

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

February 24, 2026

1:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

ADOPTED

B. ROLL CALL

MAR 24 2026

Tracy L. Wainwright, Powhatan District
Barbara E. Null, Stonehouse District
James O. Icenhour, Jr. Jamestown District
Ruth M. Larson, Vice Chair, Berkeley District
John J. McGlennon, Chair, Roberts District

Board of Supervisors
James City County, VA

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

A motion to Amend the Agenda to add a proclamation in honor of Mr. Frank Shatz and to authorize a Closed Session regarding briefing from staff members pertaining to probable litigation was made by Barbara Null, the motion result was Passed.

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

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

C. PRESENTATION(S)

1. Proclamation - Larry Waltrip

Mr. McGlennon read the proclamation aloud, noting that Mr. Waltrip had faithfully served the citizens of James City County (JCC) as a dedicated member of the Wetlands Board from September 1994 through February 2026. He emphasized that Mr. Waltrip had provided thoughtful leadership and sound judgment in helping to preserve the County's natural resources and coastal ecosystem. Mr. McGlennon also noted that Mr. Waltrip had served on the Chesapeake Bay Board from January 2024 until February 2026, where he helped advance key environmental stewardship initiatives that strengthened the protection and sustainability of the Bay and its tributaries. He went on to share that Mr. Waltrip had been well known throughout the region as the owner and operator of the Waltrip Williamsburg Executive Airport, formerly the Williamsburg-Jamestown Airport. Mr. Waltrip developed the airport in 1970 and managed it for more than five decades, fostering aviation opportunities, supporting local tourism, and encouraging community engagement. In addition to his aviation work, he founded and operated Waltrip Recycling Incorporated, established in 1991, which supported the County's commitment to responsible waste management practices, environmental sustainability, and local economic development. Over the years, he dedicated his time, expertise, and civic spirit to numerous community activities and projects, earning the respect and gratitude of colleagues, neighbors, and residents. Mr. McGlennon honored and commended Mr. Waltrip for his many years of public service, entrepreneurial leadership, and lasting contributions to the wellbeing of

the community. He expressed sincere appreciation and best wishes from JCC for Mr. Waltrip's continued success and fulfillment in his future endeavors.

Mr. Waltrip expressed his gratitude for the recognition from the County, the Board of Supervisors (BOS), and the Wetlands Board, specifically acknowledging Mr. Mike Woolson, Section Chief, Stormwater Resource and Protection Division. He shared that he had enjoyed working with everyone and, although retired, would continue to make himself available. He hoped he had left a positive impression and had helped many people through his service and his votes. He stated that he had done all he could during his time with the County and intended to remain available to assist anyone who might need his help.

The Board thanked Mr. Waltrip.

Those in attendance applauded.

Mr. McGlennon then presented the proclamation honoring Mr. Frank Shatz on his 100th birthday, declaring February 26, 2026, as Frank Shatz Day in JCC. He described Mr. Shatz as a beloved resident of the Greater Williamsburg area whose century of life had been marked by courage, integrity, and compassion. After immigrating to the United States in 1958 with his wife, Mr. Shatz had built a distinguished career as an international journalist and, beginning in 1980, had become a celebrated columnist for The Virginia Gazette through his long-running "World Focus" column. His writing had offered insight into world affairs, history, and the enduring importance of resilience, understanding, and peace, enriching the cultural and intellectual life of the Williamsburg community. Mr. McGlennon also highlighted Mr. Shatz's role in helping to establish the Reves Center for International Studies at the College of William & Mary, creating a lasting institution dedicated to global understanding and cooperation. He praised Mr. Shatz for inspiring neighbors and readers with his integrity, empathy, wit, and unwavering commitment to making the world a better place. In closing, he again declared February 26, 2026, as Frank Shatz Day in JCC, celebrating his 100th birthday, honoring his legacy, and expressing deep gratitude for the wisdom and humility he continued to share. He encouraged residents to join in celebrating Mr. Shatz's milestone.

Mr. Shatz addressed the Board and stated that he was honored to follow Mr. Waltrip. He recognized Mr. Waltrip's distinguished career and contributions to the County. He introduced himself to those present, noting his age and reflecting on his survival of Nazi concentration and slave-labor camps. He shared an African proverb that he felt captured his life's journey: "If you want to walk fast, walk alone; but if you want to have a long walk, walk with other people." He explained that he had embraced this principle, choosing not to focus solely on self-preservation but instead on helping others. He hoped he had succeeded in doing so, stating that this was the greatest accomplishment of his life. He expressed heartfelt gratitude to the community and to America for the life he had been able to build since arriving in the country.

Those in attendance applauded.

2. James City Clean County Commission 2025 Annual Report

Ms. Peg Boarman, Chair of the Clean County Commission (CCC), addressed the Board. She thanked Board members and recognized Mr. Kevin Radcliffe, Vice Chair of the CCC, who was also in attendance. She also expressed her appreciation to County staff, specifically noting, Ms. Grace Boone, Director of General Services; Ms. JoAnna Ripley, Assistant Director of General Services; Ms. Andrea Case, Sustainability Coordinator; and Ms. Regina Jackson, Administrative Coordinator. She stated that their support made the Commission's work possible. Ms. Boarman introduced the members of the CCC through a PowerPoint presentation, noting each Commissioner's district and responsibilities. She then described the Community Cleanups and Outreach Events held three times a year. She explained that the Great American Cleanup usually took place in March, the County-wide Litter Cleanup had celebrated its 47th

year the previous year, and the Clean the Bay Day event, typically held in June, was expected to occur in May this year. She reported that those efforts brought together 190 volunteers who collected more than 5,000 pounds of litter and contributed 442 volunteer hours. She noted that the CCC also offered ongoing cleanup and litter-prevention programs, including Adopt-A-Spot and the Litter League program run by the Williamsburg Regional Library (WRL). She added that Commissioners and staff participated in many outreach and educational events throughout the year, such as Harvest Fest, Boo Bash, and the WRL Summer Reading Kickoff, and that the Commission provided presentations and resources to community groups. Ms. Boarman then discussed the Beautification: Good Neighbor Grants for Gardens and Pollinators. She reported that nine projects had been completed successfully and referred to the PowerPoint presentation, which showed projects located within the Chickahominy Community, Ford's Colony, Indigo Park, La Fontaine Condominiums, Lake Toano Estates, Landfall at Jamestown, Raleigh Woods Condominiums, Riverview Plantation, and Williamsburg Landing. She added that the CCC continued to support the Water Wise Garden at the JCC Human Services Center and the pollinator garden at Veterans Park, and that the Commission sponsored the annual Arbor Day Plant-A-Tree event each April. She went on to describe the Virginia Peninsula Clean Business Forum Awards, presented quarterly in partnership with York County and the Cities of Williamsburg, Newport News, and Hampton. The PowerPoint presentation highlighted the 2025 winners: Craft 31 in the Jamestown District, Bricks & Minifigs in the Powhatan District, Thread Local 360 in the Berkeley District, and James River Equipment in the Stonehouse District. She noted that no applications were received for 2026 but encouraged businesses interested in sustainability to apply online at jamescitycountyva.gov/609. She emphasized that many practices, such as improving energy efficiency, planting native species, and reducing plastic use could qualify for recognition. Turning to recycling, Ms. Boarman highlighted the Glass-only Recycling Program, which offered curbside service and encouraged residents to bring glass to the purple bins located at County convenience centers. She explained that the collected glass was sent to the Owens-Illinois (O-I Glass) plant in Toano, which made quarterly charitable donations through its GLASS4GOOD program to the United Way of the Virginia Peninsula (UWVP). She shared that in June, O-I Glass hosted an Instagram selfie competition for World Environmental Day. Commissioners, staff, and others participated, resulting in JCC winning an additional \$500 donation. With 131 tons of glass collected, more than \$9,000 was donated to UWVP. She described the Repair Fair & Recycling Expo at Warhill High School (WHS) as the highlight of the year and likely the most popular program. Despite rain and wind, more than 250 cars came through. Sixty-two items were repaired and saved from the landfill, surpassing the previous year's record. The event also collected 74 tires, 200 pounds of glass, and 268 pounds of soft plastic. She commended Ms. Rachel West, a CCC Commissioner, who worked through the rain to collect plastic even though her vehicle was not suited for the volume. She added that 93 pairs of shoes were donated and that food scraps and pumpkins were composted. Several new volunteers, including a WHS student, had joined the team, and more specialists were preparing for the next event in November 2026. Ms. Boarman then spoke about Will Barnes Day, celebrated with a picnic honoring Mr. Will Barnes, who served as a CCC Commissioner from 1999 to 2016. She explained that the event recognized all volunteers and provided a fun way to express appreciation. During the celebration, the James City Ruritan Club presented the Jim Robertson and Will Barnes Scholarships. She noted that Mr. Jim Robertson had been the first Chair of the CCC and acknowledged the attendance of Ms. Barbara Barnes. In closing, she thanked all volunteers for their involvement. She referred to the PowerPoint presentation, that showed 1,479 volunteer hours, \$24,980 in avoided costs to taxpayers, and 2,500 event attendees. She encouraged residents to participate in upcoming events and noted that residents could sign up for the newsletter at jamescitycountyva.gov/3823. She added that more volunteers were needed for the Repair Fair & Recycling Expo and that the Good Neighbor Grant cycle would open in May. She also mentioned the Commission's meeting schedule and briefly discussed the Tree Seedling Giveaway Program, which had exceeded expectations. She concluded by offering to answer any questions from the Board.

Ms. Larson thanked Ms. Boarman for the Commission's work, emphasizing its importance to residents and visitors and its role in promoting environmental cleanliness and safety.

Ms. Boarman thanked the Board for its continued support.

Mr. McGlennon remarked that some of the busiest individuals in the community had chosen to volunteer with the CCC and had done excellent work. He noted that many residents took pride in improving the community, recycling, and repairing items. He added that he enjoyed the Repair Fair, which allowed people to share their skills in various crafts and trades, something he found inspiring.

3. Presentation - Laura Hill

Ms. Laura Hill, President and Executive Director of the Virginia Racial Healing Institute (VRHI), addressed the Board to present a new idea aimed at increasing the visibility of the Amblers House and raising community awareness of its historical significance, with the goal of generating funds to complete both interior and exterior renovations. She shared how she first learned about the Amblers House, noting that although she had lived in the County for 25 years, she had not known about the property until three years ago, and only by accident. After reviewing the research report used to obtain the historic landmark designation, she discovered references indicating that the property had ties to slavery. She added that a William & Mary student had spent 10 weeks researching the site and had created the PowerPoint presentation she was sharing. Ms. Hill began the presentation by explaining why the Amblers House should be restored. She stated that restoration was not only about preserving a structure but also about truth telling, honoring the legacy of the enslaved individuals who lived and labored there, reclaiming and contextualizing the site's full 19th-century history, and supporting racial healing and community education. She then discussed the history of the home, noting that it was a mid-19th-century farmstead built in 1852 and that its picturesque architectural style was rare for the region. She also noted that the property was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. She explained that her organization's research team wanted to understand more than the architecture; the organization wanted to learn about the people who had called the property home. Their research focused on the period, the community, the cultural context, and the individuals connected to the site. She then discussed Mr. John Coke, who served as High Sheriff of JCC and purchased the 375 acres on which he "built" the Amblers House in 1852. She noted his ties to many organizations and institutions that still existed. Ms. Hill went on to discuss JCC and slavery in the 1850s, explaining that the County relied heavily on enslaved labor and that nearly every large household owned enslaved people, noting that Virginia held the highest enslaved population in the nation at that time. She emphasized that the Amblers House stood at the center of this system, making its restoration essential for understanding the historical context. She then referenced the 1860 Federal Slave Schedule, which listed Mr. Coke as enslaving 13 individuals and maintaining six slave dwellings. She stated that his status as a slaveholder was central to the site's history and legacy. She also discussed the Coke family's connections to Bruton Parish Church, the College of William & Mary, and JCC government. She noted that although the High Sheriff role was largely symbolic at the time, Mr. Coke's influence was significant. She noted that after completing the PowerPoint presentation, her organization also learned that Mr. Coke had ties to Eastern State Hospital, where he served on the Board of Directors (BOD). She briefly reviewed the Coke family lineage. Ms. Hill then moved to the section of her PowerPoint presentation titled "Lives Built into the Brick and Soil," explaining that every brick at the Amblers House carried traces of the people who built and sustained it. She described this as the emotional core of the project, stating that the restoration was not only structural but moral, intended to restore dignity to those whose lives were literally built into the site. Referring to the PowerPoint presentation, she identified a smokehouse and a second structure believed to have been used as quarters for enslaved individuals. She emphasized the need for a historical marker, noting that although there were four markers across the street located on Jamestown Road, she noted that none of the markers acknowledged the Amblers House or its ties to slavery. She referenced Freedom Park, which commemorated free Black settlements, but pointed out that nothing in JCC yet interpreted enslaved life in the 19th century. A marker at the Amblers House, she stated, would help bridge that gap and

support public education. Ms. Hill shared that the VRHI BOD's had voted to sponsor a historical marker focused on the site's ties to slavery and had submitted an application to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, with a final decision expected next month. She stressed that history mattered because the work was not only about the past but also about healing, restoring dignity, building community connections, and creating a model for inclusive preservation, one that sought to repair, not simply record. She then outlined the next steps for restoring the Amblers House and its surrounding property. She stated that the house stood as a living testament to a complex past and that its restoration would honor both the architecture and the ancestry of the people who lived there. She stated that opening the site for educational programs and tours could help individuals learn from the legacies of slavery. She added that the project offered a blueprint for healing through history by engaging descendants, educators, and residents. She expressed that the Amblers House could serve as a model for other sites by centering truth, equity, and transformation. Ms. Hill mentioned that the organization had met with descendants of the Amblers House, including a woman of African ancestry with ties to the property. She described the story of the house as one of JCC's best kept secrets. In closing, she stated that the mission of her organization was to share the story of the Amblers House in a way that fostered reconciliation and healing from the wounds of the past. She thanked the Board.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the Board had any questions for Ms. Hill.

Ms. Null stated that she believed it was wonderful that the property was being restored and emphasized its importance.

Mr. McGlennon thanked Ms. Hill for her work on the project and stated that he looked forward to future developments and to seeing how the site could become a place where individuals could confront the past and move forward in the present.

4. Presentation - Colonial Behavioral Health

Mr. David Coe, Executive Director of Colonial Behavioral Health (CBH), addressed the Board and noted that it was a privilege to be present, adding that the last update had occurred before the COVID-19 pandemic. He stated that CBH was grateful for the County's support and looked forward to continued collaboration. He then provided a brief overview of the organization, noting that CBH was founded in 1971 and operated as a statutory agency in Virginia. He also identified other localities served by CBH, including York County (fiscal agent), the City of Williamsburg, and the City of Poquoson. He stated that CBH was a public agency as well as an unincorporated 501(c)(3) nonprofit. Mr. Coe noted that CBH had a 15-member BOD, with five appointees representing JCC. He stated that Mr. Ryan Ashe, Fire Chief, served as Board Chair; Ms. Donyale Wells, Executive Pastor and Administrator of Kingdom Life Christian Church, served on the Executive Committee; and Mr. Roy Witham, Superintendent of the Virginia Peninsula Regional Jail (VPRJ), and Ms. Lynette Diaz, Assistant Director of Social Services, also served on the BOD. He then reviewed service demographics over a five-year period, covering Fiscal Years (FY) 2021-2025, and reiterated CBH's mission to serve individuals with mental health and mental illness challenges, substance use disorders, and intellectual and developmental disabilities. He noted that the number of JCC residents served by CBH had declined after 2021, attributing the decrease to the COVID-19 pandemic, workforce shortages, and other operational changes. Using a PowerPoint presentation, he displayed demographic percentages for individuals served between FY 2021 and FY 2025. He noted that in FY 2023, 6% of those served from JCC identified as Hispanic/Latino, 24% as Black/African American, 1% as Asian, 64% as White/Caucasian, and 5% as other classifications. Mr. Coe then discussed existing and newly added services. He highlighted the addition of Mobile Crisis services, which allowed intervention to occur before an individual reached a point requiring hospitalization. He explained that the service enabled dispatch of assistance to locations such as homes or schools and had grown steadily over the past two years, serving individuals aged three and older. He also described Permanent Supportive Housing, another new service, funded primarily through state dollars for individuals with serious mental illnesses who were transitioning from state

hospitals or incarceration. He noted that additional slots were supported through continuity-of-care funding and that some slots were available outside special designations. Mr. Coe stated that CBH operated two four-bed group homes, both located in York County. He added that the Day Support Program, Opportunities Unlimited, was located on Merrimac Trail and offered transportation assistance, and that Day Support services through People's Place were available for individuals with serious mental illnesses. He noted that CBH served as the fiscal agent for Part C/Early Intervention Services provided by Child Development Resources. He also described Recovery Support services offered in partnership with SpiritWorks Foundation and Forensic Discharge Planning services available to assist with discharge coordination at VPRJ, with staff embedded at the Merrimac Detention Center. Mr. Coe then provided an overview of CBH's local coordination efforts, including its involvement in the Marcus Alert plan development. He stated that the plan had been submitted to the state and that CBH was seeking funding to implement required protocols. He noted that CBH had received state funding to assist individuals previously supported by the Williamsburg House of Mercy after that agency lost its funding. He also highlighted ongoing work with the Historic Triangle Drug Prevention Coalition (HTDPC) and CBH's involvement in planning for the Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) Behavioral Health Court Docket. He described CBH's role as a senior partner in National Drug Take-Back Days, noting that the HTDPC provided tangible and educational resources to the community twice each year. He also discussed outreach efforts, referencing a PowerPoint presentation slide displaying the 988/Lock and Talk Pizza Box initiative. He explained that during Suicide Awareness Month and Mental Health Awareness Month, participating pizza locations used boxes printed with the 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline number, CBH contact information, and Lock & Talk Virginia messaging, which promoted firearm safety. He added that Lock & Talk banners were also displayed in the community, including one currently located in Jamestown. Mr. Coe then reviewed major service trends, noting that service utilization had decreased during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. However, he stated that the complexity of cases had increased, leading CBH to expand its focus on trauma-informed care and prevention and wellness initiatives. He outlined current projects underway, including the Marcus Alert implementation, integrated primary care and behavioral health services, and the opportunity for Virginia Community Services Boards to become Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinics. He noted that CBH was working with the state to submit an application. Looking ahead to 2026, he described plans for a new CBH building adjacent to Eastern State Hospital, which would house the Center for Support and Wellness. He thanked the Board for attending the groundbreaking ceremony and expressed appreciation to County staff, stating that the project would not have been possible without their assistance. He stated that the Center would include four Crisis Intervention Team assessment slots, 12 23-hour recliners, and eight residential crisis stabilization beds for stays of two to 10 days, with hopes of opening the facility in the fall. He added that CBH was planning supported employment services for adults, a revised psychosocial rehabilitation model for adults with mental illnesses, expanded integrated care partnerships, and continued Marcus Alert implementation. In closing, he stated that CBH was proud of its work and welcomed tours, visits, and inquiries at any time. He stated that he would be happy to answer any questions or hear comments from the Board.

Mr. Icenhour noted that it was phenomenal to know that the new center was being built and would be opening this year.

Ms. Larson stated that she had attended the National Association of Counties (NACo) Federal Conference and noted the strong focus on behavioral health at the local, state, and national levels. She stated that behavioral health remained a priority for the Board and CBH and that it was one of the initiatives receiving bipartisan support. She added that members were seeking additional funding to increase the number of available beds. She thanked Mr. Coe and CBH for their efforts and hard work and stated that she looked forward to the opening of the facility near Eastern State Hospital.

Mr. McGlennon asked about the previously presented slide that reflected services provided and asked whether the numbers represented percentages.

Mr. Coe confirmed that they did.

Mr. McGlennon stated that the slide clearly showed a pattern of decline in services provided to JCC residents. He asked whether this trend was also occurring across other jurisdictions and requested that Mr. Coe speak briefly on the matter, noting that he believed there had been growing recognition of the increased need for services due to stress and critical situations and that he had hoped more individuals would seek assistance.

Mr. Coe agreed with Mr. McGlennon's observations. He stated that the number of individuals served in each locality had decreased, although some localities experienced occasional peaks. He noted that the overall trend lines were similar and that the primary cause of the decline was difficulty recruiting and retaining provider staff. He stated that this trend was beginning to improve. He explained that in previous years, CBH had faced significant challenges in hiring and retaining licensed staff. However, individuals who sought services were still served by qualified providers, even if not always through CBH, due to staffing limitations. He added that underinsured or uninsured individuals continued to receive services through CBH. He stated that retention and recruitment numbers had improved and that the organization had been restructured to strengthen access at the front door and reduce barriers to care.

The Board thanked Mr. Coe for his presentation.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McGlennon asked if any Board member wished to pull any items. No items were pulled.

1. Acceptance of Funds - \$544 - Federal Asset Forfeiture Program

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.

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

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

2. Grant Award - \$47,797 - Commonwealth's Attorney - V-STOP Grant Program Fund

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.

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

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

3. Grant Award - \$20,000 - Virginia DEQ CBPA Support Grant 2026

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.

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

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

4. Grant Award - \$20,000 - Virginia Housing Community Impact Planning Grant

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.

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

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

5. Grant Award - \$573,641 - Virginia Stormwater Local Assistance Fund

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.

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

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

6. Contract Awards - Annual Engineering Services

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

7. Contract Award - \$172,600 - Chickahominy Riverfront Park Slope Repair

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

8. Contract Award — \$238,273 — Police Firing Range Lighting and Electrical Installation

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

Ms. Larson noted that she had a follow-up question regarding the item. She asked whether the project was part of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and inquired about what remained to be constructed.

Mr. Stevens stated that the project involved a classroom and asked whether the design included restrooms or if the restrooms would be separate.

Mr. Mark Jamison, Police Chief, addressed the Board and stated that if the classroom were approved, it would include electrical work and restrooms.

Mr. Stevens credited Police Chief Jamison and noted that he had previously included a similar building in a past CIP cycle.

Chief Jamison stated that the proposed classroom would resemble a standard school classroom and noted that the estimate had been provided by the Department of General Services.

Ms. Larson thanked Police Chief Jamison for the information.

Mr. Mark Abbott, Capital Projects Coordinator for the Department of General Services, addressed the Board to clarify that the tower also included a restroom that would be constructed as part of the project.

9. Contract Award — \$385,106.52 — Police Firing Range Tower and Pavilion Construction

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

10. Contract Award - \$625,772 - Law Enforcement Center Outdoor Air Rooftop Replacement

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

11. Minutes Adoption

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

The Minutes Approved for Adoption included the following meetings:

- o January 13, 2026, Regular Meeting
- o January 27, 2026, Business Meeting

12. Revisions to Chapter 4 of the James City County Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.

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

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

E. BOARD DISCUSSIONS

1. Government Center Update

Mr. Bradley Rinehimer, Assistant County Administrator, addressed the Board to provide an update on the Consolidated Government Center. He noted that recent weather conditions had made site work challenging, as there were several weeks during which contractors could not access the site. He stated that, as mentioned by Mr. Stevens during the January update, the contractors had completed grading for the underground parking garage. However, work on the rigid inclusions and deep foundations, originally scheduled for the current week, had been delayed until the first week of March due to weather. He reported that the Construction Management Company, McDonough Bolyard Peck (MBP), was now under contract and was assisting with document review as questions and concerns arose. He explained that the team was working through detailed elements of the building design, such as hardware for restroom stall doors, access control for outdoor spaces, and camera systems. He noted that MBP had completed its review of the 50% construction documents the previous week. Mr. Rinehimer stated that a meeting had been held with The Builder Group to address approximately 75 questions identified during the review. He added that the 100% construction documents were expected within the next few weeks. He noted that the 50% set consisted of 377 pages and that the final set would be of similar or greater size. Once received, the documents would be reviewed by County staff, who would provide comments and suggested revisions. He emphasized that there was extensive coordination among County staff, MBP, and The Builder Group to ensure issues were addressed early and to minimize change orders once construction began. He informed the Board that a Power Purchase Agreement had been signed with Dominion Energy (Dominion) for the installation of solar panels on the Emergency Operations Center side of the Government Center roof. He stated that this raised a related issue for Board consideration. He reminded the Board that early in the process, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification had been discussed, along with the County Code requirement that the building achieve LEED Certified or an equivalent standard. He noted that the Board had expressed support for pursuing a higher certification level of Silver, Gold, or Platinum, but also expressed his concern about cost. Mr. Rinehimer explained that the County had anticipated receiving LEED energy credits for the solar installation; however, because Dominion owned the panels, Dominion retained the credits. Without those credits, the project remained within the LEED Certified range but fell short of Silver. He stated that the County could purchase the credits back from Dominion, but doing so would cost between \$150,000 and \$200,000. He noted that he had advised the project team that he did not believe the Board would support that expenditure solely to achieve a higher certification level, but he asked the Board whether there were differing views.

Mr. Icenhour asked whether the credits were tied to the physical use of electricity.

Mr. Rinehimer explained that the LEED scoring system was based on a point structure. He stated that approximately 40 points were required for Certified, 50 for Silver, 60-70 for Gold, and 100 for Platinum. He noted that the County's initial scorecard included nine points for solar energy use, but those points were retained by Dominion. He added that the County could obtain the credits, but doing so would increase the hourly kilowatt cost.

Mr. Icenhour asked whether there was a direct connection between the credits and the cost.

Mr. Rinehimer confirmed that there was. He stated that the County could receive the nine LEED points, but only at a cost of \$150,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. McGlennon asked whether all nine points were necessary to reach the Silver level.

Mr. Rinehimer stated that it was likely that all nine points were needed.

Mr. McGlennon noted that he had previously been involved in a LEED certification process and stated that points could also be earned through other features, such as providing shower facilities in the building. He recalled preparing a PowerPoint presentation to help others understand the LEED process and asked whether there were alternative ways to reach Silver. He stated that he did not believe the additional cost was justified and that achieving LEED Certified status would be sufficient if Silver could not be reached without purchasing the credits.

Ms. Wainwright asked what the benefit was of being LEED Certified versus achieving Silver.

Mr. Rinehimer stated that he did not believe Silver certification provided any tangible benefit beyond demonstrating that the building was more energy-efficient and environmentally responsible. He explained that points were awarded for features such as bike racks, which encouraged environmentally friendly commuting, but the certification itself did not provide a direct operational advantage.

Ms. Wainwright asked whether the building would be equally energy-efficient even without the Silver certification.

Mr. Rinehimer confirmed that it would. He then reported that work on the outdoor space continued and that the Outdoor Space Committee had made significant progress. He added that an internal working group was being formed to address art installations within the building. He stated that he was available to answer any questions from the Board.

Mr. Icenhour asked when the 100% design documents and the not-to-exceed price would be brought back to the Board.

Mr. Rinehimer stated that the not-to-exceed amount had been maintained throughout the process. He explained that the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) would be provided once the 100% construction documents were completed, reviewed, and revised as needed. He stated that the GMP was expected between April and May, after which the next phase of the Comprehensive Agreement would proceed. He emphasized that operations continued under the established not-to-exceed amount.

The Board thanked Mr. Rinehimer for his presentation.

2. James City County Community Land Trust (CLT) Key Decisions

Ms. Tammy Rosario, Assistant Director of Community Development, addressed the Board and stated that she had been pleased to work with the Neighborhood Development Division and the consultant on the CLT project over the past year. She expressed appreciation for the opportunity to continue the discussion on establishing a CLT for JCC and noted that several key decisions

required BOS approval before formal action in the coming months. She presented a PowerPoint presentation outlining the goals of the presentation, which included recapping work completed to date, reviewing items requiring BOS input prior to CLT establishment, providing an overview of next steps and the project timeline, and addressing questions while receiving direction. Ms. Rosario provided a recap of Phase 1, explaining that staff, the consultant, and the Board had explored the CLT concept to determine whether it would be an effective tool to address affordable and workforce housing challenges in JCC while protecting long-term public investment. A feasibility study was then conducted to assess whether a CLT would be a good fit for the County. She stated that the Board's feedback supported moving forward, with the understanding that staff would return for guidance on key decisions. With that direction, staff entered Phase 2 and worked with a team composed of staff from the following departments and divisions: Community Development, Financial and Management Services (FMS), the County Attorney's Office, Housing, and a citizen representative from the Housing Rehabilitation Board. She explained that the focus had been on laying the groundwork to establish the CLT as a nonprofit, including budgeting, drafting bylaws, preparing Articles of Incorporation, forming a BOD, and conducting community engagement. She noted that the project remained on track to launch the CLT in the summer and to receive its first unit from the Clark Lane development (now known as The Moore's) by the end of 2027. Referring to the PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Rosario highlighted progress on preparing and filing the Articles of Incorporation, recruiting and forming the BOD, and drafting bylaws. She stated that staff had worked diligently to reflect the Board's priorities in the financial and legal framework of the nonprofit, emphasizing that these details would shape the CLT's long-term structure. She added that although staff initially believed the Board would have many structural choices, state and federal requirements, along with financial reporting standards, made one approach clearly the best practice. She then outlined three key decisions requiring Board direction: establishing the CLT in a manner that would allow it to pursue Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) designation; confirming the Board's comfort with provisions in the organizing documents; and indicating readiness for staff to begin BOD recruitment. She explained that CHDO status would provide access to set-aside funding and regulatory support, reducing the CLT's reliance on County funding. She noted that certification typically took two to three years, which would serve as a transition period for the new organization. Ms. Rosario next addressed the organizing documents, noting that the Articles of Incorporation were targeted for filing on July 1 and that the 501(c)(3) application was planned for fall 2026. She explained that both documents required a stated purpose aligned with CHDO and nonprofit requirements. The proposed purpose was to provide decent, quality housing affordable to low- and moderate-income (LMI) households, with the additional ability to serve households earning up to 120% of Area Median Income (AMI) to support neighborhood stability and mixed-income communities. She stated that the CLT would be a member-based organization with a tripartite BOD consisting of JCC appointees, CLT homeowners, and general community members. Although more complex, this structure helped prevent mission drift, broadened community engagement, created a leadership pipeline, and supported CHDO requirements. She noted that the initial BOD would consist of nine directors appointed by the BOS, serving staggered one- to three-year terms. Over time, the BOD would transition so that two-thirds of its members were elected by the CLT membership, as required for CHDO status. Ms. Rosario then reviewed the next steps for BOD recruitment. She noted that staff planned to begin recruitment in the spring, with selected members seated by summer. She went on to state that an application had been drafted to assess candidates' skills in financial management, legal expertise, fundraising, and connections to LMI communities. A website had been created and an open house was tentatively scheduled to provide additional information. She further stated that recruitment efforts would include news releases and direct outreach to individuals involved in similar initiatives. She noted that the application portal would open in March and remain available through April, after which appointments would be submitted to the Board in May, enabling the CLT BOD to begin training and initial decision-making by August. She also noted that a logo concept had been developed featuring an infinity symbol representing housing across generations, with blue symbolizing trust and stability and green representing growth and prosperity. In closing, Ms. Rosario summarized the key decisions and requested Board feedback.

Mr. Icenhour stated that he supported the tripartite structure that had been presented; however, he expressed concerns regarding the long-term sustainability of nonprofit organizations. He noted that nonprofits often experienced a life cycle in which interest from both the Board and the public declined over time, making it difficult to maintain engagement and stability. He referenced his experience with the Community Services Coalition, which struggled due to insufficient long-term funding. He also referenced challenges faced by United Way of Greater Williamsburg and the WJCC Community Action Agency during periods of restructuring. He asked whether Ms. Rosario believed the CLT would have greater longevity than the average nonprofit.

Ms. Rosario responded that while she was not an expert in creating or sustaining nonprofits, the working group had incorporated significant insight from individuals with extensive nonprofit experience. She noted that the consultants from Burlington Associates, who managed the Athens CLT, had provided guidance on structuring the organization to support long-term stability. She explained that the member-based structure would help maintain engagement by creating a pipeline of interested individuals from within the CLT homeowner base and the broader community.

Mr. Icenhour then asked about initial land allocation and whether JCC would be responsible for providing funds for land acquisition. Ms. Rosario explained that, as discussed at the BOS meeting in September, this issue had been evaluated through the feasibility study and a 10-year Pro Forma. She stated that the goal was to time the CLT's operational launch with the Clark Lane (The Moore's) development so that units could immediately be incorporated into the CLT, ensuring that the land would serve as a perpetual affordable housing resource. She added that additional developments were already in progress and that private developer interest was expected to expand the CLT over time.

Ms. Wainwright asked for clarification regarding the County's long-term involvement with the CLT, specifically whether the CLT would purchase land from the County or whether the land would remain permanently within the CLT.

Ms. Rosario stated that the working group had discussed the transition process and anticipated that the County would provide initial funding support until the CLT was fully incorporated. After that point, funding would be provided through the County's standard budget process, similar to other nonprofits. She explained that the 10-year Pro Forma anticipated greater County support in the early years, with the CLT gradually increasing its reliance on donations, fees, and grants. Regarding land, she stated that the expectation was for the County to convey land to the CLT in perpetuity and to continue doing so as additional units were developed.

Mr. McGlennon asked for clarification regarding the sources of funding used to acquire the properties.

Ms. Rosario stated that a combination of local, state, and federal funds had been used and invited Mr. Vaughn Poller, Neighborhood Development Administrator, to provide additional details.

Mr. Poller explained that the acquisition of The Moore's property had been funded through the Affordable Housing Incentive Program (AHIP), which consisted of residual funds accumulated over approximately 25 years from the sale of properties developed through past Community Development Block Grant projects. He recalled that the initial purchase price was approximately \$500,000. He added that additional development costs for The Moore's would be supported by AHIP funds, with primary funding coming from Stonehouse proffer contributions.

Mr. McGlennon noted that the Stonehouse proffer required a contribution of \$1,000 per unit for approximately 2,000 units, resulting in a total of approximately \$2 million for the housing trust.

Ms. Null asked whether the general public representatives on the CLT BOD would be appointed through a process similar to other County Boards, such as the Chesapeake Bay Board, and whether appointments would go through the BOS.

Ms. Rosario explained that the process would involve both the CLT membership and the BOD. She stated that an application process had been developed and would be presented to the Board for feedback. The initial BOD would be appointed by the BOS, but subsequent members would apply to the existing BOD, with the Executive Director involved in the screening process. She anticipated that the CLT membership would vote on future appointees.

Ms. Null expressed concern about the voluntary nature of the general public seats, noting that it was often difficult to recruit volunteers willing to commit significant time and effort. She stated that vacancies already existed on other committees and questioned whether individuals would be willing to serve on the CLT BOD. She emphasized the importance of the public-appointed third of the Board, as the other two-thirds would always be filled, but the public seats depended on volunteer participation.

Ms. Larson asked for confirmation that the tripartite structure was required for CHDO eligibility. She stated that she shared Ms. Null's concerns about volunteer commitment and questioned how to ensure that selected members would remain engaged. She emphasized the importance of the structure but acknowledged that it raised concerns.

Mr. McGlennon offered a counterpoint, noting that the County had experience with similar organizations that occasionally struggled to achieve a quorum. He stated that selecting individuals with a demonstrated commitment to the mission helped maintain stability. He expressed confidence that affordable housing was an issue that inspired strong interest and that the CLT would attract dedicated participants, though he acknowledged the concerns raised.

Mr. Icenhour stated that the strength of the CLT model was the involvement of residents, which made it unique. He believed that the community included many individuals passionate about affordable housing and that recruitment would not be difficult. He noted that the general public representatives would constitute only one-third of the BOD.

Ms. Null reiterated her concern, noting that her experience with other committees showed that some individuals did not consistently attend meetings. She stated that her worry centered on the reliability of general public participation.

Mr. Icenhour then asked about oversight of CLT funds.

Mr. Poller explained that the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) provided oversight for CHDOs, as state funds flowed through the agency. He stated that CHDOs were subject to audits and oversight requirements and that mortgage assistance programs would involve local banks. He added that the CLT would need to conduct fundraising and maintain audited financial records when applying for funding.

Ms. Wainwright stated that she envisioned including attendance requirements in the BOD appointment process, similar to other organizations where members could lose their seat or voting privileges after missing a certain number of meetings. She emphasized that this was a bipartisan issue and recommended including language outlining expectations and removal procedures.

Ms. Rosario stated that staff could incorporate this information into the CLT website to ensure that applicants understood the time commitment and responsibilities associated with serving on the BOD. She added that the Board's recommendations could be conveyed to the BOD as it developed its bylaws with the consultant.

Mr. McGlennon then moved the discussion to the Board's decisions.

Ms. Rosario asked whether the Board concurred with establishing the CLT in a manner that would allow it to pursue CHDO designation for access to special funding and resources.

There were no objections.

Ms. Rosario then asked whether the Board was comfortable with the proposed purpose statement, which prioritized providing decent, quality housing affordable to LMI households, with the additional ability to serve households earning up to 120% of AMI to support neighborhood stability and mixed-income communities.

Ms. Wainwright asked whether the AMI threshold could be set lower, such as 70%, noting that 80% seemed high. She stated that she understood the threshold came from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development but questioned whether the County could adjust it.

Mr. Poller explained that 80% represented the upper bound for affordability programs and that the first eight units in The Moore's development, built in partnership with Habitat for Humanity Peninsula and Greater Williamsburg, were expected to serve households between 40%-60% AMI. He noted that homeownership became difficult to sustain below 30% AMI, where rental subsidies were typically required. He added that homeownership programs generally served households between 60%-80% AMI, with higher levels associated with workforce housing.

There were no objections to the purpose statement.

Ms. Rosario then reviewed the proposed structure, reiterating that the CLT would be a member-based organization with a tripartite BOD. The initial nine directors would be appointed by the BOS, with staggered terms of one to three years. Over time, the BOD would transition so that two-thirds of its members were elected by the CLT membership.

There were no objections.

Ms. Rosario then asked whether the Board was ready for staff to begin the BOD recruitment process. She stated that staff planned to begin marketing through news releases, direct mailings, and other outreach efforts. She encouraged Board members to contact individuals they believed would be strong candidates. She noted that the application would be available online in the coming weeks and that an open house was planned for the end of March.

There were no objections.

Mr. McGlennon suggested offering a presentation to the public, noting that individuals might be interested but unsure whether the opportunity was right for them.

Mr. Icenhour agreed, stating that an educational approach would be beneficial.

Ms. Larson recommended recruiting a broad spectrum of individuals, including younger residents who might be first-time homebuyers, noting that first-time homebuyers were now often in their mid-40s. She emphasized the importance of casting a wide net.

Ms. Wainwright asked whether staff had reached out to the Williamsburg Area Association of REALTORS or communicated with the organization, noting that the agency were strong advocates for housing programs.

Ms. Rosario stated that Mr. Poller had been in contact with Ms. Susan Gaston, Legislative Consultant, and that the organization was supportive of the concept.

Mr. Icenhour added that during interviews with realtors, the CLT concept had been one of the topics most discussed.

Ms. Rosario added that the Williamsburg Community Foundation had received a presentation on the concept and expressed considerable enthusiasm. She stated that staff would continue targeted outreach to build interest in the CLT and promote participation on the BOD.

Mr. McGlennon thanked staff for the presentation.

3. Landscape Ordinance

Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Community Development, thanked the Board for its decisions on the previous topic, noting the extensive work that had taken place behind the scenes and expressing confidence that the program would make a meaningful difference. He then addressed the Board regarding the County's Landscape Ordinance, reminding members that an overview had been provided on October 28 at a previous BOS meeting. He noted that a PowerPoint presentation was included in the Agenda Packet for reference. He explained that the purpose of the discussion was to provide a follow-up opportunity for staff to receive consensus and direction from the Board should it wish to pursue any changes to the current Code. Based on feedback received to date, he stated that a tiered waiver process could be developed using objective factors such as whether a property was located along a Community Character Corridor, within a Community Character Area, used for industrial purposes, or involved new development versus infill redevelopment. He emphasized that any changes would not affect previously approved legislative cases; instead, they would be incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance and apply only to new or amended by-right cases moving forward. He then invited questions and discussion from the Board.

Ms. Larson stated that she understood the changes would not apply to previous cases but used Frothy Moon Brewhouse as an example. She explained that if a tow truck operator moved into that location, situated along a Community Character Corridor, the business would not be subject to landscaping requirements because it represented a change in use. She expressed concern that this created an imbalance, noting that the property was attractive and had been well maintained, and she sought a compromise that would not penalize new occupants. She added that the Board had discussed water usage and alternative landscaping options at the Retreat and reiterated her frustration with the current approach.

Mr. Holt acknowledged that the Landscaping section of the Zoning Ordinance was complex. He clarified that landscaping requirements were generally proportional to the level of development proposed. Using Ms. Larson's example, he explained that a tow truck company operating by-right would not trigger landscaping requirements unless it added an outdoor storage yard, which would require screening under the Ordinance. He agreed that the language could be clarified through statements of intent and applicability to better set expectations and noted that such refinements could be made administratively.

Ms. Larson stated that she sought a more holistic approach and hoped to identify areas where adjustments could be made to better balance the needs of the County and business owners.

Ms. Wainwright added that the goal was to find balance, preserving community character without prohibiting the reuse of properties for different purposes.

Ms. Null referenced a property on Fenton Mill Road that was zoned A-1 and not located on a Community Character Corridor. She explained that the business owner was required to install 300 new shrubs because a building was being placed at the rear of the property. She stated that the owner was willing to add more landscaping at the front but questioned the necessity of extensive plantings at the rear. She added that the same owner was purchasing property on

Route 30, which sat far back from the road, and that the landscaping requirements for that site were estimated at approximately \$20,000. She expressed concern about the number of trees required per square foot and the financial burden placed on businesses that contributed to the County's tax base. She cautioned that excessive requirements could drive businesses to other localities and urged consideration of factors such as location, impact, and visibility rather than imposing overly burdensome standards.

Mr. Holt stated that this was precisely the type of direction staff needed from the Board. He noted that the PowerPoint presentation summary categorized the various landscaping requirements applicable to different portions of a site. He explained that the Ordinance currently required landscaping along road frontages, including a mix of trees and shrubs, although feedback from the Development Review Committee suggested that shrubs were not always desirable where mature trees already existed. He added that the Ordinance also included separate requirements for side and rear property lines, which increased based on buffer width, as well as requirements for parking lot landscaping, Best Management Practice screening, and building perimeter plantings regardless of a building's distance from the road. He emphasized that although the Ordinance allowed flexibility through credits and substitutions, staff did not have the authority to reduce minimum requirements. He noted that industrial properties already had reduced standards but stated that if the Board wished to consider fewer plantings in specific areas, staff could prepare options for review.

Ms. Larson suggested that individuals interested in the issue might benefit from meeting with Mr. Holt directly to review the Ordinance and better understand available options, noting that seeing the requirements in person could be helpful.

Mr. McGlennon suggested a workshop, observing that the Ordinance attempted to address multiple objectives simultaneously. He noted that visitors frequently commented on how green and attractive the County was, in part because landscaping helped screen certain developments, particularly residential areas along Community Character Corridors and industrial sites not intended to attract customers. He suggested that the County explore creative solutions, such as allowing commercial properties seeking visibility to use more welcoming plantings rather than full buffers. He emphasized the need to balance aesthetic goals with the financial realities faced by businesses and asked Mr. Holt whether staff could explore alternative approaches.

Mr. Holt confirmed that staff could do so and stated that options could be prepared within 30 days.

Mr. Icenhour stated that staff had indicated the Ordinance did not provide sufficient flexibility in certain areas, and he expressed interest in hearing more about this. He emphasized the importance of objective criteria, noting that consistency became difficult when waiver authority was too subjective. He stated that he wanted to understand what tools staff needed to address issues effectively while maintaining the County's standards.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Wainwright summarized that the Board wished staff to draft a tiered waiver process and expressed hope that business owners would engage in the conversation to help prevent them from relocating to other localities. She stated that such engagement was an important part of the solution.

Mr. Holt stated that once staff gathered the necessary information, staff could return to the Board for further direction and noted that more specific guidance would be especially helpful.

Ms. Null clarified that her concerns related primarily to non-residential properties. She also noted that water was a significant issue in the County and that the sewer system was nearing capacity. She questioned whether the requirement to irrigate landscaping should be

reconsidered, noting that the Stonehouse development did not allow irrigation.

Mr. Holt explained that most developments were required to enter into a Water Conservation Agreement with the James City Service Authority (JCSA). He noted that while the Ordinance did require the use of native plants, some plant choices selected by property owners naturally required more water than others.

Ms. Null went on to note that approximately 25% of the County's water consumption was used for irrigation.

The Board thanked Mr. Holt for his presentation.

4. Budget Discussion

Mr. Icenhour opened the discussion by reviewing the County-wide average reassessment percentage, which he noted was 12% and significant. He emphasized that, as usual, there would be a wide range of changes across the County. He explained that after absorbing a substantial increase during the previous two-year period, the impact had been considerable. He stated that it would be beneficial to consider how the required advertisement for the revenue-neutral tax rate was calculated, noting that it was based on the prior year's taxes and adjusted for book value to determine the rate needed to generate the same revenue. He recalled that last year the revenue-neutral rate was approximately \$0.74. He explained that one item discussed earlier in the year had not passed, had been referred to a committee for further study, and would return the following year without accounting for the impact of inflation. He emphasized that when discussing revenue, the focus should be on purchasing power rather than absolute dollars, as absolute dollars were never constant. He stated that the revenue-neutral rate should be adjusted to account for inflation, which he noted was 2.7% last year. He further explained that the revenue-neutral calculation removed growth so that growth was realized on the net book value and compensated accordingly. He stated that inflation and growth were the minimum two factors that needed to be considered when setting the tax rate. He expressed that the resulting rate would still be considerably lower than the current \$0.83. He cautioned that if the rate remained unchanged and the Board later decided to reduce it, significant adjustments would be required across the budget rather than building gradually. He recommended approaching any changes incrementally. He also suggested that once the budget was released, instead of reviewing it line-by-line, the Board should review it page-by-page or by department. He described how the process had been handled in the past and how it allowed decisions and value judgments to be made throughout the review. He expressed concern that if the Board did not provide input and direction before the budget was built, it would be difficult to make changes later.

Ms. Null stated that she believed starting at the revenue-neutral rate was acceptable and expressed that the tax rate needed to be reduced below \$0.83. She noted that her preference was \$0.75.

Mr. Icenhour added that one of the major areas requiring attention was the WJCC School Division, as much of the budget impact could depend on state decisions. He stated that whatever was ultimately decided would need to be justified.

Ms. Wainwright asked whether a target needed to be set for staff, given that staff would be presenting the budget to the Board. She stated that it appeared staff needed firm direction, as the presentations were scheduled for the end of the month.

Mr. Stevens stated that the budget would be released to the public in March for discussion, with presentations scheduled for April.

Ms. Wainwright then asked Ms. Cheryl Holland, Assistant Director of FMS, whether staff

would prefer direction now if the Board wanted a budget based on a \$0.74-\$0.75 tax rate rather than \$0.83.

Ms. Holland expressed her appreciation for any guidance and stated that she would like to present all available options, including the implications of cutting certain items and the effects of reducing the tax rate. She noted that departmental meetings would conclude this week and emphasized their importance, as they provided an opportunity to explore alternative funding sources, savings, and expenditures. She added that at the April 14 Board meeting, the public hearing on the tax rate would be held, and the revenue-neutral rate would be calculated in March.

Ms. Null referenced an activity previously completed by the Board and requested the results.

Mr. Stevens stated that he had not brought the results with him, but he had reviewed them and intended to use them to help prioritize elements of the CIP. He noted that the process was not strictly data driven. He recalled that during the Retreat, staff shared that approximately \$15 million in new revenue was expected if the tax rate remained unchanged and no other tax adjustments were made. He explained that if \$13.5 million of that amount were removed, and with \$30 million in new departmental requests, reductions would be necessary. He stated that in past years, staff began with departmental requests and then presented what was not included so the Board could clearly see what portions of the \$30 million were excluded. He noted that \$3 million of the requests were for new positions and that a 4% employee raise would cost an additional \$3 million. He stated that the raise could be reduced to 1%, but doing so would hinder the County's ability to remain competitive, which would affect staffing. He added that staffing levels were currently in a good place due to significant recent investments, which had made a meaningful difference. He further noted that school operations would require an additional \$5 million this year, meaning that \$5 million of the \$30 million in requests was already contractually committed to the School Division. He stated that if costs truly needed to be reduced, the reductions would ultimately come from personnel, which represented 31% of the budget, and from outside agencies, including the School Division, which represented 61%. He explained that the operating budget accounted for only 8-9% of overall costs. He stated that reviewing the operating budget department by department would reveal expenses such as equipment maintenance, fuel, and insurance, those being items with limited flexibility. He noted that while \$100,000 could be cut relatively easily, \$5 million could not. He emphasized that reductions would have to come from outside agency support and personnel. He stated that staff had worked hard to reflect reductions in the proposed budget and that departmental requests consistently exceeded available revenue, which was always a challenge. He noted that the Board could adjust any portion of the budget and provide direction on where funds should be removed, but doing so would likely mean no new positions next year and reductions in ongoing recurring costs. He added that while the CIP influenced the budget, recurring costs required annual planning, unlike one-time expenditures.

Ms. Null referenced JCSA's annual raise structure, noting that employees received yearly increases. She stated that she did not understand why raises were expected every year and referenced the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), suggesting that this could be used annually instead.

Mr. Stevens explained that raises were generally provided annually as general wage increases rather than merit-based increases. He noted that the County did not have a step system with automatic increases, whereas JCSA had recently implemented one. He stated that he did not believe the County could afford such a system and had not recommended it in the last pay study. He added that wage increases in recent years had been 4-5% to remain competitive with surrounding localities and retain staff.

Ms. Null stated that she was not suggesting employees did not deserve raises, but that the County might consider reducing the number of new hires.

Mr. McGlennon stated that he would take a different approach. He noted that while everyone would like to see the personal property tax rate reduced, given the recent increases, he also wanted the professional judgment of the County Administrator. He stated that he wanted to hear the Administrator's recommendations for this year's budget before making decisions. He referenced the presentation from CBH, which reported losing staff, and asked whether similar pressures were being brought to the Board's attention. He noted that many moving pieces would determine available funding. He added that the County certainly wanted to address the School Division's compensation concerns, but guidance from the County Administrator would be helpful.

Ms. Larson stated that her colleagues in other Virginia localities had already received their budgets. She was unsure whether it was possible to move the timeline up this year, as doing so would allow more time to examine the details. She stated that she was not in favor of setting a tax rate at this time and preferred to see current numbers and determine what would need to be removed to reduce the rate to \$0.74-\$0.75. She noted that the required reductions would be significant and she was not willing to take that approach at this time.

Ms. Holland stated that she understood the goal of providing information to the Board earlier and that the process had begun in the summer in previous years. She noted that staff had been working with departments since then to determine needs, review details, and incorporate information from the state and other sources, which often arrived later in the process. She stated that the budget team intended to continue moving toward an earlier timeline.

Mr. McGlennon reminded the Board that action had been taken a few years ago to reduce the tax rate by \$0.05 by using surplus funds from the prior year to offset the impact of assessments. He stated that he did not believe the County had that luxury this year.

Ms. Larson reiterated her support for the School Division's compensation needs. She noted that the Division had presented a compensation study showing that they lagged behind the City of Newport News, York County, and New Kent County. She stated that the Division's personnel actions reflected the loss of staff to other localities. She said that she could not, in good conscience, fail to support the compensation study or the employees of JCC, and she did not believe a 2% COLA was sufficient. She also raised the issue of collective bargaining, noting that legislation had passed the Senate and would affect the tax rate. She stated that this could not be ignored for either the School Division or the County and should be considered during budget discussions.

5. Development Oversight

Mr. Holt addressed the Board and noted that there were no decision points associated with this item. He provided an update on the County's surety process, which he explained was designed to ensure that required public improvements and permits were installed as reflected on approved development plans for site plans or residential subdivisions. He noted that a couple of years ago, the Board had allocated additional resources to allow staff to better manage and track the surety process and the completion of required public improvements. These resources included a dedicated staff member within the Stormwater and Resource Protection Division and the adoption of an enhanced fee structure for annual surety renewals, which discouraged sureties from being renewed long-term. With these additional resources, over the past year staff was able to reprioritize the surety database to focus on resolving older projects first, revise staff workflows to proactively reach out to developers in advance of their surety renewal dates, and require that anticipated project completion timelines be shared with staff. He highlighted the partnership with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to clarify the street acceptance process, noting that the process had been documented in new flowcharts and publications shared with developers. He added that VDOT had recently implemented several structural process changes within the Williamsburg Residency to better facilitate and support

street acceptance. Mr. Holt further explained that staff had created a new annual proactive process, used in coordination with the County Attorney's Office, to elevate outstanding issues beyond the developer when necessary and involve bonding and financial institutions. He stated that over the last 12 months staff had worked with the County Attorney's Office to comprehensively overhaul and update all surety agreement templates and financial guarantee document templates with the goal of setting clearer expectations. He stated that these proactive approaches, combined with the resources provided by the Board, had also improved the As-Built process by requiring developers to identify responsible land disturbers and document who would be responsible for completing the As-Built requirements following construction. He reported that these efforts had produced significant results over the last 36 months, including the completion and close out of more than 24 projects that were over 10 years old and at least 10 projects that were between five and 10 years old. He noted that the total value of resolved sureties was close to \$5 million, and the final amount could be higher. Overall, he stated that the changes, efforts, and Board support were making a tremendous proactive difference significantly improving the County's effectiveness. He concluded by stating that he was happy to answer any questions the Board might have.

Mr. Icenhour congratulated staff on their work, noting that stormwater issues and street acceptances were predominantly being resolved. He stated that the approach staff had taken had cleared up many longstanding issues and expressed his appreciation.

F. BOARD CONSIDERATION(S)

1. Fiscal Year 2025 School Year-End Spending Plan Appropriation - \$2,169,906

A motion to Approve the resolution was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.

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

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

Ms. Holland, Assistant Director of FMS, addressed the Board to present a resolution regarding the WJCC School Division's remaining FY25 surplus. She noted that according to the Code of Virginia, if a school division had unexpended local funds at the end of a fiscal year, those funds were returned to the applicable locality. She explained that the joint agreement for WJCC Schools specified that for any school surplus, JCC and the City of Williamsburg would dedicate 90% of their respective shares for future school use, with the remaining 10% retained by the locality. She reported that for FY25, WJCC's year-end surplus totaled approximately \$6.4 million, which was divided between the two localities based on their proportionate shares of enrollment at that time. For FY25, the County's proportionate share was 89.73%, resulting in approximately \$5.74 million being returned to JCC and \$657,000 to the City of Williamsburg. In accordance with the joint agreement, the County retained 10% of its \$5.74 million share, while the remaining 90%, or \$5,169,906, was committed to future school use. Of the committed funds, the County had already appropriated \$1 million as part of the FY26 Adopted Budget to increase the County's contribution to school operations for the current fiscal year. An additional \$2 million of the surplus had been incorporated into the planned CIP to support school capital needs in future fiscal years, specifically FY27. After accounting for these planned uses, the County's remaining share of the FY25 surplus was \$2,169,906. Ms. Holland noted that the School Division had requested funds to establish a healthcare reserve to support its transition to a self-funded health insurance plan. The Division requested \$4.5 million for this purpose, representing approximately two months of anticipated claims costs, along with an additional \$650,000 for textbooks. She stated that the County's proportional share of these needs would be approximately \$4.6 million. She reiterated that the remaining FY25 surplus available to the County was \$2.17 million and advised the Board that the resolution before them appropriated

this remaining amount into the County's FY26 General Fund Budget to support the School Division's healthcare reserve. She added that, separate from the resolution, the Board could consider using any FY26 surplus the schools might generate to help fund the remainder of the healthcare reserve and textbook needs. She noted that no estimate of FY26 surplus was currently available, but once one was received, staff would work to incorporate the potential use of those funds.

Mr. Stevens provided further clarification, noting that the action before the Board was to reappropriate the \$2.1 million returned to the County. He stated that the School Division still needed additional funding for its healthcare reserve and emphasized that the \$4 million request had not previously been included in the County's funding plan. He explained that staff had encouraged the School Division to move its own year-end surplus toward these needs, which would reduce the amount returned to the County and eliminate the need for future Board action. He noted that this approach had been shared with the Superintendent and expressed his belief that the School Division needed the reserve for healthcare and textbooks. He asked the Board if there were any concerns.

Mr. McGlennon asked whether this approach was reflected in the resolution.

Mr. Stevens responded that it was not included in the resolution because, once the School Division received the funding, it could allocate the funds for the stated purposes. He added that if the School Division chose to do so, he wanted the Superintendent to be aware of the Board's position, whether the Board supported or did not support that action.

Mr. McGlennon stated that the Board had encouraged the School Division to take this approach for several years in hopes of reducing future expenditures.

Mr. Stevens also noted that he had encouraged the School Division to transition from a fully funded to a self-insured health insurance model, which was implemented this year.

Mr. Icenhour stated that he was pleased the surplus was available and believed it was a wise use of funds. He expressed his support.

G. BOARD REQUESTS AND DIRECTIVES

Ms. Wainwright noted that during the BOS Retreat, a significant amount of information had been received and many productive conversations had taken place. She stated that she continued her Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) budget training and had attended another VPRJ Board meeting. She added that her schedule the previous week had been full, consisting largely of meetings with citizens regarding concerns and questions, as well as meetings with community members to build relationships. She highlighted the collective bargaining bills moving through the Virginia General Assembly and the impact they would have on the County's budget. She referred to unfunded state mandates that would cost the County millions of dollars and emphasized the need for citizens and voters to be aware of these issues. She expressed grave concern about additional legislation that would limit the Board's authority over zoning and development within the County. Referring back to a discussion held at the BOS Retreat, she noted that the County had done a good job conserving water, as usage had not increased; however, the sewer system was at capacity. She expressed concern that if the County were required to allow certain levels of by-right development each year, the system would be excessively strained. She encouraged communication with state representatives regarding this issue. She also referenced discussions about the upcoming April vote related to a Virginia Constitutional Amendment. She noted that the Virginia Constitution prohibited placing a measure before voters until 90 days after a bill passed the General Assembly. She suggested considering a resolution stating that the state was asking the County to take an action that would violate state law, burden the local Elections Office, and conflict with constitutional requirements. She stated that, as representatives who had taken an oath to uphold the

Constitution, the Board should voice concern.

Mr. McGlennon asked Ms. Wainwright whether she had a resolution she wished to propose.

Ms. Wainwright stated that she had drafts based on actions taken by other localities. She was unsure of the process but would email the drafts to Board members for feedback.

Mr. McGlennon stated that she could share the draft; however, he was unsure whether a Board vote would have any impact. He noted that there was a question as to whether the interpretation offered by those supporting the resolution was accurate. He added that the Supreme Court of Virginia had already ordered that the process move forward on the proposed amendment, indicating that the Court understood the timeline and would likely act before March.

Ms. Wainwright stated that although the action might not change the outcome, sworn representatives sometimes had a duty to voice opposition regardless of the effect.

Mr. McGlennon stated that he did not believe there was clear evidence of a constitutional violation and that the issue appeared to involve a statute that had been appealed.

Ms. Wainwright stated that there was currently a new hold on voting.

Mr. McGlennon noted that the hold originated from Tazewell County.

Ms. Wainwright confirmed this but stated that it affected the entire state.

Mr. McGlennon stated that because the matter had been appealed, he expected the Supreme Court to act before early voting began.

Ms. Wainwright stated that no such indication had been given. She clarified that she was expressing her opinion and reiterated that, as sworn officers, the Board had a duty to uphold the state constitution.

Mr. McGlennon stated that the Board was responsible for acting within its own authority in a manner consistent with constitutional requirements. He questioned whether it was the Board's responsibility to call out others for perceived failures to uphold constitutional provisions.

Ms. Wainwright noted that the County would be responsible for paying for the election, reiterating her perspective. She stated that she would send the draft resolution to Board members.

Ms. Null stated that she had attended the Olde Towne Medical & Dental Center meeting and reported that four new members had joined the Board.

Mr. Icenhour stated that he had met with the Ford's Colony Green Team and noted that he and Ms. Wainwright had the opportunity to speak with residents of Ford's Colony.

Ms. Larson stated that she attended the special ribbon-cutting ceremony for the refurbished JCC Recreation Center pool. She commented on the improved appearance, noting that it was bright and that an excellent job had been done. She thanked those involved. She added that she spent the weekend at the NACo Legislative Conference, where she learned a great deal. She expressed frustration that little progress was being made in Congress despite many important issues requiring attention. She encouraged continued communication with state and federal representatives and commended Senator Ryan McDougle and Delegates Mark Downey and Jessica Anderson for their responsiveness. She urged Board members to continue responding to VACo alerts, noting the significant impact that pending legislation could have on the locality. She stated that she would attend the Hampton Roads Alliance meeting on Thursday.

H. REPORTS OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Stevens thanked the Board for its participation in the BOS Retreat workshop, noting the value of the information shared and the worthwhile discussions that took place. He expressed his appreciation for the members' time. He reported that the JCC Fire Department (JCCFD) was promoting the County's Burn Law, which prohibited open burning before 4 p.m. through the end of April. He noted that questions could be directed to JCCFD at 757-220-0626. He also announced that the Parks & Recreation Department would be hosting a job fair and encouraged Board members to share the information with individuals seeking summer employment. He noted that while many applicants were typically youth, the event was open to anyone interested in a summer job. He noted that the job fair would be held on Saturday, March 7 from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. at the JCC Recreation Center located on Longhill Road. Mr. Stevens then informed the Board that JCC had lost a long-time employee, Ms. Lorraine Taylor, Real Estate Administrative Coordinator. He noted that she had served the County for more than 26 years and had passed away the previous week. He asked that her family, friends, and co-workers be kept in thoughts and prayers.

I. CLOSED SESSION

At approximately 4:14 p.m., the Board recessed.

At approximately 4:21 p.m., the Board reconvened.

Mr. McGlennon noted that a third Closed Session item was added for the consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members or consultants pertaining to actual or probable litigation, where such consultation or briefing in open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the public body pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A)(7) of the Code of Virginia.

A motion to Enter a Closed Session was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

At approximately 4:23 p.m., the Board entered Closed Session.

At approximately 5:01 p.m., the Board re-entered Open Session.

A motion to Certify the Board only spoke about those items indicated that it would speak about in Closed Session was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

1. Discussion of reports or plans related to the security of any governmental facility, building or structure, or the safety of persons using such facility, building or structure, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A)(19) of the Code of Virginia.
2. Consideration of a personnel matter, the appointment of individuals to County Board and/or Commissions, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(1) of the Code of Virginia
 - a. Appointments – Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission

No discussion regarding the appointment took place.

b. Appointments - Wetlands Board and Chesapeake Bay Board

A motion for the Appointment of Mr. Mark McElroy for a Full Member term, expiring December 31, 2031, and that the vacant alternate position be filled by Mr. Curtis Remple for a term, expiring March 31, 2030, was made by James Icenhour Jr., the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

3. Certification of Closed Session

J. ADJOURNMENT

1. Adjourn until 5 pm on March 10, 2026 for the Regular Meeting

A motion to Adjourn was made by Tracy Wainwright, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

At approximately 5:05 p.m., Mr. McGlennon adjourned the Board of Supervisors.



Deputy Clerk