

**MINUTES**  
**JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**RETREAT**  
**Legacy Hall, 4301 New Town Avenue, Williamsburg, VA 23188**  
**March 10, 2023**  
**8:00 AM**

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Hipple called the meeting to order at 8:04 a.m.

**B. ROLL CALL**

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

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

**C. PRESENTATIONS**

None.

**D. BOARD DISCUSSIONS / GUIDANCE**

I. Brief Discussion Items

a. Hazardous Dam & Strategic Plan Update

Mr. Jason Purse, Assistant County Administrator, addressed the Board to provide a brief update on two items. He stated there were two dams located within the County. Mr. Purse spoke about the dam on Overlook Drive noting Dam Safety had alerted the County that the dam had not been serviced in several years. He indicated Dam Safety inquired whether the County was willing to make the necessary improvements to bring it up to the Dam Safety's code and standards. Mr. Purse mentioned there were four parties involved who had ownership of this particular dam and discussions ensued to determine the best course of action. He spoke about one option which was to remove the dam. Mr. Purse noted a consultant firm had been hired to determine the scope of work necessary to deregulate the dam and the costs associated. He further noted this would come back before the Board once further information was obtained. Mr. Purse mentioned the objective was for all owners of the dam to agree to deregulate the dam and split the costs amongst the four parties involved.

Ms. Larson asked about the precise location of the dam.

**ADOPTED**

**MAR 28 2023**

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

Mr. Purse replied the dam was internal to the neighborhood of Kingspoint.

Ms. Larson asked if other property owners near the dam were interested in the financial aspect of dam maintenance.

Mr. Purse replied no not currently due to the long-term maintenance requirements.

Mr. Hipple questioned the amount the County owned with relation to the dam.

Mr. Purse replied minimal ownership.

Mr. Hipple stated it was essentially a private road for the property owner in the back of the neighborhood.

Mr. Purse replied correct.

Mr. Hipple asked if the other owners involved would be interested in the road.

Mr. Purse advised there was no interest.

Mr. Hipple suggested potential abandonment and giving up rights to resolve the issue.

Mr. Purse replied correct.

Mr. Purse noted this was not the first instance of a scenario such as this. He mentioned the Jolly Pond Dam, adding there were levels of County involvement. Mr. Purse stated the County did not own the dam but owned the road over top of it. He mentioned the owner of the dam was not interested in fixing the dam; however, the County had some reliability due to the road aspect. He mentioned the objective for the Overlook Drive dam was comparable to the Jolly Pond Dam situation with regard to resolution.

Mr. Stevens pointed out the good neighbor aspect.

Mr. Hipple asked how the County acquired the ownership with regard to the portion of the dam.

Mr. Purse replied it was platted in the 1960s to James City County. He moved on to discuss the Mirror Lakes Dam, adding the County had full ownership of the dam. Mr. Purse stated approximately 15-18 lots could be affected by this situation. He mentioned the dam safety was more significant in this case as there was a roadway involved. Mr. Purse recommended an earlier timeframe for maintenance on this particular dam. He mentioned Mr. Doug Powell, General Manager, James City Service Authority, had studies conducted in the 2020-2021 timeframe to determine the Dam Safety requirements to bring the dam up to code. Mr. Purse added at the time in which the study was conducted the approximate cost of improvements were \$500,000-\$600,000. He noted the potential costs in current dollars would be approximately \$1 million, adding this was included as a Capital Improvements Program (CIP) item in the budget for next year. Mr. Purse further noted decommissioning the dam was also an option. He mentioned decommissioning the dam would potentially impact the lots in the surrounding area as far as lake views; however, the long-term maintenance of the dam would be no longer.

Ms. Larson asked if real estate assessments and taxes would be impacted if the dam were decommissioned for those lots affected.

Mr. Dayle Gallagher, Director of Real Estate Assessments, noted in a previous instance such as this, there were some value adjustments made.

Mr. Purse replied this would impact the 15-18 lots.

Ms. Sadler asked if the dam was decommissioned what would the area look like visually.

Mr. Purse replied half of the water would go away and some vegetation would come back overtime.

Ms. Sadler asked if water would be filled in where the dam was removed.

Mr. Purse replied no.

Ms. Sadler asked if the County would then own the marsh in that specific area.

Mr. Purse replied no, adding in this case he believed all the property lines would go to the center line where the water was located.

Ms. Sadler asked if those property owners impacted would then have marsh in their backyard.

Mr. Purse confirmed yes. He recommended organizing a community meeting for public discussion on this situation. Mr. Purse mentioned potential transfer of ownership to keep the dam. He noted the County was not interested in the long-term maintenance of the dam.

Ms. Larson asked if there were any grant opportunities for this.

Mr. Purse replied the County had applied for the funds; however, it was for the one of the two options noted previously. He mentioned a discussion was needed to determine the best course of action. Mr. Purse indicated the costs to decommission the dam were similar to the costs of bringing the dam up to code.

Ms. Sadler asked what the long-term costs would be if the dam were to remain.

Mr. Purse replied he believed the costs would be another \$1 million at some point as time moved forward.

Mr. Stevens mentioned the importance of the community meeting and providing the necessary details on the costs of long-term maintenance for the dam.

Mr. Purse expressed his belief that the property owners impacted would not want to gain responsibility of the long-term maintenance for the dam.

Mr. Hipple touched on the history of the dam. He expressed his belief that the County should not own any dams, adding the costs associated with maintaining dams long-term were costly.

Mr. Purse mentioned the importance of notifying the property owners impacted, so there was an opportunity to include them on the decision and allow potential ownership transfer. He noted engineering studies were being conducted on the dam on Overlook Drive. Mr. Purse further noted he anticipated a decision being made within the next six months on that particular dam. He mentioned for the Mirror Lakes Dam there was funding available in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 budget, in addition to grants applied to assist with additional funds. Mr. Purse noted he believed the timeline for this dam would take longer to resolve due to various components. He looked to the Board for guidance. Mr. Purse spoke about the Strategic Plan

in which an update was conducted every five years. He noted funds were in the budget to hire a consultant and the update would begin January 2024. Mr. Purse encouraged the Board to keep the Strategic Plan in mind as time approached.

b. Property Tax Exemption Criteria

Mr. Richard Bradshaw, Commissioner of the Revenue, discussed the qualifications for real estate exemptions pertaining to elderly, disabled, and disabled veterans. He discussed the County's program and the qualifications for eligibility. Mr. Bradshaw noted those who qualify would be exempt from real estate taxes in an amount not to exceed the annual real estate rate multiplied by the first \$120,000 of assessed real estate value. He further noted the total combined annual income of household members could not exceed \$45,000, in addition combined total net worth could not exceed \$200,000 which did not include the value of the house and up to 10 acres of land. Mr. Bradshaw stated this past year there was a total of 437 applicants who qualified, and a total payout of \$419,700 in benefits to those qualified. He discussed various alternatives that other surrounding jurisdictions offered. He welcomed any questions the Board might have.

Ms. Larson asked if there was a reference list of benefits offered for surrounding jurisdictions.

Mr. Bradshaw stated Mr. Stevens compiled a list last year, adding he had three copies of that information. He asked if she would like a copy.

Ms. Larson replied yes. She asked about the deferred tax component with the risk factor if the property was not maintained.

Mr. Bradshaw mentioned a potential lien on the property annually, adding if the house was not maintained it would depreciate the value.

Ms. Larson asked about the second number referenced in the Board's Agenda Packet.

Mr. Bradshaw replied that was disabled veterans noting the Disabled Veteran Exemption was made effective in FY 2012. He explained a veteran who had been rated to have a 100% permanent and total service-connected disability by the Veterans Administration was eligible to receive a 100% exemption for the real estate tax for their primary residence. He stated there was a total of 824 disabled veterans who qualified.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Bradshaw.

Mr. Stevens mentioned there was an amendment to the Constitution of Virginia which the Board voted on several years ago. He mentioned various guidelines regarding Disabled Veteran Exemptions. He noted it was a loss of revenue for localities.

Mr. Bradshaw commented the County gained approximately two additional eligible disabled veterans annually.

Ms. Larson asked if there was compensation to localities from the state regarding the loss of revenue.

Mr. Stevens remarked not that he was aware of.

Mr. Bradshaw mentioned proposed legislation in Richmond which would allow a locality to petition the Commonwealth for compensation for anything over 1% in real estate tax; however, that had not been implemented as of yet. He stated when the Disabled Veteran Exemption was implemented it did not include a limit on a dollar amount, adding this created a significant issue.

Mr. McGlennon remarked based on Mr. Bradshaw's information provided to the Board in 2013 the County hit the high mark in terms of participants in the elderly low-income exception.

Mr. Bradshaw confirmed.

Mr. McGlennon inquired if the decrease in applicants was due to wage increases caused by inflation no longer allowing eligibility.

Mr. Bradshaw replied the number of applicants had decreased. He added the County was not turning down a larger percentage of applicants. Mr. Bradshaw noted when real property tax bills were sent out the program information was included. He mentioned a significant number of potential applicants were over the annual household income requirement.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the trend was applicants who were eligible for the exemption in the past who currently were not now.

Mr. Bradshaw replied no, the main reasons were because the property had been sold or the property owner had passed. He indicated the program was designed to help those who did not have the assets available to pay their real estate tax.

Mr. Hipple thanked Mr. Bradshaw.

#### c. Real Estate Assessment

Mr. Gallagher discussed the real estate assessment process. He spoke about validating sales, adding the Department of Taxation provided a list of sale types for qualification purposes. Mr. Gallagher indicated MLS was used as a resource to confirm data. He spoke about an excel spreadsheet that was used daily to look for trends to include factors such as number of sales, average sales, average assessment, the mean and median ratios, neighborhoods, square footage, timelines, etc. to determine the true market value. Mr. Gallagher welcomed any questions the Board might have for this part of the presentation.

Ms. Larson asked if neighborhood amenities played a role in assessments.

Mr. Gallagher replied yes.

Mr. Hipple mentioned two identical model homes may exhibit a variance in sale price based on other amenity factors that the other home may not have.

Mr. Gallagher explained visual aesthetics could not be factored into the appraisal.

Mr. Hipple expressed his belief that the appraisal amount should be based on the purchased price of the house.

Mr. Gallagher replied mass appraisal was utilized to ensure that all properties within a municipality were valued uniformly and equitably. He mentioned value could increase based on bathroom count, fireplaces, views, etc. Mr. Gallagher stated sale price did not equal assessment price. He mentioned examples such as Florida or California were states that based taxes upon purchase price of property.

Mr. Hipple asked if there was a state law in Virginia that required this practice.

Mr. Gallagher confirmed yes, the mass appraisal was a Virginia law and International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) standards must be met.

Ms. Larson asked the total number of staff in the Real Estate Department.

Mr. Gallagher replied currently nine.

Ms. Larson commented all personnel in the department had to be on the same page.

Mr. Gallagher replied correct. He referenced a sales statistic report that all personnel used. Mr. Gallagher remarked each staff member had approximately 5,000-6,000 parcels, adding each appraiser had their own subdivisions to concentrate on.

Ms. Larson asked if each had to follow the same criteria as their co-worker for parcel cases.

Mr. Gallagher confirmed the same methodology was used; however, each subdivision aspect was different.

Ms. Larson replied ok.

Mr. Gallagher stated the objective was to find the median price range.

Mr. Stevens asked if the amount of parcels for each appraiser was considered low, average, or high.

Mr. Gallagher replied it was a fair number, adding a new assessor was recently hired. He mentioned for a tenured assessor it was not a bad number; however, for a new hire it was an overwhelming number.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. McGlennon asked about the overall trend and what to expect for the next assessment.

Mr. Gallagher replied the market was stabilizing; however, he mentioned people were still paying over asking price and there were several cash sales. He noted it was difficult to predict future projections.

Mr. Hipple thanked Mr. Gallagher.

#### d. Government Center

Mr. Brad Rinehimer, Assistant County Administrator, addressed the Board to provide an update on the future Government Center. He mentioned at the Board's January 24, 2023, Business Meeting, the Board accepted an unsolicited proposal from Henderson and the Gilbane Group. Mr. Rinehimer noted further unsolicited proposals were welcome until the May 25, 2023, deadline. He spoke about a meet and greet that was conducted with Henderson and Gilbane, adding it was a productive meeting. Mr. Rinehimer stated no other proposals had been submitted yet. He mentioned an archaeological study was conducted on the James City County Recreation Center property and it was determined no findings were found. He indicated that was the proposed site for the future Government Center. Mr. Rinehimer noted once further proposals were submitted, and review was conducted, an update would be provided to the Board.

Ms. Larson asked the anticipated timeframe for the future Government Center to be operational.

Mr. Rinehimer replied he believed five years; however, it was hard to predict the timeframe

with numerous variables.

Mr. Stevens discussed the process and phases involved with this project.

Mr. Rinehimer recommended the Board view other government center layouts and Board room options to obtain an idea for design purposes.

Mr. Stevens noted he intended on conducting outreach to County personnel for feedback and recommendations as well.

#### e. General Services Building

Mr. Rinehimer addressed the Board providing an update on the future General Services building. He indicated the proposed site for the building was at the Warhill Water Tower site, behind Warhill High School. He stated the archaeological study was conducted and there were various findings such as the original Warhill House, setbacks, Resource Protection Areas, and the overall topography of this site which made it a non-viable option. He mentioned an alternative location across from Warhill High School; however, there was discussion if the future Government Center, the General Services building, and another fire station could be accommodated, if needed. Mr. Rinehimer confirmed all three potential buildings could fit on the site. He stated the future General Services building was scheduled to begin sooner than the future Government Center.

Mr. Stevens explained he did not want the area to look unappealing with regard to fleet equipment, so design would accommodate screening. He mentioned it was an ideal site in terms of location and proximity.

Ms. Grace Boone, Director of General Services, noted this had been a lengthy discussion to ensure it was the correct site and she was excited for the future building.

Mr. Icenhour asked where the future Fire Station 6 would be located exactly.

Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Community Development and Planning, noted it was more of a test fit at this time, adding there was still some discussion on designation. He mentioned the importance of conserving land if necessary for future.

At approximately 9:42 a.m., the Board recessed for a short break.

At approximately 9:49 a.m., the Board reconvened.

Mr. Hipple mentioned Item No. 3 would move ahead of Item No. 2.

## 2. Solar Industry Discussion

Mr. Stevens noted the County had asked Dominion Energy to participate in this discussion to provide information with regard to the subject.

Ms. Crystal Bright, External Affairs Manager for Dominion Energy, addressed the Board. She mentioned her team would introduce themselves and discuss solar industry.

Mr. Austin Jones, Manager, Business Development - Regulated Renewables-Solar, introduced himself and discussed distributed solar energy. He spoke about distributed energy resource systems which were small-scale power generation or storage technologies used to provide an

alternative to or an enhancement of the traditional electrical power system.

Ms. Larson asked what size defined a small-scale solar facility.

Mr. Jones replied typically up to five megawatts; however, he mentioned Dominion Energy specifically focused on small-scale solar facilities within the one-to-three-megawatt range.

Mr. McGlennon asked how much power was supplied by the one-to-three-megawatt range.

Mr. Jones replied one megawatt would serve up to 250 homes.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the three megawatts would serve up to 750 homes.

Mr. Jones replied correct.

Inaudible discussion.

Mr. Jones touched on environmental safety aspects Dominion Energy utilized.

Mr. McGlennon remarked when the County received cases pertaining to solar energy, Dominion Energy was not associated. He asked if Dominion Energy purchased the project once completed.

Mr. Jones replied sometimes. He noted the typical process for Dominion Energy was allowing another entity to develop the land, another developed all the assets necessary to constitute a project that could be built, and then Dominion Energy would purchase those assets from those entities and obtain, build, and operate it.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Larson asked about the sequence of events regarding the process for individual contracts.

Mr. Jones mentioned Dominion Energy no longer conducted this practice regarding individual contracts, adding it was strictly internal for beneficial purposes.

Ms. Sadler pointed out that potentially these projects if managed by a private entity could benefit another locality as the majority of the land for potential development was located at the northern end of the County.

Mr. Jones commented if it was a Dominion Energy project the energy would stay within the community; however, if it was a private entity there was no guarantee that the energy would serve that specific locality in which it resided.

Mr. McGlennon asked if vast majority of cases being considered were in conjunction with Dominion Energy.

Mr. Jones replied it depended as some projects may come from Dominion Energy; however, there were a number of developers pursuing these projects for economic incentives which the federal government provided in terms of tax credits. He mentioned it had increased the number of interested parties to develop these projects and the simplicity aspect of the development process. Mr. Jones discussed various solar programs such as community solar, shared solar, etc.

Ms. Larson asked if Dominion Energy purchased a project from a developer would Dominion Energy acquire all responsibility.



Mr. Jones confirmed yes. He mentioned if Dominion Energy chose to purchase the project there was a collaborative effort to ensure all requirements were met.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Jones.

Mr. Hipple asked if the panels purchased for these projects were manufactured within the United States (U.S.).

Mr. Jones replied there were various manufacturers to include Southeast Asia, Europe, and the U.S. He added all factors were considered carefully prior to purchase.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Willie Barton, Business Development Manager - Distributed Solar Business Development, discussed a potential partnership with the County to create a solar farm project located at the Jolly Pond Landfill. He mentioned the proposed project would be two three megawatt projects on the site, adding the intent would be to utilize 80 acres of this parcel for the proposed projects. Mr. Barton discussed the structure aspect and the intent to build on top of the landfill, adding the solar arrays would sit on top of cement blocks. He stated this would allow minimal ground disturbance, if at all. Mr. Barton spoke about the beneficial aspects of building at a landfill. He mentioned the importance of the interconnection and the close proximity for the project. He discussed the topography of the landfill as the land had already been cleared, graded, flat, etc., adding this was vital for development. Mr. Barton reiterated the benefits of solar projects at landfills for consideration.

Mr. Jones thanked the Board and concluded the presentation.

Ms. Bright invited the Board to tour the Rochambeau Road Solar Facility if desired.

### 3. Preservation Programs, Code Enforcement and Planning

Ms. Tammy Rosario, Assistant Director of Community Development, discussed the Greenspace Program which was the first funded program initiated in 1996 in terms of open space preservation. She noted this program allowed potential land acquisitions and conservation easements. Ms. Rosario further noted staff evaluated properties based on historical, environmental significance, contribution to character, and development threat aspects to establish a priority list to bring before the Board of Supervisors. She mentioned the primary focus was inside the Primary Service Area (PSA) along key corridors such as Jamestown Road, John Tyler Highway, Greensprings Road, and Powhatan Creek, in addition Norge, Toano, Anderson's Corner, and Yarmouth Creek were added later to the priorities. Ms. Rosario commented this program was considered a flexible method as it was not a state operated program and minimized restrictions. She moved on to discuss the Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) Program which was initiated in 2001. Ms. Rosario stated this program was an open application program which allowed property owners to apply during the open application periods, then staff would score the applications using a ranking sheet. She added the highest ranked properties were then pursued for acquisition with the Board's approval. Ms. Rosario advised this program focused solely on conservation easements and the focused areas were agriculture and forestry lands outside the PSA. She remarked the PDR Program was more of a fixed method as there was an established process and guidelines. Ms. Rosario touched on current efforts such as the completion of the Natural & Cultural Assets Plan, increased stewardship of existing protected lands, and preparation of new opportunities. Ms. Rosario looked to the Board for possible future directions such as a directed approach

for new acquisitions or more of an open application period for new acquisitions. She welcomed comments from the Board.

Mr. Icenhour expressed his belief that an open application period would be more beneficial.

Ms. Sadler asked if property owners who were involved in preservation programs were aware of the property restrictions and how did the County monitor property restrictions.

Ms. Rosario replied the owner awareness varied. She stated the original property owners who initiated with the County would have the highest level of awareness as there were various discussions to include legal representation. Ms. Rosario spoke about second and third generation owners who would receive real estate documents with that information disclosed. She mentioned aerial monitoring and annual on-site visits were the ways the County monitored properties.

Ms. Sadler asked if the County was notified of second and third generation property owners.

Ms. Rosario replied no.

Mr. Icenhour asked about how many easements the County was monitoring.

Ms. Rosario replied there was approximately 60 properties that were acquired.

Mr. McGlennon asked if there had been consideration on a private entity conducting the annual monitoring.

Ms. Rosario mentioned surrounding jurisdictions experienced the same concerns as the County with limited staff and resources; however, that could be a point to consider.

Mr. Hipple recommended these preservation programs be incorporated into one program.

Ms. Larson asked if a property owner had an easement was there a tax break associated with that.

Ms. Rosario confirmed. She mentioned there was an upfront cost for the easement, in addition to a tax break.

Ms. Larson expressed her concern with property owner violations. She asked if there was a staff member to relay the restrictions to property owners who were unaware.

Ms. Rosario replied she would be the one to relay that information.

Mr. Stevens mentioned individuals' interpretations varied and he recognized Ms. Rosario's efforts over the past couple of years.

Mr. Hipple commended Ms. Rosario on all her efforts. He suggested a director position who focused solely on the preservation programs and the options available.

Mr. McGlennon agreed on a more expedited approach on this subject. He expressed his concern that some opportunities required significant funds which the County may not have on-hand. He inquired whether borrowing funds would be considered as the value of land and the pressure of development would not diminish.

Ms. Rosario noted she was the one who focused on these initiatives; however, she mentioned other jurisdictions normally had a more team approach to this instance. She noted various

duties were more time consuming than others. She welcomed a team approach.

Mr. Holt noted the Board had already authorized the director position which Ms. Rosario filled. He spoke about various tasks conducted over the past couple of years with relation to preservation efforts.

General discussion ensued on priorities and projects.

#### 4. James City County Workforce

Mr. Patrick Teague, Director of Human Resources, addressed the Board to discuss the County workforce concerns with regard to turnover, recruitment, and retention. He spoke about various reasons County employees chose to leave based on employee exit surveys. Mr. Teague touched on feedback received from current employees from the 2022 Employee Engage Survey.

Mr. Stevens indicated various Department Directors would briefly discuss their concerns within their respective departments regarding County personnel.

Ms. Boone addressed the vacancy concerns within the General Services Department and the effects caused as a result. She remarked this trend of workforce concerns started in 2018 and had continued as time moved forward. Ms. Boone discussed the challenges on current personnel.

Ms. Sharon McCarthy, Director of Financial and Management Services, addressed the Board to discuss staffing concerns within her department. She spoke about the vacancies, ways to fill vacant positions, and additional workloads on current personnel with no compensation. Ms. McCarthy mentioned various factors such as pay, balance between work and home life, telework opportunities, etc.

Mr. Tony Dallman, Interim Chief of Police, addressed the Board to discuss staffing concerns within the Police Department. He mentioned the current vacancies and the impacts associated. Interim Chief Dallman spoke about time off limitations with staffing shortages and minimum staff on-duty requirements. He noted the demand for mental health services for staff. Interim Chief Dallman touched on community outreach programs and the staff required to conduct those events. He mentioned the challenges of finding qualified applicants in addition to the hiring process and requirements necessary prior to starting the job. Interim Chief Dallman added there were also concerns with potential upcoming retirees. He highlighted department improvement initiatives. He thanked the Board for its support.

Mr. Stevens noted Mr. Teague would discuss strategies on how to potentially correct this issue; however, he felt it was imperative to allow an opportunity for discussion for the Board to be cognizant of the concerns being had throughout County departments.

Mr. Teague discussed various recommendations to alleviate staffing challenges.

Discussion ensued.

#### 5. Debt Capacity and Financial Overview

Ms. McCarthy addressed the Board to discuss the County's CIP funding considerations, funding sources, and available funds. She expressed challenges to fund the next 5-year CIP projects new and old in its entirety due to cost escalations. Ms. McCarthy indicated the proposed CIP funds for the Williamsburg-James City County Schools Division had been fully funded. She spoke about being cognizant of the cost of borrowing due to the unprecedented times with high construction costs, interest rates, etc. Ms. McCarthy also mentioned removing and/or adding projects to the CIP could also create a domino effect in regard to costs as time moved forward.

Discussion ensued.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**


1. Adjourn until 5 pm on March 14, 2023 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 1:32 p.m., Mr. Hipple adjourned the Board of Supervisors.

  
Deputy Clerk