

**MINUTES**  
**JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**WORK SESSION**  
**County Government Center Board Room**  
**101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185**  
**May 26, 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 - via phone  
John J. McGlennon, Roberts District  
James O. Icenhour, Jr., Chairman, Jamestown District

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

Mr. Icenhour asked for a motion to allow Ms. Sadler to participate in the meeting remotely, due to an illness that prevented her attendance.

A motion to allow Ms. Sadler to participate remotely was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.

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

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon

Absent: Sadler

Ms. Sadler acknowledged her presence on the call.

**C. BOARD DISCUSSIONS**

1. Briefing on Phase 2 Activities of the Engage 2045 Comprehensive Plan Update Process

Ms. Tammy Rosario, Assistant Director of Community Development, addressed the Board noting this marked the third check-in. She noted Mr. Vlad Gavrilovic, Principal with EPR, P.C., and Mr. Rich Krapf, Planning Commission Chairman, were in attendance. Ms. Rosario highlighted the work of the Community Participation Team (CPT) in gathering community feedback, draft scenarios, as well as timelines. She noted the public engagement factor in the process. Ms. Rosario further noted the 2035 Strategic Plan Goals and their correlation to the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Goals in a PowerPoint presentation. She noted five themes from the Engage 2045 were: Nature, Community Character, Affordable Housing, Economic Development, and Quality of Life. Ms. Rosario further noted the strong continuity of public input and how that information was being used to build potential scenarios. Ms. Rosario noted Mr. Gavrilovic would address the process input.

Mr. Gavrilovic addressed the Board noting the challenging times and ongoing Zoom meetings with the CPT and the Planning Commission Working Group (PCWG) on the progress and next steps in the planning process. He noted the process of taking the feedback and data and compiling it for scenario planning. Mr. Gavrilovic further noted the question was shown in the

**ADOPTED**

**JUL 14 2020**

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

PowerPoint presentation - What are the implications of different land use and related policy directions on the fiscal health, environmental quality, and quality of life over the next 25 years? He noted two proposed scenario themes: Trendline and Public Guidance and explained how each one fit into the goals for the County's growth. Mr. Gavrilovic further noted the continuity in what citizens were saying regarding future growth and not radical changes. He noted citizens wanted a theme of environmental protection, Community Character protection, quality of life, more affordable housing, and diversified economy. Mr. Gavrilovic noted the testing of traditional trends with a more robust implementation of what the citizens are saying and a guiding vision. He continued the presentation noting the comparison between the two proposed scenarios and the control mechanism for comparison. Mr. Gavrilovic noted the factors of economy, open and rural land, residential, commercial, mixed use, redevelopment, and transportation and the respective impacts to these factors based on the existing trend scenario and the public input scenario. He further noted the Board's input was necessary to ensure the direction and vision for the 'big picture' moving forward. Mr. Gavrilovic noted a set of performance metrics was in place to evaluate the scenarios based on the previously mentioned five factors as represented in the PowerPoint presentation. He further noted a common misconception with scenario planning process involved what people wanted in a preferred scenario did not always automatically translate into the future land use plan. Mr. Gavrilovic added it was a data guided process as opposed to data driven. He continued the PowerPoint presentation with a flowchart of the process and the timeline. Mr. Gavrilovic noted the current pandemic's impact to public engagement events and future steps to address that impact. He further noted MetroQuest, a visual interactive platform, allowed for public interaction and input. Mr. Gavrilovic noted the County had received a grant which allowed for the expansion of the MetroQuest platform. He further noted fall was the target timeline for building the future land use map. Mr. Gavrilovic welcomed the Board's input and welcomed Mr. Krapf to address the Board.

Mr. Krapf addressed the Board with a summary from the PCWG's April 6, 2020, and May 6, 2020, meetings. He noted the PCWG reviewed citizen input versus existing plan goals at the April 6, 2020, meeting. He further noted the PCWG felt there was a very strong correlation between public input themes and the existing plans. Mr. Krapf noted the PCWG felt a focus on scenario planning prior to drafting language for the Comprehensive Plan framework was foremost. He further noted the group felt strongly that the wording from the public input be incorporated into the scenarios. Mr. Krapf noted the importance of this point. He further noted concern over the low number of participants, based on the County's population, in the public input process. Mr. Krapf noted additional efforts were needed to look at best practices or creative ideas that may not have been brought up in citizen comments, but were advantageous to the County. He further noted PCWG had expressed concern over two scenarios, but added that additional scenarios could potentially overlap each other with ideas. Mr. Krapf noted the citizen input to date had focused primarily on two items: 1) the current state of development in James City County, and 2) how citizens would like to see the County developed. He further noted the May 6, 2020, meeting focused on the PCWG's feedback to staff on topics it wanted addressed on a chapter by chapter basis as the Comprehensive Plan unfolded. Mr. Krapf noted this allowed staff time to address pressing and important County issues which included watershed planning as well as workforce and affordable housing and the possibility of the County having its own Housing Authority as well as the Workforce Housing Task Force recommendations. He further noted other issues included public-private partnerships as possible revenue generators and scenic overlays within the County for preservation.

Mr. Hipple asked if the Strategic Plan would drive the Comprehensive Plan or the Comprehensive Plan drive the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Gavrilovic noted Clarion had worked with the County on the development of the Strategic Plan, and in its viewpoint, the Comprehensive Plan was presented as the overarching policy

document to guide the County long-term. He further noted the Strategic Plan was more short-term, strategic action. Mr. Gavrilovic noted the two plans were in sync; however, he further noted once the Comprehensive Plan was completed, then tweaks could be made to the Strategic Plan based on the completion.

Mr. Hipple noted he saw the Strategic Plan as what the County would be doing while the Comprehensive Plan was the working plan beneath it. He further noted the details on the process under each respective plan.

Mr. Gavrilovic noted the Strategic Plan was more specific in terms of what the Board would be doing, while the Comprehensive Plan focused on a 25-year plan.

Ms. Rosario noted other plans, such as the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, were also under the Strategic Plan umbrella.

Mr. Hipple noted that was why he saw the Strategic Plan as the main piece though he recognized the Comprehensive Plan was the larger of the two plans.

Ms. Rosario noted the importance of both plans. She further noted the Comprehensive Plan was very long range, while the Strategic Plan was very specific and very focused. Ms. Rosario noted the Comprehensive Plan was very broad in some respects, almost aspirational, whereas the Strategic Plan was more nuts and bolts.

Mr. Hipple noted his viewpoint of the plans and community impact with the respective plans. He referenced the Comprehensive Plan, what are we going to look like. Mr. Hipple noted he campaigned on that point and has asked that numerous times. He further noted people used to come to James City County for its uniqueness, but added that slowly the County was becoming like other communities and that was a concern for him. Mr. Hipple noted getting feedback from older County residents and other concerns regarding development. He further noted land preservation in the Forge Road area. Mr. Hipple noted affordable workforce housing in relation to land availability. He thanked the group for its work in charting future plans for the County. Mr. Hipple strongly encouraged citizen participation and communication regarding plans for James City County.

Ms. Sadler noted the beauty and charm of Forge Road and Toano. She further noted Mr. Hipple's point of citizen involvement regarding the future plans for the County. Ms. Sadler noted the diversity within the County and meeting the needs of both the urban and agricultural areas. She expressed her appreciation to everyone involved in the planning process.

Ms. Larson noted the back and forth on the Comprehensive Plan and the Strategic Plan. She further noted a better way to communicate it as she noted the confusion among Board members and the likely confusion among citizens as well. Ms. Larson noted she hoped citizen input would continue. She further noted her appreciation of the update and the direction the County was going. Ms. Larson inquired what measures were in place to increase citizen input, particularly during these difficult times. She thanked the group for its work.

Mr. McGlennon thanked the group for its thoughtful presentation and organization of the material. He noted the Comprehensive Plan represented a broad vision for the County in 25 years, while the Strategic Plan represented the prioritization of the choices to achieve that vision. Mr. McGlennon noted the Strategic Plan would change over time as plans worked or not and other priorities were addressed. He further noted the availability of information from the 2020 Census, and the perspective on how the County looked now and 10 years ago. Mr. McGlennon noted changes in the population, smaller developments, and other factors over the years as well as the importance of trends within the community. He further noted using the polls on a wider citizen base for more public input. Mr. McGlennon noted the survey

previously used that had been mailed to citizens was a valuable resource of information from citizens. He further noted protection of rural lands, reforestation, redevelopment, and economic development in the County.

Mr. Icenhour noted citizen concern regarding the Comprehensive Plan over the years. He further noted the persistent concern regarding what citizens wanted the County to look like and the consistency of that perception. Mr. Icenhour noted citizen frustration over completion of the Plan and that it then sat on the shelf, with budgeting plans made regardless. He further noted the Strategic Plan was a crucial addition to this process. Mr. Icenhour noted the Comprehensive Plan was the long-range plan with the Strategic Plan being a shorter range, more focused process to accomplish goals. He noted the incorporation of other plans, such as the Parks and Recreation Plan. Mr. Icenhour further noted the incorporation should then drive the budgeting process as the end game. He noted subsequent citizen survey feedback would confirm if the County was heading in the right direction. Mr. Icenhour noted the importance of the watershed plans and impervious cover. He further noted making use of resources to make the process work.

Mr. Hipple noted refinement of the citizen information. He further noted another survey would capture input from citizens newer to the community.

The Board thanked Ms. Rosario, Mr. Krapf, and Mr. Gavrilovic.

## 2. Capital Improvement Projects Discussion

Mr. Stevens addressed the Board noting additional staff members would be in attendance. He noted they would be available to answer any questions relating specifically to Fiscal Year 2020 (FY 20) Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) projects. He further noted those projects were already funded and the money was still there. Mr. Stevens noted at the start of the COVID-19 Pandemic, there had been discussion regarding cash and finances as well any potential project delays. He further noted a color-coded chart that was provided to Board members. Mr. Stevens noted red represented projects that could be delayed with no set timeframe, yellow represented projects of merit for consideration, but no financial commitment at this time, and green represented projects either near completion or deemed necessary to complete. Mr. Stevens noted the scope of scale equated to \$5.3 million for red, \$8.4 million for yellow, and just under \$7 million for green. He further noted the Skiffes Creek proffer was basically spent and saw no value in holding that project. Mr. Stevens addressed different projects such as the Land Facilities Project and Purchase of Development Rights. He noted moving forward with the \$60,000 Courthouse Lot Gate Project, which he further noted Ms. Grace Boone, Director of General Services, could address any questions.

Ms. Larson questioned the specifics of the project.

Ms. Boone noted it would be located in the back where prisoners are brought in and that it would be an enclosed area that could then be locked.

Mr. McGlennon asked if this was a split cost with the City of Williamsburg.

Ms. Sharon Day, Director of Financial and Management Services, acknowledged yes. She noted the County had an agreement with the City.

Mr. Stevens noted the portable radio replacement project was ongoing. He further noted Chief Ryan Ashe, Fire Chief, was present if there were any questions. Mr. Stevens noted his recommendation to move forward on the replacement project.

Ms. Larson asked if this referred to upgrading or was this a new project. She inquired if this was part of the 911 upgrade.

Chief Ashe noted the portable radio replacement was for the Police and Fire Departments, as well as the Sheriff's Office. He further noted the units were purchased in the 2003-2004 timeframe and had reached the end of life expectancy on them. Chief Ashe noted the units were funded over three years.

Mr. Stevens noted the next item was Station 1 renovation with fairly low cost punch list items to move forward. He further noted the squad truck replacement was basically complete and recommended finishing it. Mr. Stevens recommended putting Fire Station 6 and addressing it on the Five-Year CIP discussion. He further noted the Settlers Market project as another project to complete. Mr. Stevens noted stormwater projects and the priorities in that area. He further noted moving forward with the Toano and Grove drainage projects and changing those to green status. He further noted moving to Building Safety and Security projects and recommended moving forward on that project. He asked the Board if there were any questions before moving on to the other areas.

Ms. Sadler asked if the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system upgrade was part of this CIP.

Mr. Stevens noted it was mostly FY 20. He further noted these were projects approved a year ago. Mr. Stevens noted some of these projects could be stopped and wanted to verify these actions with the Board.

Ms. Sadler asked if the CAD system was still in the works.

Mr. Stevens confirmed yes and added it was funded in the FY 21 budget.

Ms. Sadler thanked Mr. Stevens.

Mr. McGlennon asked for clarification on the Toano and Grove drainage projects.

Mr. Stevens confirmed both projects were yellow on the handout, but he recommended those projects become green to move forward. He noted the next category was General Services with various types of projects that arise during the year. He further noted Ms. Boone had a list of those projects, but added the intention was to present them one at a time as the work was needed. Mr. Stevens noted moving forward on several lift repairs in Fleet maintenance. He further noted roof repairs.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Stevens continued discussion on the various projects. He noted library projects included bathrooms and carpet. He further noted school projects. Mr. Stevens noted the Navion project under Land Facilities would continue and should be represented as green on the handout. He further noted grant funding recommendation on the Brickyard Land Purchase and the timeline before the Board's approval. Mr. Stevens continued addressing the different projects including work on the Jamestown Marina and timelines.

Ms. Larson asked if dredging was included in the cost.

Mr. Stevens noted the dredging was included.

Discussion ensued on the work at the Marina.

Mr. Stevens noted moving forward on work at Chickahominy Riverfront Park. He further noted software upgrade projects for various departments. Mr. Stevens noted the Amblers House and Tourism projects.

Ms. Larson noted she did not understand the vision for the Amblers House, particularly as its floorplan was choppy and not suitable as an event venue. She further noted she wanted to see a plan for the property and its uses.

Mr. Stevens noted the preservation of the property's historical nature. He further noted the interior needed renovation. Mr. Stevens noted his understanding was for someone to invest in the interior renovation while the County preserved the exterior. He further noted the water/sewer service need for the property and continued discussion on the Amblers House. Mr. Stevens noted the Marina project under Tourism and asked for specifics from Ms. Boone.

Ms. Boone noted the project included bathrooms and other on-land renovations in the Phase 2 stage. She further noted updating the office area.

Mr. Stevens noted more discussion on the Marina project at the June work session.

Ms. Larson noted the incredible potential at the Marina. She further noted increased activity during the Phase I time.

Mr. Icenhour noted the color-coded handout was very helpful. He further noted the money for the projects was already allocated for FY 20, but the projects could be completed over ensuing years.

Mr. Stevens noted Ms. Day could address that point.

Mr. Icenhour noted the need for a better understanding of delays previously allocated for a specific fiscal year. He questioned how that impacted projects when they rolled to another fiscal year. He noted some projects came in under budget and excess funding from previous years was available. Mr. Icenhour asked how long that cycle could last.

Ms. Day noted the current total CIP budget was \$97 million with about \$55 million allocated to school projects, and \$40 million in County-funded projects. She further noted of that about \$40 million, \$13 million was FY 20 projects with \$28 million in FY 19 projects. Ms. Day noted some projects had funding built in over time because the funding was too much up front. She further noted setting aside funding prior to bidding since the cost is unknown. Ms. Day noted excess funds from projects were not reallocated, but went into the Fund Balance and the Capital Fund.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the handout reflected all the CIP projects for FY 20.

Mr. Stevens indicated it was meant to include all the projects.

Discussion ensued on CIP projects and school budgeting.

Mr. Stevens noted he would update the handout for the Board. He further noted the Board's input gave direction on how to proceed with projects and the budget. Mr. Stevens noted a second point addressed the proposed five-year CIP budget, which did not take into account what was recommended now not to be funded for FY 21. Mr. Stevens noted those projects were still important and he wanted the Board's input on those items for the proposed five-year CIP budget. He further noted the difficulty in funding the CIP prior to the COVID-19 situation, not necessarily for FY 21 and FY 22. Mr. Stevens noted the impact to the operating fund on the five-year outlook. He further noted reshuffling several projects and two in particular. He

noted the first was the Jamestown Beach Amblers House project for \$739,000 and the specifics of that project regarding code, sewer, and fire hydrant. Mr. Stevens further noted discussion with Chief Ashe regarding a fire alarm for the structure. He noted he was not recommending the water line work be done at this time.

Mr. Icenhour asked if this was for FY 23.

Mr. Stevens confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour asked for Mr. Stevens' recommendation.

Mr. Stevens recommended pushing the project out to the end of the 10-year mark or remove it. He noted if the need arose for the water line, readdress the issue then. He further noted the \$188,000 provided water and sewer services for Amblers House, while the \$739,000 provided an outside fire hydrant. Mr. Stevens noted currently there was not a need there and recommended removing it from the CIP. He further noted the second project was the \$9.6 million Fire Station 6 project. Mr. Stevens noted the call volume from the City of Williamsburg. He further noted the number of EMS calls from the City of Williamsburg were far less than the fire calls for them that the County answers.

Chief Ashe addressed the Board referencing past concerns with an increase in the volume of calls in relation to areas of growth and development. He noted Fire Stations 3 and 4 were the busiest areas and bordered the City of Williamsburg. Chief Ashe detailed call transfers, gaps in the six-minute response time, and the rationale for building Fire Station 6. He noted some adjustments had been made during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Chief Ashe further noted additional personnel for the proposed Fire Station 6 could be used at Fire Stations 3 and 4. He noted additional costs to furnish a new fire station.

Mr. Stevens noted a delay on the Fire Station 6 project for six to nine years, with a push out beyond the five-year mark. He further noted a reserve engine, which could be put into the five-year plan as well. Mr. Stevens noted this project was not recommended for removal, but rather an extended timeline for it.

Mr. Hipple noted he had spoken with Chief Ashe regarding the utilization of staff at other stations without the pressure of building the new station. He further noted the project delay allowed for staff preparation.

Mr. Stevens noted the fire station project was borrowed funds, which helped the debt service side. He further noted the Amblers House project was cash funded. Mr. Stevens noted he and Ms. Day would work other projects into the five-year plan, but welcomed the Board's thoughts.

Mr. Hipple asked about the water rescue boat and the cost.

Mr. Stevens noted he and Chief Ashe had also discussed that item. He further noted Chief Ashe was working on possible regional funding.

Chief Ashe noted the County had applied for a Port Security Grant and hoped to hear by July. He further noted the Port of Virginia viewed James City County as a valuable asset between Newport News and Henrico County as it had the only staffed fire boat. Chief Ashe noted there were several volunteer groups along the route. Discussion ensued on projects and the five-year plan.

Ms. Larson asked Mr. Stevens about a revenue discussion in the future. She noted the recovery process and the initial Phase I reopening.

Ms. Day noted she had some revenue updates on the Meals, Lodging, and Sales Tax. She further noted the Meals Tax was anticipated to be at 40%, but was currently at 50% with the anticipation that percentage would get worse. Ms. Day noted the Lodging Tax was down 70% instead of the assumed 75% reduction. She further noted the recent Sales Tax collection for March was down 25% and the County had assumed 50% as the worst case scenario. Ms. Day noted ironically on the school side, the Sales Tax for Education was up compared to last year. She further noted that is a state-wide number so the information provided was not just based on local numbers. Ms. Day noted the County had received notification that it would receive approximately \$6.7 million in a cash funding as part of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Securities (CARES) program. She further noted those funds should be available within the first week of June. Ms. Day noted the importance of qualifying expenditures or the money would have to be returned by December 31, 2020. She further noted working with the school division on qualifying expenditures.

Mr. Icenhour asked if all that money would be used since expenses had to be COVID related.

Ms. Day said possibly, but she was actively engaged on phone calls about new opportunities. She noted the schools had about \$2 million just on its side. She further noted healthcare claims for employees as a possibility.

Mr. Icenhour noted squeezing every dollar out of that funding.

Mr. McGlennon questioned the \$6.7 million as half of what the County had anticipated receiving.

Mr. Stevens noted some confusion, but \$6.7 million reflected the 50% allocation.

Ms. Larson noted there was no specific language in the CARES Act that this funding had to be shared with localities. She further noted there was no specific language in the guidelines either, nor had there been mention of a second phase of funding to localities.

Ms. Day noted it was her understanding the state may keep it all.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. McGlennon noted Mr. Stevens and the School Board Superintendent had been working together. He further noted discussion on those items including the Schools anticipated budget shortfall for the upcoming fiscal year.

Ms. Larson asked if the Board had to take action on the CARES funding.

Ms. Day noted it could be part of the Board's budget adoption for FY 21. Ms. Day noted it could be reallocated back to the School division for one-time CIP related expenses or maintained in the County's fund balance. She further noted the proposal was instead of the money coming back to the County, it would be utilized for less of a reduction to the School division in the FY 21 budget. Ms. Day detailed a new line item to represent the money.

Mr. Hipple addressed cuts on the County side as well as the School division side. He noted potential money returned from the School division and what funding may come from the state. He further noted the Schools' involvement with the CARES money and getting the best and most use of it with both groups working together.

Mr. McGlennon noted the work done between the County and the School Division. He further noted the community's value of education and schools, while still educating citizens on public



safety and preparedness of Fire and other divisions for response to community needs. Mr. McGlennon noted letting the public know these are unprecedented times, but the value of education still remains important.

Discussion ensued on state funding estimates, School CIP projects, and other school-related topics.

Mr. McGlennon noted both the County Administrator and Dr. Olwen Herron, School Superintendent, were collaboratively working on budget needs. He further noted the Board of Supervisors' efforts over the years to assist the School Division with funding for quality education. Mr. McGlennon noted surrounding counties and localities taking action regarding budget deficits for their respective school divisions. He urged the public to watch as we move forward and work in good faith to accomplish the best for the community.

Mr. Icenhour requested the Board's consensus on the direction.

Ms. Sadler noted she had several comments. She further noted community concerns regarding the school system and support. Ms. Sadler stated she was in agreement with Mr. McGlennon in people trusting and focusing on what is best for the children, but also work within the budgetary means. Ms. Sadler extended her thanks to Mr. Stevens, Ms. Day, and staff for addressing budget concerns and ways to help each other. She also thanked Mr. Greg Dowell, the Stonehouse District representative on the School Board, for sharing his realistic solutions.

Mr. Icenhour summarized the Board's consensus for staff was to take the FY 20 school surplus and roll into the FY 21 budget as offset. He noted the consensus was to share the CARES money for maximum usage. Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Stevens if he was comfortable with the Board's comments on the CIP list in terms of changes and feedback prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Stevens noted the FY 20 budget was in good shape. He further noted there was time for the five-year budget to be revised and reviewed by the Board at a date later than the next meeting.

Mr. Icenhour confirmed that point noting the Board would be adopting the FY 21 budget, but the remaining items would be addressed later. Mr. Icenhour asked if each member approved of this direction.

A motion to Endorse the recommendations that were identified by Mr. Stevens and Superintendent Herron was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed. AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

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

#### **D. BOARD REQUESTS AND DIRECTIVES**

Mr. McGlennon reminded people to wear their masks as a deterrent to spreading COVID-19. He noted washing hands and maintaining a safe distance from others, especially inside buildings.

Ms. Larson noted information from Governor Northam would be available on May 29 regarding masks. She further noted Governor Northam indicated failure to wear a mask would not be punishable. Ms. Larson thanked her colleagues for working together in response to the numerous emails. She also extended her thanks to Mr. Stevens for help on specific questions. Ms. Larson noted the validity of citizens' questions on where the money will come from and the importance of impacts on different aspects of the community. She further noted the

unknowns regarding tourism revenue and timeline for returning to normalcy. Ms. Larson noted people needed to be patient.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Ms. Larson for taking the lion's share of responding to the community's emails.

Mr. Hipple noted the work of the Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) Public Schools and its teachers for the community as well as his children. He further noted the concern behind the numerous emails regarding the cuts to the school. Mr. Hipple noted the Board was working hard to get information and make decisions to keep the community moving. He further noted current times were testing everyone, but everyone was in this together.

Ms. Sadler noted she was sending a shout-out to her two favorite WJCC students, Connor and Evan, who were making adjustments during these changing times.

Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Stevens if he had additional comments.

Mr. Stevens thanked the Board for its compliments. He noted the work with the School staff and other groups and that it was a good relationship.

Mr. Icenhour extended his thanks to Mr. Stevens and staff for their assistance.

**E. CLOSED SESSION**

None.

**F. ADJOURNMENT**

1. Adjourn until 5 p.m. on June 9, 2020, for the Regular Meeting

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

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

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

At approximately 6:20 p.m., Mr. Icenhour adjourned the Board of Supervisors.

  
Deputy Clerk