At a regular meeting of the King George County Board of Supervisors, held on Monday, the 14th day of July, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. in the Auditorium of King George High School at 10100 Foxes Way, King George, Virginia:

**PRESENT:** Cathy Binder, Chairman
Jeff Bueche, Member
Annie Cupka, Vice-Chairman
Richard Granger, Member
Jeff Stonehill, Member
Neiman C. Young, County Administrator
Matt Britton, County Attorney

The Following comments were requested to be placed into the record.

Christine Foshay
6194 McCarthy Drive
King George VA 22485

July 13, 2020

Dear BOS,

It’s imperative that all residents of King George have access to high speed internet from their homes. I was shocked to learn that many folks have to use the Smoot Library or hot spots in order to download files, work on projects or simply browse the internet….that’s unacceptable and I’m not sure how or why we are even still operating this way. King George needs to get with the times.

I’m fortunate that I live in a neighborhood that has access to Verizon internet but I find it highly disappointing that in 2020, folks in our county do not have easy access to high speed internet. High speed internet is not a luxury, it’s a necessity and should be brought to our county as soon as possible. When I speak of high speed internet, I’m talking about [HERE ARE NAMED TWO LARGE COMPANIES THAT THE AUTHOR FEELS ARE ACCEPTABLE] ...not [HERE ARE NAMED TWO SMALLER COMPANIES THAT THE AUTHOR
FEELS ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE] Atlantic Broadband, KGI or other small companies that are less than optimal.

High speed internet is not a “want”, it’s a “need”. Give the residents of King George what they’ve needed for many years….and do it in an expeditious manner.

Thank you,
Christine Foshay

Hello,
My name is Kimberly Sekely and I have been a resident of King George County for almost 4 years. We moved in into The Meadows community to a lovely home on 11 acres.

The only downside to living in this great community is the lack of internet access! We are located in a lower “valley” of the neighborhood and have no options available to us other than hotspot WiFi with capped data limits. Even with our hotspot, our upload and download speed is ridiculously slow and the signal is weak.

During this Covid crisis, I decided to change careers and attend school for nursing. Trying to manage online courses has been an absolute nightmare. I have had to take my laptop to the library in order to take my exams. I can only imagine parents who were attempting distance learning with their children.

My husband had an opportunity to take a job that would allow him to work from home. Unfortunately, speed testing for our download and upload speed showed such unreliability that he had to turn down the position. With elderly parents at home, it would have been a perfect job for him to transition to.

We are in dire need of a solution. The lack of ability to pay bills online, download information, schoolwork, communicate with family through Zoom, or any other task involving internet accessibility is sad and unacceptable in this age of technology.

Please help us rural residents!!

Thank you,
Kim Sekely

0:00:00 Cathy Binder: To this regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of King George County, Virginia. Do we have any amendments to the agenda?
Dr Young: Yes, Madam Chair, there will be an amendment to the consent agenda. If you will note, regarding the public hearing rezoning application case 19-03-ZD2 requested by Darrell Hertenstein, Hertenstein Investment Group on behalf of Beverley Coates, also known as the Village Project. It was captured that the voting action by the board was a 5-0 vote to have the project go back to the planning commission. That is incorrect. Actually, I'm asking for those minutes to be amended to reflect the fact that Ms Annie Cupka had requested to be recused from the vote. And I would like to read her statement again as captured in the minutes, or the transcript. "Madam Chair, in an abundance of caution and in order to avoid any impropriety and appearance of impropriety, I'm recusing myself from participation in this public hearing and all related matters including discussion and voting. This conflict arises as a result of having received and properly recorded any kinda campaign contributions from the applicant today and going forward." So we wanted to amend the minutes for the board to vote on to reflect the fact that the vote was made at a motion by Mr Granger, seconded by Mr Stonehill." Miss Cupka read a statement to recuse herself from discussion and to vote on the matter. And the vote is 4-0.

Cathy Binder: Thank you, Dr Young. We'll bring that up with the correction at the consent agenda.

Dr Young: Thank you, ma'am.

Cathy Binder: Do we have to vote on that amendments to the agenda? Sorry, I forgot about that one. We haven't done those in a while. Do I have a motion to accept the amendments to the agenda?

Mr Stonehill: I move.

Mr Bueche: Second.

Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor?

Mr Stonehill: Aye.

Ann Cupka: Aye.

Mr Bueche: Aye.

Cathy Binder: Any nays? Chair votes aye, motion carries. Public comment. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person in order to afford everyone an opportunity to speak. If comments relate to a specific public hearing item, we ask that you offer those comments at that time of the public hearing. Is there anybody in the public who would like to come up and give public comment, but not on any topics that are going to be heard in the public hearing? Do we have anybody online? We do have somebody online? Mr Dines, would you like to bring that person up?

Mr Dines: Sure. Mrs Karabots, do you have something you'd like to say for the regular meeting and not for a specific public meeting?
0:02:57 Barbara Karabots: Yes, thank you so much. Good evening, and thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Barbara Karabots, and I'm currently residing at 3337 Roseland Road. I'm speaking tonight as a concerned citizen whose favorite home is now sandwiched between state properties known as Wayside Park. Our family life, privacy, and space is now compromised by park visitors trespassing from both sides of our home. So far this summer we've had to chase many intruders off our beach and pier including two separate calls that required assistance from the sheriff's department. We'd like to thank Supervisors Jeff Stonehill and Ann Cupka for initiating visits to our home to discuss our situation and personally investigate the future use of the acquired site located at 3321 Roseland Road. My husband extended an invitation last year to the King George supervisor team, but he did not receive a response. We would like to once again extend this offer. Many interested parties seem to agree that the 2-acre site at 3321 Roseland, proposed as a replacement for Wayside Park, has severe limitations. It is unfortunate that $780,000 was spent on an initiative. Many will argue it's okay because the purchased property was not made using county money. However, money given to Virginia from Maryland should still be considered public dollars, and future state and local dollars will be needed for renovations and maintenance of this site. Why put additional money into an inadequate project when our county and state are under huge financial constraints? We understand the desire and expectation that the county provide water access to our citizens. Our question is what other plans are being considered? Can we improve our old existing park? One interested town resident suggested a portion of the old Nice Bridge be used as a fishing pier and community-gathering place. Could we situate swimming and picnicking areas under the bridge similar to other parks who have successfully accomplished their setups? How about adding some jetties to build up sandy beaches and provide a safe border, preventing patrons from trespassing onto private property. As to what happens to the 3321 Roseland Road property, can it be used in a way to support public safety and social distancing? Can the location be used to enhance our community? Perhaps utilized for schools, meetings, trainings, or other county office needs. More than ever, we must make smarter decisions on all publicly-funded matters. Thank you for listening to our concerns and understanding the current fear we have for our safety and privacy. We truly appreciate you listening.

0:05:37 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Ms Karabots. Is there anybody else online Mr Dines? Anybody online? Do we have any written correspondence... Or Mister... Go ahead.

0:05:46 Adam Simenhoff: Okay. My name is Adam Simenhoff, 5340 Gordon Drive, King George, Virginia. I have five questions. Number one, Dahlgren Wayside Park and Barnesfield Park, both on US 301 South, are only accessible to the majority of King George County residents by driving on US 301 North and making a left turn or a U-turn onto US 301 South just before The Governor Nice Memorial, Senator Thomas Mack Middleton Bridge, also known as the Potomac River Bridge.

There is no traffic control to stop or go-around continuous oncoming traffic from the Potomac River Bridge. Since Maryland and Virginia entered into an agreement to modify Virginia US 301 to meet the upgrade of Potomac River Bridge, I ask the officials from the county, state, and federal levels to consider an engineering change proposal to add traffic controls to improve road safety before new road construction begins. Please provide the community with status updates,
so county park visitors do not have to risk accidents from oncoming bridge traffic approaching at highway speeds. Number two, Dahlgren Wayside beach provided a small public beach and community picnic area. Before the county surrendered the park for Maryland's Potomac River Bridge improvement, when did King George residents have an opportunity to vote on a referendum to give up our beach? No referendum was held. Why not? Number three, who approached our Congressman and the US Navy to surrender their unused land for the Potomac River Bridge expansion to save our Dahlgren Wayside beach? Four, Given the new land acquisition, what is the plan to replace the lost beach with a man-made beach at the new Dahlgren Wayside location? And finally, number five. Before the covid-19 pandemic, King George was losing retail stores. What is the county's plan to incentivize retail store landlords to keep their tenants? What is the county's plan to attract new small business start-ups, and incentivize businesses owned by veterans, women, and minorities? Thank you very much for the opportunity to present my questions to the board today.

0:08:26 Kevin Grego: Good evening. My name is Kevin Grego, 13401 Prim Road, King George, Virginia. First of all, I wanna thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak here tonight. I stand before you to encourage you to support the grant to bring broadband to the many last mile customers here in King George County, of which myself and my family are considered such. My wife and I moved here with our family in 2016, and we never thought to think about... If internet would be an issue. We managed up until March of this year, when the covid-19 pandemic became a worldwide issue, and it really hit home then how hard it is to survive in 2020, in this new age, without wired-in broadband access. I have a five-year-old who is going to be going into 1st grade. My wife and I basically did what we could with the packets starting in March, which was very little without having an elementary school teacher education. And he could not access on a hotspot, the many online virtual activities provided by the local school district here. Myself, I am a teacher for Charles County Public Schools in Maryland. Today, we were told that we would be going online... Virtual, to start the school year.

In order to upload lessons, to participate in the many lessons, to bring engaging curriculum to my students, I need to go sit in my church parking lot at Round Hill Baptist Church to access their Wi-Fi in order to do my job successfully, in order to telework. That, to me, is not right. My wife, who is a nurse here for Fresenius Medical Care, has a dream of going back to school to get her master's degree in Public Health. She wants to do an online program through Liberty University. As of right now, she cannot do that. I have exhausted all measures and means to bring broadband for my family, not only for me, but for the many people here in King George that do not have access to it. I have contacted corporate headquarters directly at Atlantic Broadband. They quoted me $50,000 to bring internet from Round Hill Road to my house at Prim Road. On a teacher's salary, as I'm sure that you know, I can't afford that. So I am asking you tonight to please thoughtfully consider this grant and vote in support of this grant that will not only benefit me, but my son's ability to continue to learn at a higher level, my ability to reach children as well in their learning experience, and also my wife's dream of achieving public health. And not only for my family, but for the many families here in King George that do not have access to it, to be successful here moving forward in the future. Thank you for your time.

0:11:47 Cathy Binder: Thank you very much. Do we have anybody else in the audience who would like to speak? Do we have any written correspondence?
0:12:03 Annie Cupka: Madam Chair, I do.

0:12:05 Cathy Binder: Okay, go ahead, Ms Cupka.

0:12:08 Annie Cupka: I have two emails I received from constituents who requested that they be read aloud. First one. "Hello, my name is Kimberly Sekely, and I have been a resident of King George County for almost four years. We moved into the Meadows community to a lovely home on 11 acres. The only downside to living in this great community is the lack of internet access. We are located in a lower valley of the neighborhood and have no options available to us other than hotspot Wi-Fi with capped data limits. Even with our hotspot, our upload and download speed is ridiculously slow, and the signal is weak. During this covid crisis, I decided to change careers and attend school for nursing. Trying to manage online courses has been an absolute nightmare. I have had to take my laptop to the library in order to take my exams. I can only imagine parents who are attempting distance learning with their children. My husband had an opportunity to take a job that would allow him to work from home. Unfortunately, speed testing for our download and upload speeds showed such unreliability that he had to turn down the position. With elderly patients at home, it would have been a perfect job for him to transition to. We are in dire need of a solution. The lack of ability to pay bills online, download information, school work, communicate with family through Zoom or any other task involving internet accessibility is sad and unacceptable in this age of technology. Please help us rural residents. Thank you, Kim Sekely, 3846 Dock Side Court." And the second correspondence, before I read it, I do need to read something in advance. I will read a redacted version of the letter, removing only the names of the author's suggested broadband entities that are both acceptable and unacceptable as they do not add or take away from the meaning of the letter, and so as not to affect any procurement processes or unnecessarily cause harm or benefit to any provider. "Dear Board of Supervisors, it's imperative that all residents of King George have access to high-speed internet from their homes. I was shocked to learn that many folks have to use the Smoot Library or hotspots in order to download files, work on projects or simply browse the internet. That's unacceptable, and I'm not sure how or why we are even still operating this way. King George needs to get with the times. I'm fortunate that I live in a neighborhood that has access to Verizon internet, but I find it highly disappointing that in 2020, folks in our county do not have easy access to high-speed internet. High-speed internet is not luxury, it's a necessity and should be brought to our county as soon as possible. When I speak of high-speed internet, I'm talking about... Here are named two large companies that the author feels are acceptable. Here are named two smaller companies that the author feels are not acceptable, or other small companies that are less than optimal. High-speed internet is not a want, it's a need. Give the residents of King George what they've needed for many years, and do it in an expeditious manner. Thank you, Christine Foshay, 6194 McCarthy Drive. Thank you, Madam Chair.

0:15:47 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Ms. Cupka. Does anybody else have any written correspondence? I have one written correspondence, but I will add it in my board report. Thank you, everyone. Right now... Hold on one second. I will close public comment and move on to reports from members of the board, Mr Stonehill.

0:16:17 Mr. Stonehill: Good evening, everybody. And if Mrs. Karabots is still on the line,
thanks for calling in and we will continue to do what we can for you guys down there, for all the residents down on Roselond. So we'll keep working on that the best we can. Mr Simenhoff, thanks for all your emails, they do get to all of us, and you were talking about the county giving up the beach down there at Wayside... They didn't really give it up, it was taken. In one of the town halls, this whole project was rammed down our throats from the county. And so it wasn't like the county gave up anything, like I said, it was taken. So we're doing what we can to get land back and get access to the public because during the times of covid and everything, everybody wants to be outside, everybody wants to fish, everybody wants to be outside, out of their houses. And about the lease and the rent and stuff and all the stores, that is definitely something that's near and dear to my heart, since I'm the supervisor in Dahlgren in the business district, and I'm watching retail stores close up one right after another because the rent is going up. I know economic development, I've spoken to Mr Minor over there about different ideas about how we can stop that, if there's any way that we can. And trust me, I'm with you all the way on that, whatever we can do, if there's a way that they need to find landlords because of raising the rent, I don't know. But it's definitely something that we're gonna be working on, so don't worry about that. Mr Grego, I hope that I'm getting that name right. Broadband, yes, is definitely a major concern for all of King George County, since we are such a rural county, it was bad before. And now during the times of covid, it really hits home for the lack of the broadband that we do have here. Until I moved over here to King George, I was in an area that I had to use a hotspot and I couldn't do anything except check emails, I couldn't stream, I couldn't do anything, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There are some things in motion right now to increase the broadband access on a countywide level, statewide, and the federal level. Congressman Wittman is always continuously sending out things about what he wants to do to try to get rural broadband to all of the rest of the county. So that's definitely something we're gonna be working on. Quick board report. July 2nd, I sat in on a meeting with a group of folks in reference to the cigarette taxing for next year. On the 2nd also, I attended the LEPC meeting and discussed with other agencies and folks from around the state of what's going on in their counties, and also, of course, combating covid. July 4th, we had an informal meeting with the folks from Hope Church, up on their property off of Mathias Point Road, where we met with... We probably had about a half a dozen of the neighbors that were right around that area. And they gave just a quick briefing about their plans and everything, and to show us the property a little bit. July 9th, myself and Mrs. Cupka held a very informal town hall meeting outside at Barnesfield Park, under the pavilion, and again, met with all the folks from Hope Church and their attorneys, and left that open for basically everybody in King George to come talk to them, and also, the neighbors on the Mathias Point area. It was very interesting to see their plans and to talk to their different members. And then yesterday, July 13th, I attended a quarterly meeting at the Sheriff's Office that Sheriff Giles put on, and spoke to those guys. Had a nice presentation from Mr Coleman, who gave them a beautiful flag to hang up at the office. And July 6th, I've actually... I spoke with the Director of the Potomac River Fisheries Commission and discussed how covid was affecting the commercial fishing industry in the Potomac River, and especially the folks here in King George are commercial watermen. And also, how it affected businesses all up and down the Potomac marinas and tackle shops and everything. Also spoke about the Mallows Bay Sanctuary, which is just a little bit north of us, but the southern boundary up there does touch King George. And we also spoke about what to do with some of the bridge material from when they do the 301 bridge. And there might be a possibility that we can keep some of that here locally in the county or... Not in the county, but on the Potomac River, outside of the county, for some artificial reefs. So the
folks here in King George can get out to mess with that. And then we also spoke about other things that were going on with the bridge and how it's gonna affect King George and the Potomac. So that's all I have.

0:22:02 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr Stonehill. Ms. Cupka.

0:22:06 Annie Cupka: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm not gonna read my entire report, but I did wanna point out a few highlights, and I will, as I always do, publish it on social media. On June 25th, virtually attended the YMCA board of directors meeting, they are working to reschedule their golf tournament and their casino night. They noted that they will not be able to do in-person shopping at Walmart with the children for Bright Beginnings this year due to the current store policy. However, there are still plans to move forward with the backpack and school supply donation drive. They are concerned that donations will be down as usage is down. I informed them that as the Y is a King George Education Foundation partner in education, there may be an opportunity to receive backpacks and school supplies from FoxSmart Center, and that I would ask the KGEF board to consider it at their upcoming meeting. KGEF agreed to do so, and I put them in touch with the Y to support the backpack drive. Thank you to King George Education Foundation for continuing to pay forward your mission, uniting the community to enhance public education, despite the uncertainty of the times we face. Saturday, June 27th, I attended the Fairview Beach Town Hall. I wanna thank Mr Bueche, James Monroe District Supervisor, for hosting the town hall and inviting me, and Sheriff Giles and Dr Young for joining us as well. In addition to the Service Authority billing issue I mentioned during the Board of Director's Report, we heard from a number of constituents regarding the need to update the golf cart ordinance, request for VDOT traffic calming study on the weekends, and a variety of enforcement issues for Sheriff Giles. Residents also expressed their displeasure at the decision to close the convenience centers on Sundays. I wanna thank also the Fairview Beach Residents Association for providing us with this opportunity after their meeting. On Thursday, July 9th, as Mr Stonehill mentioned, I co-hosted a town hall with him at Barnesfield Park for developers of the resort community rezoning application before the Planning Commission to meet citizens and answer any questions they may have. Thank you, Dr Young, for joining us as well. We informed citizens that they will have two opportunities to provide public comment regarding the project. First at the upcoming Planning Commission meeting this Thursday, July 16th, and once again, when the project is heard by the Board of Supervisors. This past Friday, July 10th, I participated in a conference call for elected officials hosted by Congressman Rob Wittman. And there was a lot of information provided in the call, I typed very detailed notes this time, as I said, will be shared with Project 94 with the Free Lance-Star and on my Facebook page. A lot of information about broadband, just as Mr Stonehill stated during his board report, a lot of work being done there. And a lot of information about school reopening. So make sure and check that out. And lastly, on Saturday, July 11th, I hosted Meet Me at the Park Office Hours from 9:00 AM to 11:00 AM at Cedell Brooks, Jr. Park. Two citizens visited with me regarding a variety of issues, including parks, the Nice Bridge Project, upcoming public hearings, and school reopening plans. As of right now, I tentatively planned to hold Meet Me at the Park Office Hours again at Cedell Brooks, Jr. Park on Saturday, August 8th and Saturday, August 22nd, from 9:00 AM to 11:00 AM as long as the weather permits. Thank you, Madam Chair.

0:25:55 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Ms Cupka. Mr Bueche.
Mr. Bueche: Thank you, Madam Chair. On June 27th, I had a great turnout for a wonderful meeting with the folks of Fairview Beach. It was great to be able to engage in face-to-face conversations again. Thank you to all who came out and participated in the discussion, and special thanks to Mike Bennett and the Fairview Beach Residence Association for the opportunity. And for Annie Cupka, Chris Giles, and Dr Young for availing themselves to this conversation. On July 5th, I was truly honored to have been elected as the Vice-Chairman of the King George Republican Committee. On July 10th, naval support activity, South Potomac, welcomed Captain Todd Copeland and said goodbye to Captain Michael O'Leary during a change of command. I'd like to extend a welcome aboard to Captain Copeland, and thank you to Captain O'Leary for his leadership and support to our King George community.

Regarding some of the public comment that was given this evening, Mr Simenoff, thank you for coming out and giving your comments. You made some good points, but the public beach wayside referendum that you had pointed out, that was something that wouldn't have been up for something of that format. What we were basically looking at is, after numerous negotiations and numerous properties that we looked at and we submitted to VDOT, they declined it. At the end of the day, if we didn't take this option, what was gonna happen was they were gonna seize the land, and the County of King George could have done nothing about it, and we would have gotten nothing in return for it either. So that's how that played out. As far as the retail and economic revitalization, the impacts that you have brought out, I absolutely agree. I think Mr Jenkins, before he left the board, was working very hard on trying to get something done. Unfortunately, we didn't get it done before he left, but there are plans in place, I think Mr Nick Minor is working on that. But something that was a very common theme in the public comment this evening was internet and the lack thereof. That also impacts businesses. And then with the closure from the governor, the phases that we're in, those businesses were not able to open, or they were opening under restrictions, so they're gonna feel that, I think that the way that the checks went out from, people call it Trump money, the federal government. I think that should have been done differently, but that doesn't get us anywhere. Hopefully, in the future, if something else is done, that they will look at the impacts on small businesses, and I would encourage you reaching out to Congressman Wittman to see if he can lobby on some of those concerns. Christine Foshay's comments, unfortunately, King George County cannot direct a private company to come here. We as a county cannot... Have zero, absolutely zero authority over a private company to bring internet to King George. That's just the truth. But we are definitely working hard. I know a lot of things have come and gone, there's been a lot of grant opportunities, there's been a lot of companies that have come to us, but we have to do our homework and we have to look at, "Is it stable? The county lost its shirt in the past, and I know we have to be able to move forward and not always worry about that ghost from the past. But if we're gonna make an investment with taxpayer's dollars, we need to make sure we're on solid footing. And I think we're actually working towards that. Mr Grego, internet is a vital utility, it isn't a nice-to-have. Grant for broadband, any possibilities that there is for internet expansion in King George? I, for myself, and I know the board, that we're willing to look at anything. It may not work out, but we're definitely willing to do our homework and see what possibilities are out there. We've been campaigning on this, the supervisor's up here, supervisors of the past. Internet's been a campaign talking point for over a decade, and still here we are. We're trying to make it happen, but
eventually, we're just gonna have to pull the trigger on something, because it's not only impacting our economic development, but now with the way things are with this covid mess, distance learning, people going to work, it's a way of life now. So we definitely need to look at that. To the Karabots, thank you very much for your comments. But I think the correct question was raised, and I'd like to know, why is the public accessing the county's new, acquired site at this point? I don't believe it's open to the public. So I'd like that looked into. Nobody should be accessing that property at this point. And Madam Chair, that concludes my comments. Thank you very much.

Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr Bueche. Mr Granger.

0:31:44 Mr Granger: Hello? Okay. Thank you... I'd like to say thank you to everyone who came out and spoke. Mrs. Karabots, thank you for sharing your concerns. I know that you and your husband have spoken here a number of times. And to say, we're all to Mr Simenhoff's comments about Wayside Park. I know we've said it a number of times, the public didn't get an opportunity to weigh in. The whole idea was that was park land. That was supposed to be park land in perpetuity, which generally means forever. So how did they take it? They made the decision to take it. The rules then were that they have to provide us with something of equivalent value. And as Mr Bueche said, we worked... It was over multiple years, we were looking at properties trying to find something, and it was very challenging to find something that would meet the needs. And so I don't think we found something perfect, but it's what we found. So it was better to take something, 'cause it was getting to the point where they were gonna possibly say, "Hey, you're not gonna get anything." So our feet were to the fire a little bit on that. But I can still appreciate the concerns pitched for the Karabots who live right there and the challenges they are facing. Some of you also brought up the county's plan for businesses. Mr Bueche again brought up Mr Jenkins, who was on the board previously, and he did push for small businesses in particular. We did pass at least the one to deal with the water connection fees. I know that there's a desire to add more to the toolbox in order to help incentivize small businesses in particular. I know Mr Minor's working on that, and I have had conversations with him. But it's finding the right way to incentivize and help businesses that will be productive to come into the county so it can generate revenue for us and so they can be successful. So it does take time, but those are great points, and I appreciate it. Mr Grego, Ms. Sekely, and Ms. Foshay all, I know, spoke about internet access. I absolutely agree, this is, especially with the current situation that we're in with covid and education, very much a need. Previously at our Vaco sessions, our main priority has always been equal taxing authority. And so I think with the way that we see things right now, I think it might actually be internet access to all people. It's really challenging especially with, I think, education. And this year how to make sure that all the children here receive the education that they're gonna require to help make sure they're educated and they can grow up and be productive members of society. So I think that is probably the highest one at this moment, and seeing where we're at right now with the challenges we're facing. With all that said, I would like to say thank you to the schools and their staff just for their... I know they haven't started yet, I know it's gonna be a challenge this year, but I know they're professional. And as I said, the education of our children is very important. They're the next step, and it's something I... We worry about the virus and people being infected, but children being educated is very important as well, and them falling behind is a big concern as well, and certainly don't wanna see that. So thank you to all the staff, those who teach, drive the kids, serve
meals, staff, administration. So thank you to all of them, and just really hoping everything goes well this year. So thank you for what you guys do. Other than that, on June 22nd, I did attend an FRA meeting. Things are going well, we are looking at, with the budgets, like everyone else, challenging with budgets, but there were some savings due to the fact that we haven't been able... Or I guess the staff hasn't been able to go out on calls to go investigate new businesses because of the whole shutdown of everything. So they've saved some money from the previous year so that that can carry over to help into the next year and to continue those activities. So that's encouraging from that perspective at least. Last thing I have is Mr Chris Clark reached out and had shared that the consensus completes at a 68.6% self response, which is good. It's better than it was last... 10 years ago. More is always better, but the census bureau is now starting to look for events to put enumerators, which are census-takers, and they're looking to start on that in the next few weeks. And so they have some applications in for the farmer's market, and Chris has been looking into different county spaces that they might be able to use, like the Citizen Center and Library [0:36:02] ____ So hopefully, we'll get through that smoothly as well. But that's all I have. Thank you.

0:36:08 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr Granger. I like that you brought up Mr Clark. When I met with GWRC's representative, Linda Milsaps, she made a point to say that Chris Clark is a superstar in the region of the census count. So I wanna have a shout out to Mr Clark and all he does, because he is the superstar in the region for the census counts, as they put it, as GWRC helps with that. And that's George Washington Regional Commission. I also wanna thank everyone who came out today to talk about broadband. I understand it well. I am one of those people who lives right off 301, but is underserved because it would cost $27,000 to lay a line down my road, so I have a MiFi hotspot. So I understand your concerns. It's just very challenging. When I was at the NACO Conference, they brought up that broadband should be considered like a public utility, is because it's vital and needed. And we're gonna address it later, and I had contacted those with the grant, that's later in this program, and they gave me some more information which I'll share at that time. Concerning Roseland Road and Wayside Park, as I'm more than willing to come anytime to see Mr Karabots. He actually waved to me last week, I was down at the Buckler property. And also Mr Karabots as they remember, I held a town hall with Dr Young, and Mr Bueche, was there and Mr Stonehill came as a member of the audience because he was not sworn in yet. And we had talked to Roseland Road about the whole... How Wayside Park and the whole thing with the land swap. And Mr Simenhoff, you might not know, but the federal parks-to-land program is a very complicated program, and it has covenants on it, and you only can do certain things. And those covenants transferred from Wayside now onto the new property but we're... You're under restrictions and you only can do certain things. And the whole project in the land swap had over 30 entities that had to give their okay and their eyes on it before. So it was well-reversed, but we really didn't have a lot of say in it. They were at the point... We were holding up the bridge and they were gonna do what they needed to do to get it done. And so we got the best offer that we could for King George. Alright. Since our last meeting on June 16th, I met with representatives from GWRC, and David Beale from the Virginia Department of Transportation about our traffic and road concerns in King George County off of Route 301. We called it the King George transportation field trip. I wanna thank Mr Beale, Linda Milsaps, and Adam Hager for joining me on the tour. We viewed the intersection of Route 205, 301, Route 301 and Eden Drive, and Roseland Road. Mr Jim Lynch from the Dahlgren Heritage Trail also talked to the group about concerns on Route 218, near Caledon State Park and safe
access to the trails. A project to make a small stretch of road safe for hikers, bikers, and families could be a good future Smart Scale project. They have offered to meet in October so they could take a look at it together. And even Eden Drive, VDOT is aware and will look to ensure the grass is mowed at that cut-through with Route 301 to help cars with a sight difference... Sight distance. I know. I'm one of those people that has a small car, and when the grass is high, it becomes a safety concern. He saw it, saw little cars going over, and he said, "You're right. It probably needs to be mowed a little bit more." Concerning Roseland Road and its intersection near the Harry Nice Bridge, the connection moves 200 feet to the south and left-out are restricted and a southbound right turn lane is provided. This, coming from Mr Beale, should ensure ample sight distance for the left-in. The bridge construction will start next month and is scheduled to be complete in 2023. And I just wanna thank them for coming out and looking our concerns because I know Ms. Milsaps said to me, "We don't get out to King George very often, it was really important to see when you bring up road projects in Smart Scale, what it's about." As a member of the Rappahannock Area Agency on Aging Board of Directors, I would like to thank all the staff and their executive director, Pat Holland. They have added over 500 residents in four Fredericksburg Restaurants that serve hot meals to shut-in seniors. And I wanna just shout out to any King George restaurants that would like to be part of it, please contact me, and I could get you in contact with Ms Holland, and they pay... They get reimbursed... And the restaurants get reimbursed. But they deliver hot meals to seniors that cannot get out due to covid, a lot of them are high-risk. And they provide hot meals to those seniors, they do visits and phone check-ins just to make sure they're okay and to check on their health. They'll even run grocery runs, get prescriptions, and anything they need from Walmart or CVS. I met with several constituents, Mr Mark Webb and Mr Fred Davies, concerning issues with development and property rights. A thank you to Mr Davies for an awesome interview about his remembrance of King George over the last 88 years of his life. I also interviewed Mrs. Elizabeth Lee who knows everything about genealogy in this county, and got an autographed copy of her new book, The Last Hope: Lies, Truths and Legends of John Wilkes Booth's 34-Hour Escape through King George County. You can pick up a copy of Ms. Lee's book from her or at the King George Historical Society. And once again, I would love to talk with more citizens and collect your stories. Just send me an email and we can set up a time to videotape. For the last... This was the email that I received. This email is entitled, "Concerning the Confederate Memorial on the Courthouse Grounds." In the next Board of Supervisors meeting on July 14th, please address your plans to remove the confederate memorial that is promptly displayed on the front lawn of the King George Courthouse grounds. Surely you all have a plan to remove the stone monument to a graveyard where it belongs as opposed to allowing it to remain in the heart of our county as an insult to all black citizens. If not, why not?" Signed, Mr David E Jones, 5415 Winston Place, King George, Virginia. I turn over now, Mr Britton.
report back to you as soon as we know exactly the status of it. That includes a lot, there's a lot of names on it and the genealogy of those names, as you pointed out. So that's what we're doing in response to your request and Dr Young. But obviously, that's my take on it. Dr Young may know something at this time, but we're working on it.

0:43:38 Cathy Binder: Dr Young.

0:43:39 Dr. Young: Yes, Madam Chair. Mr Britton's absolutely correct. Just the cursory review that we have done thus far. By all means, it was originally a confederate memorial but there are some questions on if throughout the history of that monument, if it's added, union participation by King George residents. It's even been discovered that there's actually a couple of black slaves that are actually memorialized on the memorial, so I think there's a lot of research that needs to go into the topic and go into the statue so we can get a clear understanding of exactly what it is. Was it a Confederate memorial? Yes. But is that what it is now? We can't say with absolute fidelity. We're just gonna have to do a little bit of research and bring a report back to the board.

0:44:31 Cathy Binder: Alright. Thank you, Mr Britton and Dr Young for looking into it, I appreciate and look forward to your report. That is the end of my board report. Alright. Do I have a motion for the consent agenda?

0:44:42 Mr. Granger: So moved.

0:44:44 Cathy Binder: Do I have a second? Any discussion? All those in favor.

Mr. Bueche: Second.

0:44:51 All: Aye.

0:44:52 Cathy Binder: Any nays? Chair votes Aye. Motion carries.

0:44:54 Mr. Bueche: Madam Chair?

0:44:55 Cathy Binder: Yes.

0:44:56 Mr. Bueche: I'm sorry, but did we... Before I seconded it, did we have to approve the changes, the amendments we made earlier during the consent agenda?

0:45:07 Mr. Granger: We did make a motion to amend the consent agenda based off Dr Young's input. And so the consent agenda has changed to what he presented.

0:45:16 Mr. Bueche: Awesome. Sorry about that. Thank you.

0:45:18 Cathy Binder: No. That's okay. Alright. We're now upto the County officials reports, constitutional officers?

0:45:26 Dr. Young: No report, Madam Chair.
0:45:27 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Now we're at... Mr Britton reported the county attorney. First up, dissolution of the wireless authority.

0:45:34 Matt Britton: Yes, Madam Chair. There's been a lot of talk about wireless, I'm aware of that. There was a wireless authority and it got dissolved... Thank you. Oh. Thank you. I got a bum leg here. It got dissolved, so I'm handing out... When I came on board a few months ago, I sent out a... Spoke with Dr Young and got a checklist and made sure that we had done everything that was necessary, and did the insurance that we weren't paying insurance premiums on something, things like that. And then all of the legal documents were in order. It turned out there was one outstanding document from the SCC, the State Corporation Commission, and we got it. So that's now done, it's put to rest. That's all there was on that, I just wanted to hand that out and make that a record. There's nothing further. And to tell you that I had run down everything that was necessary, decommissioning and all of that. The next matter, I believe is up, is delinquent accounts and collections, advertisement of proposed collection ordinance. And this is a bit more involved. So a few months ago, I just started meeting with all of the heads of the county. Be they the Commissioner of the Revenue, the Treasurer, Mr Weekley, anyone who has an outstanding account, and going over the various accounts and where we were. I was getting a couple of emails from the Commissioner of the Revenue who stays on top of this, "Hey. Here's a vehicle tax case that the person is not paying." Meals taxes, sales and use tax, and what have you. So some of these are actually misdemeanors, so they go through the Commonwealth Attorney's Office, they're handled by the Assistant Commonwealth Attorney, Deputy Commonwealth Attorney, who's also a part of the county attorney's Office. And so he's able to handle these things. There are other things in zoning and what have you. And I just wanted to get an aspect, how many cases do we have? If there's six or seven a year, fine, I can do it. But if there's a... Well, it turned out that in any given time on the county side, there's about 100. And not all of these go to court, but they're all collection cases. There's one person who's very capable of the Treasurer's Office, but she's one person. And it turns out on the Service Authority side, there was 550, with the revenue exceeding $200,000 in delinquent accounts and outstanding. So obviously 650 cases. That's not something that we're gonna be able to do in-house. So, of course, I'm familiar with the various organizations throughout the Commonwealth. There's a great organization tax, which is run by Jeff Scharf and a bunch of other folks. He was at the Commissioner of Revenues Office in Arlington. They have 100 folks. So I got Jeff. I called him, he came right down, he met with Cece at the Treasurer's Office, Commissioner of Revenue, myself, and I invited Mr Weekley. And you can see in the report here, everybody was extremely impressed. And this is a cradle-to-grave operation, where they are a part of the Bright System, which is the system that we use for our finances. So literally, when we push a button, they're in on every account. And they handle it from the initial contact, the follow-up contact, sending out the letters, making a payment plan, collecting the funds, and distributing to the county. And in the very rare case that it needs to go to court, which is usually someone who cannot be found, which is service through the Commonwealth, it's complicated, but you basically get a default judgment, and you put it in case they sell any property in the county, it gets collected first. People who just won't pay, they just think they're getting away with something, and people who can't be found, and there are lawyers, there are lawyers, too. So they can handle all of that. Everything, zero fiscal impact to the County, because the Virginia Code allows the county to pass an ordinance, which says that if you are delinquent on your account, we can add 20%. And
that's what they make, which is reasonable, most contingency fees for lawyers are 33%. So it's 20% by code. When I was Commonwealth Attorney, I used the Department of Taxation, which was 10%-20%, I forget which, to collect outstanding court costs. And these worked very, very well. And so we interviewed him, we all liked him, you have a presentation from him. But all that I'm asking the board to do is, number one, to tell you that I thought I would get this in hand for y'all to know, we've got sales and use tax, we've got meals tax. Those are fiduciary taxes. That means that the business is not entitled to those taxes. They're collecting sales tax on behalf of the Commonwealth of Virginia. And they hold it as a fiduciary? If you take that money, that's stealing. So that's a crime. But the other taxes that come through are fees, cost, late fees, interest, and they all build up. So these are civil matters, and that is what Mr Scharf's office handles. And so we wanted to find out, "Where are we at?" And that's where we're at, and it's pretty significant. And I think that anyone in the Treasurer's office, Commissioner of Revenue's Office, and certainly Mr Weekley's office can tell you that they just would love to get something like this underway. I can handle all this, the vetting, the signing the contract, and all that. But what the board needs to do is consider the proposed ordinance. So what I'm asking today is if you would consider advertising the ordinance, which I put in there, to add 20% to a delinquent bill. I wouldn't... Finally note. These folks know what they're doing, they're respectful, dignified people, they understand people get behind, they understand the difference between someone who made a mistake and is doing it intentionally, they understand someone who got behind and needs a payment plan, and they've done it, and they represent over 80 localities in Virginia, including two of our neighbors, Spotsylvania and Westmoreland. I did speak with Westmoreland, and they made a referral. I didn't speak with Spotsylvania because I spoke with some others. Everybody had good things to say. And actually, Jeff, he is known to our treasurer's office because he teaches the class to treasurers. Jeff Scharf, one of the principals. So it was good information, came right away, no matter who we contract with ultimately, we're going to need this in place, or else you're gonna lose a third of the bill to a collection lawyer. I would ask the board to consider authorizing the advertisement of the ordinance as presented.

0:52:31 Cathy Binder: Is there any discussion?

0:52:35 Mr. Bueche: So moved.

0:52:36 Annie Cupka: Second.

0:52:37 Cathy Binder: Discussion?

0:52:39 Mr. Granger: Do we need to provide a date for the advertisement?

0:52:43 Matt Britton: It's two weeks, so I was thinking on the August 4th or 18th. They could be up and running in five business days, and I know Jonathan... I presented this at the Service Authority, Jonathan Weakley. He was ready to go to... 'cause he has a quarter million dollars in revenue, understand?

0:53:04 Mr. Granger: I understand.

0:53:04 Mr. Britton: And so the 4th would... I can't speak for who sends the advertisement to
the newspaper, but it's not me, but I'm assuming they can send it out tomorrow.

0:53:18 Cathy Binder: Dr Young, we've got a question for you. Mr Granger.

0:53:21 Mr. Granger: The advertisement of the ordinance for the public hearing. Would we want it for the... Do we need to identify the date? We just say we want advertisements?

0:53:30 Matt Britton: Yeah. You do not need to identify the date.

0:53:31 Mr. Granger: Okay. I apologize then. I have nothing else.

0:53:34 Cathy Binder: Alright. We have a motion properly. Second. Any more discussion? All those in favor?

0:53:40 All: Aye.


0:53:46 Matt Britton: Tourism Advisory Committee report. Sorry. Appreciate Dr Young helping me out with my gimpy leg here. It is a lot of paper. Mr Bueche, you're exactly right. You charged me last meeting, I believe it was, or I think it was, to figure out what's going on with the Tourism Advisory Committee. Number one, is the money being handled correctly, and what's the fund balance? So in order to give you a complete update, I just went from bottom to the top, so you have every document there, and basically the situation is that they have a charter. The Virginia Code allows for accounting a locality, actually, to have either a tourism advisory committee or some type of tourism industrial board, we have a tourism advisory committee, or do it yourselves. And if you do it yourself, that's typically done by having a marketing manager or a tourism director, depending on how big the county is, or you may have several people like that, and then they would meet with the industry-related tourism and advise the board, and the board would actually make direct decisions. We have a tourism advisory committee, and that committee is active and robust, but what they do is they review contracts on a regular basis, and then they advise you thumbs-up or thumbs-down or thumbs-neutral on various contracts, and they also, as I understand it, do things that as they're directed like, "Please look into... " And I'm making this up, "the Fall festival or The 300 Celebration," or what have you. And then they will go out and as directed, find the contracts and make recommendations to you. So we have a tourism advisory committee, I've provided the charter. I think what isn't there is there's no strategic plan, there's no overall philosophic direction, at least that I could find. And maybe that's by design, I don't know, I wasn't around at that time. But the second thing is, how about the money? The process is this. We have, by state law, and I provided the code in there, the tax code, that we can charge 5% for what's called transient occupancy tax, that's what everybody else knows, is that, when you get at the hotel for $100 a night and then the bill's $190 a night, that's that extra hotel tax or resort tax. Well, in Virginia, we are one of the listed counties that can charge 5%, the basic transient occupancy tax, hotel tax is 2% in Virginia, but many jurisdictions can charge 5% and we do, by ordinance. 3% of that... Or three bits, not 3% of that. Three bits of that, 3% of the tax goes exclusively by law to tourism. It must be spent on tourism. So I said, "Alright, well is that happening?" And it is. So the Commissioner of the Revenue collects that,
books it in her way, then she takes it over to the Treasurer's Office, we post it, the Treasurer's Office then sends to finance which puts it into a dedicated and specified account. All expenditures from the tourism committee go to Dr Young, who's knowledgeable about them, and then they get presented to the board before that happens, and then you approve those individually. The average annual, I gave you three years. That was just something I don't think you directed me on that, I just... Standard accounting principles, I went back three years, I could go back further if you wanted. The average $250,000, quarter million dollars a year, give or take. And over the past three years, that means that you've collected $750,000, you have a fund balance of 650 roughly, I'm not looking at the paper, but you have a fund balance of roughly $650,000. I'm not a forensic accountant, but I've done this a lot, and the money is tracked, appears to be in order, and whether you want a fund balance of $650,000 I don't know, that's up to you and the Advisory Committee, but it's there. And I would say that the only thing perhaps that they could be charged with doing would be getting an overall plan. That is in the ordinance and the charter, and it appears that it's in the code... Excuse me, in the charter, which is, there's supposed to be a philosophic direction, like, "This is where we wanna go." To use a zoning analogy, "We want this type of zoning in this area, this type of zoning in this area." And for them it would be, "Meet with all of the industry. This is where we want entertainment, events, recreation, hotels, and that type of thing." That may exist, so I apologize, but no one was able to produce it for me. I did work with Dr Young who was very helpful, actually sent me a very small overview, which was totally accurate in the beginning, which was my framework with Nick Minor, and thanks to finance, the Commissioner of Revenue, and the treasurer who got back to me immediately with all the information. So it was great.

0:59:16 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr Britton. Do you guys have any questions? Mr Bueche?

0:59:19 Mr. Bueche: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr Britton, you said that 3/5 of the funds had to be allocated towards just tourism...

0:59:28 Matt Britton: By law.

0:59:29 Mr. Bueche: What about the remaining two?

0:59:31 Matt Britton: General funding.

0:59:33 Mr. Bueche: Okay. So it can be used for things outside of direct tourism, if that percentage remains intact?

0:59:43 Mr. Britton: The 2/5 can be used for general funds. You could order that it be applied only to that, but...

0:59:51 Mr. Bueche: No, I was just curious about...

0:59:53 Matt Britton: Dr Young knows about this very well.

0:59:55 Dr. Young: Yeah. I wanna make sure that we're not confusing two things. We're talking about the tourism fund, which is what you had the balance on, and what Matt, you referred to as
the transient occupancy tax, correct? Where 3% of the transient occupancy tax is going towards the tourism, in other words, the fund.

1:00:10 Mr. Bueche: Yeah, 2/5 is automatically going into our general fund as we sit today, the remaining 3/5 is going into this tourism fund, which is what this balance that we're looking at now, the $635,000 is that 3/5, that's all.

1:00:28 Dr. Young: The tourism fund, that's the 3% that's coming from the transient occupancy tax, then that other 2% automatically is going into the general fund already.

1:00:37 Mr. Bueche: Gotcha. Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

1:00:38 Matt Britton: So for every hotel dollar $0.02 goes into the... For every hotel dollar we collect tax for $0.05. $0.02 goes into the general fund. $0.03 goes into tourism.

1:00:48 Mr. Bueche: Perfect. Thank you.

1:00:50 Cathy Binder: Do we have any other questions?

1:00:54 Annie Cupka: Yes, I do have a question. So at the bottom of your memo, Mr Britton, when it says, "The county collects approximately $250,000 annually in designated tourism funds from the TOT, the transient occupancy tax." That $250,000 represents approximately the 3%, right?

1:01:26 Matt Britton: Yes.

1:01:28 Annie Cupka: Okay. And part of why we asked you to examine this is because we'd heard some questions from the Tourism Advisory Committee members... 'Cause if you look at how the revenues are reported, the budgeted amount and the appropriated amounts are $92,000.

1:01:52 Mr. Britton: Yes.

1:01:52 Annie Cupka: And so we have at least one hotel in particular that the owner/operator was pretty sure he himself had probably collected.

1:02:03 Matt Britton: I can go back. I didn't poison the well, I didn't make... I was aware of that. I didn't make any statements, I just said, "Could you please provide me with... "

1:02:12 Annie Cupka: Sure.

1:02:13 Mr. Britton: So Mr Stonehill can tell you...

1:02:15 Dr. Young: I can answer that.

1:02:16 Matt Britton: Yeah. But I was told the same thing, and that's what's causing the confusion, but there is an answer, which is Mr Young... Dr Young's gonna give you.
Dr. Young: Yes, ma'am. Traditionally, the tourism fund has been budgeted on the revenue side of the spreadsheet for accounting budget at $92,000 annually, and if you look at previous years, the last seven, eight years, they purposely have kept that conservative number. Number one, for the volatility of the funding. Like right now, we have a recession, as you're fully aware, the majority of our budget is built off of real estate taxes, which is stable, and therefore we can make stable projections on that revenue. But for these consumer taxes like transient occupancy tax, budgetary practices, to be prudent, they decided long before this board got here or this administration got here, that it was probably prudent, keep it as a place marker in the budget. That place marker is $92,000 just in the event that there is a recession and we don't depend on that money in our budget, just not to receive that revenue, and that's what's led to... Through that conservative budgeting, that's how we ended up with this fund balance, if that's what you wanna call it, of $635,000. So it was just making sure that we don't make ourselves victim to a volatile consumer tax.

Matt Britton: Madam Chair, if I may...

Cathy Binder: Go ahead.

Matt Britton: And I was told that, too. I asked the question, I said, "What is the revenue?" And they said $92,000. There is a... It's just a nomenclature issue. The budgeted amount that they're predicting... Projecting is 92. The funded amount annually is approximately $250,000, so I'm sure if someone called up and asked that, and they said, "Hey. How much goes into the tourism fund every year?" They'd say, "$92,000." But that's the budgeted amount. These are the actual amounts. And there was a little... I had that confusion, but I knew the answer, but I did drill all the way down, and finance, they had all the records for years and years and years, back a long time with... And so it was just a nomenclature issue, from what I found.

Annie Cupka: Thank you very much. I appreciate both of you addressing that, that was a major concern, and I wanted to make sure publicly that we let everyone know it's just a nomenclature issue, it's how it's categorized in the budget for purposes of being conservative, so thank you again. That's all I have.

Cathy Binder: Anybody else have any other questions? Mr Stonehill, no? I'm very happy. Thank you. You did a thorough job. I had always had a question, from all my time on the board, about what we could use with the money. And Mr Bueche, as you know, when we first came on the board, we were told one thing. But doing this research, it finds out that the options are a lot more open for using it to promote tourism, including... I've always said putting a pavilion at Cedell Brooks Park, because we have picnic benches, put a pavilion or bathrooms. So it's really great to see that it's not totally restricted and it's a little more open.

Matt Britton: And I did include in your packet, I know people go running from the room and lawyers start reading the law, but in your packets are the various code sections and ordinances related to it. If you did wanna say, "Do we need a blended system? Do we wanna give more direction to the tech? Do we want marketing?" What have you. Those options are available to you. And so I put those in there. So if you all have any questions, I can follow up.
1:05:56 Cathy Binder: Thank you. One other question I'd like to ask the board. Do we wanna maybe task the Tourism Committee of doing a strategic plan, 'cause I think that would be quite vital?

1:06:06 Mr. Granger: Yes. I believe we should, if they haven't, if they're supposed to. Yeah.

1:06:11 Cathy Binder: Does everybody have consensus to that? Mr Bueche. Right? Dr Young could... Mr Martin, can you tell the Tourism Committee we appreciate a strategic plan? I think it'd be really cool.

1:06:22 Dr. Young: Yes, Madam Chair.

1:06:23 Cathy Binder: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr Britton for doing this research, and to finance for getting all the information.

1:06:29 Matt Britton: You're welcome.

1:06:29 Annie Cupka: Madam Chair, your indulgence, please, before we leave this item?

1:06:32 Cathy Binder: Yes, go ahead.

1:06:34 Annie Cupka: So the other part of the discussion, if you all recall, last month, was one of the members of the Tourism Advisory Committee, Mr Baird was here in person and requested that we consider a joint work session with the Tourism Advisory Committee. Do we want to consider that? And if so, direct Dr Young and Economic Development and Tourism Staff to reach out to them to get dates they might be interested or available if the board desires to do so?

1:07:09 Cathy Binder: What do you guys think about that?

1:07:16 Mr. Granger: I would agree. Mr Baird gave the impression that there was some confusion maybe on the Tourism Advisory Committee about maybe what's expected. And so if there's some confusion, and they wanna meet and try to hash out exactly what we're looking for so that we all have clarity, then I think that makes sense.

1:07:34 Cathy Binder: Alright, Dr Young, thank you, I appreciate that, Ms. Cupka.

1:07:38 Annie Cupka: Thank you, ma'am.


1:07:41 Matt Britton: Madam Chair, the good news is the next two items are... I can do together. We have a police-requested towing board, that means... We don't have police. But if the law enforcement, the sheriff... We have state police. Or state police request a vehicle to be towed, then it falls under our ordinance, and there are a lot of reasons for that. But we have eight different towers on the rotation at any time, and they're governed and regulated by the ordinance.
Well, the board... Actually Sheriff Giles and I, probably 15 years ago, worked together in drafting up that original ordinance, it needs some updating, it needs some amending. We had the creation of the tow... Oh, also, the ordinance creates a towing board of five members, law enforcement officers and towers and citizens. And so now that it's created, we need to update it for how do they... What's the procedure for them to act? So we reinvigorated that... When I found out they hadn't met in a while, we reinvigorated that, y'all, if you recall, about a month, month and a half ago, reappointed the board, and they held their first two meetings. Unfortunately, one of the board members resigned, so now there's an opening. So the Sheriff's Office again... I don't know if you recall, but Patrick Weston did some heavy lifting and found five people, it's tough to find people on boards, as you know, so he did. And he has also found Mr Cave, and I put his... The letter that he wrote in... And he lives in front of the high school, if you wanted to know a district in where he was. And he'd be happy to serve. He sent you a nice note there about his willingness and desire and qualifications. And the Sheriff's Office is making that recommendation. So that would be one thing, to fill the seat vacated by Mr Zwicker. The second thing is, I would ask you to consider advertising the updates to the ordinance for your consideration after public hearing, and the main thing is level funding... I mean level billing. So right now, eight people could charge the eight different... Eight towers could charge eight different individuals who had their cars towed... There's different numbers, so you and all of us in a row could have our car towed from the exact same spot, the exact same 10 miles and all be charged differently. Well, I can tell you from being in court, and so can Mr Stonehill, people get upset about it. It doesn't matter whether they had their car towed 'cause they were doing something wrong to begin with, and that it's a lot easier to get into trouble than outta trouble, they don't... And Ms. Cupka, I can tell you they don't care. If you got charged $375 and they're waiting in court, and the person in front of them got charged $175, they're gonna tell, and then the judge might do something about that and reduce and we have to still pay that, and so the Commonwealth and the locality lose. So the Sheriff's Office said, "We want to level-bill. We want the same fee for all the towers who wanna be on this for the same services." Similarly situated people should be treated similarly, and that's what it is. There's some also just housekeeping. So those would be the two things I'd ask that you consider: The appointment of Mr Cave if you see fit or someone else, and that you consider advertising the ordinance for some date in the future.

1:11:19 Mr. Granger: I move to appoint Mr Robert Cave to the Tow Board.

1:11:23 Mr. Bueche: Second.

1:11:23 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor?

1:11:27 All: Aye.


1:11:32 Mr. Granger: I move to advertise the changes to the Tow Board ordinance.

1:11:38 Mr. Stonehill: Second
Mr. Granger: As presented.

Cathy Binder: Thank you. Any discussion?

Annie Cupka: Yes, Madam Chair.

Cathy Binder: Go ahead, Ms. Cupka.

Annie Cupka: Thank you, Mr. Britton, again, for bringing this to our attention. I cannot believe that we can charge different individuals or... I'm sorry, we don't charge them, but the tow companies are able or allowed currently to charge different individuals different fees for... You're talking about police tows, is that correct?

Matt Britton: Yeah. And storage.

Annie Cupka: Yeah. Police tows. Law enforcement requested tows and they don't have to abide by a contract rate. Individual tow companies can charge whatever they want right now.

Matt Britton: Unless you change the ordinance.

Annie Cupka: Unless we change the ordinance. Yes, please. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

Matt Britton: You're welcome.

Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mrs. Cupka.

Mr. Stonehill: I got one more question before you go. Mr. Britton, storage as well?

Matt Britton: Yes. Same.

Mr. Stonehill: Okay.

Matt Britton: Yes. And all the fees have been set by the board and the Sheriff's Office, so that the ordinance is nimble and you don't have to amend the ordinance every single time the fee changes. It goes up or down $10. We have provided a provision in there that the board sets the fees annually. The tow board, so it doesn't have to come back to y'all.

Cathy Binder: Got you.

Matt Britton: By the way, by statute, the Tow Board has to recommend changes to the towing ordinance, and they did, they met, they had a public hearing, they were there. I helped draft up the agenda, they went through all these, and these are the ones that they accepted and recommend to you themselves. I should have said that.

Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr. Britton. Do we have any other questions? So you have a
motion properly seconded. All those in favor?

1:13:23 All: Aye.


1:13:32 Matt Britton: Yeah, and I apologize. This and the last one they got caught in the cyber world, so I had to email them to you. The rest of them I have paper documents, but good for the trees, but maybe not so good for the board. This is just a one-pager, though. Right now, if you get arrested, you go to court and you're presumed innocent, you don't have to pay anything. And if you get acquitted or the charges get dropped, you don't have to pay anything. But if you get convicted, then you have to pay a bunch of fines and costs and fees, and restitution if you've damaged property or stole something or hurt somebody. One of those fees is the courthouse security fee, that's currently $10. As of July 1st, y'all can raise it to $20. Vic Mason is telling you about it, I'm telling you about it, we're not picking a position on it. Obviously, courthouse security has become very expensive lately for various reasons, mostly the pandemic. But I haven't been asked and I won't give you my opinion, but that's what you can do and most jurisdictions are upping the courthouse fee.

1:14:50 Mr. Granger: So this would be... If we want to move forward, we would make a motion to advertise change.

1:14:55 Matt Britton: Yes. It's an ordinance change, currently, I put the ordinance in there, but I just emailed it to you so you might not have seen it. But I put the old ordinance and I did the heavy lifting of changing the number 10 to 20. So we already have an ordinance, but it's at 10 bucks. This is traditionally similar to the 20% fee for a delinquent account, balancing the costs on the back of the people who create the cost.

1:15:23 Mr. Granger: I move to advertise for a change to the courthouse security fee ordinance as presented, changing it from a $10 fee to a $20 fee.

1:15:32 Mr. Bueche: Second.

1:15:33 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor?

1:15:38 All: Aye.


1:15:48 Matt Britton: Only two more, Madam Chair, I promise. I'm handing up to you, Madam Chair, you're gonna get two, you'll get the original and a copy, deeds. You may recall in one of the last couple of board meetings, you authorized and executed a deed of dedication subdivision from Hop Yard. What happened... And Ms Hall's here, what happens is, is Hop Yard or any subdivision, they hit milestones and then they have Propper's zoning ordinance and they have to
do certain things when they hit a milestone. It can be various things, it can be time, it could be number of houses. This is milestone 16, and so now they are required and they have done the requirement to dedicate certain things both to the county and to the Service Authority. We brought this same document to the Service Authority and it was approved. Two of you were there, and we drilled down on this one because, I believe, it was... Ms Cupka found a typo on the last one. So I had Miss... Everybody reviewed it this time as best we could. So if there's a typo on it, it's my fault 'cause we looked at it. Ms. Hall looked at it, Mr. Weakley looked at it, it's in order. And if you think it's in order, then I would suggest that you have a motion to accept subdivision deed and dedication to the Hop Yard from Hop Yard. And then I've already signed it as reform and Madam Chair, you and, I believe, Dr Young would need to sign it.

1:17:18 Cathy Binder: Do I have a motion?

1:17:19 Mr. Granger: I move to approve and adopt the subdivision deed and dedication as presented for Hop Yard.

1:17:23 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor?

1:17:30 All: Aye.


1:17:35 Matt Britton: And I do have one addition, I just got it hours ago. But it's good news, so I thought I'd bring it. There had been a bus accident, apparently a few years ago, maybe y'all know about it, and the county got sued... But it was a school bus accident, excuse me. And so that suit against the county was dropped, that's called a nonsuit, and so I'm just handing up the order. I'm sure y'all had an optic on that and maybe you wanted to know. I mean, obviously the school board... Anyway so the county has been dropped out of it, and I'm handing up what's called a nonsuit order. So you don't... Yes, you're welcome. No one had asked me about this, but I had just been tracking it when I did the handoff in March.

1:18:25 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr Britton, for bringing that to our attention.

1:18:30 Matt Britton: I'm not gonna ask Dr Young to get up anymore. I feel...

1:18:36 Cathy Binder: I appreciate it.

1:18:36 Matt Britton: I wish I could do it.

1:18:38 Cathy Binder: Alright. Next up, Dr Young, is the CARES Act presentation.

1:18:44 Dr. Young: Thank you, Madam Chair. Chris is gonna go upload the slide, so please bear with me. I also emailed you all the slides and they're included in the board packet as well. Here's our agenda. Next slide. So as the board is aware, we've talked in depth, but I wanted to revisit the topic and provide more background just to ensure that the general public that may be arriving to this conversation just now have a full understanding of the topic that we're discussing, which is
the CARES Act. A little bit of background, in March 2020, the US Government established a relief fund called CARES fund to the tune of $150 billion. They decided that they were gonna distro those funds to the states in accordance to the size of their population. The State of Virginia received their allocation, and decided that in turn they was gonna maintain 55% of the funding. They were going to distribute 45% of the funding to counties in accordance with the size of their population. For King George County, that local allocation equated to $2.3 million, slightly over $2.3 million. Next slide. Once we had received that allocation of slightly over $2.3 million, we did receive instructions from both the Department of Treasury... I'm sorry. From both the Federal and the State Department of Treasury on how we could spend those monies. First, they stated that it was necessary for the fund, whatever we spent these funds on, it was in response to a public health emergency. They would have to cover costs that were not accounted for in the budget, most recently approved as of March 27, 2020, which for us it translates into the fiscal year in '19-'20 budget. Or if you did decide that you were going to pay for costs that were executed in the fiscal year '19-'20 budget, it would have to be for costs... For purposes that weren't originally intended for when that expenditure was allocated. For example, we did have parts of REC employees that were budgeted for in the fiscal year in '19-'20 budget to run recreation programs. However, once recreation programs were suspended we then repurposed those parks REC employees to the convenience centers, to the Commission of Revenues office, to the Registrar to assist with other staffing gaps that we had in the administration. So by definition, those expenditures in the '19-'20 budget would qualify as legal expenditures against this CARES Act funding. In addition, the final rule that was provided to us in the guidance was, these costs would have to incur after March 21, 2020 through December 30, 2020. That's a very important point, because after December 30, 2020, whatever funds isn't expended has to be turned back over to the state and it will be returned to the federal government. Next slide. A little bit more guidance regarding legitimate expenditures. Expenditures, again, have to be a direct response to a medical or a public health emergency. And these expenditures have to be necessary and they must be reasonable. Necessary meaning that any county official or government official can see that, "Hey, yeah, this is a logical expense that will qualify for CARES Act funding." And then if that is decided, whatever monies is put towards that expense, it would be a reasonable cost and we wouldn't be price-gouged for whatever expenditure that we pursued. Next slide. On this slide we wanted to capture a couple of examples of public... I mean of legitimate expenditures. Let me highlight expenses to improve telework capabilities, 'cause that definitely impacted King George County government's ability to maintain a continuity government. Under economic support, I wanna highlight expenditures related to the provision of grants for small businesses. I've highlighted that fact because as the board is fully aware, this pandemic has affected the economic viability of our small business community. So, I just want to highlight that. If the board will still move that portion to this expenditure... I mean, of this funding could address that situation in our small-business community. And then finally, payroll expenses for public safety, public health and similarly-related employees. And I really do wanna stress the fact that when they say that payroll for public safety would be a legitimate expense, public safety is discreetly defined in the FAQs and guidance from the Virginia Department of Health, and I have provided you all those FAQs and you all can reference that to get a good understanding of which jobs or careers qualify for legitimate expenses against the CARES Act. Next slide. Here are some examples of illegitimate expenditures. Just the biggest takeaway from here, at least from the administration, is that this pay cannot be utilized to fund pay raises or workforce bonuses. They do have a statute in there, where it can be utilized for hazard pay, but it's for hazard pay...
specifically for public safety officials as defined by the guidelines and FAQ from the Department of Treasury. Next slide. Matt made sure that [1:24:32] keep the slide in here, just explaining that we do have to maintain a strong record-keeping system to ensure that in the event that we were audited, we have strong records detailing and establishing a paper trail for the expenditures against this fund. Next slide. So with that being said, I wanted to make a recommended spending proposal to the board, again, I say recommended because I'm not asking the board to make any decisions tonight. Rather, what we are going to recommend is the board consider this proposal, but establish a work session date so we can sharpen our pencils, get more guidance from the board, and have a deliberate discussion on how we can leverage this funding to the maximum for King George County's interest. According to the proposal, as you see at the top, we have a total amount of funding of $2,341,338. What I would recommend is 69% of that funding go towards the fiscal year 2021 budget. And that is deliberate. I know that that's a large chunk of money. But what I would like to stress to the board is, if we utilize $1,619,903 of the CARES act's funding to pay for the fiscal year '20, and take that exact number out of the fiscal year '20-'21 budget since it'd be covered by the CARES Act funding, it could be returned to the general fund and it would help to ease some of the financial impact that we've experienced budgetary-wise for fiscal year '20-'21 budget. With that understanding we then recommend that 17% of $400,000 of the CARES Act funding be allocated to department purchases. I have asked all of our departments that have funding requests to capture those funding requests with explanations on the rationale behind a request. I have forwarded it to the board, and what I recommend to the board is during that work session, we'd run something similar to a CIP process, where the board has opportunity to review each department's projects, they have opportunity to engage with the department heads to establish the priority, and then we will maintain a spreadsheet where the board takes a collective vote on each department project to determine which projects they want to fund with the CARES Act funding. If you'd also note, I know that Mr Simenhoff was asking about this. We're recommending that 10% of the funding or $234,000 be established for a small business grants program. And if the board will so move to move forward with that initiative, what we recommend is that that funding be allocated to the EDA. Nick Minor has been working closely with the EDA for what that program would look like, and the EDA would basically govern the small business program to ensure that we're giving some type of ease to the small business community. Finally, you'll see that also asking for $21,000, even though I finally get the cost system is back today, it's more like $15,000 for a glass-barrier project. The purpose of the glass-barrier project is, as you're fully aware, we utilize plexiglass and other expedient measures to create a barrier between high touchpoint areas where we have citizens and county employees engaging to conduct county business. While that was a temporary solution just to bring the staff back into the buildings, what I would recommend is we pursue a glass barrier project where we actually have actual glass, not bulletproof glass or anything like that, but professionally installed glass that's aesthetically pleasing, that's more permanent in nature and something that would be more protective of the general public and county staff as we move forward 'cause we simply don't know when or how long this pandemic's gonna last. So, I would recommend a permanent solution versus the continued use of a temporary solution. With that being said, you add those all up, you see that that leaves us a $66,435 deficit, which we would basically have as a contingency. And that contingency would be established for any unforeseen purchases, grants, a third-party request... When I say third-party request, as we speak, I'm receiving requests from different nonprofit organizations and other civic organizations. And I wholly expect that through the end of December there are gonna be some pop ups, some other agency that requests money.
So, I'd recommend that the board maintain that contingency in the event another priority is identified by the board, that the money is there to address that priority. Next slide. So again, the recommended way forward, and that of course is dependent on the direction of the board. But I recommend that the board establishes a work session date or allow the county staff to advertise a special meeting date for a work session regarding the CARES Act funding. Again, the county departments would present projects in a procedure that replicates our CIP process. The board would then approve the official CARES act spend plan for King George County. After that is completed we'd then bring a resolution appropriating those funds at a subsequent via West meeting. With that being said, next slide. I'll stand by for any guidance or questions from the board.

1:30:04 Cathy Binder: Do you have any questions? I'd want us to set that date right now for our work session, 'cause I think that's a great idea.

1:30:13 Dr. Young: Yes, Madam Chair.

1:30:16 Mr. Granger: How soon is... How soon?

1:30:20 Dr. Young: I would recommend... I know that there's staff members that are gonna be out, so what I would recommend is the week of 27th, if that's not too fast? Okay, I'd recommend the week of August 3rd, and the reason why I'm asking for such a quick turnaround, because again, there is a shelf life for the money. December 30th seems quite distant, but when you are trying to spend $2.3 million, especially if there are gonna be procurement hurdles, we gotta make sure that we can get the guidance as quickly as possible from the board so we can go ahead and execute.

1:31:14 Mr. Bueche: Madam Chair, I would concur we're trying to get this done as soon as possible, 'cause looking at some of the suggestions, I really like what Dr Young put in here about the small business grants, that's probably gonna be a process if the EDA is having to run that, and if we're gonna be in August, that's gonna give the EDA a short timeline to turn around and get those approved and move forward with that. And with the impact the businesses are, we don't know if there's some businesses that are gonna survive to that end point in December, so I would like to see us get that as soon as possible.

1:31:48 Mr. Granger: I believe Mr Britton just said that the 27th isn't good, but the 28th and after would be okay. So if we want to do the 28th or the 29th?

1:31:58 Cathy Binder: I would rather wait til August 3rd, or into August, the beginning of August.

1:32:03 Mr. Granger: Okay. We have a meeting on the 4th, so obviously that might not be a good day.

1:32:07 Cathy Binder: Well August 2nd or...

1:32:09 Mr. Granger: 3rd will be a Monday. Do we wanna do Monday?
1:32:11 Cathy Binder: August... That's the 3rd, correct?

1:32:13 Mr. Granger: Correct.

1:32:13 Cathy Binder: Yeah. Are you guys okay with that? August 3rd? 6:30, we would have it here at the high school?

1:32:25 Dr. Young: Yes, Madam Chair.

1:32:27 Cathy Binder: Okay. Just sent us out an invite as you always do, thank you. Go back up. Alright. Next up is the Dominion Power Broadband Initiative Local Allocation Request, Dr Young.

1:32:44 Dr. Young: Thank you, Madam Chair. Chris, can you bring up the slides? Thank you, Chris. Next slide. As the board is fully aware, King George County entered into a memorandum of understanding with the Northern Neck Electric Co-op, Dominion Power, and members of the Northern Neck communities, which includes West Moreland, Northumberland and Richmond County. The purpose of the MOU is to pursue what we're calling the Dominion Power Broadband Initiative, and the whole foundation of this initiative is to leverage utility right away as a means to run broadband fiber throughout the county and expand that fiber network. By utilizing that right away and expanding that fiber we then will have the middle mile of our broadband infrastructure completed and then from that middle mile infrastructure we have, also a member of the MoU, is All Points Broadband, where they'd run the last mile to our customers that are disenfranchised or underserved with broadband service. So I attended the manager's meeting for the Dominion Power broadband. Again, the manager's meeting is managed by the Northern Neck Planning District Commission and is attended to by the county administrators of all the member localities. And during that meeting, we received an update. If you'll see this slide here. What's conveyed to us is interim milestones have been modified to account for delays in the DACD approval process, that was for the previous VATI grant that we received to help pay for the design of the fiber infrastructure. However, the overall planning process and feasibility study for Phase One remains on schedule. I just wanted to make sure that the board had a good understanding of the new dates for the completion of phase one. Next slide. Another update. Dominion Powers, as you all aware, will have to seek a petition from the State Corporate Commission to actually gain the approval to utilize their power line right away as a means to establish a fiber infrastructure. Well, Dominion Power have multiple discussions with members of the board of the SCC, and they have actually been encouraged to accelerate the timeframe for submitting that SCC petition. What does that mean to King George County? That's actually good news, 'cause the sooner that they get a petition, obviously that means that the project matures faster and we start seeing fiber laid across King George County quicker than anticipated. To accommodate the needs for Dominion Power to... I mean the administrator needs for Dominion Power now required to submit for the SCC petition have already been completed, which included designated a GIS contact, which, of course, we have a GIS department in King George, so we made that link up, we provided them copies of all broadband surveys to include the one that was completed two years ago. In addition, we provided them Metrocast/Atlantic Broadband cable agreements, so they had a good understanding of all the different entities that are operating in
King George, and other member localities provided that same information. In addition, we supported their petition... Sorry, we are going to support their petition for the SCC. Next slide. So in addition to them pursuing the SCC petition, they have also asked for local allocation tours a VATTI grant ran that they are going to pursue. The final application for this VATTI grant has to be submitted no later than August 17th, 2020. As you all aware, the success of a VATTI grant is really dependent on two things: Number one, that there's a regional participation; and then number two, local allocation goes a long way with gaining the approval for the VATTI grant. So what Dominion Power is doing is actually pursuing a $14.3 million project. $4 million for the VATTI grant, All Points Broadband, Dominion Power and the Northern Neck Electric Co-op, is providing $9 million, and then they're asking for the member localities to provide a local cost match of $345,000, all bringing in for a total of $14.3 million. Next slide. So again, I just wanted to illustrate the makeup of the VATTI application with 30% of the project coming from VATTI funding, 60% coming from All Points Broadband and our utility partners, then 10% local match. One key takeaway is that if the board does decide to support the local allocation of $345,000, there's already been an understanding put in place with Dominion Power, Northern Neck, and All Points Broadband, that no money from that approved local allocation will be given to All Points Broadband or utility companies until construction takes place in the county. Currently, and I'm sure Ms Brenda will tell you, construction is gonna be somewhere around second or third quarter next year. So right now, what we're asking for is the board basically to appropriate that funding and purpose it. But not a dollar will be spent until we do see construction and have good confidence that the project is going to be completed. So since we aren't gonna spend $1, what we're asking for is an approval from the board to meet that local allocation requirement and authorize the county administrator to write a letter of commitment by August 2020 or at the end of this meeting. And then we'd also would capture that allocation in our CIP, and the board could then take a formal vote then as well to incorporate it and memorialize it in our CIP, and we think that that'll meet the requirements from the state for the VATTI grant. Next slide. So again, I would recommend that we approve a letter... The board authorize the county administrator to write a letter of commitment pledging the monies to the Northern Neck Broadband VATTI grant. However, there is an additional opportunity. Rather than approve an allocation that requests an allocation of $345,000, I believe there's opportunity for us to increase our match and therefore increase our order of precedence for the construction. I'm actually having detailed discussions with some of our Northern Neck localities. I know that they are not as financially flush as King George County, and they are going to have a little bit of trouble meeting that local cost allocation. Since we do have the Healthy Fund balances meet that requirement for such an important priority, what I would recommend is suggesting to those communities that, "Hey, we will contribute a little bit more to the pie, where King George County is gonna be the first to have its fiber network expanded." That was an initial discussion, and we didn't get much pushback from West Moreland and from other localities, but I think that if we actually bring a real letter or a real commitment from the Board of Supervisors, we can get that memorialized and that will be the understanding that starting next year... The third quarter of 2021, I'm sorry, we actually will start seeing construction, and it'll start up North and then work its way down to the Northern Neck. Next slide. With that being said, Madam Chair, I conclude my presentation, I'll stand by for any questions or concerns.

1:41:44 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Dr Young, for that presentation. Before I go through the questions that I contacted All Points Broadband, and Mr Ed Diggs from Dominion Power, I'll let
my colleagues ask their questions. Does anybody have any questions?

1:42:01 Mr. Granger: About the presentation?

1:42:02 Cathy Binder: Yeah. Any questions? Well, I had contacted Mr Ed Diggs and the representative from All Points Broadband. And just so the public knows, I asked him quite a few questions, and they were very thorough in their answers. And I think it's a great, great opportunity with companies that have a reputation, and that they're... Two of them are electric providers that have their own power lines already established in the county. And I asked, "Well, first question, will you be using existing power lines or need to lay new fiber cable for internet?"

They said that they plan to build the main line mid-mile along existing overhead electric distribution lines. On a rare occasion, we may need to build a short segment underground to complete a route, this would be the exception and not the rule. I asked them if they were gonna cover all areas if asked. I gave my example, I live off 301, and people would assume that it's covered, but it is not. And he said the objective of the initiative is to provide broadband access to all locations that do not currently have access to a 25/3 service. It is an aspiration to do so using fiber to the home everywhere it is technically and financially feasible to do so. Ultimately the extent of deployment and specific technology will depend on the outcome of the feasibility and planning process that is currently underway in a favorable SCC ruling on a petition that enables Dominion to construct sufficient middle-mile infrastructure to make the last mile viable. I asked him what is a potential cost? They anticipate that the monthly fees for plans will start around $55, and the pricing will depend on the same two factors noted in the response to the question I've just read. I asked him what the potential upload and download speed was and the location served. They said we'll have access to gigabit speeds. What kind of equipment would they install or would the customers need to install? And they said for their locations, the customers premises' equipment will be very similar to what consumers that currently have cable internet service have at their locations. It consists of a wired connection from the street to the home, a small enclosure on the exterior of their house similar to what is used today for phone service in our cable or internet and an in-home wireless router that broadcasts a Wi-Fi signal throughout the home.

What is the build-out timeline? Dr Young had already previously stated, the build-out timeline is entirely dependent on the SCC proceeding, including how long that process takes and what the SCC ultimately approves. Assuming the petition is submitted in the quarter three of 2020 and a favorable outcome is received, they anticipate construction will likely commence in quarter three or four of 2021. Complete build out throughout the entire area covered by the initiative will take at least a year. And I asked them if this would be a pilot program or a first of a kind. They said there is not many, but I know when I was at the NACo convention they have been pushing, especially with our representatives at the federal and state level of using these utilities to try to bring that fiber to the last mile in all those underserved areas in the United States that really need broadband internet service. And let me go back up to the top of my document 'cause I asked him what's 25/3, just so everybody knows what that means, and it is... They will... Hold on, I just gotta find it. 25/3 means a broadband service that offers download speeds of 25 megabytes per second and upload speeds of three megabytes. This is the threshold that Virginia's Department of Housing and Community Development has established for determining whether a specific location is served or underserved by broadband. And then with that, I asked them what happens if the power goes out? And they said, if the power goes out, the underlying internet service won't necessarily go out, however, it may not be usable for most people since most consumers use a
wireless router in their home to create and distribute their private Wi-Fi networks. If you can't power the wireless router you can't have a Wi-Fi access, but I just thought people might ask that question and those were all the answers. That is it, is there any more questions? Nope, okay. So do we have to have a motion on that?

1:46:20 Dr. Young: Yes, Madam Chair.

1:46:22 Mr. Granger: For both pieces, the letter and the contribution?

1:46:25 Dr. Young: Yes, yes.

1:46:27 Mr. Granger: Okay. I move to approve a letter of commitment to the Northern Neck Broadband VATI grant.

1:46:34 Annie Cupka: Second.

1:46:36 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor?

1:46:40 All: Aye.

1:46:42 Cathy Binder: Any nays? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Thank you very much, Dr Young, for bringing that to us.

1:46:46 Mr. Granger: I move to authorize the county administrator to negotiate a local contribution of $500,000 in order to secure a higher precedence in the construction timeline.

1:46:56 Mr. Bueche: Second.

1:46:57 Annie Cupka: Friendly amendment, please.

1:46:57 Mr. Granger: Yes.

1:46:58 Annie Cupka: It was the exact language Dr Young requested, was not to exceed $500,000, please.

1:47:02 Mr. Granger: Apologies. I would like to make a motion to amend my previous motion to include the not-to-exceed $500,000.

1:47:13 Dr. Young: Second.

1:47:13 Mr. Granger: Thank you Ms Cupka.

1:47:14 Cathy Binder: Any more discussion? All those in favor?

1:47:18 Annie Cupka: I'm sorry.

1:47:21 Annie Cupka: I'm sorry. I was trying to see if Mr Stonehill had something and wanted to go first, but if you'll indulge me now at this point I'm sorry, gentlemen, I apologize.

1:47:30 Mr. Granger: It's fine.

1:47:30 Annie Cupka: I just wanna point out a few things. And well, it sounds like, from what I kind of heard, my colleagues will support this, but I wanna thank everyone who came out and spoke in support or submitted written correspondence. I wanna note Mr Grego gave an address on Prim Road, which is in the Shiloh district. Ms Foshay, while she currently has service, she lives in the James Madison district, and she didn't have to speak up for this, but she realizes how much our community needs this. Ms Sekely lives in the Meadows, which I believe is in the James Monroe district. I myself live in the Dahlgren district, and I also suffer from, I believe, being underserved. My children and their learning has suffered. I measured the download-upload speeds that you referenced, the 25/3 as being the definition, if you don't have that, you are underserved, and I measured that from inside my home over the weekend, and my download speed was 18. So we literally have citizens from every district in the county, county-wide, this is not an issue just for one neighborhood. This is not an issue just for one area. This is county-wide. I also wanna remind everyone, as your grant writer, when I was on staff, I worked on that broadband planning survey that Dr Young referenced. I attempted at one point to obtain a broadband... A VATI grant for the county. And at that point in time the board was not willing to allocate local match. I am glad, I am grateful and I am proud, hopefully, that tonight this board is willing to do so. I wanna read just a couple of things from the last call, the last week, last Friday with Congressman Wittman, that he pointed out, "Some school systems have bought tablets and hotspots, but if you have less than two bars, you cannot transmit data, which means your tablet is worthless." And another point, "It's a misconception to somehow think that every student is going to have the ability to virtually learn because many of them aren't going to have the connection." So the need is real, the need is dire, especially given the current circumstances. And also in the past, his broadband task force meetings have pointed out that VATI grants that are regional in approach, and this one is, offer the services of established providers, this one does, with infrastructure, as in the utility poles and the lines in place, this one does. And the localities must contribute to the match, to show they have some skin in the game. So again, I am grateful to all of you for even considering this. I'll close with that. Thank you very much.

1:50:45 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Ms Cupka. So we have a motion. It was properly seconded. Any more discussion? All those in favor?

1:50:54 All: Aye.

1:50:56 Cathy Binder: Any nays? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Thank you, everyone, who worked on this. Alright, hold on a second. Next up, we have a public hearing. First public hearing, the King George County Board of Supervisors will now hold two public hearings which have been properly advertised to receive public input. The first public hearing is case number 20-01-Z01, Amendments to the King George County zoning ordinance to revise the sign regulations, amendments to section 3.11. I will first ask for the staff report, I will then open the
floor for public comment. Public comment is limited to three minutes per speaker in order to afford everyone an opportunity to speak. Please state your name and address before you comment. Upon completion of public comment, I will bring the matter back to the board for consideration. The board may or may not take action tonight depending on information received during public comment. The floor is yours.

1:51:55 Louis Pancotti: Good evening, Madam Chair and members of the board, I am Louis Pancotti, planner, and I will be presenting case number 20-01-Z01, amendments to the King George County zoning ordinance to revise sign regulations amendment to section 3.11. Next slide, please. At its September 3rd, 2019 meeting, the King George County Board of Supervisors requested that the planning commission review section 3.11 sign regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. Also in 2015, the United States Supreme Court ruled in Reed v. Town of Gilbert that localities cannot regulate the content of signs. Any content-based regulations were deemed unconstitutional, other characteristics of a sign such as size, placement type, can be regulated. Also, the current ordinance does not allow for signage on properties where commercial activity is not taking place, even if that property is owned by the business operator. There is also interest in making the sign ordinance more comprehensive. This draft update adds provisions for off-site signs, revises regulations to make them content neutral, and reorganizes section 3.11 to be yet more comprehensive. Next slide, please. So section 3.11 is the section of the ordinance that regulates signs, 3.11.2 is now revised to define a permitted sign as any object, device, display, or structure or part thereof visible from a public place, a public right-of-way, any parking area or right-of-way, open to use by the general public or any navigable body of water which is designed to be used to attract attention to an institution, organization, business, product, service, event, or location by any means involving words, letters, figures, designs, symbols, fixtures, logos, colors, illumination, or projected images are allowed in all districts per the requirements below. But such signs shall not be erected in any residential lot. Permitted signs may be internally illuminated or externally illuminated unless otherwise specified. Illuminated signs shall be Dark Sky compliant. Next page, please. As section 3.11.1.2 lays out the size, location, and types of signs permitted in each zoning district, I will not go into each provision as the content in this section remain mostly the same, what's on the screen just shows the headings for the sections where reorganized. Next slide. The following provisions, however, were deleted because they were not content-neutral. So roadside, produce stands will now fall under permitted signs in agricultural districts described as a free-standing sign supported by structures or supports that are placed on or anchored to the ground and are independent from building or other structure. Only one such sign shall be allowed on any street frontage and no sign shall exceed 50 square feet in area. Window signs and direction signs are now moved to exempt signs. Section 3.11.3 will be the... Next slide, please. Sorry. So section 3.11.3 will be a new section that permits off-site signs. Currently, our ordinance does not allow off-site signs. This section allows for off-premise signage defined as a permanent sign that directs attention to a business, product, service or activity conducted, sold, or offered at a location other than the premise on which the sign is erected will be permitted on properties contiguous to the property where the activity is taking place only if the contiguous property is owned by the same owner or operator of the business. One 32 square foot off-site sign shall be permitted, and a sign permit is required. Next slide, please. Section 3.11.4, exempted for permit. These signs can be erected without a permit. This section was moved ahead of prohibited signs. Most of these regulations were revised to be content-neutral. Provisions C is intended to replace what was called warning/security signs and
directional signs. Next slide, please. Here's a continuation of exempted signs, which include permanent signs where lots are offered... Or non-permanent signs where lots are offered for sale or lease, the changing of bulletin boards, and permanent banner signs on the building face. Next slide, please. And here, provisions for temporary banners for new businesses and also event signs. Provisions for auction signs are removed as they were not content-neutral and would now fall under special-event signs. Therefore, these signs will no longer be able to be erected off-site, but can be bigger than the previous restriction of four square feet. Next slide. Next slide, please. As previously mentioned, the specific references and regulations for auction signs and security signs have been removed. Next, please. The next section outlines the signs that are prohibited. This section prohibits moving signs, exposed light, fixtures, signs that obscure traffic signs. Not much has changed in this section except for provision B of the current ordinance did not include content-based regulation saying that it should not apply to digital displays of date, time, temperature, weather, environmental conditions or other off-site on-business information with messages displayed at intervals of at least 10 seconds. So those content-based references have been removed. Next slide, please. This section also prohibits signs that present a danger to the public and signs that violate state law. Next slide, please. The following sections remained unchanged by this update. Height and setback requirements for printed sign, measurement of sign area, placement of signs, unsafe and/or unlawful signs, and nonconforming signs. Next slide, please. Alright so... Finally, at its February 11th, 2020 meeting, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the text amendment to the Board of Supervisors by a vote of 8-1. The Department of Community Development and the Planning Commission therefore recommends that the King George County Board of Supervisors approve case number 20-01-Z01, amendments to the King George County zoning ordinance to revise sign regulation's amendment to sections 3.11. I'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

1:58:46 Cathy Binder: Or turn it over to public comment. Do you guys have any questions? No question? Thank you so much for your presentation. Always very thorough. Thank you. Do I have anybody from the public who would like to come up and give public comment? Please come to the podium.

1:59:14 Gary Butler: Good evening. Gary Butler, I own EXIT Realty Expertise, and I gave a handout so you can follow along if you'd like. The Board of Supervisors is in the process of updating the sign ordinance. I'm in the process of relocating my company, EXIT Realty Expertise to the vacant building at 9441 King's Highway, which is almost next-door to the courthouse. It's the old bank/post office building that was built in 1956. I'm doing a great amount of work to the building, and I think it will be a refreshing upgrade for the downtown King George courthouse area, something I think all citizens will be proud of. As part of my plan, I'm looking to invest in a digital sign. Now, these signs are very expensive, with an acquisition cost on average of between $20,000 and $40,000 depending on the sharpness of the screens. I'm getting the state-of-the-art 6 millimeter. Obviously, with such an expense, I would hope to get as much quality use out of it as possible. I plan on using to not only promote my business and my agents, but to promote community events as well: Things such as the Builders Home & Craft Show; Fall Festival; Remember to Vote; Amber Alerts and more. One of my concerns with the proposed sign ordinance is the requirement that the screen can only change at a minimum of every 10 seconds. At that rate, anyone traveling through the courthouse area will only see one message on the sign, I might as well put up a stationary sign. The 10-second rule is two and a
half times longer requirement than VDOT's state sign requirement of four seconds. I cited the
code there, it goes on to the second page, the applicable part, where it speaks about messages
change no more than once every four seconds. And that's consistent with the agreement entered
into between a commissioner of highways in the US Department of Transportation. I have no
idea what the justification is for King George mandating 10 seconds instead of four, defeats the
purpose of having a digital sign. I respectfully request that the county ordinance change to match
the state. Existing digital signs throughout the county seem to change in the four to five second
range as I've observed. To my knowledge, there's never been an issue as a result. Please make
our sign ordinance a recruiting tool for businesses to locate in King George not a hindrance.
Thank you.

2:02:07 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr Butler. Does anybody else want to give public comment?
Do we have anybody online that would like to give? Do we have any public correspondence sent
to any of us? No. Alright, I will close public comment right now. Do I have any discussion from
the board, or questions?

2:02:32 Mr. Granger: Yes. Mr Butler, thank you for coming out and speaking. I would ask does
Community Development know why the proposed 10-second was forwarded forth as the
recommendation?

2:02:48 Louis Pancotti: That is what the current ordinance says. That particular provision
wasn't in the scope of what we were changing for this amendment. I did do some research into it.
And I will share that with you. I looked at 19 surrounding counties, and came up with an average
of the ones that did have a interval requirement similar to us, and the average came out to be 22.9
seconds. But that average does include two outliers of Powhatan, which requires three minutes
and Goochland, which requires 60 seconds. So without those two outliers, the average still
comes out to 11.4 with a range of 4-30 seconds.

2:03:36 Mr. Granger: How many localities did you look at?

2:03:39 Louis Pancotti: 19 in total.

2:03:40 Mr. Granger: Out of those 19, how many were faster than 10 seconds?

2:03:49 Louis Pancotti: Nine.

2:03:53 Annie Cupka: I'm sorry, can you say that again? Did you say none or nine?

2:03:56 Louis Pancotti: Nine.

2:03:57 Annie Cupka: Thank you very much.

2:03:58 Mr. Granger: Thank you. Yes, I'm sorry, thank you. Those are the only questions I
have about that, if anyone else has any other questions. I'll let you ask first before continuing our
discussion.
2:04:08 Cathy Binder: Mr Stonehill, did you have any?

2:04:14 Mr. Stonehill: The signing company one, that seems to go quicker than I would have thought, 10 seconds, but I guess that has to be 10 seconds?

2:04:22 Louis Pancotti: It should be 10 seconds. We operate on compliant basis for zoning violations, so that has not been brought to our attention.

2:04:35 Mr. Stonehill: Yeah, I was just thinking of just sitting there at the traffic light just seeing the weather and things scroll through, and I just... It seemed quicker, but I've never measured it, so.

2:04:45 Louis Pancotti: But as the ordinance stands now, the requirement is 10 seconds. And that would be the same as the proposed ordinance.

2:04:51 Cathy Binder: Ms. Cupka.

2:04:53 Annie Cupka: Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you. Mr Butler, thank you very much for coming out tonight. Thank you for your comment. I actually had forwarded much of what you had sent earlier to Mr Britton, so Mr Britton, could you provide us with some guidance with regard to Mr Butler's request, please?

2:05:13 Matt Britton: Yes.

2:05:13 Annie Cupka: Thank you.

2:05:15 Matt Britton: Madam Chair, so this, all that was on tonight, and it's been a long... For a long time, was to change that you couldn't have sign off your own property or that you couldn't have... If you have one on your own property, you couldn't have it on the contiguous property. So when Ms Cupka forwarded Mr Butler's concern. I got with community development. They were well aware of it. Well aware of the digital sign ordinance. I'm well aware of digital sign ordinances and the various things, and we are looking into it. That's the preliminary. But what we decided to do was to go ahead and not off-road something that was already in the viewfinder, and to get that problem solved, because this is a comprehensive issue, why is it that they have any? Why is it that it's not 10 minutes, four seconds, six seconds? VDOT has one, some counties have minutes, some... So what do they call them? Warrants. What warrants those? Is it the number of accidents? Is it distraction at night? I'm not sure. So we're gonna work together to get a reason. Something that we could say it should be five seconds or four seconds, but have a reason for it. Part of that is comparables, which you heard Louis give you some of, and we're working on it. So we're gonna come back with a revamp of the digital sign ordinance. The other thing that I spoke with Ms Cupka about was just the change rate is just one part of a robust and competent digital sign ordinance. There are a lot of parts to it. So we're gonna present a proposed updated modern sign ordinance, at that time taking into account, of course, what Mr Butler and others said reach out to the community, find out what signs they are, maybe that's something TAC could do since they have... That was a Tourism Committee joke. And so we will get a full report, working together as to what's legal, what are best practices for drafting, why it is, why it
warrants. There's also... I don't know what... But how bright it is, lumens or luminosity or...
There's complicated words for it, but it's how bright it is, and all of those things should be
addressed, light pollution ordinance bill, we have to make sure it doesn't conflict with that. That's
why we're just doing this little one now. We just weren't ready.

2:07:47 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Mr Britton. Mr Bueche, you have a question?

2:07:50 Annie Cupka: Madam Chair, I'm sorry.

2:07:51 Cathy Binder: Sorry, I apologize.

2:07:52 Annie Cupka: I had one more. Thank you for that, Mr Britton. One more question, and
it is... So without naming any names, so with this then, what would this do to nonprofits who
have signs on the side of the road advertising their events, but it's not on property that they own
or contiguous? 'Cause there's one at the intersection of 205 and route 3, and the same one has
another sign at the intersection of route 3 and 301. And so are they not gonna be able to have
those signs there? Because it's talking about the owned property and the contiguous property?

2:08:49 Mr. Granger: My understanding is those signs are not allowed to be there currently,
right?

2:08:52 Annie Cupka: Yeah, right.

2:08:53 Mr. Granger: And so, but based on the fact that it's a complaint-based policing effort, I
guess no one's complained about this, would be my guess.

2:09:03 Annie Cupka: Understood, thank you.

2:09:05 Matt Britton: Right, this would not affect that. This would make it easier to do things
that didn't have any off-site and didn't have contiguous or owned piece of property. But as I said
before in other things, there's two types of policing-based, and there's complaint-based. So if
you're... I'll pick a county, Fairfax. Presumably you have a team of people who drive around and
find sign violations and other violations, and you cite them. We're a complaint-based, for
obvious reasons, and we get a complaint, we cite it. I'm not sure of the one that you're... But this
wouldn't affect it, but it wouldn't solve it either. So if a... And your question I don't know, but I
think that Mr Louis can answer his. If you own a noncontiguous piece of property, I don't think
that's included either?

2:09:49 Louis Pancotti: It would not be.

2:09:50 Matt Britton: Right, so if you have a church or a business and then you own... That
business owns just a random piece of property, they can't choose to put it on that sign either. It
has to be on their property and/or contiguous, so. We didn't address that problem. We could
bring it up at the digital sign ordinance part.

2:10:07 Cathy Binder: Yes, if we could look at it going forward, when you make further
revisions, I'd appreciate it. Thanks very much.


2:10:15 Cathy Binder: Do you have any more? That was us. Thank you. Mr Bueche?

2:10:19 Mr. Bueche: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr Butler, thank you for coming out tonight. I have a couple of things. First, I'm not a fan of ordinances in general. I don't like government restricting use of property that people own. I do understand that there's physical hazards and blinding like when we're talking about the digital sign. But I think at some point, somebody put a arbitrary number of 10 seconds up, and it just stuck. It doesn't sound like there was any basis for anything, if there's guidance from VDOT or from the state then I don't see why we would exceed that minimum on that. I don't like the fact that it's police versus complaint-monitored. You can have one business that just someone wants to troll them, and they're gonna be calling community development or Dr Young's office five times a day about somebody's sign, but down the street, there's a sign there and nobody is complaining about it. I think that's an issue. I just... I don't see this as equitable. I think at the bottom... At the end of the day, if someone has property and they own it and they let someone put up a sign and it's not of hazard to someone's visibility of the road or it's not blinding, it's not a height restriction or those concerns, let them put the sign up. That's my opinion. I think we're getting too far into... There's a point of regulation and a point of over regulation. That's my two cents, but I do appreciate everybody's time and effort into this, it is a better product than what we had initially, so thank you.

2:12:04 Cathy Binder: Mr Britton, did you have anything?

2:12:07 Matt Britton: I don't.

2:12:09 Cathy Binder: I thank you, Mr Britton, I thank you Mr Butler for coming out and giving us time. I know you've talked to me personally about this, and I know it's very important to be able to advertise your business, and as of my understanding, when you came on board, Mr Britton, you're gonna be looking at all of our ordinance to make them more robust and to update them, and that the sign ordinance will be tweaked even more and updated to 2020 standards. Is that correct?

2:12:33 Matt Britton: Yes, and hopefully with digital signs, a good part is you can program them for whatever it is, and then the ordinance changes and you can reprogram. There may be some cost to it, but hopefully that's one of the ways it's a lot easier than a physical one. Yes, we're going through them, we're looking at proper and zoning, and as you know, one by one as they come up. So the public comment helps and when we do redo the zoning ordinance comments, any ward can give the input, obviously, and we can make any of those changes that you see fit.

2:13:07 Cathy Binder: Thank you very much, Mr Britton. So what say you, board?

2:13:12 Mr. Granger: I moved to approve case number 20-01-Z01, Amendments to the King George County zoning ordinance to revise the sign regulations as presented.
2:13:21 Cathy Binder: So I have a second?

2:13:21 Mr. Stonehill: Second.

2:13:24 Cathy Binder: Any more discussion? All those in favor?


2:13:29 Cathy Binder: Any nay? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Thank you. Next up, public hearing number two, the King George County Board of Supervisors will now hold its second public hearing to receive input regarding case number 19-12-S01, Amendment to the King George County subdivision ordinance to comply with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act as recommended by the Department of Environmental Quality. Amendments to sections 1.4, 3.9, 6.2, and 7.1. I will first ask for the staff report, I will then open the floor for public comment. Public comment is limited to [2:14:07] opportunity to speak. Please state your name and address before you comment. Upon completion of public comment, I will bring the matter back to the board for consideration. The board may or may not take action tonight depending on information received during public comment. Ms. Hall.

2:14:28 Heather Hall: Good evening. As an introduction to this next tax amendment, I wanted to take the opportunity to advise the board that this past year, the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality has conducted a review of King George County's Chesapeake Bay Program. A review was conducted for King George County from January 2019 through October 2019. This compliance review required a full evaluation of our permitting files, staff site plans, division plat site inspections, as well as evaluation of our zoning and subdivision ordinances, community developments procedures and comprehensive plan. November 6, 2019, a review letter proposed three conditions for compliance, which is attached. The conditions included a follow-up to the responses received from the 2019 septic pump-out program letter and two minor text amendments requiring updated language. On June 18, 2020, King George County received the attached approval letter of our program, which found King George County Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act program to be compliant. I'd like to thank the entire staff of Community Development, as it was a lot of work, a year-long process, and on top of our, already, very heavy workload this past year. With that being said, Louis will move forward with the text amendment.

2:15:52 Louis Pancotti: I will now present case number 19-12-S01, Amendment to King George County subdivision ordinance to comply with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, as recommended by the Department of Environmental Quality, amendment to sections 1.4, 3.9, 6.2 and 7.1. Next slide, please. So on November 6, 2019, DEQ issued a compliance review of the King George County Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act program with recommended conditions as Ms Hall just stated. Recommended condition number three holds that the county should require the following notes on all plats prior to approval. One, undisturbed and vegetated 100-foot wide RPA buffer areas are to be retained. Two, onsite septic systems are to be pumped out every five years, 100% reserve drain fields are required for on-site septic system. Our ordinance currently does comply with that condition. And permitted development in RPA's is limited to water-dependent facilities or redevelopment. It was recommended that this exact language be
adopted and required on all plats prior to approval. Text amendments say subdivision ordinance are needed for the change in language. Next slide, please. Section 1.4 outlines the requirements for exempt subdivisions. That would include things such as boundary-line adjustments. Section 3.9 outlines the requirements for major subdivisions. Section 6.2 outlines the requirements for minor subdivisions. And finally, section 7.1 outlines the requirements for family subdivisions. All four sections will need to be amended, as they all include the same language regarding the required notes. As you can see here, the exact language recommended by DEQ will replace the old verbiage. Next slide, please. Finally, on March 10, 2020, the King George County Planning Commission voted unanimously to forward the... To forward case number 19-12-S01, with edits to the Board of Supervisors with her recommendation for approval. The Department of Community Development and SETH and Planning Commission recommend that the King George County Board of Supervisors approve case number 19-12-S01, Amendment to the King George County subdivision ordinance, to comply with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act as recommended by the Department of Environmental Quality, Amendment to Sections 1.4, 3.9, 6.2, and 7.1. Thank you.

2:18:27 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Do we have any questions? No question? Thank you very much for your thorough presentation, once again. Do we have any members of the public who would like to give comment? Do we have anybody online? Any written correspondence? Okay. No more questions. Do we have a motion?

2:18:54 Mr. Granger: I move to approve case number 19-12-S01, Amendment to the King George County subdivision ordinance to comply with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act as recommended by the Department of Environmental Quality, Amendment to sections 1.4, 3.9, 6.2 and 7.1 as presented.

2:19:12 Mr. Stonehill: Second.

2:19:13 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor?

2:19:17 All: Aye.

2:19:19 Cathy Binder: Any nays? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Hold on one second. Okay. Alright, public hearing number three. The King George County Board of Supervisors will now hold its third public hearing to receive input on the amendment of the FY-2021 budget to accept the CARES Act funding. I will first ask for the staff report. I will then open the floor for public comment. Public comment is limited to three minutes per speaker in order to afford everyone an opportunity to speak. Please state your name and address before you comment. Upon completion of public comment, I will bring the matter back to the board for consideration. The board may or may not take action tonight, depending on information received during the comment. First up is our staff report.

2:20:07 Dr. Young: Thank you, Madam Chair. On May 12, 2020, King George County was notified that the federal CARES Act funding for community would total $2,341,338. A fund titled The CARES Fund was established in the county administration to track expenses related to covid-19. We recommend the Board of Supervisors amend the fiscal year 2021 budget to accept
the federal Cares Act funding and appropriate $2,341,338 to the CARES fund.

2:20:39 Cathy Binder: Alright, do we have any public comment? Anybody online? Any written correspondence to board members? Alright, do we have a motion?

2:20:53 Mr. Granger: I move to approve the amendment to the FY 2021 budget to accept the federal CARES Act funding and appropriate $2,341,338, the CARES fund.

2:21:04 Mr. Bueche: Second.

2:21:07 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor?


2:21:11 Cathy Binder: Any nays? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Next up, contract with Finley Asphalt and Sealing Incorporated for the KG Middle School turn lane project.

2:21:29 Lavita Cobb: Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the board, Lavita Cobb on behalf of Department of Finance. So back in 2018, the county applied for and received $158,000 in revenue-sharing funds for the construction of the King George Middle School turn lane. And at its meeting on October 2, 2018, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution, authorizing the county administrator to execute and submit appropriate documents associated with the project. The county's budget for that project back in 2018 was estimated to be $398,000, which included the revenue sharing of $158,000 from VDOT, and 240,000 from the middle school project bond. The project budget included construction, contingency, and construction administration and materials testing. In May 2019, bids were received for the project, but at that time, we only received one bid in the amount of $531,000, and as there was only one bid we decided to... And it was significantly over budget. We rejected that bid and rebid the project in the spring of 2020. In March of 2020, the project was bid for a second time. Four bids were received and ranged from a low of $533,354 to a high of $709,000. Again, because the low bid was significantly over budget, decision was made to reject the bids at that time and then communicate with VDOT to discuss options for cost reduction or scope of work reduction. So after several discussions with VDOT, it was decided that the project will be separated into two phases, the first phase will be the right-turn lane portion of the project, and then the second phase will be the left-turn lane portion of the project. The existing revenue-sharing funds will be allocated solely to phase one. And the county would apply for revenue sharing funds during the next cycle for phase two funding. Bids were received for phase 1 on June 10, 2020. We received five bids, and they ranged from a low of $315,186.16 to a high of $402,429. The project was bid with the base bid in three alternate bid items, but due to the cost, the alternate bid items were rejected, and they were also associated with phase two. Mr Dan Sutton with Wiley Wilson, he's completed a review of Finley Asphalt & Sealing of their bid and qualifications, and he is determined that Finley Asphalt & Sealing is a qualified responsible and responsive contractor. So I recommend that the board of supervisors authorize the county administrator to issue a notice of award to Finley Asphalt & Sealing for the King George Middle School Turn Lane project phase one, base bid in the amount of $315,186.16. And authorize the county administrator to execute a construction agreement with Finley Asphalt & Sealing, subject to approval of the construction agreement as
to form by the county attorney. Furthermore, I recommend that the board of supervisors authorize $158,000 to be paid from the general fund balance. And the remaining $157,186.16 to be paid from the previously appropriated middle school project budget fund. As this is a revenue-sharing project, the county will be reimbursed the approved amount of $158,000 upon completion of the project. And then lastly, also, this is a locality-administered project, and the county engineer, Mr Travis Quesenberry has been approved by VDOT as meeting the requirements for serving as the local-government-responsible person.

2:25:27 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Do we have any questions? No questions? Do we have a motion?

2:25:40 Mr. Granger: I move to authorize the county administrator to issue a contract to Finley Asphalt & Sealing Inc in the amount of $315,186.16 for construction of phase one of the King George Middle School Turn Lane project as presented.


2:25:55 Cathy Binder: Any discussion?

2:25:56 Mr. Granger: I assume we wanna move forward trying to do phase two and getting some revenue sharing as well in the next round. I assume the rest of the board would be on board that... Their statement.

2:26:07 Cathy Binder: Yes, that, it's for safety.

2:26:09 Mr. Granger: Yes, okay.

2:26:13 Cathy Binder: So we have a motion properly seconded, any more discussion? All those in favor?

2:26:17 All: Aye.


2:26:26 Lavita Cobb: Thank you.

2:26:26 Cathy Binder: Next up, the Department of Community Development, case numbers 1912-E02 special exemption permit, request for an event venue, Backporch Vineyard owned by Spillman Wilmont, LLC. Sherri Spillman, tax map 41, parcel 36D, 40.84-acre, zone A1, limited agricultural district, 20 acres designated for the event venue.

2:26:51 Heather Hall: Good evening. Tonight, we have a special exception request for an event venue, as previously stated, for Backporch Vineyard. Backporch Vineyard is an agriculturally exempt Virginia farm winery, submitted an application to become an event venue. As described in section 4.14 of King George County zoning ordinance. The application includes an existing barn, grass parking, portable restrooms, and proposes more than 24 events... No more than 24
events in a calendar year. The recommended actions tonight is either forward this case to the Planning Commission and to hold a public hearing with a recommendation, or option two is to schedule a public hearing with the Board Of Supervisors to hear the case. The applicant has provided a letter which is provided in your packet, asking the board to retain this request and hold a public hearing.

2:27:45 Cathy Binder: Thank you, Ms Hall. Does anybody have any questions?

2:27:50 Heather Hall: Also, the applicant's here, if you have any questions.

2:27:52 Cathy Binder: I see them out there in the audience. Both of them. Thank you. Both applicants I see in the audience. Do we have any questions specifically for the applicants? Ms Cupka?

2:28:06 Annie Cupka: Madam Chair, I don't have any questions, specifically. I know they submitted a letter or a statement. Are they afforded an opportunity to speak if they so choose? Mr Britton, are we allowed to do that?

2:28:24 Dr. Young: That is correct, Madam Chair... I mean, Vice Chair.

2:28:40 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Thank you, and I appreciate it.

2:28:42 Dr. Young: That's correct, Vice Chair. You all can invite them up to speak if the board so pleases.

2:28:48 Cathy Binder: Would you like to come up and afford you a moment up to the podium? If you choose not to, you don't have to. Do you guys have any questions? Thank you very much. My only question, and I'm gonna be honest, because I try to be fair, and I love both of the ideas, I'm a big proponent, especially when I see numerous presentations about how vital sports tourism and agro tourism is to areas that wanna stay rural. But the only thing, and I know I was a stickler last October, about making sure that it runs through the proper process and go to the Planning Commission and then to the Board Of Supervisors instead of jumping over it. So that is my only thing. I love both projects, but I wanna make sure we follow the process. And that is my only comment, just following the process.

2:29:50 Mr. Granger: Madam Chair, I think that's a wise comment. I was a part of that board that made that decision. I think it probably should have gone to the process, and we shouldn't have made any special exceptions, looking back, hindsight being 2020. I appreciate where you're coming from, that you would like to expedite it, but I would really like to try to follow the process and be as consistent as possible, so everyone has the same playing field.

2:30:18 Cathy Binder: Go ahead, Ms Cupka.

2:30:18 Annie Cupka: Madam Chair, I understand where all of you are coming from. I just wanna state that, from an economic development and tourism perspective, which is where I came from on your staff, this is wedding season, this is winery season. I know this is not the only one
here, we have another applicant for a Special Exception Permit for a venue right after this one. I do understand. I appreciate where you all are coming from with regard to following the system, the procedure in place, I just... Through no fault of their own, these applicants have been put off, I feel like, for a very long time, and it's not the fault of our staff, it's because we made a conscious decision to suspend public hearings several months ago. So I wanna apologize to you all, personally, for that. That's where I'm coming from. Thank you.

2:31:20 Cathy Binder: And I appreciate that, and I'm in full support of these businesses. I just... I know I made a big deal about it all October, so I will continue to follow what I feel is the proper way, but that is my opinion. I could be outvoted, but I find they're vital businesses, and if we wanna keep our rural character, we need to promote those kind of businesses, but I'm gonna stick to the statements I have made and I will not go back on my statements that I made.

2:31:47 Mr. Bueche: Madam Chair, if I may? I agree with Ms Cupka, and I agree with Mr Granger and you. The process is very important. However, I am gonna say one thing that is gonna be contrary to the process. So I'm gonna sound like a hypocrite. Tonight, we're gonna make another declaration of emergency in King George County. Economically, we are suffering. We need to find some kinda way to stimulate businesses. By delaying the process for two businesses that we know are viable. And being that the Planning Commission offers a recommendation to the Board Of Supervisors, but ultimately, we make the decision. We have two businesses that, in the coming months, the delay with covid and the things going on, could cause those businesses not to manifest. It could cause them significant financial hardship, which a lot of our businesses are going through right now. We're losing businesses in King George County, and we got two people that wanna build a business. If this wasn't the situation where we're gonna declare an emergency tonight for economic reasons. I don't see why we can't, at a minimum, maybe hold a joint meeting. I really do have conflict by passing over the Planning Commission. Did it once, I said, "I'm never gonna do that again." We know how that turned out. But I think we're in a position where we might need to. I would like to entertain maybe a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission and the Board Of Supervisors. That's my recommendation.

2:33:42 Cathy Binder: Mr Bueche, I agree with you. I mean, I'm open to whatever the vote falls, what may, and any motion that is made. I mean, one of the applicants, the one we're talking about right now, is in my district. And they're good folks, and the other applicant are good folks. And they've gone through the process right. And due to the covid bug that appeared, they would be further along in this, but I have to stand by the morals that I set and the standards that I set, but I can be outvoted and that's all I have to say. I made a big deal about it the first time. I at least have to stand on my principles of going through the process and not passing over. But that's just one vote. So for my board, whatever you would like, make a motion...

2:34:33 Mr. Bueche: Alright. I guess I would like to make a motion to hold a joint Planning Commission/Board Of Supervisors public hearing for Backporch. Is that motion correct? Well, he can't tell us.

2:34:51 Cathy Binder: I would say to follow the language there and just say... Change it for the... Dr. Young, your advice on that?
2:35:01 Dr. Young: Okay, that's what I would advised her. If that's the motion that you wanna make, I'd advise that you recommend a joint public hearing between the Planning Commission and the Board Of Supervisors to consider a special exception permit for event venue Backporch Vineyard owned by Spillman Wilmont, LLC. Sherri Spillman, Tax Map 41, Parcel 36D, 40.84 acres, zoned A1, limited agricultural district, 20 acres designated for the event venue.

2:35:42 Mr. Bueche: Can I say "so moved" Or [2:35:44] ____...

2:35:46 Dr. Young: Yeah, you were saying "so moved."

2:35:47 Mr. Bueche: So moved.

2:35:48 Cathy Binder: Yeah, so it is just... Do I have a second?

2:35:51 Annie Cupka: I'll second that.

2:35:52 Cathy Binder: Any more discussion?

2:35:53 Mr. Granger: My only question would be, do you remember, we did this once before, and the board never got the opportunity to weigh in? It was a regular Planning Commission meeting, and so there's other business that they have going on, and so it can be challenging with the Planning Commission performing their part of it...And then having to stop to allow the board to then do their part of it, and then to go back and then finish up the rest of their meeting.

2:36:22 Cathy Binder: But as I remember, I mean, one of our challenges... And Ms. Hall's now done a very good job of shortening her presentation. But she always has a good presentation, and also we can go past midnight if we vote to choose to go past midnight. So those are options that we can do, and I don't see either of these as being very controversial. I might be wrong, but...

2:36:46 Mr. Granger: I would imagine less controversial, at least.

2:36:49 Cathy Binder: Yes.

2:36:50 Mr. Granger: I think that's a... That is a fair point.

2:36:51 Heather Hall: If I may interject?

2:36:51 Cathy Binder: Go ahead, Ms. Hall.

2:36:52 Heather Hall: I would recommend holding it on a separate night, our agenda for the August meeting is very full. If you hold a joint meeting, we could certainly have a special meeting on a separate night. I believe that both of these projects are straightforward. We haven't received any complaints from the neighbors. They seem to have all the preliminary in order. So if you do choose to do a joint meeting, I would recommend not doing it on the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meetings. We're pretty full for August.
2:37:23 Cathy Binder: So what we can do is have a special meeting and include both of them on there, and have a joint meeting.

2:37:27 Heather Hall: Yes, Ma'am.

2:37:28 Mr. Granger: Just for those two items.

2:37:29 Mr. Stonehill: Do we have a venue big enough for both groups?

2:37:33 Cathy Binder: I would assume this venue...

2:37:34 Heather Hall: This is our only venue, I believe.

2:37:36 Mr. Stonehill: This is our biggest venue.

2:37:38 Dr. Young: And, sir, if that was the case, the staff would work to probably look at opening up the curtains and making the decision to work to accommodate such a large meeting.

2:37:50 Cathy Binder: Alright. Do we have to amend that amendment for that?

2:37:54 Dr. Young: No, Madam Chair, because you're just asking for a motion to entertain a joint meeting between the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

2:38:02 Mr. Bueche: That would be scheduled at a later point.

2:38:04 Cathy Binder: Okay, so we have a motion and we have it properly seconded. Any more discussion?

2:38:09 Mr. Granger: So it would be scheduled at a later point? I'm sorry, I just would like to make sure we hammer this out before I... 'Cause I would hate for it to end up taking longer to go through this process to make a coordinated meeting than to just have each individual meeting.

2:38:21 Mr. Bueche: Good point.

2:38:21 Mr. Granger: So I would almost like to propose some dates now to the Planning Commission and see which one of those dates might be the best for them so that we can already know, "Hey, we have a plan going forth." And then authorize them to... The staff to advertise the public hearing to... Based off that feedback.

2:38:46 Cathy Binder: Dr Young, do you have some dates right now that are available or possible?

2:38:52 Dr. Young: Yes, Madam Chair, give me one second.

2:38:54 Cathy Binder: Ms. Hall, I think, has some also.
Heather Hall: Just keep in mind, we do have a notification process of 20 days in advance, as well as our two weeks of advertisement. So I would recommend middle of August.

Dr. Young: We have the Board of Supervisors meeting on the 18th, so I would suggest 17th or 19th. It'd be basically a back-to-back meeting week, but I think that that would be accommodating.

Mr. Granger: I would... Any day that week, I would be amenable to, if we wanna try getting in as many as possible, it would be a Wednesday.

Dr. Young: 19th is a Wednesday, sir.

Cathy Binder: That's fine. Yeah, but 19th is fine.

Mr. Granger: But I'll leave it to the rest of the board to give input.

Heather Hall: Do we wanna have a backup date just in case Planning Commission can't get a quorum on that night?

Cathy Binder: Yes.

Mr. Granger: That's why I was trying to say the whole week. Yeah.

Heather Hall: Okay. The whole week?

Mr. Granger: Yeah. That's what I'm saying, but I don't wanna speak for the rest of the board.

Cathy Binder: Is that...

Dr. Young: The week of the 17th?

Mr. Granger: Yeah, I can make any of those days work.

Cathy Binder: Mr Stonehill, is that okay with you?

Mr. Granger: Hopefully we would be able to get a quorum.

Mr. Stonehill: Yes.

Annie Cupka: I will make any of those days work if we can make this happen for these applicants, both of them.

Mr. Bueche: And is it possible, we can move it up to let's say 5:30, just in case? Like, Mr Granger brought up that midnight deadline.
2:40:12 Cathy Binder: Yes. Does anybody have a problem with 5:30?

2:40:15 Mr. Granger: Again, based off up the Planning Commission and quorum, I would be fine with that, but if it has to go to 6:30, that's fine with me as well. That's the only thing I'd say.

2:40:20 Heather Hall: And I know that some of my our Planning Commission members work out of town, but with covid-19, they might be a little more local these days, so I will try and facilitate that.

2:40:29 Mr. Granger: Okay. If it can't, then everyone would be okay with 6:30 still. Okay, alright, I'm good. Thank you.

2:40:39 Cathy Binder: Okay, so we have a motion.

2:40:40 Mr. Bueche: Motion seconded.

2:40:42 Cathy Binder: Seconded. Any more discussion? All those in favor?

2:40:45 Mr. Granger, Ms. Cupka, Mr. Bueche, Mr. Stonehill: Aye.

2:40:48 Cathy Binder: I have to say nay just because I'm gonna follow what I said. So motion carries. Next up... Hold on. Department of Community Development, case number O2-O2-E01, special exception permit request...

2:41:06 Dr. Young: Madam Chair.

2:41:06 Cathy Binder: Sorry.


2:41:20 Cathy Binder: Okay. No problem. Department of Community Development case number 20-O2-E01, special exemption, permit requests for an event venue. Landino Barn, owned by Alfred and Mary Landino. Tax map 26, partial 30... That's 36, 55.13 acres, zoned A2 limited agricultural district. 21 acres designated for the event venue. Ms. Hall.

2:41:47 Heather Hall: This one is very similar to the last one you just heard. The Landino Barn applied to become an event venue as described in section 4.14 of the King George County Zoning Ordinance. The application includes an existing barn, grass parking, portable restrooms, and proposes no more than 24 events per calendar year. You have two options again tonight whether to forward or retain the motion. The applicant has provided a letter requesting that the board retain that application, which was included in your packet.

2:42:20 Cathy Binder: Do we have any questions concerning? Yeah.
2:42:24 Annie Cupka: And is the applicant here, Madam Chair?

2:42:27 Cathy Binder: Did you want us...

2:42:28 Heather Hall: Yes. Actually, the applicant is here if you have any questions.

2:42:30 Cathy Binder: Mr Landino, would you like to come up and say anything? Yeah. You can come right up and talk to us.

2:42:56 Alfred Landino: How are you tonight? Good to be here. I guess we came to bypass a step I thought we were going to take anyways with the Planning Commission. It's been a while. I guess we've been going out at it for about a one year and a half. We had some problems getting the report going with a deputy who had to cancel on us, so. And we are an active venue, so we haven't really... You probably know that. So we haven't had any events this year, may not have any events this year as we were losing them in the fall already, so. And it's not a big deal. So if it has to go to Planning Commission, we're okay with it. I'll say that. Whatever is good for you is good for me. We're not gonna contest anything. And we're really not... We're not like the other venues, I guess. We don't really advertise. We've been doing it if somebody calls us, people we know, and we're gonna continue to be that way, just a place to be... So we're not gonna be full commercial like most of them are. You have any questions for me, or us?

2:43:58 Cathy Binder: Does anybody have any questions?

2:44:02 Mr. Granger: I don't. Well, I guess I'll just ask.

2:44:03 Alfred Landino: Go ahead.

2:44:04 Mr. Granger: I assume you'd be... Find the joint meeting satisfactory.

2:44:07 Alfred Landino: Oh. I find it fine, that's fine. Yeah, I don't know why I'm talking here.

2:44:08 Mr. Granger: Yeah. We're just looking to shorten the time frame. It's not... The Planning Commission isn't the problem.

2:44:11 Alfred Landino: That's fine. Any time's fine. I'm not sure you're talking about the big crowd, I don't think it's gonna be a big crowd 'cause... I think it's gonna be rather small. My neighbors are all on board with this. They've actually had three or four weddings from our neighbors, and recommending it. So they're all pretty... We try to keep it quiet and over by 10:00, as the rules state.

2:44:32 Mr. Granger: Appreciate that.

2:44:35 Alfred Landino: So I... But that's just... Yeah. So I'm fine with anything you guys wanna do.

2:44:38 Mr. Granger: Thank you.

2:44:41 Cathy Binder: Thank you.

2:44:42 Alfred Landino: That's it? Thanks.

2:44:45 Cathy Binder: Alright. Do I have a motion?

2:44:46 Mr. Granger: I move to schedule a public hearing for a joint meeting of the Board Of Supervisors and then of the Planning Commission during the week of the 17th to be decided for case number 20-02-E01 special exception permit request for an event venue, Landino Barn.

2:45:06 Mr. Bueche: Second.

2:45:07 Cathy Binder: Any more discussion? All those in favor?

2:45:10 Mr. Granger, Mr. Stonehill, Ms. Cupka, Mr. Bueche: Aye.

2:45:12 Cathy Binder: Chair votes nay. Motion carries. Thank you, Mr Landino.

2:45:19 Alfred Landino: Thank you.

2:45:19 Cathy Binder: All right. Next up, discussion item, Dr Young, on Declaration of Emergency.

2:45:24 Dr. Young: Yes, Madam Chair. As the board is fully aware, we're currently under a Local Declaration of Emergency, which is set to expire on July 16th. There is a process where the emergency manager, the county administrator, could redeclare and then have it affirmed by the board at a subsequent Board of Supervisors meeting. But seeing that this one is expiring within... I mean, this meeting was two days right before the expiration of the meeting, I felt that it would be prudent to bring the declaration before the board, and instead of affirming a local declaration, we would like to request that the board redeclare a local emergency. The statement that I'm asking for you all to redeclare is a little bit different than what's currently contained in your board packet. That is a result of some feedback that I have received from some members of the board and from the county attorney. So if you would please afford me the opportunity, Madam Chair, I'd just like to read the revised local emergency and recommend that it be approved as presented.

2:46:33 Cathy Binder: Go right ahead.

2:46:35 Dr. Young: At a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of King George County, Virginia, held at the King George High School on July 14th, 2020, the following declaration was consented to, confirmed and adopted, declaring a local emergency to exist in King George County, Virginia. Whereas, the Board of Supervisors of the County of King George, Virginia, board finds that covid-19 constitutes a continuing real and substantial threat to public health and
safety and constitutes a disaster and/or a major disaster as defined by Virginia Code 44-146.16, being a communicable disease, a public health threat.

2:47:11 Dr. Young: And that on March 16th, 2020, the local director of emergency management declared a local emergency on King George County, which was confirmed on March 17th, 2020 by the board. And that on April 16th, 2020, declaration of local emergency was extended through May 15th, 2020. And that on May 15th, 2020, the declaration of local emergency was suspended through June 15th, 2020. And that on June 16th, 2020, the declaration of local emergency was extended through July 16th, 2020. That the local emergency and disaster is and will continue and pose a threat of actual occurrence of an emergency and disaster, which is of sufficient severity and magnitude that warrant coordinated local government action to prevent or alleviate the damage, loss, hardship, or suffering. And that the county administrator, of the County of King George acting in his capacity as the local Director of Emergency Management, recommends that the board consent, confirm, and declare a continuing local emergency pursuant to the Commonwealth of Virginia's emergency services and disaster law, Virginia code 44-146.13. Now, therefore, it is hereby declared by the Board of Supervisors of the County of King George, Virginia that a local emergency exists, and continues to exist through the County of King George, Virginia, and it is further declared and ordered that during the existence of this emergency, the powers, functions, and duties of the Director of Emergency Management and the emergency management organizations. And the functions of the County of King George are those prescribed by the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the ordinances, resolutions, and approved plans of the County of King George in order to mitigate the effects of the said emergency. This state of local emergency shall end when this condition of peril has abated, or at midnight on of August 14th, 2020. Signed, the Board Of Supervisors, August 18th 2020. Signed, the Board of Supervisors, King George County, Virginia.

2:49:04 Mr. Granger: I move to reapprove and adopt the Declaration of Emergency as read by Dr Young.

2:49:13 Cathy Binder: Do we have a second?


2:49:16 Cathy Binder: Any discussion?

2:49:17 Mr. Bueche: Yes, Madam Chair.

2:49:18 Cathy Binder: Go ahead, Mr Bueche.

2:49:20 Mr. Bueche: I would like to thank Dr Young and Mr Britton for the amendment to the their language and for my colleagues for entertaining this. Previously, I had opposed the declarations of emergency because of specific language that was in here, but understanding this is a financial tool that we really need to use and that I understood the meaning of it, I asked that the specific language that I found misleading to be removed, and it has. One thing I do wanna make clear to my constituents and to those who have understood why I was opposed to this declaration, this declaration is local in nature, this does not impact the governor and his direction
of what phase we in King George will be under, or the state. We understand that there are families that have continued to get a paycheck, that telework, and everything's fine, they're getting paid. But there's another demographic in this county that hasn't gotten a paycheck in three months and can't pay their rent, grocery shop. There is a financial hardship. But this declaration does nothing for the latter, okay? This declaration is simply a financial tool to help expedite the process for the county administrator to enter into contracts and procurement. This does nothing to address those other concerns, and this does not impact the governor and what phase we're under... So with the language, thank you to everyone, I'll be able to support this declaration this evening.

2:51:14 Cathy Binder: So we have a motion that is properly seconded, any more discussion? Ms. Cupka.

2:51:20 Annie Cupka: Madam Chair, thank you. I would just point out a couple of things. Dr Williams from Virginia Department of Health, also on that call with Congressman Wittman on Friday, stated, "This is a disease of lagging indicators. It takes several days, up to a week, to get sick enough to be hospitalized. So what we see today is really the result of what happened two weeks ago. And I say this because if you all followed the newspaper over the weekend, our neighbor due east, Westmoreland County, had a huge increase, over the weekend, in cases. I think it's wise of us, whether you view this as a financial tool, as I do, or not, to reinstitute the state of emergency. I would point out that we have a number of county employees on our staff who live in Westmoreland County, so if there is spread in their community, eventually perhaps, it could impact our staff's ability to properly function. I also would point out, while today, there were zero high PPE calls, when Dr Young shared the covid internal dashboard with us yesterday, I believe there were 10 calls run by the fire department, and five of them, 50% the calls our Fire Rescue ran yesterday, ran yesterday, required high PPE calls. So I would reiterate my support for this. Like I said, I view this as a financial tool, but there are still people out there who are sick and suffering because of it. Thank you, Madam Chair.

2:53:11 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Any more discussion? So we have a motion properly seconded, all those in favor?


2:53:23 Mr. Britton: And Madam Chair, we were amending this on the fly. I realize that the footer has May 14th, when it is published, it'll say July 14th.

2:53:34 Cathy Binder: Gotcha.

2:53:35 Mr. Britton: Thank you.

2:53:36 Cathy Binder: Thank you. Alright. Dr Young, County Administrator's report.

2:53:43 Dr. Young: Thank you, Madam Chair. Unfortunately, the Community Development
Department always lease as that they do their business, and that's usually before the county administrator's report. I did wanna advise the board of the fact that Heather really did understate all of the work and effort that it took for them to meet that compliance with the DEQ and the Chesapeake Bay Act. As you all are fully aware, the Chesapeake Bay Act is a monster on land use, not only in King George County, but all localities affected by that legislation. And then anything that DEQ touches, as we already know, is very complex and is very complicated, and it's definitely not a pleasant process. Heather specifically came and sat down with me and explained to me that last year, that they would wanna go through this compliance process. And when she detailed all the work and the whole effort that's gonna be required of the whole department to meet that compliance and meet DEQ's demands, I did have those concerns, if they would still been able to maintain their current work load while engaging with the regulatory agency. And so I'm very proud to know that they were able to successfully not only meet their job, but also meet beat the plans for DEQ. And I just wanna state for the record that I appreciate all the hard work that that department is doing, the leadership of Brad and Heather to get them through this compliance process, and it's because of them that King George County is able to continue to form its land-use activities and keep our economic development initiative moving forward. So thank you all, Community Development. With that being said, I spoke with the county attorney and expressed the concern for a lack of guaranteed continuity of operations in the event a significant portion of a department or a key employee fell ill or is injured. We then researched two firms that maintain an inventory of retired municipal employees that provide interim services to address this specific issue. After vetting both companies, we concluded that Burke Group to be the best fit to meet the County's needs. I have tasked a proposed contract for your review, please note that this instrument is not financially binding unless the firm is tapped by the county to fill a personnel need. When the county makes a request, these and sellers are then negotiated with the company. The contract is termed through December 30th, 2020. At this point, the county can then determine if our environment dictates a need to retain said services. I would like to recommend that the Board of Supervisors authorize the county administrator to execute the enclosed contract, subject to county attorney approval. And I just wanna stress that we really wanted to move forward with what we're calling a staff insurance policy. Ms Cupka is absolutely right. Some of our staff, the majority of... The bulk of our staff doesn't live in King George County, they do live in our neighboring counties, and in our neighboring counties who are seeing these upticks of the covid-19 disease. And I do have great concerns that since we do not have a lot of redundancy or a back bench of staff in our County departments, all it takes is one key personnel, and that could bring the county to a screeching halt. For example, we only have one person that does payroll for teachers. If that person's out due to covid-19 or an injury, then we're gonna have a real hard time trying to figure out how we're gonna get teachers paid, and that's the situation in many departments in King George County's administration. So after expressing those concerns, went back, we just started a search to figure out how we can fill that gap and ensure that, especially in the time of this local declaration and this pandemic, that we do have the insurance policy to ensure the continuity of government. And I would highly recommend that the board consider this contract, and authorize the county administrator and the county attorney to execute it.

2:57:33 Cathy Binder: Do we need to make a motion for that. Alright. Do we have a motion?

Mr. Bueche: So moved.

2:57:42 Cathy Binder: Who would like to make a motion? So moved. It's all good. We have a motion properly seconded. Any discussion? All those in favor.

2:57:55 All: Aye.


2:58:04 Dr. Young: Thank you, Madam Chair. And Madam Chair, that concludes my report.

2:58:09 Cathy Binder: Alright, thank you Doctor Young. Ms. Cupka?

2:58:09 Annie Cupka: Can I just say something right before I read the...

2:58:13 Cathy Binder: Yes, yes you can.

2:58:15 Annie Cupka: Just with regard to your report, Dr Young. I just wanna make note for citizens that in addition to the director's reports that have historically been in the board packet, I note the addition of a Parks and Recreation Director Report and an Economic Development Tourism report. And I wanna thank you for that very much, Dr Young. It's all in our efforts to be transparent to our citizens, so thank you so much.

2:58:43 Dr. Young: Thank you, Ma'am.

2:58:46 Annie Cupka: I move that the King George County Board Of Supervisors convene in closed meeting pursuant to state code section 2.2-3711A8. For consultation with legal counsel employed or retained by a public body regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such council, specifically the county's rights in its name, logo, and other intellectual property responding to a local government imposter and disciplinary actions toward board members present and past. Invited to attend the closed meeting are the county administrator and county attorney because they are deemed necessary, and their presence will reasonably aid the board in its consideration of the topics to be discussed, pursuant to Virginia Code section 2.2-3712F.

2:59:40 Mr. Granger: Second.

2:59:42 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor.

2:59:46 All: Aye.

2:59:47 Cathy Binder: Chair votes aye, we are in closed session. Mr Stonehill, do you certify? Ms. Cupka, do you certify?
3:00:00 Annie Cupka: So certify.

3:00:00 Cathy Binder: Mr Bueche, do you certify?

3:00:00 Mr. Bueche: I certify.

3:00:01 Annie Cupka: Mr Granger, do you certify?

3:00:02 Mr. Granger: So certify.

3:00:04 Cathy Binder: And this is Cathy Binder, I so certify this meeting is called back into session. I will talk a little louder. Do I have a motion for adjournment?

3:00:13 Mr. Granger: I move to adjourn until August 3rd, at 6:30 in the... Dr Young, is it gonna be here, this work session? Okay. In the auditorium...

3:00:28 Cathy Binder: Of King George County.

3:00:28 Mr. Granger: At 6:30, King George High School auditorium.

3:00:32 Cathy Binder: Any discussion? All those in favor.

3:00:35 All: Aye.

3:00:38 Cathy Binder: Any nays? Chair votes aye. This meeting is adjourned.