

**MINUTES**  
**JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**RETREAT**  
**Legacy Hall, 4301 New Town Avenue, Williamsburg, VA**  
**March 12, 2022**  
**8:30 AM**

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. McGlennon called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

**B. ROLL CALL**

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

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

**ADOPTED**

**APR 26 2022**

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

**C. PRESENTATIONS**

None.

**D. BOARD DISCUSSIONS / GUIDANCE**

**I. Staff Recruitment and Retention**

Mr. Patrick Teague, Director of Human Resources, addressed the Board referencing the recent Great Resignation trend in the workplace. He noted the County traditionally relied mainly on full-time and part-time regular positions to maintain its workforce with an assortment of other positions for support such as seasonal or occasional workers. Mr. Teague further noted the turnover rate was a significant factor, adding it was nearly double the number from 10 years ago. He stated 13% of County positions had turned over in the past year with the current rate trending higher. Mr. Teague noted James City County was trending higher than the national average as well as the state, but the County was closing the gap with the state average. He further noted Virginia had become more aggressive in compensation with reduced turnover rates from previous years. Mr. Teague added the unemployment rate was impacting the County's staffing and retention rate, with the recent unprecedented low unemployment rate with fewer people seeking work opportunities. He noted departmental turnover rates and the variance there. Mr. Teague noted staffing in the Treasurer's Office and the Office of Elections (formerly Voter Registration and Elections) showed one current position that was not there a year ago.

Ms. Larson asked if more in-depth data was available.

Mr. Teague noted he did not have the data available, but he could answer specific questions.

Ms. Larson asked if 75% as noted in Mr. Teague's presentation was the result of two positions reduced to one position.

Mr. Teague confirmed yes.

Ms. Larson asked if exit interviews were conducted.

Mr. Teague confirmed yes, adding he would address that point shortly. He highlighted the job vacancies in the Fire Department, adding those vacancies were reviewed every six months. Mr. Teague noted the trend with 11 current vacancies. He further noted similar trends in the General Services and Parks & Recreation Departments with difficult-to-fill positions and retention of employees for those positions.

Mr. Stevens noted each department head would provide a two-minute update on staffing challenges.

Mr. Teague noted recent data showed 23 vacant positions in General Services with 109 fully staffed positions. He further noted that represented a 29% workforce vacancy, adding only 80% of workers were available to do the work over the past few years. He continued with Parks & Recreation noting a 42% vacancy rate. Mr. Teague addressed exit interviews. He noted some were based on performance issues while others were retirement-driven. Mr. Teague further noted exit interview questions consisted of reasons for departure, pros and cons of working for James City County, and what could be done to retain the employee. He stated the top reasons for leaving were career opportunities and better pay while those same reasons were also cited for remaining at the job. He noted implementation of counteroffers, but cited a recent position was lost to the City of Williamsburg and included a \$20,000 raise. Mr. Teague further noted that was a non-competitive marketplace example where the employee moved on to the new position. He stated a review of the County's benefits was another point to consider. Mr. Teague highlighted the County versus other localities and school systems regarding cost, adding the County fared well. He noted recruitment was another factor. Mr. Teague stated 67 positions were advertised in 2019 with 158 positions advertised to date in 2022. He noted an average of 41 applications were received in 2019 with an average of 12 for the current timeframe. He further noted a correlation in the employment number, which had gone from 97 to 119 vacancies. Mr. Teague stated recruitment efforts showed more advertised positions, but with fewer applications received and higher turnover on those hires which created the constant cycle of lagging behind with vacancies.

Mr. McGlennon referenced the 12 applications noted earlier. He asked how many of the 12 were still actively pursuing the job at interview time.

Mr. Teague referenced the Police Department as the prime example.

Police Chief Eric Peterson noted there may be 30 applicants, but over time that number was reduced to less than 15. He further noted sometimes only one of that number goes through the complete process. Chief Peterson stated it was a bleak picture currently.

Ms. Larson asked about the County's recruitment process.

Mr. Teague noted a relative passive approach at this time due to the COVID-19 pandemic. He further noted the County was now pursuing a more active recruitment model. He stated the County typically advertised on 23 job sites, but that point varied based on the position. Mr. Teague added professional organizations, such as engineering organization and associations were used for advertising for particular jobs. He noted social media marketing, electronic postings, and the County's website were also used, adding job fairs and such were being phased back in for recruitment. Mr. Teague further noted analysis of job turnovers, particularly in relation to the compensation review for the appropriate salary level as related to the job market. He added the biennial engagement survey to gather employee input on jobs, wages,

and other aspects. Mr. Teague noted the County contracted with three firms for hard-to-fill positions, but those firms were experiencing some similarities in reduced applications. He further noted the County worked with four veteran organizations for recruitment, adding a recent one which allowed servicemen to obtain a six-month, government paid internship with the County prior to the end of their military service. Mr. Teague stated the military had provided strong relationships to assist with recruitment as those interns could then move into a County position full-time upon leaving military service. He noted software updates by Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 for mobile-friendly technology as well as an active staffing model in the community. Mr. Teague further noted the review of increases to the salary structure to address competitive rates. He added departments used temporary staffing to assist in areas of staff shortages, but there were issues there sometimes. He also cited a review of additional career ladders to assist people in moving forward in their jobs.

Mr. Stevens noted he had discussed staffing challenges with the Board. He further noted he had asked several department directors to discuss their respective challenges. Mr. Stevens stated the challenges with the REC Connect program.

Mr. John Carnifax, Director of Parks & Recreation, addressed the Board noting market studies with various private daycares, YMCA, and other groups and the consensus of \$15 per hour for pay. He noted a \$5 weekly increase in addition to the REC Connect fee would cover that cost. Mr. Carnifax further noted the REC Connect program closure at D.J. Montague Elementary School due to staffing shortages. He stated there had been no applicants due to the salary and the Before and After shift hours, adding the schedule challenge would not be altered, but competitive salary adjustments could be made. Mr. Carnifax noted the Williamsburg Indoor Sports Complex (WISC) had staffing concerns with the \$12-\$13 salary range, but at \$15 per hour, applications increased. He further noted this challenge was a constant thread throughout various sectors in the community. Mr. Carnifax stated the move closer to the \$15 per hour for entry positions was an important attractant.

Ms. Larson noted she felt the REC Connect program should be a school issue, not a County one. She questioned the impact to current user agreements with the schools if the County did not provide REC Connect.

Mr. Carnifax noted he had spoken with an Assistant School Board Superintendent on that point. He further noted the childcare provider question had arisen during his meeting with YMCA Peninsula, adding York County contracted out to a private sector childcare provider. Mr. Carnifax stated the County's cost for the program and that the fee would increase for whichever group managed the program.

Mr. Stevens noted he, Mr. Carnifax, and Mr. Jason Purse, Assistant County Administrator, had discussed REC Connect and future possibilities. Mr. Stevens asked how many families were involved with the REC Connect program.

Mr. Carnifax indicated approximately 400-500 families.

Ms. Larson noted an upcoming National School Boards Association (NSBA) event and the abundance of information from companies that provide these programs. She further noted the increased fee regardless of the program manager. Ms. Larson asked about other challenges with the REC Connect program.

Mr. Carnifax noted the majority of vacant positions were permanent part-time with five full-time vacancies. He further noted the positions that were impacted, adding it was difficult to find qualified frontline applicants.

Mr. Hipple noted he was in agreement with Ms. Larson for the School Division taking over the

program. He further noted the Board of Supervisors contacting the School Board.

Mr. McGlennon noted the impact to the families if the program ceased. He further noted a new program would be more expensive.

Ms. Larson asked how the County got involved initially.

Mr. Carnifax noted it was probably due to the County being the sole provider. He further noted the WISC, YMCA, or even private providers were not an option back when the program began.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Doug Powell, General Manager, James City Service Authority (JCSA), addressed the Board noting approval of a Recruitment Retention Study in 2019. He thanked the Board as the study proved beneficial to JCSA. Mr. Powell noted the study was conducted pre-COVID-19 pandemic and that labor market, but he added the study indicated only one JCSA position was at the average salary with the marketplace. He further noted barring that one position, all other JCSA job positions were below the market average. Mr. Powell stated the study recommended a 5% increase for the majority of positions with some receiving 10%, which were implemented this year. He noted JCSA currently had seven vacant positions and there still existed difficulty filling more technical positions such as engineers. Mr. Powell further noted recruitment for entry-level positions was not a problem, but retention was a problem, and this impacted supervisor development and other areas.

Ms. Larson asked about supervisor training.

Mr. Powell noted the top 15 supervisors work with JCSA's recruitment team and foremen. He further noted the use of an outside consultant to assist with team building and leadership development.

Ms. Larson cited the example of a recent engineering graduate and if the County's salary was competitive with the Naval Shipyard's salary.

Mr. Powell noted that would depend on several factors. He further noted the comparison had been based on Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) and others, but less in comparison to the Naval Shipyard.

Mr. Icenhour asked about contact with military affiliates.

Mr. Powell noted he had spoken with his contact and that information had been sent to JCSA's Human Resource Analyst.

Ms. Grace Boone, Director of General Services, addressed the Board noting similarities between General Services and JCSA, particularly regarding engineer positions. She noted staffing challenges as people shift to JCSA and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) for higher wages. Ms. Boone further noted a turnover of 27 employees in the Grounds Division alone since 2020. She cited similar turnovers in custodial and other areas within the department. Ms. Boone noted the training time, in addition to purchasing safety gear, for new staff. She further noted scheduling staff from other divisions to assist with convenience centers. Ms. Boone stated the increase to \$15 per hour pay would be beneficial in alleviating staffing deficits.

Ms. Rebecca Vinroot, Director of Social Services, addressed the Board noting the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on staff. She noted from FY19 to FY20, 23% more residents were

served, followed by a 9% increase from FY20 to FY21. Ms. Vinroot further noted over 12,000 residents were served, which represented the highest number of residents served in the County. She highlighted upcoming goals for the department with citizen evaluations, adding some staff had never participated in the evaluations due to hiring during the pandemic. Ms. Vinroot expressed concern at turnover as training for Social Services programs was intensive. She noted the younger staff on the services side of the department, adding compensation was viewed as important. Ms. Vinroot further noted staff turnover to surrounding localities based on higher wages. She added there were two vacancies in the Housing Division.

Mr. McGlennon asked about training, particularly in relation to the evaluations.

Ms. Vinroot detailed the staffing levels on both the service and housing sides and noted her focus was on retention.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Larson noted the importance of Social Services' work in the community and the cost for programs and support.

Mr. Stevens noted similar challenges also existed within the Fire and Police Departments.

Mr. McGlennon thanked the Department Directors for their time and information.

Mr. Stevens concurred. He noted staff did an outstanding job in response to citizen needs. He further noted department directors advised him of areas where help might be needed. Mr. Stevens addressed retention concerns, work quality with inexperienced staff, and employee stress levels. He noted a pay adjustment in the budget proposal.

Discussion ensued on the pay adjustment and entry-level salaries for Fire and Police personnel.

Mr. Stevens noted the salary adjustments as well as changing the pay raise schedule. He further noted the pay adjustment, career ladder, and County culture were favorable factors. He added his hope was to implement the pay changes to other departments as well. Mr. Stevens noted inflation and elevated gas prices. He further noted budget considerations and specific State Code regulations if a tax rate increase was proposed.

Mr. Hipple concurred with Mr. Stevens' proposed timeline. He noted the increase pertained to the tax assessment.

Mr. Kinsman clarified a point on the exact wording for the advertisement per the State Code.

Discussion ensued on the proposed budget, public hearings on the budget, and messaging for those meetings.

Ms. Larson noted the cohesiveness of the Board in its support of the value of County services to citizens. She further noted the importance of acquiring and retaining employees to ensure that point.

Mr. Stevens noted increased revenue from various taxes. He further noted additional positions in the Fire Department and other personnel costs reflected in the budget.

Discussion ensued on budget priorities and clear messaging on staff retention, programs, and services.

Ms. Sadler noted the importance of clear messaging to County residents.

Ms. Larson noted use of the County's video team with the messaging aspect.

Mr. Hipple noted the need for more Police Officers.

Mr. Icenhour echoed that point highlighting the low number of Fire and Police personnel for the County's size. He noted the quality of service in the community despite the lower staff numbers. Mr. Icenhour added Town Hall meetings were paramount during budget discussions.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Sharon Day, Director of Financial and Management Services, noted the advertisement on the reassessment would be posted today. She further noted of the \$10 million, \$8 million was reassessment revenue with the \$2 million balance in new development. Ms. Day explained the tax breakdown that would be reflected in the advertisement.

Mr. McGlennon referenced the reassessment, noting everyone, including the County, was paying more for everything.

Mr. Hipple addressed several points to clarify the reassessment process for citizens. He questioned the County's level of insulation if the economy declined as it had in 2008. He noted the need to have a plan in place moving forward.

Mr. Stevens noted the County was in good shape with the Fund Balance. He further noted if expenses exceeded revenue, the possibility of cost cuts could exist. Mr. Stevens added staff was a large cost, but options such as a hiring freeze and other steps could be implemented if necessary.

Ms. Day noted the County was in good shape, but the need to look and plan ahead was important. She further noted the need to review other revenues beyond real estate assessments. Ms. Day also addressed reviewing rates associated with staff and benefit costs.

Mr. Stevens referenced the departmental cuts and the Board's actions during the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure funds were available.

Mr. Hipple addressed discussion with the School Division on different subjects. He noted the possibility of school programs to educate students on potential job opportunities with JCSA and County departments.

Mr. McGlennon noted he had mentioned this same point with the Hampton Roads Workforce Council (HRWC) last year. He further noted the HRWC had training funds available and while the focus had been primarily on the private sector, the surrounding localities were in need of workers. Mr. McGlennon stated that topic could be introduced at the next Mayors and Chairs meeting.

Mr. Stevens noted the use of videos to promote the various jobs within the County. He further noted the videos could promote the local government as a career option to high schoolers.

Mr. Hipple noted the County could be the innovative leader in such a program. He further noted with staffing concerns, the concept of one government building was more appealing.

Discussion on education, assessments, and other topics ensued.

## 2. Borrowing to Accelerate Projects

Ms. Day addressed the Board noting she was presenting material provided by the County's financial advisor, Davenport & Company, LLC, regarding strategies and capital needs of the County. She noted she would highlight capital projects and the borrowing options. Ms. Day further noted market considerations such as the interest rate, bonds, and other factors. She highlighted the differences between pay-go versus borrowing strategies for capital projects, the County's capacity for borrowing within its own fiscal policies, and other factors. Ms. Day noted she would present various scenarios highlighting the impact of the County's capacity and the ability to repay with different strategies using incremental amounts of \$25 million, \$50 million, \$75 million, or \$100 million. She further noted the all cash option was ideal as there were no future payments, but the large capital plans were less feasible as an all cash option. Ms. Day explained capital projects that are more expensive with longer useful life are good candidates for borrowing while the less expensive with a shorter life are more favorable for cash or borrowing. Ms. Day listed some factors that can impact the funding strategy are beyond financial, such as the project timing, material costs, and other factors. She noted referendums were required for specific types of borrowing. Ms. Day further noted in Virginia, when General Obligation Bonds are issued, the voters make the decision through a bond referendum approved by a majority of voters with an 8-year borrowing timeframe. She added an additional two-year extension can be petitioned through the courts. Ms. Day noted the County can also issue Appropriation Bonds, which had been used to fund capital projects over the past few years. She further noted the County typically funded these bonds through the Economic Development Authority. She highlighted the differences between General Obligation and Appropriation Bonds and discussed the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) requirements on specific bonds and uses.

Discussion ensued on arbitrage and its impact to County borrowing.

Ms. Day continued her presentation highlighting the County's current debt load. She noted the County's capacity to assume more debt and gave an interest rate breakdown. Ms. Day further noted in 2026, the last debt service payment on the 2014-2015 outstanding bonds would be paid. She explained the debt capacity breakdown as shown in her presentation using the incremental scenarios previously noted. Ms. Day noted her scenarios were based on borrowing in 2023, adding the strategy advised against that action and instead would implement a systematic hybrid approach. She further noted the ability to set aside additional money as the County's budget increased and supported establishing a 15% threshold rather than the required 12%. Ms. Day stated borrowing in 2023 would be difficult to complete the capital projects with low staff levels and the inflated construction market as factors. She noted the critical timing regarding debt, the IRS arbitrage, and other aspects.

Discussion ensued on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic to the budget with departmental reductions, decreased projects, and school surplus.

Mr. McGlennon noted projects suited to move forward in the current economic climate.

Ms. Day highlighted several projects which were related to buildings such as schools, General Services, several sports fields, and others. She noted the County was borrowing approximately every other year. Ms. Day further noted those projects were suitable for borrowing.

Discussion ensued on other projects including the Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program.

Mr. McGlennon noted within the next four years, several debts would be paid.

Ms. Day confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple noted a breakdown of debt costs from past years.

Ms. Day noted she would provide that, but she had been referencing principal only in the presentation.

At approximately 10:21 a.m., the Board recessed for a short break.

At approximately 10:32 a.m., the Board reconvened.

### 3. Project Discussion

#### a. Library Renovation or Expansion

Mr. McGlennon welcomed Ms. Betsy Fowler, Director of the Williamsburg Regional Library (WRL), as the first speaker.

Ms. Fowler addressed the Board noting she was speaking about a new library building. She noted WRL was based on a regional contract with James City County, the City of Williamsburg, and York County with the latter paying a lesser percentile. Ms. Fowler cited some statistics, adding WRL ranked in the top 5% of public libraries nationally based on its use as a public library. She explained the localities paid a percent of the operation budget based on the number of residents checking out from the respective localities.

Mr. McGlennon asked if WRL benefited from state funds as it was a regional library.

Ms. Fowler confirmed yes. She noted the Library of Virginia dispensed state aid based on a specific formula in the Code of Virginia which equated to approximately \$400,000 annually. Ms. Fowler further noted the local funding along with the state funding has allowed WRL to be a quality regional library. She gave a presentation which highlighted James City County contributed 71% overall to the operating budget. Ms. Fowler noted that number increased as the population grew annually. She presented an overview of existing facility space which included the Williamsburg Library and the James City County Library on Croaker Road, administrative space in the Stryker Center, and meeting rooms in conjunction with the City of Williamsburg. Ms. Fowler noted each locality was contractually responsible for capital costs within their respective jurisdictions. She further noted the formula based on one square foot per capita of library space with the James City County Library occupying 35,000 square feet with a County population of approximately 78,000 which equated to a 43,000 deficit. Ms. Fowler stated a consultant was hired and recommended a 40,000-square-foot library be built. She noted the history of the CIP request for the new library and statistics regarding the Williamsburg Library which included Americans with Disabilities Act issues and structural concerns.

Mr. Icenhour asked the square footage of the Williamsburg Library.

Ms. Fowler responded 42,000 square feet, but only 16,000 was public space. She noted two options had been proposed by the WRL Board of Trustees which included a new 40,000-square-foot library in James City County at an estimated \$24 million cost. Ms. Fowler further noted a \$1 million site placeholder and 15% contingency budget were included in that cost. She cited the library could serve as a potential economic anchor in the County's commercial corridor and other favorable factors. Ms. Fowler noted the County would cover the capital construction costs with long-term operational costs for three libraries versus two libraries at an



estimated \$1.3 million annually.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the first option was chosen and construction for a new library took place, renovations would still need to be done to the Williamsburg Library.

Ms. Fowler confirmed yes, adding something needed to be done at that location anyway.

Mr. Icenhour asked if James City County built the \$24 million library, then would the City of Williamsburg be responsible for those library renovations.

Ms. Fowler confirmed yes, adding exploration of more options was forthcoming, but a 25,000-square-foot building was a consideration. She noted the City of Williamsburg expressed interest in a downtown library, but there was no interest toward reinvesting at that location. Ms. Fowler further noted approximately \$375 per square foot for the library cost.

Ms. Larson questioned the consideration of repurposing empty retail space.

Mr. Stevens noted discussion on that consideration, adding the WRL Board of Trustees preferred a new library. He further noted a library or a County facility in a long-term lease was not the most favorable option. Mr. Stevens added more discussion on the direction would serve as guidance on that point.

Ms. Fowler equated a 40,000-square-foot library to a Food Lion grocery store for size. She noted certain factors such as ample parking, concrete slab foundation, and others were favorable. Ms. Fowler further noted the convenience of the downtown library as its location already existed in a traffic corridor citizens used. She stated the second option was a jointly constructed 50,000-square-foot library, which was a result of the consultant study and slightly less than the square foot per capita formula. Ms. Fowler noted the 50,000 square feet was deemed adequate for at least 20 years due to digital technology in libraries. She added this library would be connected to the currently underused Stryker Center Building. Ms. Fowler noted the pros and cons of this option with parking a significant consideration for this site and other factors. She further noted Mr. Stevens had suggested several public meetings to gather public input and share information on a centrally located library. Ms. Fowler noted the WRL Board of Trustees were appreciative of James City County's support.

Ms. Larson questioned the cost for option two.

Ms. Fowler noted \$42 million.

Discussion ensued on cost and the County's and the City of Williamsburg's financial obligation for a jointly funded facility.

Ms. Larson questioned if the City of Williamsburg paid operational costs for the upper County library.

Ms. Fowler replied yes, adding it was all together. She noted 15% of the operational costs were paid by the City of Williamsburg. She further noted the libraries were run as a single system.

Mr. Hipple noted a single system was fine, but parking downtown was a major issue. He further noted the central library should be a 40-year library possibly in New Town which offered proximity to the City of Williamsburg as well. Mr. Hipple added there were cost savings to that location also.

Discussion ensued on community theater, economic benefits, existing facilities, and public

input.

Mr. Stevens noted support for a library expansion which would be reflected in the 5-year CIP budget. He further noted reviewing land and space options over the upcoming months.

#### b. Future Government Complex

Mr. Jason Purse, Assistant County Administrator, addressed the Board with continued discussion on projects. He noted a preliminary ranking of projects from the Board would help in developing priorities. Mr. Purse further noted he would give a presentation on the Building Consolidation Study. He added studies over the past several years which included the Facilities Master Plan and the Space Needs Study. Mr. Purse noted the consultants merged the information highlighting current CIP budget costs for building needs versus new construction and consideration of operational savings. He further noted these points would be discussed during Public Hearing at one of the Board's Business Meetings. Mr. Purse stated the numbers in the presentation reflected approximately 400,000 square feet of County space was currently used, adding County building space was approximately 156,000 square feet below current needs. He noted those numbers were not indicative of future needs.

Ms. Larson asked if staff had returned 100% in-house post COVID-19 pandemic.

Mr. Purse responded yes.

Ms. Larson asked if all staff needed to be in office all the time.

Mr. Purse noted there could be some savings, but the office space impact was a true consideration. He further noted the possibility of conference rooms as shared office space. Mr. Purse stated the space needs and cost for the Social Services Department. He highlighted costs and the future impact to the CIP. Mr. Purse listed the various County locations, adding the School Division had been included to give an overall view for space and costs. He noted two scenarios would be presented. Mr. Purse further noted one scenario, the controlled or existing scenario, had everyone staying in their current locations and the costs to expand those facilities. He stated the second scenario, the changed scenario, was the consolidated building. Mr. Purse noted operating costs, capital costs, and other variables were factored such as the possibility of selling the Mounts Bay Road government complex site or other locations if a consolidated building option were pursued.

Ms. Larson questioned if some properties listed in the presentation meant they were available for future sale.

Mr. Purse noted some were, but not the majority. He continued the presentation highlighting parking needs of a library expansion. Mr. Purse noted the cost comparison of surface versus underground parking and energy efficiency, which indicated approximately 20% savings with the consolidated building. He further noted savings from electricity and water usage, vehicle mileage, and other factors, which the consultants would address. Mr. Purse stated a new facility cost was approximately \$350-\$450 per square foot of new building, adding renovation was approximately \$100-\$200 per square foot. He noted the existing facility renovation was approximately \$65 million, which included HVAC replacements, roofs, and other factors, with the cumulative 30-year cost approximately \$91 million. Mr. Purse further noted a new consolidated building was approximately \$99 million, but that number could be impacted with the sale of other County property. He noted additional savings with surface parking.

Mr. Hipple noted even if an existing building has renovation, the building was still old versus a new building.

Ms. Larson questioned the timeline on the scenario decision.

Mr. Purse noted he would seek priorities from the Board on projects. He stated the consolidation option would not be made at this meeting, but rather this was an information session.

Mr. Hipple referenced earlier comments about staff and maintenance of existing buildings, adding a consolidated facility could ease some of those concerns. He noted he was a strong supporter of the consolidated building option.

Mr. Purse noted the move to either renovate or build new. He further noted it was approximately five years from decision to new building occupancy. Mr. Purse noted the longer the decision delayed on the consolidation option, the higher the costs to maintain existing buildings.

Ms. Larson asked if General Services was part of the consolidation piece.

Mr. Purse answered no.

Ms. Larson asked if Human Services was considered.

Mr. Purse responded potentially. He noted that was one of the initial decisions the Board would need to make. Mr. Purse further noted Olde Towne Medical and Dental Center would be moving from the Human Services location. He discussed the option of renovation costs.

Mr. Stevens noted the lease was through June 2024.

Ms. Sadler asked about the timeline and the CIP.

Mr. Stevens noted the timeline and the allocation for design to allow for a July 2024 (Fiscal Year 2025) construction start date.

Discussion ensued on a Human Services location and budget items.

Ms. Larson asked if the County did not have the land for a new Human Services location, would the cost would increase.

Mr. Purse confirmed yes. He noted various sites had been factored by the consultants. Mr. Purse further noted discussion with all of the Eastern State developers included land to the County for public use. He stated all of the applicants understood that expectation of the public use aspect.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Stevens noted if the move from the government center to a consolidated facility was equidistant for residents with better access, it made sense based on the Consolidation Study. He further noted the specifics of location and what would be housed there were still needed. Mr. Stevens added Social Services was the exception as the other items were independent. He asked the Board if it was in agreement to move the government complex to a consolidated facility.

Mr. Purse noted there would be more discussion, particularly in reference to the earlier presentation on the borrowing capacity. He further noted General Services would be a separate point.

Ms. Larson noted with a consolidated facility, the School Division could be housed there.

Mr. Stevens stated the School Division's numbers were included in the Space Needs Study.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. McGlennon asked about several buildings on a campus, referencing the Virginia Beach tragedy. He noted options if a building was inaccessible for a time.

Mr. Stevens noted a designer could present options and costs to address those concerns.

Mr. Hipple noted a safety room for each floor of a building.

Mr. Stevens stated the master plan presented envisioned one building. He noted some design ideas that allowed for common areas such as conference rooms. Mr. Stevens further noted the long-term cost and serving the community, adding a consolidated building also offered convenience.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Purse noted today's discussion helped prepare for future borrowing as projects were identified. He further noted the other items were previously mentioned by the Board for consideration and he asked Board members to make notes regarding budget consideration.

#### c. Rural Land Protection

Mr. Purse noted the Board had already noted the PDR program. He requested direction if the Board wanted to set aside \$5 million or more toward the program.

Discussion ensued on bond referendums and funding sources.

Mr. Stevens noted a ranking of projects would provide direction. He further noted garnering citizen input as discussions moved forward.

#### d. Competition Pool

Mr. Purse provided costs for various pool sizes based on those being built by other localities. He referenced a local pool complex which cost \$30 million, but it housed three pools: 15-meter, 25-meter, and a leisure therapy. Mr. Purse noted one stadium pool with seating cost approximately \$20 million.

Ms. Larson noted the necessity of a pool if the School Division offered a swim program. She noted a competition pool would not generate outside revenue and referenced Hampton High School and its facility.

Discussion ensued on pool uses for swim teams and citizens.

Mr. Purse noted additional information could be obtained on other pool options if the Board deemed it.

#### e. General Services Complex

Discussion continued on the needs of General Services for more space and the timeline.

#### f. Human Services Renovation or Relocation

Mr. Purse noted no additional discussion on that project, adding it was already included in the list of budget projects.

g. Park Projects Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Review

Mr. Purse noted a range of projects were listed for Board consideration. He further noted a variety of Parks & Recreation projects were already included in the CIP. Mr. Purse highlighted some additional projects discussed in the Parks & Recreation Master Plan, but not included in the current budget.

At approximately 11:51 a.m., Mr. Hipple left the meeting.

h. Schools CIP Review

Mr. Purse continued the discussion regarding the Preschool space consideration.

Ms. Day noted the Preschool space would be an addition to next year's County CIP.

Discussion ensued.

i. Other Projects

General discussion ensued on priorities and projects.

At approximately 12:05 p.m., the Board recessed for a short break to individually rank the projects.

At approximately 12:12 p.m., the Board reconvened.

4. Miscellaneous

a. Mowing Criteria for County to Consider

Ms. Boone addressed the Board on median maintenance. She presented updates on additional mowing to the current cycle with the renewed contract. Ms. Boone noted a contract with the Virginia Peninsula Regional Jail for inmates to do litter cleanup several times per week. She further noted the locations and specifics of the contract. Ms. Boone stated the use of the road crew, comprised of six staff, would address cleaning around signs and sweeping curbs and gutters.

Mr. Icenhour asked if VDOT cleaned the sand used during inclement winter weather from the streets.

Ms. Boone answered yes. She noted the County's work would supplement VDOT's sweeping. Ms. Boone further noted mowing and edging biweekly of sidewalks. She noted signage and upcoming discussion with VDOT regarding responsibilities.

b. Strategic Plan Refresh

Mr. Purse gave a brief presentation on updating the Strategic Plan and the incorporation of missing operational initiatives that may not have been captured in the document. He noted the refresh allowed the Board and the community to see the County's progress in meeting those

goals, and if other strategic goals were needed. Mr. Purse further noted some new goals included technology updates, Parks & Recreation Master Plan updates, and others, while ensuring the strategic goals the Board envisioned were included. He stated the process would restart next year to determine if the seven goals still matched community needs for the County. Mr. Purse noted the Strategic Plan was a five-year document and reviewing it would be a timely move in relation to budget preparation.

Mr. Icenhour noted this was an important move.

#### c. Government Discussion of State Maintenance Code

Mr. Purse noted some County properties and long-running issues with County building codes regarding changes. He further noted requirements per the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code (USBC) as well as the Property Maintenance Code. Mr. Purse stated the latter Code allowed for a broader range of standards for long-term property maintenance and was a more intense process. He noted that Code would be implemented County-wide, adding it had some true benefits as well as other considerations such as implementation and enforcement.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Icenhour noted finding a middle ground on this point.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Larson reiterated a middle ground approach.

Mr. Kinsman noted he could research the Board's concerns regarding the sections of the USBC.

Mr. McGlennon stated it should be considered with the next legislative agenda program.

#### d. Marijuana Referendum Requirements

Mr. Kinsman noted the General Assembly did not pass the legislation on retail. He further noted the new law allowed for personal use, but no retail sales. Mr. Kinsman added there was no referendum and the County would not be taking any action. He noted personal possession and growth of marijuana were allowed.

Discussion ensued.

#### e. Other Topics

Mr. Icenhour asked about the Eastern State property potential. He noted an earlier active approach to properties prior to the Board's review, adding Mr. Stevens and Mr. Kinsman would be involved in discussion with the State and potential developers at the start.

Discussion ensued regarding possible uses for the site and location possibilities for the centralized government facility.

General discussion ensued regarding staff researching several points and some possible Ordinance updates.

### 5. Tour of Courthouse Green Properties (optional)

Mr. Stevens noted the tour was available for any Board member who had not previously visited the facility.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**

1. Adjourn until 1 pm on March 22, 2022 for the Business Meeting

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

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

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

At approximately 1 p.m., Mr. McGlennon adjourned the Board of Supervisors.

  
Deputy Clerk