

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BUSINESS MEETING
County Government Center Board Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
October 26, 2021
1:00 PM

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

Mr. Hipple requested a motion to Amend the Agenda to move the Board Considerations Item No. 1 to Board Discussions immediately following the presentation by the Commissioner of the Revenue, and to add an update on the School Resource Officers under Board Discussions as well.

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. PRESENTATION

1. Rosemary Randall Retirement Recognition

Ms. Rebecca Vinroot, Director of Social Services, addressed the Board noting the recognition of Ms. Rosemary Randall. She noted Ms. Randall had been a County employee for 49 years and cited her various positions within the County's Social Services Division. Ms. Vinroot further noted Ms. Randall was retiring as the Administrative Services Manager, adding she was highly regarded by staff and peers for her service and work. Ms. Vinroot noted several co-workers were in the audience for this recognition. She added Ms. Randall had been a critical component of Social Services' success by ensuring funding and policies were in place at all times.

Ms. Randall told the Board it was an honor, adding she had enjoyed working for James City County over the years. She recapped her service years with a moving poem.

The Board and the audience acknowledged Ms. Randall with a standing ovation.

2. Karrie D. Lee Retirement Recognition

ADOPTED

NOV 23 2021

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

Ms. Grace Boone, Director of General Services, addressed the Board noting the recognition of Mr. Karrie Lee. Ms. Boone noted Mr. Lee had been a County employee for 31 years and cited his various positions throughout his tenure. She further noted the respect of his peers and community for his outstanding teamwork and communication, adding his daily acts of kindness were also acknowledged by many. Ms. Boone thanked Mr. Lee for his service and positive impact to the County and its staff.

The Board and the audience acknowledged Mr. Lee with a standing ovation.

Mr. Lee thanked everyone.

3. Presentation on the Natural and Cultural Assets Plan Effort

Ms. Tammy Rosario, Assistant Director of Community Development, addressed the Board on the initial stages of work on the Natural and Cultural Assets Plan. She noted staff and the consultant had been working on the initial stages over the past few months, adding the undertaking had been in the works for several years. Ms. Rosario added this plan would implement an action noted in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan as well as involvement with the 2035 Strategic Plan, Fiscal Year 2021-2022 budget as a funded project, and the draft 2045 Comprehensive Plan. She noted staff's consultant, Ms. Karen Firehock, would provide a brief presentation on this effort.

Ms. Firehock, Director of the Green Infrastructure Center (GIC), addressed the Board virtually and began her PowerPoint presentation. She noted the basis for the County's natural and cultural assets was derived from various County documents. Ms. Firehock cited the 2035 Strategic Plan initiative in addition to community priority to protect natural lands and open space as noted in the three rounds of community engagement. Ms. Firehock continued the PowerPoint presentation highlighting the environmental goal to continue improvement of the high level of environmental quality within the County along with the accompanying strategy and action. She noted GIC helped communities evaluate their natural and cultural assets for a maximum return ecologically, economically, and culturally. Ms. Firehock highlighted GIC's mission statement and its application to the County's needs. She continued the PowerPoint presentation citing work in other rural Virginia communities. Ms. Firehock noted natural assets and the evaluation and protection of them within communities was similar to the physical assets such as buildings and the requirements to protect and maintain those assets. She further noted conservation of natural assets and working with local governments to protect them and provided the correlation of a portfolio's stock value being similar to the landscape assets and their value. Ms. Firehock noted GIC would be helping the County to map those assets which included natural landscape elements such as forests, wetlands, marshes, rivers, streams, and agricultural soils. She further noted the correlation between the natural assets and the cultural assets, citing beautiful architecture but without landscaping such as trees or vegetation surrounding it. Ms. Firehock added the historical assets were also impacted with the conservation of natural assets. She continued the PowerPoint presentation highlighting the benefits of natural asset conservation and the process GIC uses for assessment and analysis. Ms. Firehock stressed the inclusiveness of the process with input from the Board of Supervisors, staff, and the County's citizens in developing strategies for conservation such as easements. She noted the need to protect habitat cores as well as interior habitats and identified the formula for those areas in the PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Firehock continued the PowerPoint presentation identifying the six steps for natural asset planning and the timeline for the plan. She noted a Technical Advisory Committee comprised of County staff in addition to a Steering Committee comprised of Board appointees and community workshops would be components of the process in developing the Natural and Cultural Assets Plan. Ms. Firehock further noted July 2022 was the timeline for the project wrap-up. She concluded the PowerPoint presentation and asked if there were any questions.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Ms. Firehock for the presentation. He questioned the success of recreating assess in other localities.

Ms. Firehock noted yes, adding work that had been done in Accomack County. She further noted evaluation of land restoration and existing land opportunities. Ms. Firehock referenced an urban plan for the City of Norfolk which encompassed existing assets and a future map for additional assets the City plans to incorporate.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Ms. Firehock.

Mr. Hipple asked if the Plan would work with property owners of 20 acres or larger. He noted the importance of reaching out to the landowners and involving them in the process. He further noted it could serve as an educational piece for some of the County's larger property owners.

Ms. Firehock agreed. She noted discussion with property owners on future maintenance of preservation corridors. She further noted areas within the County such as the Agricultural and Forestal Districts encompassed lands which the property owners had already pledged to preserve over specified times.

Mr. Hipple noted the issue of trash and its impact within the County. He further noted trash and clean waterways.

Ms. Firehock noted that example was one that could be incorporated into the evaluation process. She further noted travelers want to see a beautiful historic corridor within the County.

Mr. Hipple thanked Ms. Firehock.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Hipple asked if any Board member wished to pull any items.

Ms. Larson noted she did not wish to pull any items, but she did have a question on Item No. 2.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the earlier motion to amend the Agenda was only to relocate some items, not remove them.

Mr. Hipple confirmed yes.

Ms. Larson asked about the rate of pay.

Mr. John Carnifax, Director of Parks and Recreation, noted two issues were involved. He further noted one was the rate of pay for several positions that had been reviewed. Mr. Carnifax stated that some positions were below the market rate when evaluated. He noted this specific position was a holdover with the employee in the position for approximately 20 years with 30 hours and full benefits. Mr. Carnifax added the cost-effectiveness of the conversion. He noted full-time employees tended to stay longer than part-time, and this position was the first opportunity in the fitness area to make the change. Mr. Carnifax further noted the pay scale could have some flexibility, but filling positions was currently a challenge. He added the challenge was a state-wide issue.

Mr. Stevens noted a pay study was taking place in relation to the \$15 minimum wage increase over the next few years. He further noted an impact was being reviewed. Mr. Stevens added

that increasing one position can also impact several other positions as Mr. Carnifax had noted. Mr. Stevens noted concern within many departments regarding pay rates and the ability to attract qualified employees. He further noted the challenges of recruiting staff.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Carnifax and Mr. Stevens.

1. Minutes Adoption

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

The Minutes Approved for Adoption included the following:

- September 14, 2021, Regular Meeting
- September 28, 2021, Business Meeting

2. Authorization for the conversion of the existing Part-time 30-hour Fitness Attendant Position to a Full-Time Fitness Attendant Position

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

3. Contract Award - Fleet & Equipment Garage Bay HVAC Installation - \$190,996

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

4. Emergency Communications Center HVAC Upgrades

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

5. Grant Award - Comprehensive Community Corrections Act and Pretrial Services Act - \$21,872

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

6. Authorization to Purchase 8 Police Vehicles - \$214,573

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

7. Appropriation - State Compensation Board Mandated Sworn Sheriff Officers Bonus - \$41,984

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

8. Authorization of One-Time Employee Pay Adjustment

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

9. The Foxes Stream Restoration

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

E. BOARD DISCUSSIONS

1. Commissioner of the Revenue - Update

Mr. Richard Bradshaw, Commissioner of the Revenue, addressed the Board noting he would take questions first.

Mr. Hipple noted discussion on Airbnbs and difficulties addressing them. He further noted the possibility of some legislation regarding them.

Mr. Bradshaw noted there was legislation already in effect, adding Airbnb was not included in the legislation. He further noted the other internet platforms were included in the legislation and those platforms such as Expedia would be reporting the local taxes collected. Mr. Bradshaw noted there was no current requirement that the platforms indicate who received payment. He further noted the Commissioners Association was working on that point. Mr. Bradshaw added the sales tax was effective September 1, 2021.

Mr. Hipple noted discussion with Mr. Bradshaw regarding Wawa and potential revenue.

Mr. Bradshaw noted the County would not receive any revenue from that business. He further noted the Wawa was physically located in York County. Mr. Bradshaw referenced the former Exxon gas station and its physical location was split between James City County and York County. He noted that was not the case with the Wawa store which was predominantly in York County.

Mr. Hipple asked if the amount was 12%.

Mr. Bradshaw noted it was 12% of the surface area. He further noted from a business asset perspective, the County had one gas pump.

Mr. Hipple expressed his disappointment at the revenue loss for James City County. He noted future considerations for such projects when the Board reviews and votes on them, adding the significant revenue loss and the increased traffic.

Ms. Sadler noted she had thought a small percentage of revenue would be coming to the County. She further noted other businesses in the area.

Mr. Bradshaw noted there were three businesses including the Exxon station that were split between the two counties. He further noted the other two businesses (small convenience store and Thai restaurant) were at McLaws Circle.

Mr. Icenhour noted the importance of reviewing similar situations for the future. He further noted he probably would not have supported the proposal had he known the current situation

versus what had been told to the Board.

Mr. McGlennon noted past discussions regarding online sales tax revenue and misapplication to other localities via zip codes. He asked the status of the reconciliation on those differences.

Mr. Bradshaw stated there was no way to know since the information from organizations such as Amazon was not provided to the County. He noted those organizations self-allocated, adding the shared zip codes primarily indicated Williamsburg, which meant less revenue for the County.

Ms. Larson asked if the addresses could be used to identify the locality.

Mr. Bradshaw noted if it was a business located locally, the address could be used. He further noted online sales had revenue allocated from businesses out of the area.

Ms. Larson noted that was a problem.

Mr. Bradshaw noted there was no solution except to send an auditor to Amazon's headquarters to review transactions.

Ms. Larson noted one solution would be to change the zip code. She further noted Mr. Bradshaw was part of a Commissioners of Revenue organization. Ms. Larson questioned if the organization could address that point.

Mr. Bradshaw replied the organization had no connection with the United States Postal Service.

Ms. Larson asked if the organization could advocate for change.

Mr. Bradshaw noted the organization constantly advocated. He further noted the Airbnbs could provide collection locations. Mr. Bradshaw stated multiple sales and multiple locations created the problem. He noted it had been an ongoing issue for approximately 30 years even including brick and mortar locations.

Mr. McGlennon noted internet sales tax were unavailable for collection for a long period of time.

Mr. Bradshaw confirmed yes.

Mr. McGlennon noted the importance of state and national organizations addressing the issue. He asked about the number of Airbnbs with regard to reporting and licensing requirements.

Mr. Bradshaw noted the locations were licensed as hotel/motel and not as Airbnb. He further noted he would check and let Mr. McGlennon know the number of licenses, adding the real issue was zoning requirements. Mr. Bradshaw stated the current statutes required a Special Use Permit in most cases. He noted timeshare owners who used a platform similar to that of Airbnb to rent the units. Mr. Bradshaw further noted other factors that made that information unavailable.

Mr. McGlennon acknowledged there were challenges.

Ms. Larson questioned if an individual sought a business license, but zoning was incorrect, and that individual continued the operation of an Airbnb, would that information be available to share with staff.

Mr. Bradshaw noted part of the application process included the completion of a home occupation registration form which was then sent to the Zoning Division.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Bradshaw for the information.

Mr. McGlennon questioned the implementation of the cigarette tax.

Mr. Bradshaw noted \$171,000 was the total current collection.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the tax had been operational since September 1, 2021.

Mr. Bradshaw confirmed yes. He noted the upcoming need to have a different stamp for carryover inventories. Mr. Bradshaw further noted wholesalers would not pick up and swap out existing inventories.

Mr. McGlennon noted the \$171,000 collection represented two months of implementation.

Mr. Bradshaw confirmed yes.

Mr. McGlennon noted the significance of the revenue. He thanked Mr. Bradshaw.

Mr. Bradshaw noted another issue dealt with personal property values. He further noted the motor vehicle value increase, adding since January 2021 there was an increase of approximately 35-40%. Mr. Bradshaw cited his own vehicle as an example with an increased value of approximately \$4,400. He noted when the supply shortage lowered, the increased value would also lower. Mr. Bradshaw further noted awareness of the volatility on that point and the impacts to the upcoming tax year.

Mr. Hipple asked Mr. Bradshaw if the County could get the 12% from Wawa.

Mr. Bradshaw noted to get the percentage, every business with shared localities would need to be addressed. He further noted that approach went both ways.

Mr. Hipple asked about the other businesses.

Mr. Bradshaw noted the other two businesses were split 50-50 between the two localities. He further noted the dividing line went straight through both businesses, adding that had been the case with the Exxon station. Mr. Bradshaw stated the general rule that had been followed with York County used the predominant location of a business as the determinant for the locality that received the revenue.

The Board thanked Mr. Bradshaw for the update.

2. Fiscal Year 2021 School Year-End Spending Plan Appropriation - \$8,128,540

A motion to Approve the School Division's Capital Improvements Program requests with funding for the Jamestown High School cafeteria renovations and the Lafayette High School renovation to be considered during the normal Capital Improvements Program process for the Fiscal Year 2023 budget was made by James Icenhour Jr, the motion result was Passed.

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

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, McGlennon, Sadler

Nays: Larson

Ms. Sharon Day, Director of Financial and Management Services, addressed the Board noting

the Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) School Board adopted a spending plan for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 Year-end funds on September 21, 2021. She noted the funds totaled approximately \$8.9 million, adding the funds represented underspending in revenues received from the original budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2021. Ms. Day stated the County's share of total local funding was approximately 90.4% with approximately \$8.1 million returned to the County. She noted the adopted spending plan included projects such as school bus replacements, transit fleet expansion, Clara Byrd Baker Elementary School dehumidification solution, classroom instruction upgrade, competitive bus driver salaries, and Capital Improvements Plan set asides. Ms. Day noted additional documentation was provided with specific requests from the School Board. She further noted the resolution, if adopted, approved the School Board's requested spending plan with appropriation from the County's budget for those intended purposes. Ms. Day noted Dr. Olwen Herron, School Superintendent, was in attendance for any questions.

Ms. Larson asked if the School Division was making a presentation.

Ms. Day noted no formal presentation.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. Day.

Mr. McGlennon asked about the school bus replacement plan over the next 15 years. He noted the move to replace diesel fuel buses with electric ones. Mr. McGlennon noted the electric buses were more expensive, but had lower maintenance costs. He asked if these were factors being considered.

Ms. Day deferred that question to the School Division.

Dr. Herron addressed the Board noting WJCC School Division currently had four electric buses. She noted there were no additional plans to purchase more until the current ones had been evaluated. She further noted the buses were twice the cost of the traditional diesel fuel buses. Dr. Herron stated the four electric buses were purchased with a grant fund to pay the difference between the diesel and electric buses. She noted monitoring the cost and efficiencies over time.

Ms. Sadler asked if a grant program was typically used. She inquired if it was a matching grant.

Dr. Herron noted there was a matching grant for the first bus. She further noted two other grants had been reviewed, adding one was not beneficial as all monies had to be paid up front with no guarantees. Dr. Herron added another grant program was currently being reviewed. She noted avoidance of grants that required specific buses be purchased and then the School Division would have multiple types of buses in its fleet.

Ms. Sadler thanked Dr. Herron.

Ms. Larson asked if drivers would be available with the bus acquisition. She also asked if on time had improved.

Dr. Herron noted on time had improved significantly. She further noted within the plan there was an increase for driver pay, adding WJCC bus driver pay was lower than other regional school divisions. Dr. Herron noted nine openings currently as well as CDL training for several drivers. She further noted bus drivers was an ongoing issue. Dr. Herron added the possibility of minibuses as a diversification of the School Division's fleet and which did not require a CDL. She noted hiring for those positions was easier due to no CDL requirements.

Ms. Larson noted that was a good idea, particularly between schools. She further noted it was more economical. Ms. Larson noted the School Board had not appeared before the General Assembly to request taxing authority and had to request funding from the County at year-end and she had an operational question. She further noted some school systems were implementing additional time off to ease teacher burnout. Ms. Larson asked if teacher burnout had been discussed and value of the school system from an economic development and citizen perspective. She noted providing the best school system available. Ms. Larson further noted the past two years had been stressful and questioned how staff was coping under the circumstances.

Dr. Herron stated there was much concern for staff and morale, particularly teachers and their workloads. She noted she had sent correspondence to teachers to assist in alleviating the situation. Dr. Herron added the factors included pausing all professional learning for the year, supplementing each building with a second permanent substitute with use of federal funds, and sending Central Office staff out to relieve substitutes several times a week. She noted some virtual days were also on the school calendar, adding the first goal was to retain students in the schoolroom five days a week with the focus on teaching and learning.

Ms. Larson thanked Dr. Herron.

Ms. Sadler asked if the vehicles for minivans or minibuses.

Dr. Herron noted 10 minivans had been requested in the plan. She further noted those were for use on low-ridership routes, which predominantly are used for special education students being transported from their zone to a specialized program. Dr. Herron added the minivans could also be used for homeless students as that number was lower. She noted non-CDL drivers would be available to diversify the fleet and provide transportation to County students in the minivans as opposed to using full-size buses to transport a marginal number of students.

Ms. Sadler thanked Dr. Herron.

Ms. Larson asked if the Homeless Act allowed for transportation to a student's school regardless of the location of the student. She cited the example of a student's location changing to Clara Byrd Baker Elementary School, but the student had been attending D.J. Montague Elementary School and asked if the School Division was still required to transport that student to D.J. Montague Elementary School.

Dr. Herron confirmed yes. She noted the McKinney-Vento Act required the transportation of all homeless students.

Ms. Larson thanked Dr. Herron.

Mr. McGlennon asked about the other components of the capital projects other than transportation. He noted the reference to dehumidification at Clara Byrd Baker Elementary School and asked about the seriousness of the air quality issues.

Dr. Herron noted a significant air quality issue two summers earlier and ongoing resolution was still taking place. She further noted the new system would sit atop the HVAC system and dehumidify the building. Dr. Herron added when the HVAC system was replaced, the new dehumidification system would be incorporated into the newer unit.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the other two projects were at Lafayette High School and the cafeteria at Jamestown High School.

Dr. Herron confirmed yes. She noted additional high school classrooms based on proposed

enrollment had been moved out of the five-year plan. Dr. Herron further noted the cafeteria project at Jamestown High School had been retained. She stated the cafeteria was at 102% capacity with students eating outside and in hallways, which posed a challenge during the COVID-19 social distancing restrictions. She added the other project was the renovation of the 900 building at Lafayette High School.

Mr. Icenhour addressed the \$1.13 million for school bus replacement. He noted a transition of 10 buses replaced annually, adding in FY21 a total of 14 school buses were bought.

Dr. Herron confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour asked what the FY22 plan was to buy buses prior to submitting this latest request to the Board.

Ms. Rene Ewing, WJCC School Division Chief Financial Officer, addressed the Board noting replacement for four buses had been built into the FY22 budget.

Mr. Icenhour noted an additional 10 buses were being requested.

Ms. Ewing confirmed yes. She noted the use of some of the funds had gone toward the purchase of two minivans and one minibus to diversify the fleet, but to date, no full-size buses had been purchased pending contract review.

Mr. Icenhour noted none of the four planned bus purchases had been made.

Ms. Ewing confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the plan was approved would 14 buses be purchased with the funding.

Ms. Ewing noted 12 would be purchased as some funding had already been allocated to the minivans and minibus.

Mr. Icenhour thanked Ms. Ewing for the information.

Mr. Hipple noted ongoing talk about school buses and seat belts. He further noted diversion of school bus funding and the increased request for additional school buses. Mr. Hipple stated he struggled with the concept of money allocated for buses that was then appropriated for something else, adding he recognized when the money was allocated to the School Division then it determined how to use the funds. He added as a businessman, when he allocated funds for a particular thing then that particular thing was purchased. Mr. Hipple noted his support of the schools and the buses, adding it seemed the mark was being missed.

Dr. Herron noted this year was unique. She further noted in the past the school bus allocation was usually spent on buses barring an emergency need. Dr. Herron added the need to diversify the fleet necessitated the use of the funding for alternative vans and buses. She noted the bus replacement request came at the year-end spending annually as buses age out. Dr. Herron suggested making the 10-bus request part of the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) and not part of the year-end plan. She noted that change would help standardize the request.

Mr. Hipple noted that allowed the Board to see the set amount annually. He further noted he currently was unsure about electric buses, citing life expectancy on diesel buses was closer to 400,000 miles. Mr. Hipple questioned the life expectancy of electric buses, adding diesel buses added more dollar value now.

Dr. Herron noted she knew few details about bus batteries, but an automatic replacement

component was part of the current contract.

Mr. Marcellus Snipes, Senior Director for Operations, addressed the Board noting a electric bus battery's life expectancy was 10 years.

Mr. Hipple questioned the average on the diesel buses.

Mr. Snipes noted the state's recommendation was 15 years, 150,000 miles. He further noted that was the basis for WJCC's plan.

Mr. Hipple questioned the cost of the electric bus battery and the possibility of recycling the batteries in the future.

Mr. Snipes noted he would obtain that information for Mr. Hipple.

Ms. Sadler noted the school bus fleet was predominantly idle for the 2020 school year. She asked if that adjusted the timeline on bus replacement purchases.

Mr. Snipes noted some of the buses to be replaced were already over the 150,000-mile threshold.

Ms. Larson asked about the renovation to the 900 building.

Dr. Herron noted the Child Development Resources (CDR) had another building for use when it exited in June 2022. She further noted the renovation would create additional classroom space at Lafayette High School.

Ms. Larson asked if there was a specific plan for the renovation.

Dr. Herron noted the design was in the current CIP with the process slated to begin soon.

Mr. Hipple noted redistricting and alleviating pressure on Jamestown High School.

Dr. Herron noted the possibility of more open space if the renovation was completed.

Ms. Sadler asked the current capacity at Lafayette High School.

Dr. Herron replied 1,126 students. She noted that was an 86% occupation rate with the 900 building being used for alternate programs. Dr. Herron further noted with the repurposing of the building to normal classroom space, a greater capacity than 86% could be achieved.

Mr. Hipple thanked Dr. Herron. He noted the list of projects, adding the air quality issue was important and acknowledged the School Division was addressing it. Mr. Hipple further noted the renovation of the 900 building would ease pressure on enrollment. He added he wanted more time for discussion on the other items and recommended moving those items into the County's budget process.

Mr. McGlennon indicated the importance of moving forward with work on the Jamestown High School cafeteria. He noted the heavy enrollment and the size of the cafeteria, particularly during the current times.

Ms. Sadler asked Mr. Stevens if the remaining funds were required to be spent. She asked if he had any recommendations on the balance.

Mr. Stevens noted there was no requirement for the funds to be spent, but added the School

Division had appeared for the Board's authorization on reappropriation. He further noted if the funds were not spent on this year's projects then the funding could be designated for school use and the Board's consideration for the next year.

Ms. Sadler asked if the money could be held.

Mr. Stevens noted yes if the Board wished to do that.

Mr. Icenhour noted some of the other projects were more immediate in nature. He further noted the cafeteria and the 900 building renovations were FY23 items which the Board has not approved that budget to date. Mr. Icenhour agreed with Mr. Hipple that the longer range projects be built into the FY23 CIP with money set aside in the budget to address the projects as needed. Mr. Icenhour noted the money would be earmarked, but not committed, as the budget process moved forward.

Ms. Sadler noted her support of Mr. Icenhour's suggestions. She further noted it could potentially allow the School Division to address redistricting to alleviate overcrowding.

Ms. Larson noted redistricting would not alleviate the numbers. She further noted the current School Board had expressed no desire to redistrict. Ms. Larson said if the cafeteria renovation and the 900 building renovations were not considerations, and CDR was slated to exit in June 2022, then funding would not be available.

Mr. Icenhour noted that was not his intent. He further noted in July 2022, FY23 would begin and the budget would include the CIP list. Mr. Icenhour added that FY22 already included the cafeteria design cost with the remainder of the work scheduled for FY23. He noted the Board could set the funds aside now as part of the normal budget process and the School Division would have the money to begin the project after June 2022.

Ms. Sadler asked if the Jamestown High School cafeteria renovations were ranked No. 25 toward the bottom of the list.

Mr. Stevens responded the Policy Committee ranked the renovation as No. 25 in the CIP list. He addressed Mr. Icenhour's point on funding by noting the cafeteria renovation was programmed for FY24. Mr. Stevens noted the School Division's request moved the CIP project one year earlier. He further noted the cafeteria design money was the only funding commitment for this year, adding if the Board approved or moved the money for the cafeteria renovations then those funds could be spent in the current year rather than part of next year's budget process.

Mr. Hipple noted retaining the project in the budget process.

Mr. Icenhour noted approving the requested items and setting aside funding for the FY23 projects of Jamestown High School cafeteria renovations (\$2.278 million) and the Lafayette High School renovation (\$2.946 million) for later discussion and allocation during the budget process in January for the FY23 budget. He further noted the design money and the other CIP projects would be approved with those two projects put into the normal CIP cycle.

Mr. McGlennon noted he would vote aye in recognition of the Board's desire to approve the plan, though his preference was to move forward on the other two items. He further noted establishing a clear direction for the School Division.

Ms. Larson asked the specific amounts that were being pulled for the projects.

Ms. Day noted the numbers represented in the School Division memorandum were not 100%

funding for the two projects. She further noted the \$2.278 million and \$2.946 million for the respective projects exceeded the actual requested amount, adding the School Division was requesting approximately 92% of that amount. Ms. Day stated that amount was \$4.5 million.

Ms. Sadler qualified her aye vote with the understanding that the two projects would be vetted at a later time during the budget process.

Ms. Larson noted her vote of nay was based on failure to approve the list in its entirety.

3. School Resource Officers Update

Mr. Hipple welcomed Police Chief Eric Peterson and noted this presentation stemmed from an article in the *WY Daily* about Resource Officers and some communities' lack of them. He further noted James City County and York County had Resource Officers and he felt it was a great partnership with the schools.

Chief Peterson introduced Officer Mike Ferriero, School Resource Officer (SRO) for Jamestown High School and Officer of the Year, to discuss day-to-day and external benefits of SROs.

SRO Ferriero noted he had been at Jamestown High School since August 2015 as the School Resource Officer. He further noted the County had five SROs who covered the County's three high schools and two middle schools. SRO Ferriero explained the daily operations were not specifically law enforcement purposes, but SRO presence for those purposes was available if needed. He noted the SRO role was a mentor program that encompassed a wide range of students. SRO Ferriero cited an example at Toano Middle School where a plan for a Special Education student was in place to assist the student with the help of the aide and the SRO. He noted other situations where SROs were involved with students. SRO Ferriero further noted when schools were closed during the pandemic and SROs were assisting Patrol Officers, students would see the SROs in the community. He added the students have a rapport with the SROs and even outside of school that can be helpful in dealing with certain situations or gathering information on potential school issues. SRO Ferriero noted the officers also attend extra-curriculum events such as sporting events. He further noted the interactive cooperation between the SROs, students, staff, and parents.

Chief Peterson noted all the officers were Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) certified through a highly selective process. He further noted the officers were not appointed, but competed for those positions. Chief Peterson added the importance of working with the schools and the community and continuing those relationships.

SRO Ferriero noted most of the programs are geared toward middle schoolers, adding COPs Camp was held twice a year. He further noted it was a community outreach program which lasted a week and culminated with a community service project. He listed several other programs currently in operation for both students and parents.

Ms. Sadler extended her appreciation to the Police Department and all its efforts, particularly with kids.

Ms. Larson noted the importance of SROs. She further noted she would have appreciated an invitation to the schools to hear the principals' responses to the SRO work. She noted the partnership and the positive relationship impact for young people with law enforcement officers. Ms. Larson further noted James City County Police Department did a great job with community policing, adding that was not the case everywhere. She added her disappointment that some localities in Virginia had terminated their SRO programs. Ms. Larson noted the

County had invested in the SRO program over the years.

4. FY 2021 Year-end Financial Update

Ms. Day addressed the Board noting she would address the FY 2021 and 2022 updates together. She noted the updates reflected the last quarter of FY 2021, which ended June 30, 2021, and the first quarter of FY 2022, which covered July 1, 2021 to September 30, 2021. Ms. Day began the PowerPoint presentation highlighting the General Fund revenue, also known as the operational fund. She noted these numbers were considered preliminary as the end-of-year fiscal audit was still ongoing. Ms. Day further noted all known adjustments had been applied and she did not anticipate any significant changes to the numbers represented in the presentation. She added the figures represented did not include any COVID-19 funding, which included approximately \$15 million in Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funding or approximately \$15 million in American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding, nor any other grants received. Ms. Day noted the grant funding was designated separately as it was deemed one-time funding versus the operational financials of the General Fund. She further noted the County had fared very well in comparison to the budget and FY 2020 as represented in the PowerPoint presentation, adding a 10% decrease adjustment had been made in the budget based on anticipated economic impacts from the pandemic. Ms. Day noted the County began a slow recovery in the second half of FY 2021. She further noted a breakdown in the categories with real estate and personal property taxes increasing under the General Property Taxes category. Ms. Day echoed the comments from the Commissioner of the Revenue regarding used car personal property increases. She noted Ms. Jenni Tomes, Treasurer, commented this category benefited from the County absorption of the credit card convenience fee. Ms. Day further noted the public service revenue was included in this category and was reflective of the now fully operational Skiffes Creek Connector. She continued the PowerPoint presentation highlighting the areas of collection for the Sales Tax, Meals Tax, and the Lodging Tax.

Ms. Larson asked Ms. Day if she could speak to the Sales Tax in relation to the zip code when she discussed it more in depth.

Ms. Day said yes. She continued the presentation noting every category from the previous year was up except licenses, permits, and fees category. Ms. Day noted this was primarily due to the business licenses area which pays taxes in arrears. She further noted monies collected in FY 2021 were for calendar year 2020, adding this was also the time the pandemic impact was being seen. Ms. Day continued the PowerPoint presentation highlighting the breakdown of the major tourism-driven revenue. She noted these taxes are collected in arrears with Sales Tax two months behind with Meals and Lodging Taxes one month behind. She further noted overall the County did well and the Sales Tax was a major contributor. Ms. Day stated the internet sales tax was a newer tax. She noted two years earlier, FMS, the Commissioner of the Revenue, and Information Resources Management (IRM) worked on a collaborative project to closely examine sales taxes that are collected on local brick and mortar businesses with physical addresses. Ms. Day further noted data was obtained from the state on individual businesses which was then compared to the Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping system. She stated this allowed the County to identify specific locations. Ms. Day highlighted one example of the findings which included larger grocery stores with a County location and a City of Williamsburg location, but only one corporate tax return was filed and that was filed in the City of Williamsburg. Ms. Day stated part of that revenue was due to the County and an appeal was filed. She added a three-year review since the business opened was obtained and the County received its sales tax. Ms. Day noted the project proved very beneficial. She further noted she continued to have conversations with the City's Finance Director regarding questions on brick and mortar locations in addition to monitoring businesses opening and closing. Ms. Day stated the various professional associations and discussion had taken place

at the Treasurer Association Finance Officer Association. She noted James City County was not the only locality facing this dilemma, but the County was one with the dilemma at this level. Ms. Day further noted the change to James City County and not Williamsburg for the address to aid in identifying the proper locality.

Ms. Larson noted it would probably be easier to change the zip code. She further noted concern over the lost revenue. Ms. Larson stated associations working with the General Assembly and local legislators to address the issue. Ms. Larson noted it was a trend and more convenient in the current situation. She added she hoped this was an ongoing pursuit.

Mr. McGlennon asked if he ordered from Amazon, would Amazon know the applicable state sales tax, the local share of that state sales tax, and the Historic Triangle Tax based on his address.

Ms. Day noted that was an interesting question. She further noted she did not have access to the daily data as that was more on the Commissioner of the Revenue side, but she added as a personal shopper, she checked for the 1% Historic Triangle Tax charge and found it all around. Ms. Day noted some businesses did include it while others did not, adding regardless of which locality, that revenue was not being received.

Mr. McGlennon noted that was another interesting point.

Ms. Day continued the presentation noting the Lodging and Meal Taxes had taken a significant hit during the pandemic. She noted changes as businesses and Busch Gardens reopened. Ms. Day further noted the improvements in tax revenue in the presentation. She noted the next part of the presentation covered the expenditure side of the budget, adding these numbers were unaudited as noted previously. Ms. Day continued the presentation highlighting the various departmental breakdowns, adding the School Division funding accounted for approximately 54% of the County's budget and was followed by 27% of funding for personnel. She noted each department came in under budget despite the 10% reduction from the previous year's budget. Ms. Day further noted most of the savings was from personnel. She cited the cessation of Parks and Recreation programs was a revenue loss which was offset by personnel savings normally needed for those programs and services. Ms. Day highlighted the savings in the School Division category. She noted with the pandemic, capital projects were delayed for the County and the School Division so no new debt was issued. Ms. Day further noted those savings would roll over into the Fund Balance. She stated the contributions to outside entities reflected lower health and dental claims due to the possible factors of masks, social distancing, and reduced surgeries with that balance rolling over to the health and dental reserve. Ms. Day added that reserve could be used in future budgets to control cost increases. She continued the PowerPoint presentation highlighting the overall surplus of \$26.5 million and the allocations, adding the unassigned Fund Balance had fiscal policies requiring a 10-12% balance of total expenditures be maintained as reserve. Ms. Day noted the reserve helped in times such as the pandemic and natural and emergency disasters until recovery funds were available from FEMA. She further noted the County was currently at 17-18%. Ms. Day noted a portion of the \$8.6 million in the Unassigned Fund Balance was appropriated by the Board for the purchase of property at the Williamsburg-James City County Courthouse for approximately \$7 million, leaving a balance of \$1.6 million in the fund.

Ms. Larson asked the frequency of reviews for workmen's compensation claims. She noted a review compared to budget, time off, and accident prevention.

Ms. Day noted the Risk Management Department, which was within FMS, was a shared service with the School Division that provided workmen's compensation services to the School Division and the County. She further noted formal meetings are held once a month in addition to a software purchase within the past two years to assist with data analytics in

identifying trends. Ms. Day stated the analytics allowed staff to determine if certain schools had more workmen's compensation claims or classrooms with claims than others. She noted one school had higher claims and that information was shared with the School Division so as budget preparations were made, this data was available for consideration. Ms. Day further noted the involvement of the insurance provider, Virginia Association of Counties Group Self-Insurance Risk Pool (VACORP), over the past 18 months. She added that was very helpful in taking preventive and proactive measures in addition to training programs offered as part of the County's premium paid to VACORP. Ms. Day noted VACORP also shared state and national viewpoints regarding claim types. She further noted the County received a rebate as workmen's compensation claims, particularly with the School Division, were lower during the pandemic. Ms. Day added a reduction in the premium for this fiscal year also.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. Day.

Mr. McGlennon asked about the earlier reference to the Skiffes Creek switching station and the additional revenue for property taxes.

Ms. Day noted it was approximately an additional annual revenue of \$2.2 million. She continued the PowerPoint presentation addressing the current fiscal year. Ms. Day noted revenue was up approximately \$1 million primarily due to increases in the tourism-related taxes. She further noted the first allotment of the cigarette tax was received mid-August, adding her report reflected the collection through September. Ms. Day added the cigarette tax revenue had been earmarked for CIP in the FY 2022 budget. She noted the decrease in the state and federal revenue reflected the change in accounting for the Sales Tax for Education, adding the funds that came to the County for remittance to the School Division now go directly to the School Division. Ms. Day highlighted the \$7 million in the Fund Balance that was allocated for the property purchase at the Courthouse. She continued the presentation highlighting collection of the different taxes, adding these taxes are collected in arrears. Ms. Day noted the spending side of the budget and departmental spending in relation to the 25% benchmark. She further noted several departments were above the threshold. Ms. Day stated one department was Public Safety with the radio maintenance contract of \$1.4 million, of which 50% was already paid, as well as the July maintenance contract on several pieces of equipment. She added those contracts are paid in full at the beginning of the year. Ms. Day noted the price of gas at the pumps was being closely monitored as that had not been a foreseeable factor. She further noted the increase in Financial administration with the insurance carrier premium due in July as well as the audit services which were paid in the first part of the year. Ms. Day noted IRM was above the threshold, also in part due to contract payments early in the year.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Ms. Day for the comprehensive report and the good news that accompanied it.

The Board concurred and thanked Ms. Day.

5. FY 2022 First Quarter Financial Update

Ms. Day noted earlier this update had been combined with Item No. 4.

6. Financial Forecast Update

Mr. Courtney Rogers, Davenport & Co., addressed the Board with the financial update. He noted he and his staff had been working with Ms. Day and Ms. Cheryl Cochet, Assistant Director of FMS, on the business model to modify it for the County's needs. Mr. Rogers noted the presentation would focus on preliminaries based on the five-year model. He added

that timeline could be extended if needed. Mr. Rogers further noted the model was similar to the budget with line items with the General Fund currently reflected with the contribution breakdown for the School Division, Library, outside entities, transfers to other funds, and such. He added the full assumptions would be identified as the model developed. Mr. Rogers noted the ability to make cost-of-living adjustments across the board and within specific line items. He further noted as capital projects with operational expenditure were introduced, those specific numbers could be added to the respective line items. Mr. Rogers noted the preliminary model summary highlighted the actual, adopted, and projected budgets in the PowerPoint presentation. He further noted the actual numbers would be updated for their respective years as the numbers were audited. Mr. Rogers continued the PowerPoint presentation highlighting the revenue snapshot with a line item breakdown. He then noted the expenditure snapshot on a departmental level, followed by expenditure by Object Code to show aggregate overall changes in areas such as salary increases of 1% as well as individual department changes. Mr. Rogers continued the PowerPoint presentation highlighting the Debt Service Fund and future CIP projects. He noted scenario summaries for potential salary increases overall and additional increases for specific departments and the impact to the total dollar amounts. Mr. Rogers further noted the model allowed for such dynamic editing to see the impact to the budget. He added that Ms. Day and Ms. Cochet currently had the model and were making assumption edits, adding the FY 2021 numbers would be updated pending the audit finalization. Mr. Rogers noted the model should be available for the FY 2023 budget cycle.

Mr. Hipple noted with the two scenarios presented, the County would be in debt by 2023.

Mr. Rogers noted that was not unusual. He further noted the 2% real estate assessment could be very conservative. Mr. Rogers stated the housing boom and impacts of the pandemic.

Mr. Hipple asked about the national economy and impacts to James City County. He noted the Board needed to be aware to ensure the County remained in a good financial position.

Mr. Rogers noted the strength of the Fund Balance was a key component. He further noted the retention of staff. Mr. Rogers added retirement was always a factor, but drawing strong talent for staff replacement was important and it was more difficult across many areas of employment. He noted the possibility of wage inflation at the employment level and retaining strong staff talent. Mr. Rogers added that factor needed consideration during the budget process. He noted interest rates were still down, with only a slight increase.

Mr. Hipple noted the 10-12% safety nest that the County retained for its bonding rate. He further noted the possibility of more funds in that area, adding the current bond rate was very good.

Mr. Rogers confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple asked if the amount should be increased to 14%. Mr. Rogers noted the 10-12% policy was good. He further noted as an unofficial policy if the Board wanted to increase the current amount as the Board considered the future.

Mr. Hipple noted if times became difficult, he wanted to ensure staffing and maintain services for the citizens. He further noted setting funds aside now could be beneficial on those points. He stated staff had done a remarkable job with cuts. Mr. Hipple noted if funds were available, they tended to be spent, but if they were set aside, they tended to be held in reserve.

Mr. Rogers noted some of the planned projects could have inflationary impacts. He further noted the extra funding was beneficial with so many uncertainties.

Mr. Hipple thanked Mr. Rogers for the presentation.

7. American Rescue Plan Act Use of Funds

A motion to Endorse the proposal in total but Authorize going forward on the six now to allow for an opportunity for fine tuning of the remaining identification list of funding sources 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

Mr. Stevens noted the spreadsheet he had shared with the Board, adding Ms. Day would explain the process.

Ms. Day addressed the Board to discuss the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds and the departmental requests. She noted FMS developed a process in August 2021 for official departmental requests of the ARPA funds consideration. Ms. Day further noted it was a similar process to that used with the nonprofit organizations and the CARES Act funding. She highlighted the four specific criteria for the departmental requests for ARPA funding. Ms. Day noted 33 requests were made for a total ask of \$36 million. She added every department submitted requests, adding the County's allocation of ARPA funding was approximately \$15 million with the first allocation in May 2021 and the second allocation in May 2022. Ms. Day noted a committee, comprised of Finance members and County Administration, was formed to vet the requests and establish criteria for use. She further noted 20 of the 33 requests have been recommended for funding spread across all departments. Ms. Day listed the various requests in a departmental breakdown for the Board. She noted, in addition to herself, other members of the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) were available for questions.

Ms. Larson asked Ms. Day to restate the four criteria.

Ms. Day noted the criteria were: 1) to respond to the public health emergency or its negative economic impacts (which included assistance to households, small businesses, nonprofit organizations, and impacted industries such as tourism, travel, and hospitality); 2) respond to workers who are performing essential work during the pandemic while providing premium pay to eligible workers (no requests received for this criteria); 3) provision of government services to the extent of the reduction in revenue due to the pandemic (referred to as the loss of revenue); and 4) make investments in water, sewer, and broadband infrastructure. Ms. Day noted the approximately \$15 million in ARPA funding received, adding when FMS performed its revenue loss calculation, that amount was exceeded. She further noted the amount was approximately \$17 million. Ms. Day stated the recommendation was to use the provision of government services, which provided a broader base when the committee reviewed the requests.

Ms. Larson noted tourism had taken a substantial hit. She further noted \$500,000 had gone toward revenue loss in that category. She stated she would have wanted to know the ranking of these items, adding that some were obvious such as the James City County Marina.

Mr. Stevens noted requests had been solicited from all the departments. He further noted some requests were currently in the CIP, while others were not. Mr. Stevens noted with the revenue loss criteria, the money could be used to fund activities the Board designated and the committee could reevaluate the categories. He further noted after conferring with Ms. Cochet, the projects were ARPA eligible for funding. Mr. Stevens stated with tourism, a grant program for tourism-related businesses had been successful. He noted the 30-Day Fund assistance and possible Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding for business grants. Mr. Stevens further noted the list represented two phases of funding with some projects potentially moved to a later date. He stated the Board did not need to make a decision on the entire list

and some or none could be approved. Mr. Stevens addressed potential property purchase for Workforce Housing development. He noted approximately \$1 million was related to Workforce Housing, adding consideration of temporary positions to support the projects had been factored into the funding with a future determination on the need of those positions. Mr. Stevens further noted the position within FMS to support staff with the additional requirements necessary regarding the funding. He added staff had done a very good job, but many hours of work had been involved. Mr. Stevens noted the specific CARES Act funding requirements for nonprofit organizations to receive grants. He further noted ARPA funding covered COVID-related loss or relief, which offered a broader use for nonprofit organizations in the community. Mr. Stevens suggested money be designated for nonprofit use and each organization could apply for allocation if the Board wished. He added this was allowed under ARPA requirements. Mr. Stevens noted other projects were primarily CIP ones. He further noted five highlighted projects he felt had a higher sense of urgency with the balance of projects not time sensitive. Mr. Stevens noted Board input on one of the five highlights was the nonprofit use and the timeline for the process would need to be determined. He further noted the Housing Financial Analyst piece was another highlight within the FMS Department. Mr. Stevens added another item was the Marina, which encompassed the Billsburg Brewery building in meeting existing taproom capacity issues and structural concerns while continuing to serve County needs over the next five to 10 years with minimal investment. He indicated there was a sixth point on the list which addressed elimination of several bathroom touchpoints. Mr. Stevens noted CARES Act funding was being used for that project, but it would not be completed before the CARES Act deadline at the end of December 2021. He further noted supply issues had impacted installation. Mr. Stevens added the credit card waiver fees and possible extension with a Board decision in late November. Mr. Stevens stated the last item was the creation of a mowing/litter crew, which was time sensitive. He noted it could be created within the current year's savings with ongoing costs to address the needs. Mr. Stevens further noted General Services staff was not enough to address the growing number of requests. He added the lead time on this request addressed equipment and personnel and the financial breakdown of each component. Mr. Stevens noted other items could be addressed later.

Mr. Hipple asked if the sanitary sewer line improvements would be addressed under the James City Service Authority's (JCSA) budget.

Mr. Stevens noted he thought JCSA only had the funding to do that project and that ARPA funding could be used in that case. He further noted identification of existing septic systems with continual problems to address.

Mr. Hipple asked if the County would need to fund \$15 million of the approximately \$36 million project list.

Mr. Stevens recommended not funding the list in its entirety, but designating some items as future CIP projects at a cost of approximately \$12 million or more from the \$36 million. He noted there were potentially other areas within the current year's savings based on the Board's decision. Mr. Stevens further noted the increase in firefighter overtime due to vacancies, injuries, and staffing issues.

Mr. Hipple noted it had happened several years back with personnel and overtime. He further noted it was wise to monitor the cost.

Mr. Stevens stated the pressure on staff and time off versus overtime was preferred. He noted the pre-hiring of firefighters for Station No. 6 had helped reduce overtime with the delay of that station for several years. Mr. Stevens further noted an additional engine company had been instituted and the overhire personnel had been absorbed there along with the normal attrition rate of retirement.

Mr. Hipple asked if the General Services Administration building could possibly be moved to the Warhill land tract.

Mr. Stevens confirmed yes, adding this represented only the design piece without construction. He noted it was a good CIP project to move forward.

Mr. Hipple asked if the County's funding and the ARPA funds would address the list of projects.

Mr. Stevens confirmed yes. He noted the future CIP projects would be discussed during the upcoming budget process.

Mr. Hipple noted the \$5 million for the Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program. He further noted \$1.5 million was needed for three traffic lights with those locations being Stonehouse District, Berkeley District, and Jolly Pond Road.

Mr. Stevens noted he would confirm the cost with Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Community Development. He further noted Jolly Pond Road met many of the signal warrants and with funding already in place that project was moving forward. Mr. Stevens added he would confirm that information and get back with Mr. Hipple on those points.

Ms. Larson asked about the additional overtime and the number of first responders out on workmen's compensation currently.

Mr. Stevens noted he would confirm with Fire Chief Ryan Ashe about the number, adding he did not think it was a substantial number.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Stevens.

Mr. Stevens noted there was no great staffing shortage in Public Safety, but vacancies tended to create a ripple effect. He further noted the impact of six positions while those firefighters were still in the academy impacted daily staffing. Mr. Stevens added he would get some information regarding that point for Ms. Larson.

Mr. Icenhour noted the project list was a good representative of allocations for the \$14.98 million. He further noted small areas to adjust were available, but commended staff for the excellent work and detail. Mr. Icenhour asked the timeline for a decision on the six highlighted areas Mr. Stevens had referenced earlier.

Mr. Stevens noted the sooner the Board gave an answer, the sooner those projects could move forward.

Mr. Icenhour noted the candid explanation of the items. He further noted his approval of those six items. Mr. Icenhour added the benefits of the credit card fees waived exceeded the cost and had aided collection recovery.

Ms. Sadler noted she was in favor of the six items. She further noted concerns with the tourism program not fully funded. Ms. Sadler added tourism was one of the main drivers in the area.

Ms. Larson questioned the touch-free zones in bathrooms. She asked if paper towels were being replaced with dryers.

Mr. Stevens did not think that was the case. He noted he would verify that point.

Ms. Larson and Ms. Sadler noted dryers were not as sanitary. Ms. Larson noted her endorsement of the six items.

Mr. McGlennon noted his overall endorsement, adding there were some areas for adjustment. He further noted he would like to see a tourism program.

Ms. Day noted she had attended a webinar earlier in the day where the state had announced a substantial program for destination marketing areas of which the local area was one such location. She further noted the specific portal and details would be available on Friday, November 12. Ms. Day added they would learn more about the state plans. Ms. Larson noted that funding would be going to marketing for the Williamsburg Tourism Council under the leadership of Ms. Vicki Cimino, Chief Executive Officer. She further noted that funding would not be going to Busch Gardens. Ms. Larson noted Ms. Cimino, under her charge and creation, could not do a specific destination.

Ms. Day concurred.

Ms. Larson hoped for an uptick in the marketing effort with the collaborative efforts.

Ms. Day noted when the findings were available, she would share them with the Board.

The Board thanked Ms. Day for the hard work.

Mr. Hipple noted he could support the entire list, but looked to the Board for direction.

Ms. Larson questioned the Ambler House and the amount of \$739,000 for that project. She noted she wanted to know the plan for the property. Ms. Larson further noted a recent wedding in which the couple was delighted with the venue, adding everything from water to bathrooms had to be brought in for the event. She stated she would like \$20,000 to go toward the Ambler House's exterior, particularly since someone was willing to use the site as a wedding venue. She noted the exterior improvements would be beneficial and reiterated with that type of investment in the property there should be a future plan for it.

Ms. Sadler concurred.

Ms. Larson noted her endorsement, but added she wanted some more details on the plan for the Ambler House.

At approximately 3:53 p.m., the Board recessed for a short break.

At approximately 3:59 p.m., the Board reconvened.

8. Legislative Agenda

Mr. Kinsman addressed the Board noting the legislative agenda was being informally presented as had been done in past years. He noted he would receive the Board's input, finalize it for the November 9, 2021 meeting, and discussion with local legislators at the November 23, 2021 meeting. Mr. Kinsman further noted each Board member had a copy of the legislation and he could address the information as the Board deemed.

Mr. Hipple asked if any Board member wanted to discuss or add any items.

Mr. Icenhour referenced the five items Mr. Kinsman had highlighted for the Board. He noted Mr. Kinsman's recommendation for a charter amendment was not listed. Mr. Icenhour

referenced the charter amendment to give the Board the power to only accept letters of credit or cash escrow instead of bonds. He noted the County was still paying for Settler's Market 15 years later with an unsettled bond issue, which was costing taxpayer money. Mr. Icenhour further noted the unlikelihood of a state law being passed in favor where a charter amendment could work. He referenced the charter amendment to address abandoned cars.

Mr. Kinsman noted that legislative piece did not get through the General Assembly, but it did succeed as a charter amendment.

Mr. Icenhour noted the problem of abandoned cars, but stressed this was a financial hardship on the County's taxpayers. He further noted the number of bond issues.

Mr. Kinsman noted few localities had the number of bond pulls as James City County had. He further noted a bond pull was likened to an insurance claim. Mr. Kinsman cited the example of a dented automobile and the how, why, and when of the repair. He noted the similarity to a bond pull, adding it was on a larger scale in some circumstances. He presented an example of a simpler bond pull would be minor infrastructure remaining in a neighborhood. Mr. Kinsman stated the County would make a claim on the bond company followed by a response with discussion between both parties going back and forth, engineering review, and a final decision as to the work either being completed or money to the County. He noted both scenarios had taken place in the County. Mr. Kinsman further noted a bond pull on a small scale was one thing, but the Settler's Market had been going on for 10 years.

Mr. Icenhour noted the amount of staff time and expenditure on the Settler's Market bond pull.

Mr. Kinsman noted that was true, particularly for the engineering and environmental staff who evaluated the situations.

Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Kinsman to explain the process if a letter of credit was involved instead.

Mr. Kinsman noted a letter of credit was money set aside in the bank, which was held for the County. He further noted the County then would send a letter to the bank with the appropriate verbiage to match the originating document and request payment. Mr. Kinsman stated in his experience that check was cut and delivered to the County in those situations. He added the only option better was a cash escrow.

Ms. Sadler noted it was an easier process.

Mr. Kinsman confirmed yes. He added a letter of credit generally resulted in a check to the County in a timely manner.

Mr. Icenhour stated he wanted the item on the agenda to see if the legislators could work with the Board using the charter amendment approach.

Mr. Hipple asked Mr. Kinsman to add that item to the legislative agenda.

Mr. Kinsman confirmed yes.

Ms. Larson noted citizen input on a legislative agenda item. She further noted the results of a Virginia Housing Commission study were pending and thus the item was not on this year's agenda. Ms. Larson added the item dealt with homeowner control of homeowner associations.

Mr. Kinsman confirmed a letter had been sent to the Virginia Housing Commission study group. He noted the Commission's meetings coincided with the General Assembly. Mr. Kinsman further noted based on the citizen concerns, this route was more inclusive as opposed to incorporation into County Code change.

Mr. Icenhour noted the importance of addressing the concerns and protecting the citizens of James City County.

Mr. McGlennon noted Item No. 1.1 would probably not get picked up, but added the possibility of an increased state contribution to the cost of local education. He further noted recent report indicated Virginia was 41st in the country for state support per student while being one of the top 10 states in relation to income. Mr. McGlennon noted this meant the burden was on local governments to provide funding. He further noted the reference to impact fees under Item No. 1.3 with modification to some of the language. Mr. McGlennon referenced a request from the Chesapeake Bay Foundation in support of reauthorization of recently passed legislation encouraging reforestation which aided stormwater absorption and runoff. He noted Item 1.5 and the insertion of reforestation regarding the use of state funding. Mr. McGlennon noted qualified immunity and the need for discussion and knowledge prior to its incorporation into the legislative agenda.

Ms. Sadler asked how that would be done. She noted she wanted to protect police in the best way possible.

Mr. McGlennon agreed. He noted having an understanding of the issues and proposals.

At Mr. Hipple's request, Mr. Kinsman noted he could have an informational sheet to address the points Mr. McGlennon referenced. Mr. Kinsman noted that item was a late addition to last year's legislative agenda. He further noted he would provide the various legislation that had come before the General Assembly.

The Board thanked Mr. Kinsman.

F. BOARD CONSIDERATION(S)

1. Authorization for a Full-time Position and Use of American Rescue Plan Act Funds

Ms. Larson asked if the Board could move forward with the Agenda as this item had been discussed earlier in the meeting.

A motion to move forward as the item had been previously discussed 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

2. Consideration of the James City County Comprehensive Plan, Our County, Our Shared Future: James City County 2045 Comprehensive Plan

A motion to Accept Option A was made by James Icenhour Jr, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

Ms. Ellen Cook, Principal Planner, noted the County's draft 2045 Comprehensive Plan was before the Board for consideration. She further noted the amendments to the Plan as noted at

the Board's September 28, 2021 meeting. Ms. Cook stated the Board had requested additional information on the Croaker Road interchange area and the Moderate Density Residential designation. In a PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Cook highlighted the land use designations which indicated northeast and southeast interchange quadrants be removed from the Primary Service Area (PSA), redesignation of most parcels to Rural Lands with the two Historic Virginia Land Conservancy parcels redesignated to Community Character Conservation, Open Space or Recreation (CCOR) as shown in the presentation. She noted Option A if the Board decided to maintain the northeast and southeast quadrants inside the PSA, which would return 14 of the 16 parcels back to their current land use designation of Low Density Residential Neighborhood Commercial and Mixed Use as indicated in the PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Cook further noted the two remaining parcels, owned by the Land Conservancy, would be designated CCOR. She indicated the draft revised language as presented. Ms. Cook continued the presentation with Option B, which returned all 16 parcels to their Adopted 2035 Land Use designations. She added that designation included the two parcels owned by the Land Conservancy and indicated the revised language as presented. She noted, at the Board's request, that the Land Conservancy was comfortable with either option, but felt the CCOR designation was a better match to the conservation easement in addition to the parcel remaining within the PSA. Ms. Cook noted she would take any questions before moving to the next item.

Mr. Icenhour noted the Land Conservancy supported either option, though flexibility for farmland use was a consideration.

Ms. Cook noted Option A's land use designation allowed for the farmland use.

Mr. Hipple asked about the Land Conservancy's preference for land use designation.

Ms. Cook noted the indication had been toward Option A, but either option was acceptable.

Mr. Hipple asked if Option B kept the land designation in its current use.

Ms. Cook confirmed yes. She noted it was the designation per the 2035 Comprehensive Plan as Mixed Use.

Mr. Icenhour noted he was in favor of Option A. He further noted it matched the Land Conservancy's needs for use. Mr. Icenhour stated Option A allowed the 14 parcels to remain as Mixed Use per the 2035 Comprehensive Plan except the other two parcels of the Land Conservancy.

Mr. Hipple noted that was his question.

Mr. Icenhour confirmed yes.

Ms. Sadler asked the difference in the two options.

Ms. Cook noted the two Land Conservancy parcels were designated CCOR in Option A. She further noted those same parcels were designated Mixed Use in Option B.

Ms. Sadler asked the benefit of being in a CCOR category.

Ms. Cook noted the land use designations were the guiding vision for the property so it represented what staff, Planning Commission, and the Board would review if legislative cases arose.

Ms. Sadler questioned if the CCOR designation created more restrictions to the surrounding

properties under Option A.

Ms. Cook indicated no. She noted the guidance language in Mixed Use discussed buffering parcels in recognition of them as valuable assets.

With the unanimous approval of Option A, Ms. Cook moved to the second item for consideration, Moderate Density Residential designation in the draft 2045 Comprehensive Plan. She noted this designation had two levels of potential density. Ms. Cook identified the specifics to each level as shown in the PowerPoint presentation. She noted staff did not recommend changing the name now as there was no reference to High Density Residential areas on the draft 2035 Future Land Use Map.

A motion to Retain the current language was made by Sue Sadler, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

Ms. Sadler asked for background on this item.

Mr. Icenhour noted he had raised the question regarding designation. He further noted on the number of units per the two levels. Mr. Icenhour questioned the maximum number of 18.

Ms. Cook indicated that Mixed Use designation had a maximum of 18, but the revised one was 16.

Mr. Icenhour questioned the definition of High Density within the Comprehensive Plan and if so, did it identify the minimum number of units per acre and above.

Ms. Cook responded no. She noted the Comprehensive Plan only had Low Density Residential with previous plans having the one level of Moderate Density, but if the 2045 Comprehensive Plan was adopted then two levels would exist.

Mr. Icenhour noted concerns over High Density designation. He further noted the need to have the definition and questioned what the top end would be in that case. Mr. Icenhour noted four units per acre was the definition for Low Density Residential. He added the top end was not truly known for Moderate Density as the current numbers were now higher. Mr. Icenhour noted 16-18 units per acre was high for moderate designation, adding that was his personal opinion. He further noted citizen input did not want higher density within the PSA, but a lower density outside. Mr. Icenhour stated he felt these densities being discussed were not what citizens wanted.

Mr. Hipple stated he understood Mr. Icenhour's comments, but added the PSA was there to put the higher densities within it. He noted citizens indicating elevating and condensing in terms of building within the PSA to avoid spreading into rural areas outside of it .

Mr. Icenhour cited the City of Williamsburg as an example. He noted space restrictions there and the City would have to grow vertically in more dense areas. Mr. Icenhour further noted higher density within the PSA and the majority of citizens would not be happy with that as a vision for James City County.

Ms. Sadler asked if Level Two would be in a more densely populated area set up for that designation.

Ms. Cook confirmed yes. She noted there were a set of Moderate Density Residential designated parcels on the Future Land Use Map at various locations in the County. Ms. Cook

further noted staff needed to do a deeper analysis of which parcels qualified as Level One or Level Two and the nuances within the designations as opposed to a one size fits all approach.

Ms. Sadler noted the diversity within the County. She asked if both levels could exist with evaluation on the projects as they come forward.

Ms. Cook noted yes, adding Zoning Ordinances would need updated as the process was updated. She further noted additional details could be forthcoming. Ms. Cook noted the project would be evaluated against the established criteria of the designation.

Mr. Hipple asked if New Town would qualify as Level Two.

Mr. Icenhour noted parcels were designated on the map as Level Two.

Ms. Cook noted those areas were not pre-designated.

Mr. Icenhour noted the areas were Mixed Use with different level designations.

Ms. Cook confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple asked if New Town, even at 16 units per acre, would qualify under the Level Two designation.

Ms. Cook noted New Town was designated Mixed Use which could have a maximum of 18 units per acre.

Mr. Icenhour asked about the varying densities within New Town.

Ms. Cook noted she was not sure of each specific density.

Mr. Icenhour cautioned intense development on small parcels and future problems. He emphasized the need for a clear definition of high density.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Larson noted further discussion on density needed to be addressed. She further noted moving forward.

Mr. Hipple noted addressing the definition of low, medium, and high densities. He asked how this impacted current designations.

Ms. Cook noted the Board could change Moderate Density to High Density within the Plan. She further noted the Land Use Map would not have any areas designated as High Density Residential, adding it would be a designation with no immediate practical application.

Mr. Hipple noted the designation change could be incorporated into the next Comprehensive Plan review with this designation in its Land Use Map. He further noted that would then be reviewed by the Planning Commission as a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Hipple added the definition for High Density Residential could be incorporated at that stage.

Mr. Icenhour noted flexibility, but added that the Moderate Density number had increased over the years. He further noted there was a clear understanding of the Low Density definition.

Mr. McGlennon asked if there were developments over 16 units per acre currently in the County.

Ms. Cook noted she thought that was so, but was uncertain of which ones.

Mr. McGlennon noted some apartment buildings probably matched that criteria. He asked if those were classified.

Ms. Cook said some situations were incorporated with a master planned community and not specifically broken down regarding the density criteria.

Mr. McGlennon noted several apartment complexes such as Conway Gardens with multiple units per building exceeded the 16-18 units per acre.

Ms. Cook noted if the complexes were nonconforming and zoned R-5, then the maximum density would be 12.

Mr. McGlennon asked if there was a maximum then for multifamily use.

Ms. Cook noted she was referencing the R-5 Zoning District.

Mr. McGlennon asked if a Zoning District had a restriction on density, why was that not a more generally understood point.

Mr. Icenhour noted this referenced a previous discussion point on developable versus non-developable. He further noted the example of 100 acres with four units per acre, but 50% was swamp land so the bulk of the units went on the remaining 50% with eight units on the developable land. Mr. Icenhour referenced the floating scale on properties with those parameters. He noted few cases had come before the Board previously, but he felt there would be more in the future and the impact on the community. Mr. Icenhour further noted developers will push for the maximum number of units on the land and the Board needs to be prepared.

Ms. Cook noted Mr. Holt had shared information regarding protections in place if this particular issue was put on hold. She further noted the current Zoning Ordinances which would implement the current Comprehensive Plan were based on past Comprehensive Plans. Ms. Cook stated the current R-5 Zoning District had a limit of 12 units, which would require an amendment to move forward. She referenced the legislative cases that could come before the Board and the language regarding the number of units and public benefit factors. Ms. Cook added that allowed the Board to consider those factors in reviewing and voting on land cases.

Mr. Icenhour noted the issue would need to be addressed when reviewing Ordinances and Land Use cases. He stated his need to address the potential problems in this area.

Ms. Larson asked if the wording would remain, but the density question could be addressed later.

Mr. Icenhour confirmed yes.

Ms. Larson indicated no motion was needed.

Mr. McGlennon agreed.

Mr. Hipple concurred, saying no changes would be made.

Mr. McGlennon noted discussion on the draft 2045 Comprehensive Plan since the Public Hearing, adding there were some areas to address for the next planning process. He further

noted as a procedural point if the Comprehensive Plan vote should be done at a regular Board meeting as opposed to the current Work Session meeting. Mr. McGlennon added if the draft 2045 Comprehensive Plan was voted and approved at the November 9, 2021 meeting, it allowed citizens another opportunity to speak during Public Comment.

Ms. Sadler noted she was ready to move forward. She further noted public input had been heard for several months.

Mr. Hipple noted he was ready to move ahead. He asked the others for their thoughts.

Ms. Larson stated she felt staff was thinking the Board would move ahead at this meeting. She noted she was ready to move ahead acknowledging Mr. McGlennon's comments.

Mr. Hipple sought a motion for approval.

Ms. Larson asked about the interior lighting in the boardroom. She added the lighting was very dim.

Mr. Stevens noted the online presentation was better. He further noted the technicians thought the system could be reset and possibly work, but were unsure. He extended his apologies. Mr. Stevens added the lighting issues would be resolved for the November 9, 2021 meeting.

Ms. Larson noted the issues of being able to see.

Mr. McGlennon noted the possibility of a small reading lamp.

G. BOARD REQUESTS AND DIRECTIVES

At approximately 4:52 p.m., Ms. Sadler excused herself from the meeting.

At approximately 4:56 p.m., Ms. Sadler returned to the meeting.

Mr. Icenhour noted he had attended the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) and Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC) meetings. He further noted the meetings were the day after an hour and a half at a dead stop on the Willoughby Spit bridge. Mr. Icenhour highlighted a piece of information from the HRTPO meeting that congestion pricing, also known as tolls on High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, would be coming to the Peninsula. He noted the state had done some research in that area, adding that could pose some issues for County citizens. He further noted he was unsure about the implementation and who would receive the revenue.

Mr. Hipple noted Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Committee (HRTAC) was due to receive the largest portion and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) receiving funding for the gantries. He further noted this would be implemented on Interstate 64 (I-64) at the Jefferson Avenue area where the HOV lanes start. Mr. Hipple added the existing HOV lane would be used as part of the gantry and that lane would be available at a price (toll) for usage.

Mr. Icenhour continued noting the boring machine for the Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel (HRBT) project would be arriving in November 2021. He noted boring would begin in August 2022 and end in August 2024 with a September 2025 completion date. Mr. Icenhour further noted the HRTPO's legislative agenda included the 29-mile gap on I-64 as a high priority with an estimated \$600-700 million price tag. He added HRTPO was looking for toll relief from the Elizabeth River, but he questioned that possibility. Mr. Icenhour noted some requests for

passenger rail service and alternatives to the fuel tax. He further noted the HRPDC was discussing the SAIL250 or semiquincentennial (250th) anniversary of the country's independence. Mr. Icenhour stated the anniversary was slated to begin shortly after the HRBT opening and the offshore wind project completion. He noted several other items on the legislative agenda included state support of school construction, local ability to protect and expand tree canopy, and relief for public notifications.

Ms. Sadler noted her virtual attendance at the Regional Jail Board meeting along with Mr. Stevens. She further noted her attendance at the Agricultural and Forestal District (AFD) Board meeting and the Economic Development Authority (EDA) meeting. Ms. Sadler added during the EDA meeting, it was announced the Southern Economic Development Corporation, who presented James City County with its second award for participation in Virginia 30-Day Fund, would be returning to the Historic Triangle for its annual conference in 2023. She noted a presentation on local shopping was also made at the EDA meeting and provided the specifics of the program. Ms. Sadler further noted the proposed locations for the program and card purchase were at Merchants Square in Williamsburg, Riverwalk in Yorktown and New Town, and/or Premium Outlets in James City County.

Ms. Larson noted her attendance at the Grand Opening of The Maine of Williamsburg with Mr. McGlennon. She further noted The Maine of Williamsburg was the new event space at 2580 John Tyler Highway with over 50 weddings already slated for the location. Ms. Larson noted she had an upcoming Tourism meeting, as well as the upcoming Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) meeting. She further noted her attendance at the Peninsula Chamber of Commerce for a Women in Leadership breakfast. She added one of the presenters was a County business owner, Ms. Kathy Howell, who worked with the EDA and represented James City County very well.

Mr. McGlennon noted Ms. Larson's comments at the opening of The Maine of Williamsburg were excellent. He further noted her efforts in a successful fundraiser to assist a community member experiencing serious health setbacks. Mr. McGlennon noted his attendance at the opening of the Community Action Agency, now operating under ACE, for the new preschool and prep academy at Poplar Hall. He further noted the Honorable Senator Monty Mason and Ms. Rebecca Vinroot, Director of Social Services, and the session on addressing the needs of young people who age out of the foster care system, particularly in relation to a workplace connection. Mr. McGlennon added Career Works had opened at the Virginia Peninsula Community College Historic Triangle Campus with support staff from surrounding localities for that office. He noted some of the programs and opportunities there.

Ms. Larson followed up on the two retirees who were recognized earlier in the meeting. She noted the recognition of County staff and years of service. Ms. Larson further noted 49 years of service held a lot of County information and institutional knowledge. She commended 31 years of service and maintaining two jobs during his tenure. Ms. Larson noted the importance of retiree recognition and expressing appreciation for the time and dedication of those employees.

Mr. Stevens noted his appreciation of the Board's recognition. He added some employees were not willing to be up front at the meetings, but were very appreciative of the recognition.

Mr. Hipple noted he and Mr. Stevens attended the Mayors and Chairs event yesterday. He further noted one point of discussion at the event focused on crime and its impact on communities and stress levels. Mr. Hipple noted the discussion also focused on the regional viewpoint and educating community members. He further noted that was the reason he asked Chief Peterson to bring in SRO Ferriero and discuss what James City County was doing in this area, particularly in light of other localities cancelling that resource. Mr. Hipple encouraged community members to reach out to the police officers and get to know them as well as Fire

and Emergency Management Services (EMS) personnel.

H. REPORTS OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Stevens noted the Williamsburg Health Foundation awarded its annual 2021 award to the Emergency Management Departments of James City County, York County, and the City of Williamsburg in honor of their efforts and innovations during the pandemic. He further noted the community benefited from this collaborative effort, adding each locality received a \$5,000 grant to further the collaborative work with the community-based organizations. Mr. Stevens expressed his appreciation to the Williamsburg Health Foundation for the award and to commend the Emergency Management staff for its efforts.

I. CLOSED SESSION

Mr. Hipple read the items of the Closed Session discussion.

Mr. Kinsman clarified part of the discussion involved the County-City School contract.

A motion to Enter a Closed Session 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

At approximately 5:08 p.m., the Board entered Closed Session.

At approximately 5:37 p.m., the Board re-entered Open Session.

1. Consideration of a personnel matter, the appointment of individuals to County Boards and/or Commissions, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(1) of the Code of Virginia

A motion to Certify the Closed Session 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

2. Appointment - Colonial Community Criminal Justice Board

A motion to Appoint to the Colonial Community Criminal Justice Board Judge Josh DeFord for a term that will extend to July 31, 2023, 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

3. Appointment of the Natural and Cultural Assets Mapping Committee

A motion to Appoint to the following candidates for appointment to the Natural and Cultural Assets Mapping Committee for the time of expiration of the Committee and the report comes back to the Board for the nomination of Adrienne Frank, Mary Bressler, Jay Everson, Jennifer Kritzenberger, Matthew Woolsey, Deborah Bussert, Bruce Abbott, and Alain Outlaw 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

4. Discussion or consideration of the investment of public funds where competition or bargaining is involved, where, if made public initially, the financial interest of the governmental unit would be adversely affected; and consultation with legal counsel employed or retained by a public body regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel. Nothing in this subdivision shall be construed to permit the closure of a meeting merely because an attorney representing the public body is in attendance or is consulted on a matter, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(6) and (A)(8) of the Code of Virginia, pertaining to the contract between WJCC Schools and James City County and the City of Williamsburg

J. ADJOURNMENT

1. Adjourn until 5 p.m. on November 9, 2021 for the Regular Meeting

A motion to Adjourn was made by James Icenhour Jr, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

At approximately 5:40 p.m., Mr. Hipple adjourned the Board of Supervisors.


Deputy Clerk