

AT A WORK SESSION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, VIRGINIA, HELD ON THE 28TH DAY OF MAY 2013, AT 4:00 P.M. IN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM, 101 MOUNTS BAY ROAD, JAMES CITY COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

John J. McGlennon, Chairman, Roberts District
Mary K. Jones, Vice Chairman, Berkeley District
James G. Kennedy, Stonehouse District
James O. Icenhour, Jr., Jamestown District
M. Anderson Bradshaw, Powhatan District

Robert C. Middaugh, County Administrator
Leo P. Rogers, County Attorney

C. BOARD DISCUSSIONS

1. Joint Board/Planning Commission Work Session – Coordinated Regional Comprehensive Planning Process, James City County FY 14 Comprehensive Plan Update, and Proposed Updates to the Zoning Ordinance

Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Planning, called the Planning Commission to order.

Roll Call

Mr. George Drummond – Absent
Ms. Robin Bledsoe
Mr. Christopher Basic
Mr. Timothy O'Connor
Mr. Michael Maddocks
Mr. Richard Krapf
Mr. Alfred Woods

Mr. Holt stated that the purpose of this Joint Work Session is to discuss the Coordinated Regional Comprehensive Planning process, the FY 14 Comprehensive Plan Update and the next round of updates to the Zoning Ordinances. He stated that in the Agenda Packet is a list of decision points to help guide the discussion.

Ms. Ellen Cook, Senior Planner II, addressed the Board and the Commission giving an overview of the Coordinated Regional Comprehensive Planning Process included in the Agenda Packet. She stated that staff has two key questions in order to wrap up the Coordinated Regional Comprehensive Planning Process: Does the Board concur with the approach to the regional documents suggested by the Policy Committee – endorsing the summary document and the James City County/Williamsburg/York County Comprehensive Transportation

Study, and adopting the Regional Bikeway Map? Does the Board concur with the Policy Committee suggestion to continue to participate in a regional process in the future years; and if so, does the Board have any suggestions for elements to retain or change?

Mr. Al Woods, Chair of the Planning Commission, addressed the Board and asked Mr. Tim O'Connor to speak to the Summary Document and the Regional Bikeway Map.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the Planning Commission felt it was important to recognize the process, and the efforts put in by the three regional entities. He stated that a lot of feedback was received, especially in regard to the public forums. He stated that the feedback was very helpful and the decision was made to continue to have three separate Comprehensive Plans. He stated that by endorsing the work of the regional entities, the supporting documents would become technical documents for the County's own Comprehensive Planning Process, and would acknowledge the work of the other jurisdictions. He stated that in regard to the Regional Bikeway Map, that the other two jurisdictions have already adopted this updated version, and adopting it would keep the County moving down the path with the bikeway plan. He stated that the Planning Commission recommends endorsing the Summary Document and adopting the Regional Bikeway Map.

Mr. Icenhour stated that the regional entities are on their own timeframe for their Comprehensive Plan Updates. He asked how these documents would be utilized when each entity is at varying stages in their Comprehensive Planning Process, or would the documents just be considered background documentation.

Mr. O'Connor stated that would be the intention. He stated that these would be living, breathing documents that can, and will be, updated and will become additional resources. He stated that it would also drive the conversation between the jurisdictions which are an important piece.

Mr. Bradshaw stated that he is not surprised that the regional entities were not able to synchronize their Comprehensive Planning Processes; however, he does not believe that the timing is the important piece. He stated that the important piece is that the County pays heed to what is being done by our neighbors in the region. He stated that focusing on the items that, by their nature, are interconnected like the regional comprehensive transportation study and the regional bikeway map has to be the essence of the regional effort. He stated that those items that, by their proximity, become an issue, like land use, should be focused on as well. He stated that he is pleased with the documentation that came from the Regional Comprehensive Planning Process.

Ms. Jones stated that there is a significant amount of emphasis placed on the Regional Bikeway Map; however, she is wondering if too much emphasis is being placed on it because the statistics of the number of citizens that bike or walk to work do not sustain it. She stated that the bikeways seem to be more recreational and not a necessity. She stated that she brings this issue up because the roadways and infrastructure needs to be maintained, which costs money and so do the bike paths. She stated that when looking at dollars and cents, the roadways need to be prioritized over the bike paths.

Mr. Bradshaw stated that until the bikeways reach a certain maturity, one cannot use them to get to where they need to go. He stated that until some of the circuits are completed, they never will have high use.

Mr. McGlennon stated that those are both valid questions and points because we are living in a world of limited resources and priorities. He stated that when improving roads, incorporating bike lanes is the much cheaper route to go than coming back and doing it after the fact. He stated that marginal increases in the number of people walking, biking, or using mass transit would have a significant impact on the congestion on our roads.

Mr. Woods stated that all these points were discussed during the process. He stated that he did not want the perception to be that the Planning Commission gave this more importance than something else.

Ms. Jones stated that was not what she was implying.

Mr. Woods stated that it was interesting to see this issue come to the forefront in the other jurisdictions and be embraced by them. He stated that as work is planned for infrastructure improvements, looking at the regional bikeway map to see how it can be connected would be far cheaper and more efficient.

Ms. Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner, stated that during the work on the Regional Bikeway Map, the emphasis was on completing routes and connecting routes that were most likely to succeed and be utilized.

Mr. Kennedy stated that when talking about bike paths, they need to be prioritized. He stated that he does not want to see bike paths that lead to nowhere. He stated that it makes more sense to him to piggy back on things to completion, instead of having a bunch of partial completion. He stated that the other concern when talking about bike paths is signage. He stated that maintenance of the bike paths is also a concern. He stated the other issue then becomes enforcement of using the bike paths, riding abreast, and obeying the traffic rules. He stated that he hears from citizens about bike clubs being out on the weekends, riding abreast on the roads, and then vehicles cannot get through.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the areas where the jurisdictions come together were a factor in the discussion of the Regional Comprehensive Planning Process.

Mr. Richard Krapf stated that at the first ever Joint Regional Planning Commission Meeting, it was an important first step. He stated that the Planning staffs from all three jurisdictions have a very good working relationship and that they coordinate with each other. He stated that having the Planning Commissions talking and interacting with each other more is an important step. He stated that there are overlapping issues that make it incumbent upon the Board and Commission to having a good working relationship with the other jurisdictions. He stated that the Commission supports more interaction with the other jurisdictions and the reality is that there are more and more issues that are overlapping.

Mr. Icenhour asked if there was a plan to have more of those meetings between the three Planning Commissions.

Ms. Rosario stated that there is a spirit of wanting the staffs to come together more often to discuss those issues at the staff level. She stated that the Regional Issues Committee will be meeting in July to discuss the efforts on more of a broader scale. She stated that formally the next cycle for this to occur would be in 2018.

Ms. Rosario stated that, in an effort to summarize for staff, she did not hear any opposition to endorsing transportation document and approving bikeway map through a later process. She stated that there was not much discussion about the summary document, so does that mean that the Board is in agreement with the Planning Commission.

The Board nodded in agreement.

Ms. Rosario asked if there were any specific comments from the Board, in addition to the ones proposed by the Commission, about the Regional Process that staff could bring back to the Regional Issues Committee.

Mr. Icenhour asked how productive the public meeting was to the process. He asked if the Commission believes that changing the format and the approach will make the process more productive.

Mr. Woods stated yes. He stated that he believes it is fair to say that the format of the public meeting helped to promote a "herd" mentality, and that is not particularly productive with the type of strategic thinking that we are trying to engage. He stated that the Commission believes changing the format of the public hearing is important. He stated for example, divide the group into five or ten smaller groups with carefully constructed discussion topics would allow for richer information to be solicited and brought forth.

Ms. Robin Bledsoe stated that all the Commissions were on the same page, wanting the public hearings to be beneficial. She stated that with a facilitator or the smaller group discussions, it is believed that the information would be more productive. She stated it was left to staff to look into the various options. She stated that all were in agreement that the format used this last time was not as beneficial as it could have been.

Mr. Kennedy stated that he believes this should be approached with a lot of caution. He stated that there are many groups out there that are political. He stated that it could have the appearance of being subjective, and some of these groups could take that as an assault on their rights. He stated that people need to be enlightened on what planning really is and what is realistic and what is unrealistic. He stated that he is not sure that a facilitator would be able to get us to that point.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the County is very lucky in that it has many bright people in this community, and the Policy Committee believes that those people have ideas that need to be tapped in to. She stated that what happened at the public hearing is that some of those political groups tried to take over the dialogue, which was not fair. She stated that it is the hope that in smaller groups everyone would have a chance to voice their opinion.

Mr. Icenhour stated that he is fine with endorsing the Summary Document, the Regional Transportation Study, and with adopting the Regional Bikeway Map at a later date. He stated he would like there to be a plan to keep these documents up to date, so that when we begin our Comprehensive Plan update, that the County has the most up to date information. He stated that in regard to the public forum, he believes that Mr. Kennedy is right and it needs to be as inclusive as possible. He stated that for that to work, he believes the small group discussions are the best way to include everyone and allow people the chance to be heard.

Mr. Kennedy stated that in 2001 the County contacted every registered group in the County in an attempt to be as inclusive as possible in the process. He stated that he is not sure if that is something that is still being done. He stated that perhaps the groups that are in dissent should be given the opportunity to meet with leaders and have their views heard. He stated that perhaps that would keep one particular group from dominating a public forum.

Ms. Rosario stated that when the County does its own Comprehensive Plan Review there is more flexibility and it has been the tradition to reach out to all the community groups. She stated that the last Comprehensive Plan Team allowed each group to do a presentation, and be recorded, and it seemed to be a beneficial session. She stated that she believes it would be a good process to do again at the next review.

Mr. McGlennon stated that he believes the County has been very diligent in reaching out to the various groups in the County during the Comprehensive Plan Reviews. He stated that those meetings have been very successful. He stated he believes that the issue of regionalism at the public forum for the Regional Comprehensive Plan Review triggered the problem. He stated for some, the issue of regionalism and a regional plan is a hot topic.

Ms. Jones stated that we represent our constituents in our districts, so the concern with regionalism is that people from a different jurisdiction are influencing decisions in James City County. She stated that it is understandable that citizens would have concerns over this idea of regionalism, and if it went unchecked, it could become quite significant. She stated that she agrees with the synchronization of the regional comprehensive plans, but she would caution the extent of the idea of regionalism.

Mr. McGlennon stated that a check on the opinions that comes out of these public meetings is that the County does a survey of a random section of the population to see what those opinions are as well.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the planning process is different than the issue of the moment. He stated that many times the same people and groups show up to these meetings, and while it is great that they are participating, the planning process is more thought out and long range. He stated that he would be careful of breaking groups apart; he believes it might give more push back. He stated in regard to the surveys that Mr. McGlennon mentioned, he would recommend moving away from the yes/no questions because they do not necessarily give an accurate interpretation of the issues.

Ms. Jones stated that it is always important to have the views of the stakeholders at the front end of the discussion. She stated that she agrees with Mr. Kennedy that the survey questions are more open-ended so that the County receives more constructive feedback.

Ms. Rosario stated that all this feedback goes along with the next discussion point which was does the Board concur with the approach to updating the James City County Comprehensive Plan suggested by the Policy Committee, which would entail completing a citizen survey and pursuing a more limited updated scope, which focuses on Land Use, Transportation, and Economic Development sections. She stated that the comments made about the surveys will definitely be taken into account with the next round of citizen surveys that are sent out. She stated that the Planning Commission believes that a more limited scope is all that is necessary, generally focusing on those areas that require more frequent updates, like land use, transportation, and economic development sections.

Mr. Icenhour stated that he liked this approach. He stated that we went through the whole process last time, so he is in agreement with this more focused and limited scope. He stated that he believes the critical element is a truly random, unbiased, citizen survey sample. He stated that it has been discussed about the groups that participate and speak out, and that tends to be a self-selected sample, which has a bias. He stated that the citizen survey is how we deal with that bias, so modifying the questions to get more feedback is important. He stated he believes that the survey is key because people will respond to that even more so than responding by going door-to-door. He stated that his other concern is that there is not a policy that will shape or control growth in our county. He stated that the top two citizen concerns are rural lands and residential growth, and there is a disconnect between how the Comprehensive Plan is going to address those two issues. He stated that ultimately we have 144 square miles, and what is the build out of those miles going to look like. He said that this upcoming Comprehensive Plan needs to address the issue of density.

Ms. Jones stated that there are tools in the Comprehensive Plan to help control the build out. There are land use designations and zoning which are definitive tools. She stated that there are environmental restrictions and height restrictions in place as well. She stated that she is not sure how writing a statement will change that. She stated that you want to leave development up to the free market, and the economy has changed the rate of development in the County. She stated that she would be cautious of overstepping on private property rights.

Mr. Icenhour stated that yes there are a lot tools in the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that what is lacking is the political will to use them.

Mr. Kennedy stated he believes there has been a lot of usage of political will in the last decade. One of them would be Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) and Greenspace. He stated that the market is setting the rate of growth. He stated that James City County is a desirable place to live. He stated that Mr. Icenhour is right in the sense that we have never said what we want James City County to look like. He stated that he believes in more open space and higher density; however he stated he is not in favor of looking like Manhattan, but there is a median in between. He stated if we can agree that there is going to be growth and where we want that growth to be, and then he is willing to participate in that conversation, but the political will needs to be on both sides.

Mr. McGlennon stated that the real questions here are what should be done as we go forward. He stated that he supports the surveys with some of the same close-ended questions because it allows the assessment of a change in opinions. He stated that while he agrees that the focus of the Comprehensive Plan Review should be more focused, he believes that the citizen survey should be broad and incorporate services provided by the County. He stated that he believes the surveys should be completed early in the process so that staff has an opportunity to draw out the information and then be able to follow those answers up in public comment or focus groups.

Ms. Jones stated that a good question to ask is if the citizens know what the Comprehensive Plan is.

Mr. Kennedy stated that his concern over the survey is that it will be used as a political tool.

Mr. McGlennon stated that we cannot resolve the fact that people will use evidence of their position wherever they find it. He stated that hopefully people will be open to other positions, or at least open to the fact that they might not get 100% what they want.

Mr. Kennedy stated that his point is that when people say the growth rate is too fast, but then say that there is not enough affordable housing or retail, it contradicts each other.

Mr. McGlennon stated he believes that leads into a more detailed discussion. He stated that perhaps the growth rate is too fast, but when development does occur there needs to be more of a mix of available housing.

Mr. Kennedy said that then that is what needs to be found out.

Mr. McGlennon stated that when providing guidance on the surveys, the Board needs to say these are the issues we want to find out more about. He stated that the Board needs to provide some sense of what we intend to use this information for and to accomplish.

Mr. Bradshaw stated that it makes sense to focus on those particular areas mentioned, but to make the information gathering be somewhat broader. He stated that he would encourage the Comprehensive Plan to include some language that is a bit stronger than what was included in Williamsburg and York County's Comprehensive Plans about regional cooperation. He stated that perhaps even stated that the impact on neighboring jurisdictions be considered. He stated that it does not compel the decision be made that way, but to consider the impact.

Ms. Rosario stated that she has heard consent on a more focused Comprehensive Plan Update and considerable input and importance on the development of a citizen survey. She stated that there will certainly be questions that will us to benchmark ourselves in the future, but also develop ways to dig deeper into the answers to the questions.

Mr. Holt stated that the last topic on this particular agenda is the next round of the Zoning Ordinance

Update. He stated that the key decision point is does the Board concur with the Policy Committee's suggested priorities for ordinance amendments, or ordinance-related work activities, that the Planning Division should pursue in FY 14.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the Policy Committee identified the Rural Lands public engagement piece and the Accessory Apartment as the high priorities. She stated that the recommendations were based on comments from staff about what they have been hearing. She stated that the medium priority items are restaurants change and housekeeping items. She stated that there was a desire to do a better job defining what is considered fast food restaurants and what is considered dining restaurants. She stated that the low priorities are "emerging technologies, like wind and solar. She stated this does not mean that they are not considered a priority; it is just not something that needs to be addressed at this point.

Mr. Bradshaw asked if she could expand upon that statement a bit more.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that at this point, wind and solar is not something that staff has seen expand enough that it would need to be addressed at this point.

Mr. Bradshaw stated then it is not something that staff sees in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Holt stated that with limited resources, the Policy Committee and staff felt it was not a high priority issue.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that there was a lengthy discussion on the keeping of chickens, and it was decided that, at this time, there would be no amendments made to the ordinance, and the recommendation is to enforce the ordinance that is already on the books.

Mr. Middaugh asked for clarification on the Accessory Apartment component.

Mr. Krapf stated that at this time, the accessory apartment must be attached to the main structure of the house. He stated that the issue was raised that if someone wanted to build an accessory apartment above their garage, that would not qualify; however, if a breezeway was built to connect the house to the garage, then it would qualify. He stated that it is necessary to revisit the ordinance in order to work with the reality of the situations that people are looking for.

Mr. Icenhour stated that there is a company that does a modular accessory apartment that is fairly easy to put in, so it is good that the Commission is reevaluating this issue.

Mr. McGlennon stated that most of the more decent developments have covenants in place that would prevent this from happening. He stated that the older developments, some of which pre-date Homeowners Associations, are where this is more prevalent.

2. Rural Lands

Ms. Leanne Reidenbach, Senior Planner, addressed the Board and Commission giving a summary of the staff report included in the Agenda Packet.

Mr. Icenhour asked when staff comes back to the Board after the public meeting, what would be the status of the economic development strategic plan.

Ms. Reidenbach stated that staff could provide an update at that point, but it will be about a year and a half long process.

Ms. Reidenbach stated that the first discussion point is does the Board re-endorse the three-pronged approach listed in the staff report for approaching Rural Lands, and does the Board concur with partnering with the Virginia Cooperative Extension for the public engagement piece.

Ms. Jones stated that it is important to reach out to the landowners that have property in the Rural Lands. She also stated that citizen input needs to be reevaluated.

Mr. McGlennon stated that he believes it is important to note that the citizens at large are stakeholders in this discussion as well. He stated that the largest impact will be on the landowners that own those large tracts of land; however the citizens are impacted as well.

Ms. Reidenbach stated that during the public engagement piece the intent is to educate the public about the economic development incentive.

Mr. Icenhour asked what staff's analysis is of the different public engagement options. He stated it is a little difficult to choose one or the other without knowing the pros and cons of each option.

Ms. Reidenbach stated, for clarification, the first option pairs the educational and listening sessions in a single meeting, and option 2 involves one educational seminar and separate public input sessions. She stated that when looking at the options, the biggest difference is the time commitment. Option 1 requires a lengthy time commitment, approximately four hours, from the citizens. She stated that the disadvantage, as viewed by staff, of option 2 is that not everyone will attend both sessions. She noted also that the speakers would not be available during the input session of option 2.

Mr. Icenhour stated that he does not believe that people will attend a four hour session. He stated that there are drawbacks to both options, but he tends to lean toward option 2.

Ms. Jones stated that she tends to agree with Mr. Icenhour. She said one possibility is to record the educational session and make it available to the public. She stated that might limit the concern of citizens attending the input session without having heard the educational component.

Mr. Icenhour asked if there had been a decision on the time of day to do these sessions.

Ms. Reidenbach stated that no decisions have been made about the time of day to hold the sessions.

Mr. Kennedy stated that he would look at holding the meetings on the weekends to avoid having to make citizens choose between work and the meetings. He stated that doing them in June or July is during the vacation months, and he stated that staff may want to look at doing these meetings in the later months. He stated that he did not see a four hour meeting as something that most citizens would consider feasible.

Ms. Rosario stated that staff appreciates the feedback and it seems that the group is gravitating toward Option 2. She stated that staff would like to hold the meetings at different times and different locations in an effort to be as accommodating to most people as possible. She stated that staff did consult with those landowners that are actively farming on what months would be best for them, and the response was July or August.

Mr. Krapf asked if staff had to resources to provide an extended day format on a weekend for those that wanted to attend an all-day version of the meeting, and then still provide the other version of the meetings by separating the components. He asked if that would possible with the speaker panel, or would it become cost-prohibitive.

Ms. Reidenbach stated that it would depend on speaker availability more than anything. She stated that staff is in the beginning stage of planning these meetings and reaching out to speakers. She stated at this point, staff does not know if there will be speaker fees associated.

Mr. Krapf stated that some people might like the continuity of doing the components all in one day.

Ms. Rosario stated that the Communications Division has stated their support of taping the speakers. She stated that citizens could tune in to taped educational component and then provide feedback through other electronic means, not just at the public meeting.

Mr. O'Connor indicated that he needed to leave as he had another engagement that he must attend.

Mr. McGlennon asked if there was a specific group that staff was hoping to reach at these meetings.

Ms. Reidenbach stated that staff is hoping to reach as many citizens as possible.

Mr. McGlennon asked if every landowner was to participate, how many would that be.

Ms. Reidenbach stated that staff has begun to pull up the data in the GIS system, and the number of Rural Landowners is in the thousands. She stated that staff would look in to doing some direct mailings to make sure the large property owners are notified.

Mr. Icenhour stated that the last Rural Lands public meeting that was held at Legacy Hall was attended by 100-150 people.

Ms. Rosario stated that is the expectation with these meetings as well.

Mr. Bradshaw stated that he has a concern over a false impression over who is occupying the Rural Lands. He stated that there are only a handful of farmers occupying the Rural Lands. He stated that it is good information for the public to have, but need to be careful in giving the idea that every farmer is going to find a young farmer to take over his land. He stated that he does not want to give the false impression that this is some new way of farming that is going to make farming profitable again.

Ms. Reidenbach stated that the real goal of these meetings is to throw out all the available options, and allow people to look in to those that interest them.

Mr. Bradshaw stated that he concurs that Option 2 is the more feasible option to reach the most people.

Ms. Reidenbach stated that it appears there is clear preference for Option 2, taping the educational component, and having an option to supply feedback outside of the public meeting.

Ms. Reidenbach stated that she was hoping to receive feedback on the draft questions for this forum and help staff come up with a final questionnaire.

Mr. Bradshaw stated that he was particularly intrigued by the outline of how the County defines Rural Lands and what it is that the County is trying to preserve. He stated that he liked the fact that it is part of the discussion.

Ms. Reidenbach asked if there was consensus on using the questionnaire document that is shown on page 9.

Mr. McGlennon stated that it reflects a lot of time and effort on the part of staff and seems well thought out. He stated that he is confident that if staff sees some of the questions are not working, that staff will adapt.

Ms. Rosario thanked the Board for their input, and stated that staff would work rapidly to get the meetings organized. She stated that staff would come back to the Board in the fall to give an analysis of the meetings and the feedback generated.

Mr. McGlennon thanked the Planning Commission for their participation in this joint meeting.

Mr. Woods thanked the Board for the opportunity to attend and for their forethought in sharing opinions between the Board and the Planning Commission.

At 5:55 p.m. the Joint Work Session between the Board and the Planning Commission concluded and the Board recessed for a ten minute break.

The Board reconvened at 6:08 p.m.

Mr. Icenhour made a motion to go into Closed Session.

On a roll call vote, the vote was: AYE: Mr. Icenhour, Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Jones, Mr. McGlennon, (5). NAY: (0)

D. CLOSED SESSION

1. Consideration of acquisition/disposition of a parcel/parcels of property for public use, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(3) of the Code of Virginia.
2. Consideration of a personnel matter(s), the appointment of individuals to County boards and/or commissions pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A)(1) of the Code of Virginia
 - a. Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee

At 6:36 p.m., Mr. Icenhour made a motion to certify the Closed Session.

On a roll call vote, the vote was: AYE: Mr. Icenhour, Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Jones, Mr. McGlennon, (5). NAY: (0)

RESOLUTION

CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, (Board) has convened a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3711 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Board that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia,

hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge: 1) consideration of acquisition/disposition of a parcel/parcels of property for public use, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(3) of the Code of Virginia; and 2) consideration of a personnel matter(s), the appointment of individuals to County boards and/or commissions pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A)(1) of the Code of Virginia.

a) Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee

E. ADJOURNMENT

The Board recessed at 6:37 p.m. until their Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m.


Robert C. Midaugh
Clerk to the Board

052813bosws_min