

## **VIRGINIA:**

A meeting of the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors was held in the courthouse of said county on Thursday, August 30, 2001.

Present: F. W. Jenkins, Jr., Chairman  
Cundiff H. Simmons, Vice Chair  
B. Wally Beauchamp, Board Member  
Donald O. Conaway, Board Member  
Patrick G. Frere, Board Member  
William H. Pennell, Jr., County Administrator

Other Present: Joe Staton, Virginia Department of Transportation; Norman Mosher, Mary Ball Washington Museum and Library; George Washington, Virginia Watermen's Association; Allen Burgess, Tidewater Oyster Association; Jack Larson, Representative for Planning and Land Use, Robert Mason, Rappahannock Record

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

## **PUBLIC INPUT SESSION**

Mr. Norman Mosher, President, Board of Directors for Mary Ball Washington Museum and Library, stated that members of the Board would like to submit a Resolution to the Board of Supervisors and Virginia Department of Transportation. At the July 17, 2001, meeting of the Board of Directors for the Mary Ball Washington Museum and Library, the Directors unanimously approved a resolution to ask VDOT and the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors to evaluate traffic safety issues at Lancaster Court House and to take measures to slow vehicular traffic as it passes through the courthouse village.

Mr. Mosher said the museum buildings, which are a major element in the courthouse community, are located on both sides of Route 3. He said visitors and patrons

of the museum tour the buildings on both sides of Route 3, and many patrons and volunteers work and do research at our genealogy and family history library. Those using the library must park in the lot on the opposite side of the highway from it. Both staff and visitors have expressed concerns about crossing Route 3, as numerous automobiles and heavy trucks pass through Lancaster Court House at speeds dangerous to pedestrians.

The Board of Directors for the Mary Ball Washington Museum and Library therefore urges the Virginia Department of Transportation and the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors to post a mandatory 25 miles per hour speed limit through Lancaster Court House, establish a crosswalk between the parking lot on the south side of the highway and the courthouse and museum buildings on the north side, and erect yellow warning and caution signals on Route 3 at both the east and west highway entrances to the village.

The Board of Directors urges these measures for the safety of museum and library visitors, volunteers, staff, neighbors and courthouse visitors, as well as for those motorists passing through Lancaster Court House. The Board of Supervisors and VDOT are asked to do this expeditiously, before there is a serious accident at this location. The danger of such is extremely high.

Mr. Mosher stated that most of the visitors and volunteers are elderly persons crossing the street, and that heavy vehicles are shaking the mortar out of the buildings.

Mrs. Treenie Chilton said she lives directly across from the courthouse. As she walked out of her driveway to come to the meeting, about halfway across the road, she noticed a car approaching quickly and had to run in order to get across to the courthouse safely.

Mr. Jenkins stated that a study of the speed limit at the courthouse was done by VDOT and would be addressed by Mr. Joe Staton when the VDOT presentations are done a little later on the agenda.

## **PRESENTATIONS**

Introduction of Chinese Oysters into Virginia's Public Waters - Mr. George Washington, of the Virginia Waterman's Association said he has provided a copy of a resolution to each member of the Board of Supervisors to get the support for the introduction of Chinese Oysters into the Chesapeake Bay. He read "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors urges the Virginia General Assembly to enact enabling legislation to permit the introduction of *Crassitrea Ariakensis* into the public waters of the Commonwealth of Virginia." The oyster industry has gotten so bad that in 1995 the Virginia Seafood Council requested that the Virginia General Assembly authorize a study and search for an alternative oyster production. He said this has become a very serious problem for the watermen of this state. In 1958 there were approximately 5,000 watermen working oyster grounds in the State of Virginia, and in 2000 there were only 210 watermen working oyster grounds in the State of Virginia. The State of Virginia produced over four million bushels of oysters in 1958 and in 2000 the State of Virginia produced 22,624 bushels of oysters and 89 bushels came from the Rappahannock River. He stated this was a very serious economic problem for those in the seafood industry. There used to be two or three shucking houses on every creek and now there are only four or five shucking houses left in the county. There will be some opposition from the environmentalists. He introduced Dr. Jim Wesson, Scientist at Virginia Institute of Marine Science.

Dr. Jim Wesson said that the Virginia Seafood Council asked VMRC and VIMS for their assistance, and he has been monitoring the project. He said VIMS got these oysters from the East Coast of Africa, the Coast of India and up to the Coast of China. After testing was done at VIMS, it was found that the new oyster does not get the diseases that our oysters got. Despite working for 40 years to get our oysters healthy, we

still have a problem because oysters die once they get to a good size. The Chinese oysters have been reaching market size in about five months. Again, after careful testing, it has been found that the oysters do not die from disease. He said taste tests were done, and there was very little difference in taste.

Mr. Conaway asked if anyone had considered long term health issues to individuals who consume the oysters.

Dr. Wesson said there are no documented cases in this area of illness caused by the oysters.

Mr. Conaway said that questions would not be able to be answered until extensive testing has been completed.

Dr. Wesson stated that 70,000 oysters are currently being tested for various reasons.

Mr. Beauchamp asked about the status from VMRC, and whether they had approved this project.

Dr. Wesson said that's why VMRC has allowed testing.

Mr. Frere said if the resolution was adopted to permit the introduction of the oysters into Virginia Public Waters, it does not give specifics in saying what are the stock oysters and where they are coming from. He asked if they would be the sterile seed oysters being placed into public waters.

Dr. Wesson stated that was yet to be determined.

Mr. Jenkins asked if there has been any attempt to study the oysters to see if they carry parasites or bacteria.

Dr. Wesson said the oysters have been through those safety checks and do not carry parasites or bacteria.

Mr. Jenkins asked if the new oyster was capable of cross breeding with our native oyster.

Dr. Wesson said no.

Mr. Jenkins asked Dr. Wesson in his personal opinion if the new oyster would take over our native oysters.

Dr. Wesson said that would be a question that would probably never be answered.

Mr. George Washington said that Virginia was once the premier oyster producer in this country and he would like to get back to that. Therefore, he would like the Board of Supervisors to approve this resolution.

Tommy Kellum said that diseased oysters generally affect the liver and with the new oyster there has been no sign of unhealthy oysters. He said the taste of the new oyster is basically the same as our native oysters. The Virginia oyster industry was at a crossroad, and the work at VMRC and VIMS has great economical value.

Mr. Charles Welzant said he was fifth generation in Lancaster and he has 40,000 bushels of shells producing oysters in front of his home. He said he, Mr. Kellum, and the Kellys would like the Board of Supervisors to approve this resolution. You have a chance to rejuvenate the oysters in the Chesapeake Bay. He believes if you get someone to shuck oysters on a part time basis, you get a gallon of oysters from the Corrotoman River for about \$120 per gallon. Please endorse this resolution.

Mr. Allen Burgess, President of the Tidewater Oyster Association of Gloucester, Virginia, stated it's great to see the Virginia Waterman Association, the Seafood Council, VIMS and VMRC all singing the same tune. He said he is an environmentalist and when the oysters clean the waters the grass grows and crabs and fish survive. He encourages the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors to approve the resolution.

Mr. Conaway said he still has concerns because he's a health provider/worker and he sees so many different diseases and no one ever knows where they began. He does not know a lot about this oyster project and he does not want to look at this as just an economic benefit but would like to look at the safety issue. He stated he went to a conference in San Francisco and there was a sign as soon as you enter the hotel which stated water and materials used in this building have been determined to cause cancer. They had to make the public aware of any health concern. Has the study been done long enough to ensure the health and safety of the individual who would consume this product? His concern was the statement "Be It Further Resolved, that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors urges the Virginia General Assembly to enact enabling legislation to permit the introduction of *Crassitrea Ariakensis* into the public waters of the Commonwealth of Virginia". He believes it's too early to say this is not going to be detrimental to the health and safety of individuals.

Mr. Kellum said the oysters have been tested by VIMS before entering the public waters, and went through Virginia State quarantine inspections. The waters are where the oysters have gotten the diseases. Delegate Albert Pollard and other legislative members would like to know why they have not acted sooner.

Mr. Beauchamp made a motion to adopt the resolution for Introduction of Chinese Oysters into Virginia Public Waters.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

**WHEREAS**, the native Virginia oyster has suffered severe damage due to MSX and DERMO; and

**WHEREAS**, the Virginia oyster industry has suffered irreparable damage therefrom; and

**WHEREAS**, the Virginia Institute of Marine Science has tested *Crassitrea Ariakensis*, commonly referred to as the “Chinese Oyster” in local waters with satisfactory results and has published its report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Virginia Waterman’s Association is endorsing its introduction into Virginia waters and is requesting the support of local governments.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors supports the introduction of the “Chinese Oyster” into the public waters of the Commonwealth of Virginia for the purpose of revitalizing Virginia’s oyster industry by permitting the planting, growing, harvesting, processing, marketing and selling of these oysters; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors urges the Virginia General Assembly to enact enabling legislation to permit the introduction of *Crassitrea Ariakensis* into the public waters of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

#### **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

Speed Limit at the Courthouse - Mr. Staton said the traffic engineers studied and reviewed the speed limit and pedestrian crosswalk issue at the court house. He said Route 3 was the main corridor through the Northern Neck for commercial trucks, residents, schools and businesses. VDOT tried to establish what signs are placed and the criteria for the signs to be placed and speed limits. He said that the engineers suggested

40 miles per hour at the courthouse which was what, statistically, they could support. The problem with the pedestrian crosswalk are the criteria used was 40 miles per hour, which is the posted speed limit, it would give the driver time to see a pedestrian or another vehicle and should be able to stop within 400 feet. The front of the courthouse is so close to the hill that vehicles would not be able to stop. According to the drawing which was provided for the Board of Supervisors, they have a place for a crosswalk which would give 600 feet site distance, giving the driver enough distance to stop or slow down. He stated signs would be put up saying “pedestrian crossing ahead 200 hundred feet” in both directions. The request for the 25 mile per hour speed limit or flashing light will not work from the engineering standpoint; however, he would still take the resolution back to the administrative staff of VDOT for further direction.

Mr. Jenkins said he believes that the speed limit should be lowered. He said there was a very short line of sight for both directions when leaving the courthouse. The county asked people to park across the street to conduct governmental business. He said that 40 miles per hour was too fast for such high pedestrian traffic and asked what VDOT could do to assist with this situation.

Mr. Staton said that VDOT depended on statistics and he would take the resolution to the administrative and executive staff. The traffic engineers are liable for the decisions they make and the decision made was based on the study completed. VDOT can not cut the hill down. The people using Route 3 need to be accommodated in their travels. He hopes to have information available at the next meeting.

Mr. Conaway asked if VDOT considered placing a sign there stating that between the hours of 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. the speed limit would be lowered.

Mr. Staton said VDOT had not considered it because people are going to drive as fast and safely as they can to get to their destination and to put up that type of sign does not meet any of the standard criteria.

Mr. Beauchamp asked to have Mr. Staton take this information back for further study and consideration, and he would like to see the speed limit lowered.

Mr. Frere asked if the proposed crosswalk signs would be incorporated in both directions.

Mr. Staton said yes.

Mr. Jenkins stated, by consensus, the Board of Supervisors would like to see the speed limit lowered and have Mr. Pennell write our commission member and explain further about the buildings and safety of the citizens who visit the court house area.

Mr. Simmons said that there is some basis for lowering the speed limit to 25 miles per hours if you have 250 feet or less sight distance from the entrance of the court complex, whether it's a pedestrian or vehicle entrance. He believes it could be supported from an engineering standpoint just on that basis alone.

Town of Irvington Speed Limit and Crosswalk - Mr. Staton said that he and Mr. C.C. Burgess met the Town of Irvington Mayor, Council Members and citizens and talked about speed limit, cross walks, and putting up signs.

Mr. Beauchamp said he would like to follow up on the lowering of the speed limit on King Carter Drive. He said that a petition has been signed by every resident on that street, including the Tides Inn, because they are concerned about the bike traffic. He appreciated Mr. Staton meeting with the Town of Irvington Mayor, Council Members and citizens. Because of the increase in traffic, there has been a Deputy there and every third or fourth vehicle comes through the town speeding.

Mr. Staton stated it has been looked at and is being reviewed.

Route 684 – Twin Branch Road – Mr. Staton said that Route 684, which is a dirt road, would be hard surfaced in a couple weeks. VDOT has a few problems with the road maintenance and construction program such as what to do with brush and dirt, VDOT can not burn the brush because of environmental issues and can no longer give dirt to property owners.

Route 630 – Taylor's Creek – Mr. Staton said that VDOT obtained the right of way a couple of years ago and is getting ready to move the utilities; however, due to funding within the county secondary road improvement program, it would be late 2002 before they go to contract.

Election Signs – Mr. Staton stated he has to write a letter to local people about the rules of placing signs on the right of way. He said for state and federal elections they would receive a letter from Mr. David Ogle about Code of Virginia law and placing signs on the right of way. If the signs are placed on the right of way they would be removed.

Route 3 – Paving - Mr. Simmons stated he would like to commend VDOT for the work done on Route 3 between White Stone and Kilmarnock. He thanked Mr. Staton for getting the work done in such a timely fashion.

Route 354 – White Hall - Mr. Jenkins said that in the White Hall area, Route 689, the very last part of that road has not been completed and he would like this on the list to be completed.

Work Session - Mr. Staton said at the September or October Board of Supervisors meeting they would need to have a work session.

Route 600 Speed Limit - Mr. Conaway said on Route 600 he asked about having a study done to lower the speed limit and have Deputies and/or State Troopers monitor the traffic. What was the outcome?

Mr. Pennell stated that Deputies and State Troopers have been on Route 600 and have written a lot of tickets for speeding.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

Catherine Stacy Bagby-Schlutow – Special Exception Application – Mr. Larson stated that the applicant was requesting a special exception in order to allow the placement of an individual manufactured home on property located off VSH 650, Fleets Bay Road, near Kilmarnock, VA. This property is described as Tax Map #29-81 and is zoned R-1, Residential General. The property is in Voting District 4.

Mr. Larson said the applicant has met all the requirements to place an individual manufactured home. Adjoining property owners have been notified and advertising as required by law has been conducted. As of this date, staff have received no phone calls from adjoining property owners or other interested members of the public concerning this application.

Mr. Larson stated that staff recommends approval.

Mr. Simmons said that he and his brother owned the pond.

Mr. Simmons made a motion to grant approval of the special exception application for Catherine Stacy Bagby-Schlutow for placement of an individual manufactured home.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

Richard and Debbie Hardwick – Special Exception Application – Mr. Larson said the applicants are requesting a special exception in order to allow the placement of an individual manufactured home on property located off VSH 646, Christ Church Road, near Irvington, VA. This property is described as Tax Map #27-210 and is zoned R-1, Residential General. This property is in Voting District 4.

Mr. Larson stated that Mr. and Mrs. Hardwick have met all the requirements to place an individual manufactured home. Adjoining property owners have been notified and advertising as required by law has been conducted. As of this date, staff have received no phone calls from adjoining property owners or other interested members of the public concerning this application.

Mr. Larson said staff recommends approval.

Mr. Simmons made a motion to approve the special exception application of Richard and Debbie Hardwick for the placement of an individual manufactured home.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

William J. Turenne – Request for Bay Act Waiver – Mr. Larson said the applicant requested a Chesapeake Bay Act waiver to permit the construction of a swimming pool within 41’ of tidal waters. The property on which this would occur is described as Tax Map 27B-4-15, located off Waterview Point Lane on Carters Creek near Irvington, VA. This property is in Voting District 5.

Mr. Larson stated that Mr. Turenne has a previously approved site plan to construct the proposed swimming pool in the highlighted area of the attached site plan. While the original location is within the 100’ buffer but beyond the 50’ seaward portion of the buffer, the new location may be even more acceptable. Specifically, the new location does not entail the removal of significant trees whereas the original location does. Additionally, Mr. Turenne is proposing to build a retaining wall along with the required infiltration trench that would further aid in the retention and percolation of storm water. Finally, existing grass will be replaced by shrubbery that augments existing shrubbery and further mitigates the impact of runoff. He said that the intrusion of the swimming pool as proposed was no greater than the intrusion of the home, so therefore it would not be setting a precedent as far as allowing a greater amount of intrusion into the

buffer area. Adjoining property owners have been notified and advertising as required by law has been conducted. As of this date, staff have received no phone calls from adjoining property owners or other interested members of the public concerning this application.

Mr. Larson said staff recommends approval.

Mr. Larson said he has met with Mr. Frere and he has copies of the original site plan. Mr. Frere pointed out that on the original site plan the pool was on a flat surface whereas the proposed swimming pool is on a slope.

Mr. Simmons asked if there was proposed grading downstream or down the hill from the retaining wall? If there would be any grading between the retaining wall and the infiltration system?

Mr. Larson said no, it's an established and stable bank.

Mr. Frere stated his reason for not voting for this request; he believes it was consistent with allowing an encroachment when discussing the 50' to 100' buffer. When you discuss the 0' to 50' buffer, the past waiver or variance requests that have been granted were only for additions to primary structures and not for accessory structures. He said that the Board of Zoning Appeals and the Board of Supervisors last month allowed additions to the primary structure itself as close as the closest encroachment of the house, but not for accessory structures. He believes the site plan approved in 1997 had a buildable area outside the 50' buffer.

Mr. Jenkins asked if the retaining wall was going there without the change in pool location.

Mr. Larson stated it was not proposed in the original site plan.

Mr. Frere said there were a lot of people in the county who do not have their swimming pool located where they want it because of the way the county has interpreted the Chesapeake Bay Act. He said the Board of Zoning Appeals has denied many such requests.

Mr. Jenkins asked if the trees have mitigating effects.

Mr. Larson said the county enforces maintaining significant trees in the 100' vegetated buffer and anytime significant trees are cut; it has to be done with an approved plan. If these trees were cut you would expect some loss of mitigation. He said according to VIMS, a tree that is about 30" in diameter acts like a hydraulic pump. It sucks about one hundred gallons of water out of the ground each day. In other words trees do consume stormwater that would otherwise run off into the tidal waters.

Mr. Beauchamp made a motion to approve the request for a Bay Act Waiver for William J. Turenne.

VOTE: 3 Aye (Jenkins, Beauchamp, Simmons) 2 Nay (Frere, Conaway)

### **CONSENSUS DOCKET**

Motion was made by Mr. Frere to approve the Consensus Docket items B – D and recommendations as follows:

A. Minutes of June 28, July 19, July 26, 2001

Recommendation: Remove

B. Dominion Virginia Power Contract with Lancaster County

Recommendation: Approve the contract and authorize the county administrator to execute the necessary documents

C. Arthur Bryant Subdivision (Continuation)

Recommendation: Continuation until September 27, 2001

D. Founders of American Communities Resolution

Recommendation: Adopt resolution

**WHEREAS**, the County of Lancaster, Virginia, is an exceptional tourism destination; and

**WHEREAS**, many of the persons and events that founded the United States are associated with Lancaster County, Virginia; and

**WHEREAS**, the founding of the United States is a story deserving greater recognition and would provide the basis for additional tourism opportunities in the Commonwealth of Virginia; and

**WHEREAS**, communities have an opportunity to share in the Commonwealth's 2007 Rediscover through the **Founders of American Communities in Virginia** program.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors supports the **Founders of American Communities in Virginia** program in order to foster recognition of the Commonwealth of Virginia's unique role in the creation of the American Republic; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors encourages the Virginia General Assembly to adopt such resolutions as necessary to create and fund the **Founders of American Communities in Virginia**.

VOTE: 5 – 0

## **CONSIDERATION DOCKET**

The Board considered the following items on its Consideration Docket:

1. Approval of August 2001 Salaries and Invoice Listings

Motion was made by Mr. Beauchamp to approve the Salaries for August 2001 in the amount of \$127,872.45 and Invoice Listings for August 2001 in the amount of \$420,727.36.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

2. Old Orchard Subdivision – Release of Letter of Credit – Mr. Larson stated that Colinbrook Way was established as part of the State Secondary System of Highways when the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution at the June 28, 2001 board meeting. The applicant has requested to be released from the letter of credit in the amount of \$15,650, stating that he has completed performance for which letter of credit was required.

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to Release of Letter of Credit for the Old Orchard Subdivision.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

3. Health Insurance Renewal - Mr. Pennell stated that October 1<sup>st</sup> marks the annual beginning of Health Insurance Coverage for Lancaster County employees. A request for proposals was issued and responses were received from Southern Health Insurance and Trigon.

Mr. Pennell stated that the Board of Supervisors has allowed the county employees to select the Health Insurance carrier the majority prefers. He said voting forms were distributed to employees who either participate or plan to participate in the Health Insurance coverage. The results of the voting of

county employees utilizing the Health Insurance Benefits were Trigon – 5 and Southern Health – 51.

Mr. Beauchamp made a motion to accept Southern Health Insurance as the health insurance provider for the County.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye

### **BOARD REPORT**

Mr. Frere discussed the correction to the minutes. The corrections and amendments were made on June 28, 2001 and July 26, 2001. There were no corrections made on the July 19, 2001 minutes.

Mr. Conaway made a motion to approve the minutes with the corrections and amendments.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

### **COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR REPORT**

Rural Economic Analysis Program – Horizons – Jul/Aug 2001 – Mr. Pennell stated he received copy of the recent *Horizons* newsletter published by *Virginia's Rural Economic Analysis Program*. He said he read the article *The Urban/Rural Dilemma or Why Should Virginia Care about Rural Prosperity?* He was curious if Lancaster County was a “donor” county (sending more tax money to the Commonwealth) or a “receiver” county (having more tax money returned than it sends).

Mr. Pennell stated he contacted Ms. Karen Mundy, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and learned that in 1998 the County of Lancaster sent taxes to the Commonwealth in the amount of approximately

\$10,756,000. In that same year, Lancaster County received \$5,282,000 in the return of tax money from the Commonwealth which was less than one-half of the money it sends to Richmond.

Lancaster County Board of Supervisors Minutes - Mr. Frere said that because the minutes are put online and some people can not attend the meetings, they would have the opportunity to read the discussions and would know how their representative voted and why. That would be lost if the minutes only reflected the action taken.

Mr. Jenkins said the difficulty was that in most cases they have other issues to deal with and would want each member to make sure everything they said was stated in the minutes. The minutes should be crisp actual facts on what happened but not narrative.

Mr. Frere said there should be some way to capture the discussion. He said when he was the Planning and Land Use Director he would often have to go to the minutes as a basis for testimony. The discussions are not complete enough they could be misinterpreted. The county could be legally put in a compromising situation. There should be some type of detailed record. He asked that staff check with other counties to see how their minutes are recorded. He said, for example, New Kent video tapes their board meetings.

Mr. Simmons said he was not sure that video tapes are allowed under law as a record of board action. As far as getting the information to the public, as to what the discussion was by an individual member of the board, he believes the press covers that very well and if the press gets too far out of line, they know that members of the board would go to the press and object to what was written. The papers are archives and that information would be available. As far as county liability, he believes it would help relieve some liability of the county if someone had to testify in court as to what was said; the value of someone's testimony would be a reflection of the person's credibility. The

discussion has little bearing in court; it's what action the board took. We can't be sued for the discussion but could be sued for the actions of the board.

Mr. Conaway said he could see if this was a committee or club that had to discuss so many issues and come to a final adoption. We are individual elected board members, and we are responsible to our constituents as to how we vote; the discussions are important. He stated he understood the difficulty it would be to type verbatim. He would like to know that there was some discussion; otherwise, it would appear that opinion only went one way. We leave it to the secretary to decide what's important or not and that's not fair. He stated that we are all individual supervisors, making individual comments that reflect the way constituents are represented. He believes it's important to include those discussions in the minutes.

Mr. Simmons stated that appears to be a political move and the only thing that voters will remember was how a supervisor voted on a specific issue, not what the discussion was. If constituents followed the board and press, they would have a pretty good idea as to where their representatives stands on particular issue. If the minutes were verbatim, then you would argue forever about the inflections. He said minutes could not show the inflections in someone's voice in a written record.

Mr. Conaway said you could certainly determine from the written minutes what was spoken.

Mr. Simmons said that the press would quote the Board of Supervisors if there was a controversial issue. Other than that, it's political and has very little to do with the action of the board. The action of the board is the end result.

Mr. Frere said he disagreed with Mr. Simmons and his opinions. He stated this was public record, the minutes are adopted and placed in the Board of Supervisors book and would be there 100 years from now to read. It's for clarification and to let the people who elected you know your reasons for making your decision. It is not political for him.

Mr. Conaway stated it was not political for him.

Mr. Pennell stated he had the opportunity to speak to a few people about this at the LGOC and said that Bedford County summarizes the minutes and keeps the tapes; however, we destroy the tapes after one year. Individuals would be able to come in and listen to the tapes. The tapes were a record but not the official record.

Mr. Beauchamp said he does not feel that the minutes should be verbatim.

Mr. Frere requested that Mr. Pennell survey 15 counties to see how they record minutes and possible technology that would type the minutes as each person spoke.

Consensuses of the board to have Mr. Pennell complete a survey and looks at new technology to see if it's available.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion was made by Mr. Beauchamp to adjourn the meeting. VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.