

**MINUTES**  
**JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**RETREAT**  
**JCSA Training Room, 119 Tewning Road, Williamsburg, VA 23188**  
**April 28, 2023**  
**9:00 AM**

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**B. ROLL CALL**

James O. Icenhour, Jr., Vice Chairman, Jamestown District  
John J. McGlennon, Roberts District  
Ruth M. Larson, Berkeley District  
Michael J. Hipple, Powhatan District - absent for medical reasons  
P. Sue Sadler, Chairman, Stonehouse District

Scott A. Stevens, Secretary to the Board  
Adam R. Kinsman, County Attorney  
M. Douglas Powell, General Manager

**ADOPTED**

**JUN 13 2023**

Board of Directors  
James City County, VA

**C. PRESENTATIONS**

None.

**D. BOARD DISCUSSIONS / GUIDANCE**

Mr. Powell gave some introductory comments and thanked the Board for its time at the first ever Board of Directors Retreat. He recognized the busy schedules for everyone and expressed his appreciation. Mr. Powell noted several memorandums would be presented with follow-up statements to seek the Board's input and guidance. He introduced staff members in attendance: Ms. Stephanie Luton, Assistant General Manager, Mr. Mike Youshock, Chief Water Engineer, Mr. James Canning, Chief Wastewater Engineer, and Ms. Shannon Howlett, Finance Specialist. Mr. Powell noted Ms. Howlett was relatively new to the James City Service Authority (JCSA) as she had previously worked in the Treasurer's Office, adding she worked with Ms. Luton. He welcomed Ms. Howlett and stated she was a valuable member of the JCSA team. Mr. Powell thanked Mr. Stevens and Mr. Kinsman for attending the retreat as well as Ms. Teresa Saeed, Deputy Secretary for the Board of Directors. He added Ms. Saeed had been instrumental in her work for the retreat and he extended his appreciation. Mr. Powell noted the retreat's theme focused on changes at JCSA over the past few years. He further noted JCSA was now an independent organization with growth in new customers, revenue, and workload as well as external changes with the economy, the labor market, and other aspects that impacted the organization. Mr. Powell stated the theme focused on reevaluation of some of JCSA's long-standing policies and procedures in relation to modernization and adoption of best practices for consistency with contemporary uses for a medium-size utility.

**I. Proposed Sewer Cap**

Mr. Powell presented an overview of the sewer cap policy. He noted implementation of this policy would eliminate the need for the submeter program. Mr. Powell added the submeter program had become increasingly difficult to manage and was a major source of customer

complaints. He cited several concerns with the program, adding a report from JCSA's consultant was included in the Board's Agenda Packet. Mr. Powell noted the program would only apply to single-family residential accounts. He further noted the parameters regarding the cap set in relation to maintaining the current rates. Mr. Powell stated the current billing system was labor intensive for staff as well as confusing for customers at times. He added JCSA depended on customers to report usage which sometimes generated late readings and other aspects. Mr. Powell noted the submeter program was difficult to manage for both staff and customers. He further noted 6,500 registered customers had submeters, but only 4,500 of those 6,500 customers submitted readings in 2022. Mr. Powell stated 4,500 represented 16% of JCSA customers. Ms. Larson questioned what had been done about the 2,000 customers. Mr. Powell stated if no submissions were received then the customers were billed for their usage. He noted the 2,000 customers received no credit regardless of irrigation or no irrigation.

Ms. Larson referenced an earlier point on accuracy. She asked if accounts were reviewed for actual usage versus reported usage.

Discussion ensued on timing and credits.

Mr. Powell noted if the Board was not interested in the sewer cap policy, there were other options for consideration. He referenced a policy used by the Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) which indicated if a reading was not submitted within a year, the customer was removed from the program. Mr. Powell added that provision was not in JCSA's policy. He noted staff's recommendation for the sewer cap policy, but other options were available with the aforementioned item one of those options. Mr. Powell stated if domestic usage was over 8,000 gallons per month, the bill would lower regardless of a submeter or not. He added if the domestic usage exceeded the cap, the customer would only be billed at 8,000 gallons. He explained the criteria for setting 8,000 gallons as the cap, adding the Board's Agenda Packet had reports to identify cost differences, which were marginal for most submeter customers. Mr. Powell noted the sewer cap policy proposal created a simpler approach for JCSA and the customer.

Mr. Icenhour asked about the average monthly household usage estimate. He noted the usage at his home in comparison.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Powell noted the majority of JCSA customers used less than 8,000 gallons.

Ms. Luton added the single-family residential average was 4,275 gallons.

Discussion ensued on the reduced usage trend and other points.

Mr. Powell summarized the positive aspects of the sewer cap policy. He noted if this policy was implemented then coordination with HRSD would need to take place. Mr. Powell further noted this would allow customers to receive a submeter credit on their wastewater treatment through HRSD. He explained the options for existing and new customers. Mr. Powell noted the decision on the sewer cap policy would impact the decision on the Enterprise Software implementation which would be discussed later. He further noted the Board's immediate feedback on this point was most important regarding vendor programming and software. Mr. Powell stated if the Board chose to move forward then formal action would be required and brought before the Board for approval with proposed implementation slated after the current irrigation season. He asked the Board for feedback on the sewer cap policy, the 8,000-gallon limit, and the timeframe of formal action before the Board in fall or winter.

Mr. Icenhour addressed the pros and cons of the policy.

Mr. Powell noted it was likely there would be some customer complaints.

Ms. Sadler asked if communication would be sent to customers.

Mr. Powell confirmed yes.

Discussion ensued on credits, submeter reading submissions, and revenues.

Mr. Powell addressed the staff member dedicated strictly to submeters and other points.

Mr. McGlennon asked for more details on the HRSD program.

Mr. Powell explained only one reading needed to be submitted and then JCSA and HRSD worked together to determine the credit. He noted he would present the proposed changes to the Board in the fall.

Mr. Icenhour asked if a public hearing would be required at that time.

Mr. Powell noted no public hearing was required for changes to the regulations.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Powell thanked the Board for its input and moved to the next item on the Agenda.

## 2. Proposed Revision to Grinder Pump Policy

Mr. Powell noted this item addressed proposed revision to the grinder pump policy. He further noted he had met with each Board member individually several months prior to discuss possible changes to the grinder pump policy. Mr. Powell stated there was unanimous consensus to do away with the policy, adding he had proposed a 10-year phase out period. He added Board members had proposed a five-year phase out period. Mr. Powell noted that point in consideration of vendors who were currently contracted for 3-1/2 years but contracts could be extended to the five-year mark. He added additional time beyond that point would require an additional procurement process and a less viable option regarding vendors. Mr. Powell asked the Board its comfort level for ending the program in five versus 10 years.

Discussion ensued on the number and location of the grinder pumps in the County.

Ms. Larson asked the cost to the County.

Ms. Luton responded \$221,000 for the current year.

Mr. Icenhour asked if there were options for grinder pump participants who had no agreement with JCSA.

Ms. Luton replied yes. She noted several area contractors offered services.

Mr. Icenhour noted five years was good as it allowed a transition period. He further noted the staff time to track the program.

Discussion ensued on several points.

Ms. Sadler asked if potential vendors would be provided to customers requesting grinder pump service.

Mr. Powell noted that information could be provided.

Discussion ensued on modifications to the program, customers under grandfather clauses, and compliance issues.

Mr. McGlennon noted Kingsmill used Newport News Waterworks.

Mr. Powell explained the grinder pump program was really a sewer program. He noted the legacy of the grinder pump systems in older neighborhoods and that some of the vendors were contracted to do the grinder pump work for JCSA. Mr. Powell further noted a revision to JCSA's timeline was needed and then he would send that updated information to the Board. He stated staff would no longer accept new applications effective Monday, May 1, 2023.

Ms. Larson noted sending clear communication to customers.

Mr. Powell confirmed yes. He noted Mr. Youshock would address the next few items.

### 3. Proposed Revision to Design Standards

Mr. Youshock addressed proposed changes to the design criteria. He noted JCSA, along with many other Hampton Roads area utilities, followed HRSD standards with some modifications to meet JCSA's needs. Mr. Youshock further noted the standards were reviewed regularly to ensure they were up-to-date regarding technologies. He added the design revisions, by nature, required no Board action but JCSA wanted the Board to be aware of the proposed changes. Mr. Youshock noted these changes would affect both JCSA and development projects. He highlighted one change focused on water main material and the specific requirements of either PVC or ductile iron pipes within particular areas. He noted the recent upgrade to zinc coating and polywrap on the ductile iron pipes in 2021 for better protection. Mr. Youshock addressed the benefits of ductile iron pipe, adding other localities used ductile iron pipe. He noted pipes of different materials eventually fail over time underground, but better materials equated to a lower replacement ratio over longer periods of time. Mr. Youshock further noted this point applied to the water system with similar materials applicable to the sewer system. He stated the importance of maximizing the life of JCSA's assets for tomorrow's use with the materials used in the ground. He added age of the product was one factor of asset life.

Ms. Larson asked if developers would be notified of the pipe material change.

Mr. Powell confirmed yes, adding that was just one component of the presentation. He noted ductile iron pipes were more expensive than PVC and he wanted the Board to be aware of potential comments from developers.

Mr. McGlennon asked if a combination of materials could be used.

Mr. Powell confirmed yes.

Mr. Youshock replied yes that transition couplings could be used. He added the location could also determine the substitute pipe material for some repairs.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Powell noted one previous concern had been ductile iron pipes had not been available. He

further noted that may have been true at one time, but not so much currently, adding that may be a concern voiced from developers. Mr. Powell stated JCSA had waited for the materials on one of its projects.

Mr. Icenhour noted reviewing the revisions to the design standards. He asked if the Board needed to approve those changes.

Mr. Powell noted he could approve those changes.

Mr. Youshock noted the next change addressed water main grouping. He further noted this change was incorporated in the 2021 revision, but he wanted to clarify several points and get feedback. Mr. Youshock explained the process and logic of looping water mains. He stated JCSA was required monthly to check chlorine levels throughout the County. Mr. Youshock noted other aspects regarding the water mains, adding Fire Code was a major factor.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Youshock noted one water main in Governor's Land served 808 customers. He further noted failures that occurred on that main and created issues. Mr. Youshock stated James Terrace was another example of a long water main, adding potential difficulties with repairs due to its proximity to Route 199. He cited the oldest section of Stonehouse development as another example. Mr. Youshock noted these examples were the reason these requirements were being put in place, adding evaluation from other projects had been helpful.

Discussion ensued on redundancy and other locations in the County.

Mr. Icenhour noted the developer was responsible for the infrastructure and questioned the supervisory review process. He further noted that was labor intensive for staff.

Mr. Youshock noted JCSA had three dedicated construction inspectors. He further noted they were divided geographically to review development projects.

Mr. Icenhour asked if cameras were required for acceptance.

Mr. Powell confirmed yes for sewer lines.

Mr. Youshock noted water lines were pressure tested.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Youshock stated a dependence on technology. He noted tracing lines and utility marker balls assisted with locating buried utilities. Mr. Youshock further noted JCSA was required by Virginia 811 (formerly Miss Utility) to mark lines and this revision allowed JCSA more assurance of the proper location for buried lines.

Mr. Icenhour questioned the lifespan on the utility marker balls.

Mr. Youshock responded supposedly it was lifetime as the units did not contain batteries. He added there were different frequencies for water and sewer to assist identifying the utilities.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Powell noted JCSA had two locators and their workload had increased with utility location for Shenandoah Cable Television, LLC ("Shentel"), as Shentel had begun offering cable television service in the County. He further noted a temporary, part-time locator had

recently been hired, but this change made utility location easier within JCSA's infrastructure.

Discussion ensued on the utility marker balls.

Mr. Youshock noted whatever changes were incorporated into JCSA's standards applied to both developers and JCSA for capital projects. He continued his presentation highlighting the policy regarding service connections. Mr. Youshock explained earlier in the 2000s when a new development came in, the entire water and sewer infrastructure had to be built. The developer built the entire system, tests were run on it, and JCSA standards had to be approved. He added after that point, then the developer could start connecting to houses. Mr. Youshock noted at that time the building community disagreed with the policy which stated all utilities had to be in place prior to construction of any homes. He explained the water meter allowance process where developers paid the JCSA a set amount which served as a deposit should the developer stop work or leave the area. Mr. Youshock noted most local developers chose this option to ensure they could quickly build houses. He added most developments were built-out prior to JCSA's acceptance of the facilities though JCSA was still providing service. Mr. Youshock noted some developers go bankrupt and JCSA had not accepted the facilities, but service was still provided years later. He further noted staff's recommendation for removal of this option and use the option that ensured facilities were constructed, tested per JCSA standards, and under JCSA ownership prior to providing service to customers. Mr. Youshock cited the reasons JCSA supported this option.

Discussion ensued on bonds against defaulted developers and other points.

Mr. Powell noted developers would not favor this option as the current system allowed for development to occur. He further noted with the elimination of Option 2, developers would be required to spend more money upfront prior to revenue from any sold houses. He added this would slow development and make developers spend rather than make money first.

Discussion ensued on services provided by other localities, regulatory concerns, design standards, and the revised policy implementation timeline.

Mr. Youshock noted the Board's consensus to move forward on the proposed revisions.

The Board agreed.

#### 4. Proposed Connection of Independent Systems to Central System

Mr. Youshock noted the next point addressed the connection of the independent water systems to a central system. He referenced an area near the Williamsburg Pottery which required significant upgrades and viable options. Mr. Youshock noted the significance of a central system connection would also provide cost savings. He referenced recent County land development Ordinances which limited the potential for future independent water systems.

Discussion ensued on groundwater permits and other points.

Mr. Youshock noted the Liberty Ridge and Westport independent well facilities would be combined the Central System. He further noted the two systems would be combined into the Central System Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) groundwater withdrawal permit with no anticipated changes. Mr. Youshock stated the addition of the two facilities to the Central System would have no negative impact to the DEQ or the Virginia Department of Health (VDH) permits.

Discussion ensued on costs.

Mr. Youshock noted with the systems combined into the VDH Central System operations permit, it was expected to have an increase in the VDH permitted capacity. He asked the Board for feedback.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Youshock noted the Board's consensus to move forward on the connection process for the two systems.

The Board agreed.

Mr. Powell noted this action would come before the Board later as a Special Use Permit for approval.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Powell stated some introductory points on the next item. He noted this project was similar to the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) project. Mr. Powell further noted the SCADA project had been a multiyear, multimillion-dollar project which required substantial time and effort for implementation. He added Ms. Luton had taken the lead with the SCADA project outside of her job description. Mr. Powell noted Mr. Youshock was taking the lead on the software project in a similar way, adding he was the only JCSA staff member with previous experience on this type of job. Mr. Powell added he wanted the Board to be aware of those points.

Ms. Luton thanked Mr. Powell.

Mr. Powell commended the caliber of staff and commitment in volunteering for projects outside of their normal job descriptions.

#### 5. Update – Enterprise Software

Mr. Youshock noted he would give a general update on the project and its timeline. He highlighted the various modules used with the Enterprise software which would replace customer service and billing functions. Mr. Youshock noted JCSA would be independent of HRSD with the new system. He further noted aspects of the updated customer portal and other features of the new system such as the mobile use which would eliminate paper and process online work orders and other aspects. Mr. Youshock stated the entire system would be mobile.

Ms. Larson asked if this product was an all-inclusive one.

Mr. Powell confirmed yes.

Discussion on billing ensued.

Mr. Youshock noted the new software allowed JCSA better data availability and other aspects.

Ms. Larson noted HRSD used Apple Pay, PayPal, and Venmo. She asked if JCSA's system would also use those payment options.

Mr. Powell confirmed yes.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Youshock noted a communication plan was being planned.

Mr. Icenhour asked the timeline for the software launch.

Mr. Youshock responded the end of 2023 to early 2024.

Ms. Luton noted six months was the probable timeline. She addressed other aspects of JCSA billing and HRSD.

Mr. Youshock presented a sample draft of a bill. He noted the sample was included in the Board's Agenda Packet and he welcomed any input. He added this was not the final draft.

Mr. Powell noted two major improvements with the sample bill. He further noted two aspects were useful with gallons as the unit and the monthly usage profile.

Mr. Icenhour noted Virginia Natural Gas provided the monthly usage profile for 12 months.

Discussion ensued on suggestions to the bill format.

Mr. Youshock presented a five-minute video from the vendor highlighting the customer portal.

Ms. Larson asked if JCSA would then be paperless.

Mr. Youshock confirmed yes.

Discussion ensued on other system features.

At approximately 10:48 a.m., the Board recessed for a break.

At approximately 10:57 a.m., the Board reconvened.

## 6. Compensation

Mr. Powell referenced the compensation discussion at the Board of Supervisors Retreat. He noted exploring a different pay plan for JCSA. Mr. Powell further noted retention and recruitment would allow people to know future salaries. He stated some current challenges, adding he would welcome the opportunity to join with the County on its compensation study. Mr. Powell noted if that opportunity was not available, he would like the Board's support to conduct a separate compensation study. He questioned the feasibility of such a study and at what levels. Mr. Powell noted the recent loss of employees to Dominion Energy and not for current salaries, but for the projected income over the next few years. He further noted it was a concept he wanted to explore, adding retention was a major focus for JCSA.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Powell noted review of some JCSA policies as they applied to JCSA employees. He cited several examples for the Board's consideration.

Discussion ensued.

## 7. Closed Session: Consultation with legal counsel pertaining to actual or probable litigation,



where such consultation or briefing in open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the public body, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(7) of the Code of Virginia; and Consultation with legal counsel employed or retained by a public body regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(8) of the Code of Virginia and pertaining to a proposed policy and fee revision for dedicated fire protection lines.

A motion to Enter a Closed Session was made by James Icenhour Jr, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 4 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 1

Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

Absent: Hipple

At approximately 11:11 a.m., the Board of Directors entered a Closed Session.

At approximately 11:27 a.m., the Board re-entered Open Session.

A motion to Certify the Board only spoke about those matters indicated that it would speak about in Closed Session was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 4 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 1

Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

Absent: Hipple

#### **E. ADJOURNMENT**

- I. Adjourn until 5 pm on May 9, 2023 for the Regular Meeting

A motion to Adjourn was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 4 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 1

Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

Absent: Hipple

At approximately 11:28 a.m., Ms. Sadler adjourned the Board of Directors.

  
Deputy Secretary