He said from the day the franchise is awarded to them, they can service 700 potential subscribers. He said that they propose a seven mile institutional network either receiving or sending signals as part of the package. He indicated that Fire Station No. 3 could be tied to each school at no extra costs, and the county could, if they purchased the necessary equipment, control thermostats at each of the schools also. Mr. Day said that naturally some features would be more costly because of the computer hook-up. He further stated that Warner Cable can more easily service the southeast portion of James City County, because they can extend their cable in the City and do not have to go down Route 199. He said that Warner had strand mapped the County and knew exactly where all components of the system would go. Mr. Day concluded that Warner Cable is very enthusiatic about upgrading and connecting Williamsburg to James City County as well as providing entertainment and educational opportunities in the county.

Mr. Bartlett asked Mr. Day how many other jurisdictions Warner Cable presently serves.

Mr. Day replied that Warner Cable is fifty percent owned by Warner Communications and fifty percent owned by American Express and they presently service 143 areas throughout the United States. He said that in Virginia they service Hampton - approximately 18,000 subscribers, and in Williamsburg - approximately 1,200 subscribers and they also serve Harrisonburg, Virginia.

Mr. DePue asked Mr. Day if it is true that Warner Cable had a contract with James City County in 1974 but they defaulted on the franchise.

Mr. Day said that it was true, the company had made a mistake because at that time there was only one possible source - basic cable at approximately \$7.95 month - of revenue and and as a result the project was not financially feasible. Rather than to begin building a system which could not pay for itself, Warner made the decision to default on the franchise. He said that with the addition of pay cable services, the average monthly revenue per subscriber would be approximately \$7.00, so the cable system could now pay for itself. Mr. DePue asked if it was an oversight on the company's part in eliminating James City County on their list of previous customers.

Mr. Day commented that it was an oversight on the company's

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing.

part.

AAJ927

Mrs. Irene Douglas, resident of James City County, asked the Board to consider adopting language in the ordinance before they awarded the franchise to any of the companies letting them know what would not be acceptable to James City County on Cable television. She urged the Board to make sure that area homes would not be receiving pornographic films.

Mr. R. M. White, resident of James City County asked the cable companies how long it would take them to complete the project.

Mr. Buz Goodall, of Continental Cable, said that they would have the project completed within one year after they were awarded the franchise.

Mr. Ron Roe, of Hampton Roads Cablevision, said the entire area could be completed in two years and any problems that would arise would be getting third parties (C&P and VEPCO) to do their work.

Mr. George Strimel, of Commonwealth Enterprises, said they could have the project completed within eighteen months.

Mr. Bill Day, of Warner Cable, said that they could construct about 20 to 30 miles a month of cable starting within ninety days after the franchise was awarded and completion within a year.

Mr. DePue asked if there are ways of screening $^{\prime\prime}R^{\prime\prime}$ and $^{\prime\prime}X^{\prime\prime}$ rated movies.

Mr. Ron Roe said that a lock is available to screen certain features.

A brief discussion centered around regulations regarding $^{\prime\prime} X^{\prime\prime}$ rated movies.

Ms. Irene Douglas read an excerpt from an ordinance which stated that no person by means of cable television can use obscene material.

Mr. Edwards asked if the Cable Advisory Committee would present their recommendation to the Board in February 1981.

Mr. Turnbull answered that the Committee would present their recommendation to the Board of Supervisors in late February or early March 1981.

Mr. Edwards closed the public hearing.

Mr. Edwards moved to adjourn. The motion carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

The meeting ADJOURNED at 8:45 P.M.

James B. Oliver, Jr. Clerk-to the Board



MEMORANDUM

Date: May 12, 2015

To: Records Management

From: The Board of Supervisors

Subject: Board of Supervisors Minutes: January 26, 1981; March 27, 1981; and July 11, 1981

The following minutes for the Board of Supervisors of James City County dated January 26, 1981; March 27, 1981; and July 11, 1981 are missing an approval date and were either never voted on or never presented for approval in the year surrounding these meetings.

These minutes, to the best of my knowledge, are the official minutes for the January 26, 1981; March 27, 1981; and July 11, 1981 Board of Supervisors meeting. They were APPROVED by the current Board of Supervisors at the May 12, 2015 meeting.

Please accept these minutes as the official record for January 26, 1981; March 27, 1981; and July 11, 1981.

Am Michael J. Hipple

Chairman

Br√an Clerk

MEMO-1981BOS