

VIRGINIA:

A meeting of the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors was held in the Administrative Building of said county on Thursday, April 28, 2011.

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

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

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

PUBLIC INPUT

Greenvale Creek Update

Nick Ferriter stated he lives on Greenvale Creek and said he would like to give a quick update and status report. They have formed the Greenvale Creek Maintenance Association and with assistance from William Pennell, other county staff members, and Gene Underwood have pulled an application for dredging the sand in front of the creek. They have repaired a small breakwater that hopefully will help keep the sand from coming back into the creek.

Lindsay Trittipoe, Treasurer for the Greenvale Creek Maintenance Associate stated he has a home on Monaskon Road, is a user of Greenvale Creek and for many years kept his boat docked at his father-in-law's. They held an organizational meeting two weeks ago at the Ruritan Center and had approximately 50 people in attendance. He would again like to thank Mr. Pennell for his assistance in helping to guide the meeting.

He said Brian Barnes was extremely helpful with the process as well. They formed the Greenvale Creek Maintenance Association under the Virginia Non-Stock Corporate Act, it is non-profit, and an account was opened with a local bank in Lively and has raised \$6,000 toward the cost of dredging and believes another couple of thousand is on the way. The association has spent \$1,000 to repair the rotten sea wall at the head of the creek. The association will continue to accept contributions and believes they will get over \$10,000. The cost to dredge will be at least \$20,000. He said Jones Excavation estimated 1,000 cubic yard plus of sand to be removed. He stated according to VRMC and Army Corps of Engineers that if this work is not done within six month Greenvale Creek will be a salt pond. He asked Mr. Jenkins, District 1 Board of Supervisors Representative to put in the budget a matching grant since this is the only public boat landing in the county; however, they hope to raise the money.

Mr. Jenkins stated that the original agreement that Lancaster County Board of Supervisors signed with Game and Inland Fisheries was that Lancaster agreed they would be responsible for all maintenance to keep Greenvale Creek a viable boat ramp. It is the only public boat ramp and he will support the idea for the county to appropriate funds to help with this process.

Lloyd Hill, District 4 asked if he understood that the county will consider helping with Greenvale Creek project.

Mr. Beauchamp stated it would consider during the budget process, because it is the only public boat ramp in the county.

-

PRESENTATIONS

None

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Harper stated Sean Trapani sends his regards and said he enjoyed working with the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors and William Pennell over the years.

Road Paving and Maintenance

Mr. Harper said Lee Hy Paving will be repaving the east bound lanes between Kilmarnock and White Stone and VSH 688/James B. Jones Memorial Highway bypass. He stated plant mix by Lee Hy Paving has just been completed VSH 201/Lively to Miskimon for this year, VSH 222/Weems Road from VSH 200/Irvington Road to Weems and also be doing on the entire width of VSH 646/Old Salem Road. They will be starting milling and paving on Monday in the Town of Kilmarnock beginning by Tri-Star at the intersection of VSH 3 and VSH 200/Irvington Road continuing down to VSH 1036/Harris Drive. Work will also begin at VSH 604/Merry Point Road to get plant mix from VSH 3 to VSH 611/West Point Road. They just finished 12 miles of latex on secondary roads and surface treatments are scheduled to begin June 2011. He stated street sweeping will begin in the Towns of White Stone and Kilmarnock in June and mowing will also begin mid-June.

Mr. Geilich said VDOT had quite the response to the tornado aftermath that came though Foxwells and the community really appreciates the assistance.

Route 789/Hadlea Drive

Mr. Geilich said he believes that Route 789/Hadlea Drive was first priority on the pave in place list for this year and asked him to check on the status of this project.

Mr. Harper said a second car count was performed and Hadlea Drive does not meet the car count of 50 vehicles per day.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. FY 2012 Lancaster County Public Schools Budget – Mr. Larson presented the school budget for approval. He said the budget was heard at public hearing on April 28, 2011. There was one interested member of the general public suggested that the budget increase proposed was more than the consumer price index (CPI)

and that it should be held to no more than the CPI. All other comments were supportive of the budget as presented.

Operating Budget

Revenues:	Approved FY 11	Proposed FY 12	Difference
State Sources	\$ 3,158,703	\$ 3,035,252	\$ - 123,451
Federal Sources	\$ 988,437	\$ 1,324,830	\$ 336,393
Other Funds	\$ 186,696	\$ 186,696	\$ 0
County Funds	<u>\$10,256,808</u>	<u>\$10,399,939</u>	<u>\$ 143,131</u>
Total	\$14,590,644	\$14,946,717	\$ 356,073

Expenditures:

Instruction	\$11,138,197	\$11,562,464	\$ 424,267
Administration	\$ 762,581	\$ 872,238	\$ 109,657
Transportation	\$ 1,097,624	\$ 1,103,860	\$ 6,236
Ops & Maint.	\$ 1,398,846	\$ 1,398,846	\$ - 78,000
Debt Service	<u>\$ 193,396</u>	<u>\$ 87,396</u>	<u>\$ 106,000</u>
Total	\$14,590,644	\$ 14,946,717	\$ 356,073

School Cafeteria

Revenue

Food Sales	\$ 167,500	\$ 167,500	\$ 0
State	\$ 12,500	\$ 12,500	\$ 0
Federal	<u>\$ 400,000</u>	<u>\$ 400,000</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>
Total	\$ 580,000	\$ 580,000	\$ 0

Expenditures \$ 580,000 \$ 580,000 \$ 0

Susan Sciabbarrasi, Superintendent of Schools gave a quick recap by stating that all the school has met state accreditation. At the high school last year 46.5% graduated with advance diplomas and this current year 56% will graduate with advance diplomas. The high school drop out rate last year was 2.8% and the state average is 8.1%. We have one of the highest on time graduation rate and the lowest drop out rate in our area. She said the ADM last year was 1,260 and increased this year to 1,265. Last year they did not spend \$346,798 according to the audit, \$204,000 was because Virginia Retirement System delayed their last quarter payment plus an additional \$147,000 was unspent. She stated this year there was 1.5% step increase included in the budget and they have made reduction in the budget to cover the energy performance contract, so that payment is covered by the school and will come off the Capital Improvement Budget making a reduction of approximately \$2 million. However, there are some additional expenses from the State, the fees delayed by Virginia Retirement System (VRS) last year in the amount of \$204,000 but increased their percentage this year by \$159,000. She indicated the composite index increased by \$118,000. She stated the schools will receive \$278,000 and she is asking the county for a lump sum approval of \$10,426,506 in county funds with a total appropriation of \$15,608,291. She requested that the board consider an escrow account developed for unused fund balance earmarked for school use. She thanked the Board of Supervisors for their support over her four years and the support to Lancaster County Schools.

Dr. Russell congratulated Ms. Sciabbarrasi on the percentages of advance diplomas and low dropout rate and asked approximately how many graduates go on to higher education.

Ms. Sciabbarrasi said there are 96 students to graduate this year, 50 students will be attending a four year college/university, 22 students will be

attending a two year college, 7 will be attending trade schools, and 6 to employment.

Dr. Russell asked Ms. Sciabbarrasi to do a quick analysis of where the system is in terms of strength, weakness, opportunities, etc. What would be your opinion?

Ms. Sciabbarrasi stated the strength would certainly be the outstanding staff and obviously when you look at the percentage of on time graduation rate and low percentage of drop out and their always put in extra hours. The weakness would be the economy, because of the high composite index and the large percentage of students who are considered economically disadvantaged. However, because we have such excellent and dedicated parents who get involved, the school standards are high because of that interest.

Dr. Russell asked on a scale of 1 - 10 rates the physical condition of the school facilities.

Ms Sciabbarrasi said the schools are old which mean a larger maintenance and operational cost. She said the primary school is the older of the three schools which has some of the most difficulties, the high school because it was built as an open school meaning the all the rooms were extremely large, there would be a class of 25 – 30 students in each corner of the room. So, when there was renovation done at the high school, walls were put in dividing the classrooms and now some classrooms are very warm while others are very cold this is why the energy bills are so high. The schools have an excellent maintenance staff that keeps the school well maintained, however; there are some challenges that a costly. She believes the life of the primary and high schools are 15 – 20 years.

Dr. Russell stated one of the weaknesses was funding, will anything have been forgone this year because of funding.

Ms. Sciabbarrasi stated the cost of living (COL) over the last several years continue to increase, however; the salaries do not increase to match the COL.

Dr. Russell asked what would be the biggest challenges for the next superintendent.

Ms. Sciabbarrasi said the first year is always difficult because you have re-learned the new district. There are advantages because that individual could bring new ideas.

Chairman Beauchamp opened the public hearing.

George Bott, District 1, stated he looked at the budget as published in the Rappahannock Record for \$15,028,291 for FY 2012 for the 1,296 students projected which is an \$11,927 per student. He said from the FY 2011 school budget to the FY 2012 proposed school budget there is a 3% increase. The superintendent stated the cost of living is high, however; he disagrees as the congressional budget office projects no social security cost of living for 2010 – 2012. He said social security COLAs are based on cost of living increases. The Office of Management and Budget in February article said the COLA rate was 1.4% projected for next year. He believes the school budget should live within the cost of inflation. The Federal Reserve Board projection for cost of inflation is 1.5% which means the 3% increase to schools budget is 200% of that. The school's food budget is level funded and the fuel was only increased by .02%. He wanted to commend Ms. Sciabbarrasi because things were not good three or four years ago and she turned things around.

Mr. Jenkins said just a point of clarification he does notice that projected revenues are projected to increase next year by \$336,000 which is all federal funds. He asked Ms. Sciabbarrasi what was the purpose of those funds?

Ms Sciabbarrasi said those funds are for improvements at the primary school and the funds have been allocated for a specific purpose.

Charles Costello said if you take off the federal and state funding, the new funding is only \$100,000. He stated he compared Northumberland and Lancaster and had a number of questions, so he called Jack Larson. He said Mr. Larson answered all his questions and Ms. Sciabbarrasi returned his calls to answer questions and explain other details. Ms. Sciabbarrasi has done an excellent job and will be missed.

Lloyd Hill asked about the pending law suit that has been pending for two or three years, and how it would affect the school budget.

Mr. Pennell stated it would not affect the school budget; it would come back to the county.

Chairman Beauchamp closed the public hearing.

By consensus of the Board of Supervisors, they would meet Thursday, May 5, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. to make a decision on the proposed FY 2012 Lancaster County Public Schools Budget and also review the applications submitted for the position of County Administrator.

2. 2011 Decennial Census Redistricting – Mr. Pennell stated the Board of Supervisors previously appointed a committee of Lancaster County citizens to recommend a redistricting plan following the 2010 national census to ensure the population within the five districts remain within the allowable 5%± deviation, maintain two minority-majority districts and ensure that the districts maintain communities of interest.

Mr. Pennell said the committee members making this recommendation are:

Mr. Weston F. Conley – elected chairman of the group

Mr. Alexander McD. Fleet

Ms. Cornell M. Jackson

Mr. David E. Dew

Mr. Lloyd B. Hubbard, Jr.

Mr. William Lewis Lee

Mr. Pennell said the recommendation was approved unanimously.

Mr. Pennell said the demographic details of the recommended districts were provided to the board for their review. This public hearing is to take testimony from interested citizens and the committee recommended redistricting for 2011. If acceptable, adopt the ordinance describing the metes and bounds of the new district. Mr. Rowe was available to move census blocks to see how the numbers change. He said District 4 is currently at 54.1% minority population and was at 54.18% in 2001 and District 2 is currently at 55.1 % was at 59.1% in 2001. The reason is because Lancaster County a higher percentage of minority people who have left the county.

Mr. Jenkins asked Mr. Pennell to explain the 2011 Redistricting Plan and boundary as presented.

Mr. Pennell stated that the dark lines indicate the current and the bleed over of color is the proposed redistricting.

Mr. Jenkins asked why was Lancaster Shores taken from District 1 and moved into District 2. If Lancaster Shores was not taken what would the difference in deviation be.

Mr. Pennell said the justification for moving Lancaster Shores is because if it would have remained the same the deviation would have been at 49%.

Mr. Rowe stated if Lancaster Shore was move back into District 1 the numbers for District 2 would be 54.5 % with a deviation of over 5% threshold. With the inclusion of Lee Town back into District 1 the numbers will 54.17% in District 2.

Mr. Palin said making a comparison from 2001 – 2011 looking the percentage of whites in 2001 was 40.8% and minorities at 59.1% making that a difference of 411 people and 2011 whites were at 49% and minorities were at 55.1% making that a difference of 236 people which is a difference of 175 people over the course of 10 years.

Mr. Jenkins stated those three communities are communities of interest in District 1 not District 2.

Mr. Palin said if not for the 2001 redistricting he would not be sitting on the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Jenkins said that may be correct but could not understand why redistricting should split communities in half.

Mr. Palin said he does not want to see a percentage reduction of minorities in District 2 and he likes the proposed 2011 Redistricting Plan.

Dr. Russell said comparing Laurel Point and the part of Kilmarnock in his district what the total number of people was.

Mr. Pennell said he is losing whites but picking up minorities.

Dr. Russell stated the issue is not whether they are white or African Americans, rather the total number of people that would be affected. He stated he could live with 54%.

Chairman Beauchamp opened the public hearing.

Lloyd Hill, President of the Lancaster County NAACP, applauded the redistricting committee for maintaining the two minority-majority districts, however; he feels that the minority percentage should be higher. He said he read an article from the 1989-1990 redistricting case Taylor vs. Forrester the figure of 65% was a viable percentage. Maybe Dr. Russell can live with that, but this is for a ten year plan and someone else may not be able to live with those numbers at some other point in time. He wondering if this is the best plan that the Redistricting Committee could come up with to create the numbers that will make more of a minority-majority in District 2 and 4. He stated he also read that it was suggested that we use the voting age population (VAP) be used rather than the general census numbers. He was interested in knowing what the numbers were before in District 4 in 2001.

Mr. Pennell stated the minority-majority percentage was 54.1% in 2001.

Mr. Hill stated he would like to compare the numbers for 2001 to 2011 but because he does not have that information, he can not say if the county is regressing or progressing. He was interested in knowing whether the number of minorities was reduced in a district during the 2011 Redistricting when comparing the number to the 2001 Redistricting. He said District 3 has 90% majority and has 189 African Americans voters. He indicated that some of the minority from District 3 in the Churchill Beach area could be moved into District 4. He is interesting in getting the 185 that Dr. Russell indicated he was happy with now to a little higher number.

Dr. Russell said he never stated he was happy, but said he can live with the percentage of minorities in the proposed 2011 Redistricting Plan.

Mr. Jenkins said there has been 176 person decrease in the population; everyone needs to understand that a majority of that decrease was in the African American population.

Mr. Pennell said there was a lost of 74 African Americans from Lancaster County's population. The African American population is at 27% having a greater effect on the overall numbers.

Dr. Russell said District 4 lost a total of 34 people, while 11 of those were minorities. He indicated if Mr. Geilich was willing to give up people and be moved to District 4 he would be like to take them.

Mr. Jenkins said Churchill Beach could not be moved into District 4 because it would become an island.

Mr. Hill stated his main concerns were if this was the best possible redistricting plan and if the use of voting age population or general census. He spoke to Dr. Wilson, Norfolk State University Political Science Department Chair who drew up a plan in 2001. He use a computer program to create a plan closest to what the Justice Department guidelines, which should be 65% using the voting age population.

Mr. Pennell stated Dr. Wilson created a plan for the 1991 Redistricting law suit not 2001. He said the 2001 Redistricting Plan was submitted to the Justice Department, met all the guidelines and criteria and was approved. By having the percentage rate in the mid 50% for District 2 and District 4 is the best that can be done. We can not create people.

Mr. Hill said he was merely suggesting moving additional minority-majority to District 2 and District 4 bringing the percentage rate higher.

Rev. Gail Fowler stated she was a plaintiff in the 1991 Lancaster County Redistricting Plan law suit. She said she read about the proposed 2011 Redistricting Plan in the local paper and was very concerned with the numbers. When we pursued the 1991 case, it was made very clearly by the Justice Department that a district with less than 65% would make it very difficult for a minority to win and discourage others from running. She indicated she contacted Norfolk State University Political Science Department and asked them to take the proposed Lancaster County 2011 Redistricting Map and see if their computer program could make any improvements. It appears as if the proposed plan is based on general population and by law it should be based on voting aging population.

Mr. Jenkins said the 2001 Redistricting Plan was approved by the Department of Justice and he would like to know if this plan should actually be based on voting age population verses general census numbers.

Rev. Fowler suggested that the board review the order of the 1991 law suit and find out how the numbers should be used.

Mr. Pennell stated the board currently has two African American sitting on the board and the percentage rate was not at 65%.

Rev. Fowler provided the Board of Supervisors with a CD, map, and additional stats from the Norfolk State University Political Science Department. If the redistricting plan is done base on voting age population and not general census number there would be 54.9% in District 2 and 51.3% in District 4. She said the part of the Taylor vs. Forrester case was exactly this same point and the reason the county lost amongst other things was because their figures were not based on voting age population but should have been. She asked the Board of

Supervisors to please review the information provided by NSU. This county has been to court once before and if the plan is done in accordance with the legal procedures, in all likelihood the county will find itself in the same position again.

Dr. Russell stated his concern that the county does what is legally correct.

Mr. Beauchamp said without question the Justice Department approved the 2001 Redistricting Plan and the county is following the same procedure.

Rev. Fowler stated her major concerns for the proposed 2011 Redistricting Plan is that District 2 and District 4 remains minority-majority district with the highest possible percentage rate of minority. The Board of Supervisors and School Board have great representation and have made a difference in the two districts.

Dr. Russell said the congressional redistricting is based on general census not base on voting age population. Why would the county be any different, he believes that the county should do some research.

Mr. Pennell stated Donald Conaway and Mac Howard were both contacted by the Justice Department in 2001 for their input and opinion. The county attorney will be contacted for further review to ensure the correct procedure is being followed.

Mr. Jenkins said Lancaster County lost 176 people with 74 of them being minorities and if we go to the voting age population that would make the minority-majority percentage decrease.

Rev. Fowler stated there was no one available to represent the Lee Town community and hopefully someone will contact them prior to them being moved from one district to another.

Mr. Jenkins said they are already in District 1 and the only registered voter has supported him and introduced him at his church.

Rev. Fowler asked the Board of Supervisors to consider the points she has presented, the legal base, and review the information provided by NSU.

Chairman Beauchamp closed the public hearing.

Mr. Beauchamp asked what was the deadline to submit the 2011 Redistricting Plan to the Justice Department.

Mr. Pennell said tomorrow because the county was not given much time. He recommended would be to adopt the proposed 2011 Redistricting Plan as submitted in order to forward a working document to the County Attorney.

Mr. Jenkins stated he feels as if he is being forced to do something that he is not comfortable with. He would like to know if it should be based on voting age population rather than general census and research the 1991 law suit.

Dr. Russell agreed with Mr. Jenkins and believes research need to be done prior to the board adopting an ordinance to forward onto the county attorney.

Mr. Geilich said he can not believe the county did something wrong ten years ago. However, he agreed and believes that research should be done.

Mr. Pennell said the questions for the county attorney is what effect the 1991 settlement has on the existing redistricting and are we required to use the voting age population verses the general census numbers.

By consensus of the board they thanked Mr. Conley and the Redistricting Committee on a job well done and Glenn Rowe for his assistance with the mapping and technical support.

The board of supervisors agreed to consider these additional matters at the next meeting to adopt the school board budget.

CONSENSUS DOCKET

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

A. Minutes for March 31, 2011

Recommendation: Approve minutes as submitted

B. A. T. Wright School - Proclamation

Recommendation: Approve the following proclamation:

A. T. WRIGHT SCHOOL

WHEREAS, the Alumni of the A. T. Wright School of Lancaster County, Virginia are planning a reunion for Saturday, September 3, 2011; and

WHEREAS, Alumni of the A. T. Wright School have spread throughout the world to live out their lives as role models for those generations that succeed them; and

WHEREAS, the A. T. Wright School was an excellent example of an institution being able to overcome challenges it faced during difficult times;

WHEREAS, the citizens of Lancaster County are proud of the Alumni of the A. T. Wright School.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors proclaims September 3, 2011 as the A. T. Wright School Day in Lancaster County, Virginia; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors hopes the A. T. Wright School reunion allows the rekindling of old friendships and the making of new.

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

CONSIDERATION DOCKET

The Board considered the following items on its Consideration Docket:

1. Approval of April 2011 Salaries and Invoice Listings

Motion was made by Mr. Palin to approve the salaries for April 2011 in the amount of \$225,041.48* and Invoice Listings for April 2011 in the amount of \$645,489.62*.

*Judicial Center Expenses \$41,837.02

*Capital Improvements \$100,294.22

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

2. Contract Award – Lancaster County Administration Building Renovation – Mr. Larson asked the Board of Supervisors for consideration

Mr. Larson said there were three respondents to the initial request for proposals to renovate the old Deeds Room and the old Circuit Courtroom to accommodate newly planned uses for these two rooms. Two have done work for the County before. After reviewing the responses, it was necessary to meet with each to clarify the scope of work and to request best and final offers. The proposed cost for performing this work was as follows:

C.W. Walker Construction, LLC	\$34,805.04
Eagle River Construction, LLC	\$39,000.00
Connemara Construction	\$55,470.25

Mr. Larson stated all three were responsive offerors. Mr. Larson recommends awarding the contract to C.W. Walker Construction as the company who will perform the work successfully at the lowest bid price.

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to Award the contract to the lowest bidder C.W. Walker Construction, LLC in the amount of \$34,805.04.

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

BOARD REPORTS

Appointments

Historic Resource Commission

Mr. Palin made a motion to appoint Leon Laws, Sr. to the Historic Resources Commission to represent Lancaster County District 2 for a three-year term which ends April 30, 2014.

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

Wetlands Board

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to reappoint Edna Revere to the Wetlands Board to represent Lancaster County District 1 for a five-year term which begins July 1, 2011 and ends June 30, 2016.

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

Board of Zoning Appeals

Mr. Beauchamp made a motion to recommend reappointment for Thomas Richardson to the Board of Zoning Appeals to represent Lancaster County District 5 for a five-year term ending June 30, 2016.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Planning Commission Update

Mr. Gill stated the Planning Commission considered a rezoning of a 1 acre parcel on Irvington Road just outside of town limits of Kilmarnock from R-1 Residential General to the new R-4 Residential Community District. The applicant currently has a duplex on this 1 acre property and would to add a third unit. The only district that will allow that third unit is the new R-4 district. The new R-4 Residential community District was approved by this board on April 2009 as a replacement to the R-2 district. During the discussion at the Planning Commission public hearing on April 21, 2011, the R-4 would have the base density of two dwelling units per acre but can go up to three units if 10% of the total numbers of units are built in a range that is affordable to residents that falls between 80% - 120% of the median family income bases on the most recent HUD estimate for Lancaster County. The applicant's third dwelling unit along with the other two are being planned for Section 8 housing, by most estimates Section 8 will fall below the 80% median income guideline. The discussion at the Planning Commission was if applicants were eligible under Section 8 they should certainly fall below the 80% - 120%, however; the ordinance specifically that income must fall between 80% - 120% and Section 8 falls below 80% therefore not being allowed. Based on that fact the Planning Commission tabled the vote on that rezoning until May 2011 and requested that staff research an amendment to the ordinance, because it is not the intention of the ordinance to excluded lower income housing. Next month the Board of Supervisors may see the proposed amendment for R-4 prior to the public hearing for rezoning of that 1 acre parcel.

Mr. Jenkins encouraged each board member to read the new R-4 Community District ordinance clearly states you can go to higher density if you have housing that is affordable to the 80% - 120% range, but if you go to a higher density and having something affordable to someone at 60% range it is affordable for someone at the 80% the range. It is not exclusive and the intention should not be to exclude Section 8.

Blue Star Memorial Highway Marker Dedication

Mr. Pennell stated the Board of Supervisors has been invited to the unveiling of the Blue Star Memorial Highway marker dedication on Saturday, May 21, 2011 at 3:00 p.m.

Industrial Development Authority Name change Request

Mr. Pennell stated the Industrial Development Authority (IDA) met today and after some discussion they would like to change their name to Economic Development Authority (EDA). It is only a name change but it requires an ordinance to do so. Because citizens associate Industrial with heavy development, smokestacks, etc. and Economic Development would be more in tune with what the authority does, this request has merit. He asks the Board of Supervisors to authorize him to advertise a draft ordinance for public hearing at the May 26, 2011 meeting.

By consensus of the Board of Supervisors, the county administrator will advertise a draft ordinance for public hearing at the May 26, 2011 regular board meeting.

Dr. Russell stated one of the major things that will do for the county will be to increase the visibility and hopefully let the citizens know the doors are open and Lancaster County is interested in economic development. We are not only losing people but jobs and something needs to be done soon.

Budget Work Session Scheduled

Mr. Larson asked the board to establish a budget work session to hear the request from organizations asking for county funding. Many of the organization need to come before the board as they are requesting a sizable increase in funding.

By consensus of the board, the budget work session will be scheduled for Wednesday, May 18, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. in the Administrative Meeting Room.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins to adjourn to Thursday, May 5, 2011 at 5:30 p.m.

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