

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BUDGET WORK SESSION
County Government Center Board Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
April 21, 2020
4:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

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

Scott A. Stevens, County Administrator
Adam R. Kinsman, County Attorney

Mr. Icenhour requested a motion to allow Ms. Sadler to participate remotely for the Budget Work Session, due to an illness which did not allow her attendance.

A motion to Allow Ms. Sadler to Participate Remotely for the Budget Work Session was made by Michael Hipple, the motion result was Passed.

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

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon Absent: Sadler

Mr. Icenhour welcomed Ms. Sadler to the meeting.

Ms. Sadler acknowledged her presence on the call.

C. BOARD DISCUSSIONS

I. Current Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Discussion

Mr. Stevens stated that per his request, some department heads were not present at the meeting due to social distancing efforts in regard to COVID-19; however, they were available by phone for any questions. He noted the discussion would be centered around the County's General Fund for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 and for FY 2021 for the proposed budget. He commented the County is in good financial shape due to the actions of staff and the Board. He noted the intent was not to spend any County savings, which is in excess of \$30 million, within the General Fund and all efforts were geared toward maintaining those savings. He stated Ms. Sharon Day, Director of Financial and Management Services (FMS), was prepared to give a short overview of revenue and expense reductions for the current year and then proceed into projections of three-, six-, or nine-month scenarios for the proposed year. He asked the Board if there were any questions and mentioned documents prepared for the Board members which included budget books, handouts (one being Ms. Day's presentation), printed emails concerning the FY 2020 revenue adjustments, expenditure reduction recommendations, current year reduction amounts from the school system, FY 2021 revenue adjustments and expenditure recommendations, and revenue reduction assumptions FMS used in making

ADOPTED

MAY 12 2020

**Board of Supervisors
James City County, VA**

recommendations in what might be collected relating to property taxes and sales taxes in both years. He noted Board feedback regarding the recommendations would make a significant difference in projections moving forward.

Ms. Day began her presentation with an overview of the COVID-19 pandemic timeline, included in the Agenda Packet, when the County declared a Local State of Emergency on March 13 through present day April 21. She discussed the COVID-19 FY 2020 impact in relation to revenue and expenditures. She noted the focus was on preserving cash and providing essential services and stated departments have been notified to delay and eliminate non-essential and non-personnel items as well as capital projects. She further noted working together in partnership with the Williamsburg-James City County School Division, which comprised approximately 52% of the County budget, emphasizing many conversations had taken place. She explained the focus of this meeting was on the General Fund, also known as the operating fund, and reviewed the table reflecting the FY 2020 adopted budget as well as FMS's projection of actual revenues with the COVID-19 impact. She commented that most revenues were paid in arrears; therefore, there will be some insight into March's activity later this month. She reviewed the general property taxes and noted the reduction of approximately \$565,000 as well as other local taxes with a reduction of approximately \$2,995,000. She briefly discussed property tax bills and the possible hardship for citizens to pay on time, and noted convenience fees had been waived in an effort to assist citizens making payments online. She further discussed the various other local taxes projections and assumptions, noting three years' worth of data was used as opposed to the typical use of one year. She emphasized that the state has allowed remitters a one-month delay in making their payments, therefore what was due to the state in March is now due in April. She noted working with the state to determine if this was a filing requirement or a payment requirement.

Mr. McGlennon inquired if online sales were attracting the County, City of Williamsburg, and York County effectively.

Ms. Day replied yes. She continued her overview and discussed meal and transient occupancy taxes, also known as the lodging taxes.

Discussion ensued regarding meal taxes in regard to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Ms. Larson inquired if Mr. Chris Johnson, Director of Economic Development, could reach out to local businesses and see how much business was down at particular restaurants.

Mr. Stevens suggested the Restaurant Association might have insight to that information.

Ms. Larson noted to include hotel and motel numbers.

Mr. Hipple included Busch Gardens in the discussion. He estimated business losses could be much higher in terms of what was not going to be received as opposed to what had been projected. He observed many restaurants offering take-out could be an effort to try and stay open.

Ms. Day proceeded with her overview and discussed bank franchise, Deeds of Conveyance, and recordation taxes. She spoke of business license permits and fees, commonwealth/state taxes, charges for services, as well as miscellaneous monies referencing the PowerPoint slideshow included in the Agenda Packet.

Ms. Larson referenced ambulance fees and inquired if they were taken to collections if unpaid.

Ms. Day replied no, they were part of a "soft billing policy." She noted that in most cases these charges were paid by Medicare, Medicaid, or insurances.

Mr. McGlennon inquired about why a reduction could be seen.

Ms. Day replied there were self-pay categories with approximately \$2.7 million, with about \$600,000 of that being self-pay.

Mr. McGlennon inquired if the self-pays would be mostly tourists.

Ms. Day replied it would be people who are not eligible for Medicare, Medicaid, and do not have insurance. She continued her presentation and gave an overview of miscellaneous, other fees, and courthouse categories as seen on the PowerPoint slideshow included in the Agenda Packet.

Mr. Hipple inquired if there had been any furloughs at the courthouse.

Ms. Day replied she was not aware of any furloughs.

Mr. Stevens replied staff at the courthouse was still working in terms of teleworking as well as in the offices and commented there had not been any furloughs other than part-time staff within the County structure.

Ms. Larson inquired if the Sheriff's Department was continuing to pay staff whose primary job responsibility is providing security in the courthouse. She asked what types of conversations had occurred with the constitutional officers.

Mr. Stevens replied there were weekly conference calls with department heads and constitutional officers with discussions occurring regarding revenues, employees, as well as providing guidance. He discussed employee teleworking scenarios and maintaining the public's trust of working and being paid. He mentioned some departments had the ability to catch up on backlog work and noted the courthouse is still open and security still has to be provided for the building as well as limited court proceedings. He emphasized if an employee is being paid to work they should be working and if the job is not there, we either find something else or leave time/furlough should be used on a temporary basis.

Ms. Larson stated these are difficult conversations; however, moving forward we are looking at a rough period of budgetary issues. She emphasized the need for everyone to be playing on the same field by understanding what the Board's outlook is and why it is asking if there are efficiencies that can be realized and the opportunity taken to do so.

Discussion ensued regarding the Sheriff's Department and this issue as well as various department position vacancies not being filled at the present time.

Ms. Day continued her presentation and gave an overview of the COVID-19: FY 2020 Expenditure Reductions Summary available in the Agenda Packet. She discussed operations, capital, and monetary transfers in regard to the County as well as the School Division side.

Ms. Larson inquired about monies on the operating side for the School Division.

Ms. Day replied that a memorandum had been provided that discussed things the School Division was doing on the operating side, which were very similar to things the County had done. She noted academic and athletic stipends had been deferred, delayed, or not paid at all as well as less monies toward fuel, bus drivers, substitute teachers, and temporary help in classrooms.

Mr. Hipple remarked "it's a small number but a big number and with us funding 52% of their

budget shouldn't the cut be 52% of savings.”

Ms. Day replied a fair way of looking at it would be to take the contribution to the School Division and deduct the debt to service payment, since that portion of the 52% is mandated.

Mr. Hipple inquired about the figure of that amount or percentage.

Ms. Day responded the debt service the County pays the School Division is \$14.8 million, so approximately \$95 million of it is operations and \$14.8 million is for debt.

Discussion ensued regarding this topic.

Mr. Stevens referenced the school superintendent and finance officer stating they have been team players and he and Ms. Day had shared good conversations with them. He noted the figures would be closer to \$1.2 million in operations, other items, and capital. He briefly discussed he expected to exceed the numbers given, that these were just for the current year and emphasized they do recognize the situation and where we are in terms of finances.

Mr. Hipple emphasized this Board does support the schools; however, in tough times what is equal for everyone has to be considered and then moved forward.

Mr. McGlennon stated he would like to see what the impact was going to be before deciding the right split figure. He commented we had funded at higher levels in the past, as a share of the total budget over the last couple of decades.

Mr. Hipple agreed and commented if we do not give up together, then one gives up more than the other. He noted that after schools, Police, EMS, and Fire are taken out of the equation, there is very little left to operate the rest of the County and wanted to make sure we were sharing in both sides equally or equally proportioned to what will be received.

Mr. Icenhour addressed the issue of capital and maintenance projects and referenced 2008 when maintenance was cut and things deteriorated over time. He emphasized there needed to be some type of recognition, that capital and maintenance cannot arbitrarily be cut, and it should be based on what needed to be done in order to maintain the capability going forward from a safety and financial aspect. He stressed the importance of having conversations with the School Board, noting there is a comfort level and we do not want to be not cutting them to the point where it makes it more difficult to recover in the long run. He further noted this was more important moving forward in FY 2021 than now, but still something that needed to be considered.

Mr. Hipple recommended reviewing the budget and *Capital Improvements Program (CIP)* at the next Board meeting and paying particular attention to three details: 1) asking our leaders what is a necessity and what items can be pushed back a year or two; 2) a budget set up with numbers that would be if there was enough revenue in the June or July 2021 timeframe; and 3) the budget that was presented before COVID-19 occurred. He emphasized this would allow the Board a better overview of different scenarios.

At approximately 4:39 p.m., the Board took a brief recess in order to deal with technical issues Ms. Sadler was experiencing.

At approximately 4:42 p.m., the Board reconvened and Ms. Sadler's technical problems were resolved.

Ms. Sadler conveyed concerns regarding CIP projects and referenced past CIP payments noting assets were viable at the time. She suggested possibly obtaining a small loan,

maintaining cash on hand, and when things return to normal to pay off the loans. She likened this method to those frequently used in household budgets. She emphasized the importance of having cash available during strenuous times. She inquired about FY 2020 meal and lodging taxes as well as Business, Professional, and Occupational License tax decreases.

Brief discussion ensued regarding these topics.

Ms. Sadler referenced Williamsburg-James City County school funding and briefly discussed that going forward we needed to be realistic in terms of what we are trying to accomplish with getting the budget through.

Mr. McGlennon remarked historically funds remained from schools where determinations were made in the fall, and asked if there was any reason to think that would not be true this year.

Ms. Day briefly discussed that this part of the budget discussion included the schools projections through June 30.

Mr. Stevens stated there was time to officially make the determination and he 'planted the seed' with the superintendent that it may be a year where the Board might not have the opportunity to prefund some of their capital items.

Mr. Icenhour inquired if there was a certain amount the schools were automatically allowed to keep and anything above that amount came back to us.

General discussion ensued regarding this topic and the approval process.

Mr. Stevens emphasized the schools were working very well with the Board in terms of sharing information and trying to do the same kinds of things the Board is doing.

Ms. Day stated there currently are shared services allowing visibility for major purchases. She continued her presentation and discussed the School Division expenditure side impacts referring to the PowerPoint slideshow included in the Agenda Packet.

Mr. Icenhour referenced going forward to the next budget work session and asked if there was any other guidance from the Board to staff before going into the FY 2021 portion.

Ms. Larson referenced a proactive email that Mr. Stevens sent to 'all staff' the previous day and noted it was a well-crafted message in moving forward.

Mr. Stevens expressed his thanks and commented he had a lot of help.

Ms. Larson noted efficiencies were currently being looked at to navigate through the end of this fiscal year and asked that the communications continue.

Mr. McGlennon stated he had some questions regarding the budget process for this year. He further stated the General Assembly would be meeting April 22, 2020, to consider amendments the Governor submitted to the budget. He noted the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act provides money for local government to recover pandemic related expenses. He referenced the Advanced Life Support and Basic Life Support transport issue. He pondered if that was potentially something that might be an impact of the COVID-19 situation, because it allows for the recovery of lost fees and sales taxes relating to the pandemic. He referenced the National Association of Counties and stated James City County would be eligible for approximately \$6.7 million under the recently passed proposal and briefly discussed qualifications and opportunities to draw federal funds. He asked if there had been

any guidance on transit.

Ms. Day replied guidance had been very general at this point. She stated the next work session would provide an update opportunity to review various programs staff has researched and feels would provide revenue relief. She noted researching loan programs that provide cash, but are a loan, as well as some programs where localities greater than 500,000 in population qualify for direct funding. She noted the County does not have that size population; therefore, funding would come from the state. She stressed there are lots of programs with many variables to consider in an effort to determine which provide the most benefit. She mentioned working with Olde Towne Medical to see what programs it qualified for and noted it recently applied for a loan which was approved.

Mr. Stevens stated Ms. Day was experienced with natural disasters in the area and tracking costs. He noted the challenge was replacing some of the lost revenues.

Mr. McGlennon stated Ms. Sadler raised the question of borrowing versus pay as you go. He noted information at the beginning of the presentation stating the intention was not to go into the cash reserves at this time, but rather to operate within the broader perimeters of the budget originally adopted.

Ms. Day replied yes.

Mr. Hipple stated it would be good to hold onto money put aside and try to tighten the budget. He briefly discussed these are the times that set things up one behind the other and when we get through this there will be funding to take care of an issue.

Ms. Larson remarked it was important to keep in mind the schools had not caught up from the recession in 2009 and were still being funded at 2009 levels, noting that was on the Commonwealth.

Mr. Icenhour asked Ms. Sadler if she had any further comments.

Ms. Sadler replied no.

Mr. Icenhour asked the Board be kept informed as the figures start to come in.

Mr. Hipple noted that in May the Board generally approved the budget; however, it did not have to be approved until July 1.

Ms. Day commented June 30.

Mr. Icenhour suggested pushing the date back in to June if needed, but wanted to be aware of not hindering the schools in its efforts to follow up on things that needed to be done.

Ms. Larson emphasized schools do not send contracts out until receiving the County's budget.

Mr. Hipple emphasized the possibility of new information or funding coming in that the Board was not aware of and perhaps may quickly change its course.

Mr. Stevens stated the Board may know a little more each month, but felt it did not necessarily change a lot month to month. He noted the possibility of the Board amending the budget from time to time throughout the year.

2. Proposed Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Discussion

Ms. Day continued her PowerPoint presentation included in the Agenda Packet and stated the proposed budget was issued on April 2, 2020, but was prepared before the COVID-19 pandemic. She noted \$500,000 that was originally earmarked for employee compensation was moved to a contingency account. She commented further adjustments are expected as more is learned about the situation and the potential impact on the County. She referenced and briefly discussed revenue and expenditure tables in the slideshow which depicted three different scenarios:

1. Assuming a three-month impact, meaning the impacts from COVID-19 would range from July 1-September 30, 2020; and
2. Assuming a six-month impact meaning the impacts from COVID-19 would range from July 1-December 31, 2020; and
3. Assuming a nine-month impact meaning the impacts from COVID-19 would range from July 1-March 31, 2021.

Ms. Day asked the Board for guidance on which scenario it would like the focus or if it would like a different direction taken.

Mr. Icenhour clarified with Ms. Day that it was his understanding she had details for the three-month projection, but it would probably be the next meeting before there were specific details for the six- and nine-month projections.

Ms. Day replied that was correct. She stated a lot of the assumptions made for the three-month impact were very similar to the three months of this fiscal year and expects the impact will be greater as time moves forward.

Mr. Stevens referenced a handout given to the Board showing what the dollar amounts per category would be for reductions; however, did not give the detail the PowerPoint slides contain. He asked the Board for guidance regarding which scenario it would like to explore, stating the conversation today could be in regard to the three-month scenario. He commented the upcoming work session could include discussion regarding the six- or nine-month scenarios. He noted the budgets would be the best estimate to date and could be subject to change moving forward through FY 2021.

Ms. Larson suggested reviewing the three- and six-month scenarios.

Mr. Icenhour inquired if the three-, six-, and nine-month projections were based on the pandemic continuing that length of time and not necessarily including any recovery and briefly discussed a projection example. He stated he would like to start with the three-month impact and keep in mind that when we return to the budget work session next week we can begin looking at some of these scenarios. He further stated it was his opinion the Board would pick a number based on its best guess and then adjust to that number. He explained that a three-month number could require tightening the belt; whereas, a six-month number may not. He reiterated his choice of a three-month scenario and questioning the effects going forward.

Ms. Sadler stated rather than starting with the lower impacts and taking things away, she preferred concentrating on the six- and nine-month scenarios and plan for a 'hard hit.' She noted at that point as things recovered items could be added back. She stated no one knew what the full impact will be, but was optimistic there would be a great recovery. She shared her grandmother's old adage "you plan for the worst and hope for the best." She commented that as a citizen, planning for the worst scenario and then bringing things back on board, would make her feel more confident that elected officials were taking a serious look at how tax

dollars were being spent.

Mr. Icenhour briefly discussed the importance of keeping perception in the back of one's mind.

Mr. Hipple stated it could take up to a year to get back into a rhythm, but things would get back to where they were before this all started. He noted getting things up and running again and stressed that he favored a safe, thought out, soft business opening approach to getting things reopened. He discussed the possible economic impact of the pandemic, planning for financial losses, and bringing things back online and moving forward in the community.

Ms. Larson inquired about a clarification of the definition of "impact."

Discussion ensued regarding the definition of "impact" in various circumstances, percentages, assumptions, and issues.

Ms. Larson briefly discussed restaurants, activity programs, as well as tourism and their possible effects throughout the pandemic. She stressed the need for conversations and a plan of reentry on the state level. She commented the impact is based on something much larger than when the doors open, because we do not know what that will look like. She asked Ms. Day her recommendation for which of the scenarios the Board should review.

Ms. Day replied her recommendation would be to go with the three-month impact and make adjustments along the way, due to a current lack of information and discussed factors leading to her choice of scenarios.

Mr. Stevens stated whichever budget the Board chose to adopt that he, Ms. Day, and staff would be watching month to month and not approving large expenditures until revenue was secure. He noted in terms of employees, salaries and benefits were fixed numbers every two weeks. He referenced capital projects and stated we would not award any without the Board's involvement, except for the extremely critical ones, which would be very few. He commented the bid process would not be started on any of those things without first speaking with the Board. He noted sales and meal tax numbers delay; therefore, it could take a few months into the New Year before there was an idea of those figures. He noted anything we do we will use caution in terms of next year's budget.

General discussion ensued regarding the three different timeline scenarios and/or percentages.

Mr. McGlennon suggested an alternate way of thinking about what was presented. He explained, think about a situation with a cumulative effect over the course of a year where revenue could be under 5%, 10%, or 15% compared to what we were anticipating. He noted this scenario accomplished the same thing and allowed priorities to be set. He suggested perhaps thinking of a scenario in terms of operations and transfers to other funds and outside agencies. He explained we were discussing one level of reduction, but on the capital side we were thinking about using more tendency to adjust our needs; explaining if we were thinking about a 5% reduction generally, but maybe more toward the 10% reduction in capital projects for the year. He emphasized that he was just suggesting there are different ways to think of this matter of concern. He referenced the timeline we have been operating on and noted this started in March and we are currently in April. He stated in looking at the three-month projections we are really talking about a six-month period, the end of this fiscal year and the first quarter of the next fiscal year. He recognized as of today the number of cases identified went up, noting we have not hit the peak of the outbreak. He stated once we have hit the peak, we are supposed to be on a downward slide for a couple of weeks before things open up again. He further stated that everyone knows what will happen if we open up prematurely, which is, we will get another outbreak and will have to close everything down again in order to

attempt to get it under control again. He noted Colonial Williamsburg (CW) announced today that it will be closed until May 31, adding it is a clear sign that CW does not think we are going to get that kind of level of all clear to start getting back to normal until that time. He briefly discussed the dynamics that make up the community and suggested offering ourselves as a community that wants to be on the frontline of the broadest testing possible, therefore allowing for a level of confidence to build and sending a message that we take this situation very seriously and are in control of the virus. He explained we have to push the state and national governments to make sure those effective tests are out and we have a contact program in place. He suggested perhaps spending money that had not been budgeted for those purposes and recovering the funds if possible.

Mr. Hipple clarified some of the points he made on having a soft reopening with various businesses and scenarios as well as noted concern for people dealing with health concerns during the pandemic.

Discussion ensued regarding the local virus peak and testing.

Mr. Icenhour commented to his fellow Board members that in order to commit to a number, figure, or percentage there needs to be the best possible information available from staff, which it has provided. He stated he would like staff to have the opportunity to bring a full-blown presentation at the upcoming April 28, 2020 budget work session, allowing Board members more detailed information.

Discussion ensued on this topic.

Ms. Sadler stated she had not seen any guidelines from Richmond as to what the openings are going to look like and asked how to take these different components and measure them in the budget. She noted that at some point a number will just have to be picked.

Mr. Icenhour stated the projections for the percentage decreases for the tourism related taxes are something that we can get a better feel for as more data becomes available over the next month or so. He noted real estate taxes on houses, if paid by a mortgage company, should be paid on time.

Ms. Larson inquired if a number was available regarding the percentage of local homes whose taxes were paid by mortgage.

Ms. Day replied approximately 20%.

Ms. Larson reiterated the number of citizens financially struggling during this pandemic. She stated she was fine with looking at three-, six-, and nine-month scenarios and having discussion about other areas we are willing to look at and make some cuts.

At approximately 5:57 p.m., the Board took a short break.

At approximately 6:03 p.m., the Board reconvened.

Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Stevens his recommendation for moving the next budget work session and James City Service Authority (JCSA) Board of Directors meetings from April 28, 2020, to May 5, 2020, in an effort to allow extra time for collecting more data and scenarios.

Mr. Stevens referenced the idea of adopting the budget at a later date and commented that works well and allows time for more information. He further commented staff was prepared to meet next week as originally scheduled, but if the budget adoption date was moving to May 5 there would be time for gathering more data for discussions. He noted also having the JCSA

meeting on May 5 as the JCSA budget would go along with the County budget and be adopted at a later date. He commented staff would advertise the date revision of the two Board meetings following this budget work session. He stated following today's meeting staff would be preparing for the May 5 meeting with three to four different scenarios showing the differences between 10%, 15%, 20%, and 30% in terms of those 20% reductions. He explained this would allow side-by-side scenario comparisons.

Ms. Larson stated staff should check with schools to see what impact pushing the budget date back would have on contracts.

Mr. Hipple referenced the May 14, 2020, Board of Supervisors meeting where he spoke of funding for the Hampton Roads Military and Federal Facilities Alliance (HRMFFA). He stated he accidentally missed its next meeting, which was a virtual meeting. He briefly discussed that during the virtual meeting it was decided HRMFFA would ask for full funding even though it currently had \$1.3 million in reserves. He noted he was not happy with the decision and would be reviewing tapes from that meeting. He further noted his recommendation was for zero funding for HRMFFA this year and the following year discussion should take place regarding full funding.

Ms. Larson explored different areas of cost savings and referenced the work force in regard to seniority noting costs and benefits, and inquired about employee buyouts. She asked about the possibility of temporarily closing recreational facilities on Sundays or changing the hours at the facilities.

Mr. Stevens replied he would speak with Human Resources in regard to retirement issues and noted no buyouts in recent years had been discussed. He recognized sometimes localities go through such an evolution as a cost saving measure and would research that scenario. He noted closing a building for one day does not generally save a lot on heating and cooling expenses, instead savings are typically found on staffing costs and commented information could easily be gathered.

Ms. Larson commented in a budget this size it may not be very 'meaty,' but she was trying to get answers to questions asked to her and would appreciate that information.

Mr. Icenhour referenced scenarios reviewed at the next meeting, and stated the details sought would be significant differences between operations and capital as well as being able to track how capital flows from one part to the other and ripples. Mr. Icenhour stated that moving the April 28, 2020, Budget Work Session date to May 5, 2020, for the Board and the JCSA, would allow for a decision to be made to delay the adoption of the budget or have different options going forward.

Ms. Larson stated she would appreciate a conversation with the Hotel/Motel and Restaurant Association to get some idea about what they were hearing.

Mr. Stevens replied absolutely.

Ms. Larson commented she would like to hear if Mr. Chris Johnson, Director of Economic Development, had heard of any businesses that may not be returning after this pandemic.

Mr. Icenhour referenced a document included in the handouts Mr. Stevens provided the Board that was from Economic Development and briefly discussed its content.

Mr. McGlennon expressed his surprise to read the newest manufacturing company in the County is already on the ground and operating.

A motion to Amend the Calendar to Move the April 28, 2020, Budget Work Session Meeting to May 5, 2020, for the Budget Work Session and have staff re-advertise for moving the James City Service Authority Meeting to May 5, 2020, was made by Michael Hipple, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

Mr. Icenhour asked the Board if it had anything to mention in a Board Request and Directives type of approach.

As there were no comments from his fellow Board members, Mr. Icenhour referenced a previous discussion regarding composing a letter to the Governor. He noted there were enough differences of opinion on issues that it was difficult to achieve true consensus and for this reason did not feel comfortable sending out something without complete consensus of the Board. He recommended not doing this together as a Board, but instead for each member to individually express his/her thoughts to the Governor.

General discussion ensued regarding this topic.

Ms. Larson referenced a health team the Governor previously assembled and inquired about a possible reopening team.

Mr. Stevens replied he did not mind asking, but noted obtaining responses to some questions had been difficult. He commented he did not mind reaching out or pushing for an answer, but anything the Board could do to push those things along would be helpful. He further commented he had not heard enough of what the plan is or what all the teams are doing and briefly discussed testing and typical timeframes for results.

Ms. Larson inquired if the turnaround time was still 14 days.

Mr. Stevens replied the state lab was still the faster lab, but its capacity was only so much and hospitals were using independent labs that typically took approximately 6-10 days. He commented testing availability seemed to have improved, but it still took a while to get the results.

Discussion ensued regarding testing, frustration associated with turnaround times, testing facilities, and DNA analysis database.

Ms. Larson inquired about deaths and presumptions of deaths related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Mr. Stevens replied according to the State of Virginia a deceased person had to test positive to be counted as a test positive. He stated that if a medical practitioner believed it was COVID-19 related, it could be reported as a COVID-19 death which would increase some of the counts.

Ms. Larson inquired about testing of a deceased person in case the death was not COVID-19 related.

Mr. Stevens replied that it was his understanding that currently in Virginia, if the medical practitioner felt it was COVID-19 related based on symptoms, no testing was required.

Mr. McGlennon referenced the Virginia Department of Health website and stated today it quoted approximately 330 deaths reported were directly related to COVID-19 with another 176 deaths presumed to be related to COVID-19.

Ms. Larson discussed possible symptom confusion.

Mr. Icenhour mentioned recent news where sailors aboard the USS Theodore Roosevelt tested positive for COVID-19 and were contagious, yet never displayed any symptoms. He noted these are the realities being faced in regard to this pandemic.

D. CLOSED SESSION

None

E. ADJOURNMENT

1. Adjourn until 4 p.m. on May 5, 2020, for the Budget Work Session

A motion to Adjourn was made by Michael Hipple, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

At approximately 6:34 p.m., Mr. Icenhour adjourned the Board of Supervisors.


Deputy Clerk