

**MINUTES**  
**JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**RETREAT**  
**LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER COMMUNITY ROOM**  
**4600 OPPORTUNITY WAY**  
**WILLIAMSBURG, VA 23188**  
**March 2, 2024**  
**8:00 AM**

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Larson thanked the Board and staff for attending the Retreat on a Saturday.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Barbara E. Null, Stonehouse District  
Michael J. Hipple, Powhatan District  
John J. McGlennon, Roberts District  
James O. Icenhour, Vice Chair, Jamestown District  
Ruth M. Larson, Chair, Berkeley District

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

**ADOPTED**

**MAR 26 2024**

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

**C. FACILITATED DISCUSSION/ACTIVITY**

Mr. Jason Purse, Assistant County Administrator, addressed the Board regarding discussion on various topics. He noted Ms. Sharon Amoss, Director of Operations for InnerWill Leadership Institute, was available for the discussion facilitation. Mr. Purse stated InnerWill Leadership Institute had previously worked with various County departments and the County's Executive Leadership Team in a similar discussion.

Ms. Amoss introduced herself and thanked the County for its partnerships with InnerWill. She provided some background information on the company. Ms. Amoss noted the discussion would address important points for individual Board members as well as the collective Board. She acknowledged the 160 years of the Board's collective leadership in addition to the perspective of the Board's newest member. Ms. Amoss detailed the outline for the Board's discussion to garner information.

Mr. McGlennon acknowledged a strength of the Board was mutual respect among its members and the common goal of pursuit of a better community.

Ms. Larson echoed the mutual respect was valued by citizens.

Mr. Hipple noted each Board member was entitled to individual thoughts, adding respect for those differences was important. He further noted the importance of the community.

Ms. Larson stated the mutual respect extended to recognition of each Board member's workload.

Ms. Amoss acknowledged the amount of time and work required of the Board members.

Mr. Icenhour echoed other comments regarding balance between family, work, and the Board.

Ms. Null referenced her tenure on the Planning Commission and the mutual respect of working with that group. She added that experience was helpful in transitioning to the Board. Ms. Null emphasized the importance of community involvement.

Discussion ensued on community, quality of life, and involvement.

Ms. Amoss noted identification of effective and ineffective actions and the Board's response to such situations.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Larson stated mutual support for fellow Board members. She added opinions could differ, but commitment to the Board and the community were important.

Ms. Null noted the need for citizen involvement and contact with Board members on issues. She referenced the Comprehensive Plan and citizen input for the County.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Icenhour stated the importance of engaging constituents to listen and learn. He noted the significance of decision-making along with the education around the situation and decision.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Amoss highlighted the Board's input and feedback.

Mr. McGlennon noted the importance of staff and its role in assisting Board members.

Mr. Icenhour echoed that comment. He noted he worked with staff for answers to problems and questions, as well as to educate constituents.

Ms. Amoss shifted the focus to individualized Board viewpoints. She described the details of the format.

Small group discussion ensued.

Ms. Amoss noted the next phase focused on the County overall. She further noted areas of change, no change, and other factors for consideration.

Discussion ensued on community character preservation, growth, and other aspects.

Ms. Larson noted local parks and education were strong points in the community.

The Board agreed County staff was great.

Discussion ensued on affordable housing, businesses, and other factors.

Ms. Amoss highlighted some discussion points.

Discussion on competitive pay for County staff ensued.

Mr. McGlennon noted younger workers sought a better work-life balance than previous generations.

Ms. Amoss acknowledged the changes in the workforce.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Amoss noted a discussion point on the industrial base in the County.

Discussion ensued on industry, skilled laborers, and other factors.

Ms. Amoss summarized several key points from the discussion. She noted challenges within the County as constituent needs and societal changes shifted. Ms. Amoss stated the individual and group discussions were helpful tools. She expressed her pleasure working with the dedicated people in James City County.

The Board thanked Ms. Amoss.

At approximately 10:05 a.m., the Board recessed for a short break.

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

#### **D. BOARD DISCUSSIONS / GUIDANCE**

Ms. Larson extended her thanks to staff for coordinating the facilitated discussion with Ms. Amoss.

##### **1. Strategic Plan Input**

Mr. Purse stated it was time for the Board's review of the Strategic Plan which originated in 2016. He noted after the 2008 recession that the County had primarily focused on maintenance and capital projects and rebuild the workforce after the economic downturn. Mr. Purse provided some historical points to the 2016 Strategic Plan in which the County focused on seven goals. He noted additional initiatives or capital projects were highlighted within the seven goals. Mr. Purse further noted those initiatives and projects were reflected in the past few budgets. He detailed the timeline, adding input opportunities from the Board, staff, and the public would be available.

##### **2. Red Light and School Speed Zone Cameras**

Mr. Brad Rinehimer, Assistant County Administrator, addressed the Board regarding its inquiry into school speed zone limit cameras and red light cameras. He noted in 2006-2007 the County had reviewed the use of red light cameras, adding James City County was one of two localities in the Commonwealth granted permission to implement the use of those cameras. Mr. Rinehimer further noted the County had chosen not to implement their use. He stated the County had school bus stop-arm cameras. Mr. Rinehimer noted available vendors for both the red light and school speed zone limit cameras attended both the County Administrator and Police conferences. He further noted school zone speed studies had been done previously by some of the vendors, adding there were speeding issues in some of the local school zones. Mr. Rinehimer provided statistics on County schools and intersections. He noted criteria for establishing one red light camera per 10,000 residents, adding a maximum of eight red light cameras could be installed. Mr. Rinehimer stated there was a maximum \$50 fine per civil violation, adding a maximum \$100 fine accompanied the school speed zone violation. He noted if the Board moved forward then both he and Police Chief Mark Jamison wanted to incrementally implement the use with three schools, Toano Middle School, Stonehouse Elementary School, and Lafayette High School. Mr. Rinehimer provided additional details.

Ms. Larson noted the highest volume of complaints regarding safety were the Stonehouse Elementary School and Lafayette High School areas. She noted implementation of the cameras

was not a revenue generator, but a safety concern. Ms. Larson favored the camera implementation.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the speed cameras were separate from the red light camera criteria per 10,000 residents.

Mr. Rinehimer responded separate items. He noted there was no limit on the school speed zone cameras.

Mr. Icenhour noted with the phased implementation more statistics would be available regarding speeding and accidents.

Discussion on the timeline and administrative fees ensued.

Ms. Larson asked for data.

Mr. Rinehimer noted the data would be supplied by the vendor. He emphasized Ms. Larson's point that this venture was not a revenue generator, but a safety issue.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Rinehimer provided cost and other details.

Discussion ensued.

The Board agreed with Mr. Rinehimer's proposed plan.

### 3. Government Center

Mr. Rinehimer referenced some informational points regarding the Government Center. He provided a basic update on the interim agreement between the working group and the Henderson-Gilbane group. Mr. Rinehimer noted the nine-month timeline, adding there could be an extension. He detailed the next step if another interim agreement was implemented.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Icenhour questioned the timeline.

Mr. Rinehimer noted the working group and the Henderson-Gilbane group were establishing a schedule and would be meeting on a bi-weekly basis. He further noted that input from the Board, the public, staff, and other factors would need to be considered and a schedule established for each group.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Rinehimer.

### 4. Human Resources

Mr. Patrick Teague, Director of Human Resources, addressed the Board noting the Human Resource presentation would feature Mr. Dan Ripberger with Bolton. He noted the County had contracted with Bolton for a compensation and classification study in the fall of 2023. Mr. Teague noted the results and recommendations from Bolton would be presented followed by possible County decisions regarding those study findings.

#### a. Pay and Classification Study

Mr. Ripberger, Practice Lead, addressed the Board and thanked it for the opportunity to present Bolton's findings. He stated Bolton conducted both compensation and benefit consulting. Mr. Ripberger noted Bolton evaluated the current program and compensation, performed a market analysis, and several other components. He further noted some key tasks of the project, which included interviews with departmental and organizational leadership, were compiled. Mr. Ripberger stated job classifications and descriptions were also reviewed. He noted exempt and non-exempt job positions were identified and analyzed in the study. Mr. Ripberger addressed policy review and its alignment with the current market was another analysis point. He highlighted percentages between pay grades and within ranges in relation to the market, adding a formula was used for determining the compensation ratio (Compa-ratio) for range. Mr. Ripberger noted these numbers determined if an organization was within a competitive range with the market. He provided additional information on research and comparative reviews. Mr. Ripberger cited percentages ranging from 25% to 75% demonstrated how the County ranked in pay comparisons to the market, adding data from the private sector was identified. He identified particular areas where the private sector traditionally paid higher. Mr. Ripberger continued the presentation highlighting Bolton's recommendations. He noted the continuation of job analysis and documentation with Human Resources reviewing these areas for compliance and consistency. Mr. Ripberger referenced the market noting a balance of internal and external equity was necessary. He noted 65% was the target point Bolton used. He further noted maintaining the County's current pay ranges but aligning the midpoints to the market target. Mr. Ripberger provided additional details on implementation if the Board chose the recommendations.

Mr. Teague thanked Mr. Ripberger for the presentation.

At approximately 11:13 a.m., the Board recessed for a short break.

At approximately 11:18 a.m., the Board reconvened.

Mr. Teague noted he would continue the discussion following Mr. Ripberger's presentation. He stated discussion would focus on the proposed compensation study and benefits and retirement-health reimbursements. Mr. Teague referenced Agenda Packet material which highlighted statistics regarding service years for County employees. He noted 68% of County staff had 10 years or less of service. Mr. Teague discussed the relation of experience and pay and its impact on the Compa-ratio.

Discussion ensued on trends, retention years, and other factors.

Mr. Teague stated salary was consistently the number one reason employees cited for leaving employment during their exit interviews. He noted staff's proposal would align with Bolton's 65% recommendation. Mr. Teague provided examples of the County's current pay structure at 50% and the impact with the 65% implementation. He continued the presentation identifying other compensation components such as salary range based on years of experience. Mr. Teague addressed the implementation costs associated with the respective percentiles identified. He noted adjustments regarding temporary and on-call positions were being reviewed. Mr. Teague further noted other compensation considerations based on Bolton's recommendations.

Discussion ensued on turnover rate, retention, and other factors.

Mr. Stevens noted department heads had reviewed data regarding costs and new hires in addition to other considerations. He further noted the need for Board input on the material presented. Mr. Stevens addressed the salary impact on new employees and long-term employees with adjustments.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Stevens noted the implementation of career ladders and development processes in certain departments. He added those situations were subject to funding.

Discussion ensued.

The Board noted a consensus to move forward with the 65% range consideration.

b. Benefits

Mr. Stevens noted Mr. Teague would address retirement-health reimbursements. Mr. Stevens provided details from surrounding localities regarding that benefit and alternative options.

Ms. Larson questioned years of service in relation to retirement-health reimbursement.

Mr. Teague provided details for various localities. Mr. Teague explained the criteria regarding the defined benefit plan. He noted the County was evaluating a defined contribution approach in which money was allocated but a percentage or dollar figure was not guaranteed. Mr. Teague further noted the account balance was your allocation, adding it was similar to a defined contribution like a 401(k). He stated the plan would include contributions, qualified medical expenses, eligibility rules, and other details. Mr. Teague continued the presentation with estimated contribution costs for both full-time and part-time employees. He noted the plan was based on years of service, similar to the Virginia Retirement System currently used by the County of a five-year vestment period. Mr. Teague further noted approximately 90 days for the set-up for the plan. He addressed payment details.

Mr. Stevens stated he wanted to present the plan concept to the Board with decisions on implementation and other details for a future discussion. He noted the criteria regarding funding for the account. Mr. Stevens further noted more plan design would be forthcoming if the Board chose to explore the option.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Teague noted this plan was based on a defined contribution not a defined benefit.

Mr. Stevens addressed the timeline and specifics regarding the plan if the Board agreed to move forward.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Teague addressed the next benefits point focused on leave. He noted the proposal included paternity, maternity, and family care leave. Mr. Teague provided details on the respective leave types. He noted these were not new leave designations, but rather a new way to use the leave which currently existed.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Icenhour questioned how accumulated leave was compensated.

Mr. Stevens provided details on the payout.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Teague provided a healthcare plan update. He noted an increase to the high deductible healthcare plan deductible for individual and family which was mandated by the IRS. Mr. Teague further noted details regarding changes to the traditional plan.

At approximately 12:06 p.m., the Board recessed for lunch.

At approximately 12:36 p.m., the Board reconvened.

c. Collective Bargaining

Ms. Liz Parman, Deputy County Attorney, addressed the Board noting there were several Virginia localities that permitted collective bargaining. She noted a list was included in the Agenda Packet, adding the Cities of Richmond and Charlottesville and several localities in Northern Virginia participated. Ms. Parman further noted activity regarding collective bargaining in Hampton Roads as well as a task force in the City of Virginia Beach to study the feasibility for its employees. She cited details for other localities. Ms. Parman noted the overall Virginia employee unions accounted for 4.3% of all wage and salaried workers compared to 10% nationwide. Ms. Parman noted several bills were in the General Assembly which could impact the County. She detailed the ones that remained in Committee and others that continued into the 2025 Session. Ms. Parman noted monitoring the General Assembly's actions in the upcoming years. She further noted she and Mr. Teague had listed general pros and cons of collective bargaining on the handout in the Agenda Packet. Ms. Parman noted with the scarcity of employees, their bargaining power had increased over the past few years. She referenced the state's grievance procedure to assist employees with employment protection. Ms. Parman cited additional pro and con points to unions. She noted if the Board pursued collective bargaining in the future, the changes would need to be implemented by Ordinance or resolution. Ms. Parman provided details for the process.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. Parman.

5. Community Development

Mr. Purse noted previous discussion on the upcoming budget in relation to Comprehensive Plan versus Zoning Ordinance. He stated various staff members would participate in the presentation.

a. Zoning Ordinances/Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Christy Parrish, Zoning Administrator, noted the original James City County Zoning Ordinance was adopted in 1969. She stated the basic organization of that document remained unchanged. Ms. Parrish detailed three historical highlights regarding the Zoning Ordinance updates, but added the changes between those three major times were revised piecemeal. She noted the need to ensure consistent wording throughout. Ms. Parrish further noted those inconsistencies had been identified and clarified. She cited some examples of inconsistent wording and terms and the accompanying benefits with addressing those inconsistencies. Ms. Parrish addressed the possibility of adopting a new Zoning Ordinance map, adding the last comprehensive map was adopted in 1986. She noted every rezoning approved since then had been an amendment to that document. Ms. Parrish stated additional information could be incorporated to include proffers and other factors.

Mr. Adam Kinsman, County Attorney, noted he, Ms. Parrish, Mr. Purse, and Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Community Development, had notes to address the inconsistencies. He commented that the four members, with staff's help, would work on updating the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Holt noted he wanted to update the document to assist with the Comprehensive Plan. He highlighted the timeline and specifics of the update.

Discussion ensued.

The Board concurred with moving forward on the Zoning Ordinance update.

b. Workforce Housing

Mr. Holt addressed the Board regarding workforce housing and affordable housing. He noted some historical points and referenced the work done and recommendations made by the Workforce Housing Task Force (WHT) Committee in the past. Mr. Holt further noted those recommendations required no significant new funding or staffing and were feasible in a timely manner. He cited several successes over the past few years which included two Home Repair Blitz events with Habitat for Humanity of the Peninsula and Greater Williamsburg and receipt of state and federal aid. Mr. Holt thanked Mr. Vaughn Poller, Neighborhood Development Administrator, for his work with funding. Mr. Holt noted the WHT Committee recommendations had been incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. He further noted details regarding workforce housing which included construction of the first 3D-printed house. Mr. Holt stated a new Housing portal was being developed which would incorporate resource lists and other components to assist citizens. He addressed additional recommendations from the WHT and noted discussion for possible options for adoption under the existing State Code. Mr. Holt stated Mr. Poller would discuss those options in the next segment of the presentation.

Mr. Poller stated of the three available sections of the State Code two were considerations for Board adoption. He noted one section was the creation of an Affordable Dwelling Ordinance. Mr. Poller outlined the criteria of that Ordinance. He stated the second section addressed adjustment or removal of existing Zoning Ordinances which conflicted with affordability for density exchange. Mr. Poller noted the specific sections addressed the application of density. He cited additional criteria regarding program compliance and other aspects. Mr. Poller noted the State Code addressed maintenance of affordability over a time range of 15 to 50 years. He detailed options and funding needs, adding one WHT recommendation was the possibility of conversion of hotel/motel to residential. Mr. Poller added that would require a Zoning Ordinance amendment. He addressed additional points regarding workforce housing which included potential General Assembly action related to the topic.

Mr. Holt noted the General Assembly action would be monitored next year regarding any possible impacts. He asked the Board for direction.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the proffer for \$1,000 per unit in the Stonehouse development which would go to the County for affordability had been placed.

Mr. Holt responded no.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the money was in a trust fund.

Mr. Holt noted he would follow up with Ms. Sharon McCarthy, Director of Financial and Management Services, at a later date.

Mr. McGlennon noted affordable housing was a local, state, and national issue. He stated the need for a measurable outcome so progress could be tracked in that area. Mr. McGlennon questioned a possible County voucher program to supplement the currently available federal voucher. He addressed several points of such a program. Mr. McGlennon addressed the possibility of acquisition of existing properties for redevelopment that benefited low-income housing such as mobile home parks.



Ms. Larson noted the possibility of hotels and motels as an affordable alternative.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Icenhour questioned the number of possible units in the County.

Mr. Holt noted two. He further noted some trends were emerging with conversion of old school buildings. Mr. Holt noted some inquiries had been made on Family Inn of America Williamsburg and Motel Zuma, but density and Comprehensive Plan requirements presented limitations.

Mr. McGlennon noted inquiries about Fort Magruder Hotel.

Mr. Holt confirmed there had been some inquiries several years ago.

Mr. Hipple addressed the difficulties around affordable housing. He noted the creation of an affordable area for housing. Mr. Hipple detailed some potential options.

Mr. McGlennon noted some affordable housing options had been incorporated in Toano Trace and Ironbound Square.

Mr. Poller confirmed yes.

Mr. McGlennon asked about the current situation with both locations.

Mr. Poller noted the soft second limitation of 10-15 years for Toano Trace expired in 1995 with buildout completed in 1997. He further noted the units originally sold for \$75,000, but were currently priced in the \$200,000s. Mr. Poller stated the same thing had occurred on Palmer Lane and Ironbound Square. He added that housing was a national issue and there were many ideas that could be researched and possibly incorporated. Mr. Poller noted both the Habitat for Humanity and the state were looking at other options including modular homes.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Holt and Mr. Poller.

c. Transportation/Sidewalks/WATA Bus Stops

Mr. Holt addressed the current state and status of sidewalks around local schools. Mr. Holt noted County sidewalk locations were required by the Zoning Ordinance and the Board's adopted Pedestrian Accommodations Master Plan. He stated some developments were in place prior to the sidewalk requirement, which included areas around area schools. Mr. Holt referenced funding to assist with sidewalk projects. He noted Mr. Tom Leininger, Principal Transportation Planner, had completed a comprehensive review.

Mr. Leininger noted that during the Comprehensive Plan guidance was presented regarding sidewalk funding. He listed the guidance was based on need, gap in the network, available funding, and location. Mr. Leininger noted the schools were adopting non-transportation zones within a half-mile radius for elementary schools and a mile radius for secondary schools. He noted within these zones, families were responsible for providing their own transportation. Mr. Leininger provided details on the areas matching these parameters.

Mr. Holt noted a map for each school was provided in the Board's Agenda Packets.

Mr. Leininger stated both the roadways and subdivisions were reviewed. He explained the color codes for the map to identify subdivisions with/without sidewalks. Mr. Leininger stated that the Williamsburg-James City County Schools averaged overall at 44% of roadways and existing sidewalks within the one-mile buffer around the school site. He noted Norge Elementary School and Warhill High School had the highest percentages, 89% and 81%, respectively with roadways that have sidewalks. Mr. Leininger noted the lowest percentages for elementary schools included Matoaka, J. Blaine Blayton, and Clara Byrd Baker Elementary Schools at 13%, 17%, and 24%, respectively. He added Lois S. Hornsby Middle School was the lowest at 17% with Toano Middle School at 35%. Mr. Leininger noted Jamestown High School was the lowest at 28% of its roadways having sidewalks.

Ms. Larson asked if someone lived within a half mile of Clara Byrd Baker Elementary School then transportation was not provided unless extenuating circumstances.

Mr. Holt noted that was the general policy, but schools could address exceptions. He added that policy applied to the half-mile and one-mile buffers.

Ms. Larson noted there was a lot of missing sidewalks.

Mr. Leininger stated the County had the option to use Safe Routes to School funding for elementary and middle schools. He added that was a Virginia Department of Transportation application which required a 20% locality match. Mr. Leininger referenced two completed projects were Clara Byrd Baker Elementary School sidewalk and James River Elementary School in 2013. He discussed the variable costs for sidewalks based on different criteria. Mr. Leininger noted the Clara Byrd Baker Elementary School sidewalk project was completed in August 2023 at an approximate cost of \$688,000 for approximately .55 miles of sidewalk. He further noted the upcoming project for Laurel Lane Elementary School at .45 miles and a current project cost of \$1.77 million. Mr. Leininger stated the cost was based on the number of properties where rights-of-way would be required in addition to stormwater improvements. He added the Richmond Road Sidewalk and Bike Lane improvements project in Norge, currently in progress, has a \$3.77 million project cost for .33 miles. Mr. Leininger noted staff's use of the transportation match funds in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP). He cited details for the process, adding use of the Revenue Share program required a 50% match.

Mr. Holt noted slow and steady progress. He further noted other considerations included stormwater, potential utility relocation, and other factors that affected cost. Mr. Holt stated an additional 27 miles of sidewalk were needed to be built to meet the non-transportation policy. He noted the estimate for those 27 miles was \$34-\$300 million and current available resources. Mr. Holt addressed some potential funding sources to assist with the Laurel Lane Elementary School project, Jamestown High School and intersection improvements, and other locations. He noted estimated timelines and other updates for the Board.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Holt noted the competitive nature of the funding as other localities vied for the same funding. He further noted official funding with the Commonwealth Transportation Board's approval would be announced in June or July. Mr. Holt continued the presentation discussing transit stops and alignment with the Williamsburg Area Transit Authority (WATA) Board's Strategic Plan. He highlighted possibilities for increased ridership and other aspects to coordinate with WATA's Strategic Plan. Mr. Holt noted 153 WATA transit stops existed in James City County, but only 30 of those had trash cans and 25 had shelters. He added that 33 stops had benches with four having bicycle racks. Mr. Holt noted some potential opportunities for the County to align with WATA's Strategic Plan, adding the City of Williamsburg was also working on some implementation plans. He noted the need for a standing pad, bench, and trash can at each stop. Mr. Holt stated there would be more discussion on those points.

Discussion ensued on shelters, funding, and compliance concerns.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Holt for the great information.

6. Budget Guidance and Process

Mr. Stevens presented the Board with a budget timeline. He noted a budget podcast slated for early April and Budget Community meetings scheduled April 3-11. Mr. Stevens further noted the public hearing on April 9 and additional April dates. He provided a departmental update on proposed job positions and reclassifications. Mr. Stevens addressed the process for ranking criteria in determining priorities.

Discussion ensued on ranking, CIP requests, and timeline considerations.

Mr. Stevens noted both CIP and position requests could be reviewed in the fall for budget preparation. He further noted adjustments could also be made between the proposed budget and adopted budget. Mr. Stevens referenced the tax rate and reassessments. He identified drivers and respective impacts to the budget.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Stevens noted the timeline for budget numbers. He further noted he would meet with Board members prior to finalization and other considerations.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Larson thanked everyone for their attendance and work.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**

1. Adjourn until 5 pm on March 12, 2024 for the Regular Meeting

A motion to Adjourn was made by Michael Hipple, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

At approximately 2:22 p.m., Ms. Larson adjourned the Board of Supervisors.

*Teresa J. Saeed*

---

Deputy Clerk