

**MINUTES  
KING WILLIAM COUNTY  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 24, 2014**

At a regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors of King William County, Virginia, held on the 24<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2014, beginning at 7:00 p.m. in the Conference Room of the County Administration Building, order was called with the following present:

O. O. Williams, Chairman  
T. S. Stone, Vice-Chairman  
C. T. Redd III  
T. J. Moskalski  
S. K. Greenwood

T. L. Funkhouser, County Administrator  
D. M. Stuck, County Attorney

**RE: REVIEW OF MEETING AGENDA**

Chairman O. O. Williams called the Board of Supervisors meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and agenda changes were discussed.

There was general discussion of the meeting agenda items.

The Board recessed and moved to the Board Meeting Room of the County Administration Building to continue the meeting.

Chairman Williams called the meeting back to order at 7:20 p.m.

**RE: APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA**

On motion by T. S. Stone, seconded by T. J. Moskalski, with the following roll call vote, the Board adopted the agenda for this meeting as presented by the County Administrator, with the following change: under item 16 – Adjournment was changed to Recess as the Board of Supervisors will reconvene on March 13, 2014, at 6:30 p.m., for a Joint Dinner Meeting with King William School Board at Hamilton Holmes Middle School to review a draft school budget.

Those members voting:

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| T. J. Moskalski | Aye |
| S. K. Greenwood | Aye |
| T. S. Stone     | Aye |
| C. T. Redd III  | Aye |
| O. O. Williams  | Aye |

**RE: PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – SPEAKERS: ONE OPPORTUNITY OF 3  
MINUTES PER INDIVIDUAL OR 5 MINUTES PER GROUP ON NON-PUBLIC  
HEARING MATTERS**

The Chairman opened the Public Comment Period.

1. Curtis Mason, of the 2<sup>nd</sup> District and President of Mattaponi Rescue, asked the Board to restore the \$5,000 cut from his budget last year.

2. Ann Davenport, of the 2<sup>nd</sup> District, hopes a public hearing will be held in King William with regards to the distribution of biosolids.

3. Kathy Morrison, of the 2<sup>nd</sup> District and member of the Rappahannock Community College Board representing King William County, gave applause to King William County for paying the funded amount for this program so promptly. She gave a brief statistics report on the number of enrollments from King William County and the Town of West Point that participates in the continued education programs offered at RCC for adults and high school students. She urged the Board to consider funding the capital improvement fund presented by Dr. Crowther during last year's budget session. She commended the Board and County staff for the format developed in the past recent weeks allowing citizens to express opinions, ideas and perceptions of how money is spent in King William County. She also commented on the new website and said she was very pleased when she downloaded the agenda for tonight's meeting.

4. Rodney Inge, President of King William Volunteer Fire and Rescue Department, once again thanked the Board for the continued support and open communication with the agency. He appreciates the honesty in the feedback received from the Board.

Ms. Stone thanked Mr. Inge for all of his efforts and said they are appreciated.

5. Don Wagner, of the 5<sup>th</sup> District, also spoke of his hopes a public hearing will be held in King William for citizen input on biosolids applications. He briefly explained some of the findings of research he has done on allowable ingredients of biosolids and feels we do not need to become a landfill for industries disposing of these metals.

6. Bob Ehrhart, of the 5<sup>th</sup> District and speaking on behalf of the King William T.E.A. Party, stated he recently designed an online survey for the T.E.A. Party and

gathered information from King William citizens for just over 30 days. He presented two items from the survey he considers to be the most significant facts, household income levels have declined in the past 3 years; and majority of participants do not support tax increases. He stated respondents of the survey represented all five districts of the county.

Ms. Stone asked how many responded to the survey in total.

Mr. Ehrhart stated he is not privileged to disclose information of participants.

There being no other persons to appear before the Board the Chairman closed the Public Comment Period.

**RE: CONSENT AGENDA**

On motion by C. T. Redd III, seconded by T. J. Moskalski, with the following roll call vote, the Board approved the following items on its Consent Agenda:

a. Minutes of the Regular meeting of January 27, 2014

b. Claims against the County for the month of February, 2014, in the amount of \$743,865.80 as follows:

(1) General Fund Warrants #78957-79030 in the amount of \$42,831.61; and ACH Direct Payments #4645-4709 in the amount of \$89,553.26; and General Fund Warrants #79031-79087 in the amount of \$163,241.52; ACH Direct Payments #4710-4746 in the amount of \$112,052.77; Direct Deposits #19051-19158 in the amount of \$181,752.62; and Electronic Tax Payment in the amount of \$72,576.62 for February, 2014.

(2) For informational purposes, Social Services expenditures for the month of January, 2014, Warrants #309976-310007 in the amount of \$24,122.48; ACH Direct Payments #1093-1115 in the amount of \$11,982.00; Direct Deposits #3164-3181 in the amount of \$31,783.84; and Electronic Tax Payment in the amount of \$12,426.39.

(3) Tax Refunds for the month of February, 2014, in the amount of \$1,543.02.

c. Resolution #14-10 – A Resolution to refer to the Planning Commission certain amendments to the Zoning Ordinance of King William County – Stormwater Management Program; was approved.

Those members voting:

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| S. K. Greenwood | Aye |
| T. S. Stone     | Aye |
| C. T. Redd III  | Aye |
| T. J. Moskalski | Aye |
| O. O. Williams  | Aye |

**RE: PRESENTATIONS TO THE BOARD**

a. Update on Biosolids Monitoring – Neil Zahradka, Manager of Land Application Programs with the Department of Environmental Quality and Robert Crockett, with Advantus Strategies, representing Virginia Biosolids Council –

Mr. Neil Zahradka gave a brief review of the Virginia Biosolids regulations amended in 2013 and explained localities have the option of employing a local monitor to oversee and enforce the regulations for the application and storage of biosolids. He stated the DEQ provides training for monitors; training is a requirement prior to reimbursement for a monitor.

Ms. Stone asked if a locality doesn't have a monitor who is monitoring.

Mr. Zahradka stated the DEQ has inspectors that inspect approximately 80% of land application activity.

Ms. Stone questioned if reimbursement for a monitor covers the employment of a full time position.

Mr. Zahradka stated some localities have a shared employee to perform monitoring or the duties are assigned to present employees.

Ms. Stone asked given the permit under consideration if the majority of the tons of biosolids will be applied in King William.

Mr. Zahradka stated the majority of the tons would be applied in King William.

Ms. Stone asked how many of the public hearing requests received by DEQ were from King William residents.

Mr. Seth Williams, with the DEQ, stated there were 72 requests in total; the majority was from King William citizens.

Ms. Stone asked for clarification a public hearing will be held in King William; Mr. Seth Williams answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Redd commented on the recent application of the biosolids, on Wakema Road, and said the debris that was spilled on the road surface was pushed in the

ditches. He is concerned biosolids are entering the river and the wells of the nearby residents. He also mentioned that during this application residents were limited in outdoor activities due to the strong foul odor; some residents reported having respiratory illnesses they feel were related to the stench. In his opinion the DEQ is putting the responsibility of monitoring the applications of biosolids on localities. He feels the DEQ should contact landowners affected by the recent application and offer to test their wells. He noted a sample of the debris spilled on the roadway was gathered and should be tested as well.

Mr. Zahradka stated the local monitoring program is intended as a supplement to what DEQ does. He said the DEQ inspects 80% of the applications of biosolids and is the most water tested program they have. He explained regulations require if applications are spilled on roads the spillage is to be cleaned up by the end of the day; as far as what is "cleaned up" is being addressed by the DEQ. He further explained any time biosolids is land applied it has to be applied under a nutrient management plan, making sure the rates and timings that the crop it is applied to can take up the nutrients and they are not lost to the bay; not all activities on agricultural lands fall under those requirements. He said DEQ is confident their inspectors are covering the activity in the State very well; the monitoring program is just a supplement.

Mr. Redd asked for clarification the Wakema land application was inspected.

Mr. Zahradka confirmed the site was inspected but he was unaware of how many inspections occurred.

Mr. Moskalski has concerns with how local monitoring will help the process and feels enforcement and regulation is needed. In his opinion the application on Wakema Road was very poorly done. He asked for clarification local monitors have authority to enforce regulations. He also voiced his dissatisfaction with the application and cleanup process at this site.

Mr. Zahradka stated local monitors have the authority to stop the landowner from any further activity if found not to be in compliance with regulations.

Chairman Williams commented on an application some years ago in the upper end of the County and at that time the Department of Forestry said the application was experimental; application was blown through trees being harvested, he understands

this has become regular practice. He asked if the Department of Forestry has changed their standards of the way biosolids are used, or did DEQ come up with a more lenient standard to allow the application.

Mr. Zahradka stated land application methods were developed in conjunction with the Department of Forestry with Virginia Tech; environmentally protective method as well as rates of the growth of timber. He said parameters were developed from these methods to be included in the regulations; including surface application.

Chairman Williams has concerns for the citizens where the applications are being applied on top of the ground and with the metals being put in the soil.

Mr. Zahradka explained the biosolids applied in Virginia are below the magnitude metals concentration allowed by the EPA. He said the numbers stated by Mr. Wagner seem to be the lifetime loading rates; he has never seen a site even come close to the lifetime loading rate. He stated a lot of the metals in biosolids can be found naturally occurring in soil; metals in biosolids are tracked and the numbers have come way down, particularly because of the pretreatment at wastewater treatment plants.

Chairman Williams asked if biosolids applied are below the standard rates so they don't have to be tracked.

Mr. Zahradka stated that is correct; but most land appliers supply metal levels to the DEQ.

Mr. Robert Crockett, with Advantus Strategies, representing Virginia Biosolids Council, stated he has found that having a local monitor provides better comfort to citizens, administration and elected officials. He shared some good experiences from other localities that have used the local monitor program. He said there are many benefits to using a local monitor during the process; from start to finish.

Mr. Moskalski wonders, since this is the most regulated activity by DEQ, how a project such as the one that occurred on Wakema can be so badly mismanaged by the company performing the application.

Mr. Crockett speculated if the company had a do over it wouldn't have occurred that way.

Mr. Redd asked Mr. Crockett if he represents the Virginia Biosolids Council and who makes the council up.

Mr. Crockett stated he represents the council. He said the council is composed of most of the medium to large wastewater treatment plants operating in Virginia and all contractors that recycle biosolids; whether they are composters or land application contractors.

Mr. Redd questioned the information provided by Advantus Strategies and whether the information is only what the organization wants to share with the public.

Mr. Crockett said he doesn't believe so. He stated the wastewater treatment plants associated his organization, Advantus Strategies, protects the water in Virginia by ensuring the treatment they supply is safe and environmentally secure. He said the regulations used to provide oversight to the activities associated with biosolids are a great interest to his organization.

Mr. Redd agrees with Mr. Moskalski that a terrible job was done with the application of the biosolids on Wakema Road.

Chairman Williams stated he looks forward to a public hearing to be held in King William County before any more permits are authorized.

Upon conclusion of the update on biosolids it was noted the DEQ will hold a public hearing in King William County for citizen input on the recent permit submitted for future applications of biosolids in the County.

b. Activity Update – Sheriff Jeff Walton – Sheriff Walton gave an activity update and stated there were about 1,100 more law enforcement calls for 2013 than in 2012. He said King William County continues to hold one of the lowest crime rates in the Greater Richmond Metropolitan area. He explained burglaries and breaking and enterings reported in 2012 were unusually high because of a rash of residential burglaries that spread across several localities; adding crimes that happen like this are not usually committed by local folks. He stated he has three investigators and a lot of man hours are used to track and bring these cases to trial. He noted the King William Sheriff's Office is a part of a regional drug task force, Quin Rivers Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Force, and in his opinion participation has been very beneficial; one person is dedicated to the task force but we get the benefit of having five members from other

jurisdictions to help us out. He said Virginia is broken when it comes to the mental health system and gave details of the time involved in finding and transporting a person to a facility. He has high hopes the General Assembly is going to work on some of these issues this year and more next year. In closing, he said it may seem there are a lot of deputies in his department but, they are spread thin when it comes to handling the numerous things that are going on throughout the county.

Ms. Stone asked the difference between a larceny and a burglary.

Sheriff Walton explained a larceny is when someone comes in your yard and steals something; a burglary is when someone enters your home or business and steals something.

Mr. Greenwood asked what is considered destruction of property; he has noticed a number of mangled highway signs that appear to have been shot.

Sheriff Walton said in most cases when someone calls to report such an incident it is the following day and too late to find out whom did the destruction.

Mr. Moskalski added he called and reported someone shooting at a road sign near his home and a deputy responded right away to investigate but was unable to apprehend anyone.

**RE: OLD BUSINESS**

No old business was brought before the Board.

**RE: NEW BUSINESS**

a. Resolution #14-11 – VJCCCA Budget Amendment (Fund #737) – FY 13-14 and Appropriation of Prior Year Excess Funds – Virginia Juvenile Community Crime Control Act – The County Administrator stated this request is for a proposed vehicle purchase for the VJCCCA which has a fund balance and an increased need for vehicles. He said the County Administrators, of the five member localities, have thoroughly discussed this request and recognize the need and support this vehicle purchase for transporting minors needing to report for community service assignments. He noted King William County is the fiscal agent for VJCCCA and requires Board authorization for budget authority to spend their fund balance.

Chairman Williams asked for clarification this is a fund balance from all the participating localities.



The County Administrator answered in the affirmative.

On motion by T. S. Stone; seconded by C. T. Redd III, with the following roll call vote, the following Resolution #14-11 VJCCCA Budget Amendment (Fund #737) – FY 13-14 & Appropriation of Prior Year Excess Funds – VJCCCA, was adopted:

RESOLUTION #14-11  
VJCCCA BUDGET AMENDMENT (FUND #737) – FY 13-14 &  
APPROPRIATION OF PRIOR YEAR EXCESS FUNDS - VJCCCA

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors wishes to amend the FY 13-14 County Budget to provide funds to the Virginia Juvenile Community Crime Control Act (VJCCCA) agency for the purposes of purchasing a van at a cost of \$25,000 by appropriating prior year excess funds of the VJCCCA agency associated with Intensive Court-Ordered Monitoring Fees; and

WHEREAS, in FY 2014 the agency was required to be responsible for certifying and monitoring minors at court-designated service hours and staff is transporting groups of minors to certified locations and such work requires a larger, additional vehicle; and

WHEREAS, the County of King William is responsible for the fiscal administration of the VJCCCA agency on behalf of partners in the counties of Charles City, King & Queen, Middlesex and New Kent; and

WHEREAS, the VJCCCA Director and county administrators of the five partner localities are in agreement the vehicle can be purchased with prior year excess funds,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Supervisors of King William County hereby amends the FY 13-14 County Budget to establish a VJCCCA vehicle purchase line item and \$25,000 is hereby appropriated to the VJCCCA vehicle purchase line item and is directed to be transferred to that line item for the above stated purposes.

Adopted this 24<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2014

Those members voting:

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| T. S. Stone     | Aye |
| C. T. Redd III  | Aye |
| T. J. Moskalski | Aye |
| S. K. Greenwood | Aye |
| O. O. Williams  | Aye |

b. Resolution #14-12 – Budget Amendment – FY14 – Proposed Vehicle Purchase – Sheriff’s Office and Motor Pool – The County Administrator noted the proposed Resolution #14-12 is a request for the purchase of a vehicle for the Sheriff’s Office and a motor pool vehicle for Board consideration. Continuing he explained the Sheriff’s Office has two vehicles no longer in service; one is a total loss due to an accident and the other has transmission problems and very high mileage. He said both vehicles are scheduled for replacement in 2015 but there is an urgent need to

replace one. He said the proposed resolution is also for a request to purchase a vehicle to add to the motor pool.

Mr. Moskalski stated he supports replacing the damaged vehicles. He feels the motor pool vehicle should be considered during the FY15 budget process.

Ms. Stone agreed with Mr. Moskalski.

T. S. Stone moved for approval of amended Resolution #14-12(R) Budget Amendment – Sheriff’s Office Vehicle FY14; motion was seconded by T. J. Moskalski.

Chairman Williams called for additional discussion.

Mr. Redd asked for clarification of the vehicle used by the Animal Shelter and if King & Queen shares the expenses for the vehicle.

The County Administrator stated currently King & Queen is not sharing the expenses for the vehicle but we are in discussions. He explained the purpose of the vehicle used by the Animal Shelter is to transport animals for shots and other medical needs. The vehicle is used as an emergency back up for the Sheriff’s office.

Mr. Greenwood asked for clarification that the Sheriff’s Office vehicle considered a total loss was valued at only \$4,000 due to age and mileage.

The County Administrator answered in the affirmative.

Upon completion of discussions the following amended Resolution #14-12(R) was approved with the following roll call vote:

RESOLUTION #14-12(R)  
BUDGET AMENDMENT – SHERIFF’S OFFICE VEHICLE  
FY14

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors wishes to amend the FY 13-14 County Budget to provide funds to the Vehicle Replacement Fund for the purposes of replacing one patrol vehicle of the Sheriff’s Office at a cost of \$32,055 by appropriating General Fund Balance and Insurance Proceeds; and

WHEREAS, General Fund Balance and Insurance Proceeds have sufficient cash to cover this capital expense in the Vehicle Replacement Fund

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Supervisors of King William County hereby amends the FY 13-14 County Budget to establish the following transfers for the referenced revenues and expenditure:

|                |   |           |
|----------------|---|-----------|
| TRANSFER FROM: | General Fund Balance                          | \$ 28,000 |
| TRANSFER TO:   | Capital Project Fund -<br>Vehicle Replacement | \$ 28,000 |
| REVENUE        | Insurance Proceeds                            | \$ 4,055  |
| EXPENDITURE    | Capital Project Fund -                        | \$ 32,055 |

Vehicle Replacement

and \$32,055 is hereby appropriated and is directed to be transferred to the above-referenced line items for the above stated purposes.

Adopted this 24<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2014

Those members voting:

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| C. T. Redd III  | Aye |
| T. J. Moskalski | Aye |
| S. K. Greenwood | Aye |
| T. S. Stone     | Aye |
| O. O. Williams  | Aye |

c. Resolution #14-13 – Budget Amendment – King William Social Services Office Appropriation of State Funds for Aid to Families and Dependent Children Non Entrusted Foster Care (AFDC-FC) and Adoption Subsidy Under Title IV-E and Additional Funding for Eligibility Part-Time Workers to Meet Increased Applications – FY14 – The County Administrator explained Resolution #14-13 is for a budget amendment essentially for aid to families with dependent children, some adoption funding, and increased part-time hours to address applications that are expected to increase as a result of the Affordable Care Act; last item listed requires a very small match in local funding. He stated this request is for budgeting authority to appropriate the funds for these requests.

T. J. Moskalski moved for approval of Resolution #14-13; motion was seconded by C. T. Redd III.

Chairman Williams called for discussion.

Ms. Stone asked for clarification what optional actions represent.

The County Administrator stated the optional action is for the eligibility work.

Upon completion of discussions the following Resolution #14-13 Budget Amendment – King William Social Services Office Appropriation of State Funds for Aid to Families & Dependent Children non Entrusted Foster Care (AFDC-FC), Adoption Subsidy Under Title IV, and Additional Fund for Eligibility Part-Time to Meet Increased Applications – FY14 was approved with the following roll call vote:

RESOLUTION #14-13  
BUDGET AMENDMENT – KING WILLIAM SOCIAL SERVICES OFFICE  
APPROPRIATION OF STATE FUNDS FOR  
AID TO FAMILIES & DEPENDENT CHILDREN NON ENTRUSTED FOSTER CARE  
(AFDC-FC), ADOPTION SUBSIDY UNDER TITLE IV, AND ADDITIONAL FUNDING  
FOR ELIGIBILITY PART-TIME TO MEET INCREASED APPLICATIONS – FY14

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors wishes to amend the FY 13-14 County Budget to provide funds to the Social Services Office for the daily care payments to care providers and staff; and

WHEREAS, there has been an increase in number of cases requiring day care at residential placement facilities for AFDC-FC; and

WHEREAS, there has been an increase in age and number of cases requiring care at residential placement facilities for IV-E children; and

WHEREAS, there has been an increase in number of Medicaid and FAMIS applications in response to the Affordable Care Act additional staff hours are needed to meet the demand; and

WHEREAS, AFDC-FC and Title IV-E require no local match from the County, but does require budget authority from the County to act; and

WHEREAS, additional staffing hours for part-time eligibility workers will require 15.5% local match, and additional budget authority from the County in order to act,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Supervisors of King William County hereby amends the FY 13-14 County Budget to establish the following revenue and expenditure:

|              |                                   |               |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| REVENUE:     | Proceeds from Commonwealth        | \$ 44,458     |
|              | Transfer from General Fund        | <u>817</u>    |
|              |                                   | \$ 45,275     |
| EXPENDITURE: | Part-Time for Eligibility Workers | \$ 5,275      |
|              | AFDC-FC                           | 20,000        |
|              | Adoption Subsidy – IV-E Adoptions | <u>20,000</u> |
|              |                                   | \$ 45,275     |

and \$45,275 is hereby appropriated and is directed to be transferred to the above-referenced line items for the above stated purposes.

Adopted this 24<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2014

Those members voting:

- T. J. Moskalski     Aye
- S. K. Greenwood   Aye
- T. S. Stone         Aye
- C. T. Redd III      Aye
- O. O. Williams     Aye

d. Resolution #14-14 – Budget Amendment – King William Comprehensive Services Act Appropriation for Congregate Care for Non-Title IV-E Children, Congregate Care for Parental Agreement/Non-Custodial Children, and Educational Services for Children in Congregate Care – FY14 – The County Administrator stated Resolution #14-14 is also a budget amendment. He said Ms. Anne Mitchell, Director of King William County Department of Social Services and one of her staff members is available to answer questions. He noted County staff concerns are with the actual historical reimbursement rates, things change, and there is little flexibility at the local level. Briefly, the State is not always paying necessarily what they claim to pay. He

said this budget amendment is abnormal for King William and funds are not necessarily set aside for this purpose; hopefully this will not be a trend.

Ms. Anne Mitchell clarified the Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) is a separate entity and not in Social Services. She further explained the CSA is a County program that serves children who are mandated by the law to receive these services because they have special needs in school, mental health issues, foster children who are not Title IV-E eligible or court ordered juveniles who need services. She stated Anne Porter is the CSA coordinator for King William, housed in her office, and the authority on this program.

Chairman Williams asked how did we get this far behind without knowing.

Ms. Anne Porter said we cannot predict how many children will have to be served; most cases are required to be serviced. She said costs for services continue to rise; the number of children to be served in residential settings from last year to this year has doubled. She gave some details of the progression of open cases and also explained the State match rates for particular types of cases.

Chairman Williams asked Ms. Porter to explain residential settings for the public.

Ms. Porter said a group home is considered a residential setting and houses eight to ten children with constant adult supervision. Locked facilities are another type of residential setting which have more restrictions than a group home and house higher risk children. She said the children placed in residential settings are not considered incarcerated and added if they are in detention they do not receive mental health services.

Ms. Stone stated she is no longer able to attend the meetings for the CSB due to a change in employment and noted the Board is working on assigning someone else to the committee. She explained the State changed the funding mix about seven years ago to encourage fewer children in residential settings to more of a community base. In order to do that, local government had to match a higher amount for a residential setting and a lower rate for a community based setting. She feels unfortunately, for rural counties, it is more of a challenge and they don't have an option for community based services, as do the urban areas. She understands the intent,

and certainly we do want children in less restrictive settings, but the change had a bigger impact, or more difficult impact, in a rural setting because we have fewer options for a community setting.

Ms. Porter confirmed the statements made by Ms. Stone.

Mr. Redd said he is glad Delegate Hodges was present to hear this conversation.

Mr. Greenwood asked for clarification the agency is asking for \$270,000 in additional funds for the current year.

The County Administrator stated the requested funds are for projected use; either cases already in progress and then based on the current caseload. He said additional cases could be added and in theory they could be back asking for more funding.

Ms. Mitchell stated it appears they are receiving more difficult cases; the older children get the harder they are to serve. She said there are cases of children being placed in residential settings and kicked out because they are so difficult. She said it is unfortunate there are so many in residential settings; the goal is for them to be at home with their families where they belong.

The County Administrator said, as the Sheriff commented earlier, certain crime trends and medical detentions have long been a problem for localities. He said statistically the more development and growth in a locality the time devoted to these cases will continue to rise.

On motion by T. S. Stone; seconded by T. J. Moskalski, with the following roll call vote, Resolution #14-14 Budget Amendment – King William Comprehensive Services Act Appropriation for Congregate Care for Non-Title IV-E Children, Congregate Care for Parental Agreement/Non-Custodial Children, and Educational Services for Children in Congregate Care – FY14, was approved.

RESOLUTION #14-14  
BUDGET AMENDMENT – KING WILLIAM  
COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES ACT APPROPRIATION FOR  
CONGREGATE CARE FOR NON-TITLE IV-E CHILDREN, CONGREGATE CARE  
FOR PARENTAL AGREEMENT/NON-CUSTODIAL CHILDREN, AND EDUCATIONAL  
SERVICES FOR CHILDREN IN CONGREGATE CARE – FY14

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors wishes to amend the FY 13-14 County Budget to provide funds to the Community Policy and Management Team (CPMT) and

the Family Assessment and Planning Team (FAPT) for the overall care of at-risk children; and

WHEREAS, there has been an increase in number of cases requiring congregate care at residential placement facilities for Parental Agreement/Non-Custodial children; and

WHEREAS, there has been an increase in number of cases requiring congregate care at residential placement facilities for Non-Title IV-E children; and

WHEREAS, there has been an increase in number of cases requiring educational care outside of King William County Schools and West Point Schools for children in congregate care; and

WHEREAS, all three mandated programs require local match from the County, and budget authority from the County to act. The historical match rates are as follows:

|                   | State Approved<br>Child & Service <u>Not</u><br>Medicaid Eligible | State Approved<br>Child & Service<br>Medicaid Eligible | Historical Actual<br>Child & Service<br>Medicaid Eligible |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
| Local             | 48.16%  | 24.08%   | 71.26%  |
| Commonwealth      | 51.84%  | 25.92%   |   |
| Federal Pass-Thru |   | 50.00%   | 28.74%  |

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Supervisors of King William County hereby amends the FY 13-14 County Budget to establish the following revenue, expenditure, and corresponding transfer budgets:

|              |                                  |                |
|--------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| REVENUE:     | Proceeds from Commonwealth       | \$ 77,598      |
|              | Transfer from General Fund       | <u>192,402</u> |
|              |                                  | \$ 270,000     |
| EXPENDITURE: | Non-Title IV-E Congregate Care   | \$ 15,000      |
|              | Parental Agreement/Non-Custodial | 100,000        |
|              | Education – Congregate Care      | <u>155,000</u> |
|              |                                  | \$ 270,000     |

and \$270,000 is hereby appropriated and is directed to be transferred to the above-referenced line items for the above stated purposes.

Adopted this 24<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2014

Those members voting:

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| S. K. Greenwood | Nay |
| T. S. Stone     | Aye |
| C. T. Redd III  | Aye |
| T. J. Moskalski | Aye |
| O. O. Williams  | Aye |

Mr. Redd commented on the statement in the resolution about the increase in the number of cases requiring educational care outside of King William County Schools and West Point Schools, and said it seems to him the schools have a responsibility to educate children. He said when reviewing the budget this year he would like to see the percentage the CSA money we are spending actually takes care of these kinds of cases. He said maybe we can go back to the schools and let them

know they are responsible for these costs because the County is not going to cover this under the general fund; if this is legal.

Ms. Stone stated the cost of residential placements far exceeds what a school system would spend on educating a child. She feels this would be a good discussion and the statistics would be interesting.

**RE: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS – TRENTON L. FUNKHOUSER,  
COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

a. Public Safety Radio System – Project Progress Report – The County Administrator said County is in the final process of the public safety radio system improvements. He said a meeting with Motorola and others, in Hanover, was canceled due to inclement weather; meeting has been rescheduled for February 27<sup>th</sup>. He said due to technical reasons associated with available transmit/receive frequencies, the State Police Tower equipment will need to be supported, sooner rather than later, by a microwave link on a tower proposed for the rear of the Courthouse; the link was part of the project budget but not the tower. He said in reviewing the final design a change had to be made and the proposed tower will be installed behind the courthouse and additional information will be brought before the Board for approval. He said the good thing is this can be accomplished under the original budget approved by the Board for the project. He noted the T-1 link costs King William \$18,000 a year with Hanover County. He said, thankfully, with the savings we have experienced throughout the project, even with adding the tower; we have the State Police equipment as well as the microwave link currently in the project budget. He noted an update will be brought to the Board after the meeting on the 27<sup>th</sup> of February.

Ms. Stone is interested in a side by side comparison of what we thought was in the budget and what it looks like now for capital expenses and also those ongoing expenditures such as the T-1.

**RE: APPOINTMENTS**

a. Resolution #14-08 – Resolution of Appointment – Regular and Alternate Members to serve the Middle Peninsula Broadband Authority –



On motion by C. T. Redd III, seconded by T. S. Stone, with the following roll call vote, the following Resolution #14-08 Resolution of Appointment Regular and Alternate members to serve the Middle Peninsula Broadband Authority; reappointment of Trenton L. Funkhouser as Regular Member and appointment of Travis J. Moskalski as the Alternate Member; each appointment is for a term of four years commencing March 1, 2014 and expiring February 28, 2018, was adopted.

RESOLUTION #14-08  
RESOLUTION OF APPOINTMENT  
REGULAR AND ALTERNATE MEMBERS TO SERVE  
THE MIDDLE PENINSULA BROADBAND AUTHORITY

WHEREAS, the Middle Peninsula Broadband Authority (the "Authority") was established on May 14, 2010, by concurrent resolution of the counties of Essex, Gloucester, King William, and Mathews to facilitate the provision of affordable broadband service to businesses, governmental agencies, and the general public, in the best interests of the general welfare of the citizens of each county; and

WHEREAS, the County of Middlesex has taken action, by Resolution adopted by its Board of Supervisors on December 18, 2012, to join the Authority as a Member Locality; and

WHEREAS, the Authority, in accordance with § 15.2-5431.10A of the Code of Virginia, has amended Article 2 of its by-laws to increase the size of its Board from four members to five members, one from each participating locality; and

WHEREAS, member localities include the Counties of Essex, Hampton, James City County, King and Queen, King William, Mathews, Middlesex and York and the Cities of Poquoson and Williamsburg; and

WHEREAS, as stated in Article 2 of the Bylaws the Authority Board shall request the governing body of each member jurisdiction to appoint a regular member and an alternate to serve in the absence of the regular board member,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Supervisors of King William County hereby reappoints Trenton L. Funkhouser, County Administrator, to serve as the regular member and appoints Travis J. Moskalski as the alternate member representing King William County, both to serve on the Middle Peninsula Broadband Authority for a term commencing March 1, 2014 and expiring February 28, 2018.

Adopted this 24<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2014

Those members voting:

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| T. S. Stone     | Aye |
| C. T. Redd III  | Aye |
| T. J. Moskalski | Aye |
| S. K. Greenwood | Aye |
| O. O. Williams  | Aye |

b. Resolution #14-09 – Resolution of Appointment King William County Recreation Commission –

On motion by T. J. Moskalski, seconded by C. T. Redd III, with the following roll call vote, the following Resolution #14-09 Resolution of Appointment King William

Recreation Commission, appointing Leigh Hubbard to serve on the King William County Recreation Commission representing King William County Schools, for an unexpired term ending June 30, 2015; was adopted.

RESOLUTION #14-09  
Resolution of Appointment  
King William County  
Recreation Commission

WHEREAS, it is necessary for the Board of Supervisors of King William County to appoint a member to the King William County Recreation Commission for an unexpired term ending June 30, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors appointed Mr. Steven Tupponce on May 21, 2012, to serve as a member of the Recreation Commission representing King William County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, at this time Mr. Tupponce is unable to complete the term of his appointment to the Recreation Commission; and

WHEREAS, by letter dated February 6, 2014, from the Division Superintendent of King William County Public Schools, Mark R. Jones recommends the appointment of Ms. Leigh Hubbard to serve the unexpired term on the Recreation Commission,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of King William County, Virginia, that Ms. Leigh Hubbard is hereby appointed to serve as a member of the King William County Recreation Commission, representing King William County Public Schools, for an unexpired term ending June 30, 2015.

Adopted this 24<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2014

Those members voting:

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| C. T. Redd III  | Aye |
| T. J. Moskalski | Aye |
| S. K. Greenwood | Aye |
| T. S. Stone     | Aye |
| O. O. Williams  | Aye |

**RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COMMENTS**

Chairman Williams opened the Board of Supervisors comment period.

Ms. Stone thanked everyone for attending the meeting tonight and wished everyone a safe trip home.

Mr. Redd is glad to hear a public hearing will be held in King William County on the biosolids permit. He feels this was mostly initiated because of interested citizens and thanked everyone for their efforts in making this happen.

Mr. Greenwood thanked the County Administrator for conducting the various town hall meetings; he feels they went well.

Mr. Moskalski thanked Delegate Hodges for being present at the meeting tonight. He is always grateful when our state representatives come and listen to the

business conducted by their constituent localities. He thanked Ms. Mitchell and Ms. Porter for the explanation on the last business item that was much needed. He also is pleased to hear a public hearing will be held for the biosolids permit in the county. He personally has concerns with DEQ's level of concerns regarding some of the actions by the applicants; equally concerned about Synagro and the biosolids council insistence that the regulations, or at least the enforcements of these regulations, are adequate despite ample evidence to the contrary in this county. He also thanked everyone that attended the town hall meetings.

Chairman Williams thanked everyone for coming out. He said it was tough appropriating money tonight because it appears to him parents are not parenting. He said we have laws that we can't spank children and children let you know about it; he feels this is a problem. He feels children should have respect for teachers and authority. He said he sees some respectful youth, but then he sees some that are disrespectful; this bothers him. He thanked the citizens for making the town hall meeting held in Mangohick in the inclement weather; he apologized for not being in attendance because he was called into work to clear the roads.

**RE: RECESS OF MEETING**

There being no other business to come before this Board the meeting was recessed at 8:55 p.m. The Board of Supervisors will reconvene on March 13, 2014, at 6:30 p.m., for a Joint Dinner Meeting with King William School Board at Hamilton Holmes Middle School to review a draft school budget.

COPY TESTE:

---

O. O. Williams, Chairman  
Board of Supervisors

---

T. L. Funkhouser,  
County Administrator  
Clerk of the Board