

**MINUTES**  
**JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**BUSINESS MEETING**  
**County Government Center Board Room**  
**101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185**  
**November 23, 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 add an item to the Consent Calendar for the ARPA Utilities Assistance Grant Program Memorandum of Understanding.

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

**ADOPTED**

**JAN 25 2022**

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

**C. PRESENTATION**

**1. Recognition of the Friends of WRL Book Nook Volunteers**

Ms. Sandy Towers, Youth Services Director for Williamsburg Regional Library, addressed the Board noting the Friends of the Williamsburg Regional Library (WRL) Book Nook Volunteer group consisted of 30-40 dedicated community members. She noted the group maintained an ongoing used book sale, also known as the Book Nooks, in the City of Williamsburg and James City County libraries. Ms. Towers further noted the sales' proceeds directly benefited the WRL. She stated prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, these volunteers donated in excess of 6,000 hours of time annually. Ms. Towers noted since 2010, the book sales (Book Nooks and online) had brought in over \$1.15 million for library support. She added over 51,000 hours had been volunteered in that same timeline. Ms. Towers noted the Book Nook volunteers ensured the extra level of excellence which the community valued. She further noted these volunteers worked tirelessly and were true advocates for WRL, adding \$60,000 in revenue was raised during COVID due to their continued efforts. Ms. Towers noted the 2021 monthly revenue levels had almost returned to the pre-COVID levels. She thanked the Board for recognizing the volunteers. Ms. Towers acknowledged several of the volunteers in attendance: Ms. Terry Cavanaugh, Book Nook Coordinator for the James City County Library, Ms. Pat Van Zandt, Book Nook Coordinator for the Williamsburg Library, Ms. Terry Johnson, a long-time Book Nook volunteer, her husband, Mr. Jack Johnson, and Mr. Carl Lounsbury, Chair of the Friends of WRL Foundation Book Sale Committee.

2. Colonial Soil & Water Conservation District Annual Report

Mr. Robert Lund, one of James City County's two elected directors to the Colonial Soil & Water Conservation District, addressed the Board noting the Fiscal Year 2021 Annual Report in the Agenda Packet. Mr. Lund noted the Colonial Soil & Water Conservation District (CSWCD) was a regional effort. He highlighted an overview of CSWCD in a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Lund noted supplemental funding from local governments and grants were instrumental in CSWCD's work. He continued the PowerPoint presentation highlighting agricultural programs which included the Virginia Agricultural Cost Share Program (VACS) and the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act (CBPA). Mr. Lund noted the VACS program included Nutrient Management Plans within the County in addition to other practices and the benefits of the program. He continued the presentation highlighting education programs, the Williamsburg Community Growers Partnership, and the Virginia Conservation Assistance Program (VCAP), an urban program. Mr. Lund noted the Turf Love program, which taught homeowners how to maintain their lawns in an environmentally responsible manner with Nutrient Management Plans (NMPs) as well as the upcoming Shoreline Evaluation Program (SEP). Mr. Lund thanked James City County for its support over time and requested continued support of the four programs in addition to a request for supplemental funding for VCAP.

Ms. Larson expressed her appreciation for the report and the hard work that was done in the local area.

Mr. Hipple extended his thanks to Mr. Lund and the staff for their efforts.

**D. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Mr. Hipple asked if any Board member wished to pull any items. As there was no request, Mr. Hipple sought a motion for adoption.

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:

-October 26, 2021, Business Meeting

2. Abandonment and Dedication of a Portion of Six Mount Zion Road

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. Authorization to enter into a partnership with the Hampton Roads Economic Development Alliance and reappropriate the money previously appropriated for the Greater Williamsburg Partnership for Fiscal Year 2022

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. Compensation Plan and Personnel Policies Agreement with Clerk of Court

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. Compensation Plan and Personnel Policies Agreement with Commonwealth's Attorney

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. Contract Award - James City County Recreation Center HVAC Upgrades - \$445,099

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. Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance Violation at 4861 Centerville Road

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. Grant Application - COVID-19 Recovery Urgent Need Community Development Block Grant - \$1,000,000

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. Grant Award - COVID Homelessness Emergency Response Program - \$20,000

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

10. Grant Award - Fiscal Year 2021 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant - \$13,037

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

11. Participation in Proposed Settlement of Opioid Related Claims

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

12. Participation in the American Rescue Plan Act Municipality Utility Assistance Program as Fiscal Agent for the James City Service Authority and Grant Award - \$240,808

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. 2022 Legislative Agenda Discussion with Legislators

Mr. Kinsman addressed the Board noting the 2022 legislative program was included in the Board's Agenda Packet. He noted the legislators were in attendance.

Mr. Hipple thanked the Honorable Michael Mullin, Virginia House of Delegates, the Honorable Amanda Batten, Virginia House of Delegates, and the Honorable Montgomery Mason, Member of the Virginia Senate, for their attendance.

Mr. Icenhour noted Item No. 3 which addressed amending the James City County Charter to allow the County to refuse to accept bonds as a form of subdivision improvement security. He further noted this item was particularly significant to his district and was an ongoing concern for James City County. Mr. Icenhour cited a 20-year situation in New Town that remained unresolved due to legal entanglements. He noted gaining support from the legislators to address this point.

Mr. McGlennon noted impact fees for development. He further noted the current opportunity to deal with proffers for the capital costs incurred from development for legislative cases or property rezoning. Mr. McGlennon added impact fees addressed development either by-right or rezoning. He noted if impact fees were advanced, then there needed to be assurance the costs were realistic in reference to infrastructure and citizen impact. Mr. McGlennon further noted he was the Chair for the Coalition of High Growth Communities and the group was very interested in the issue of the impact fees. He stated the group also expressed concern if the rate of those fees was inadequate to address assistance, adding the Coalition would welcome the opportunity to provide input on that point. Mr. McGlennon further noted the concern for the cost of public education. He stated the lag in state educational support in relation to the expectation of local government contribution. Mr. McGlennon noted encouragement for the General Assembly to increase public education funding. He further noted additional funding for programs that addressed mental and behavioral health, various environmental concerns, and libraries. Mr. McGlennon added two environmental concerns were the Stormwater Local Assistance Fund (SLAF) and reforestation funding.

Ms. Larson noted an item of discussion at the recent Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) annual conference was the state's surplus. She further noted there was no surplus if all the bills were unpaid. Ms. Larson encouraged the bills be paid to see if surplus was available. She noted the importance of public education and full funding. Ms. Larson encouraged the General Assembly to vote against any bills that would eliminate or otherwise reduce the official immunity of police officers. She added some promising trajectory was seen from Senate Bill 942 (the Sales Tax), which showed local tracking was almost to the 2019 numbers. Ms. Larson noted this data reflected no overseas travelers or group business, only leisure. She stressed the importance of tourism to the area's economy and encouraged the legislators to consider any action in that area.

Ms. Sadler reiterated the General Assembly's vote against any bills that would eliminate or otherwise reduce the official immunity of police officers.

Mr. Hipple noted the significance of the stormwater funding for James City County and the County's leadership in the area of stream restoration. He further noted the separation of the Hampton Roads/Peninsula Health District into three districts to address each locality's specific needs. Mr. Hipple stressed the need to change the school funding index for fairer allocation, adding the restrictions placed on the County's budget with approximately 50% allocation to the school system. Mr. Hipple noted protection of police officers was important. He asked the legislators to support the County's 2022 Legislative Program.

Ms. Larson noted the impact of the Grocery Tax. She further noted elimination of the Grocery

Tax equaled approximately \$550 million in revenue and the impact associated with the potential loss. Ms. Larson added the local allotment loss would greatly affect roadways and schools.

Mr. McGlennon thanked the legislators for past support, particularly regarding additional fiscal authority such as the Cigarette Tax. He noted the significant revenue from that tax. Mr. McGlennon thanked Delegate Batten for legislation which addressed the issue of early voting, whether absentee or in-person, to the precinct where the voter resided. He noted some localities had implemented their own system to address that point, adding it would be advantageous for the entire state to follow suit. Mr. McGlennon further noted his attendance at a conference on foster care hosted by Senator Mason. He cited Delegate Mullin's work on criminal justice reform and Senator Norment's work on various legislation, including the Sales Tax. Mr. McGlennon noted discussion on 1% of the Sales Tax going toward school capital needs and the impact to the County's Sales Tax. He asked the legislators their view of the upcoming General Assembly session outline, particularly in reference to James City County.

Delegate Mullin thanked the Board for the opportunity to participate in the evening's discussion. He noted Ms. Larson's reference to the Grocery Tax elimination, adding he was unaware of that cost to James City County.

Ms. Larson noted that information could be obtained and then shared with Delegate Mullin.

Delegate Batten thanked the Board for sharing its legislative priorities. She noted the Governor-elect had not identified any definitive legislative bills or initiatives at the present time. Delegate Batten further noted the transitional time in the House of Delegates, adding she and Delegate Mullin were currently unaware of their committee assignments. Delegate Batten referenced conversations among various Virginia localities regarding the cost of law enforcement caring and monitoring individuals with mental health crises due to unavailable beds. She questioned if James City County had been impacted, adding smaller localities had reduced staff and capacity.

Mr. McGlennon noted the impact at the Virginia Peninsula Regional Jail regarding the significant number of its occupants were experiencing mental health issues.

Ms. Larson noted getting that information, adding sometimes the Sheriff's Office worked with the County's Police Department with transportation assistance.

Ms. Sadler asked Ms. Rebecca Vinroot, Director of Social Services, if she had any information to that point.

Ms. Vinroot noted there was an impact. She further noted the Crisis Intervention Team Assessment Center (CITAC) at Riverside Doctors' Hospital was very helpful. Ms. Vinroot stated any funding and additional resources would greatly assist. She noted the upcoming Mental Health Awareness Response and Community Understanding Services (Marcus) Alert legislation. Ms. Vinroot further noted a local planning group was involved with the Marcus Alert in conjunction with consultation with other localities under the Colonial Behavioral Health group. She stated the plan for the Marcus Alert dealt directly with law enforcement and individuals with mental behavioral health issues, adding more information would be forthcoming.

Discussion ensued on that topic.

Ms. Sadler thanked Ms. Vinroot.

Senator Mason noted a full work session could be devoted to mental health and the

community. He further noted the CITAC Ms. Vinroot had referenced was proposed to move to a 24-7 operation. Senator Mason added a lot of work was being done in that area. He extended his thanks to the Board members for their time and work on outside statewide boards and commissions. Senator Mason referenced Ms. Larson's earlier comment on "bills in the drawer" that needed to be paid and other topics from the Senate Finance committee. He noted the need for discussion in Virginia to modernize its tax code and the impact to the local funding formula. Senator Mason further noted other topics included analysis of statewide health departments and continuation of the SLAF program within James City County. He commended James City County for its efforts with SLAF and the partnership opportunity.

Mr. Hipple thanked the legislators for their participation.

Mr. Icenhour shared a legislative agenda article from the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (PDC) and the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (TPO). He noted one priority agenda item of interest to James City County was completion of the I-64 gap.

## 2. WJCC Preschool Needs Assessment

Ms. Vinroot addressed the Board noting the consultant representatives were present via Zoom. She noted the representatives were available for the presentation as well as questions, adding this presentation had also been made to the Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) School Board. Ms. Vinroot further noted she was joined by another preschool taskforce member, Ms. Carla Javier with Child Development Resources (CDR), which runs the Early Head Start Program.

Ms. Tara Adam, consultant with AnLar, LLC, introduced herself and Ms. Kathi Gillaspay, Head of Technical Assistance with AnLar, LLC, to the Board. Ms. Adam highlighted the two goals of the needs assessment: 1) identify the needs of all children and families within the localities; and 2) explore potential preschool expansion options. She noted the guiding questions for the needs assessment in a PowerPoint presentation, adding different data sources and analysis were used. Ms. Adam further noted the Board had a more detailed description of the report in the Agenda Packet while she would provide a broad overview in the PowerPoint presentation. She continued the presentation highlighting the findings of the first question: what is the current early childhood landscape in James City County and the City of Williamsburg? Ms. Adam noted approximately 25 public and private options were available with some common elements, but also unique with a variety of curricula and such to offer a variety to families. She added providers were impacted by local factors as well as state initiatives and highlighted these points in the presentation. Ms. Adams noted the presentation's reference to public providers included both locally and/or federally funded. She further noted Advancing Community Excellence (ACE) operated Head Start at Norge Elementary School, Poplar Creek, and James River Elementary School. Ms. Adam continued the PowerPoint presentation highlighting the statistics of classrooms, capacity, and enrollment. She noted the next provider was Bright Beginnings Preschool, a public school-based preschool program offered by the WJCC School District. Ms. Adam further noted the five locations included D.J. Montague, Laurel Lane, J. Blaine Blayton, Norge, and Clara Byrd Baker Elementary Schools. She highlighted the eligibility criteria and specific statistics for this provider. Ms. Adam noted the specifics for the next provider, CDR, and its Early Head Start program. She further noted over 20 private providers were available locally. Ms. Adam continued the PowerPoint presentation highlighting the Virginia Child Care Subsidy Program which increased availability and access to affordable quality child care services. She noted there were eight local providers. Ms. Adam addressed the second question: how many children are the early childhood providers currently serving and how has this number changed over time? She highlighted the statistics for children five years or younger, adding the local preschool

population had nearly doubled from 2014 to 2019. Ms. Adam continued the presentation with more statistical data on the children served. She noted the third question encompassed several points: what are the individual capacities of the early childhood providers? are there children who are eligible, but who are not currently being served and why? and if barriers exist, how have similar early childhood systems resolved them? Ms. Adam noted the use of an estimation method to determine the number of eligible children currently not served. She highlighted the number of eligible children, demographic breakdown, and other factors. Ms. Adam addressed the various reasons families did not enroll their eligible children in preschool programs. She noted of the 231 eligible children who wished to enroll, inadequate spacing existed due to providers currently at or close to capacity. Ms. Adam highlighted examples of creative solutions for additional space such as reconfiguration for increased capacity and implementation of mixed delivery systems for preschool programming. She addressed the fourth question: what is the cost (including infrastructure and direct operating costs) to deliver early childhood programming to children? Ms. Adam continued the presentation showing the personnel versus non-personnel breakdown of the cost components and the weekly average cost based on the child's age. She highlighted further refinement to the costs using the past three fiscal year budgets.

Ms. Gillaspay continued the presentation with the fifth question: is it better to have preschool in the public schools in the elementary buildings or in a separate building? She noted the use of quantitative analysis showed pros and cons to both approaches. Ms. Gillaspay highlighted the pros to the integrated preschools, adding these included more integrated curriculum for program continuity, improved access to resources, and other factors. She noted the cons included conflict when resources tighten, often the elementary school became prioritized. Ms. Gillaspay further noted the challenges of wage disparity between elementary and preschool teacher salaries. She added this was not particularly an issue in the WJCC School System as the public preschool teachers are paid on the public school pay scale. Ms. Gillaspay noted there were fewer pros to the separate preschools, adding the larger buildings offered higher quality services to the children and their families. She stated the cons included fewer sites having increased transportation costs, waitlists and capacities, and isolation of preschool staff from the Kindergarten-12 (K-12) staff. Ms. Gillaspay continued with the sixth question: what is the best means/most efficient way to provide preschool services to an increased population? She noted this question was answered by reviewing the high-quality education issue, adding program quality should not be compromised by cost. Ms. Gillaspay further noted there was no "one size fits all." She noted research supported a mixed-delivery system, which used funding from various sources for a collaborative effort to ensure children were in the best spot to receive the highest quality education. Ms. Gillaspay further noted this collaborative effort could encompass a blend of a Head Start program with a public preschool program or public preschool slots in private child care centers. She added various combinations were being developed by localities. Ms. Gillaspay noted maintaining high quality programming, which included qualified and well-compensated staff, developmentally-appropriate activities, and parental engagement. She stated recommendations included 10-25 additional classrooms to accommodate the projected 231 children eligible for public preschool with an additional cost of approximately \$2.6 million in support. Ms. Gillaspay noted a collaborative effort to find creative solutions for the expansion. She further noted questions for consideration which had been sent to the WJCC School Board as detailed in the presentation. Ms. Gillaspay stated two options were considered. She noted the first was to explore options for implementation of a mixed-delivery system, which offered many benefits including cost efficiency. Ms. Gillaspay further noted the use of subcontracting, one of four common types of partnerships, which created slots or entire classrooms within a high-quality private program that became part of the public preschool program. She added this method had proved very effective in North Carolina. Ms. Gillaspay noted the recommendation to develop or create a coordinated enrollment system if the mixed-delivery system was implemented as well as a simplified enrollment system of one application which could be used for various public programs. She further noted the second option addressed the potential allocation of additional classrooms

within existing elementary schools within the district, adding this option offered many benefits. Ms. Gillaspay added discussion with the School Board and its potential plan to build, which could include dedicating the additional space required for eligible children. She noted AnLar, LLC, did not recommend consolidation of preschool locations at this time as it could potentially create transportation issues and other factors. Ms. Adam concluded the presentation highlighting the three opportunities for systematic change. She thanked the Board and welcomed questions.

Ms. Larson referenced a slide with a study from 2004 and inquired if any more recent studies were available.

Ms. Gillaspay noted it was almost 20 years old and that was an issue in the research world regarding early childhood.

Mr. McGlennon asked about the online surveys sent to teachers and community members. He requested detail on the number of surveys and other points.

Ms. Adam noted two online surveys were fielded. She further noted one survey focused more on the demographic background of teachers which included years of classroom experience and years of educational attainment. Ms. Adam stated the surveys were sent to staff at Bright Beginnings, ACE, and CDR staff with receipt of 161 responses. She noted the report's details were included in the Agenda Packet.

Mr. McGlennon requested a copy of the survey instrument.

Ms. Adam confirmed she would.

Mr. McGlennon asked if any questions about facilities was included on the survey.

Ms. Adam noted there were none on that survey. She further noted the second survey was the larger community stakeholder survey. Ms. Adam stated one question requested input on the facility quality.

Mr. McGlennon noted he had participated on that survey. He further noted no question regarding the difference between elementary school facilities and the consolidated facilities.

Ms. Adam replied the survey did not have that question.

Mr. McGlennon noted the information and balance of the report, but added the strong recommendation toward a preference was evident despite an earlier reference in the presentation to "no one size fits all." He further noted the report seemed to assume preschool existed in all of the elementary schools, while approximately half of the schools had preschool classrooms. Mr. McGlennon noted the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and that WJCC Schools had done an outstanding job providing preschool services to children with disabilities, and that reduced individual class size. He stated Bright Beginnings had less than 10 disabled students per classroom. Mr. McGlennon noted students with economic disadvantages may not have the full opportunity at a preschool education with regards to current enrollment levels. He further noted recognizing both groups, thus raising the average classroom size to expand the program.

Ms. Gillaspay noted there was no research to identify an ideal class size for young children with disabilities. She further noted substantial research suggested inclusive programming (a mix of children with and without disabilities) which also included children with economic disadvantage, though not exclusively, was beneficial in development potential possibilities. Ms. Gillaspay added growth and development was possible in classrooms larger than 10-11



students.

Mr. McGlennon noted students coming into the classroom under IDEA would likely require more intensive service.

Ms. Gillaspay noted sometimes. She added some students under IDEA may be speech only, which would be a lower level of service for several times a week versus a child with multiple disabilities requiring more service time. Ms. Gillaspay noted the aspect of teachers and administration understanding the multi-faceted needs as well as the financial impact regarding classroom accessibility and materials. She further noted the financial aspect to have higher qualified staff with the training to do general and special education.

Mr. McGlennon noted concern with incorporation of the classrooms only in elementary schools and the significant economic variation in those schools. He questioned if that would worsen the situation.

Ms. Gillaspay noted that was a good point. She further noted AnLar, LLC, was advocating for the mixed delivery, adding some of the slots could be in elementary schools while still considering partnerships with high-quality private partners with Early Head Start programs who may have slots also. Ms. Gillaspay added the importance of location for community access and other considerations.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Hipple noted he had envisioned this study would address the current operation with recommendations to alleviate issues. He further noted private facilities within the area offered parents the option to attend those facilities. Mr. Hipple added assessing the current situation to review options on building several facilities at a lower cost over the cost of a new elementary school. He noted the importance of maintaining the quality of education and assisting and preparing these children for entry into the local school system. Mr. Hipple stressed the importance of not missing anyone in the process, adding the cost of staff and maintenance to a new building over time. He noted staff and resources were already available at existing facilities which was more cost-effective.

Ms. Larson asked if any pre-K teachers, who were in the buildings where preschools existed, had been interviewed. She questioned the level of interaction between the pre-K teachers and the K-5 (Kindergarten-Fifth grade) teachers and current operations.

Ms. Adam noted in-person conversations through focus groups with the pre-K teachers were not held. She further noted AnLar, LLC, provided feedback on the community survey, adding a significant number of teachers provided feedback.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. Adam.

Mr. Icenhour referenced the data presented on the \$11,275 x 231 children for a total of \$2.6 million. He asked if that number reflected only personnel costs.

Ms. Adam noted that number was based on the Fiscal Year 2020-2021 WJCC budget.

Mr. Icenhour asked if that amount included non-personnel.

Ms. Adam replied yes. She added it reflected costs for personnel, materials, and resources.

Mr. Icenhour inquired if real estate costs were included.

Ms. Adam replied no construction costs was included.

Mr. Icenhour noted this was an operating cost.

Ms. Adam confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour noted the number of classrooms and programs across the schools equated to approximately 368 students with a current cost of approximately \$4 million. He further noted that amount was probably already allotted within the school budget with the \$2.6 million additional cost for personnel. Mr. Icenhour stated the elementary schools were at capacity and pre-K needed to be addressed. He noted 34 classrooms plus four from Norge and James River Elementary Schools for the Head Start program with 25 children per classroom equaled approximately 900 children who could be accommodated in a normal elementary school where the classrooms are used with a lower number of children in pre-K programs. Mr. Icenhour further noted focus on the ever-expanding pre-K program, adding the 10-year rate on the K-5 population was relatively flat. He noted funding for the projected 231 children with potential federal and state money was an important component. Mr. Icenhour further noted several compelling points in favor of co-location with an elementary school had been made, but the construction of another elementary school without addressing the pre-K problem moving forward was, in his opinion, being overlooked. He thanked the group for the information.

Ms. Sadler noted most of her questions had been answered.

The Board thanked Ms. Adam and Ms. Gillaspy.

Ms. Larson noted discussion was needed, adding the school system indicated it needed an elementary school regardless of preschools. She asked Mr. Stevens if he could confirm that point.

Mr. Stevens noted that was his understanding from the meetings. He further noted the school system felt a new elementary school would solve some of the pre-K issues and spacing needs. Mr. Stevens added this had been a consistent point from the school system for several years. He noted the need to develop some solutions.

Ms. Larson noted the school system was not interested in one or two pre-K buildings. She further noted the construction of a new elementary school was on the school's Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and a decision would need to be made. Ms. Larson referenced the presentation and asked Ms. Vinroot what local centers were considered high quality and if they had available room, adding that was important information to know for the discussion.

Ms. Vinroot noted she was joined by Ms. Javier who was involved in the mixed delivery discussions. She further noted the challenges faced by the private providers who participated in the mixed delivery. Ms. Vinroot noted there was a capacity issue from birth to five, adding the need for transition was also a point for discussion.

Ms. Javier noted AnLar, LLC's data indicated insufficient spots available in local high-quality programs for purchase. She further noted the data showed approximately 52 available spots in high-quality programs for the approximately 231 children mentioned in the presentation. Ms. Javier stated engagement of a partnership with a private preschool program required that preschool program must adhere to all the same requirements as those of the public school program. She noted speaking with Smart Beginnings Southwest for more information on mixed delivery, adding the group's plan was very small scale. Ms. Javier further noted the group received funding through the Preschool Development Grant Birth through Five (PDG B-5), but she was not sure that funding would be available to support a mixed delivery model. She noted

administration of a mixed delivery program could not be added to the current preschool administration in the public schools. Ms. Javier further noted the infrastructure was not in place for Bright Beginnings to also administer programs in other community-based programs. She noted there was a significant difference between a child care and a preschool program. Ms. Javier further noted parents look for location and hours based on their employment in terms of child care, adding preschool programs like Bright Beginnings and Head Start were not full-day, year-round programs. She added parents with children enrolled in preschool programs usually had child care also. Ms. Javier explained if expansion of child care options in the community was being addressed, that would be a different discussion. She noted if expansion of the preschool program was the target for high-quality, preschool readiness, then that was another discussion.

Ms. Larson asked if the School System was interested in universal pre-K or prepared for it. She questioned if the School System was looking to assist children lagging behind or to serve everyone, adding that was a large piece of the puzzle.

Ms. Javier noted in conversation with Ms. Amy Gulick, Principal of Bright Beginnings, the group wanted to serve the children they were already tasked to serve. She further noted those children included those with special needs (IDEA) and those under the Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI) who might be experiencing risk factors. Ms. Javier noted universal pre-K was another conversation.

Ms. Vinroot noted approximately 50 children were on the waitlist for Bright Beginnings. She further noted there were children who met the eligibility criteria, but no capacity. Ms. Vinroot added the children who met the qualifications would be the first ones to be served. She noted some parents could afford alternative programs, but low-income and special needs children required the extra attention. Ms. Vinroot further noted the partnership with CDR, Head Start, and Bright Beginnings, addressed meeting those children's needs.

Ms. Larson noted her past experience with an inclusion class program. She further noted the program lasted a year, adding it involved a lot of time and resources on those involved in the program.

Ms. Vinroot noted the professional development and specialized training for staff who served those children was different than those in child care. She further noted the flexibility of classrooms to accommodate different age groups, transportation considerations, and other factors were the desired goal of the Needs Assessment.

Ms. Javier noted the average qualifications of a community-based program's teacher was a high school degree with possibly some professional development. She further noted the Bright Beginnings teachers in the public schools had a higher percentage of teachers with Master's degrees than any other program in the WJCC schools.

Mr. Hipple noted the cost-effectiveness impact to the community and the assistance to support the program within the schools. He further noted supporting the program and the schools in the most effective way, adding construction of a new school or schools would not solve the problem. Mr. Hipple noted additional facilities on the same campus used resources such as cafeteria and transportation to one centralized location.

Ms. Vinroot noted the flexibility of classroom use. She further noted capacity would need to be increased at some point, but what type of capacity. Ms. Vinroot added flexible capacity was more cost-effective.

Mr. Hipple noted classrooms could be designed around flexible needs.

Ms. Javier noted early childhood classrooms were not the same as those of third grade classrooms. She further noted the early childhood classroom required a bathroom, handwashing station, and other elements. Ms. Javier also noted appropriately sized playground equipment. She added not all classrooms could be reconfigured unless they were designed specifically. Ms. Javier noted J. Blaine Blayton Elementary School was designed with one wing for preschool and Norge Elementary School had a wing added for preschool.

Ms. Larson noted the Board needed to work on the impasse facing it. She further noted she was not referencing the money aspect, but having direction, adding that point was still undetermined. Ms. Larson noted that was a discussion the Board needed to have also.

Mr. Icenhour suggested each individual Board member meet with the respective School Board counterpart one-on-one to have this discussion. He noted he had seen each group having discussions within their own Boards and some at the School Liaison meetings. Mr. Icenhour further noted having these discussions between now and budget time in the spring. He noted presenting the argument for a capacity issue accommodation, mostly aimed at the pre-K program, in a more cost-effective way. Mr. Icenhour further noted the willingness to spend money to resolve the capacity issue, but not with the overhead costs for construction.

Ms. Larson referenced a session at the recent VACo conference that highlighted one center in Chesterfield County that serviced 400 students. She noted visiting the center and seeing what works or does not work there and gathering that information. Ms. Larson further noted a former elementary school had been retrofitted to become the center, adding Chesterfield County gave the property back to help address the preschool population need.

Ms. Javier questioned if Ms. Amy Gulick, Principal of Bright Beginnings, had been asked for her thoughts and feedback. Ms. Javier noted the local experts dealt with this daily.

Mr. McGlennon noted the need for early childhood education, child care needs, and consideration of consolidated buildings where child care needs were met after half-day programs. He further noted that option allowed parents a sense of security and flexibility. Mr. McGlennon stated there were several areas for serious discussion.

Ms. Larson stated she wanted the Needs Assessment Study presented at the Joint Meeting of the WJCC School Board, Board of Supervisors, and the Williamsburg City Council. She noted both funding bodies would be available for discussion with the School Board at that time, adding the School Board had not wanted to do that. Ms. Larson asked if the School Board was willing to discuss the issue.

Mr. Stevens replied he would contact the School Board. He noted the upcoming Joint Meeting would address CIP items.

Mr. Hipple noted Mr. McGlennon had asked the pre-K question repeatedly. He further noted the Board wanted to ensure citizens' monies were used in the best way to address the issue.

Ms. Vinroot noted additional data such as transportation could be obtained for the Board if needed.

Ms. Larson asked about the relationship between pre-K teachers and K-5 in the buildings. She noted being told anecdotally there was no relationship and there was true separation.

Ms. Javier noted she had received a text from Ms. Gulick saying there was really very little relationship between Bright Beginnings teachers and staff and elementary school staff. She further noted the pre-K world was vastly different from the K-12 world which attributed to that point.

Ms. Larson noted it was the nature of the situation.

Ms. Javier agreed. She noted each group were administered by separate principals and functioned differently. Ms. Javier further noted there were key points where the two groups converged during the transition to Kindergarten.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. Javier.

Mr. McGlennon asked for the data on transportation for pre-K. He noted cost and other factors.

At approximately 3:13 p.m., the Board recessed for a short break.

At approximately 3:21 p.m., the Board reconvened.

### 3. Waste Collection & Consolidation Study

Ms. Grace Boone, Director of General Services, addressed the Board noting she was joined by several members of the team, Mr. Chris Lund and Ms. Jennifer Porter of Gershman, Brickner & Bratton (GBB) Consultants, to present the findings of the study. She noted the study evaluated if a consolidated service provided more efficient services, better costs, and environmental improvements for the community and citizens.

Mr. Lund addressed the Board noting an update would be shared with a PowerPoint presentation. He noted the study began four months ago. Mr. Lund further noted the presentation's agenda addressed key questions, phone survey overview, key findings, current collection and hauling environment, and the benchmarking of other similar communities followed by possible next steps for the County.

Ms. Porter addressed the Board highlighting the six key questions: 1) what program options should the County consider; 2) mandatory or voluntary; 3) fee-based program or include in tax rate; 4) County-wide or Primary Service Area (PSA) only; 5) County-run or contracted out; and 6) maintain convenience centers. Ms. Porter noted the County's trash program was currently free market where citizens contract their own hauler or use the convenience center with an opt-in on the recycling program. She further noted the focus was to provide information to answer these questions and determine a course. Ms. Porter stated a subconsultant, ShapardResearch, LLC, conducted a statistically significant survey of the County's population, which included cell phone and land line. She noted the statistical breakdown in the PowerPoint presentation, adding simultaneously the County's website had a place for public comment. Ms. Porter highlighted the phone survey results noting callers were asked about current and future programs. She noted statistics showed a high level of satisfaction, but respondents were open to change. Ms. Porter further noted comments for program features citizens wanted most was cost followed by missed or late pick-up. She stated consistent scheduling and fewer trucks on the road were dependent on a consolidated program while other factors were not dependent. Ms. Porter continued the PowerPoint presentation with the ranking of the collection services in relation to items such as electronics, construction debris, and other factors. She noted additional phone results showed the breakdown for private haulers or through a homeowners association (HOA). Ms. Porter noted the median range for monthly cost was \$23-\$25. She further noted the respondents who did not have a private hauler subscription and typically used the convenience center ranked the convenience center high.

Mr. Icenhour asked what percentage of the total this group was.

Ms. Porter replied 5%. She noted the use of a routing analysis and a cost analysis. Ms. Porter highlighted some of the key assumptions, adding what the County and other communities offer in their programs has the highest cost with trash. She noted the industry standard was two-thirds of trash collection program cost was in the collection with one-third in disposal and processing. Ms. Porter further noted that point was key to the analysis. She added the lack of information on the private router information in the County. Ms. Porter noted more than six private operating trash companies service the County, but three of those served more than 75% of the customers. She further noted those three companies were GFL Environmental, Inc. (GFL), Republic Services, and County Waste.

Ms. Larson asked about GFL.

Ms. Porter clarified it was Republic, GFL, and Waste Management.

Ms. Larson noted comments regarding the independent, smaller companies and the impact to them. She further noted the percentage indicated they were not getting much work.

Mr. Hipple noted sizing was an issue for smaller companies.

Ms. Larson noted equipment was another issue.

Mr. Hipple noted limited hauling issues. He further noted some of those companies had been in operation for a long time in the County.

Ms. Porter noted the use of a baseline scenario in the current status with two collection options. She further noted the options included full County coverage and only the PSA. Ms. Porter added this was a planning analysis, not a full cost analysis. She presented the route modeling breakdown, adding recycling was available in the County through the Virginia Peninsula Public Service Authority (VPPSA) as an opt-in with TFC as the service provider. Ms. Porter noted the baseline number of approximately 29,000 currently eligible recycling households in the County for the status quo service. She continued highlighting the 47 routes being serviced with the weekly breakdown for mileage and time. Ms. Porter noted the one hauler/one district option showed 32 routes with the weekly breakdown for mileage and time, as well as the consolidated recycling program breakdown.

Mr. Hipple asked how three haulers were doing 47 routes while one hauler was doing 32 routes.

Ms. Porter noted it was one company operating with different trucks. She further noted the three haulers were traversing more area. Ms. Porter stated if the entire County was routed, maximum efficiency for those routes would be implemented. She added currently multiple trucks moving all around the County was less efficient. Ms. Porter noted multiple trucks could be on the same street serving for the same tons and same households.

Mr. Hipple replied that was similar to FedEx.

Mr. Icenhour noted a minimum of three carriers on three different days serviced his neighborhood. He further noted if one company was the provider, all the trash would be picked up on the same day. Mr. Icenhour noted that would reduce traffic in his community by approximately one-third.

Ms. Porter noted analysis of two haulers and two districts which essentially split the County.

Ms. Sadler asked if the entire County was being used.

Ms. Porter confirmed yes. She noted the full County designation and the PSA only designation in a color-coded map.

Mr. Lund continued the presentation identifying the key findings breakdown of number of households, estimated routes, hours, and miles traveled. He noted projected estimates for trash operating, disposal, asset, and incremental management costs were made for both the full County and the PSA only with County operators and the private sector. Mr. Lund further noted the difference between the private hauler and the County was a 20% profit margin. He highlighted the higher asset cost for the County reflected more equipment than a hauler already in the County with their facilities.

Mr. Icenhour noted one provider/private sector indicated the County contracting one provider to service the entire County.

Mr. Lund confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour noted one provider/County operated meant the County would provide the service inhouse.

Mr. Lund confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour thanked Mr. Lund for the clarification.

Mr. Lund continued the presentation highlighting the total annual cost of curbside trash collection and disposal for both categories. He noted curbside bulk pickup four times annually eliminated the need to call in for select bulk pickup requests. Mr. Lund further noted the total monthly cost for all programs per household monthly in both categories. He added the status quo, which was the private hauler for trash and the estimated \$7 recycling fee, equaled \$30-\$32 monthly.

Mr. McGlennon cited the \$7 recycling fee. He noted the current contractor under VPPSA had tried to renegotiate the recycling fee. Mr. McGlennon asked the status of the recycling market.

Mr. Lund noted the market had recovered. He further noted money was being made on recyclables now.

Ms. Sadler asked if any private sector contractors had been contacted with relation to the rate base used.

Mr. Lund replied no. He noted if it was a free market then those were the current numbers.

Ms. Sadler asked about contacting just one provider the County contracted with for services.

Mr. Lund replied no. He noted GBB Consultants did not want to reach out that far on that discussion.

Ms. Sadler questioned the basis for the numbers.

Ms. Porter noted the number was derived from the categories which included collection, assets, and other factors. She further noted a review of recent bids for York County trash collection, with just trash collection in the \$7 range. Ms. Porter added the consultants felt comfortable with the numbers based on those findings.

Mr. Lund noted evaluation of the different components in the different scenarios. He

highlighted key points to consider for and against consolidation in the presentation. Mr. Lund noted Ms. Boone's team was reviewing the study, adding if the County considered consolidation in more depth, a timeline for the steps to implement consolidation was shown in the PowerPoint presentation. He further noted Step One was a decision; Step Two was a plan and full cost accounting analysis; and Step Three was implementation. Mr. Lund noted the capital cost for implementation included personnel, equipment, infrastructure, and other factors with a timeline of three-five years. He further noted the upfront investment needed for County operation versus one contractor. Mr. Lund added he wanted to return to the slide highlighting the pros and cons of consolidation and addressing the right side (Why Not Consolidation?). He noted the current system was working with high customer satisfaction. Mr. Lund further noted the higher initial cost to the County and change could be difficult. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to present the findings.

Mr. Hipple asked the number of containers per household for the study's basis.

Mr. Lund responded two cans with one for recycling and one for trash.

Mr. Hipple noted additional cans would cost more, which would increase the monthly cost. He further noted he had a private hauler he paid \$24.60 monthly with three cans. Mr. Hipple noted if he put a fourth can out, it was hauled. He further noted he paid the hauler on a yearly basis, adding it was long-time County hauler who paid County taxes. Mr. Hipple noted community comments regarding traffic and other factors.

Ms. Sadler noted her neighborhood had one trash day with multiple haulers.

Mr. Hipple thanked Mr. Lund and Ms. Porter for a great report with good information.

Ms. Larson noted her service cost was \$28.50 monthly and that was due to electronic billing. She further noted her father was charged an additional \$2 monthly for a paper statement. Ms. Larson noted her service included one can with additional cost for a second can. She further noted the mandatory HOA in reference to Ms. Sadler's situation, adding that was not the majority case in the County. Ms. Larson noted her neighborhood had no mandate on trash pickup on set days. She further noted the lack of bulk pickup, particularly after a storm, that was available in the neighboring county. Ms. Larson added the County had a large trash problem, while some unsafe vehicles were picking up trash. She noted some of those vehicles had trash blowing out as the containers were not regular haulers. Ms. Larson stated her appreciation, but questioned how to pay for the service.

Ms. Sadler asked if part of the discussion was on operation hours for the convenience centers.

Mr. Hipple noted no that this was informational.

Ms. Sadler asked about closure of the convenience center overall.

Mr. Hipple noted overall it would tie in with the trash discussion. He asked about the \$4 million for the one-time hauler and if that was the County's responsibility.

Mr. Lund noted that was the private investment and not the County.

Mr. Hipple noted if the County went with a single provider, the County would not put in any money.

Mr. Lund confirmed correct.

Mr. Stevens noted there were some County items if a single provider was used. He further



noted the questions of the County handling customer service and billing, adding if this was a County-run program then the County would be responsible for those parts. Mr. Stevens noted the contractor could handle those points and the Board could make those decisions at a later time. He further noted with the recycling program, a contractor was used, but the County provided the customer service and billing pieces. Mr. Stevens stated he did not see a \$4 million County investment for one contractor, but noted the County did not have a utility billing system, a call center, or staff to address citizen questions and concerns. He noted there were some costs to the County, but those decisions could be made by the Board at a later date if it chose to move forward in the process.

Mr. McGlennon asked about HOAs and prior arrangements. He noted Kingsmill had a contract with GFL.

Mr. Lund noted the residents within the HOAs would be included. He further noted the individual residents would be responsible for payment based on how the system was set up.

Mr. McGlennon asked if that shifted the responsibility off the monthly HOA fee to a separate bill. He asked if there was any information on the negotiated deals, adding he heard recycling had been part of the deal.

Ms. Sadler asked about the contract.

Mr. McGlennon noted the implementation process was three to five years so possibly the contract was not that long.

Ms. Porter noted the plan involved decision on consolidation followed by the other steps which involved billing.

Mr. Lund noted incorporating counsel advice in the process.

Mr. Hipple asked if the consolidation program was implemented and people said they were not participating and instead going to the dump like always, what was the recourse.

Mr. Lund noted trash was still being addressed. He further noted the situation was like school, but without children.

Mr. Hipple noted citizens questioning why a charge if they handle their own trash.

Mr. Lund noted looking at trash like a utility. He further noted there was one provider.

Mr. McGlennon noted discussion on PSA and no PSA as a factor.

Mr. Hipple noted inside the PSA were more developments. He further noted additional discussion was needed. He noted the service setup he had at home.

Ms. Larson noted 76% of the surveyed group used trash collection.

Ms. Porter confirmed that was 76% per the market research.

Mr. Hipple noted that was 76% of the 400 survey respondents compared to 78,000 County residents.

Ms. Porter noted the survey was designed to be representative. She further noted the program was modeled based on everyone's participation in it. Ms. Porter stated there were ways for people to opt out of the program, but the program was not modeled that way.

Mr. McGlennon noted several points for refinement. He further noted HOAs with contracts, dislocation of small businesses that had contributed to the County over years, and trash carters who will pick up multiple cans and also provide back- and side-yard pickup. Mr. McGlennon noted a plus to a County service universally then open burning could be controlled. He added that enforcement could not be done currently in zoned neighborhoods.

Mr. Lund noted some entities have done small business set aside.

Mr. McGlennon noted he was interested in that.

Mr. Lund cited several groups who did small business set aside.

Mr. Hipple noted the work on the convenience center in the Grove area, adding Mr. McGlennon's work on that project. He further noted the convenience centers were used by many citizens. He further noted the Jolly Pond Convenience Center should be open free to the citizens, have a \$25 bulk pickup fee, and get another knuckle boom truck for the County's use with bulk trash pickup. Mr. Hipple added the bulk pickup would address yard debris and trees. He noted the question of how often the service could be used, adding some citizens may use the service more while others may never use it.

Mr. Icenhour referenced the Cities of Hampton and Newport News in comparison to James City County. He noted Newport News did its trash totally inhouse, adding he thought it was mandatory. Mr. Icenhour asked how that compared with Hampton, York County, and the City of Williamsburg. He added he thought each of those localities had a form of consolidated or mandatory County-contracted or County-run program.

Ms. Porter noted York County was an enterprise fund.

(Inaudible conversation)

Mr. Icenhour asked if the County contracted out to one particular company.

Ms. Porter confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple asked if everyone had to do it without any opt outs.

(Inaudible conversation)

Mr. Icenhour noted the upper part of York County was more rural. He questioned how York County handled that piece.

Ms. Porter noted York County was opt in.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the City of Williamsburg was contracted or inhouse.

Mr. Lund noted they had not specifically looked at Williamsburg.

Mr. Icenhour noted his HOA had started with BFI/Republic. He further noted as the cost escalated to \$30-\$32 monthly for just trash, he found another vendor. Mr. Icenhour noted his HOA had offered a one-year contract with County Waste that cost \$16 a month. He added the cost with the \$7 recycling fee kept going up. Mr. Icenhour noted possible cost negotiation on a county-wide program with a large contractor, adding the varied costs for current trash service. He further noted in his opinion for the program to be fully effective, it needed to be mandatory, but inside the PSA or not was a point for discussion. Mr. Icenhour added he

wanted to keep the convenience centers open. He noted if the costs for services came down, then possibly illegal dumping would lessen.

Mr. Hipple reiterated keeping the landfill free, noting there were more problems after the switch to the transfer station was made.

Ms. Larson expressed her frustration with people dumping trash.

Mr. Icenhour noted reviewing the study and analyzing the impacts. He further noted consideration of the small companies and the set asides.

The Board thanked the consultants.

#### 4. Building Consolidation Study

Mr. Stevens addressed the Board regarding the Government Center and possible cost savings if another facility was considered. He noted a consolidation study could be implemented, adding the cost was less than \$50,000. Mr. Stevens further noted he wanted the Board's consensus before moving forward on that study, which he hoped to have available by January-February 2022.

Mr. Icenhour asked if this study would be contracted out for the information and then be presented to the Board at a work session.

Mr. Stevens noted this was another piece of the overall plan. He further noted there were reports on maintenance, future needs, costs, and other efficiency factors, adding this would provide good information. He added there had been discussion, but felt the study could help with decisions on future plans.

#### 5. ARPA Funding Discussion

A motion to Endorse the list 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 an addition to the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) project list previously submitted to the Board. He referenced Ms. Larson's earlier comment regarding tourism-related projects. Mr. Stevens noted \$450,000 for underground electrical work at the Amblers House with interim electrical outlets for use during events. He further noted \$50,000 for landscaping with bushes and shrubbery, adding this type of landscaping would not require daily or weekly maintenance. Mr. Stevens noted the cost of portable bathroom facilities was approximately \$75,000. He further noted use of the ARPA funding could address a stage for tourism use, adding tent and stage equipment was frequently rented for use in the County's parks. Mr. Stevens noted this additional project's funding was based on reduction of the marina infrastructure support, adding the reduction equaled the ARPA funding and a placeholder would remain there for a potential outside entity regarding development regarding parking and such. He further noted he did not currently have a definitive project there to move forward. Mr. Stevens noted the green highlighted projects on the list represented slightly more than \$7 million in ARPA funding with the remaining balance of approximately \$9 million for projects for spring or later. Mr. Icenhour asked for clarification. Mr. Stevens noted the color breakdown for projects the Board had already approved. He further noted approval of the green-colored projects would be helpful in moving forward, adding the blue colored projects were not urgent for the next three to six months.

Mr. Icenhour noted blue highlighted projects on the front of the list had funding allocated, but not the blue highlighted projects on the back.

Mr. Stevens confirmed yes. He recommended the projects on the front use the ARPA funding, but the back page projects were for future CIP or General Fund savings as available throughout the year.

Mr. Icenhour asked if this was representative of the full ARPA funding.

Mr. Stevens noted the total in the ARPA column, which indicated recommended funding, totals \$14.8 million. He further noted the \$14.8 million was the total ARPA funding.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the deadline was 2024.

Mr. Stevens noted 2024 to obligate the funds, and 2026 to spend them. He further noted if the Board was comfortable with the entire ARPA list, he could move forward on it. Mr. Stevens noted the second part, \$7.4 million, was expected to be received May 2022.

Mr. Icenhour asked if only half was available now.

Mr. Stevens confirmed yes.

Mr. McGlennon noted his motion to endorse the list, adding a request for a progress report on projects at a later time.

Mr. Stevens noted that worked well as the Board would be involved in the other projects also. Mr. Icenhour noted receipt of a constituent email regarding the ARPA funding. He further noted the email asked about citizen recommendations for consideration. Mr. Icenhour noted his response was to forward those recommendations to the County Administrator for review and possible inclusion.

Mr. Stevens noted the possibility of a community meeting to discuss current thoughts and if anything had been missed. He further noted further conversation with those interested would be helpful.

Ms. Larson noted the importance of community input. She further noted surrounding communities had included public discussion. Ms. Larson suggested an opportunity to gather that input.

Mr. Stevens noted he would be happy to do that.

## **F. BOARD CONSIDERATION(S)**

1. Initiation of Consideration of Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance to Provide Additional Requirements to Protect and Preserve Scenic Roadways such as Forge Road

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

Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Community Development and Planning, addressed the Board noting the details of the Initiating Resolution in the Agenda Packet. He noted the protection and preservation of scenic roads implemented the Goals, Strategies, and Actions of Land Use 6.3

in the adopted 2045 Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Holt further noted staff recommended approval of the Initiating Resolution.

Mr. Icenhour asked about the timeline after approval of the Initiating Resolution.

Mr. Holt noted he did not have that timeline currently, but staff was working on it.

2. Authorization for a Full-time Position in Real Estate Assessments

A motion to Approve 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

Ms. Sharon Day, Director of Financial and Management Services (FMS), addressed the Board noting two positions in the Real Estate Division were eliminated in 2008 due to the housing market crash and the economic downturn. She noted one position was the Deputy Director of the Real Estate Assessment Division who was responsible for staff supervision, residential assessments, and performing the bulk of the commercial assessments. Ms. Day explained the residential parcels shifted to the four appraisers while the supervision and commercial assessments shifted to the Director of Real Estate. She noted the changes reflected a higher staff workload with one position handling the bulk of the commercial assessments. Ms. Day further noted the reduction of staff still remained while the number of real estate parcels had increased significantly over the past 15 years. She stated FMS was seeking approval to reestablish the Deputy Director of Real Estate position at an estimated \$75,000 for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2022. She noted funding would be provided by savings in the General Fund.

Ms. Larson noted her support of the position, adding she had concerns about the real estate assessments she had shared with Mr. Stevens. She stressed the need for fair and accurate assessments and working to resolve there was enough staff to that point.

**G. BOARD REQUESTS AND DIRECTIVES**

Ms. Sadler began by wishing everyone a Happy Thanksgiving. She extended congratulations to Supervisor Larson for her recent VACo election as Second Vice President.

Mr. Icenhour extended his congratulations to Ms. Larson and thanked her for taking on the position. He congratulated Mr. Kinsman for his 15 under 50 award. Mr. Icenhour noted the work of the Greater Williamsburg Chamber of Commerce through the Military Tourism Committee for the close work with the U.S. Coast Guard Training Center Yorktown and the Naval Weapons Station to establish grants for junior enlisted to receive spending cash to get home for the holidays. Mr. Icenhour further noted the grant was \$300 per person via an application process with an in-person presentation on December 10, 2021, at 10:30 a.m. at the U.S. Coast Guard Training Center Yorktown followed by another presentation at the Naval Weapons Station at noon. He noted he would provide updates at the next meeting, but added they had successfully raised significant funds. Mr. Icenhour extended his appreciation to the Parks and Recreation staff. He noted two members of his household, Cody and Charlie, were strongly in support of the new dog park. Mr. Icenhour further noted the success of the dog park and consideration for other areas within the County.

Ms. Larson noted she was joined by Mr. Icenhour, Mr. McGlennon, Mr. Stevens, and Mr. Brad Rinehimer, Assistant County Administrator, at the recent VACo conference. She further noted her attendance at the Economic Steering Committee presentation by Mr. Chris Thompson, Director of Strategic Housing. Ms. Larson added Mr. Thompson had spoken with

her indicating he was working with Mr. Vaughn Poller, Neighborhood Development Administrator for the County, on affordable housing ideas. She noted attendance at the VACo and Virginia School Boards Association (VSBA) collaborative leadership program presentation on strengthening the relationships between School Boards and Boards of Supervisors. Ms. Larson further noted she and Mr. Stevens served on a panel at the recent VSBA conference. She added her attendance at the K-12 education funds and initiatives presentation and the transition between the current and future administrations. Ms. Larson noted concern for the educational system with the impact of teacher loss as well as fewer entering the profession. She further noted the addition of two more benchmarks, adding that intensified pressure on students and teachers. Ms. Larson noted her attendance at a presentation on tax policy and state budget priorities.

Mr. McGlennon extended his congratulations to Ms. Larson for her graduation and completion of the Board of Supervisors certification program that VACo sponsored.

Ms. Larson thanked the County for its support. She noted the program ran 18 months.

Mr. McGlennon noted his attendance at the VACo conference where he conducted a meeting of the Coalition of High Growth Communities. He further noted his participation with the Police Department at its Stuff the Cruiser Toy Drive event for Thanksgiving, adding another Stuff the Cruiser Toy Drive event will be on December 4 at Target on Monticello Avenue. Mr. McGlennon thanked the Police Department for its outstanding work in the community.

Mr. Hipple extended double congratulations to Supervisor Larson. He wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving.

## **H. REPORTS OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

Mr. Stevens noted he had no report though he extended wishes for a safe and Happy Thanksgiving to all.

## **I. CLOSED SESSION**

Mr. McGlennon noted the Agenda was slated for a Closed Session to address appointments to Boards and Commissions. He further noted he had recommendations and had spoken with each Board member so the appointments would be addressed in 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

2. Historic Triangle Bicycle Advisory Committee Reappointment

A motion to Appoint to Ted Hansen to the Historic Triangle Bicycle Advisory Committee for a three-year term which would expire on December 31, 2024, 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. Social Services Advisory Board Appointment

A motion to Appoint Henry Wells to the Social Services Advisory Board to a term that would expire on September 30, 2025, 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. Colonial Juvenile Services Commission Board Replacement

A motion to Appoint to the Colonial Juvenile Services Commission Board Ronnie Davis for a term expiring on June 30, 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

5. Board of Equalization Reappointment

A motion to Recommend to the Circuit Court Judge that they reappoint Michael Barry to a term that would expire on December 31, 2024, 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. Clean County Commission Appointment

A motion to Appoint Heath Richardson to the Clean County Commission for a term that would expire on 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

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

1. Adjourn until 5 pm on December 14, 2021 for the Regular Meeting

A motion to Adjourn 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

At approximately 4:45 p.m., Mr. Hipple adjourned the Board of Supervisors.

  
Deputy Clerk