

**VIRGINIA:**

A meeting of the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors was held in the courthouse of said county on Thursday, May 29, 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

Prior to the opening of the meeting, on behalf of the Board of Supervisors, Chairman Geilich presented the Lancaster Schools Girls Basketball Team, the Boys Wrestling Team and their coaches with individual resolutions commemorating the successful year for both teams during this school year. Comments were received from each of the teams' coaching staff further describing their respective team's successes.

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

**PUBLIC INPUT**

Mr. Geilich stated he understands there will be a number of citizens to comment about the new judicial center financing and the Board of Supervisors would like to hear those comments. Later in the meeting there will be an item on the consideration docket discussing the various financial aspects. If the comments relate to finance he suggested those citizens wait until the presentation. It is not a public hearing, however; he will allow citizens the opportunity to make comments and ask questions during that time.

**School Board Budget**

William Smith, Chairman of the School Board, he thanked the Board of Supervisors for their support during this fiscal year's budget and for honoring the schools' sport teams. He stated this year's budget was tough and he would like to say that the School Board and Board of Supervisors have worked together, compromised, and made decisions that benefited the whole. The School Board stated they would report to this board in late May on their financial position. They have come a long way and the regular operating budget may be in the red. Unfortunately, the cafeteria has been a huge problem and the school board did not sign a contract with Aramark for the upcoming school year. They are taking steps to put together their own staff to run the cafeteria next year. At this point the schools are looking at a possible \$70,000 - \$73,000 deficit in the cafeteria and the superintendent and administrative staff are working toward a break even figure. He noticed on the agenda that the school board has requested a supplemental appropriation for the school cafeteria, however; believes they are just giving information at this meeting. Secondly, he would like to speak about the restrooms at the high school because he believes there is a misunderstanding. The school board may have to spend more for the field restrooms at the high school and the school board did not want to request additional funding from the Board of Supervisors, they thought they would find the funding within their FY08-09 budget. He asked the Board of Supervisors if they would vote to transfer funds from the Capital Improvement Fund in the amount of \$34,000 to complete the project or can the funding be taken from next years budget?

Mr. Pennell stated Mr. Larson properly identified a mixture of Capital Improvement and next year's spending from a budget that has not been appropriated. He rightfully called attention to that situation and if the wording in the memorandum was found to be offensive he asked the school board to accept his regret. He stated he spoke with Ms. Sciabbarrasi and explained the school board was in a lose/lose situation because of the way it was proceeding without the Board of Supervisors' knowledge. If at the end of the next fiscal year, the school board's operating account is running short because it spent \$34,000 ahead of time that was not budgeted, the Board of Supervisors would question how that happened; likewise, if the school board was in the black at the end of next year's budget and Board of Supervisors would say the school board was \$34,000

over funded. The school board will have a bottom line budget next year and the school board has the ability to spend the money any way the school board chooses.

Mr. Smith stated that this issue is time sensitive as the school board has received a low bid from a reputable contractor. The school will be using some of its staff to perform a huge amount of the work. The school board needs recommendations and direction from the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Pennell stated the Board of Supervisors has received the report and he recommends waiting to the end of the next fiscal year to see what happens.

Mr. Jenkins said the Board of Supervisors has concerns with the schools' Director of Operations and Transportation going out for engineering studies which should have been a simple building; too much money was spent on designing the building. He certainly supports having the facilities at the high school football field. There should be some accountability. This was a simple job that did not require a \$46,000 engineer study on a \$200,000 structure.

Mr. Smith said there is a lot of wiring underground which may eventually expand to other buildings and that engineering study will be helpful in the future. It has been his goal to ensure a restroom facility is built at the high school and hopes that will happen before the first football game for upcoming season.

Mr. Pennell stated the school board can sign a contract and Ms. Sciabbarrasi said she can take the money out of the operating account for next year, because the bills will not be due until after July 1, 2008. The school board will use the remaining funds available from the \$200,000 capital appropriation and the rest will come out of the operating account.

By consensus of the Board of Supervisors, the school board can sign a contract for the high school restrooms.

## New Judicial Center

Phillip Oestreich stated he received a call from the Lancaster County Taxpayers Association to see if he wanted to be involved. He said he still has concerns about the courthouse and would like to see this issue placed on the ballot in November for voters/ taxpayers to decide. He asked the Board of Supervisors to think before the county builds a new courthouse. He is in total agreement to have security for the judges, because this courthouse is not secure for the judges, citizens, or prisoners.

Lindsay Trittipoe stated this was his third time voicing his concerns at a Board of Supervisors meeting about the proposed courthouse. He is not stating the county should ignore Judge Taliaferro's concerns because we have both a moral and statutory obligation to address his concerns otherwise he will force the county to do so. The association came up with a constructive plan rather than fighting with the board. The concern is how the Board of Supervisors went about this process. He suggested that because this was a capital project it must survive a proper vetting process and the board apparently did some vetting but the people of the county did not see any evidence of that. He asked the board to table the IDA financing and put together a citizens committee comprised of qualified individuals with financial experience to see what option the people prefer. The process should also involve defining the need, and once the need is defined, perform a cost-benefit analysis. He said that because Kilmarnock is the center of the county there may be a need to relocate the courthouse and the benefit is that there is water and sewer availability. After this citizen committee looks at all the options, the public can be better informed and understand. He asked the Board of Supervisors to consider this approach.

George Bott asked about the advertised FY08-09 budget which talks about a six cents per \$100 of assessed value increase in the real estate levy. He attended a number of budget meeting and still has problems understanding what taxpayers are paying for with that additional \$1.8 million.

Mr. Geilich stated \$1.2 million goes to the school board of which \$800,000 is the decrease in the State funding. The Sheriff requested two addition deputies for support at \$80,000 each, a 2% increase for employee salaries, a 5% reduction in the assistance from the State to constitutional officers which was a shortfall of \$102,000, request made for two additional full-time EMTs, and the reserve funds are at \$300,000 that need be replenished and increased to \$860,000.

Mr. Bott asked if Lancaster County has an Industrial Development Authority (IDA) and if so who the members are.

Mr. Pennell stated the county does have an IDA a list can be found on the internet or for Mr. Bott to call the administration office for that information.

Dana Gilmore said he was reviewing the Courthouse Presentation prepared by Davenport and Company with three cases and talked about up front tax requirements. So the six cent increase does not in any way accommodate any of the three cases.

Mr. Geilich stated there no impact in the upcoming year's budget in regard to a levy for the new judicial center.

Joseph Powers of Kilmarnock said he has concerns with the proposed Lancaster Courthouse Project after talking to the Taxpayers Association. The county is about to put taxpayers \$7,000,000 in debt without their approval. The Board of Supervisors has concerns with \$44,000 the school board spent but has not real concerns about spending \$7,000,000. He considers himself to be a fiscal conservative along with so many others as everything is going up at an alarming rate. Please take a closer look at this issue.

Mr. Geilich explained whether or not the county builds a new judicial center now or later, it will be built.

Mr. Power stated he is a retired attorney from Maryland and not very familiar with this part of the law but see a lot potential legal issues.

Mr. Pennell provided Mr. Power with the Code of Virginia § 2.2-16.43 which gives judges the authority to order the construction of new courthouses.

Mr. Jenkins stated the county is simply trying to stay ahead of the game and keep the cost of the judicial center down for taxpayers.

### **PRESENTATIONS**

1. Lancaster High School 2008 Girls Basketball Team – Mr. Pennell stated the Lancaster High School Girls Basketball Team had an extremely successful year during 2007-2008. The young women were runners-up in the State Tournament.

Mr. Pennell asked the board to adopt the Resolution of commendation. The presentations to the team members and their coaches were made earlier.

Mr. Jenkins made the motion to adopt the Resolution of commendation for the Lancaster High School 2008 Girls Basketball Team for an extremely successful year.

### **LANCASTER HIGH SCHOOL 2008 GIRLS BASKETBALL TEAM**

**WHEREAS**, the Lancaster County High School Girls Basketball Team was the regular season and tournament champion in the Northern Neck District; and

**WHEREAS**, the Lancaster County High School Girls Basketball Team was celebrated as the Region A Championship Girls Basketball Team; and

**WHEREAS**, the Lancaster County High School Girls Basketball Team was the runner-up in the 2008 Virginia Group A, Division 2 championship final game; and

**WHEREAS**, this was the first state championship game in which the Lancaster County High School Girls Basketball Team ever played.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors commends the following members of the 2008 Lancaster County High School Girls Basketball Team; Taylor Nelson, Andrea White, Takeia Jones, Kimberly Crockett, KaTisha Crippen, Tyesha Harvey, Miesha Wiggins, Amber Smith, Jasmine Moody, Chiffon Beane, Darnisha Jones and Ashley Ransome for their hard work and successful year; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors commends Lancaster County High School Girls Basketball Team Coaches; Joanne Webb-Fary, Shanna McComb and India Henderson for their commitment to and leadership of the basketball team.

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

2. Lancaster High School 2008 Wrestling Team – Mr. Pennell stated the Lancaster High School Wrestling Team had an extremely successful year during 2007-2008. Several of its members received state recognition for their successes.

Mr. Pennell asked the board to adopt the Resolution of commendation. The presentations to the team members and their coaches were made earlier.

Dr. Russell made the motion to adopt the Resolution of commendation for the Lancaster High School 2008 Wrestling Team for an extremely successful year.

**LANCASTER HIGH SCHOOL  
2008 WRESTLING TEAM**

**WHEREAS**, the Lancaster County High School Wrestling Team celebrated its most successful year in 2008; and

**WHEREAS**, the 2008 Lancaster County High School Wrestling Team finished fourth in the Virginia Group A Wrestling Tournament; and

**WHEREAS**, six members of the 2008 Lancaster County High School Wrestling Team qualified to wrestle in the state tournament; and

**WHEREAS**, four of the six qualifiers placed in the final tournament include one member who won the state gold medal; and

**WHEREAS**, the entire 2008 Lancaster County High School Wrestling Team brought honor to themselves, their school and their community.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors commends the following members of the 2008 Lancaster County High School Wrestling Team; Robert Wineland, Sam Frere, Robert Lally, Renan Beltran, Ibraheem Bullock, Charles Miller, Zach Saunders, Weston Johnson, Michael Stickler, Steven Self and Brian Jones; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors commends Lancaster County High School Wrestling Team Coaches; Craig Oren, Matson Terry, Chris Lee and Brian Conboy for their commitment to and leadership of the wrestling team.



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

3. Zina F. Middleton, Certified Municipal Clerk Designation – Mr. Pennell said Zina F. Middleton, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk has completed the requirements prescribed by the International Institute of Municipal Clerks. She has received her Certified Municipal Clerk designation through hard work and perseverance. She is also the first clerk for Lancaster County to receive this designation.

Mr. Geilich made a presentation to Mrs. Middleton.

**VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

VDOT Six-Year Plan

Mr. Trapani said this would be both a work session and public hearing for the Six-Year Plan. The Code of Virginia requires that the Board of Supervisors in conjunction with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) formula a Six Year Secondary Improvement Plan and priority list for the Secondary Improvement Budget - Projected Fiscal Year Allocation for 2008-09 through 2013-14 and for the FY08-09 Budget.

The first priority is VSH 604/Merry Point Road, at the VSH 611 intersection, to improve alignment. Second priority is Rte 614/Devils Bottom Road that runs past the primary school to a quarter of a mile east of Rte 669 to improve the alignment and replace the bridge. Third priority VSH 1026/School Street and intersection of VSH 3 in the Town of Kilmarnock to install a right turn lane from VSH 3. Unpaved priority #1 is Route 789/Hadlea Drive to reconstruction and surface treat a non-hard surface road.

Unpaved priority #2 is Route 777/Riverview Road for surface treatment and to construct a turnaround.

Mr. Trapani said there is \$30,000 budgeted for incidental items to include \$12,000 for rural additions. The Six Year Plan fund is for improvements and new constructions and does not include maintenance work.

Chairman Geilich opened the public hearing.

Mr. Costello asked if he heard correctly about VSH 614/Devils Bottom Road is proposed to be bridge replace or repair at a cost of \$500,000.

Mr. Trapani stated 500 feet.

Mr. Costello provided the Board of Supervisors with photographs taken of Devils Bottom Road Bridge which is a very rural scenic area. He stated the current bridge is a 20' x 20' structure over Browns Creek. This is a very sensitive area and asked if there would be an environmental impact study. To tear up 500' is pretty obtrusive and the cost will be too high to replace the bridge. VDOT could possibly do repairs with minimum impact on this very fragile area and still accomplish the safety and needs of the area.

Don Schelling said he lives in District 2 and is Coordinator for The Devils Bottom Preservation Society and the Devils Bottom Preservation Society is comprised of 750 property owners that would like see Devils Bottom Road and the surrounding area remain as it is with as little improvement as possible. Safety has been used for years as a reason to replace the bridge and straighten the curves on Devils Bottom Road. By personal measurement the bridge is a foot and one half wider then the two way access road used by parents to deliver and pick up the children at the primary school. If the road is safe enough for parents and children why is not the bridge on Devil Bottom Road safe enough for everyone? It is a shame to destroy the area and there are many better uses for the

monies budgeted for this project. After talking with Del. Pollard he believes that funds earmarked for secondary roads can now be used for primary road improvement.

Mr. Geilich said last year the Board of Supervisors discussed this issue and decided they wanted the area to be safe but did not want to do anything major.

Mr. Palin stated there were concerns with the sharp curve and the bridge. He still has concern about the width and safety of the area. After talking to bus drivers he has been told they sometimes have to stop and wait for other vehicles to cross the bridge. The buses can not travel the access way mentioned earlier because of the width of the roadway, which is the very reason they use the front area to drop off students.

Mr. Schelling said another enabling factor discussed with Del Pollard was the waiver of standard by VDOT which has recently been incorporated, which gives greater latitude in the degree of improvement initiated. The Board of Supervisors has the power to execute the will of the people and the obligation to spend our tax dollars efficiently and in the name of 750 concerned citizen/taxpayers please consider the information given.

Mr. Trapani stated it is for the replacement of the bridge, which is to reduce the scope of the project. The bridge will need to be replaced to meet today's standards. The bridge is structurally sound, but deficient to today's standards.

Dr. Russell asked what the weigh limit was.

Mr. Trapani stated it is an un-posted weight but is 80,000 lbs limit. He said the waiver of standards, where there is a process for design exceptions and this would be a good project to ask for design exceptions. Federal dollars are being used for this bridge project so the State law will not help with design requirements with this project because it is Federal funding.

Mr. Jenkins asked about the bridge between Lively and Lancaster Courthouse.

Mr. Trapani stated that is on this year's schedule.

Mr. Geilich asked why the rush to rebuild the bridge.

Mr. Jenkins said when the VSH 600 bridge was washed out and it took three years to rebuild. This bridge could be prone to flooding or damage in the future. The Board of Supervisors at that time was concerned and standards changed and using Federal funds for the bridge construction means following federal guidelines.

Mr. Costello said even if it is federal funds it's still taxpayers dollars. He is in total favor of the turn lane on School Street which needs to be done as soon as possible.

Mr. Palin stated he is inclined to keep the replacement of the bridge in the plan for safety purposes. If the bridge project is removed from the plan and we find that the bridge needs to go back on the plan, how long would it take to get acquire funding? He agreed that the bridge replacement should remain on the plan.

Ron Benson said he lives on Merry Point Road and with respect to the Devils Bottom Road bridge replacement he recalls reading about the Taylor's Creek Project and the money spent and issues that surrounded that whole project. He wanted to remind the Board of Supervisors of the Taylor's Creek Project and to carefully review the cost. He asked about the cost to straighten the sharp curve on VSH 604.

Mr. Trapani stated cost estimate to straighten that curve on VSH 604 is \$2 million with right-of-way, utilities, and total project.

Chairman Geilich closed the public hearing.

Mr. Palin said the board has considered reduction of the scope of work on the Devils Bottom Road Project. It is a beautiful and scenic area but the bridge needs to be replaced.

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to table the Six Year Plan until the next regular Board of Supervisors meeting which will be held June 26, 2008.

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

County-wide Maintenance

Mr. Trapani stated primary mowing has been completed and VDOT will start on secondary mowing.

Mr. Trapani said highway department is currently performing county-wide patching and paving on Harris Road toward VSH 3.

VSH 610/Oak Hill Road Speed Study Request

Mr. Trapani stated a preliminary study for VSH 610/Oak Hill Road has been done and proper signage will be erected. They will continue to review the speed study request.

Mr. Pennell said a concerned citizen asked about the “No Outlet” sign as you proceeding down VSH 610/Oak Hill Road toward Yankee Point Marina which is before the Yankee Point Marina turn and believe the sign need to be relocated.

Mr. Trapani stated that sign will be relocation as part of the study.

Mr. Jenkins asked Mr. Trapani to have the engineer lower the speed limit to 25 mph on VSH 610/Oak Hill Road.

## Black Stump Road

Mr. Beauchamp asked about the speed limit study on Black Stump Road. What is the status on the signage?

Mr. Trapani said there are 28 signs that will be erected.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. Marva E. Carter – Application for Special Exception (Individual Manufactured Home) – Mr. Gill presented an application for Special Exception by Marva E. Carter to place an individual manufactured home on a 1.0 acre parcel described as Tax Map #17-15A. This property is located on VSH 605 (Pinckardsville Road) near its intersection with VSH 615 (Carlson Road) and is in Voting District 2.

Mr. Gill said Ms. Carter’s individual manufactured home meets all of the requirements of Article 5-1-3 for “by right” placement EXCEPT “a roof pitch of 3.25:12 or greater” and therefore requires a special exception. The roof pitch, as stated by the applicant and verified with Clayton Homes, is only 3:12. Previous approvals by the Board have been based on legitimate concerns raised by adjacent property owners.

Mr. Gill stated this issue has been advertised and adjoining property owners notified as required by law. To date, there has been no input from adjoining property owners or other interested members of the public.

Mr. Gill said further investigation by staff with Clayton Homes and Oakwood Homes, the two largest manufacturers of individual manufactured homes sold in our area, revealed that the majority of homes they sell have roof pitches of 3:12 or less. Therefore, most would require special exception permits. This is contrary to the information those companies provided when the roof pitch

requirement was added to the zoning ordinance. As a result, he intends to ask the Planning Commission to review the roof pitch requirement of our ordinance for possible changes.

Chairman Geilich opened the public hearing.

Hearing no comments, Chairman Geilich closed the public hearing.

Mr. Palin asked Mr. Gill if the Planning Commission should revisit this ordinance.

Mr. Gill stated he will forward this on the Planning Commission.

Mr. Jenkins stated as the only sitting board member that was a part of the original discussion that established the ordinance it was done on purpose to give it by right. Because even though that seems like only a small difference in the pitch it was significant enough to make double wide appear as if it was a regular home. Both Clayton and Oakwood Homes cut costs by lowering the pitch making the individual manufacturing home look tacky and the Board of Supervisors did not want that to happen without a special exception.

Mr. Palin made a motion to Approve the Application for Special Exception for Individual Manufactured Home made by Marva E. Carter for property is located on VSH 605 (Pinckardsville Road) near its intersection with VSH 615 (Carlson Road) described as Tax Map #17-15A.

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

By consensus of the Board of Supervisors, do not forward this matter to the Planning Commission.

2. Earth Resource/Two Jonahs, LLC – Application for Special Exception (Disposal of Dredge Spoil) – Mr. Gill presented an Application for Special Exception by Earth Resources, Inc./Two Jonahs, LLC (property owners) to dispose of dredged spoil on a portion of parcels containing 89.962 acres described as Tax Maps #16-58 and 17-46. This property is located off VSH 3 at 11185 Mary Ball Road and is in Voting District 2.

Mr. Gill said Article 4-1-48 of the zoning ordinance allows disposal of dredge spoil with a special exception. The applicants wish to stockpile the dredge spoil and use it as reclamation material in the mined out areas of their sand pit. The stockpile and use areas are located in the rear of the property, behind the building and tree line and would not be visible from Route 3. Staff views this location and use of dredge spoil favorably and recommends approval.

Mr. Gill stated this issue has been advertised and adjoining property owners notified as required by law. To date, there has been no input from adjoining property owners or other interested members of the public.

Chairman Geilich opened the public hearing.

Hearing no comments, Chairman Geilich closed the public hearing.

Mr. Palin made a motion to Approve the Application for Special Exception by Earth Resources, Inc./Two Jonahs, LLC (property owners) to dispose of dredged spoil on a portion of parcels containing 89.962 acres described as Tax Maps #16-58 and 17-46. This property is located off VSH 3 at 11185 Mary Ball Road.



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

3. Application for Change of Zoning District Classification – Llewellyn D. Barnes (Conditional Rezoning) – Mr. Gill presented an Application for Change of Zoning District Classification from R-1, Residential, General to Conditional C-1, Commercial by Llewellyn D. Barnes for 0.956 acres described as Tax Map #15-92. This property (the old post office building) is located on VSH 3 (Mary Ball Road) in the Lancaster Courthouse Village Area and is in Voting District 2.

Mr. Gill said this property has a history of commercial use, but was not zoned as such when the zoning ordinance took effect in 1975. Since then, the building has housed a variety of private and government offices and retail sales shops. The structure has six available rooms, but currently has only two retail shops operating under a Special Exception granted for the space occupied by the previous Lancaster Pawn Shop. Different uses would require additional Special Exception consideration that could become costly at \$100 per application, as well as time consuming, as each would require its own public hearing at the Board of Supervisors level. In addition, the applicant has noted reluctance on the part of prospective renters to locate their businesses in a building zoned Residential General, R-1. As a result, the applicant has concluded that a one-time rezoning to C-1, Commercial would be the best approach to alleviating his problems. To help his request, he has submitted a signed and notarized “Conditional Rezoning Proffer” outlining the requested permitted uses he seeks as a condition of approval of this rezoning.

Mr. Gill stated this request is considered reasonable and appropriate given the property’s history of commercial use and its location in the Lancaster

Courthouse village area. There are also C-1 properties with a convenience store, gas station and restaurant adjacent to this location.

Mr. Gill said adjoining property owners have been notified and advertising conducted as required by law. To date, there have been two inquiries from the public, both in support of this rezoning.

Chairman Geilich opened the public hearing.

Hearing no comments, Chairman Geilich closed the public hearing.

Mr. Palin made a motion to Approve the Application for Change of Zoning District Classification from R-1, Residential, General to Conditional C-1, Commercial by Llewellyn D. Barnes for 0.956 acres described as Tax Map #15-92. The property is located on VSH 3 (Mary Ball Road) in the Lancaster Courthouse Village Area.

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

4. Heirs of Hubbard BHB Jr., LLC – Application for Special Exception (Verizon Wireless Telecommunication Tower) – Mr. Gill presented an Application for Special Exception by Verizon Wireless/Heirs of Hubbard BHB, Jr., LLC to site a 300 feet wireless telecommunications tower and associated fenced equipment compound on a portion of a 184.0 acre parcel described as Tax Map #34-373. This property is located off VSH 646 at 348 Ocran Road and is in Voting District 4.

Mr. Gill stated this was the second application for a wireless telecommunications tower to be processed under Article 25 “Siting of Wireless Telecommunications Facilities” (enacted 1/03). The prior request served as a guide and aided the staff review of this application. In addition, this application has been forwarded to Resource International for an independent, third party peer review. Their recommendation is expected prior to the May 29 meeting.

Mr. Gill said staff views this request favorably. The tower will enhance wireless communication services at the lower end of the County and its location on a large, well-buffered forest and farm parcel is less intrusive to the area. Also, set-back distances from adjoining parcels exceed the height of the tower, which would enable the structure to be contained on the property in the unlikely event of a collapse. The applicant has complied with the pre-construction requirements of Article 25 and has pledged in writing to adhere to the applicable post-construction requirements of the ordinance. A performance bond as required in Article 25-21 will be obtained prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Gill provided the board with a copy of the independent, third party peer review from Resource International. It recommends approval with five conditions. The first, second and fourth conditions (geotechnical study, grounding and bonding certification and FAA lighting certification) would be included with the specific construction drawings to be submitted after Special Exception approval, but prior to the issuance of a building permit. The time and expense involved with these conditions would be wasted if the Special Exception request were not granted, therefore it is logical and reasonable to make them conditions of approval. The third condition (underground utilities certification) will be clarified in a letter. The fifth and final condition is merely a re-statement that the site plan conforms to all applicable local, state and federal ordinances, regulations and laws, which has already been stated in the narrative of the application.

Mr. Gill stated this issue has been advertised and adjoining property owners notified as required by law. To date, there has been input from adjoining property owners or other interested members of the public all in favor of this request.

Chairman Geilich opened the public hearing.

Stephen Romine with LeClair Ryan on behalf of Verizon Wireless introduced Merrill Daiger and Joyce Sawyer who gave a brief overview of the project. The tower will be designed for a standard Verizon (12) antenna array along with design for five additional carriers. This tower will provide better coverage for this area and asked the Board of Supervisors to approve the Special Exception.

Charles Brockerbank, President of the White Stone Volunteer Fire Department stated some time ago they were in talks with Verizon about placing a tower on their property on Windmill Point Road. Later they found out they were not zoned properly and did not have the support from the community. The fire department is still in support of the tower that better serves White Stone, Irvington, and Windmill Point area. He explained calls made to 911 from White Stone goes to Middlesex County and in the case of an emergency every second counts. Having better communication with the sheriff and other emergency service agencies is the key factor. He asked the Board of Supervisors to approve the placement of this cell tower.

Howard Kyzer, Ocran Road resident stated he is familiar with the location of the tower and supports this special exception.

Phillip Oestreich stated he is in support of this special exception.

Paul Rockefeller said he is also in favor of this special exception.

Danny Greenbaum said he is in total support of this special exception and asked about beautification of the tower. He asked what other carrier may be placed on the tower.

Mr. Romine stated the beautification of the tower will not work in this area and the other tentative carriers will be AT&T, Sprint/Nextel, Alltel, and internet service.

Chairman Geilich closed the public hearing.

Mr. Beauchamp said he always have concerns about law enforcement and emergency services. Will there be an antenna on the tower to benefit Lancaster County and our citizens?

Mr. Pennell stated as part of the ordinance they have to provide that service. Mr. Romine agreed that county emergency services will be permitted on the tower.

Dr. Russell said after looking at the map, according to the existing coverage he should receive good to marginal coverage.

Mr. Romine stated at this time of year with leaves on the trees he could get spotty coverage.

Dr. Russell made a motion to approve the Application for Special Exception by Verizon Wireless/Heirs of Hubbard BHB, Jr., LLC to site a 300 feet wireless telecommunications tower and associated fenced equipment compound on a portion of a 184.0 acre parcel described as Tax Map #34-373. This property is located off VSH 646 at 348 Ocran Road

VOTE: Peter N. Geilich Aye

Jack S. Russell	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 April 24, 2008, May 1, 2008 and May 9, 2008

Recommendation: Approve minutes with amendments

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	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 May 2008 Salaries and Invoice Listings

Motion was made by Mr. Geilich to approve the Salaries for May 2008 in the amount of \$206,772.85 and Invoice Listings for May 2008 in the amount of \$504,559.47.

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

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

2. New Ambulance Billing Fees and Services – Mr. Hudson, Chief of Emergency Services reported the Department of Emergency Services has developed a new billing fee schedule for ambulance services rendered. The new billing fee schedule is based on the current Medicare reimbursement standards.

Mr. Hudson asked the Board of Supervisors to approve the proposed fee schedule and authorize the County Administrator to proceed with making appropriate arrangements with Diversified Ambulance Billing (DAB) to make these changes.

Mr. Beauchamp made a motion to approve the resolution for the proposed fee schedule and authorize the County Administrator to proceed with making appropriate arrangements with Diversified Ambulance Billing (DAB).

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

3. Groundwater Management Area – Mr. Pennell said for some time, county staff has been participating in discussions and presentations regarding the establishment of a Groundwater Management Area in the Northern Neck of Virginia. Much of Virginia is already within a Groundwater Management Area managed by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

Mr. Pennell said the recently adopted Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan indicates the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors' desire to have the

Eastern Virginia Groundwater Management Area extended through the Middle Peninsula and the Northern Neck. He also provided the board with additional supporting documentation to support the groundwater management area designation.

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to adopt the Resolution requesting the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality to establish a Groundwater Management Area in the Northern Neck of Virginia.

### **GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA**

**WHEREAS**, the Virginia Administrative Code (9VAC25-610-20) states “The Groundwater Management Act of 1992 recognizes and declares that the right to reasonable control of all ground water resources within the Commonwealth belongs to the public and that in order to conserve, protect and beneficially utilize the ground water resource and to ensure the public welfare, safety and health, provisions for management and control of ground water resources are essential.” and

**WHEREAS**, water levels in the only two deep monitoring wells in the Northern Neck at Kilmarnock and Montross have declined in excess of one foot per year since 1967 when record-keeping began, Condition #1 for establishment of a Groundwater Management Area has been met (1. Ground water levels in the area are declining or are expected to decline excessively), and

**WHEREAS**, the United States Geological Survey has stated that “... withdrawals represent an essentially permanent removal of water from the regional flow system.” - 6. Assure that ground water withdrawals do not, on the average, exceed recharge is being violated, and



**WHEREAS**, the absence or minimal nature of recharge as documented by the United States Geological Survey meets Condition #3 for establishment of a Groundwater Management Area - 3. The available ground water supply has been or may be overdrawn because withdrawal of water from an aquifer without equivalent recharge must lead to aquifer depletion, ultimately overdrawing the available water, and

**WHEREAS**, the absence or minimal nature of recharge as documented by the United States Geological Survey meets Condition #3 for establishment of a Groundwater Management Area - 3. The available ground water supply has been or may be overdrawn because withdrawal of water from an aquifer without equivalent recharge must lead to aquifer depletion, ultimately overdrawing the available water, and

**WHEREAS**, the continued withdrawal of potable groundwater will ultimately lead to saline intrusion from deeper units, polluting the water so that it is no longer potable, Condition #4 for establishment of a Groundwater Management Area has been met - 4. The ground water in the area has been or may become polluted, and

**WHEREAS**, no significant hydrologic boundaries exist in the aquifers beneath the Coastal Plain at the northernmost extent of the existing Groundwater Management Area, and

**WHEREAS**, the 2007 Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan states “Lancaster County will actively support efforts to have the Eastern Virginia Groundwater Management Area extended through the Middle Peninsula and the Northern Neck. . . .” (p. 3:24), and

**WHEREAS**, “The board . . . . upon receipt of a petition by any county, city or town within the area in question, may initiate a ground water management

area proceeding, whenever in its judgment there is reason to believe that any one of ... four .... conditions exist:”, and

**WHEREAS**, there is reason to believe that at least three of four Conditions listed in 9VAC25-610-70 exist, it is therefore required “.... that regulatory efforts be initiated,” and that “... the board shall declare the area in question a ground water management area, by regulation.”

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Board of Supervisors of Lancaster County formally requests the existing Coastal Plain Groundwater Management Area be extended northward to the Virginia-Maryland line so as to incorporate the entire Virginia coastal plain and include all ten counties that constitute the Middle Peninsula and Northern Neck. As per 9VAC25-610-80 the western boundary of the extension is defined to include most of Caroline County and all of King George County, the northern boundary to be the State Line, the eastern boundary to be the western shoreline of Chesapeake Bay and the southern boundary to be the northern boundary of the existing Groundwater Management Area. Further, we define all aquifers, whether or not they contain potable water, between the land surface and the “basement” to be subject to management.

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

4. Building/Land Use Proposed Fee Increases – Mr. Gill presented a proposed Permit/Publication Fee Schedule for the Department of Building and Land Use.

Mr. Gill said the Building and Land Use staff compiled and compared a list of permit and publication fees charged by Lancaster, Richmond, Westmoreland, and Northumberland Counties. After review, staff has proposed changes to reflect current costs and time associated with the various permits and publications. The proposed changes make Lancaster County’s permit and publication fees comparable to its neighbors.

Mr. Geilich made a motion to approve the resolution for the Building/Land Use Proposed Fee Increases.

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

5. The Tides/Lancaster County Wastewater Treatment Agreement for Greentown/Gaskins Road CDBG Grant – Mr. Pennell said over the past several months, Lancaster County, its county attorney, The Tides, its attorney and representatives from the State Corporation Commission have been working to establish an agreement by which work on the Community Development Block Grant for Greentown/Gaskins Road can proceed. Unfortunately an agreement has not been established to date and he request that this issue be removed for the docket.

The board agreed, by consensus, to remove this item from the docket.

6. Request for Supplemental Appropriation – School Cafeteria – Mr. Pennell stated Ms. Sciabbarrasi, Superintendent of Schools asked for a supplemental appropriation of \$70,000 in the event the school cafeteria fund is overspent at fiscal year end.

Mr. Pennell said to her credit, Ms. Sciabbarrasi is keeping the Board of Supervisors informed of possible shortages in the cafeteria revenues or overages in spending for a program that has been determined to be ineffective and plagued with management difficulties not of her making.

Mr. Pennell stated in lieu of a supplemental appropriation he asked the Board of Supervisors to accept the report with a commitment that it will review the final results of the cafeteria budget final revenue and expenditures. In the event the Board of Supervisors is satisfied that the school administration has performed all reasonable actions to mitigate the difficulties, commit that it will make a supplemental appropriation at a later date to “zero balance” the school cafeteria fund.

Mr. Geilich said this matter has been taken under advisement and will revisit the matter at the June 2008 regular Board of Supervisors meeting.

7. Judicial Center Financing – Ted Cole, Davenport & Company introduced Dan Siegel, Sands Anderson and stated after a number of meetings with the board, the purpose of this meeting is to present the county Board of Supervisors with a complete Plan of Finance for the new judicial center. Hoping that after this presentation the Board of Supervisors will approve the financing and move forward. After receiving bids from financial institutes the Bank of Lancaster and Chesapeake Bank jointly came back with the lowest bids.

Mr. Cole said there are three cases to review and he will summarize each case. He again stated that, jointly, the Bank of Lancaster and Chesapeake Bank submitted a package with the most aggressive interest rate and most favorable terms and conditions as it relates to funding on the loan, the ability to pre-pay the loan, or restructure the loan in future without any penalty. As the cases are being reviewed he will describe debt services associated with the project according to their proposal. Case one is level debt service which is what you would typically

see in a mortgage were you to combine principal and interest on a fiscal year basis. They have looked at ten, fifteen, and twenty year paybacks and have shown what the number of pennies on the tax rate would be required in order to raise the revenue with which to pay back the debt. The idea is the shorter the payback period the higher the annual payment so more resources would be needed to repay that loan. He stated 1.8 pennies on the tax rate for the ten year payback, 0.86 pennies on the tax rate for the fifteen year payback, or .0.50 pennies on the tax rate for twenty year payback which are one time adjustments that would be required in order to raise the tax revenue to repay the debt. In all the cases the county will be funding a \$7 million loan. The total payment on the \$7 million loan for ten years will be \$1.6 million interest, fifteen years there would be \$2.5 million interest, and twenty years \$3 million interest. By keeping the loan on the shorter end of the amortization schedule you minimize the out of pocket expense on the interest component of the loan. The taxes rate could be increased over FY09-10-11.

In case two, they looked at the same approach of ten, fifteen, twenty year loan the difference is you use some borrowed money to help pay for the debt service in the first year which is known as capitalizing the interest. This is not a recommended approach.

In case three the debt has been structured around the declining debt that is already in place which are existing debt obligation that are going to paid off in the next few years. To attempt to layer that new debt around the declining debt service numbers.

Mr. Cole said they put together scenarios to try to take advantage of a very low interest rates, taking advantage of the ability to issue on a bank qualified basis. The rates are locked in with fixed interest rates and the ability to prepay without penalty through the life of the debt.

Dan Siegel with Sands Anderson Marks and Miller stated the Board of Supervisors will need to approve the Resolution which states there will be a \$7 million loan with a 4% fixed interest rate for ten years with the Bank of Lancaster and Chesapeake Bank. With the courthouse there a ground lease to the Industrial Development Authority and the Industrial Development Authority lease to the county. Surrounding counties have done the same thing. He also gave a brief overview of the Resolution.

Mr. Jenkins asked about a conflict of interest as members of the IDA are employed by both financial institutes.

Mr. Siegel stated the conflict of interest issue must be determined individually by virtue of the IDA director's affiliation with the lending institutions. This issue will be addressed at the IDA meeting on this subject.

Lindsay Trittipoe asked if there were seven members of the IDA board and suggested three had a conflict of interest which are Weston Conley, Director of Bank of Lancaster, Jeff Szyperski, CEO of Chesapeake Bank, and Edward Pittman. He believes that the Virginia Bureau of Financial Institutions would have an issue and controlling officers and directors would have to abstain leaving four members to vote affirmative. He said at the May 9, 2008 meeting Davenport and Company talked about the great deal this would be at an interest rates of 4%. He said the 1.8 cent rate if the board goes with the ten year amortization it should not be inferred that will be the total cost of this new judicial center project. He remembered a statement that each penny was worth \$300,000 in Lancaster in the budget. What will be the true cost to operate the new judicial center? The renovation of the old courthouse has not been looked at. He asked if Sands Anderson has looked into historical tax credits.

Mr. Geilich stated the county has not explored any options to rehab the old courthouse at this point.

Mr. Jenkins asked Mr. Trittippoe if he meant simply to rehab the old courthouse and forgo building a new judicial center.

Mr. Trittippoe said the Board of Supervisors might choose to go that route rather than build a new judicial center. He is not sure of the statutory requirement to build a new courthouse.

Mr. Jenkins stated safety was the main concern.

Mr. Pennell said prisoners being mixed with the general public makes this a safety concern. After the study was done by Wiley and Wilson it was determined that renovating this courthouse would not be feasible.

Mr. Trittippoe stated the Board of Supervisors has already determined that a new judicial center is needed and apparently has evidence that the existing courthouse can not be renovated. He said \$7 million is a lot of money and he thinks that if the existing courthouse can be renovated with the historical tax credit its cost could be significantly lower.

George Bott said 4% is a good interest rate which maybe good for a lease purchase bond which is one of nine types of revenue, however; a Virginia Municipal Bond with an AAA rate is currently going for 3.6% so 4% is not a really good deal.

Mr. Geilich explained the county is not AAA rated.

Mr. Bott said a General Obligation Bond instead a of lease purchase which has collateral as the motive of obtaining funding. Why are general obligation bonds or revenue bond not a consideration.

Mr. Pennell explained this was a moral obligation bond not a general obligation bond which obligates the full faith and credit of the county. The proposed 4% interest is lower than many of the general obligation bonds as of May 9, 2009 in Virginia as reported by the Times-Dispatch. It's also a matter of timing, good market, and the local bank proposal in Lancaster County and the need is present and unquestioned.

Mr. Bott said the main point is that the general obligation bond requires full faith and credit which means obligating taxpayers no matter what is done.

Mr. Cole states a true revenue bond is not an option for a project such as this because there is no source of revenue. When funding a public facility such as a courthouse or school there is not a direct stream of revenue tied to that facility that can be devoted to the debt, which is why a moral obligation bond is applicable to financing a public facility such as this. A general obligation bond could be used for financing. They looked at where bank qualified privately placed bonds were in the current market. They found that for non-rated bank qualified general obligation bonds, the range is 4% - 4.5% today. He said they are talking about a lease revenue structure that is a moral obligation to the county debt service subject to appropriation as part of the annual budget process. What is more important is if any board ever choose not to appropriate the debt service as part of the budget they close themselves out from future borrowing on any other project needed. There has never been a default in Virginia from a public entity on a moral obligation bond.

Mr. Jenkins said if the Board of Supervisors could go with general obligation verses the moral obligation route what expectations would there be for difference in interest rates.

Mr. Cole said for non-rated bank qualified general obligation bond is going to be in the range of 4% - 4.5% today which are no different from the lease



revenue bond. It would take approximately six months to issue a general obligation bond with all the paperwork and which is an uncertainties of rate going up or down.

Mr. Beauchamp asked how long is the 4% interest rate offering from the Bank of Lancaster and Chesapeake Bank.

Mr. Cole said until June 24, 2008 and it may possible extend the date if necessary.

Mr. Bott stated when he looked at the Code of Virginia on the Industrial Development Authority and some of the purposes were for industrial things but did not talk about capital project such as courthouses or schools. Incidentally the Lancaster County Ordinance that refers to the Code of Virginia has the wrong citation. He believes a general obligation would be more appropriate for this type of facility.

Mr. Jenkins asked Mr. Siegel to explaining the lending procedure as it has already been done with schools.

Mr. Siegel stated the original Industrial Development Authority Act was amended in the '90s to allow financing of government buildings. Most governmental bodies are now using their Industrial Development Authority and he provided the Board of Supervisors with a list of how Industrial Development Authorities are used.

Tom Smith said the 1.8 cents does not appear to cover the entire cost of the project.

Mr. Cole said the 1.8 cents pays for the debt service on the \$7 million.

Joseph Power said the issue of the judicial center financing has been placed on the consideration docket but he believes that the Board of Supervisors already decided to go forward. He read though the Code of Virginia regarding the judge's authority to mandate that the county build a new courthouse.

Mr. Pennell stated it is to avoid the mandate and it would be a three judge panel to render the opinion. The mandate has not been issued yet which is what the Board of Supervisors is attempting to avoid. If mandated, the county will build a courthouse and build it according to the Supreme Court's specifications. The Board of Supervisors is trying to get ahead and do the best thing for taxpayers while still in negotiating power with the judge.

Mr. Power asked the Board of Supervisors not to rush to judgment.

Mr. Trittipoe asked the Board of Supervisors to table this issue.

Mr. Jenkins said whether it is this Board of Supervisors or the next board - this courthouse will be built. The board is trying to get an adequate longest-lasting new court facility with the least impact on the taxpayers. If the county waited and placed this issue for referendum and could be given a better interest that would be great - but he has not heard that. If this was an option he would say bring the taxpayers in. After years of discussion with the judges sooner or later we will spend the money necessary to build a courthouse which will replace a building built in 1860 added on in the 1930's and again in the '70s. If this is not done while this board has options there will be a mandate and forced to build to the Supreme Court specifications. The courts in the counties of Virginia are not a creature of the county, the county is a creature of the court. It was a determination by the General Assembly (then call the Grand Assembly) that decided there was a need for a new court in a territory area that said a new county will be established and that law still prevails today. If there is anyone who thinks

you take on the Circuit Court Judge with the authority he has, you would certainly lose.

Dr. Russell said he agrees with Mr. Jenkins and the board is attempting to build a new judicial center with the least amount of impact on the taxpayers but at the same time his constituents elected him to make decisions on their behalf and he will do that. He respects all the comments made but its time to bring closure to this issue.

Mr. Beauchamp stated he also agrees the statements of his fellow board members. He said Appomattox County when to referendum and failed and had to build a courthouse according to the Supreme Court specification at a much greater expense to their citizens.

Mr. Geilich said he believes that the ten year amortization is the best saving.

Mr. Palin stated go with the shorter plan and save some money.

Mr. Geilich made a motion to adopt the Resolution for the Judicial Center Financing using the Case One – a ten year amortization.

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**

### Planning Commission

Mr. Geilich made a motion to reappoint Donald McCann to the Lancaster County Planning Commission as an At-Large member for a four year term.

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

Motion failed 2 Aye – 2 Nay – 1 Abstain.

Industrial Development Authority

Dr. Russell made a motion to appoint William R. Lee to the Industrial Development Authority as a representative for District 4 for an unexpired four year term ending November 11, 2011.

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

Lancaster County Board of Zoning Appeals

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to recommend to Judge Taliaferro the reappointment of Steven M. Sorensen to the Lancaster County Board of Zoning Appeals as a representative for District 1 for a four year term ending June 30, 2013.

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

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

Mr. Beauchamp made a motion to appoint William Evans as the Lancaster County representative to serve on the Tri-River ASAP for an unexpired three year term ending December 31, 2010.

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**

#### County Payroll Increase

Mr. Pennell asked the Board of Supervisors to increase the payroll authorization on a monthly basis to \$225,000 because of additions to the monthly salary totals.

Mr. Geilich made a motion to increase the payroll authorization to \$225,000 with Chesapeake Bank.

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

Collection of Real Estate Bids

Mr. Pennell stated the county has received two responses from qualified law offices, one from John Hutt and the other from Sands Anderson Marks and Miller, to be considered for collections of real estate taxes and has asked both the Treasurer and Commissioner of the Revenue to assist with an interview. He asked if any member of the board would like to sit on the panel or simply receive a report.

By consensus of the Board of Supervisors to receive a report after the interview process by the Commissioner, Treasurer and County Administrator.

By consensus of the board a June 16, 2008 public hearing for the county budget was scheduled. The meeting will take place at 7:00 p.m. in the General District Courtroom.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins to adjourn to the meeting until Monday, June 16, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. for Public Hearing for the County Budget 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