

VIRGINIA:

A meeting of the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors was held in the courthouse of said county on Thursday, April 24, 2008.

Members Present: Peter N. Geilich, Chair
Jack S. Russell, Vice Chair
B. Wally Beauchamp, Board Member
F.W. Jenkins, Jr., Board Member
Ernest W. Palin, Jr., Board Member

Staff Present: William H. Pennell, Jr., County Administrator
Jack D. Larson, Assistant County Administrator
Don G. Gill, Planning and Land Use Director

Mr. Geilich called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PUBLIC INPUT

Tax Levy Increase

Warren Goddard stated he had concerns about an article he read in the Rappahannock Record about a possible tax increase by the Board of Supervisors. He said after a 50% increase in assessments, he is in opposition to a tax increase.

Lindsay Trittipoe stated he is full-time resident of Richmond and part-time resident of Lancaster County. He said he had concerns about the proposed judicial center and stated he is not sure if the county should or should not build a new judicial center. If the county does need a new judicial center he has concerns with the process the county has taken. The judicial center is an essential component to the county, if indeed the county needs to spend \$5 or \$10 million to build a new judicial center; there should be a better process. The first step would have been to invite the judge to submit a letter to the Board of Supervisors for public knowledge citing the reasons why a new judicial center

would be needed. There should be public hearings in the way county financing has been done over the last 150 years for judicial centers. That is to sell general obligation bonds. Over the past twenty years local government has skirted voters by engaging in lease appropriation bonds which are moral obligation bonds and, in effect, puts county taxpayers in debt without their consent. This should be put on a referendum for taxpayers to vote on and if it is the will of the people go forward. He suggested slowing down the process and listen to what the voters have to say.

2007 Audit

William Osisek, Sixth Grade American History Teacher, lives in the county ten-eleven months a year and his rental payments goes toward paying county taxes asked when the county's audit would be put on the agenda for presentation.

Mr. Geilich stated the 2007 Audit was presented by Paul Lee with Robinson Farmer Cox Association at the February 28, 2008 Board of Supervisors meeting and the audit is available on the county's website.

Lawsuit against Former Superintendent

Sharon Bagnall presented the Board of Supervisors with a petition to drop the lawsuit against the school board. Where the intentions may have been good, the lawsuit would further deplete funds that could be put to much better use.

PRESENTATIONS

None

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

County-wide Maintenance

Mr. Trapani stated mowing would start the week of May 1, 2008 and again trash would be picked up prior to mowing.

Mr. Trapani said highway department will be performing county-wide patching and paving.

Traffic Signal at VSH 688/James Jones Memorial Highway and VSH 200/Irvington Road

Mr. Trapani said the traffic light at the intersection of VSH 688/James Jones Memorial Highway and VSH 200/Irvington Road has been activated.

VSH 610/Oak Hill Road Speed Study Request

Mr. Trapani stated the speed study request for VSH 610/Oak Hill Road is a seasonal issue and the speed study request will be done after June 1, 2008 for a better count.

Six-Year Plan

Mr. Trapani said they would like to have a Six-Year Plan work session and public hearing at the May 29, 2008 Board of Supervisors regular meeting.

Welcome to Lancaster County Sign

Mr. Pennell stated that VDOT has received his permit applications for the Welcome to Lancaster County sign.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. FY 2009 Lancaster County Schools Operating Fund and Cafeteria Fund Budget – Mr. Larson stated the Lancaster School Board Budget request summary for the Fiscal Year 2008 – 2009 has been properly advertised.

Mr. Larson said the school superintendent presented the budget request from Lancaster County Schools. The increase was reviewed by staff and comments passed to the School Superintendent and Finance Director. Their response to staff comments generated additional staff comments. There remains a disparity in the amount of increase that can be justified. Expenditures per student also continue to increase rather than stabilize or decrease.

Mr. Larson said the renewal for health insurance has been recently received from the provider, and the proposed increase in premiums is 27.4%. The Schools will work to bring that figure down through negotiation and possibly completing a new proposal. The proposed \$75.00 per month per employee increase for health insurance contribution would cover a premium increase of 20% for single insured. The 27.4% proposed increase, therefore, does provide a quantifiable basis for the request for increase contribution.

Mr. Geilich said the Board of Supervisors would listen to each comment, however; no decision would be made at this meeting. The Board of Supervisors may approve a set amount of money and the school board does the detailed allocation. The Board of Supervisors does not decide the priorities.

Chairman Geilich opened the public hearing.

Lindsay Trittipoe stated he lives in Richmond full-time with his wife and two teenage children and a believer in public education. His children attended Mary Mumford School which is a great public school, but now they

attend a catholic school. He would love to move to Lancaster County on a full time basis but is not willing to put his children in what he considers a mediocre school system. He said public education can be made to work. It goes beyond just education level that the children receive at the cost of over \$13,000 per pupil. He believes its time for people to rise up and say enough is enough. County taxpayers have been forking over good money after bad and supporting a mediocre public school monopoly. There are 1,200 students in Lancaster County Public Schools with 250 employees being a 5:1 ratio which is totally misaligned and at \$13,000 per pupil that is higher then the City of Richmond. It is a mathematic certainty that if the county allows this to continue, where the school board is 50% – 60% of the county’s budget and keeps coming to the board for 10% - 20% proposed increases which forces the board to raise taxes every year. The tax rate is increased by 6% - 9% per year and retirees’ income is growing at 2% - 3% per year and inflation is more than that. He proposed that the long term goal would be the abolishment of the independently elected school board members in this county and need to put control back in the hands of the Board of Supervisors. Secondly, he suggested the school board give financial control over to the Board of Supervisors and further place a referendum on the ballot to see what the voters want. If the county looks at other models, you can deliver great education at bargain prices.

John Langlo stated he has been a county taxpayer for twenty years and said his taxes and assessment have gone up 300% since he has lived in Lancaster County, however; his income has gone down. He has concerns with the proposed school budget with excessive administrative costs. Based on 1290 students at a cost of \$601 per students in administrative cost, whereas; Virginia Beach is \$189 per pupil, Chesapeake is \$238 per pupil, Roanoke is \$325 per pupil, and Richmond is \$589 per pupil. Lancaster County cost per student is greater than those areas and would like to know why. The teachers need to paid more; it seems that money is being waste by the schools. For

example, paying an engineer and architect firms \$50,000 - \$60,000 and locally this county is rich with contractors and he does not believe it was necessary to spend that type of money for the installation of restrooms at the high school athletic field.

Mr. Palin stated you need to compare school divisions that are comparable in size otherwise, your comparison is skewed.

Dana Gilmore said he has taken a different look at the school budget, taking a macro approach and based upon a comparison of costs amongst five school systems. This will be an analysis of Lancaster versus four neighboring schools. One school has been selected to be compared to Lancaster because both schools met Adequate Yearly Progress under “No Child Left Behind.” Lancaster County Public Schools has consistently been at the top in expenditures per pupil from fiscal year 2002 thorough 2007 and projected higher for FY08-09. Lancaster Schools’ projected expenditures per pupil accelerates higher in the FY08-09 budget request to \$11,635 and if fully funded would further widen the gap against the selected neighboring school to over \$1,500 per pupil which would raise taxed 4 cents. He did a comparison of Lancaster Schools and the selected neighboring schools debt service, composite index, etc. and recommended funding Lancaster County Public School for FY08-09 at \$14,055,000 and further recommended the county appropriate \$9,278,000 in local funding. This level of funding would equate to an expenditure of \$10,129 per pupil. He suggested that the Board of Supervisors reserve an additional \$500,000 for “buy-outs” or “early retirement.” He indicated there is data that does support a continuing decline in ADM looking toward the future. And finally, the composite index, Lancaster County is high but the good new that it will top out at .8000 and can not get any worse.

Tara Booth, a teacher at Lancaster Middle School said she will make the same comment that she does each year which is she wants the Board of Supervisors to support public education. She asked if the total school board budget request was \$15,494,208 which is a 2.14% increase and a difference of \$331,946.

Mr. Geilich explained that because the state and federal funding have been decreased and the county funding has to increase.

Mrs. Booth said she wanted to make everyone aware of the fact that the schools were not asking for a 10% - 12% increase over last year overall school budget. The changes that happened within the school system actually decrease the budget. The composite index rate increased which is why the school budget increased. The school system is a good system and hopes the board approves the school budget as submitted.

Stacy Jespersen, Parent Teacher Student Organization President at Lancaster High School stated she spoke to the school board in March about teacher compensation and has similar remarks for the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Larson, Assistant County Administrator, said the schools should be run like a business. She stated she holds a number of degrees in accounting and public administrator with a focus on local government budgeting and finance. The most successful organizations have long term perspective which takes into account their most valuable asset which is their employees. When employees feel valued - moral goes up, productivity increases and every one recognizes success. The business of the school district is to educate children. The primary employees in a school district are the teachers; every other employee of the district, including the school board members, superintendent, and administrative staff plays a secondary or supporting role to the teachers. In Lancaster County we say that we value education yet our teachers are among the lowest paid in the eight surrounding counties. Our starting teacher

salary is the lowest and does not get any better until a teacher has been teaching for ten to fifteen years. In a recent survey of 69 Lancaster County teachers it was found that 26 teachers hold two or three jobs to make ends meet, 15 teachers cannot live in Lancaster County because they cannot afford housing, 2 teachers are eligible for reduced lunch for their children and free health services, 3 teachers are eligible for other government assistance, and 1 teacher commented that because he/she held a second job the family does not receive government assistance. These are college educated and supposedly gainfully employed individuals. Our teachers put in long hours and many spend their own money on resources for their students and classrooms. Of the 69 teachers surveyed, 17 do not have health insurance through the school district because the insurance is too expensive and the coverage is poor. The proposed school budget includes a 2.5% increase but due to rising cost in health insurance premiums that increase will wipe that out. Teachers need to be paid competitive salaries and are entitled to an increase of 3.5% or greater to keep ahead of the rising cost of gas, food, or other necessities. Teachers in surrounding counties are already being paid more will be receiving 3.5% – 4% increase and those teachers do not live in one of the ten wealthy counties in Virginia. She believes there are some taxpayers who would be willing to pay a moderately higher tax rate for significantly improved teacher compensation. Presumably, the property tax revenue generated given the reassessment will cover the budget and provide ample revenue for additional teacher raises without having to increase the tax rate. Our citizens are willing to pay more to support our teachers and our schools. She asked to Board of Supervisors to approve the school board budget as submitted.

Mr. Geilich stated those were excellent comments which should also be given to the School Board.

Mr. Jenkins said Ms. Jespersen thoughts were well presented and the concerns are still the same as they have been in the past. Why teacher salaries

in Lancaster County are less than surrounding counties and why Lancaster County pays more per pupil than both like and surrounding counties. Why is Lancaster County paying more per child and the monies not getting to the teachers' pocket?

Dr. Russell asked if every teacher should get the same raise or should there be a merit increase.

Ms. Jespersen said she believes that at some point merit increases should be given but Lancaster County is not at that point yet and everyone should be able to take care of their family.

Tara Brent, Gloucester resident, Lancaster County landowner and Special Education teacher at Lancaster Middle School stated she has worked in Newport News and Gloucester making more money but chose to work here as a teacher because her husband grew up here and he feels passionate that he could make a difference here in Lancaster County. She stated she would not talk about the lack of materials, heating and cooling problems, or technology issues in the schools. She informed the board that this was her first year teaching at Lancaster County and she had to take the minimum amount of maternity leave time which is six weeks. The schools were informed of her pregnancy prior to the start of the school year and a substitute was secured. However; because of a previous commitment the substitute only worked three days. Another substitute was unable to be secured and the three other Special Education Teachers at the high school had to cover her classes for six weeks. Within weeks of her return in March she was informed that due to teacher vacancy she would be moved to the middle school. For nearly half of a school year, her high school students were unable to receive her services for no other reason other than money. The students she teaches need continuity the most which has not been given to them. It is not the fault of the student that she had a baby or that her position was moved to the middle school. Why should the

students have to make do? The administration was forced to work under such stringent budget constraint that they did what they had to do. She asked the board not to allow this to happen again or we could have a mediocre school system.

William Osisek, second year Sixth Grade American History Teacher at Lancaster Middle School stated he has worked in four states and this is a great school system. A lot of the problems are caused by the “No Child Left Behind.” The federal government requires certain things to be done which cost money. Lancaster County has a higher rate of students on free or reduced lunch than the surrounding school systems. He noticed that we have an upper class and lower class but no middle class, which is also a problem. Lancaster County needs to attract more middle class families. The composite index has been one of the biggest problems that people really do not understand. The state and federal government looked at not just Lancaster County but counties across the State of Virginia that within the last two years had more retired and business people move here and purchase land than almost the States of Florida or Georgia. The problem is that a lot of that wealth has moved into the county and the state looks at the wealth of the county and the state and federal then lowers the rate given to the county and the county is forced to make up the difference. A lot of the counties in the state have looked at this issue and said they must raise taxes. For example, Fairfax County lost \$6 million in state and federal fund because the composite index but raised the tax rate to .62¢ without very much outcry and came up with \$6.2 million. He knows that Lancaster can do the same; we have a good Board of Supervisors and School Board and if they work together this can be achieved. The county has old schools that are falling apart. Do we need a new courthouse or new schools? Children are guaranteed an education by the Constitution of the United States and Commonwealth of Virginia. We have the responsibility to educate our children in the best environment. If students are in a least restricted environment and learning the AYP and certification will go up. Teachers are

currently being moved around because of budget issues and a reading program was cut but needed. The health care plans are too expensive. He said a \$17 million budget would be good and a \$20 million budget would be great. It has been stated that taxes may have to be raised by 4¢ and after talking to approximately 200 people in the last two week, they said yes to a raise.

Mr. Jenkins said that the composite index only effects state funding.

Maria Siverson stated she has four students in Lancaster County Schools and one is a senior accepted into Virginia Tech. Lancaster does provide and excellent education and produces great students. She asked the Board of Supervisors to make education an important priority. As parents we take this duty and responsible seriously and every parent wants the best for the children. It has been said that the schools should be run like a business but for every business to do well, we have to invest in the business. They must hire good qualified employees and pay them well and give them the proper tools and support to do the job well. There are problems in the school system that need to be fixed but can not be fixed overnight, however; with a new superintendent she is trying to correct things. It will take time and she needs the support of everyone. Ms. Sciabbarrasi has started to implement the changes needed and is doing a great job. We as parents have invested in children because we want them to succeed in life and in order for them to do so the children must have a good education. The Board of Supervisors should be doing all they can to make this a better school system to ensure that each student gets a good education. Teachers need better salaries in order to retain them, therefore; giving students consistent and quality education. She asked boards, parents, teachers and the community to work together and make a difference for all the children in Lancaster County.

Curtis Dozier stated he is the Key Club Coordinator for the Kiwanis Club and just got back from a three day convention in Richmond where

fourteen Lancaster High School Key Club members attended. They interacted with 900 other Key Club members from three different states and the District of Columbia. Our students stood tall among the other students. They are getting a good education. As a member of the scholarship committee he has had an opportunity to read the stories of many Lancaster County students. The students must maintain a 2.5 grade point average and have a financial need. It is sometimes heart wrenching to read the backgrounds of the students that maintain an A or B grade average, play sports, and work. Somebody is doing something right. He is concerned about the lawsuit being pursued because he believes it is going to cross purposes. All are here to work for the children to ensure that they get a good education.

Patrick McCranie, State Trooper since 1990 in this community, newly elected School Board Member said his wife is a teacher at the high school and also has two students in the Lancaster School system. He passed up better job opportunities to remain in Lancaster County. He said it is an honor to live and serve Lancaster County and look forward to working with the Board of Supervisors.

Linda Coye stated she is resident of Lancaster, taxpayer, voter, and a 20 year employee of the Lancaster County School System. She said she has several issues and concerns to address. The composite index has created a budget shortfall within the schools. According to the State, business has been good and real estate has been selling well in Lancaster County for the past few years and Lancaster is in the same league as Arlington, Alexandria, Goochland, Falls Church, Williamsburg City, and Fairfax City which are in the 80% composite index category. She understands the loss of \$800,000 because of the composite index is indeed falling on the shoulders of the school system to find the money by cutting jobs and programs. The teachers and students account for very little of the \$127 million in sales, rather there are 56% of the student qualifying as economically disadvantaged in this county.

She asked why this governing body and surrounding counties have not banned together and gone to the State to indicate this is a poor county as we have no industry and the composite index is wrong and should be recalculated. If the composite index is accurate, she asked the Board of Supervisors not to have the school system bear the brunt of this shortfall. It is not the children's fault that this county is perceived as being a very wealthy county. She urged the Board of Supervisors to share this among all the taxpayers and find creative revenue sources. Her second concern is the lawsuit brought against the former superintendent, school board, and financial officer. Please consider the withdrawal of this lawsuit as the money being spent on the lawsuit could be going to the support of the schools. She asked the Board of Supervisors to visit the schools as there a many good things happening.

Sharon Bagnall parent of a middle school student and White Stone resident stated she did not know of all the sacrifices teachers make. They do not make enough money and some have two or three jobs to make ends meets, can not afford health insurance for their families and they spend personal money on their students. She is saddened but grateful for all the teachers do and for caring so much and making the sacrifices. Our greatest assets are our children and ensuring that they receive the best education is very important. She asked the Board of Supervisors to approve the school budget as submitted.

Dr. Bagnall comments were presented by his wife Sharon Bagnall because he was working at the Free Health Clinic and unable to attend the meeting. He and his wife discussed both the county and school budget. Private education was a choice for his family but they instead chose the public school system after research prior to moving to the area in 2001. He was concerned that the current decision about not adequately funding the school budget, particularly in light of the cuts in State funding, will seriously undercut and ultimately erode the ability of our school system to carry out its

mission, no matter how dedicated its teachers and administrators are. Much has been said in recent weeks about running the school system like a business. If that concept is merely a way of punishing the system for mistakes and misdeeds of the previous administration, then he is dead set against it because ultimately, it only punishes the children of the school system, the teachers and the current administration are trying to fix any problems from the past. If however that concept is a way to engender better fiscal responsible for the resources that are given to the school system, then he is highly in favor of it. Our schools are a business in a sense that it is their mandate to create a quality product - literate, responsible citizens who as adults will contribute to the public good. For it to be a successful business and create a quality product several things need to present. Every successful business has to be properly capitalized and have sufficient resources to do what it needs to do; to create a quality product otherwise it will fail at its mission. All the good will and dedication in the world won't overcome a lack of basic capital. The capital, the resources any business needs to succeed, is not just the money, but also the human resources, the human capital. Our school system depends on quality teachers with pay and benefits should encourage them to stay and not simply see Lancaster County as an entry level teaching position. It should also encourage them to work on continually developing their skills toward creating a quality product - the educated student. A quality business with a quality product will foster loyal customers and attract new ones, critical for long term success. A mediocre business with a substandard product with fizzle out quickly. A county with its eye on long term future growth should be very concerned about its school system attracting new customers. We can not survive as an older population of retirees or pre-retirees but need to focus on attracting younger people with families who provide the essential infrastructure for a well functioning community, finance, law, retail, medical, service industry, etc. He is realistic enough to know that younger people won't decide to move to Lancaster County because of the school system but many will make the decision not to come because of the school system, if it

does not offer a quality product. As the Board of Supervisors you have the opportunity to approve a budget that reflects a solid commitment to educating our young people but enabling our school system to create a quality product. We as a county certainly have the financial where with all to do if we choose. There are lots of demands for monetary resources for our county, however; none more important than excellence in the education of our children. He urged the Board of Supervisors to take the opportunity to fully fund the school budget.

Rev. Tom Coye, a 20 year resident of Lancaster County stated his remarks are different from other presented. He stated he empathizes with the Board of Supervisors' position as pressure comes in all directions, but commended the board for allowing each person to present their comments and to listen. There is a feeling that somehow the school board itself is the problem and without a better school board we can not move forward. Both the Board of Supervisors and School Board need to work together. Also, you need to look at creative solutions, other ways to handle our situations rather than just cutting positions and programs which hurt the morale of the school system. He hopes that the Board of Supervisors as leaders and partners in shaping the budget of the county to be open to some of the creative solutions.

Mr. Geilich stated the relationship between the Board of Supervisors and School Board has improved over the years and are working well together.

Mr. Jenkins said that this Board of Supervisors has no standing with the insurance policy held by the school system. The board can not make a claim for \$208,000 which we believe was inappropriately paid to the former superintendent. The only way this board had to encourage the school system to put the onus of the suit on them to encourage them to file for the insurance claim. Had that been done by the school board there would not have been a lawsuit.

Lloyd Hill a life long resident of White Stone and a middle class citizen in the county believes this is another example where our county is probably not going to deliver what they have advertised. Lancaster County advertises we have over 300 miles of waterway even if it is very difficult to get to it, the county advertises we have a very good school system but haggling over \$332,000. That does not seem like a lot of money to one of the richest counties in this area, realizing the pie is only so big and everyone is getting a slice but he does not understand why it seems that frequently we try to balance this issue on the backs of the children and school system. The Board of Supervisors may want to try creative ways to find other sources to get the funds, in order not to raise taxes. If our children are the future and we all agree that the county needs to do whatever it can to find the money so that our school system can still progress and meet all the mandates that are being placed by the state and federal government. He said he is willing to pay the 4¢ tax increase, in order for the teachers to get an adequate raise.

Charles Costello stated after attending a number of Board of Supervisors and School Board meetings, the two boards have improved their communication and have worked together in more productive manner this year than in past years. He believes with the new superintendent that things will continue in the future. He is a tutor and has been for a number of years and there are bright students and will do well. The schools need more tutors and maybe some of the retirees moving to the county will be willing to volunteer. He gave some of the statistics for the Lancaster County Schools online report card and said Lancaster is not that far off statewide. We do have good educated teachers and the teachers love their students and work with them. The schools are good but can be better and he is willing to pay the 4¢ on an increased tax rate.

Donna McGrath has lived in Lancaster County for approximately 13 years and moved from the best school districts in New York. Her husband is a physician and has had an opportunity to move but loves Lancaster County and there is no better place to live and raise her children. She asked if the figures given by Mrs. Coye were incorrect from the composite index whose job is it to ensure the figures are right and raise the composite index rate.

Mr. Jenkins stated the correct figure is \$3.1 billion in assessed value of real estate in Lancaster County. He has had an opportunity to work with other members of the General Assembly being on the Rappahannock River Basin Commission giving him a chance to meet routinely with members of the house and senate that represent several counties that touch the Rappahannock River and they will not review the composite index formula. The reason is because larger have more representatives than Lancaster, Northumberland, and Highland Counties which are three counties caught in this bind. The larger localities have more votes in the General Assembly and it is a done deal for them.

Mr. Pennell stated that Delegate Pollard will be conducting a meeting on May 13, 2008 at 5:30 p.m. at Trinity Episcopal Church to discuss the composite index rate. There will be people from the State to explain the three elements that make up the composite index which are real estate, income, and sales tax. He invited the public to attend.

Mr. Beauchamp stated he spoke to Governor Kaine about the composite index and he does not want to touch the issue.

Jackie Oren, spouse of a school employee stated she was confused after listening to the positive and negative comments and the one thing that everyone agreed upon which that our teachers are paid a ridiculously low salary when compared to surrounding counties, yet we have one of the highest

composite index rates. The Board of Supervisors has looked at the budget more closely this year because of past years. She has continuously heard that Lancaster County is wealthy and the Board of Supervisors has stated to go to the school board with budget concerns and that is not helping the situation at hand which is teachers' salaries and overall funding of the schools.

Mr. Geilich stated that the relationship between the School Board and the Board of Supervisors is the best since he has been on the board. Everyone is after the same thing and he complimented the school board and new superintendent for a good start. He recognized that change takes time and believes that both board understand. The Board of Supervisors also has an obligation to the citizens of the county and wants to do what's right for all involved.

Mr. Jenkins said when compared to our peer schools in this region, we are putting more money per student than other counties. If those other school systems are able to pay higher teacher salaries at less cost per student then Lancaster County should be able to also. The funding is better or equal to surrounding counties. The issue that needs to be addressed is why Lancaster County pays more per pupil and less teacher salaries.

Mrs. Oren stated another issue would be teachers in Lancaster County being unable to afford to live here, which is even a bigger issue.

Mrs. Bagnall asked why are we paying more per student and the teacher salaries are so much lower. Is it because the buildings are older and in need of constant repairs.

Mr. Jenkins stated that the cost to repair the school buildings comes out of the Capital Improvement Fund which is separate from the operating expenditures.

Mrs. Booth said that Lancaster County offers full health benefits to our school bus drivers, whereas; other counties do not which is a huge cost. This is a good thing because it is their livelihood and they deserve health insurance?

Rev. Coye asked why the cost per student is high.

Ms. Sciabbarrasi said that Lancaster County does have a higher cost per student and part of that are benefits to the bus driver and food services, whereas; other school districts do not provide those services. We also have a lower pupil/teacher ratio and research shows the lower the pupil/teacher ratio the better quality education in the classroom. The pupil/teacher ratio is 17-1. Because there are more teachers per student which means it costs more per student.

Chuck Rusniak said he believes the Board of Supervisors is supporting the school system. It can not be the teachers against citizens or the Board of Supervisors asking always for a salary increase because the schools are being sufficiently funded. Where is the money going? He agreed with Mrs. Bagnall and suggested that the school board appoint a Citizen Advisory Commission to do research. He does not oppose a tax increase if it's made known as to how the funds are being spent.

Lisa Rose a White Stone resident stated that Ms. Sciabbarrasi held a meeting at the middle school and explained the funds being allocated and it was very detailed. The revised 2009 School Budget was done over the Spring Break and citizens had an opportunity to attend meetings or go to the school board and ask questions.

William Smith, Chairman of the School Board said the school board realizes that they spend more per student and Ms. Sciabbarrasi explained why that is the case. The school board and Ms. Sciabbarrasi are looking at reducing staff but not compromising the education of the children. If there are teachers within the school division who are not meeting the expectations of the school board or superintendent there is no place for them in Lancaster County. It is the intention of the school board and superintendent to keep the good teachers and the goal is to bring their salary up to the top. The school board is only as strong as the manager they have in place and with Ms. Sciabbarrasi there will be a major change, unfortunately this being her first year and coming into a budget that was not hers, it just happens to be when the state increased the composite index. This year has been very tough. He feels that Board of Supervisors is going to do the right thing and both boards have been working stronger and closer together. Everyone has asked why we pay more per student and the board is currently researching and will find out why it cost more per student.

Chairman Geilich closed the public hearing.

Mr. Geilich thanked everyone in attendance, those who gave their input and those who came in support the budget. The Board of Supervisors has listened and will have to make a decision. The communication between the Board of Supervisors and school board is better, however; there is still room for improvement.

CONSENSUS DOCKET

Motion was made by Mr. Beauchamp to approve the Consensus Docket and recommendations as follows:

- A. Minutes for March 27, 2008, April 2, 2008, April 9, 2008, and April 17, 2008

Recommendation: Approve minutes

B. Safe Boating Week - 2008

Recommendation: Adopt the following resolution:

SAFE BOATING WEEK

WHEREAS, on average 700 people die each year in boating-related accidents in the U.S.; nearly 70% of these are fatalities caused by drowning; and

WHEREAS, the vast majority of these accidents are caused by human error or poor judgment and not by boat, equipment, or environmental factors; and

WHEREAS, a significant number of boaters who lose their lives by drowning each year would be alive today had they worn their life jackets; and

WHEREAS, modern life jackets are more comfortable, more attractive and more wearable than styles of years past and deserve a fresh look by today's boating public; and

WHEREAS, over 70% of boating fatalities involve a boater that has not taken a Safe Boating Course.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Lancaster Board of Supervisors, do support the goals of the North American Safe Boating Week Campaign and United States Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 33 and proclaim MAY 17-23, 2008 as National Safe Boating Week and the start of the year-round effort to promote safe boating.

C. Destruction of Paid Tax Tickets

Recommendation: Approve the destruction of tax tickets dated 1997 or older

D. Judicial Center – Reimbursement Resolution

Recommendation: Adopt the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF
LANCASTER COUNTY, VIRGINIA, DECLARING ITS
INTENTION TO REIMBURSE ITSELF FROM THE PROCEEDS
OF ONE OR MORE TAX-EXEMPT FINANCINGS FOR CERTAIN
EXPENDITURES MADE AND/OR TO BE MADE IN
CONNECTION WITH THE ACQUISITION, DESIGN,
CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPPING OF COURTHOUSE
FACILITIES FOR THE COUNTY**

WHEREAS, the County of Lancaster, Virginia (**the "County"**) is a political subdivision organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the County has paid, beginning no earlier than February 24, 2008, and will pay, on and after the date hereof, certain expenditures (**the "Expenditures"**) in connection with the acquisition, design, construction and equipping of courthouse facilities for the County (**the "Project"**); and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County (**the "Board"**) has determined that those moneys previously advanced no more than 60 days prior to the date of adoption of a reimbursement resolution and to be advanced on and after the date hereof to pay the Expenditures are available only for a temporary period and it is necessary to reimburse the County for the Expenditures from the proceeds of one or more issues of tax-exempt bonds (**the "Bonds"**); and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF LANCASTER COUNTY, VIRGINIA, AS FOLLOWS:

Section 000000001. The Board hereby declares, in accordance with U.S. Treasury Regulation Section 1.150-2, as amended from time to time, the County's intent to reimburse the County with the proceeds of the Bonds for

Expenditures with respect to the Project made on and after that date which is no more than 60 days prior to the date of adoption of a reimbursement resolution. The County reasonably expects on the date hereof that it will reimburse itself for the Expenditures with the proceeds of the Bonds.

Section 2. Each Expenditure was and will be either (a) of a type properly chargeable to a capital account under general federal income tax principles (determined in each case as of the date of the Expenditures), (b) a cost of issuance with respect to the Bonds, (c) a nonrecurring item that is not customarily payable from current revenues, or (d) a grant to a party that is not related to or an agent of the County so long as such grant does not impose any obligation or condition (directly or indirectly) to repay any amount to or for the benefit of the County.

Section 3. The maximum principal amount of the Bonds expected to be issued for the Project is \$7,000,000.00.

Section 4. The County will make a reimbursement allocation, which is a written allocation by the County that evidences the County's use of proceeds of the Bonds to reimburse an Expenditure, no later than 18 months after the later of the date on which the Expenditure is paid or the Project is placed in service or abandoned, but in no event more than three years after the date on which the Expenditure is paid. The County recognizes that exceptions are available for certain "preliminary expenditures," costs of issuance, certain de minimis amounts, expenditures by "small issuers" (based on the year of issuance and not the year of expenditure) and expenditures for construction projects of at least 5 years.

Section 6. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its passage.

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye

B. Wally Beauchamp Aye
Ernest W. Palin, Jr. Aye

CONSIDERATION DOCKET

The Board considered the following items on its Consideration Docket:

1. Approval of April 2008 Salaries and Invoice Listings

Motion was made by Mr. Palin to approve the Salaries for April 2008 in the amount of \$192,291.23 and Invoice Listings for April 2008 in the amount of \$688,351.59.

VOTE: Peter N. Geilich Aye
 Jack S. Russell Aye
 B. Wally Beauchamp Aye
 F. W. Jenkins, Jr. Aye
 Ernest W. Palin, Jr. Aye

2. Windmill Point Re-subdivision and Boundary Line Adjustment – Preliminary and Final Plat Approval – Mr. Gill said Section 3-7 of the Subdivision Ordinance requires that the preliminary and final plats for all subdivisions where condominiums are proposed be submitted to the Board of Supervisors for their approval or disapproval. Windmill Point is in District 3.

Mr. Gill stated the intent of this re-subdivision is to adjust existing boundary lines to conform to the Master Plan that was approved on February 23, 2006. If existing lot lines remained, several buildings would be built across them. This adjustment places the lot lines in a more suitable configuration.

Windmill Point is comprised of ten different parcels that will now become twelve:

- Two newly created parcels: Parcel 6, the non-residential site of the community water supply facility; and Parcel 7, the non-residential site of the wastewater treatment facility.
- Five parcels remain as they currently exist: Tax map 41 – 4J, 4K, 4L, 4M and Parcel 4, which did not change, but should be correctly listed as it currently exists as Tax map 41B-1A, especially since it is still zoned A-1 and not R-2 as the other properties.
- Five other parcels: Parcels 1, 2 and 3 (condominium area), Parcel 5 (marina area) and Parcel 8 (remaining acreage have only adjusted their boundary lines.

Mr. Gill said while the total number of parcels will increase from ten to twelve, it is important to note that the total number of non-conforming lots will decrease from eight to seven.

Mr. Gill stated as evidenced by the checklist, this re-subdivision and boundary line adjustment meets all requirements except for the contingencies noted in the recommendation.

Mr. Pennell asked if the developers would be willing to remove the word “proposed” for the public beach access and simply said public beach access and use easement. This would double the size of the beach area and proper signage could be erected.

Mr. Geilich made a motion to approve the Windmill Point Re-subdivision and Boundary Line Adjustment – Preliminary and Final Plat contingent upon three things: 1) Parcel 7 to include the notation, “non-residential site of wastewater treatment facility”, 2) Parcel 4 to be correctly listed as the existing Tax map 41B-1A, 3) “Fairway Drive” to be renamed as it exists elsewhere in the county, and 4) Remove the word “proposed” from public beach access.

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye
	B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye
	F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
	Ernest W. Palin, Jr.	Aye

3. Planning Commission Request – Parks and Recreation – Mr. Gill asked the Board of Supervisors establish a citizen’s committee charged with making recommendations for projects and improvements to be included in a Parks and Recreation Program.

Mr. Gill said at the March 20, 2008 Planning Commission meeting Chairman David Jones asked about this issue. He referenced Chapter 7 of the revised Comprehensive Plan regarding the formation of a citizen’s committee to research and recommend improvements for parks and recreation in the County. He asked that the Board consider this issue by establishing such a committee or direct the Planning Commission to do so.

Mr. Palin asked what are the goals and focus.

Mr. Jenkins said it’s to determine recreational needs and resources that are available. The long term goals are future consideration.

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to authorize the Planning Commission to establish a citizen committee to investigate current recreational opportunities with the aim toward developing a Parks and Recreation Program in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye
	B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye

F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
Ernest W. Palin, Jr.	Aye

BOARD REPORTS

Board of Social Services

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to reappoint Douglas Anderson to the Social Services Board as a representative for District 1 for a four year term ending April 30, 2012.

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye
	B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye
	F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
	Ernest W. Palin, Jr.	Aye

Building Code Board of Appeals

Mr. Geilich made a motion to reappoint Kenny Beatley to the Building Code Board of Appeals as a representative for District 3 for a four-year term ending April 30, 2012.

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye
	B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye
	F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
	Ernest W. Palin, Jr.	Aye

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Pennell said Ted Cole with Davenport and Dan Siegel with Sands Anderson Marks and Miller would like to schedule a work session in May to proceed on the funding strategies for new judicial center.

By consensus of the board a May 1, 2008 budget work session was scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Mr. Geilich to adjourn to the meeting until Thursday, May 1, 2008 at 4:00 p.m. for a Budget Work Session in the General District Courtroom.

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye
	B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye
	F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
	Ernest W. Palin, Jr.	Aye