

VIRGINIA:

A meeting of the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors was held in the courthouse of said county on Thursday, December 28, 2000.

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

Others Present: Joseph Staton, Virginia Department of Transportation, Patricia Gibbs, First Commonwealth Cablevision, Ltd., Jack Larson, Director, Planning and Land Use, Stewart McKenzie, Northern Neck Planning District Commission, Robert Mason, Rappahannock Record

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

PRESENTATIONS

Status of Extension of Cable Plant in Lancaster County - Mrs. Patricia Gibbs, Representative for Cablevision thanked the board for the opportunity to attend the meeting and to bring an update on the Corrotoman peninsula project. The cable television franchise extension granted to their company last year required that five miles of cable plant be constructed for each five-year period. Cablevision has begun construction of approximately seven miles of new cable plant serving the Corrotoman peninsula. Specifically, underground cable has been installed from the tower site to Rte 624, Western Branch Road and aerial construction has been completed from Rte 624 to Sullavans Road. There will be 20 to 25 homes along Sullavans Road activated within 10 to 14 days subject to the electricity being turned on at the tower and weather permitting. In addition, aerial construction has begun in Corrotoman by the Bay. The plan is to go down Corrotoman Drive and rather than activating the whole area at one time, they will activate the new plant in approximately one mile sections.

Mr. Jenkins asked how long would it take activating a section?

Mrs. Gibbs stated it wouldn't take any longer to complete the project but it is better than hanging cable in the entire area and making everyone wait for cable to be activated at one time. The customer will be able to obtain service as the one mile sections are completed and activated. They will go down Corrotoman Drive and get that activated and then branch off onto the side roads. Mrs. Gibbs said unfortunately she

could not give an exact time frame but it took approximately three to four weeks to get that one section on Sullavans Road activated. Cablevision is using it's own in house construction team as opposed to hiring a contractor, because each contractor that submitted a bid could not do some of the required work (i.e. underground).

Mr. Jenkins asked why is it taking so long to do so little work?

Mrs. Gibbs stated they started looking for a contractor back in the late Spring/early Summer and sent out maps to a number of companies. Toward the end of October they decided it would be more feasible to have their construction team start the work because some of the companies couldn't start when needed. The construction team has been working on the Corrotoman project since the middle of November and has made real progress.

Mr. Jenkins asked what the schedule was for the remaining 200 homes in Mollusk?

Mrs. Gibbs stated they have to come out from the tower and keep the continuity.

Mr. Jenkins stated the cable company would still have approximately eight miles to get to Bertrand. How long will it take to get cable to all the customers on the Corrotoman peninsula and not just on Corrotoman Drive?

Mrs. Gibbs stated Mr. Belyea's first map design included about seven miles.

Mr. Jenkins asked if she was suggesting the county should accept seven miles as being adequate for providing cable for the significant portion of the county?

Mrs. Gibbs stated that this was only the first seven miles which has been designed.

Mr. Jenkins said it has been about a year since your renewal.

Mrs. Gibbs stated that they are required to complete five miles of cable every five years.

Mr. Jenkins stated you are saying that your company is only going to do a little more than they are required.

Mrs. Gibbs said that as per their previous discussions that there was 45 miles of cable to complete and what is currently being built would be applied toward the 45 miles.

Mr. Jenkins said he recalled a discussion on how neglectful the cable company has been with providing cable service to the upper end of the county and five miles was the minimum for your cable company to get the renewal. He said his concern is the cable company has met the minimum five miles required, the upper end of the county has no way to believe that the company will do another five or seven miles of cable. The areas such as Corrotoman peninsula, down to Morratico or anywhere else may not have cable services until your franchise is up for renewal again.

Mrs. Gibbs informed the board that is not the intent and once they start to build, they will continue to build. They are currently looking at another seven-mile stretch and counting homes as they continue to build.

Mr. Jenkins stated the company stopped in 1992 when they first started to lay cable and never provided the service at that time and there's no guarantee that you won't stop construction again.

Mrs. Gibbs said it's her understanding the plans of the company will continue to build and not stop at the seven miles. She asked if the area Mr. Jenkins was speaking about was outside the present design?

Mr. Jenkins informed her that it was outside the present design and it's at the end of the peninsula.

Mrs. Gibbs stated she would make a note and bring this to the attention of Mr. Belyea.

Mr. Pennell stated another very dense populated area is Heritage Point, which is immediately adjacent to Corrotoman by the Bay, if you go across the creek. However, if you travel down Rte 354 there's about two or three miles of run before you reach Heritage Point. He stated it's approximately 100 feet across Seniors Creek. He asked if it is possible to take the cable underwater?

Mrs. Gibbs said yes, in some cases they have taken cable underwater or across.

Mr. Pennell stated that would be the faster way to get cable to that reasonably dense community.

Mr. Jenkins said his concern is to have excess to cable at least along the entire length of the main artery of Rte 354 which ends at the town of Bertrand.

Mrs. Gibbs again stated she would research and take the information to Mr. Belyea, designer, part owner and engineer. He had a planned vacation at this time and could not cancel. However she can get the answers within the next week to ten days.

Mr. Jenkins requested that Mr. Belyea attend the January meeting.

Mrs. Gibbs said that would be fine.

Mr. Pennell asked about the extension of the existing cable from Nuttsville tower to Morratico because that is another dense area that has been neglected.

Mrs. Gibbs stated she would be happy to come back to the board with answers. She apologized for not having the answers. However, she was pleased with the progress on the Corrotoman peninsula project.

Mr. Jenkins explained you have to understand that he's not as pleased because it's eight years late in coming.

Mr. Beauchamp discussed the letter in regard to the answering service. He said over the holidays he had approximately four or five individuals voice their concerns about rude and no follow through from customer service. This is an issue you are aware of with customer service, he recommended that the cable company continues to stay abreast of the problem and consider another answering service.

Mr. Jenkins said his position is that he is more than a little disappointed in your response to Mr. Pennell's letter. Clearly part of your franchise agreement is to provide a level of customer service and be responsive to the users of your cable service and the concerns would be efficiently handled and clearly that is not being handled properly through the third party. He said he has received calls that are complaint calls that could have been handled through your customer service. However, it is rare that he receives complaint calls because there are so few people in his district on your cable system but enough that he gets the complaint calls when the cable franchise doesn't do its job properly. Your cable franchise is clearly not in compliance and will not be tolerated much longer.

Mrs. Gibbs asked if this is because that their answering service is not what it should be.

Mr. Jenkins stated the fact that your cable company does not provide customer service and problem resolution as your franchise agreement requires on a prompt and efficient manner and this has become a very serious matter.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Six-Year Plan - Mr. Staton stated the six-year plan required signature of the board of supervisor's chairman in order to finalize the project.

Traffic Light Study at the Intersection of Irvington Road and Harris Drive (Hospital Road) - Mr. Staton informed the board that a traffic engineer has studied the intersection and it does not qualify for a light. There are eleven different criteria to meet if a traffic light is to be installed and the Irvington Road and Harris Drive intersection did not meet one requirement. The primary requirement is to have 600 vehicles per hours for eight hours of a 24-hour count and at this intersection, no hour had the required traffic volume. An analysis of the accident history in 46 months should there was one accident which was a side swipe type and traffic lights generally prevent angle type accidents. The intersection does not qualify now, however traffic will continue to grow and they will continue to monitor the intersection. Mr. Staton asked permission of the board to place this information in the local paper and have them do an article on the criteria and perhaps the public will have a better understanding.

Mr. Beauchamp stated that would be a good idea.

Mr. Conaway stated he doesn't understand the methodology of the survey. He asked does this designate the area as not being an accident-prone area and what would happen if there were three accidents within the next 24 hours?

Mr. Staton said they would first look at the cause of the accidents and begin looking at putting down more lines or blinking lights at the intersection. Sometimes a traffic light may make the intersection worse if the volume or justification is not there. Furthermore, from the engineer's standpoint, if it does not meet state and federal guidelines the engineer could be held liable. The state and federal guidelines have been established by years of statistical data, designing and experience with building intersections.

Mr. Conaway asked if a serious accident happened who would be held liable, after this has been brought up as a very serious concern? There was not a need for a traffic light at Harris Drive (Hospital Road) which intersected with Rte 200 Irvington Road until the new road was built which has caused the difference and made it a potential hazard. As your report stated, only one accident occurred which was a sideswipe and he understood that because there wasn't a road coming across an intersection. However, connecting the new road to Harris Drive crossing a major throughway makes it an area of high concern.

Mr. Staton said he hoped that would not happen but if the situation you described happened, based on our statistics, it would not be because there was no traffic light present. That's the reason why studies are conducted and being technical people, they have to go with the data observed when a study is completed.

Mr. Conaway stated it's easy for the engineers and people like you to sit in Warsaw or Fredericksburg and try to decide according to the numbers this intersection doesn't qualify for a traffic light. But if you drive the road on a daily basis or lived in the area you would have a different viewpoint. He understands from the VDOT point of view that a study was done and it shows that the intersection does not qualify for a traffic light. He is not satisfied with the decision because he travels this road every day and sees the potential hazard and does not want to see a serious accident with fatalities. This serious concern has been brought to the attention of VDOT and a study has been conducted and unfortunately the study of statistical data showed that the intersection does not qualify for placement of a traffic light.

Mr. Staton stated it's not easy for an engineer to look at statistical data and make decisions to satisfy everyone.

Mr. Conaway thanked VDOT for completing the study of the Irvington Road and Harris Drive (Hospital Road) intersection.

Mr. Beauchamp stated the VDOT report showed the traffic count at that intersection was approximately 9,423 vehicles which is a much higher count than was anticipated. There is less traffic approaching the intersection from the James P. Jones Memorial Highway at 1,311 vehicles compared to Harris Road which was at 1,670 vehicles.

Mr. Staton said they would continue to monitor the intersection. He stated that at the last meeting a citizen expressed concern about Harris Drive getting more truck traffic because of the bypass. Mr. White met with the citizen and looked at all the curves that they thought could have been helped by cutting trees or bushes for better sight distance but they did not want VDOT to cut any of the trees or bushes. At this point there's not a lot that can be done because straightening the road is a long term goal which would have to be included in the six year plan and that job would compete against roads that have been in the plan for 15 or 20 years. If the citizens are really concerned, they must give VDOT permission to cut some trees and bushes to improve the sight distances, which is a safety issue.

The Mahone Run Bridge Project/Rte 600 – Mr. Staton stated the bridge project has the trailer set up and all the erosion control devices in place. They have to use 24' x 24' solid concrete pallets. They will be starting the project after the first of the year.

Preparing for Inclement Weather Conditions – Mr. Staton stated that Mr. Harper has prepared three times to be ready for snow storms but has only gotten a dusting. They have to be prepared otherwise the road conditions could become serious. They have received some donated right of way for turn around on Rte 727 in the Town of Irvington. About two months ago they received a complaint about the end maintenance sign being in the wrong place on Rte 677 and people were turning around in a private driveway. They got someone to donate a piece of property for a turn around which will help during snow emergencies.

Mr. Jenkins stated he recently drove through Middlesex, Matthews and Gloucester and the roads were not in good condition. However, the roadways in Lancaster County were clean, this is to say that the Lancaster crews should be commended for their work.

Mr. Staton said thank you for the compliment and the crew in Lancaster will be pleased to hear your comments.

Mr. Jenkins took an opportunity to thank Mr. Staton for his help with a speeding problem. He appreciates the prompt service.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

The following public hearings were held:

Donald and Belinda Fauntleroy – Special Exception Application – Individual Manufactured Home – Mr. Larson stated the applicants are requesting a special exception for placement of an individual manufactured home on property located off Route 646 near White Stone. Mr. & Mrs. Fauntleroy have met all the requirements for placing a manufactured home.

Mr. Larson stated this request has been advertised and adjoining property owners were notified. As of this date, one phone call was received from an adjoining property owner not to express opposition but to request clarification as to the reason for notification.

Mr. Simmons made a motion that the special exception be approved.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

CONSENSUS DOCKET

Mr. Frere stated there were a few items that need to be clarified and would like to table the adoption of the minutes until a future meeting.

The board agreed by consensus to table the approval of the November 30, 2000 minutes until a future meeting.

CONSIDERATION DOCKET

The Board considered the following items on its Consideration Docket:

1. Approval of October 2000 Salaries and Invoice Listings

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins to approve the Salaries for December 2000 in the amount of \$125,178.01 and Invoice Listings for December 2000 in the amount of \$366,550.15.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

2. Final Discussion and Adoption of Revised Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Larson assured the board that there was adequate language in the plan to protect open space, some consideration was given to where rezoning may occur whereby large parcels of agriculture property that are presently in A-2 may be rezoned to A-1. There was a section missing on the bike plan that has been added. The continuity of the last three chapters has been fixed. He has rewritten Chapters 7 – 9 and added the bike path section to Chapter 6 to address all of the concerns. Additionally, as Mr. Pennell directed, a copy of the revised draft was made available to the Northern Neck Planning District Commission. There was one person from that office who went over it in considerable detail and his comments were that he was very impressed with the amount of detail and work that had gone into putting the plan together. He offered some editorial suggestions and additionally he pointed out the flood plain map he had in the draft was not a flood plain map because it talked about hydric and non-hydric soils and water. He provided us with a new and revised copy of the flood plain map that will replace the old map and it clearly talks about the 100-year flood plain. A topography map was also suggested as an addition, Mr. Larson made the point that while Lancaster County is not flat; it does not have significant elevation to contribute to considerable run off especially in the non-tidal areas. He feels that is a useful map for displaying the condition of the land in Lancaster County and thinks it should be added behind the flood plan map. The other item suggested by Mr. Frere was to combine the general development map and the future land use map. However, after talking with the people at the Northern Neck Planning

District Commission they came to the conclusion that trying to combine the two maps. There was a lot information that they wanted to display would make the map full and cluttered which would render the map useless or lower it's utility. There were good points on the general development map especially the designation of the building centers which is included. As a result the rewrite of Chapter 9 explains the two maps and links them together and there's less confusion.

Mr. Simmons stated the hydrate soils map should be left in the plan because it pertains to the wetlands.

Mr. Larson asked if the map should be relabeled?

Mr. Frere stated it should be placed in septic system section.

Mr. Frere stated he would like to have the following items included: 1. On page 9-10 regarding the waterfront commercial development and waterfront dependent facility on the current zoning map, he would add "see future land use map".

1. The zoning map does not show the non-conforming waterfront and the majority on the waterfront is non-conforming. The future land use map will try to show all the non-conforming commercial structures.
2. In 9-9, two areas need to be added to the Village Centers - Foxwell and Westland.
3. There were a few of page numbers mixed up.
4. On the revised 100-year flood plain map, if you look at North Point at the Northwest part of Fleets Island, the 100-year flood, that North Point would be under water. The areas of Coles Point and Mosquito Island should also be shown as white. He believes what happened was the FEMA flood insurance rate map was used and they don't show the coastal barrier area that's seen in the 100-year flood plain, they are shown differently.

Mr. Pennell asked if these are land masses that are separate from the main body of Lancaster County?

Mr. Frere stated they are wetlands or very close to wetlands (i.e. the new subdivision in Foxwell called Rivers Edge). The coastal barrier areas are not show on the flood plain.

Mr. Pennell asked if the flood plain was shown it as a hatched area?

Mr. Frere said it was shown as a hatched area and it doesn't designate the difference in the 100-year plan. However this map is more accurate than the old map.

Mr. Beauchamp made a comment about the bike path and bike trail already being included in the plan but the bird trails have not been addressed. Is it necessary to include the bird trails in the plan?

Mr. Pennell asked if a statement such as the Board of Supervisors of Lancaster County supports the establishment of bird trails.

Mr. Beauchamp said that would be great.

Mr. Simmons made a motion to adopt the Comprehensive Plan as amended.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

Mr. Jenkins took the opportunity to thank the staff, Planning District Commission and Mr. Simmons for a job well done in the preparation of the new Comprehensive Plan.

Planning and Land Use Department Update on Tree Cutting - Mr. Larson stated he wanted to update the board on the tree cutting court case. The county filed a criminal complaint concerning tree cutting in the last two or three months and finally a judication did occur during this past month. He said the outcome was that the court found the evidence submitted, was sufficient to convict the defendant of a criminal misdemeanor violation of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance.

Furthermore, the order read as follows: Upon joint motions of the county and defendant the matter is hereby taken under advisement for the period of one year from the entry of this order. Under the express term of the defendant, Glenn Crockell, during that period, keep the peace and be of good behavior and not violate any land development statues of the Commonwealth of Virginia in any county, city or town. After one year the defendant shall appear before the court

with counsel and make oath that he has complied with the revision of this order and without further evidence this matter shall be dismissed. Should the defendant fail to abide by the terms of the order, the county may impose without further evidence of guilt or innocence of this offense, said penalty as described by law for violation of this criminal misdemeanor offense.

Mr. Larson commented about a few things came out of the court proceeding. It became clear that we need a change to the ordinance with a provision for a waiver of the clearing plan. It's very clear that a waiver must be in writing because the benefit of the doubt will be given to any defendant that appears on a charge under this act and they can claim receiving some type of verbal authority. The burden of proof will then shift to the county and it clear that it could be a matter of understanding. Giving verbal authorization, the defendant would be given the benefit of the doubt. So, he believes that there has to be stipulation in the ordinance that any waiver to a clearing plan be granted in writing. Beyond that were a few suggestions in terms of the way it's organized, so that it doesn't offer room for misunderstanding. The court proceeding went very smoothly, he believe the ordinance stood on its own. As far as the enforcement of the ordinance, there have been two or three other cases, where the county attorney has been consulted with the idea of bringing criminal charges against the individuals. This will not be done unless the county believes that there's strong case. Even if criminal charges are not brought up, the county does try to get replacement and/or restitution of lost trees and the county has been successful in doing so. There have been three other cases that have complied by getting site plans after the fact, having a clearing plan done and following up with planting the trees that are required. He believes that the county is properly enforcing that ordinance.

Mr. Pennell stated Mr. Larson failed to mention that there was a \$2,600.00 fine imposed upon the defendant in that particular case. Mr. Larson has finished two major projects, the Comprehensive Plan and the Capital Improvement Budget. He has asked Mr. Larson to go through the land use ordinances and look at them with a critical eye to make the kind of corrections he has just described. We should be coming back to the board within the next few months with ordinance amendments cleaning up some of the language.

3. Historic Resources Commission Request to Transfer Budget Funds

Mr. Pennell said there's a letter from Ms. Louise Jesse, the chairperson of the Historic Resources Commission, she is also the chairperson for the 350th Anniversary Committee. She would like to transfer \$1,500.00 from the Historic

Resource Commission budget to the 350th Anniversary Committee budget. The money is expected to be paid back in full to the Historic Resources Commission.

Mr. Jenkins made the motion to transfer funds from the Historic Resources Commission to the 350th Anniversary Committee.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

4. Coastal Program Award Notification – Windmill Point Canoe/Kayak Launch Site

Mr. Pennell stated he received notification that Lancaster has received a grant to install a Canoe/Kayak Launching facility at the six-acre site at the corner of Brightwaters Drive and Windmill Point Road. He has learned that there is a \$13,000 cash match required. He has checked with the grantor and the county attorney and we may by ordinance or regulation prohibit all vessels except those that are non-motorized. If the board is interested the canoe/kayak launch site as part of the blue water trails.

Mr. Jenkins asked if there's a plan and drawing?

Mr. Pennell stated the plan and drawing were included in your package.

Mr. Frere said the wording in the contract states that we are not required to send \$13,000 if the costs do not amount to that much. He asked about the drawing because the pier looks like it extend over the line.

Mr. Pennell stated that Mr. Frere was correct and it would have to be turned to the right.

Mr. Frere said he thinks this is a good thing for the county and we have the ability to double whatever dollars we put into the project. Furthermore, he thinks it would be a capital improvement on existing county owned land, unfortunately it comes ahead of the capital improvement plan being adopted but he believes it would be something that would be included in our capital improvement plan. He believes the county should take advantage of this opportunity and he made a motion to go forward with the Canoe/Kayak Launch Site plan.

Mr. Jenkins asked what was the deadline?

Mr. Frere said the end date is March 31, 2001.

Mr. Pennell stated that this is actually a 1999 grant that we received at the end of the year. March 31, 2001 is the correct date and there is a close out period that goes to May 15, 2001. The actually project end date indicated on the grant is September 30, 2001.

Mr. Frere stated the reason the Virginia Coastal Resources Program has grant money to distribute is because last year, rather than given the money out, it went toward the oyster reef restoration program. Lancaster County was one of the locales that was able to get some of the money toward oyster reef restoration.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

The County Attorney said that we could exclude motorized boats. Could we direct Mr. Pennell and the County Attorney to prepare an ordinance to prohibit motorized watercraft?

Mr. Beauchamp said yes.

Mr. Frere made a motion to have an ordinance in place prohibiting motorized vessels at the Canoe/Kayak Launch Site.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

5. 2001 Organizational Meeting

Mr. Pennell has suggested January 3, 2001 at 7:00 p.m. for the Organizational Meeting.

Mr. Pennell said that is the first working day of the new year. Agendas were given to each board member.

Mr. Frere suggested moving the meeting time to 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Beauchamp made a motion that the Organizational Meeting be held on January 3, 2001 at 6:00 p.m.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

BOARD REPORTS

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to reappoint Mr. Robert Forrester to the Social Services Board.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to appoint Mr. J. W. Wyne to the Building Code Appeals.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

Mr. Frere stated he read last week's Northumberland Echo and the Northumberland Board of Supervisors act on a resolution concerning redistricting in the Northern Neck as far as the house district. Their county approved a resolution asking the General Assembly to keep the Northern Neck together as a whole. He stated that Richmond County has approved a similar resolution. After reading the article he agreed with a lot of things that were said however their resolution has some additional wording. It basically stated the districts have been there since 1952, shares the Planning District Commission, Vocational School District, VDOT Warsaw Residence, etc. Since we act together regionally on grants and enterprise zones, the Northern Neck should be represented by one Delegate. In the Senate District, Senator Chichester does not serve the whole Northern Neck. The resolution wording needs to encourage General Assembly to redistricting and add Richmond County back into the 28th Senatorial District. Our representation with the House of Delegates and Senate would be regional, representing the Northern Neck as a whole. He asked the board to consider adopting this resolution.

Mr. Pennell stated he called Senator Chichester's office and he supports the inclusion of Richmond County into his Senatorial District.

Mr. Frere said Richmond County has been contacted and they would like to be added back into the 28th Senatorial District.

Mr. Jenkins states some years ago, the Senatorial district took Richmond County out and took a portion of Essex County and added them in.

Mr. Frere said to add wording stating "with such area that is necessary to achieve proportional representation." Which could mean areas could be added or dropped off as necessary.

Mr. Pennell asked if you are suggesting making it more specific.

Mr. Beauchamp stated he agrees that it should be written more specifically.

Mr. Frere made a motion to approve adopting a resolution with the additional wording.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

Redistricting

Mr. Jenkins said the requirement to redistrict in 2001 requires the board to establish a redistricting commission.

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to establish a commission to study redistricting based on the 2000 Census each voting district to have its own representative with the ability to increase commission membership if so desired by the Board of Supervisors.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to have Mr. Eudy as part of the commission studying the 2000 Census.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR REPORT

Lancaster County New Brochures

Mr. Pennell showed the board with a copy of the first draft of the county's new tourism brochure. He believed McFadden and Clay had done a wonderful job. However there were a few items that have been changes

Donation of Property

Mrs. Mildred T. Lee submitted a letter asking the county to buy or accept a donation of a parcel of property, the property known as Tax Map 9-72A, approximately .671 acre piece of land at the intersection of Beane's road and Chestnut Grove Lane in Lancaster County, Virginia.

Mr. Conaway made motion to accept the land as a donation from Mrs. Lee.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins to adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: 5 – 0 Aye.