

**MINUTES  
JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
RETREAT**

**James City Service Authority Operations Center  
119 Tewning Road, Williamsburg, VA 23188  
January 30, 2021  
9:00 AM**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**B. ROLL CALL**

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

Scott A. Stevens, County Administrator  
Adam R. Kinsman, County Attorney  
Bradley J. Rinehimer, Assistant County Administrator  
Jason Purse, Assistant County Administrator  
M. Douglas Powell, General Manager, James City Service Authority

Mr. Hipple called the Board of Supervisors Retreat to order.

**C. PRESENTATIONS**

1. Vaccination Update

Mr. Rinehimer updated the Board on the vaccination count at the Colonial Williamsburg Visitor Center which has been serving as a vaccination clinic. He noted 1,150 people had been vaccinated on January 29, 2021, with the majority being Williamsburg-James City County School staff. He further noted 80% of County staff that had requested the vaccine had been vaccinated with an additional 1,000 more doses scheduled for the next week. Mr. Rinehimer noted vaccinations continued for County staff, the City of Williamsburg staff, Williamsburg-James City County School staff, and York County staff. He further noted the Virginia Department of Health had requested the clinic not open to the public yet.

Discussion ensued on the distribution of the vaccines to the various groups.

Ms. Larson applauded the cooperation between the City of Williamsburg, York County, and James City County. She noted the amount of coordination among the many people.

Mr. Hipple noted the efforts of staff and asked if there was a way to use the media to recognize staff for their collaborative efforts.

Mr. Stevens noted he could reach out to the other groups and coordinate an ad in the *Virginia Gazette* and coordinate the timing with the clinic opening to the public. He further noted he felt the ad's recognition to the many people working on

**ADOPTED**

**MAR 23 2021**

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

coordinating the vaccination efforts was important. Mr. Stevens noted the volume of calls to the Call Center.

Ms. Sadler asked about the Call Center and scheduling when the clinic opens to the public and if the Virginia Department of Health (VDH) would be schedule the appointments.

Mr. Rinehimer noted the VDH model was the one to be used.

Ms. Sadler noted concerns regarding current issues with VDH calls as well as citizens who may not have internet or email.

Mr. Stevens noted he was hopeful the Call Center could help citizens with scheduling through VDH software, but they were not there yet.

Ms. Larson noted a recent Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) meeting in which several localities were posting weekly updates from their health directors on their websites.

Mr. Stevens noted County Administrators received updates from the district health director.

Ms. Larson noted praise from the VACo meeting attendees regarding the County website updates with the Good Morning JCC segment.

Mr. Hipple noted the health district as a legislative priority for the upcoming year. He further noted the district was too much area for one director to cover and suggested breaking it into three health districts.

Discussion ensued.

## 2. Facilities Master Plan

Ms. Grace Boone, Director of General Services, addressed the Board about the facilities space needs study. She noted the timeline of June 2021 which allowed time for discussion, future plans, and budget preparation. Ms. Boone introduced Mr. Tony Bell, consultant with Mosely Architects, for the presentation.

Mr. Bell noted a recap of the various County buildings in the space needs study in his presentation. He further noted the Ironbound Road campus, the Mounts Bay Road campus, and others were included in the study. Mr. Bell noted individual space needs had been developed for the different departments as listed in his presentation and it would serve as the basis in moving forward with the Facilities Master Plan. He further noted the plan would assist the County in meeting its space needs over the next 20 years and not incremental short-term needs. Mr. Bell noted discussion would center on expanding individual buildings or think ahead to consolidation of departments into one centrally located building. He further noted the Police Department was housed in a facility that would accommodate future growth as an example. Mr. Bell continued his presentation highlighting factors such as landlocked County properties, cost of expansion versus new construction, and a phased implementation plan approach. He noted the process focused on input from individual departmental needs which would then be presented to the Board for additional input and prioritization. Mr. Bell further noted the decisions needed to reflect the best results for the citizens. He noted while the total dollar amount for the

project would look high, consider that amount spread over 20 years in the Capital Improvements Program. Mr. Bell further noted expansion of particular campuses which included the Tewning Road site, the Warhill Sports Complex, Fire Stations 2-5, and the Law Enforcement Center (LEC) complex. He noted additional sites may be included in the list. He further noted discussion on existing County sites and the pros and cons of changes to those facilities. Mr. Bell presented the Board with data on the departments with the greatest space need efficiency, with the Ironbound Road campus topping the list. He asked the Board to use the list and determine if the sites were optimal to serve the needs of James City County residents from a geographical perspective. He cited the LEC as an example of space and need usage.

Mr. Hipple noted the need for one centrally located County facility. He further noted it eliminated the need for employees to travel from various locations, cost savings on fuel, safety rooms, housing the School Board, and other factors. Mr. Hipple noted the additional costs of maintaining multiple facilities throughout the County and that impact on General Services. He further noted the outstanding work General Services did throughout the County. Mr. Hipple noted the possibility of using Jolly Pond as a site to house General Services, store its vehicles and equipment inside, and be within three-miles of a centralized County facility. He further noted the convenience for citizens to have multiple departments housed under one roof when taxes are paid, Board meetings to attend, and other factors.

Ms. Larson noted the pressing note to address General Services' space now.

Discussion ensued on space needs regarding staff and storage requirements as well as changes brought on with the COVID-19 Pandemic work environment.

Ms. Larson questioned Warhill Sports Complex as a central location. She noted the space was available, but the fields were booked for use. She further noted how that aspect worked in determining it as a potential location for expansion.

Mr. Bell noted that point involved discussion with Parks and Recreation. He further noted development of property and the long-term plan.

Discussion ensued on temporary use of buildings and facilities and the one centralized County facility.

Mr. McGlennon noted the traffic concern around Richmond Road if a centralized facility was located in the Warhill area. He further noted analysis of input from both the public and the County departments. Mr. McGlennon noted the possibility of separation from the School Board by not housing it in a central County facility.

Ms. Larson noted the need for a larger School Board building in the future.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Sadler asked about the athletic field space and the area at the Warhill Sports Complex as a possible facility location.

Mr. Stevens noted there was a 20-acre space behind the LEC near Thomas Nelson Community College. He further noted other available spaces in the County also.

Mr. Icenhour noted he was not opposed to a consolidated County facility, but questioned the level of consolidation. He further noted other property within the

County that could be potential facility sites. Mr. Icenhour reiterated traffic concerns. He further noted General Services had immediate and long-term needs.

Mr. Hipple noted a centralized location and the cost-savings of maintenance. He further noted several satellite offices would need to exist, citing the Emergency Operations Center as an example.

Ms. Sadler noted General Services' needs would need to be addressed first.

Mr. Hipple agreed noting Jolly Pond as the site for the General Services expansion.

Ms. Sadler asked about the timeline on the expansion decision.

Mr. Bell noted it would be within the next 60-90 days and June would be the wrap-up date on the expansion effort.

Ms. Sadler inquired about public input and constraints.

Discussion ensued on use of the County website and other options as well as cost-savings.

Mr. Icenhour noted the plan would need to be evaluated like other construction projects. He further noted a traffic impact analysis, expansion needs and cost, and impact to citizens. Mr. Icenhour noted LEC was a good example of a building with growth potential and applying that to the needs of General Services.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Stevens noted the Board's consensus for a centralized building, possible housing James City Service Authority (JCSA) and General Services together, and other discussion points.

Mr. Icenhour noted the space needs for Voter Registration. He further noted with current voting changes, the possibility of commercial property leasing over County-owned property may be a more feasible option.

Discussion ensued on the space needs for Voter Registration.

Ms. Sadler noted the earlier point of JCSA and General Services sharing a co-location and how it was envisioned by Ms. Boone and Mr. Powell.

Ms. Boone noted she and Mr. Powell noted there were some efficiencies to both divisions sharing a location. She further noted there were some site restrictions currently.

Mr. Powell noted the synergy of having both departments together, but added the Jolly Pond site was not beneficial for JCSA and its service area. He further noted JCSA owned all of the Tewning Road complex with the exception of the Fleet building and the small building at 109 Tewning Road near the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) property. Mr. Powell noted the County paid JCSA \$85,000 rent annually for County-occupied areas within the complex. He further noted the County lease expired on July 1, 2024. Mr. Powell noted some additional ideas could be shared as the group took a walking tour of the Tewning Road site. He

further noted JCSA alone had 66 service vehicles in addition to other equipment and the need for more space.

Ms. Boone addressed the safety issue of more robust buildings versus metal warehouses for equipment storage.

Discussion ensued.

At approximately 10:45 a.m., the Board of Supervisors recessed for a break and a walking tour of the Tewning Road site.

At approximately 11:15 a.m., the Board of Supervisors reconvened.

### 3. Budget Preparation

Mr. Purse discussed Board salary data compiled from counties throughout the state for comparison. He noted State Code and budgetary information regarding Board salaries.

Mr. Stevens noted the salary had been a budget item which had been removed with the COVID-19 Pandemic onset. He further noted the amount of time Board members put into their positions.

Discussion ensued on salaries and other related topics.

Mr. Kinsman noted the Board's last salary increase had been June 13, 2000. He further noted at that time Board of Supervisor members were paid \$7,000 apiece with the Chairman and the Vice Chairman receiving an additional \$1,800 and \$1,200, respectively, and JCSA Board of Director members received \$2,000 apiece.

Ms. Sadler noted there had not been a salary increase in 20 years.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Stevens noted two avenues were available to address the salary increase.

Mr. Kinsman noted under the election year increase, the salary adjustment could be made when at least 40% of the Board membership are to be elected. He further noted under this method, the Board must vote to set the salary prior to July 1, with any change effective January 1 of the following year. Mr. Kinsman noted if the salary change was done outside of an election year, the salary was done on a statutory salary scale based on the populous and required a public hearing, which could be done as part of the budget public hearing.

Discussion ensued on timing, salary increase, and implementing a review every few years instead of every 20 years.

Mr. Purse noted the next point of discussion centered on media maintenance and both the County's and VDOT's obligations. He further noted the County's arrangement with VDOT did not encompass areas where the County had plantings and not exclusively grassy areas. Mr. Purse noted the specifics of the \$118,000 annual private mowing contract for 14 mowings with an additional \$75,000 paid to VDOT for two additional mowings on VDOT's schedules. He further noted six mowings and litter pickup were part of that additional cost to VDOT. Mr. Purse

noted approximately an additional \$21,000 of cuttings along Monticello Avenue which cost approximately a total of \$214,000 annually for median maintenance of the high visibility areas.

Ms. Boone noted of the \$20,800 cost, \$4,600 was included for the Monticello Avenue-Settlers Road area median maintenance cutting and tree trimming. She further noted the County was asking VDOT to do trash pickup on primary roads beginning in February, secondary roads in March, an additional trash pickup, and three additional mowings to occur in April, July, and September with VDOT doing its regularly scheduled mowings between those dates. Ms. Boone noted the News Road-Centerville Road area was an upcoming item for the 2022 budget, which was not set at this time. She further noted her contact with VDOT and improvements throughout County locations.

Mr. Icenhour noted the varying heights of the grass after mowings from VDOT, the County, and the independent contractor.

Ms. Boone noted VDOT and the County had different height standards.

Ms. Sadler referenced the median area near the LEC and the appearance.

Ms. Boone noted that area could be reviewed for possible change as well as other areas to be identified.

Ms. Sadler noted the number of constituent calls she receives on these areas.

Mr. Purse noted VDOT would only handle areas with grass. He further noted if the County maintained those areas, any plantings could be done there, but the County would have the maintenance responsibility.

Ms. Sadler referenced Ms. Larson's idea of corporate sponsors for medians.

Ms. Boone noted when the Environmental Coordinator had been with the County, she had worked with VDOT. She further noted sometimes volunteer groups assisted, but County oversight was needed.

Mr. Stevens noted the possibility of corporate or volunteer organizations assisting in the maintenance. He further noted the difference between the City of Williamsburg and the County with regards to VDOT and corporate sponsors.

Discussion ensued on median maintenance and costs.

Mr. Stevens noted the varying heights of grass cutting between York County, VDOT, and James City County. He further noted coordinating with York County for the mowing schedule to have a consistent look to the medians. Mr. Stevens noted a timeline and budgetary factors.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Hipple noted County crews did an exceptional job mowing compared to VDOT and others. He further noted the cost for VDOT to mow.

Ms. Boone noted the \$118,000 corresponded to the mowing in the 14 red areas designated on the map.

Discussion on the breakdown and VDOT's responsibility ensued.

Ms. Boone noted from a cost-saving aspect, VDOT received a large volume discount on its mowing. She further noted if the County were to hire a contractor the discount would not be as great. Ms. Boone noted a \$2 per mile VDOT charge versus a potential \$6 per mile County charge based on the volume of mowing as an example.

Mr. Hipple noted the cost-savings, but also the importance of maintaining the County's main corridor. He further noted York County had been actively working on replanting near Lowe's.

Ms. Boone noted coordinating with Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Community Development and Planning, on median plantings. She further noted planting selection that assisted maintenance as a factor.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Stevens noted general budget concerns, particularly with regards to the motel sales tax and long-term impact. He further noted discussion on the cigarette tax and the Board's thoughts on that point as budget preparations began.

The Board's consensus was to move forward on the cigarette tax.

Mr. Stevens noted addressing the real estate tax in upcoming years, but that discussion would probably surface during the five-year plan.

Discussion ensued on budget concerns regarding departmental needs and operating costs.

Mr. Stevens noted the County's department heads were aware of costs. He further noted staffing needs and the constant pressures for the County and school staffing going forward.

Mr. McGlennon noted staff efficiency in relation to citizen ratio and the amazing job staff has done over the years, particularly regarding past staffing cuts.

Ms. Larson asked about the schools.

Mr. Stevens noted not as much this year due to the COVID-19 Pandemic concerns. He further noted statewide teacher raises and budget challenges.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Stevens noted the Education Sales Tax revenue. He further noted the impact of state funding for schools.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. McGlennon asked what the City of Williamsburg does regarding funding.

Mr. Stevens noted they followed suit with the County.

Mr. Icenhour noted direct funding to the schools and the use.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Stevens noted the County's portion to the School Division and school expenditures in relation to the budget. He further noted various allocations over the last five to 10 years. Mr. Stevens noted conversation with the School Division and the City of Williamsburg and negotiation of the School contract which will be renewed in the coming year.

Ms. Larson asked about very little Board representation during recent negotiations.

Mr. McGlennon noted he had served as the County representative for the negotiations.

Ms. Sadler asked how often that contract was renewed.

Mr. McGlennon noted every five years.

Mr. Icenhour noted his agreement to have a Board representative at the negotiations. He further noted it provided feedback to the Board on that point.

The other Board members concurred.

Mr. Stevens noted the need for a lobbyist for school funding from the state. He further noted sharing that cost with the City of Williamsburg.

Ms. Larson noted there were numerous localities who had full-time lobbyists in Richmond. She further noted the funding benefits of having a lobbyist on-site.

Mr. Icenhour noted schools and better utilization to accommodate students. He further noted effective use of other localities to eliminate overcrowding and the need to address the problem and redistricting issues.

Ms. Larson noted the possibility of reduced in-school enrollment as some older students might prefer online learning. She further noted allowing more time to monitor the situation.

Discussion ensued on vocational schooling and other points.

At approximately 12:30 p.m., the Board of Supervisors recessed for a short break.

At approximately 12:45 p.m., the Board of Supervisors reconvened.

Mr. Stevens continued the discussion regarding schools and a study for Pre-kindergarten needs. He noted the study could serve the population well in determining those needs.

Mr. Icenhour noted it was a very good start.

Mr. Stevens noted the Liaison Committee would serve in an oversight capacity with the three Boards and staff members working together. He further noted he would move forward with the Liaison Committee in hiring a consultant for the study as the Board was in general consensus on that point. Mr. Stevens noted the minimum wage increase over the next few years and the financial impact to the budget over the next



few years. He further noted the increase to \$11 an hour in Virginia by January 2022, \$13.50 by 2025, and up to \$15 by 2026. Mr. Stevens noted pay remained an employee concern as noted in the Evergreen Classification and Compensation Study for the County several years ago. He asked the Board if there were additional items to consider for the budget discussion.

Mr. Hipple noted recycling and grass mowing. He further noted with these things comes cost.

Ms. Sadler asked about trash pickup and referenced York County.

Ms. Boone noted hiring a consultant and reviewing several alternatives. She further noted working through the details with Virginia Peninsulas Public Service Authority.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Larson asked about a recycling update.

Ms. Boone noted the County was holding steady at 13,000. She further noted that number showed a lot of James City County residents were still recycling. Ms. Boone noted some earlier billing challenges, but added she felt comfortable with current processes. She further noted an Environmental Coordinator and school discussions on recycling in the future. Ms. Boone noted the importance of education about recycling.

Discussion ensued.

#### 4. Ambler's House Site Use

Mr. Stevens noted as no public or press were in the room, the Board chose not to go into Closed Session for this discussion. He further noted Mr. Purse would direct the discussion.

Mr. Purse gave a brief overview of costs and potential uses for the property and the building. He noted two Request for Proposals (RFPs) had been sent out.

Due to a technical issue with the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Purse noted Mr. Kinsman would address the next agenda item and then return to the Ambler's House discussion.

#### 5. Redistricting

Mr. Kinsman noted the Division of Legislative Services puts out a summary of redistricting over the past 20 years. He further noted he had no dates until the census numbers were in, adding some localities were not expecting the census numbers until possibly July. Mr. Kinsman noted once the numbers were in, redistricting would happen. He further noted areas of growth in the County and how the Board wanted to direct drawing the maps. Mr. Kinsman noted previous Boards had citizen groups do it. He further noted three possible options for drawing the maps: 1) the Board; 2) a citizen group; or 3) staff.

Ms. Sadler asked if a combination was a possibility.

Mr. Kinsman noted Ms. Kim Hazelwood, Geographic Information System Supervisor, would represent staff as she would have the maps, etc. He further noted without Kim, it could not be done.

Ms. Sadler asked if there was criteria in place to keep elected officials from being removed from their districts.

Mr. Kinsman noted in previous years that the Board had adopted a set of criteria that was given to whomever was working on those lines. He further noted a part of the criteria addressed the preference for incumbents to retain their district. Mr. Kinsman noted the School Board was also been done at this time.

Mr. Icenhour noted redistricting and the criteria used in 2001 and 2011. He further noted three School Board members were moved out of their districts in 2011 due to criteria changes. Mr. Icenhour noted one criteria to consider would be movement of the least number of voters. He further noted he has lived in his same house since 1994, but has been in three districts during that time.

Ms. Sadler asked about the General Assembly members running in their current districts.

Mr. Kinsman noted everything was up in the air right now.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Icenhour noted his preference was for staff to follow the Board's criteria, draw the maps, return to the Board with options, and then the Board could have a public hearing to get citizen input.

Mr. Hipple noted having Ms. Hazelwood and Mr. Purse draw maps with three options.

Mr. Kinsman noted he would keep the Board updated when the census numbers were available. He further noted once available, then he would set up the steps in the process.

Mr. Purse noted there were already certain requirements in place. He further noted one was the number of people per district had to be relatively the same and that information was available.

Mr. Kinsman noted the Planning Department's numbers were probably already very close to the census data.

Mr. Hipple noted a boundary such as a roadway or body of water served as a divider in the shared Ford's Colony area.

Mr. Icenhour noted confusion in the past about two different Board representatives within one development such as Ford's Colony.

Ms. Larson agreed with Mr. Icenhour in the less people moved during redistricting meant less confusion. She noted the overwhelming support for bipartisan redistricting.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Kinsman noted he would forward the two criteria memorandums from 2001 and 2011 to the other Board members to review. He further noted the possibility of an additional precinct as precincts had a 5,000-maximum person limit. Mr. Kinsman noted this did not change the voting district, but the precinct.

Ms. Larson questioned that point and the expense.

Mr. McGlennon noted two precincts could vote in one spot.

Discussion ensued.

*Continuation of Ambler's House Discussion*

Mr. Purse returned to the discussion on the Ambler's House. He highlighted the details of the two RFPs and possibilities for use of Ambler's House and property.

Ms. Larson noted a tour of the house and property with Mr. Stevens and Mr. John Carnifax, Director of Parks and Recreation. She further noted the possibility of a public venue use.

Mr. Purse noted no decision was required of the Board at this time. He further noted consideration of the Board's vision for Ambler's House and how it would best serve the County.

Discussion ensued on viable use, potential revenue, and the differences in the two RFPs.

Ms. Larson noted Ambler's House was on the Historic Register. She further noted Mr. Carnifax was checking on the details of its use based on that point.

Mr. Purse noted additional information from the RFPs that could be presented later in a Board Closed Session. He further noted additional discussion was warranted.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Sadler asked if and when there was a timeline on the RFPs.

Mr. Purse noted no immediate timeline. He further noted the RFPs had been received recently so there was time for Board discussion and evaluation.

6. Transportation Projects

Mr. Purse noted an update on transportation projects. He further noted the success of transportation projects was due to the Board's foresight to set aside money in the budget for them. Mr. Purse noted the \$1.5 million set aside annually in the Capital Improvements Plan and VDOT programs had assisted in finishing many of the projects. He further noted the current projects: Croaker Road, underground utilities at Longhill Road, and setting money aside for Pocahontas Trail. Mr. Purse noted these projects took the County through Fiscal Year 2026. He further noted the Board's interest in having other funding for transportation projects that are not in the scale of VDOT's SmartScale program. Mr. Purse noted possible Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission funding for Airport Road. He detailed the specifics and timeline for that project. Mr. Purse noted the question of funding

for transportation projects such as traffic lights, etc. and how to address the items in the budget. He further noted if the Board had specific projects, the funding needed to be identified such as setting aside \$500,000 for a traffic signal fund in the budget. Mr. Purse noted caution against letting VDOT think the County was doing all the work, but emphasized setting aside funding for those projects.

Ms. Sadler asked about the projects and referenced work around the elementary school.

Mr. Purse noted some projects the County has struggled with and VDOT has not been active on those projects. He further noted how best to navigate and not get ahead of VDOT.

Mr. Hipple noted the importance of setting money aside to work with VDOT on projects.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the Board was being asked to set aside additional money beyond the \$1.5 million for other projects.

Mr. Purse confirmed yes.

Mr. McGlennon noted the importance of the Pocahontas Trail project and the heavy commercial use there. He further noted the commercial revenue source as an aspect of the Pocahontas Trail and Skiffes Creek projects.

Discussion ensued on projects, funding, and priorities.

Mr. Icenhour noted the revenue impact to the County's economic base when considering some of these projects. He further noted Mr. McGlennon's reference to that point. Mr. Icenhour noted the importance of work in the Grove area and the economic impact for the revenue base.

Mr. Purse noted two areas of consideration he had identified were Pocahontas Trail and Schoolhouse Lane. He further noted some smaller projects may also be available.

Mr. Stevens noted caution in leveraging the funding. He further noted the importance of the rate of return.

Mr. Hipple noted he would like to continue setting money aside in the budget past 2026 for these projects.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Larson noted the flashing speed sign on Monticello Avenue.

Mr. Rinehimer noted it was a solar-powered unit the Police Department had acquired. He further noted the location had good lighting and also had a speed change from 45 to 35 miles per hour.

Discussion ensued.

7. 757 Recovery and Resiliency

Mr. Stevens noted this item would be discussed at a later time. He further noted the Hampton Roads Alliance was working on it.

**D. BOARD DISCUSSION/GUIDANCE**

Mr. Hipple asked if there was any additional discussion.

Ms. Larson noted she had learned a lot. She further noted her appreciation to staff and everyone for the information.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**


1. Adjourn until 5 p.m., February 9, 2021 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 3:30 p.m., Mr. Hipple adjourned the Board of Supervisors.

  
Deputy Clerk