

**VIRGINIA:**

A meeting of the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors was held in the courthouse of said county on Thursday, April 26, 2007.

Present: Peter N. Geilich, Chair  
B. Wally Beauchamp, Board Member  
F.W. Jenkins, Jr., Board Member  
Ernest W. Palin, Jr., Board Member  
William H. Pennell, Jr., County Administrator

Others

Present: Sean Trapani and Robert Harper, Virginia Department of Transportation; Charles Costello, Friends of Lancaster County; Jack Larson, Planning/Land Use; Randolph Latimore, Lancaster County Schools; Joan McBride, Rappahannock Record; Starke Jett, Northumberland Echo and others.

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

Mr. Geilich said the tragic events at Virginia Tech on April 16, 2007 have shocked and sadden us all and asked everyone to stand for a moment of silence.

Mr. Geilich stated that Supervisor Jack Russell was absent due to the death of his brother in Arizona.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

None

## **PRESENTATIONS**

1. Rappahannock Preservation Society Presentation – Oyster Reefs – Capt. Robert Jensen said he wanted to advise the Board of Supervisors of work done on the river for the last 13 years. At that time VDOT Commissioner Patel stated he had good news and bad news. The good news was that a new deck would be placed on the Norris Bridge and the bad news was that the bridge would be closing from 10:00 p.m. – 6:00 a.m. If the deck was being removed, they wanted to put it to good use. Capt. Jensen and others worked with Virginia Department of Transportation to keep the bridge opened with one way traffic and flaggers.

In 1956 the supporting structure of the bridge was constructed. When they sent their diver down to check the supporting structure in 1957, the divers could not find the concrete supporting beams because they were covered with oysters the size of silver dollars

Capt. Jensen stated Rappahannock Preservation Society is running out of time and requested that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors send a letter of support to Commissioner Steven Bowman if the board believes that the work that the Rappahannock Preservation Society is beneficial for the river.

## **VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

### Abandonment of Route 222

Mr. Trapani stated he received a letter from Benjamin Woodson concerning discontinuance of the end of Route 222 in Weems. This would require a public hearing and asked the Board of Supervisors what they would like to do.

Mr. Pennell stated there has been some illegal dumping and the sheriff's department has been called to that area a number of times and he recommended this go to public hearing for discontinuance.

By consensus of the board, advertise for public hearing at the May 31, 2007 regular meeting.

#### VSH 646/Christ Church Road

Mr. Trapani stated they will have to replace the drainage pipe on VSH 646/Christ Church Road and the road between VSH 200 and VSH 222 and the work will begin sooner than anticipated. He said Mr. Harper spoke to Tim Guill, Director of Transportation for Lancaster County Schools to see how this would affect the buses. There are two buses that will be affected and Mr. Guill stated one bus could be re-routed, however; one bus will still have to pick up students. The work would last approximately one week. He said they would inform the citizens prior to the start of work by going door to door and advertise in the local paper.

#### Traffic Light Study

Mr. Trapani said the request was still being reviewed and the traffic engineers from Richmond would be sending someone down one weekend to look at the intersection VSH 688/James Jones Memorial Highway and VSH 200/Irvington Road in order to get a traffic count.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. School Board Budget – Public Hearing – Mr. Pennell said the Lancaster School Board Budget request summary for the Fiscal Year 2007 – 2008 has been properly advertised.

Mr. Geilich said the Board of Supervisors would listen to each comment, however; no decision would be made until May 3, 2007. It is exceeding difficult and some will be pleased and some will not. The Board of Supervisors approves 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.

Richard Griffy, Teal Lane Resident, stated he attended a Chicago school with grades 1 – 8 with a total staff of nine people, there were eight women and one man. The eighth grade teacher doubled as principal and the one man was the janitor. He said he frequently drives by the primary school and noticed for many months that the parking lot out front was always full. He stopped by the primary school to satisfy his curiosity and counted the cars in the parking lot. There were 68 private passenger cars parked, every parking space was taken, so he drove around to the back and found 8 more private passenger cars parked in the back, which is a total of 76 cars. He said assuming one person per car, this works out to 76 people operating K – 3 at the primary school, which works out to about 19 persons per grade level. We all know of the problems that the airline and automobile industry has had, where they were losing money and they did not raise rates/prices, instead they cut costs. The biggest cost was personnel. Citibank also had to cut costs, and the way to meet a better budget was to reduce personnel. Soon, they will have a new superintendent of schools and stated this may be an opportune time for the new superintendent to conduct an audit of the school system personnel. Rather than increasing the budget by 10%, perhaps enough saving could be realized by the administration and a savings could be used in operation of our school system. The saving could pay the well deserved raises to the remaining staff and faculty at the school.

Margaret Lynn Smith, lives in Lively, parent of a student in the school system, Science Teacher and Department Chair at Lancaster High School and has

been teaching for 12 years which includes teaching Alternative Education, Honors Biology, and Advanced Placement Biology. As a come here, she is concerned with current state of the school system. The school follows the governments “No Child Left Behind” Program, whereas the government and state fund some of the programs, but the schools must also purchase SOL materials and books to meet the guidelines. Virginia has also implemented, the Virginia Scholars Pilot Program, this program offers challenging courses that also require materials. The school currently has outdated and inadequate materials. Virginia’s focus is to bring business into our community; as a result there is a focus on math and science with technology. Science is always changing, so is the cost of equipment. Hands on labs, demonstration, and inquiry based lessons require equipment. Some of the equipment used by the Science Department is outdated, other school systems charge lab fees, whereas; our students can barely pay for notebooks and pens. We can not afford to remain stagnate in the budget every year, while the cost of supplies and materials continue to rise. Our students need the necessary education to become volunteer fire fighters, work in nursing homes, future business employees, business owners, and other workers in our community. Without school programs, students have no structure, no structure could possibly lead to crime. We need to compete with other school systems by bringing in qualified teachers and keeping them. We have had teachers turn down a teaching position because the salary was so low and the cost of living so high. We currently have teachers that have family and can barely make ends meet. Students require stability and because of the high teacher turnover, the students do not get the much needed stability. She asked the board to please consider the points made and information given as they look at the budget and consider what is best for the students and schools future.

Anna Kellum, 540 Good Luck Road, parent of a sixth grader, graduate of Lancaster County High School and teacher at Lancaster Primary School where there are 500 + students. Before the Board of Supervisors makes a decision on the current budget she wanted to provide the board with salary information.

Based on the Department of Education Teacher Salary Survey results the average state teacher salary for 2006 was \$47,310.18. The average salary in the State of Virginia is greater than the highest step on the Lancaster County teacher salary scale. Lancaster first year teacher salary has also been state ranked 92<sup>nd</sup> in 2004-05, 91<sup>st</sup> 2005-06, and 91<sup>st</sup> 2006-07. There has been little or no improvement in that state standing for the last three years. When Lancaster County is compared with the surrounding counties (Westmoreland, Essex, Northumberland, and Richmond County), first year teachers are ranked last, teacher with five years of experiences are ranked fourth, ten years of experience are ranked fourth, fifteen years of experience are ranked third, and twenty years of experience are ranked fourth. In addition, a recent survey that in Lancaster and Northumberland Counties there are only ten housing units that a person on a teacher's salary could afford. Many teachers are working a second job to make ends meet. The board needs to take into consideration that teachers take money out of their own pocket to help supply their classrooms with materials needed to successfully educate their students. Fuel prices and the cost of living continue to rise, which is why it is hard to hire and keep educators in our county under the current salaries offered. In education, research shows that you can not teach children the same way children were taught ten years ago and teachers are continuously learning and making changes to meet each a child's needs and the same goes for the schools' budget. We can not successfully run our school system on the same amount of funding each year, we need to do all we can to support the Lancaster County School System, the educators and staff and most important our future tax payers and members of society.

Mr. Jenkins stated that Lancaster County pays more per student than Westmoreland, Essex, Northumberland, and Richmond Counties in local contributions. He asked why she believes that teacher salaries lag so far behind. Per student cost for Lancaster County, either on a local contribution or total local, federal, state, surpasses all of the other four counties mentioned, yet they are able to pay their teachers more.

Alex Stickler, resident of Lively, taxpayer, registered voter, father of three children and two are currently students at the primary school. He said he hopes this meeting goes better than last year's meeting, because he felt he was personally attacked by members of board. After comments from the board both last year and this year, he stated he was appalled and offended that the county elected representatives had called for the removal of history teachers at the high school last year. Members of this community have shown very little caring about our children, because they do not have children in the school system and therefore, see no benefit in supporting the schools. Teachers need new technology, materials and supplies, as they teach our future doctors and leaders. He said, as a father, he would not allow his children to be told they have to be in a class with 30 or more students because citizens wanted a low tax rate. Teachers deserve the requested 4.5% raise and deserve the same \$400 the county employees have been given for their insurance. Teachers deserve to be treated like the professional they are.

Mr. Geilich again stated the Board of Supervisors does not allocate school funding for specific programs in the schools.

Albert Pollard, lives at 879 River Road and is a parent of a Lancaster Primary School student and understands the difficulty the board has in building a budget. He was not present to tell the board what the right magic number should be, which is why the citizens trust the board. After reading a staff memo dated April 2, 2007 which encourages level funding, he urged the board to reject that position. Lancaster Primary School is not a gold plated school; but an excellent school. It probably does have a number of disproportionate staff resources because it is the primary school. The school system has made a conscientious decision to disproportionately fund the lower grades at a higher level, to avoid troubles later, because of some of the severe pockets of poverty. There are supplies and material that are out dated and need to be replaced. The primary school has been closed

for three days because some of the capital improvement investments have not been made. He believes that level funding in the times of inflationary pressures, especially with health insurance and cost of living in this county would not be good for the future of schools or children.

Mr. Jenkins said that Mr. Pollard had the opportunity to serve in the General Assembly and seeking office of Senator and must know from that service that one of the things that this county falls prey to is the Composite Index. Because Lancaster County has very valuable waterfront properties, this forces upon this county the assumption that we are able to pay more than the City of Virginia Beach for each child. Currently, Lancaster County contributes an amount per child that is 10<sup>th</sup> in the State, and suggests that one of the major problems is not what the taxpayers is paying for our students, it is the Commonwealth of Virginia and the General Assembly who do not know how to stand up to money and interest of the urban areas of Northern Virginia, Tidewater, and Richmond and allow this absolutely fraudulent Composite Index to torture counties like Lancaster and Northumberland which have no large commercial and industry base, they only have a base of some of their land being valuable.

Emerson Gravatt, Kilmarnock resident and spouse of a school teacher, stated most of the people who were present at this meeting are responding to a staff memorandum dated April 2, 2007. He said he was not present to debate every line item, but the memo was offensive to him and he would like to address the first five issues in memo. One, no increase in staff, he understand that increase in staff is for a Special Education teacher to meet federal requirement involving "No Child Left Behind". In the memo, Mr. Larson said realignment of positions could cover that position. Teachers need to be certificated in the jobs they teach, you can not realign teachers who teach Special Education. That is not a justifiable reason to cut \$155,000. Secondly, teacher salaries, the step increase a few years ago were initiated into the Lancaster County School system to help bring our tenured teachers back in line with our competing counties. The cost of



living has hovered about 3% for years and the state has increased the funding to Lancaster County by about 3%. Eliminating the step and cost of living increase should be considered by the board.

Mr. Geilich again stated the Board of Supervisors does not get directly involved with salaries, materials, or equipments. The Board of Supervisors approves an amount and the school board allocates the funding.

Mr. Jenkins stated that Mr. Larson has a great deal of background as a budget analyst in the federal government and qualified to review a budget. He was not suggesting level funding, rather a 2.9% increase which fits in line with the 3% cost of living. There were concerns about the increased cost of health care and that is a real concern.

Mr. Gravatt said the third item of concern was no increased contribution for health insurance. Teachers are second largest users of health care in the nation. The memo stated not to increase the contribution in health insurance and that says the board does not care about the teachers and staff at the school system.

Mr. Jenkins stated Lancaster County is contributing much more per child to educate our children and the surrounding counties are able to give higher contributions to health care and higher salaries, where is the problem. He asked is the problem with what the taxpayers of Lancaster are allocating to the schools or the way the schools are handling the funding once at the school board.

Mr. Gravatt said as a spouse of a teacher, he knows that his wife spends approximately \$700 or more on school supplies every year. The memo date April 2, 2007 said materials and supplies at the current level the saving would be \$54,000 and the reason is that currently execution does not support an increase nor does justification. His fifth concern is how anyone could think that SOL Remediation is not justified. The memo stated that saving \$85,000 for

remediation is not justified. A student who does not pass the SOL in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade is certainly not going to pass the SOL in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade if they don't have help. Remediation does work. He asked the Board of Supervisors to approve the budget as presented.

Mr. Pennell said the State of Virginia approved a 3% increase for teachers, that only applies to the teachers that are apart of the Standard of Quality (SOQ). The remaining teachers are paid entirely by the local taxpayer, they do not get state support and that 3% salary increase is further eroded by Composite Index.

Alexis Forrester, Lively resident, teacher for 33 years and remediation teacher. The "Tea for Two" Program is a remediation program that has 31 volunteer tutors with 756.3 hours working with 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> graders. With the "No Child Left Behind" Program it is necessary to have a remediation program and to help update the SOL scores for the students who participate. All students are required to pass SOLs by 2012-13. Studies show that remediation is best at the earliest levels. She has spent over \$2,000 out of her pocket for her program and students. It is important for the school board, county administration and Board of Supervisors to understand the frustrations of the teachers because teachers need their support.

Margaret Socey, Weems resident and has been a volunteer at the primary school for the last 16 years. This county has teachers who work well beyond their regular hours because they want to see the children succeed. It is a crime that the boards are arguing over this budget. She is retired and willing to pay more taxes, to ensure the children of the county get what they need to succeed. We will need people to care for us as we get older, doctors, nurses, carpenters, auto mechanics, cooks, etc. She said she read that Northumberland County approved a budget which includes an 8.9% salary increase for their teachers. The school board can not decide what to do with the money, if they do not have the money. These

children are our future. She asked the board to approve the school budget as presented.

Cindy Booth-Clark, lives at 120 Old Point Road and has two Lancaster Primary School students. She has major concerns about the safety of the children at the primary school. She stated that approximately 123 students are dropped off and picked up everyday. Each day parents are presented with dangerous traffic patterns and parking situations. This situation was reviewed by the School Improvement Committee and they are in complete agreement that the current parking situation was dangerous and needed immediate attention. She asked the Board of Supervisors to support the budget as presented.

Mr. Jenkins stated that was part of the Capital Improvement Budget and is currently the second item on the list.

Tara Booth asked how and who set the priority on the Capital Improvement Budget.

Tammy Smith, 97 Eubank Drive resident and parent of a primary and middle school student, one with special needs. Lancaster County Schools have to fight for every improvement and every dollar. Why is education placed at the bottom of the list? The children are the future of this county and we should take care of them now. She asked to board to approve the school budget as submitted.

Sean Stickler, resident of White Stone, said he was confused about the memo dated April 2, 2007, wherein, Mr. Larson analyzed the schools budget. Suggestions were made with no increase in health care and no buses. If these recommendations given to the board for the best way to reduce the budget and heard from everyone saying these are not acceptable, then maybe the budget should not be reduce and approved as presented. No one wants their taxes increased but the reality is the cost of living, fuel, operation cost for the school,

and cost of health care increasing every year. We are a Title I School and the Board of Supervisors needs to account for the differences between the surrounding areas. He asked the Board of Supervisors to please consider all the facts and do not punish the teachers, school, and students.

C.D. Hathaway, resident of Weems, now understands that Board of Supervisors approves the funding for the schools and the school board allocates the money. He encourages mediation between the Board of Supervisors and School Board Members because there is no spirit of team work. He asked the Board of Supervisors to approve the budget as presented.

Tabitha Rhinehart, LHS 12<sup>th</sup> grade student, stated she does not feel safe at the school, as the hallways are overcrowded and the school is in need of many repairs. She thanked all the teachers at the schools for doing a great job. She does not believe our schools are a number one priority and does not understand where the money is going.

Charlie Braun stated he was in support of Mrs. Forrester's "Tea for Two" Program. He said he drove by the primary about fifteen years ago and stopped in, to see if he could help. They said sure and he helped with math, which he did for two semesters, after that he volunteered with the "Tea for Two" Program and has been a tutor ever since. It is important that students get the help they need. He asked the board to approve the school budget as submitted.

Maggie Elbourne, 332 Chesapeake Drive and parent of a 2<sup>nd</sup> grader who participates in Mrs. Forrester's "Tea for Two" Program. She said reading has always been difficult for her child, but since he has been in "Tea for Two", he is a better reader and more confident. The teachers, tutors, and volunteers take time out of their busy schedules to help our children become successful and she asked the board to approve the school budget as presented.

Joan Rice, 381 Greentown Road, she is a Paraprofessional at the Primary School. She said now realizes that things have changed from year to another. There are children who go home and do not do any homework because they do not have help. If a child can not read, they can not do their homework. The after school programs are needed in order for the students to be successful. She asked the Board of Supervisors to approve the school budget as submitted.

Rosemary Moody, 267 Black Stump Road, Special Education Teacher at the middle school, asked why Mr. Larson was asked for his input and was anyone else asked for input. She said her main concern was education and wanted to ensure that the board had received input for other sources. She hopes that the board was taking into consideration all the input from the people given an opportunity to speak this evening.

Mr. Geilich stated that Mr. Larson is a county employee with extensive budgeting experience and the board asked him to review the budget which is a common practice in any organization. The Board of Supervisors has received input for others, because the budget is made of other departments. He said education is approximately 65% of the county budget.

Christy Steensma, Weems resident and parent of two primary school students said Mr. Geilich made a comment at the beginning of the meeting, “half will be happy and half will be unhappy”. She said it sounds like the Board of Supervisors has its mind made up about the budget. The children of the county are very important and she hopes that the board listens and understands what everyone has said this evening. She asked the board to pass the school budget as submitted.

Mr. Beauchamp said that with any decision made by the board, some citizens in the county will not be happy because taxes would increase.

Shawna McCranie, 777 Cox Farm Road resident, has children who attend the primary school. She graduated from Northumberland High School and currently is the Art Teacher at Lancaster High School. She worked at the Northumberland Primary School when it was new and her room was beautiful. When offered a position at Lancaster High School, she toured the school and looked at the art room; it was in a dilapidated condition. She said the school administration assisted with getting the room in working condition and did that with little to no money. She has been a teacher for fifteen years, has a masters degree, and the county probably pays her more than a new teacher. If you want quality teachers to stay in the county, they will need adequate materials, supplies, equipment, and pay. She stated as an Art Teacher all her materials and supplies go out the door.

Mrs. Vogel, Primary School Art Teacher invited the Board of Supervisors to the Lancaster Middle School to the Annual Art Show which will be held Saturday and Sunday, April 28 & 29, 2007 from 12:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Kim McNannus, Hills Quarter resident, Vice President of Finance at Rappahannock Community College said he knows the difference between corporations cutting its cost and a school cutting its cost. He has two primary school children and the teachers are doing a great job. He hopes that the Board of Supervisors is careful in their consideration when reviewing the budget.

Kelly Barnhart, 1118 Riverwood resident and parent, asked the Board of Supervisors to pass the budget as presented.

Jack Hoffman, 233 Bald Eagle Road resident and parent of a primary school student asked the Board of Supervisors to support the school board budget as presented. He presented the board with a petition and in just over 48 hours, three people collected over 790 signatures of Lancaster County Citizens who want

the Board of Supervisors to approve the school budget as presented and understands there will be an increase in taxes.

Mr. Costello, Merry Point Road resident, said he and his wife Anna has volunteered and tutor many children in the county. The budget that the school board as presented was not justifiable enough to pass. He has 35 years of budget experience and a budget must be justified. This year the school wanted to add one Special Education Teacher, a ROTC Instructor, Accounts Payable Clerk, and Finance Teacher with no initial justification. At the school board public hearing there was one person in attendance and more citizens and teachers need to be present. The budget, as it stands now, has more justification, but there could be more justification on many line items. One of the line items says funding for three buses, you have to justify why those three buses are needed. The school board has given the Board of Supervisors a budget with a 20% increase, however; more justification is necessary. He said he hopes that everyone attends the county's budget public hearing and that everyone agrees to a tax increase, because if they want an increase in pay the taxes must be increased.

Dr. Latimore said this would probably be his last time to speak before the board. He thanked Mr. Larson and Mr. Pennell for sending him the memo as requested and he sent that memo to his school board, staff, and LEA. He and Mr. Guill met with the Board of Supervisors on a Friday during spring break. The appropriating board only makes the appropriations, but when the appropriations are not sufficient, it does tie the hands of the school board. The school board is charged with making the appropriations fit within the budget to fund what it feels are the needs for the school division. But again when the appropriating board make an appropriation that it feels is appropriate, and then it ties the hands of the school board when it goes to fund programs that are needed for the education of the children in Lancaster County. He said he knows that in his eleven years as Superintendent that when they come before the Board of Supervisors to say "it's for the children" its offensive to some, as educators they come before the board on

behalf of the children of this county. He had a number of concerns with Mr. Larson's memo dated April 2, 2007. The reduction of funding for dual enrollment courses, not fully understanding what dual enrollment courses are, you can not make a recommendation when you don't understand the need for the item being requested. SOL Remediation and "No Child Left Behind" since 2000, we know what has to happen. All of Lancaster County Schools were fully accredited last year, but each year the bench mark gets set higher and higher, therefore we can not continue to do thing the same way. Some of the other items requested in the budget were the three buses, go back and look at the Efficiency Review done by an external organization commissioned out of the Governor's Office though the Office of Budget and Finance that the school division volunteered to participate in. The report stated for the School Board to continue to work with the Board of Supervisors to maintain the level of replacing its current fleet of buses. Each Board of Supervisors member should have a copy of that review and Mr. Larson should have read that report prior to making recommendations, which consists of 222 pages and Lancaster County was compared to school divisions alike in size. Keeping in mind the free and reduced lunch rate is compared to the wealth rate for the county. Much concern has been made to the Office of Budget and Finance for the school division, one of the recommendations that came from the Efficiency Review that this board graciously endorsed was the position of Director of Budget and Finance. That was the only position which was added to the business department. The report said to downgrade the Business Manger Position, which was done and the school board already had what was called Financial Clerk. The position of Special Education Teacher, if you do not understand the concept of inclusion, you can not adequately make a decision or recommendation to do away with something. You can not just reassign a teacher to be a Special Education Teacher because licensure requirements must be met. With the push of "No Child Left Behind", we will be left behind as a school division and community if the schools are not properly funded. He believes that if recommendations are made, it should be done so with having the knowledge and understanding of the educational programs. He stated according to the



Efficiency Review there was never a mention of top heavy administration, rather changing the Assistant Superintendent title to Director of Academic Affairs and changing another title but not the position. Lancaster County was compared to other similar school divisions and they are not over staffed by any means. The issues of why Lancaster County pays more per student than other surrounding counties, we do have some of the better facilities on the Northern Neck and the Department of Education can only gauge that by what currently exists. We do not have a field house or restrooms on the fields but when you look at the overall conditions, we do not a new facility, however; our facilities are well kept for their age. He said he respects the positions that the Board of Supervisors hold as leaders for Lancaster County, he asked that the board read Mr. Larson's recommendations and consider if this decision is in the best interest for the children of Lancaster County and if so, the budget needs to be funded as requested. Because if not, then hands of the school board members are automatically tied as they have to determine what programs are to be funded. If the budget is approved as presented, it will than have to be presented to citizens of the county, because it will mean a tax increase.

Dr. Latimore stated he has enjoyed working with the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Geilich said thank you to Dr. Latimore as he has been a great spokesperson for Lancaster County Schools and his heart is in his work, which is evident. He said it has been a pleasure working with him throughout the years.

Anne Frere, Kilmarnock resident, has four children in the school system. Overall she is pleased with the school system, she said her priorities as a parent and taxpayer is education and public safety and do not always think that these are county's proprieties. She believes the budget should be passed as submitted and as a taxpayer she would not object to paying more taxes if that's what it would take to make sure our schools are properly funded.

Jessica Davis, 741 Maston Wharf Road and a teacher, said if justification is what was needed, this is what the Board of Supervisors should have requested. As a teacher she works many, many extra hours and trusts that the county officials make good decision for the whole county. She hopes that by May 3, 2007 prior to the board's decision, that they have justification for each line item of the budget. The school board can only work with what the Board of Supervisors allocated. This is Lancaster County, your county, these are the students that will be representing you and voting soon.

Tara Booth, White Stone resident, taxpayer, parent of a student at the primary school, and teacher at the middle school said that children are our future. She asked the board to support the budget as presented. She talked about the petition submitted earlier to the board by Mr. Hoffman and stated that the budget is not about the relationship between the School Board and Board of Supervisors, it is about the future of the children in Lancaster County. If the SOL Remediation Program is not funded because it was not justified, there would a number of students who would be less likely to pass the state mandated SOL Test without the remediation program. Lancaster High School currently offers dual enrollment and advanced studies which gives our students a better opportunity as they earn college credits and give our student an opportunity to compete with others when applying to the college of their choice. The children of Lancaster County deserved the best and understand many people move here because of the low tax rate, however, the older or retired citizens are not the only people who pay taxes in this county. The voices of the parents of our children in this county must be heard.

Bill Smith, 301 Weems Road resident and school board member said that he understands the tough job the board has when making a decision on the budget. He hopes that the Board of Supervisors passes the school budget as presented. It is the not board's responsibility to set salaries or put a number on materials and

supplies, but it is the responsibility of the Board of Supervisor to fund the schools budget. The citizens (mainly retirees) in his district encouraged him to run as a write-in and want our students to excel, have the best facilities, and the appropriate materials, supplies and equipment. The Board of Supervisors wants the best out of Lancaster County Schools, but there is a price that comes with excellence. The Board of Supervisors approved a school budget three or four years ago with a significant increase, which allowed Lancaster County School to become competitive. That increase allowed Lancaster County Schools to implement programs that other surrounding schools already had in place and gave teachers adequate raises, however; the following year the school received level funding. The boards need to work together. He said it takes a village to raise a child, which means it takes the taxpayers, Board of Supervisors, School Board, Teachers, tutors, volunteers, and parents.

Mr. Larson said he wanted to speak as the author of the much discussed memorandum and taxpayer and he would have made the recommendations in either case. He stated his background consists of 18 years in defending federal budgets up to \$1 Billion in each account, three different accounts in his last assignment. He said this is not a personal issue, which is what this has been turned into. When defending a budget to the next level it must include workload and performance indicators. In the school board budget those numbers would be the number of students and SOL Test scores. In defending the budget especially in defending increases, detailed justification as to how those dollars would support an increase work load or performance and be very specific. He said he has been looking at the school budget for the past seven years with no justification. He never said he knew anything about dual enrollment which is why the justification is needed. How will the funding be used and the results/performance that will be achieved. The same thing with SOL Remediation Program, he never said the program should not be funded, he simply stated that justification was needed. The bottom line is that the school board and administration have a responsibility to justify those large increases in the budget.

Donald McCann said he talked to Mr. Larson and stated if the memorandum would have been given to the school board they would have had time to justify each line item.

Linda Carter, 160 Lancaster Creek Drive resident, asked the board while considering the budget, the Board of Supervisors should bear in mind the education and safety of the our students. There are true safety issues at the primary school with both the front and back parking lots. She said teachers spend their own money on supplies and has devoted countless hours above and beyond their scheduled work hours. Please approve the budget as presented as the funding is needed.

A citizen asked how someone could obtain copies of letters and memorandums from the county offices.

Mr. Pennell stated that under the Freedom of Information Act and most documents can be obtained. However, there are so many document written and received, a person would need to be specific when requesting information.

Mr. Costello said he attends the Board of Supervisors meetings and work sessions and the meetings are properly advertised. It is up to the citizens of the county to get involved. It takes time out of their schedule, get a representative to go the meetings and obtain the information, it is extremely important to get involved and be informed.

Margaret Lynn Smith said in the future when we make recommendations for budget, when a large amount is requested as she did this year, which was \$168,000 for the Science Department, it will be justified. She explained there are chemicals in the classroom dating back to the '70, some of the chemical can not

be opened because the tops are rusted shut, paint is peeling off the walls, and it is so cold in her classroom it is called “the cave”.

Mr. Jenkins stated that Ms. Smith’s request was included in the budget as nothing more than justification as an SOL need. However, he got a list of supplies needed and that should be in any lab, where very little was available and he wondered how did the chemical stock get so low.

Mr. Pennell stated that the Board of Supervisors can not go to each teacher’s classroom. In, accordance with the Efficiency Review the first finding said that the budget presented by the school board should be presented in a fashion that could be understood by either the school board or the Board of Supervisors.

Patricia Means, Assistant Principal at Lancaster Middle School stated she remembers when she first moved to Lancaster County and attended a board meeting similar to the meeting being held this evening. If the Board of Supervisors does not continue to fund the school system they will pay later. There is nothing for the children to do in this county after school, therefore, administrators and teachers open the schools early and stay later in order, to keep the children off the street and give them something positive to do. Again, the board can pay now or pay later. The crime will run rampant.

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.

Chairman Geilich closed the public hearing.

2. Sexually Oriented Business Ordinance – Mr. Pennell said at the March 29, 2007 meeting of the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors, the members directed the advertisement of the draft ordinance to regulate sexually oriented businesses in Lancaster County.

Mr. Pennell stated the draft ordinance establishes a permitting process to allow sexually oriented businesses in the C-1, Commercial, General District if a number of conditions are met and maintained. The draft ordinance also prohibits the location of sexually oriented businesses within certain distances of churches, playground, schools, etc.

Chairman Geilich opened the public hearing.

Hearing no comments, Chairman Geilich closed the public hearing.

Mr. Jenkins stated that on page 7, Section D, Item 2, should be amended to read: A public or private park .....because it could be a park at a church, apartment, etc. that is not public property.

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to amend page 7, Section D, Item 2 of the Sexually Oriented Business Ordinance to read: *A public or private park* or recreational area which has been designated for park or recreational activities including but not limited to a park, playground, nature trails, swimming pool, reservoir, athletic field, basketball or tennis courts, pedestrian/bicycle paths, wilderness areas, or other similar public land within the County which is under the control, operation, or management of the County park and recreation authorities;.

#### ROLL CALL

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

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to adopt the amended Sexually Oriented Business Ordinance for Lancaster County.

ROLL CALL

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

**CONSENSUS DOCKET**

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

A. Minutes for March 29, 2007

Recommendation: Approve the minutes.

B. Safe Boating Week – May 19-25, 2007

Recommendation: Adopt the following resolution:

**SAFE BOATING WEEK - 2007**

**WHEREAS**, on average 700 people die each year in boating-related accidents in the United States; 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 the 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.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors supports the goals of the North American Safe Boating Week Campaign and United States Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 33 and proclaims **May 19-25, 2007**, as Safe Boating Week in Lancaster County, Virginia, and the start of the year-round effort to promote safe boating.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors urges all those who boat to "Boat Smart - Boat Safe - Wear It." and practice safe boating habits.

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

### **CONSIDERATION DOCKET**

The Board considered the following items on its Consideration Docket:

1. Approval of April 2007 Salaries and Invoice Listings

Motion was made by Mr. Beauchamp to approve the Salaries for April 2007 in the amount of \$182,944.57 and Invoice Listings for April 2007 in the amount of \$519,237.35.

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



2. Reserve at Lake Chase – Phase I Subdivision Application, Preliminary and Final Plat Approval – Mr. Larson presented Reserve at Lake Chase – Phase I Subdivision Application for Preliminary and Final Plat approval for a forty-three (43) lot subdivision as required by Article 3-7 of the Subdivision Ordinance.

Mr. Larson said the Board of Supervisors granted preliminary plat approval of a 98-lot subdivision on February 23, 2006 contingent on submission of acceptable covenants. On June 29, 2006, the Board of Supervisors granted an extension to February 28, 2007 for final plat consideration. Since that date was not met, and, more importantly, the subdivision has changed in scope and design, that preliminary plat approval is considered no longer valid. The subdivision plat before the Board of Supervisors, while represented as Phase I of a two-phase plan should be considered on its own. It was reviewed as such and meets all requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance, the Zoning Ordinance, and the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance with the exceptions noted in the recommendation. Proposed covenants and traffic impact analysis were provided for the board as was a master plan for Phase I and II development at the request of the applicant.

Mr. Larson said staff recommends approval conditional on approval of road plans and profiles by Virginia Department of Transportation and posting of a performance bond sufficient to ensure completion of interior subdivision roads.

Mr. Beauchamp made a motion to Approve the Reserve at Lake Chase – Phase I Subdivision Application for Preliminary and Final Plat approval for a forty-three lot subdivision as required by Article 3-7 of the Subdivision Ordinance with the condition of approval of road plans and profiles by Virginia Department of Transportation and posting of a performance bond sufficient to ensure completion of interior subdivision roads and fire protection plan.

VOTE:            Peter N. Geilich            Aye

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

3. Chinn’s Mill Wood, Section Two – Subdivision Application, Preliminary Plat – Mr. Larson presented the Subdivision Application for Chinn’s Mill Wood, Section Two, Preliminary Plat. Paragraph 3-7 of the Subdivision Ordinance requires that the preliminary plat for all subdivisions that are six lots or more be submitted to the Board of Supervisors for the approval or disapproval.

Mr. Larson said this consideration should be continued until a more definitive statement as to the safety of proposed access from VSH 3 and VSH 354 can be obtained from the Virginia Department of Transportation.

Mr. Larson said this proposed preliminary plat meets all the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance for preliminary plat consideration with exception of the requisite traffic impact analysis. Mr. Larson stated he has provided the board with a letter dated April 6, 2007 that is not considered a traffic impact analysis, nor is it definitive enough to give the Board of Supervisors sufficient justification to deny approval of the preliminary plat. It is also not considered sufficient to force the developer to create a new design or provide interior subdivision roads in lieu of individual access to these two major corridors.

Mr. Palin made a motion to table the Subdivision Application for Chinn’s Mill Wood, Section Two, Preliminary Plat until a more definitive statement as to the safety of proposed access from VSH 3 and VSH 354 can be obtained from the Virginia Department of Transportation.

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

**BOARD REPORTS**

None

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR REPORT**

Mr. Pennell said county representatives would be participating in the Greentown/Gaskin Road Clean-Up Day on Saturday, April 28, 2007 from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins to adjourn the meeting until Thursday, May 3, 2007 at 3:00 p.m. for a Joint Board Budget Work Session at the General District Courtroom.

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