

**MINUTES**  
**JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**BUSINESS MEETING**  
**COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM**  
**101 MOUNTS BAY ROAD, WILLIAMSBURG, VA 23185**

**April 23, 2024**

**1:00 PM**

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Larson called the meeting to order at approximately 1:02 p.m. following the James City Service Authority (JCSA) Board of Directors Budget Business meeting.

**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 (remote)  
Ruth M. Larson, Chair, Berkeley District

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

Ms. Larson requested a motion to allow Mr. Icenhour to participate in the meeting remotely due to travel out of the country.

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

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

Ayes: Hipple, Larson, McGlennon, Null

Absent: Icenhour, Jr

Ms. Null asked Mr. Icenhour for his location.

Mr. Icenhour noted he was in London, England.

Mr. Stevens asked Mr. Icenhour, at the County Attorney's request, to state if his visit was for personal reasons and thus his absence from the Board meeting.

Mr. Icenhour acknowledged it was for personal reasons.

**C. PRESENTATION(S)**

Ms. Larson asked Mr. Stevens if there were any presentations.

Mr. Stevens recognized Ms. Teresa Saeed, Deputy Clerk to the Board, and asked her to come forward to the podium. He noted in advance of the 55th Annual Professional Municipal Clerks Week, May 5-11, 2024, he wanted to recognize Ms. Saeed for her support of the Board as elected officials as well as himself as the County Administrator. Mr. Stevens stated Ms. Saeed had served as the President of the Virginia Municipal Clerks Association for the past year. He thanked Ms. Saeed for her service. Mr. Stevens noted Ms. Larson had a proclamation for Ms. Saeed.

**ADOPTED**

**MAY 28 2024**

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

Ms. Larson read the proclamation aloud prior to the presentation to Ms. Saeed. She thanked Ms. Saeed for her service.

**D. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Ms. Larson asked if any Board member wished to pull any item(s).

1. Acceptance of Funds - \$3,244 - Virginia Forfeited Asset Sharing Program

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

2. AsserWorks Fleet Management Software

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

3. Contract Award - \$241,751 - Additional Roll-off Truck

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

4. Contract Award - \$260,192 - Knuckle Boom Truck Replacement

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

5. Contract Award - Strategic Plan

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

6. Contract Renewal Fiber Optic Maintenance Services - Cable Associates, Inc.

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

7. Minutes Adoption

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

The Minutes Approved for Adoption included the following meetings:

- o March 12, 2024, Regular Meeting
- o March 26, 2024, Business Meeting
- o April 3, 2024, Budget Community Meeting
- o April 4, 2024, Budget Community Meeting
- o April 8, 2024, Budget Community Meeting
- o April 10, 2024, Budget Community Meeting

o April 11, 2024, Budget Community Meeting

## **E. BOARD DISCUSSIONS**

### **I. ARPA Funding Discussion**

Ms. Sharon McCarthy, Director of Financial and Management Services (FMS), addressed the Board. She introduced Ms. Stephanie Williams-Ortery, the County's Grants and Special Projects Analyst. Ms. McCarthy noted Ms. Williams-Ortery had been with the County for over 23 years. She added that 21 of those 23 years had been with the County's Police Department and had encompassed various capacities. Ms. McCarthy noted the last two years of Ms. Williams-Ortery's County tenure had been in FMS where she moved to assist with the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds. She added it was fitting for Ms. Williams-Ortery to provide the ARPA update. Ms. McCarthy noted Ms. Williams-Ortery managed over \$37 million worth of state and federal grants on an annual basis by herself. She added that amount was not comprised of all the County's grants, but it represented a large portion and served as a cost-saver to County residents.

Ms. Williams-Ortery addressed the Board and highlighted an ARPA overview in a PowerPoint presentation. She stated James City County (JCC) received \$14.8 million in Coronavirus State and Local Recovery Funds as part of the federal ARPA funding in 2021. Ms. Williams-Ortery noted the ARPA funding was accounted for in a separate fund specifically for it, adding these funds had extensive reporting and audit requirements. She stated four eligible categories were available for spending and provided details on the County's category selection. Ms. Williams-Ortery noted two key dates for funding included the obligated date (December 31, 2024) and the expended date (December 31, 2026). She addressed FMS working with County departments regarding these timelines. Ms. Williams-Ortery noted the United States Treasury provided recent guidance on the movement of funding between projects after the obligation date. She continued the PowerPoint presentation with an overview of the County's ARPA funding projects which included Housing and Neighborhood Development. Ms. Williams-Ortery provided details on the five projects within that category. She noted other areas of funding projects included Community Development Department and transportation, Social Services Department and nonprofit grant programs, and General Services Department with the elimination of bathroom touch points as one of its many projects. Ms. Williams-Ortery stated the Parks & Recreation Department/Tourism Division had several ongoing projects which included work at the Amblers House and the Marina. She noted two new limited-term positions were funded in FMS and various compensation adjustments were made in the Fire, Police, and Animal Control divisions of Public Safety. Ms. Williams-Ortery stated Information Resources Management projects included replacement of the County's telephone system and fiber optic cabling. She added an amount just under \$400,000 of unallocated funding remained in a contingency account.

Mr. Stevens noted Ms. Williams-Ortery's summary was well done. He added the projects highlighted in the presentation were the ones seen at the beginning of the ARPA spreadsheet. Mr. Stevens stated Ms. Williams-Ortery had summarized the current status of that spreadsheet. He noted future discussion with the Board on potential projects regarding the unallocated funding which would be used accordingly, and no funding would be left unencumbered to benefit County citizens. Mr. Stevens stated Ms. Williams-Ortery and Ms. McCarthy were leading the way on that point.

Mr. McGlennon questioned the relative proportion of funding in relation to projects the County would have to complete anyway.

Mr. Stevens responded most of the projects were ones the Board would have approved anyway. He noted some of the positions which started with this funding would likely continue due to need. Mr. Stevens stated that point would be part of ongoing discussion with the Board, adding some positions were possibly started earlier than originally slated due to the funding opportunity. He stated one project that potentially would not have been started was the increase to the nonprofit grant program. Mr. Stevens asked the FMS team if there were any projects it felt would not have been done.

Mr. McGlennon stated these projects were of community importance and this funding allowed an earlier opportunity to move forward on them.

Mr. Stevens confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple noted he had received questions regarding the project list, and he had reminded people these projects were not funded by the County's General Fund. He noted the ARPA funding allowed projects to be completed without a tax increase to citizens. Mr. Hipple expanded on these points. He noted County staff implemented many cost-saving measures for the citizens. Mr. Hipple asked if the compensation adjustment was one-time or recurring.

Ms. Williams-Ortery stated one-time. She noted the adjustment was funded by the second half of Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 and then the General Fund after that point.

Mr. Hipple noted the adjustment was recurring and started with the ARPA funds, but then moved to the General Fund.

Ms. Williams-Ortery confirmed yes, adding the FY24 General Fund picked up the adjustment. She clarified that the compensation was ongoing, but that the ARPA funding in support had been completed.

Mr. Hipple noted questions would arise on those points. He stated these were costs the County would incur, but the initial costs were covered by the ARPA funding. Mr. Hipple added the compensation adjustments were necessary to retain employees and keep the community safe. He thanked Ms. Williams-Ortery.

Ms. Larson noted Ms. Williams-Ortery had been brought in to assist with the ARPA funds, but additional duties had been incorporated and she would remain in FMS.

Ms. McCarthy nodded her head in confirmation.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. Williams-Ortery. She addressed Mr. Icenhour.

Mr. Icenhour noted his questions had already been asked by his fellow Board members.

## 2. Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Budget

Ms. McCarthy stated she was being joined by Ms. Cheryl Holland, Budget Manager, who would guide the Proposed Budget discussion.

Ms. Holland addressed the Board stating she would provide an overview on the budget process and updates. She highlighted the budget timeline and the respective key points in a PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Holland stated FMS provided training to ensure departmental understanding of the entire budget process. She noted the County used a method called zero-based budgeting. Ms. Holland stated zero-based budgeting required departments to start the process with nothing and build requests line-by-line. She added department staff typically prepared the budget with a review by the department director, followed by a review by FMS, Human Resources (HR), and

County Administration for further review. Ms. Holland detailed the additional reviews, public hearings, and other process components with the scheduled adoption slated for May.

Mr. McGlennon noted Ms. Holland's reference of the zero-based budget.

Ms. Holland confirmed the use of zero-based budget.

Mr. McGlennon noted that use had been questioned at the public forums. He stated he wanted to clarify the use to justify each department's ongoing expenses.

Ms. Holland confirmed yes. She continued the PowerPoint presentation noting the first year of the FY2025 Proposed Budget was the only year in which spending was appropriated. Ms. Holland stated \$289.3 million was the total Proposed Budget for all funds excluding interfund transfers. She stated the Proposed Budget General Fund at \$254.5 million was the County's main operating fund. Ms. Holland noted no change in the real estate and personal property tax rates were proposed. She added the Proposed Budget also included funding for investments in County staff retention and compensation, and increased funding for the Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) School Division's request to support teacher and staff pay raises. Ms. Holland noted the Proposed Budget excluded \$9 million in additional requests. She explained FMS, HR, or County Administration reviewed those requests and determined the available resources could not support them. Ms. Holland highlighted the additional revenue allocation differences in the Proposed Budget as compared to the adopted FY24 budget. She noted questions had arisen over these allocations and other points which would be addressed. Ms. Holland stated the Proposed Budget had several uses of the Fund Balance within it, adding the County had policies regarding Fund Balance use and maintaining fiscal liquidity or Unassigned Fund Balance to maintain within the General Fund. She referenced a two-page handout of detailed Fund Balance changes for the Board, adding the first page contained a breakdown of major funds used for the General Fund and the Capital Projects Fund. Ms. Holland provided additional details on the handout's contents. She noted the first page was proposed to be added to Section A of the Adopted Budget.

Ms. McCarthy noted the additional data was based on feedback received regarding the General Fund in particular. She stated the Code of Virginia required adoption of a balanced budget which meant revenues must equal expenditures. Ms. McCarthy explained the new section's starting point was the General Fund's Fund Balance and then subtracted the portion already assigned to other uses. She provided details on the process. Ms. McCarthy also explained the County's Fiscal Policy which mandated 15% of the unallocated funds had to be maintained as a Reserve Fund. She noted Fund Balance was not typically used for recurring expenditures, but if it was used, FMS recommended it be used for Capital Projects or other one-time needs. Ms. McCarthy stated the first page of the handout reflected the amount available for spending.

Ms. Holland noted the second page addressed the major changes in the non-detailed fund which included debt services, Social Services, Housing, and other funds. She explained the difference between a major and non-major fund was dependent on the size of the fund's budget, adding General Fund was always a major fund. Ms. Holland noted the Capital Projects Fund was also presented as a major fund. She provided additional details on the second page data.

Ms. McCarthy stated the information as previously presented was in accordance with the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) and the requirements from the technical authority regarding disclosures. She noted the handout information provided additional detail, adding the aggregate number was shown with a breakdown by fund and which funds used Fund Balance. Ms. McCarthy further noted some funds used no Fund Balance while others did significantly and the rationale behind those recommendations. She noted Fund Balance typically was not spent unless necessary such as a deliberate use for a one-time expenditure. Ms. McCarthy stated the breakdown indicated the proposed areas to use the Fund Balance and the purpose of its use.

Ms. Holland continued the PowerPoint presentation addressing the proposed real estate tax rate. She provided details on the reassessment, adding Real Estate taxes were not the County's only source of General Fund revenue. Ms. Holland noted Mr. Stevens would address potential budget reductions.

Mr. Stevens noted every one cent on the tax rate equaled approximately \$1.3 million in revenue to the County. He stated he believed the items on the list were necessary and sought input from the Board.

Mr. Hipple addressed the Fund Balance and the 15% reserve requirement.

Ms. Holland referenced the handout noting \$113.5 million which reflected the total Fund Balance for the General Fund followed by the \$34.3 million reflected any non-spendable assigned items. She noted the \$79.2 million was the Unassigned Fund Balance.

Mr. Hipple asked if the \$44.4 million amount reflected the 15% reserve.

Ms. Holland confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple questioned if the remaining \$34 million was for the Unassigned Fund Balance.

Ms. Holland confirmed yes. She noted the \$34.7 million was currently unallocated to other funds. Ms. Holland further noted the proposed use for those funds was undetermined and therefore slated for FY25 and FY26.

Mr. Hipple asked how much of the \$34.7 million was going to be used.

Ms. McCarthy noted it was approximately \$22 million in the five-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Plan. She referenced the handout and movement of approximately \$12.7 million in FY2025, followed by approximately \$2.6 million in FY2026 as well as the ensuing three years.

Mr. Hipple stated on the current trend the amount would equal approximately \$12 million.

Ms. McCarthy confirmed yes. She noted surplus funds could be added to that number.

Mr. Hipple noted that \$12 million equated to approximately 10 cents on the tax base.

Ms. McCarthy confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple stated citizens wanted to maintain their quality of life in the County without raising taxes. He noted various challenges while maintaining the reserve. Mr. Hipple provided more detail to those points. Mr. Hipple noted CIP school projects and maintaining reserve funding. He further noted the importance of identifying necessary projects versus repairs. He referenced the City of Williamsburg-JCC School contract. Mr. Hipple addressed different school projects and potential savings. He provided additional details on that point.

Ms. Larson noted several Board members had questioned the HVAC system at Matthew Whaley Elementary School (MWES). She referenced the uncertainty between the County and the City of Williamsburg and that impact on business. Ms. Larson cited the need for more discussion.

Mr. Stevens noted support of that discussion. He expressed concern regarding funding delays until all decisions were made. Mr. Stevens addressed that point in more detail. He noted joint investments from both groups and referenced the \$4 million from the City of Williamsburg for

the Pre-K project and the impact from each group for funding commitments. Mr. Stevens noted expectations regarding funding should a separation occur.

Ms. Larson noted discussion prior to the budget's approval. She cited the County's investment of \$3.7 million in comparison to the City of Williamsburg's \$428,000 for the Matoaka Elementary School project in 2026 if funded.

Mr. Stevens noted that amount was significant.

Ms. Larson confirmed yes. She noted the need for discussion prior to the budget approval.

Mr. McGlennon asked when the School Division would be seeking bids on that particular project. He noted his hope the City of Williamsburg would reach a decision close to the end of the fiscal year this year and a decision could be made. Mr. McGlennon further noted his reluctance to pull the project from the CIP now.

Ms. Larson stated the City of Williamsburg had seen the CIP list. She noted the City of Williamsburg was aware of the cost of the three projects and the impact to the County. Ms. Larson further noted the City of Williamsburg had to be considering some of these same points.

Mr. Stevens noted he and the City of Williamsburg Manager, Mr. Andrew Trivette, had held a conversation but no agreement was reached at that point. He stated recouping funds if invested in the CIP projects and the validity of further discussion. Mr. Stevens noted direction from the Board and his concern of a multi-year impact.

Mr. Hipple referenced the \$4 million from the City of Williamsburg. He noted the CIP projects in the budget which would then be paid for by the City of Williamsburg with those funds. Mr. Hipple further noted then the County could use the Pre-K funding of \$4 million, adding that would eliminate a back-and-forth payment to each party. He addressed additional details to that point. Mr. Hipple stated he would not vote in favor of a CIP with funding toward the City of Williamsburg without assurance that funding was reciprocated. He stressed the County should spend the \$4 million in James City County and let the City of Williamsburg spend its \$4 million there. Mr. Hipple noted he was not asking for removal from the CIP, but rather retain as a placeholder and not be spent.

Mr. McGlennon stated he was not in favor of escalating the issue. He noted if the preschool funding was the first priority, he was agreeable once the decision was made by the City of Williamsburg.

Ms. Larson noted the need for discussion. She referenced the School Study meeting and the indication that MWES was possibly going to be slightly overcrowded due to Pre-K to fifth grade. Ms. Larson further noted the need to confirm that the City of Williamsburg was in agreement with the County regarding Bright Beginnings. She provided further details on the timeline and other points.

Mr. Icenhour echoed some of the earlier concerns. He noted the three projects in the CIP for FY2025: HVAC system at MWES, roof at Berkeley Middle School, and turf at Cooley Field. Mr. Icenhour further noted those projects were approximately \$4.5 million in County funding with approximately \$500,000 in funding from the City of Williamsburg. He stated the City of Williamsburg could be having similar concerns with funding for school projects at Laurel Lane, Norge, and J. Blaine Blayton Elementary Schools, Lois S. Hornsby Middle School, and specifically the Pre-K project. Mr. Icenhour noted the City of Williamsburg funding would primarily be for schools in JCC and the County's funding for the three schools in the City of Williamsburg. He further noted approximately \$3.5 million net funding would still come from the County as opposed to the City of Williamsburg's approximately \$500,000 portion. Mr. Icenhour provided additional details to this point. He noted his reluctance to a budget

commitment with so many unanswered questions, adding more discussion and information were needed.

Mr. Stevens asked the Board if it would consider moving some CIP projects from FY26 to FY25 to create a better balance regarding County schools. He noted his concern regarding an agreement with the City of Williamsburg in three to four weeks, adding he did not want the budget process to stop. Mr. Stevens further noted once the operating budget was approved, those funds were obligated to send as the School Division made its requests. He added that the CIP historically allowed the County to have more control on those projects moving forward without automatically sending the funding to the School Division. Mr. Stevens stated the budget could be approved with projects switched and if on July 2 there were changes, the Board could switch the projects.

Ms. McCarthy noted the School Division used the County's Procurement Division. She further noted the County was aware earlier in the process when the School Division was considering particular projects. Ms. McCarthy stated that information could then be conveyed to the Board.

Ms. Larson noted the Board could approve the Operating Budget at the May 14, 2024, Regular Meeting with the CIP approval moved to the following meeting.

Ms. McCarthy noted the difficulty arose with the transfer from the Operating Budget to the CIP. She added the number would change based on project allocation.

Mr. McGlennon stated a budget amendment could be made on the adopted budget.

Ms. McCarthy noted another public hearing could be required depending on the extent of the amendment.

Ms. Larson asked Ms. Null if she had any comments.

Ms. Null questioned some expenditures listed on page D-5 of the CIP.

Mr. McGlennon clarified the amount was from the previous year's CIP.

Ms. Larson expressed concern about moving projects forward as she was worried about the answers regarding the HVAC system. She added she was uncomfortable until some agreement was in place.

Ms. McCarthy noted the ability to approve a dollar amount for school-related projects could be an option. She further noted between current time and June 30, that list of projects could be determined. Ms. McCarthy stated that was an option to be explored.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. McCarthy.

Mr. McGlennon questioned the school funding dedicated in the Operating Budget and if it was based on the legislative initial budget or the Honorable Governor Glenn Youngkin's budget.

Ms. Holland noted the County had an agreement with the School Division in which the School Division developed requests based on the anticipated federal funding. She added then a locality need was presented to both the County and the City of Williamsburg. Ms. Holland noted the annual enrollment as of September 30 was also provided. She further noted the annual enrollment was reviewed to garner the numbers for a pure count for both the County and the City of Williamsburg. Ms. Holland explained the calculation process and results, adding those calculations were compared to the Virginia Department of Education's (VDOE) Standards of Quality.



Ms. McCarthy noted the original funding requested by the School Division was based on the Honorable Governor Glenn Youngkin's budget released in December. She added updates had been provided. Ms. McCarthy stated the latest numbers were based on the most recent Virginia General Assembly approved budget. She added the process was ongoing as the state had yet to adopt its budget so changes could be forthcoming.

Mr. McGlennon noted the \$350 million difference from the legislature's approved budget and the Honorable Governor Glenn Youngkin's proposed budget and where the difference would land. He questioned if the amount the School Division was requesting was needed.

Ms. McCarthy stated the School Division received a calculation tool from the VDOE based on the Virginia General Assembly's budget in March which provided approximately \$4 million in additional funding. She added that change prompted a request revision to the County. Ms. McCarthy noted there were pending bills and numbers could potentially change.

Mr. McGlennon stated he anticipated the number to be on the high side, but added the Virginia General Assembly would reconvene on May 13, 2024. He noted his support of the budget's priority list. Mr. McGlennon further noted his support of the 83 cents tax rate was necessary, but he questioned the possibility of a one-time rebate to offset some of the tax bill for the coming fiscal year from some undesignated Fund Balance. He stated the one-time rebate in consideration of people's concerns regarding the high rate of increase. Mr. McGlennon questioned if that was a viable option and if negative consequences would result.

Ms. McCarthy noted conversation with Mr. Kinsman. She further noted the County had some ability to do that, but an Ordinance was required to give the Board the authority for that action. Ms. McCarthy stated some localities had done that and it was typically in the form of a credit opposed to a rebate. She noted rebate equaled checks whereas a credit was better administratively, and citizens received the discount sooner. Ms. McCarthy provided details on such a program.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Ms. McCarthy. He noted he wanted to present that option for the Board to consider.

Ms. Null referenced the School Board's initial request for a 3% raise, which was then increased to 4.5%. She asked Ms. McCarthy if that included the 2% increase from the state.

Ms. McCarthy stated the 4.5% was all-inclusive.

Ms. Larson noted the School Superintendent's 3% proposal followed by a larger request from the School Board to assist with staff retainment. She spoke to other related points.

Mr. Stevens clarified an approximate \$600,000 shortage in school funding in the production of the Proposed Budget. He noted that addressed additional healthcare and dependent care costs. Mr. Stevens added that an additional request was made during the time of the publishing.

Ms. McCarthy noted at the time of the revised request for the County's Proposed Budget, \$4 million was the amount used which represented state funding the School Division would receive. She noted the \$4 million was a rough estimate and upon receipt of the VDOE calculation tool, the amount was \$3.6 million or a \$400,000 difference. Ms. McCarthy added additional funds of \$550,000 were requested by the School Division for health insurance contribution and conversion of a part-time to full-time Bilingual Specialist. She noted those items were not included in the County's number.

Ms. Larson referenced a list of requested items the County Administrator had chosen not to fund. She added she had previously requested a list from the School Division but questioned if it had been received.

Ms. McCarthy noted she had not received anything official. She further noted her understanding was there had been a recent briefing from the School Division to the School Board on that list. Ms. McCarthy stated that information should be available to the County sometime during the current week.

Ms. Larson noted one request specifically addressed healthcare. She added that request was for a monetary amount but was not necessarily for healthcare. Ms. Larson added as a point of clarification that where that money was allocated was dependent on the School Board's decision.

Ms. McCarthy confirmed yes.

Ms. Larson asked Mr. Icenhour if he had any questions or comments.

Mr. Icenhour referenced a Board handout that highlighted potential budget reduction points. He noted six to eight items with a total cost of approximately \$2.8 million. Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Stevens if those items were priority with his recommendation for reductions.

Mr. Stevens confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour noted a reduction of approximately \$1.3 million with regards to the Compensation Study if implementation was delayed until October 1. He further noted the \$2.94 million in the next line item which addressed a transfer to Capital Projects Funds. Mr. Icenhour stated that would be a transfer from the General Operating Budget to the Capital Projects Fund and questioned where the reductions would occur in the CIP.

Mr. Stevens stated that amount was relative to the County's 5% policy to transfer money to the CIP. He noted if the policy was not followed then a reduction in the CIP would impact the General Fund. Mr. Stevens further noted that amount was based on the new General Fund Budget, adding if the General Fund Budget was reduced then the 5% transfer would be reduced. He stated he had compiled a CIP project list with a total of approximately \$6 million in reduction but there was no real impact there to the operating, ongoing costs for County revenue. Mr. Stevens noted those reductions were not particularly helpful dollar for dollar.

Mr. Icenhour agreed. He referenced the list and spoke to possible reductions to that point in more detail. Mr. Icenhour asked Ms. McCarthy for clarification as he questioned if any surplus held in the General Fund from previous years could be used for a rebate.

Ms. McCarthy noted it was based on a known surplus. She added since the County was still in FY2024, that number was currently unknown as several more months remained in the fiscal year. Ms. McCarthy noted the FY2023 surplus was known and was approximately \$13 million. She added that \$13 million would be available as a credit.

Mr. Icenhour noted he had received constituent communication regarding concerns for the 83 cents tax rate. He further noted the possibility of lowering that rate several cents, but he favored relief via the credit for the next fiscal year. Mr. Icenhour stated a one-time credit as Mr. McGlennon had previously indicated. He noted a combination of these two considerations could potentially offer a four to five cents tax relief to citizens for this year. Mr. Icenhour asked the Board to consider reviewing those points.

Mr. Hipple referenced an earlier point regarding instruction for students who neither resided in the County or the City of Williamsburg.

Ms. Holland noted there was a student group which was neither County nor the City of Williamsburg in the count determination for allocation. She further noted the support

encompassed students from neighboring localities or transient situations such as hotels.

Mr. Hipple asked if the hotel location where the student resided could be determined as James City County or the City of Williamsburg. He questioned if that information was considered in the calculation.

Ms. McCarthy noted that information was detailed in the contract and addressed certain exclusions. She further noted that information was included in the School Division's total enrollment number, but removed from the calculation when the split was determined. Ms. McCarthy stated her understanding was due to the frequent moving, these students were excluded. She noted at the Board's discretion changes could be made during contract negotiations regarding that point.

Ms. Larson stated some students were protected under federal law. She explained if a homeless student had been enrolled in WJCC Schools and then moved to the City of Newport News then that student still had the ability to return to WJCC Schools to receive their education.

Ms. McCarthy noted there were some students who resided in neither locality as they were a student of either a teacher or an employee.

Mr. Hipple noted the County's maintenance regarding healthcare costs and questioned the School Division's costs. He questioned if the County's practices could assist the School Division with cost reduction.

Mr. Stevens noted the County was self-insured with consultant assistance. He spoke to that point in more detail.

Ms. McCarthy noted the key point was the County was self-insured. She further noted the County could adjust in real time with claim information from consultants. Ms. McCarthy stated she was engaged in conversation with the City of Williamsburg and the School Division regarding the Local Choice Program. She added that program was the state's insured program. Ms. McCarthy noted they would probably use the same consultant the County used. She further noted demographics were outside both groups' control, adding school division demographics greatly differed from a local government's demographic. Ms. McCarthy stated school division demographics were traditionally female-oriented with a tendency toward higher costs. She noted she had previously done research on this topic while working with another locality. Ms. McCarthy addressed that point in more detail, adding it could be 12 to 18 months to move from fully insured to self-insured due to claim backlogs. She stated the implementation of a Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) program with the School Division, adding the HMO plan was trending better than the previously used plan.

Ms. Larson noted the topic was discussed at the School Liaison meeting.

Mr. Hipple stated that would be an option to consider if the County and the City of Williamsburg split the school system. He provided additional details to that point.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the health insurance component requested by the School Division for funding was designed for cost reduction to the employee share.

Ms. McCarthy noted that was her understanding.

Ms. Larson thanked everyone who had worked on the budget. She noted the importance of the employee compensation component and its competitiveness. Ms. Larson further noted she felt the same way regarding the School Division. She stated the volume of assessment feedback received. Ms. Larson noted the County's two-year assessment and questioned what was involved to do a yearly assessment.

Mr. Stevens noted citizens with higher assessments were concerned with the yearly schedule so the change to every two years was implemented. He further noted the County's 20% increase was average for the region. Mr. Stevens stated the City of Williamsburg assessed annually, York County assessed every two years, and the City of Hampton assessed annually. He noted annual citizen discussion regardless of the assessment schedule as parts of the community would have higher assessments with increased value. Mr. Stevens addressed reviewing the mechanics of the process and the timeline and presenting the information to the Board at a later date.

Ms. Larson noted a citizen comment from a Community Budget meeting regarding recycling and other fees which would not be passed on. She stated the citizen was not a recycling participant, adding the citizen questioned the benefit if there was no increase to those who recycled versus those who did not. Ms. Larson asked about the impact of recycling in reference to the budget.

Mr. Stevens noted the recycling impact was several hundred thousand dollars. He added the Proposed Budget did not reflect Parks & Recreation Department's recommended \$500,000 in various fees for its programs. Mr. Stevens noted those fees and the recycling fees could be incorporated and passed along with a monthly increase of approximately \$7 per month to \$9 per month. He further noted those items could be added back into the budget if the Board chose that route. Mr. Stevens referenced another locality that had lowered its tax rate by three cents was receiving much criticism. He noted the rate reduction signaled acknowledgment by the Board, but it was not equivalent to substantial money on a median home. He addressed the rate reduction and credit options in more detail.

Ms. Larson requested the Parks & Recreation Department fee breakdown.

Mr. Stevens noted he had that breakdown.

Mr. Hipple referenced \$1 million for Cooley Field in the CIP. He noted the Energy Study on current County buildings and potential savings there as plans for the new Government Center unfolded.

Ms. McCarthy noted the Energy Study Mr. Hipple referenced on page D-15 was on the list of projects already in the approved budget prior to next year. She further noted the Energy Study was the one conducted several years ago. Ms. McCarthy stated page D-15 showed projects approved up to the current time and not in the next five years.

Mr. Stevens noted an Energy Study would not be conducted on buildings anticipated to not be occupied in five years. He further noted he would confirm that with the General Services Department.

Mr. Hipple questioned the \$700,000 playground replacement project in FY2025 listed on page D-16.

Ms. McCarthy noted carryforward projects listed on pages D-14-D-16 were projects approved in previous budgets, but not completed. She further noted those projects were already funded and not part of the approval for the next five years.

Mr. Hipple questioned the Williamsburg Regional Library project, the playground, and other points.

Ms. McCarthy noted it was only the library which resided in James City County. She added the playground was funded by the Friends of the Library and was an outside funding source.

Mr. Hipple thanked Ms. McCarthy.

Ms. Larson asked Mr. Icenhour if he had additional questions.

Mr. Icenhour recommended a nominal reduction in the tax rate of two to three cents. He noted an additional two to three cents one-time credit for the next fiscal year. Mr. Icenhour asked if that could be compiled for review. He noted the need for a stronger sense of necessary projects versus deferred projects regarding the schools particularly pending the decision on the schools. Mr. Icenhour reiterated the need for better information prior to decision-making. He noted no placeholder for the possible building of a new middle school in the five-year CIP which would require a complete review. Mr. Icenhour stated with no school decision the budget process was difficult.

Ms. Null noted her attendance at the five Community Budget meetings where she heard repeatedly about the need to reduce the tax rate. She referenced Mr. Stevens' list of possible reductions and highlighted the \$4.161 million. Ms. Null noted the possible reduction in CIP projects of \$6.255 million. She further noted when these numbers were added and divided by \$1.3 million, an eight-cent reduction occurred with a 75 cents tax rate.

Mr. Stevens noted the CIP challenge was that it would not reduce the impact on the General Fund. He further noted it was being funded with Fund Balance or the 5% policy of the General Fund allocated to the CIP. Mr. Stevens added that reducing the CIP did not really reduce the ongoing revenue.

Ms. Null stated \$4 million was already reduced in the budget which equaled three cents.

Mr. Stevens confirmed yes. He added that part of the \$4 million impacted the pay study implementation as it would be reduced and delayed. Mr. Stevens addressed the revenue cycle and potential impacts. He noted removal of the \$1.3 million reduced the County's competitiveness. Mr. Stevens further noted it was an improvement, but the County would still lag behind neighboring localities, adding those were his thoughts.

Ms. Larson stated she was not interested in the reduction.

Mr. McGlennon agreed to that point. He addressed the delay of the compensation plan implementation, but added the full cost of that implementation would be felt the next year. Mr. McGlennon noted his reluctance for a tax rate reduction based on that point. He referenced citizen comments, adding most comments reflected on the difficulty of dealing with the tax rate at one time. Mr. McGlennon spoke in favor of a taxpayer credit for the coming year rather than a significant tax rate reduction. He spoke to that point in more detail.

Mr. Icenhour agreed with the noted reductions, but to retain the compensation study. He noted the importance of pay raises, compensation, and the schools were important and necessary components. Mr. Icenhour further noted the credit benefit and some other assistance that would not create significant impact to next year's budget.

Mr. Hipple noted his concern for citizens who were on fixed incomes. He further noted employee benefits and raises should not be touched, adding holding to the teacher raises as well. Mr. Hipple emphasized that to maintain the quality of life, cuts could not continue. He addressed the approximately \$12 million remaining in the Fund Balance added to the \$3 million for a total of \$15 million. Mr. Hipple suggested using that money to lower the tax rate near 77 cents over the next two years in time for the next assessment and reevaluation. He provided additional details on that point. Mr. Hipple stressed the importance of the County employees.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Hipple. She addressed Mr. Stevens on providing various scenarios with the full impact for the Board to review.

Mr. Stevens stated the Board meeting to review those materials prior to the May 14, 2024, Regular Meeting. He noted approximately a week to gather the information and then determine a date to meet.

Ms. Larson noted that was an expectation during this time of the year.

Mr. Kinsman noted any rebate would require an Ordinance amendment, so he had placed the advertisement to that point. He further noted the Board would see that advertisement for its Public Hearing, adding it could be canceled if the Board chose not to do that. Mr. Kinsman stated to meet advertising requirements, he had to submit the notice.

Ms. Larson asked if the Public Hearing would occur before or on May 14.

Mr. Kinsman confirmed it would occur on May 14. He noted it would occur separately as part of the budget, but he had advertised it for the May 14, 2024, Regular Meeting.

Mr. McGlennon asked if that action allowed the Board to do the Ordinance amendment if desired.

Mr. Kinsman confirmed yes that it gave the Board the option.

Mr. Hipple questioned the wording of the advertisement.

Mr. Kinsman noted the specific wording with the option for the rebate.

Mr. Hipple thanked Mr. Kinsman.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. Holland and Ms. McCarthy. She also extended her thanks to Mr. Stevens.

### 3. SUP-20-0010. 9537 Barnes Road. Hertzler Clearing and Grading - Progress Update

Ms. Christy Parrish, Zoning Administrator, addressed the Board and provided historical details on Special Use Permit (SUP)-20-0010. 9537 Barnes Road Hertzler Clearing and Grading. She stated two property inspections were completed in compliance with the SUP conditions with one conducted on January 19, 2024, and the latter one conducted on April 3, 2024. Ms. Parrish stated inspection details and notes were provided in the Board's Agenda Packet. She noted she would highlight specific areas in the PowerPoint presentation as well as provide an update on the owners' progress. Ms. Parrish further noted the timeline of the site plan with regard to both Planning and Zoning. She continued the update from the Building Safety and Permits aspect which included seven buildings identified as being constructed without building permits and other issues. Ms. Parrish provided the Fire Marshal's Office update which included combustible liquid tanks on-site, unapproved electrical conditions, and other factors. She noted the Stormwater and Resource Protection Division's update focused on concern with the survival of existing mitigation plantings, adding surety was expected as a requirement of plant replacements prior to the site plan approval. Ms. Parrish continued the presentation highlighting owner progress and responsiveness. She added that Mr. and Ms. Hertzler were not in attendance due to schedule conflicts, but that they were working to address any issues. Ms. Parrish noted she was joined by representatives from the various divisions of Planning, Building Safety and Permits, and Stormwater and Resource Protection, and the Fire Marshal's Office for any questions from the Board.

Ms. Larson asked Ms. Parrish if the Zoning Division would return to the Hertzler's property.

Ms. Parrish confirmed yes, adding she had the owners working on dates for completion. She noted she received an email prior to the meeting to that effect. Ms. Parrish stated Building Safety and Permits Division would follow up on the building inspections and Ms. Hertzler would contact the Fire Department regarding the stockpiles. Ms. Parrish provided additional details regarding the follow-up.

Ms. Larson noted she had a question for the Fire Marshal.

Mr. Joseph Davis, Assistant Fire Marshal, came to the podium.

Ms. Larson noted a large fire several months previously involving a woodpile.

Mr. Hipple and Ms. Null noted it was Hankins.

Ms. Larson thanked them. She asked Mr. Davis if the Hertzler property stockpiles was similar to the Hankins property stockpiles.

Mr. Davis noted he was not present at the Hankins fire. He stated Assistant Fire Marshal Jared Randall had visited both sites and was present to answer questions.

Mr. Randall addressed the Board noting the stockpiles were not similar. He noted one condition in the SUP requested the Fire Department's assistance regarding the stockpile height from solid ground. Mr. Randall stated that point was not seen at the Hankins fire which was a contributing factor to difficulty controlling that fire. He addressed that point in more detail.

Ms. Larson referenced the unpaved road and fire truck accessibility.

Mr. Randall noted there would be some equipment limitations as not every piece of fire apparatus could access the road. He further noted some of that equipment might not be needed at the location. Mr. Randall stated the availability of brush trucks and hoses. He noted the roads needed a better foundation, so washout was not a possibility. Mr. Randall added that heavy trucks were currently used on the roads. He noted the Fire Department was able to access the stockpiles in their current locations.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Randall.

Mr. Hipple noted he had gone to the Hankins fire. He further noted the proximity of the Hertzler property to Interstate 64, which was even closer than the Hankins property. He questioned the cost to the County for its part in dealing with the Hankins fire as multiple jurisdictions were involved. Mr. Hipple addressed potential problems to that point and the guidelines applied to this SUP for safety and other factors.

Ms. Null asked the distance between the stockpiles to avoid one catching fire while the other did not.

Mr. Randall noted there could be differences between the State Code, County Ordinances, and SUP conditions. He further noted the SUP conditions were followed.

Ms. Null stated she was unsure if that distance was included in the SUP.

Mr. Randall noted the distance was reviewed for safety. He further noted the Hertzler property basically had one stockpile in comparison to the Hankins property.

Ms. Null expressed concern for the space.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Randall stated he felt confident the space would accommodate the fire equipment.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Randall. She noted Ms. Parrish had supplied a progress update but questioned if any Board action was needed.

Ms. Parrish confirmed no action was needed unless the Board had specific actions for staff to present at a later date.

Ms. Larson acknowledged Ms. Parrish and staff were monitoring the situation.

Ms. Parrish noted safety was the top priority.

Ms. Larson agreed. She asked Ms. Parrish to pass the safety message along.

Ms. Parrish confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple asked when the remaining items would be completed.

Ms. Parrish replied June 15 for the fire and electrical issues. She noted that was the date in the email she received earlier in the day. Ms. Parrish stated she specifically requested a date and summary from the owners, adding staff would assist the owners in compliance with the safety issues.

Mr. Hipple questioned some dates that had been received previously.

Ms. Parrish noted April 10 was the deadline for the first inspection. She added that date was to get everything into compliance, adding those issues were being continually identified and to work with the owners. Ms. Parrish noted if the compliance stopped and the required progress abated, staff could present that action as a violation to the Board or to the next level as an SUP violation. She detailed other steps in the process if progress ceased or additional violations ensued.

Ms. Null asked about the inspections.

Ms. Parrish noted one was in January with the other in April.

Discussion ensued on compliance points and dates.

Mr. McGlennon asked how much staff resource was consumed by this SUP holder.

Ms. Parrish stated more than most but that was due to coordination of the many groups reviewing the property. She noted at the first meeting there were tankers and large trucks to ensure maneuverability. Ms. Parrish further noted putting the compliance issues back to the owners so inspections could occur.

Mr. McGlennon asked if there were any other cases Ms. Parrish knew of that required this level of attention.

Ms. Parrish replied not many, adding each situation had different zoning perspectives. She noted both she and the Deputy Zoning Administrator had been actively involved in this SUP as it had a 20-year history. Ms. Parrish stated this situation had a variety of issues to address for compliance and the involvement of different departmental staff in the review.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Ms. Parrish.



Ms. Larson asked Mr. Icenhour if he had any comments.

Mr. Icenhour replied no.

Ms. Null questioned if the owners had addressed the retaining pond built on their property.

Ms. Parrish noted the retaining pond was there, but she was unsure if the owners had anything to address regarding the retaining pond unless it was to be used as a water source for any form of fire suppression.

Ms. Null asked if permission was required to build a retaining pond. She referenced a Best Management Practice (BMP).

Mr. John Risinger, Senior Planner, noted one of the conditions required the pond be made into a Level II wet pond. He stated the site plan would require the details to the stormwater point.

Ms. Null expressed her concern if the pond was being addressed. She thanked staff for the input.

Mr. Risinger referenced Ms. Null's earlier question regarding the separation distance between the stockpiles. He noted a 50-foot separation requirement was in place should the owners move forward with separate stockpiles.

Ms. Larson thanked everyone for their efforts.

#### 4. Virginia Opioid Abatement Authority

Ms. Barbara Watson, Director of Social Services, addressed the Board and introduced Ms. Denise Kirschbaum, Chief of Services for the County's Social Services Department. Ms. Watson stated Ms. Kirschbaum had been working with other localities and community members regarding a regional initiative regarding the use of the opioid funding.

Ms. Kirschbaum provided historical details from 2020 regarding the collaborative regional effort to apply for the Virginia Opioid Abatement Authority (OAA) grant. She noted regional members met in 2022 and 2023 to review potential projects for the grant funding. Ms. Kirschbaum noted the overall grant requested budget was approximately \$600,000, adding the chosen programs were based on inclusion with the support of the local partners over future fiscal years regardless of OAA distributions. She cited the three components of the OAA requirements with the first two dedicated to prevention and awareness to enhance current initiatives. Ms. Kirschbaum noted the third component was a new effort dedicated to individuals with substance use disorders who were involved in the criminal justice system. She listed the specific projects included in the funding. Ms. Kirschbaum noted James City County had agreed to be the fiscal agent with an application submission to OAA on April 1, 2024. She further noted working with the other localities to receive matching funds to the grant funds, adding the amount was approximately \$150,000. Ms. Kirschbaum stated both she and Ms. Williams-Ortery were available if the Board had any questions.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. Kirschbaum for the update.

#### 5. Government Center Update

Mr. Stevens noted he would provide the update as Mr. Brad Rinehimer, Assistant County Administrator, was on another assignment. He stated Mr. Rinehimer continued to meet with the builder and the architect on programming phases. Mr. Stevens added that point contributed to

consolidation and reduction of overall space while coordinating departmental proximity. He noted the current square footage was approximately 180,000 with 160,000 square feet listed in the initial proposal. Mr. Stevens stated Mr. Rinehimer met with Mr. Daniel Keever, Assistant Superintendent for WJCC Schools, regarding scheduled meetings with the School Division and the architects about the potential School Administration building on-site. He noted a tour of the Cities of Virginia Beach and Suffolk was scheduled for Thursday, April 25. Mr. Stevens further noted Mr. Hipple and Mr. McGlennon were slated for that tour. He welcomed any other Board members to join the tour, but noted this meeting would need to be continued if a third Board member was in attendance. Mr. Stevens indicated the tour would be a full day.

Mr. McGlennon noted he had contacted Mr. Rinehimer as he would be unable to attend.

Mr. Stevens stated an employee input session was slated for May 7, from 8 a.m.-12 p.m. He noted the session would be held in the Board Room for any employee to engage in discussion on the Government Center. Mr. Stevens stated the architect was pushing for a visit to a Minneapolis facility with a tentative travel date of June 5 and 6. He noted if any Board member wished to attend then contact Mr. Rinehimer to coordinate it. Mr. Stevens stated the first community stakeholder group meeting was being held on May 15 in the glass Conference Room, Building D. He welcomed the Board members to attend, adding if three or more members were present then a public meeting notification would be made. He added that meeting was at 4 p.m.

**F. BOARD CONSIDERATION(S)**

None.

**G. BOARD REQUESTS AND DIRECTIVES**

Ms. Null noted she met with The Junkluggers of Williamsburg in Toano. She provided additional details on the newly opened business.

Mr. Hipple noted he had nothing to report.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Mr. Stevens, Mr. Doug Powell, General Manager of JCSA, and County staff for a great job with the Employee Service Award event at Busch Gardens Williamsburg. He noted he and Mr. Hipple were recognized for their tenure with the County as well as County staff. Mr. McGlennon stated his attendance on April 22 at a session sponsored by the Village Initiative which featured the 6th Annual Report on Equity in the WJCC School system. He spoke to that point in more detail.

Ms. Larson asked if that report would be shared.

Mr. McGlennon noted a link was provided in the email invitation that had been sent.

Ms. Larson thanked Mr. McGlennon.

Ms. Larson noted the Employee Service Award event was great. She extended her congratulations to the three people recognized for their service.

Mr. McGlennon noted Mr. Stevens was also recognized for his tenure.

Ms. Larson expressed her appreciation of all the effort to make the Employee Service Award ceremony a great event. She thanked Mr. Jason Purse, Assistant County Administrator, for his participation at a community meeting with her. Ms. Larson noted approximately 60 people attended the meeting, adding her thanks to that neighborhood for its participation. She stated

she threw out the first pitch at the Williamsburg Youth Baseball League (WYBL) opening day event. Ms. Larson noted WYBL had over 700 athletes and 58 teams. She commented the ballfields at Warhill Sports Complex were 25 years old this year and they were beautiful. Ms. Larson gave a shoutout to the Parks & Recreation staff as well as the parent volunteers for their work there. She noted a particular shoutout to Mr. Keith Cobb of the WYBL Board. Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Rinehimer for his help on his assignment. She also extended appreciation to the citizens who spoke at the Community Budget meetings. Ms. Larson noted for citizens unable to attend meetings, Board members could be reached by phone calls and emails. She addressed a personal connection to investment in the community and provided more insight to that point.

Mr. Icenhour asked if Mr. Stevens could contact Glo Fiber, the internet service provider, for the connection status in various neighborhoods. He noted Indigo Park was one where a constituent had questions on the process and its progress. Mr. Icenhour further noted he would be unable to join the Thursday tour due to his travel schedule.

Ms. Larson noted some issues with Glo Fiber which included gas line damage which impacted local traffic on Jamestown Road.

Mr. Stevens noted he would look into both of those requests.

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

Mr. Stevens noted the Drug Take Back Day was slated for April 27 at the Law Enforcement Center, 10 a.m.-2 p.m. He provided details on the event. Mr. Stevens stated New Town Tunes, in partnership with the New Town Commercial Association, JCC Parks & Recreation Department, and CultureFix VA, would begin May 1. He noted the events would be on Wednesdays and run through June 12 behind Legacy Hall at Sullivan Square and weather-permitting.

## **I. CLOSED SESSION**

A motion to Enter a Closed Session was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

At approximately 3:21 p.m., the Board of Supervisors entered a Closed Session.

At approximately 3:26 p.m., the Board re-entered Open Session.

A motion to Certify the Board only spoke about those matters indicated that it would speak about in Closed Session was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

1. Discussion or consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A)(3) of the Code of Virginia, and specifically regarding 7402 Richmond Road.

## **J. ADJOURNMENT**

1. Adjourn until 5 pm on May 14, 2024 for the Regular Meeting

Ms. Larson noted a caveat that the Board could meet earlier than May 14, but proper notice would be given.

A motion to Adjourn was made by Barbara Null, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

At approximately 3:27 p.m., Ms. Larson adjourned the Board of Supervisors.

*Teresa J. Saeed*

---

Deputy Clerk