

**MINUTES**  
**JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**WORK SESSION**  
**County Government Center Board Room**  
**101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185**  
**July 28, 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.

Mr. Icenhour asked for a motion to amend the agenda to include the Virginia Department of Transportation Quarterly Update.

A motion to Amend the agenda 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

**C. BOARD DISCUSSIONS**

**I. Virginia Department of Transportation Quarterly Update**

Mr. Rossie Carroll, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Williamsburg Residency Administrator, addressed the Board with an update on VDOT's maintenance projects during the pandemic. He noted VDOT had completed 1,074 of the 1,174 work orders received between February and June 30, 2020. He further noted that was a 91% completion rate. Mr. Carroll noted the remaining 100 projects included drainage, roadway, and vegetation work. He further noted highlights of completed work during the February to June 2020 timeframe, which included sweeping, asphaltting, and mowing. Mr. Carroll noted the I-64 Segment III project was currently underway. He further noted the specifics of the project including bridge rehabilitation over the Colonial Parkway and Lakeshead Drive as well as bridge replacement

**ADOPTED**

**SEP 08 2020**

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

over Queen's Creek. Mr. Carroll continued his update noting two miles of noise walls would be installed along I-64, the Longhill Road widening project, safety improvements at News and Centerville Roads, the Skiffes Creek project, and the plant mix schedule. He noted upcoming projects included the four-lane widening and pedestrian and bike lanes at Croaker Road in addition to updates on safety projects, land use plan reviews, and permits.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Mr. Carroll. Mr. McGlennon noted cleanup work along Route 199 and the guardrail, street sweeping on Route 60 in the Grove area, and pavement cracking in the Rolling Woods neighborhood. He further noted work needed along Lake Powell Road off Neck-O-Land Road. Mr. McGlennon noted it was a small section of road in dire need of repair and had been for a long time. He further noted the possibility of federal funding and a potential project partnership between the County and VDOT.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Carroll for work on the flashing beacons. She noted additional accidents at Route 5 and Greensprings Road and requested a statistical update on Route 5 and Centerville Road.

Ms. Sadler thanked Mr. Carroll. She noted exiting I-64 westbound at Exit 227, shrubs were a visibility issue for vehicles turning left. She further noted another shrubbery and visibility issue near the Williamsburg Indoor Sports Complex and Longhill Road, adding that she was not sure if that area was easement or private property.

Mr. Carroll noted an update on School House Lane, Route 30, and Old Stage Road and a draft final had been received. He further noted that the final should be available in the upcoming weeks.

Mr. Icenhour also thanked Mr. Carroll and noted Mr. Carroll had addressed one of his concerns, the pedestrian crossing at Ironbound Road. Mr. Icenhour noted the southern end of Route 199 and the surface conditions in that loop of the road.

Mr. Carroll noted that section was included in this year's paving schedule.

Mr. Icenhour noted he had received an email from a constituent regarding Powhatan Secondary on the pool side of the road. He further noted speeding and pedestrian safety near the pool on Charterhouse Lane. Mr. Icenhour suggested the possibility of a four-way stop at the intersection. He noted he would forward that email for Mr. Carroll to review possibilities.

## 2. Contract Award - Cardiac Monitor Replacement

A motion to Approve 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

Fire Chief Ryan Ashe addressed the Board and provided the details of the memorandum and resolution in the Agenda Packet.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the older equipment was traded in as part of the process.

Chief Ashe confirmed that was part of the negotiation process for the new equipment.

Ms. Larson asked if the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act money could be used for the equipment.

Ms. Sharon Day, Director of Financial and Management Services (FMS), addressed the

Board and noted ongoing discussion on the funding of the equipment purchase. She noted the cardiac monitor replacement was currently funded in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) budget as a cash purchase. Ms. Day further noted discussion included financing or an alternative source such as CARES money or other COVID funding the County had received. She noted she wanted to reach out in conversation with state and federal partners to determine if the purchase qualified.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. Day.

Mr. Stevens noted some of the equipment had been allocated over a two-year budget, but due to the Federal Drug Administration change regarding the equipment, all 25 units needed immediate replacement. He further noted the allotment for this year had already been budgeted and thus CARES funding could not be applied. Mr. Stevens noted conversation centered on the remaining units that were in next year's CIP budget and determining options. He credited the vendor and the Fire Department for getting the total number of units in under the anticipated cost.

### 3. CARES Act Funding Discussion

A motion to Adopt the Emergency Ordinance extension on the convenience fees until December 30, 2020 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

Ms. Day noted she and Ms. Rebecca Vinroot, Director of Social Services, would address the Board regarding CARES Act funding.

Ms. Day noted prior to reviewing the CARES Act funding, a projected review of where the County was on June 30, 2020, at the end of its fiscal year was done. She further noted updates would be provided to the Board of Supervisors as most revenue is collected in arrears. Ms. Day noted sales tax was two months behind with the meals and lodging tax one month behind. She further noted those figures in relation to the impact on tourism. Ms. Day noted this season's closure of Busch Gardens and the impact on the lodging tax. She gave a PowerPoint presentation detailing taxes and projected loss. Ms. Day noted the reduction in the meals and lodging tax, but an increase in the sales tax, which was a higher number and created an overall net of earlier projections. She further noted that in April, the projection had been about \$7.6 million reduction in revenue. Ms. Day noted the sales tax for education and the School Division's portion of the budget. She further noted positive numbers in several categories including real estate and personal property taxes, but noted a dip in charges for Parks and Recreation services as those are program driven. She noted while the revenue was not there nor were the expenditures so those two factors offset each other. Ms. Day continued her presentation noting a projected surplus of roughly \$1.8 million for end of year. She noted savings measures that had been implemented including postponement of CIP projects. She further noted an adjustment in the timeline from 45 to 60 days for year-end posting due to the time extension on both the personal property and real estate taxes. Ms. Day noted there was some latitude in the timeframe, but recommended not pursuing it.

Ms. Larson asked about the maintenance effort that was required by Senate Bill 942 per code and if that effort was funded by the \$1 from that revenue source.

Ms. Day noted there were two funding sources. She further noted a transfer of the lodging tax for the tourism fund and the County's 50% allotment from the \$2 tax comprised those sources. Ms. Day noted for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020, a shortfall was projected for both the lodging tax and the \$2 tax.

Ms. Larson asked the shortfall amount.

Ms. Day noted she would get that information.

Discussion ensued over the impact on FY 2021 with the current season's closing of Busch Gardens and Water Country, tourism contingency fund, and the uncertainty of timelines.

Mr. Hipple noted the impact on FY 2021 and asked about estimates on County-wide losses.

Ms. Day noted new developments were coming in daily. She further noted the programming for the 10% reduction, but added that had not been 'straight across the board' which involved reviewing every revenue differently. Ms. Day noted reviewing the meals and lodging revenue as Governor Northam had placed additional restrictions on Hampton Roads and the impact on restaurants.

Mr. Hipple noted closely monitoring the numbers, but acknowledged the difficulty with revenues in arrears by a month and the impact on decisions for next year's budget.

Ms. Day noted the majority of those taxes were received in the summer months. She further noted that would have a greater impact now as opposed to winter.

Ms. Larson noted the School Division had made a decision on a virtual return to school for the upcoming term. She asked about its decision on personnel who may not be needed for day-to-day operations.

Ms. Day noted she had reached out to her counterpart at the School Division on that point. She further noted she and Ms. Vinroot had an upcoming call to discuss that specific point. Ms. Day noted discussion around any CARES money the School Division may receive, the possibility of a fourth round of a federal package with funding for schools and their virtual needs, and a review of how the School Division ended for FY 2020.

Mr. Hipple asked if the School Division received separate CARES Act funding other than the allocation from the County.

Ms. Day noted \$1.7 million had been allocated from the County specifically for laptops during virtual learning. She further noted upcoming discussion with the School Division included any additional funding it may have received for virtual learning. Ms. Day noted questions to be asked included what money had been received, what was in the pipeline, and what it could be used for. She further noted one guideline of the CARES funding was that the money could not be used for the same thing twice. Ms. Day added a new federal guideline required how the money was being used and certification that the money was not being used twice. She noted that applied to the School Division and the County, particularly if the County provided money to the School Division to address possible 'double dipping' of funds.

Mr. Hipple asked that the financial information of any money received in addition to County funding be emailed to the Board.

Ms. Day replied yes, adding that would also require an amendment to the School Division's budget as it was not part of the original budget document.

Mr. Stevens noted a monthly report from Ms. Day for the Board to review as well as updates every other month during work sessions. He further noted tracking and monitoring on a regular basis.

Ms. Day gave an overview of the state's allocation of federal funding through the CARES Act and the County's allotment of that allocation. She noted the County received 50% of the state allocation based on the County's population on June 1, 2020. Ms. Day further noted Governor Northam had indicated the balance of the allocation would take place, but additional requirements were stipulated with this allocation. She noted those requirements included certification regarding adherence to the federal regulations and completion of an online survey on how the money was spent and submission of supporting documentation. Ms. Day noted August 10, 2020, was the requirement deadline with receipt of the remaining allocation due within five days. She further noted the sooner the requirements were submitted, the sooner the funds would be available. Ms. Day noted the Board would receive an update on year-to-date spending today. She further noted she had not received any additional information if the money could be used for any revenue shortfall or if a deadline for its use had been extended past December 30, 2020. Ms. Day noted the United States Treasury Department had submitted guidelines on the usage of the funds. She further noted three criteria for eligibility to use that funding had to be met: 1) expenditures related to the public health emergency with respect to the Coronavirus; 2) cannot be accounted for in the current budget; and 3) expenditures had to be incurred March 1-December 30, 2020. Ms. Day added that currently those funds could not be used for any revenue shortfalls.

Mr. Hipple asked if the second allocation had an extension past the end of December.

Ms. Day noted she had not heard of an extension, but further noted an extension was the desire of localities.

Ms. Larson asked if that was a federal or state decision.

Ms. Day said she did not know.

Mr. Stevens noted federal.

Mr. McGlennon noted the CARES Act required it be done by December 30, 2020. He further noted he had been following Congressional action and packages that would benefit localities. He further noted the House of Representatives' bill addressed funding to assist localities with revenue shortfall and employment levels. Mr. McGlennon noted the Senate's bill did not provide additional funding to localities, but extended the December deadline into 2021 and allowed for up to 25% of CARES Act money coming to localities to be utilized for revenue shortfalls. He noted the timeline for the bills and hopeful signs that would assist localities.

Discussion ensued on the bills, possible extensions, and requirements on the funding.

Ms. Day continued her PowerPoint presentation showing the usage of the CARES Act funds in major categories. She noted actual costs incurred as of June 30, 2020, as well as financial commitments with the School Division receiving the largest amount of \$1.7 million for student laptops. Ms. Day further noted funding to Business Relief, Personal Protective Equipment for staff and first responders, payroll/leave requirements of the Family and Medical Leave Act, public health measures, cleaning and hand sanitizers, medical supplies, Information Technology software and equipment, and community assistance. Ms. Day summarized noting receipt of \$6.7 million of CARES Act funding with expenditures and commitments totaling \$4.6 million for a funding balance of approximately \$2 million to be spent from present to December 30, 2020. She further noted a list of consideration for the remaining funds included facility renovations for public and staff safety, broadband improvements, discussion on an employee sick leave bank, potential childcare assistance based on the School Board decision, and increased demand from the community for services from nonprofit groups. Ms. Day noted the recent announcement of Rebuild Virginia, a state initiative to help nonprofit organizations and

businesses.

Ms. Vinroot addressed the Board regarding childcare assistance and support for nonprofit organizations and the increase in demand for services. She noted the School Board's decision for virtual learning and the need for parents to work. Ms. Vinroot further noted the question of where could students go to be safe while having their virtual learning needs met. She noted several organizations and private entities in the County who offered programs. Ms. Vinroot stated that while opportunities for childcare were available, costs could be a concern, particularly for families currently struggling financially. She noted discussion with the Board of Supervisors on the possibility of expanding Parks and Recreation programs to offer those services as well as support for those programs. Ms. Vinroot further noted this could assist lower-income families as well as employees for both the County and the School Division who had not anticipated childcare cost during the fall.

Mr. Hipple noted the cost of paying for schools and the daycares as a double expense. He further noted closing the schools for safety reasons, but then children and young adults would still be sent to the daycares and it meant paying twice for the same thing. He questioned why the children could not congregate at school, but could at a daycare and the increased pressure on the County. Mr. Hipple noted the COVID money as a resource but added cautioned this was 'not free money' and payback would come in some form. He further noted this was a difficult situation in addressing this point.

Ms. Larson noted teachers and their own children. She asked who in the school system was the childcare provided for and how would the prioritization be handled between School, County, and community. Ms. Larson noted there would be a limit on the number of spots available for children. She further noted health concern for the safety of the Rec Connect staff and staffing capacity. She asked if the daycares would be in schools since Rec Connect took place there. Ms. Larson noted quality childcare was difficult prior to COVID. She further noted the pressure on parents, learning expectations, and the plan if students did not return back after nine weeks. She asked about the priorities.

Ms. Vinroot noted these points had been part of the internal discussions and were ongoing. She further noted an upcoming meeting with School employees, County staff, and others, but at present she was not aware of the School Division's expectations for teachers. Ms. Vinroot noted her understanding was some classes would be recorded, some real-time, but she believed the School Division would be accommodating to both students and staff. She further noted flexibility within County departments regarding work, stating these were points for discussion. Ms. Vinroot noted the childcare programs would not replace the educational aspect, but those involved, whether parent or Rec Connect staff, were working to facilitate the learning opportunities 'when you're not a teacher'. She further noted the recent survey in which the majority of parents opted for virtual school, whether for safety issues, telework opportunities for parents, or other factors. Ms. Vinroot noted some daycares had not closed during the current conditions. She further noted some parents will have to send their children to childcare while others will have the option of keeping their children at home. She noted concerns over classroom size as a health factor. Ms. Vinroot further noted a lower cost, safe alternative to avoid having children home alone or older siblings trying to help younger siblings.

Ms. Larson inquired what type of fee structure was being considered.

Mr. McGlennon asked what was the typical enrollment for the Rec Connect program. He noted this would give a better sense of the scale of participation.

Mr. Hipple and Ms. Larson asked if this would grow the program.

Mr. McGlennon noted that was not necessarily so as Rec Connect has been viewed as a

source of childcare for years.

Mr. John Carnifax, Director of Parks and Recreation, addressed the Board. He noted the summer camps, which usually had over 800 registrants, currently only had 200. He further noted weekly attendance had dropped 70% from last summer. Mr. Carnifax asked what were the options as most children would not attend the Before and After program with no school. He noted some private providers and nonprofit organizations were preparing to offer full-day programs with mentors to assist with curriculum. Mr. Carnifax noted at the upcoming meeting there would be discussion on location, expected capacity, and other factors.

Ms. Sadler questioned the use of the school facility if the children would not be there for school during the virtual phase. She noted it did not make sense. Ms. Sadler noted the question of safety even at the private facilities. She further noted discussion at the upcoming meeting that focused on how the schools should decide to pay for the childcare.

Mr. McGlennon inquired about the scale of enrollment. He noted that number could answer some of the questions asked. He further noted classroom size was usually 20-25 children depending on age in school facilities as opposed to potentially six to eight in the childcare programs.

Discussion ensued on the limit of children, adequate Rec Connect staff, and safety issues.

Mr. Carnifax noted currently the Rec Connect program was offered in the schools through the summer with a maximum of 50 children based on the size of the school facilities that were accessible such as cafeterias, gyms, and classrooms. Ms. Larson asked if everyone was kept together. Mr. Carnifax noted social distancing was in place to meet the requirements for childcare. He further noted the department was licensed and was following the guidelines, but that by limiting the number of children attending and capacity allowance, they were able to offer the program. Mr. Carnifax noted he was unsure what the demand would be for the program. He further noted his prediction that numbers would go down as school resumed.

Ms. Larson asked how to prioritize for the limited number of spots in the program between the school, County, and community.

Mr. McGlennon noted Mr. Carnifax was not expecting higher numbers for attendance.

Ms. Larson noted it still involved a prioritization for those spots.

Mr. Carnifax said it was similar to other programs in his department that maxxed out: registration process, start date, and waiting list. He noted then evaluation of Ms. Larson's scenario involving additional people at a particular facility.

Ms. Larson asked if this equated to first-come, first-serve regardless of County, School, or community.

Mr. Carnifax noted that decision had not been made, but was a valid question to consider. He further noted applying the standard operating procedures that other Parks and Recreation programs used.

Ms. Larson noted the unknowns regarding teachers and if their own children would be at home with them pending a decision from the School Division, County employees, as well as community members with financial struggles. She further noted someone not struggling may be able to access a childcare spot and the equity to serve all three facets equally and fairly. Ms. Larson noted her concern regarding an unexpected higher number need.

Mr. Camifax noted a discount would be applied if applicants qualified based on income. He further noted those in need of the discount could qualify for the CARES funding, while those not in need would pay full price.

Ms. Larson asked if that piece had already been determined.

Mr. Camifax noted that was the current policy in place.

Ms. Sadler noted aside from the affordability, was the factor of emotional separation from friends a part of the discussion. She further noted if not, it should be considered.

Ms. Vinroot noted that was something to consider, but safety was key. She further noted children being home alone while parents work and a safe location for those children. Ms. Vinroot noted the social aspect was a part of it, as well as the financial assistance to School and County employees who were not anticipating the need for childcare during the day. She further noted that was part of the discussion and the possibility of pre-tax assistance for County employees.

Ms. Day noted that was one point of consideration that had been discussed. She further noted if this was provided as a benefit to County or School employees, it was considered a taxable fringe benefit. Ms. Day noted the first \$5,000 was tax free; however, it still had to be reported on the employee's W-2. She further noted a mechanism to track it would need to be in place and also determine fair market value for the service. Ms. Day noted if COVID money was used, would a charge be applied or would it be free because of the use of COVID money or would the COVID money be used for the lower-income families. She further noted subsidizing and various factors that were involved.

Ms. Larson asked if a sliding scale would be used for County employees. She noted self-reporting, and inquired about proper bandwidth for the schools for the work done virtually.

Ms. Vinroot noted those factors would be incorporated into the discussion. She further noted she had spoken with Mr. Patrick Page, Director of Information Resource Management, about the schools and bandwidth. Ms. Vinroot noted applying the Parks and Recreation policy of determining enrollment demands and then assessing the number of sites needed. Ms. Vinroot noted the program setup discussion, community options, financial assistance for individuals, employees, and community members. She further noted the many aspects of the discussion, which she added would not take place until the next day.

Ms. Larson noted she had no problem with a sliding scale for County employees, but added she left that aspect to Ms. Day. She further noted her concern if all of the County's CARES money was used or did the School Division contribute.

Ms. Day noted it was a joint school system so she felt the City of Williamsburg would want to be part of that discussion.

Ms. Vinroot noted her counterpart for the City of Williamsburg Social Services Division would also be participating. She further noted regional discussion on childcare had been happening since day one. Ms. Vinroot noted the number of people with children who had been working all along and the proper message of the importance of support for childcare for those who may have no other option. She further noted that was a challenge but a key component of the discussion.

Mr. Hipple noted some concerns. He further noted the importance of safety. Mr. Hipple noted 52% of the budget supported the School Division. He expressed concern that the students could not go into the schools yet they would return to be involved in the childcare program. He



questioned other options for opening school by district rotation on particular days of the week with virtual learning on the alternate days. Mr. Hipple noted the children without internet connections and the impact to their education.

Ms. Vinroot noted program possibilities with internet capabilities for those in the County who did not have it.

Mr. Hipple noted the no internet impact on students and parents who wanted to enroll their children in programs, but could not because not everyone had a hot spot on their cell phones. He questioned the schools reopening and the implementation of social distancing and safety. Mr. Hipple noted the School Division made have already calculated a safe number of students to be present, but added he was not aware of that information. He further noted a joint meeting between the School Board and the Board of Supervisors should take place. Mr. Hipple noted uncertainty over any additional funding and the need for an increased utilization of the school facilities, staff, and other resources. He further noted the need 'to utilize what you have'.

Ms. Vinroot noted the School Board's decision was made with the best information they had. She further noted federal guidelines and student ratio requirements for education, but added the programs being discussed had different ratios and the number of students could be fewer. Ms. Vinroot noted the additional programs offered equity across the board for people who needed it, whereas schools were open to everyone. She further noted the decision was already made on schools reopening, but offering some program was necessary no matter the school schedule. Ms. Vinroot noted the decision to have the meeting involved the days the School Division would not be open and people still needed to work.

Mr. Hipple noted that was a good point and asked why the School Board had not initiated it.

Ms. Vinroot said that was how it happened. She noted County staff discussion, adding that she had heard the School Division was also having staff discussion on its side. Ms. Vinroot further noted she reached out to the School Division to have a joint conversation on the common points.

Mr. Hipple asked if parents were involved.

Ms. Vinroot noted first the type of program needed to be decided, then how to offer, and to whom. She further noted a survey would likely follow, adding a survey of County employees had taken place earlier in the year. Ms. Vinroot noted summer and fall needs were different in part of employment changes for some people.

Mr. Hipple noted utilizing the school facilities and buses on a limited basis. He further noted addressing the needs of County employees in terms of childcare.

Ms. Larson noted the priority of Wi-Fi in homes and getting the word out to people. She further noted Mr. Hipple's point regarding the lack of internet and people's inability to then apply for these programs. Ms. Larson stressed the importance of getting students without internet into programs.

Ms. Vinroot noted broadband discussion was taking place, but she did not have all the details.

Ms. Larson expressed concern regarding the timeline on the availability in time for school reopening. She noted the national issue of how childcare is perceived. Ms. Larson further noted her appreciation of actions being taken, but added issues had arisen from the pandemic situation. She noted assistance to working County employees who had children. Ms. Larson further noted the success of the Rec Connect program over the summer. Ms. Larson noted the

upcoming discussion should include a timeline and a plan if schools continue virtually beyond the initial nine-week period.

Ms. Sadler noted asking the School Division about its use of the CARES money during the discussion. She further noted the impact on County and School employees. Ms. Sadler echoed Mr. Hipple's comment on double-dipping the taxpayers and the School Division's responsibility for funding.

Mr. McGlennon noted there were two issues going on with one focused on schools and the other on childcare. He further noted the need for childcare had been an ongoing issue, but now needed expansion over a broader time period. Mr. McGlennon noted the need for additional options for parents who were working beyond five-six hours. He further noted private facilities used the model of providing care when you need it regardless of the time period. Mr. McGlennon noted there may need to be programs that extended the usual time lengths to accommodate working parents or caregivers. He added that if a child came to school for one or two days that still did not eliminate the need for additional childcare. Mr. McGlennon noted his support for assistance of a childcare program under the CARES Act money. He further noted while not free, he felt it should assist those most stressed financially.

Ms. Larson asked about the age of the children for the program.

Ms. Vinroot noted working parents with children younger than school age already had plans for childcare usually. She further noted this new need that had arisen. Ms. Vinroot added that to Mr. McGlennon's point, the need for childcare has always existed, but the current situation has brought it to the forefront. Ms. Vinroot noted her prior involvement in access improvement to childcare, the childcare subsidy, and quality programs. She further noted these conversations were not new, but these conversations were being expanded due to the current situation.

Mr. McGlennon noted approximately 400-450 people per week had used the Rec Connect program in the past. He further noted the high unemployment rate which could equate to people currently at home who previously had not been and may not have the funds for childcare.

Ms. Vinroot noted with unemployment potentially ending, some people will be returning to work. She further noted with the opportunity to telework, some people would not have the need and that made it hard to quantify.

Ms. Larson noted employer expectations were a factor.

Ms. Vinroot noted that was just the childcare discussion and an additional topic was to be discussed. She further noted it focused on outside entity and community support which included programs with nonprofit organizations. Ms. Vinroot noted those organizations had reached out to assist with the increased demands. She further noted allocating some funds, though the dollar amount was currently unknown, to allow entities to apply for assistance with those funds. Ms. Vinroot noted this procedure would be similar to the regular budget cycle where agencies fill out a form, identify the needs for funding, and then a determination is made on acceptance and funding amount. Ms. Vinroot further noted a series of questions had been developed which included identification of the area of need - emergency food, rent/mortgage assistance, utility assistance, emergency shelter, childcare, other; how have they responded to residents' needs; use of funds; any collaboration with other organizations; other support they have received. She noted funding and certification for the funding as mentioned earlier.

Ms. Larson questioned the type of organization.

Mr. Stevens noted the focus was on nonprofit organizations that were providing a COVID-related response. He further noted the CARES Act was very specific in terms of community businesses and their expenses. Mr. Stevens cited an example of a nonprofit organization such as the Food Bank, which may have increased deliveries due to COVID, but it needed more money. He noted that funding was allowed. Mr. Stevens noted Ms. Day had been in communication on that point. He added nonprofits in general did not qualify per their understanding.

Ms. Larson noted that was disappointing since many nonprofit organizations did great work in the County.

Ms. Day noted initially there was not much guidance available when the CARES Act money became available. She further noted that usually prompted one of two directions: there are not a lot of restrictions so we can use it for what we want or the restrictions are not available yet so we should be more conservative on our spending. Ms. Day noted this had created a lot of inconsistency in the interpretation of what the money could be used for in her professional opinion. She further noted if it did not specifically address items for which it could be used, staff took a conservative approach. Ms. Day noted some localities across the state were re-evaluating the use of their allocations. She further noted approximately \$225,000 was allocated in the County budget for assistance to nonprofit organizations which provided services to citizens that the County did not provide. Ms. Day noted those nonprofit organizations would probably qualify due to the increase in the demand for their services, whereas others would not based on revenue shortfalls.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Vinroot noted some agencies that originally had not provided a service had since shifted and transformed to provide a service in response. She further noted those agencies may then qualify as the services related to the demand from COVID. Ms. Vinroot noted there was no set dollar amount, but an assessment of organizations' needs would take place. She added no one knows the timeline.

Ms. Larson asked who made the assessment.

Ms. Vinroot noted Social Services staff reviewed entities serving citizen needs, while other entities reviewed based on their job needs. She further noted an initial, collaborative effort between Social Services and FMS to assess the applications. Ms. Vinroot noted entities who checked the other category could have staff work with them for alternative funding possibilities. She further noted the concept of opening up and seeing what the need is as opposed to restricting it. Ms. Vinroot noted this approach did not imply a promise, but inquired about the need and if the entities met criteria.

Mr. Stevens referenced the 4H childcare program as a possible funding recipient, but that would need review. He noted if the Board wanted assistance to be offered to nonprofit entities, staff would need to research that point. He further noted the Board had allocated funds to local businesses prior to receipt of the CARES Act money and if the Board felt strongly toward helping nonprofits, County General Fund dollars could be used. Mr. Stevens noted it would not include CARES money. He further noted the challenge to decide what groups qualified would still exist. Mr. Stevens noted staff would pursue this point if the Board decided in that direction.

Mr. Icenhour noted the \$500,000 which had been set aside to assist businesses currently had over \$300,000 in remaining funds.

Mr. Stevens noted the most recent dollar amount had the fund with a \$300,000 balance as

\$200,000 had been spent as of this week.

Mr. Icenhour inquired about the use of the money and meeting the CARES criteria for funding.

Mr. Stevens noted if the CARES money was to be used then the specific criteria would need to be met. He further noted a separate funding source could be determined, but staff would need to determine if that was processed through the Virginia 30-Day Fund or through the County itself.

Ms. Day noted one criteria staff had reviewed was entities had not raised their fees, but were incurring additional costs around cleaning and such which qualify as an eligible expense. She further noted determining what was driving the cost and the budget. Ms. Day noted the certification process so if funds were not allocated appropriately, those funds would need to be returned.

Mr. Icenhour noted the nonprofit had not been dismissed, but added that the process of adherence to strict guidelines and rules would be in place.

Ms. Day responded absolutely.

Mr. Icenhour noted the \$300,000 for funding and possible options.

Ms. Sadler noted she had recently spoken with Mr. Pete Snyder of the Virginia 30-Day Fund regarding a big push to make people aware of the funding. She further noted it would extend until Labor Day. Ms. Sadler stressed the importance of making the business community aware of the funding.

Mr. Icenhour noted as this funding was CARES money then it could carry until the end of the year.

Mr. Stevens noted the CARES money could, but he was not sure about the Virginia 30-Day Fund timeframe. He further noted conversation with the Commissioner of the Revenue to compile a list of community businesses and addresses that might qualify. Mr. Stevens noted the list had been narrowed to approximately 3,700 businesses. He further noted sending a flyer out to those businesses in conjunction with business information coming from the state level. Mr. Stevens noted there was only one action item before the Board from the discussion section, which addressed the Ordinance allowing for an extension of the convenience fee charge until December 30, 2020. He inquired if the Board wanted to entertain that extension as the current one expires August 5, 2020. Mr. Stevens noted it was a CARES Act eligible expenditure which equated to approximately \$280,000 between August and December, 2020. He further noted the extension had been well received by residents and staff, particularly the Treasurer's Office.

Mr. McGlennon requested another item be added to the list of possible CARES Act money expenditures. He noted additional support for the upcoming election at the James City County Recreation Center. He further noted additional sites at both the upper and lower ends of the County to assist people voting.

Ms. Larson inquired how the Registrar was doing and if she had received any CARES Act money. She noted a large purchase of personal protective equipment (PPE) had been made.

Ms. Day noted Ms. Dianna Moorman, General Registrar and Director of Elections, had used CARES Act money for the PPE. She further noted discussion with Mr. Page about reprogramming the voting machines for the Recreation Center which would link to all the polling places. Ms. Day noted it would take some money to reprogram the equipment for

compliance. She further noted time was essential and this was a late development, but the Procurement Director was working on this and coordinating with York County under a cooperative clause. Ms. Day noted that would be eligible for CARES funding.

Discussion ensued on election issues.

Mr. Hipple asked about an update on the broadband issue.

Mr. Stevens noted Mr. Kinsman and Mr. Page had been in discussion with Cox Communications (Cox) regarding coverage maps. He further noted contact with the School Division to identify student locations as well as working with Cox to determine how to have internet service in those areas. Mr. Stevens noted Cox had indicated it could provide service in a number of areas. He further noted an update in the next month was the goal. Mr. Stevens noted Cox indicated it could extend cable into those areas within months as well as cost estimates for contract award. He further noted he was hopeful on making progress in that area before September 2020, but certainly in the fall.

#### 4. 2020 Shaping Our Shores Master Plan Update

A motion to Approve 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

Ms. Carla Brittle, Community Centers Administrator for Parks and Recreation, addressed the Board with a final update on the Shaping Our Shores Master Plan for its approval. She noted after a year and a half of hard work, staff members were to be commended. Ms. Brittle noted the team consisted of Mr. Alex Holloway and Mr. Alister Perkinson of Parks and Recreation, Mr. Chris Johnson and Ms. Laura Messer from the Office of Economic Development, Mr. Darryl Cook and Mr. Shawn Gordon from the Department of General Services, Mr. Jose Ribeiro from the Planning Department, and Mr. Mike Vergakis from the James City Service Authority. Ms. Brittle provided details on the history of the Shaping Our Shores Master Plan. She noted the updates and improvements as well as increases in park usage, and revenues. Ms. Brittle further noted in reviewing and updating the plan, several things were considered: evaluating current park amenities in meeting community needs; identify unmet needs or challenges to improve existing amenities; and to evaluate maintenance and conditions of park features. She highlighted the recommendations for review as they applied to water restrictions, grant easements, environmental concerns, resource protection areas, zoning, and codes. Ms. Brittle noted events over the update timeline that included public meetings and Planning Commission review for the three parks: James City County Marina, Chickahominy Riverfront Park, and Jamestown Beach Event Park. Ms. Brittle highlighted improvements at each facility, respectively in the PowerPoint presentation. She noted Mr. McGlennon had received a constituent concern over impervious cover at the Marina. She further noted while the map did not provide that level of detail, those stormwater and environmental factors would be strongly considered before beginning any work at that location in particular.

Mr. Hipple asked about the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation's parking area at the Jamestown Beach Event Park.

Ms. Brittle noted the Foundation currently used the parking area on an as-needed basis during large events.

Mr. Hipple inquired if that would remain the status.

Ms. Brittle confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple inquired about the County's use of the parking.

Ms. Brittle confirmed the County had used when for large events when the Foundation was not using it and with its approval.

Mr. Hipple noted he was pleased with the fishing pier. He inquired about use of the VDOT area on the edge of the park as another fishing area.

Ms. Brittle said yes as no improvements were slated at that area.

Mr. Hipple inquired about the name Williamsburg, which was on a building at the Chickahominy Riverfront Park.

Ms. Brittle noted the building was part of a partnership lease deal with the College of William & Mary, the County, and the Williamsburg Boat Club. She further noted the need for a second building.

Mr. McGlennon expressed his thanks to all the members of the team. He noted careful consideration to citizen comments as well as transparency on the changes being proposed.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. Brittle and the team. She inquired on the status of the Ambler House and if it currently had electricity and water.

Mr. Carnifax noted the house did not have electricity, but there was electricity on-site.

Ms. Larson asked for clarification.

Mr. Carnifax noted there was electricity, but the building was not open to the public.

Discussion ensued on several points regarding the Ambler House and its use as an event venue.

Ms. Larson asked about the possibility of the Running Center.

Mr. Carnifax noted recent conversation with the Running Center representatives who were interested as well as some RV/camping site usage. He further noted he had notified both groups they would be responsible for utilities as the County had not been able to incorporate the loop system. Mr. Carnifax noted these may be points to be addressed in the Running Center's original proposal. He further noted the RV/camping group had recognized that factor in its proposal. He noted if the Board adopted this proposal and moved forward, a Request for Proposal would be issued.

Mr. Icenhour noted a resolution for adoption on the Shaping Our Shores Master Plan was before the Board.

Mr. Stevens addressed the Board regarding metal detecting in the County and at Jamestown Beach. He noted metal detecting had been permitted prior to the summer months and would resume in October pending a re-evaluation. Mr. Stevens noted concerns from the Archaeological Society, while the recreational groups had enjoyed the opportunity. He further noted if the Board wanted change, a public hearing and Ordinance amendment would need to be addressed in September 2020. Mr. Stevens noted the recommendation, if the Ordinance was changed, would allow metal detecting with the oversight of the recreation staff, or the Archaeological Committee, or a group of both. He further noted if the Ordinance was changed, it would allow for some metal detecting in a controlled circumstance.

Ms. Larson asked if items had been found during the metal detecting time period.

Mr. Carnifax noted some items and that people had sent him pictures. He further noted those items ranged from loose change to several metal items that posed safety issues. Mr. Carnifax noted the groomer only collected superficial trash when run across the beach, but metal detectors went deeper. He further noted no artifacts or historically significant items had been found. Mr. Carnifax noted the use of metal detecting on man-made beaches and the timelines.

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

Ms. Larson noted she had just completed her first Virginia Association of Counties Supervisor certification class. She thanked her fellow Board members.

Mr. Icenhour noted the Forest Heights groundbreaking ceremony for Habitat for Humanity that occurred earlier in the day. He extended appreciation to the corporate sponsors and Habitat for Humanity for its community involvement. Mr. Icenhour noted Ms. Janet Green, Chief Executive Officer of Habitat for Humanity, had requested assistance in obtaining land to continue assisting families in the community. Mr. Icenhour further noted the rise in coronavirus cases locally and the importance of wearing masks. He noted the upcoming public hearing to declare the James City County Recreation Center as an office of the Registrar for the absentee vote. He further noted a special meeting was necessary and he proposed September 1, 2020, at 5 p.m.

Ms. Larson asked if additional items would be discussed at that time regarding the Registrar.

Mr. Stevens noted he would have the information regarding costs and the possibility of other voting locations for more discussion.

A motion to Amend the calendar for the Board of Supervisors to add a meeting on September 1, 2020, at 5 p.m. 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

#### **E. CLOSED SESSION**

None.

#### **F. ADJOURNMENT**

1. Adjourn until 5 p.m. on September 1, 2020 for Special Meeting

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 6:36 p.m., Mr. Icenhour adjourned the Board of Supervisors.

  
Deputy Clerk