

AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, VIRGINIA, HELD ON THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF MAY, NINETEEN HUNDRED EIGHTY-ONE AT 7:30 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  
 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  
 Frank M. Morton, III, County Attorney

B. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Redistricting Ordinance - An ordinance to amend Chapter 2, Administration, of the Code of the County of James City, Virginia, Article II, Magisterial District, Election Precincts, by amending Section 2-5, Election District Boundaries, to provide for appointment of members of the County Board of Supervisors, to establish boundary lines of the Election Districts and to name each Election District.

Mr. Henry H. Stephens, Planner, addressed the Board on this matter. He stated that the Board has been involved in work sessions over the past several months going over some of the reasons why redistricting is necessary. Mr. Stephens gave a general overview of the proposal as advertised. He explained that to redistrict so that all the districts are approximately equal the following adjustments are proposed:

1. Shift the "First Colony" area with 625 people, from the Berkeley District into Jamestown District which would increase the Jamestown District to within -0.2% (4541) of the ideal from -14% (3916).
2. Shift the "Mooretown Road" area, with 368 people, from Powhatan District which was 6% above the ideal, to Berkeley District which had fallen too far below the ideal by the shift of "First Colony" to Jamestown District. It also makes Berkeley District and Powhatan District only 2% each below the ideal which is one-fifth (4553).

After pointing these areas out on the map, Mr. Stephens concluded his presentation.

Mr. Edwards opened the public hearing.

Ms. Shirley Hundley asked the Board what is to be accomplished by redistricting.

Mr. Edwards explained that by state and federal law redistricting must be done after each census and each locality has to comply by adjusting each of their election districts so that they are approximately equal in size.

There being no other speakers to this ordinance, Mr. Edwards closed the public hearing.

Mr. Edwards said that he asked Mr. Stephens and Mr. Murphy to look into Mr. DePue's question concerning the School Board member whose eligibility for reelection could be in jeopardy if the Shellbank area is shifted into the Jamestown District.

AAJ927

Mr. Stephens stated that the School Board member would be affected under the first proposal, but he presented the Board with a second alternative that would allow Shellbank to remain in the Berkeley District.

Mr. Bartlett commented that he shared the concern about this situation in that people are involved and the School Board member's positions should be taken into consideration.

Mr. DePue asked if the map was advertised along with the public hearing notice on this ordinance.

Mr. Stephens replied that the map was not advertised but the public hearing notice indicated that it was available at the county offices for inspection.

To view the map more closely, Mr. Edwards called a five minute recess at 7:55 and the Board reconvened at 8:00.

Because of concerns of the Board members about approving a second alternative versus the one that was advertised, it was the general consensus of the Board to continue the public hearing at their May 26, 1981 meeting.

Mr. Edwards reopened the public hearing. There were no speakers.

Mr. DePue commented that he is concerned about the configuration as outlined and wishes that a little more compactness could be achieved and would like time to talk with the residents in the Mooretown area. He asked for figures on News Road and Centerville Road. Mr. DePue said that he does not have an alternative. He added that the corridor leading from Berkeley into the Mooretown area is extremely small.

Mr. Edwards commented that he is also concerned about the narrow strip also.

There being no further discussion of this matter, it was tabled until May 26, 1981 at 3:00 P.M.

#### C. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Setting Public Hearing Date for the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation Six-Year Secondary Road Improvement Plan. June 8, 1981

Mr. Edwards moved to approve setting the above for a public hearing on June 8, 1981. The motion carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

Mr. DePue urged Mr. Stephens to make the public aware of the public hearing on the Six-Year Plan. He said that even though we fulfill our legal requirement, the public hearings sometimes go unnoticed by those genuinely concerned.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Edward Oyer of the Popular Fall Subdivision, addressed the Board. He said that in talking with citizens in the county they feel that the Board hears them, but does not actually listen to them because whenever they raise a question at a Board meeting there has never been a reply from the staff or a Board member. Mr. Oyer said that when he asks a question concerning the school system the newspaper will state that the School Board is not under the jurisdiction of the Board, however he disagrees with that because according to the Citizens' Guide, all things go back to the chain of command. He asked if the staff is conducting thorough background checks on administrative personnel. Mr. Oyer went on to say that in talking with different contractors in the area there is a general consensus that assessments are too high and he cannot understand how the county goes about deciding the assessment.

He said that according to a newspaper article the school board has a surplus of funds which could be used for annexation in his opinion.

Mr. Frink commented that as he recalled Mr. Oyer did mention the situation about Vo-Tech, which should have been addressed at a School Board meeting because the Board has no control over what programs the school system ensues.

Mr. Oyer said that since monies are appropriated to the school system by the Board they should exercise some control over what programs are implemented or deleted.

AAJ927

Mr. DePue said that he felt the need to address some of Mr. Oyer's statements. He said that as a fiscal conservative he is offended by any newspaper that says one month the county has a good budget and the next month imply that the Board is not listening to the people about that budget. He commented that he wish he would hear more from his constituents, but no one called him at home or at his office to ask him to vote against the budget. Mr. DePue said that as far as the assessments issue, real property must be assessed at market value because that is state law. He said that he shares Mr. Oyer's concern because the increases do look rather high in some neighborhoods, but on an individual basis they are very much in line. Mr. DePue added that he was upset about the editorial he read in the local newspaper because as a fiscal conservative who supports the decreasing of county expenditures and taxes, he would have been a hypocrite to vote against the budget. He said that he voted against the budget last year because it had a trend for increased growth in expenditures, but this year's budget showed a dramatic decrease - instead of twenty new positions there were four, the capital improvements were down and the tax rate will drop by four cents pending a court battle on annexation, and the Board is committed to dropping the tax rate. He said that he rejects the assumption made by some people that the Board is not listening to County citizens. He further stated that the Board does listen, and any independent observer would have to admit that even the most ardent anti-expenditure persons were not coming out as in previous years.

Mr. Oyer commented that the citizens do not come out because they feel they will not be listened to.

Mr. DePue said that it is unfortunate that those persons feel that way because it does not do any good to complain after the fact.

Mr. Edwards commented that at a public hearing the Board does not respond to every question that is raised because it could not be done very effectively. He said that the Board tries to listen to people who have views about the subject being discussed. He said that in the case of the budget, one of the things a County Administrator is responsible for doing is to get a good understanding beforehand of what the community wants and what the Board wants.

There being no further business, Mr. Edwards moved to adjourn. The motion carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

The meeting ADJOURNED at 8:27 P.M.

  
James B. Oliver, Jr.  
Clerk to the Board