A SPECIAL BUDGET WORK SESSION OF THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAS HELD ON THE 2ND DAY OF APRIL IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND NINE OF OUR LORD IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 6:00 P.M.

IN RE: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Thomas W. Evelyn	Absent (arrived at 6:20 p.m.)
David M. Sparks	Present
James H. Burrell	Present
Stran L. Trout	Present
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Present

It was announced that Mr. Evelyn would be late because of a flat tire.

IN RE: BRENDA "SAM" SNYDER, DECEASED

Mr. Burrell moved that the Board consider adoption of a resolution in the April 13 Consent Agenda in recognition of the recently departed Brenda "Sam" Snyder. The members were polled:

Thomas W. Evelyn	Absent
David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: EARLY ABSENTEE VOTING

Chairman Davis indicated that General Registrar Gwen Ellyson had requested that the Board of Supervisors join her in opposing the Governor's amendment to a bill that would allow no-excuse in-person early voting in Virginia. He reported that the amendment would require the addition of staff and equipment, at the County's cost. He noted that Mrs. Ellyson had advised that the requirement would overwhelm the existing staff in her office, and would require additional staff for two to three weeks prior to each election.

Following discussion, the Board was in agreement to a letter being sent to the State Legislators advising that the Board was not opposed to the concept but to the cost that would have to be absorbed by already cash-strapped localities.

Assistant Financial Services Director Amy Stonebraker reported early estimates were that it would cost at least $3,100 (salary plus FICA) for this extra staffing.

IN RE: FY10 BUDGET

Mr. Sparks stated that the justifications included with the budget requests had been very helpful. Mr. Trout agreed, stating that he liked the new format. County Administrator John

Budesky explained that the new format was still a "work in progress" and staff would welcome feedback on how it could be improved.

Mr. Budesky reviewed the items on the "rolling agenda" for the budget work sessions and suggested that the Board get through as much as it could at each session and then pick up where it left off at the next meeting. He indicated that he had invited Financial Advisor Ted Cole to be present for the first session to review the Utilities budget and Debt.

IN RE: PUBLIC UTILITIES

It was noted that the most significant proposed change to the Utilities fees was the request to switch from quarterly billing to monthly billing. Mr. Dame confirmed that the proposed new fees did reflect an 8% across-the-board increase as called for in the Utilities *Pro Forma.*

Mr. Sparks asked about the reason for the change in billing. Mr. Dame explained that customers found it easier to pay a smaller routine monthly bill than a larger quarterly bill that was sometimes unexpected. He admitted that he had not yet done a cost analysis and knew that there would be a larger postage expense, but indicated that with the new radio read meters, readings could be completed in a half a day and an advantage was that the revenue would be in the bank and earning interest sooner. Mr. Budesky added that it was also a customer service improvement because monthly readings would result in finding leaks quicker which would be a cost savings for both the customer and the County. Mr. Dame stated that it would also help with collection of unpaid accounts as it would result in earlier billings for customers who had moved. He reported that his staff was aggressively seeking to collect some delinquent accounts and was having some success.

Mr. Sparks commented that he felt that it would make more work for County staff and would be more costly, and asked Mr. Dame to do a financial analysis and share that information with the Board.

Mr. Burrell approved of the change and thought it would be easier for the customer.

It was confirmed that utility customers were able to pay their bills online with a service charge.

There was discussion regarding the County's lack of authority to place a lien on a property for an unpaid utility bill. Mr. Dame indicated that the County had tried repeatedly to have the General Assembly add New Kent to the list of localities with that authority, but had not yet been successful. It was confirmed that those liens could only be placed when it was the owner of the property who was the user, and not a tenant. Mr. Dame indicated that he would continue to push for that change in legislation.

There was discussion regarding the *ad valorem* tax in the Bottoms Bridge Service District (BBSD). It was confirmed that the *ad valorem* tax was revenue that went directly to the Utility Fund and was computed on the value of the property, as determined by the Commissioner of the Revenue, and further that property owners in the BBSD paid the extra tax instead of sewer availability fees.

Mr. Budesky reviewed that there were no new utility positions recommended for FY10. He added that, like all other departments, there were no wage increases for utility workers and increases in health insurance premiums would be absorbed by the County and not passed on to the employees. He indicated that when the Parham plant expansion was completed and operating seven days a week, there would be a need for two additional operators, but that would not be in FY10.

Mr. Evelyn asked about the increase in the fuel budget. Mr. Dame explained that utility staff was responding to calls all over the County and although they tried to coordinate trips as best as they could, they had to respond in a timely manner. He indicated that they had been "caught short" in their current fuel budget, and it cost $25,000 for one fill-up of their 10,000 gallon tank. He reported that their diesel fuel consumption was less than expected because the generators did not use as much as they projected.

Mr. Dame also reported that bids had been received on the tractor and backhoe whose purchase had been previously approved by the Board and the costs were less than what had been estimated, and staff would be asking the Board for an award on an upcoming Consent Agenda.

Mr. Davis asked if there was any stimulus funding for the purchase of hybrid vehicles. Mr. Budesky advised that an analysis had been performed and with a seven-year breakeven point, it did not make sense financially for the County to spend the extra money for hybrid vehicles, although it "would make sense if it got them for free" with stimulus funds.

There was discussion regarding the SCADA system. Mr. Dame explained that with the SCADA system, staff could constantly monitor by computer what was going on in all of the wells and would not have to visit them every day. He indicated that with the SCADA system, conditions were often flagged even before alarms were activated and equipment could then be fixed before problems occurred and permanent damage sustained.

Mr. Trout asked about the status of the Parham plant expansion. Mr. Dame reported that the project would be advertised for bid in May. There was discussion regarding stimulus funding. Assistant County Administrator Bill Whitley reported that the State Water Control Board was expected to make final decisions during its April 27-28 meeting and staff planned to have an update for the Board at its April 29 work session.

Mr. Budesky mentioned a previous inquiry from Mr. Sparks regarding the need to maintain the 8% annual increase in utility rates. He reported that the Utilities Pro Forma was based on 8% yearly increases in the rates and until the Utility fund was to the point where connection and availability fees had increased and, most certainly for FY10, it was important to continue with that rate of increase so that the young utility system would not need support from the General Fund.

Mr. Cole reported that there were some positive things that had developed, one of which was that the utility system had less debt than had been anticipated, and another being that the expansion project would be advertised at a time of lower-than-expected bids, which would require less borrowing. On the negative side, he noted that a new system was always very dependent on connection and availability fees to help with operations because user fees were not sufficient to pay operation expenses and debt service. He indicated that, working with staff, they had always tried to be conservative when making growth assumptions and had scaled them back where appropriate. He very strongly recommended that the County continue on the projected increase schedule, adding that maybe in a couple of years as projects came online and connection fees picked up, then perhaps the rate increase could be scaled back.

Mr. Sparks asked if revenues from the Reclaimed Water project were in the proposed FY10 budget. Staff explained that no anticipated revenue from the project was in the budget, but the construction costs for the project was in the CIP, but not the debt service because it would not start in FY10.

Mr. Sparks commented that it looked likely that the Reclaimed Water project would receive some stimulus money but reminded that the Board had not yet decided to do the project. Mr. Budesky indicated that it was anticipated that more information would be available by the April 29 work session. He reminded that if the Board decided not to proceed with the project, it would in effect be telling three County businesses that their water would be shut off in three years. Mr. Sparks asked if that same message was being conveyed to every golf course in the State. Mr. Budesky responded that those in the Eastern Virginia Groundwater Management Area who had groundwater withdrawal permits coming up for renewal were being advised that as of 2011 they would not be able to use groundwater to irrigate.

He reported that staff was working on an analysis to bring to the Board at the April work session that would reflect whether the project made sense and identify the risks. There was discussion regarding potential reclaimed water customers and storage issues. Mr. Budesky added that DEQ had indicated that the businesses might be able to use their wells for back-up if there was not enough reclaimed water. Mr. Dame indicated that New Kent had joined a nutrient bank whereby it would be able to annually lease discharge credits to localities who were not meeting their discharge limits. It was also reported that a golf course from James City County had approached New Kent about the possibility of obtaining reclaimed water, and the golf course at the Farms of New Kent had also expressed some interest. Mr. Dame explained that after 2012, there would be no increase in the discharge loading limits allowed in the Chesapeake Bay and a Reclaimed Water system in New Kent would likely fill a regional need as well as serve as an incentive for potential businesses. He described it as a lucrative undertaking with phenomenal potential, but added that if the County used stimulus funding for the project, then it had to be careful not to overcharge customers.

As an aside, Mr. Dame reported that he and Economic Development Consultant Mark Kilduff had recently met with a hotel developer who commented that it had been watching New Kent and was impressed with its master plan, the way that the Board was proactively promoting business development, and the fact that utility infrastructure had been “put in the right places”.

IN RE: DEBT SERVICE

Mr. Budesky reviewed a handout detailing the balances in all of the various funds and advised that with the current lower interest earnings of around 2%, he had asked Mr. Cole to analyze whether the County should give up some of its liquidity to pay off some higher interest debt. He also reported that the Economic Development Authority (EDA) had recently paid off its note of $721,508.50 on the purchase of the Fisher property.

Mr. Cole indicated that he had identified three potential loans that could be paid off. The first was a 2005 loan with BB&T on the Vehicle Maintenance Facility, which had an interest rate of 3.76%, and ran until 2020. He indicated that the loan could not be paid off until August 1, 2009, at which time there would be additional interest and a 1% prepayment penalty. If the Board chose to pay off that loan, then it would save the yearly debt service payment of $215,000 beginning in FY10.

The second loan for consideration was a 2007 borrowing from Citizens & Farmers Bank (C&F) for the Human Services Building at an interest rate of 3.98% which ran through 2027.

He indicated that this loan could be prepaid at any time, in full or in part, without penalty. He reported that if the Board chose to pay off the entire balance of $2.7 million, it would save $215,000 a year in debt service payments, or could pay off only $1.9 million, saving $150,000 in debt service payments and leaving a balance of $65,000 to pay going forward.

The third was a 2008 loan with RBC that was used for school roof improvements and to refinance some prior loans, at a 1.988% interest. He noted that there was a 1% pre-payment penalty, and although that was the lowest interest rate of the three loans, it would give more immediate cash flow relief in the amount of $430,000 in debt service savings.

He reflected that on a purely economic basis, paying off the loan with C&F would "give you more bang for the buck" because it was the highest rate, had no prepayment penalty and had the longest term; however, on a cash flow basis, prepayment of the RBC loan was the best.

Mr. Budesky indicated that considering the fund balance and the funds recently received from the EDA, it made sense to pay off debt. He suggested possible funds that could be used were those in the Revenue Sharing Fund which had a little more than $1 million, but cautioned that in the event the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) later came up with program money as a match, then New Kent would no longer have the funds for projects. Additionally, in the event localities were required to assume responsibility for public roads, then New Kent would have no funds and would have to "start from scratch".

There was discussion regarding transportation funding. Mr. Budesky advised that he was not aware of any stimulus funding for transportation projects in New Kent. Mr. Trout agreed, stating that New Kent had few qualified collector roads that would be eligible.

Mr. Budesky also suggested that the Board could use some of the funds collected from meals tax fund balance to pay off debt.

He indicated that it would be the Board's decision whether it wanted to maintain cash liquidity to pay off some higher interest rate loans, or allocate it elsewhere. He clarified that he was not asking the Board to make that decision at the meeting but to decide on its end goal. He pointed out that there was no "one-time money" used to balance the proposed FY10 budget because all of the County's shortfalls had been covered by cuts. He reviewed that if the Board's goal was to pay off the highest interest rate loan, then that would be the loan with C&F, but if it wanted to free up as much cash as possible, then it would make sense to pay off the loan with RBC. Mr. Cole added that it was unclear as to when interest rates would return to the 4 – 5% level, but reminded that the fund balances were "cash in the bank" and would be difficult to build back up once they were spent, especially with budgets continuing to get tighter.

There was discussion regarding New Kent's ability to borrow and whether fund balances were necessary to maintain bond ratings. Mr. Cole reported that New Kent was close to the limit on its debt policy, which was based on how much of its budget went to debt service, but he felt comfortable that if the County used its cash on hand to reduce overall debt which would result in a sustained benefit and then later found that it had a need for funds, there would not be a problem and New Kent would likely get rates similar to those in a recent borrowing in Halifax of 3.785% to 4.5%.

Mr. Trout expressed his concern that no one knew what was going to happen and the County might wind up having to borrow at a much higher rate or not be able to borrow anything.

Mr. Sparks stated that it made sense to pay off a higher interest rate loan when the funds were only earning 2%, but the Board needed to think things through carefully. He asked if it would be possible to make a partial payment on the RBC loan. Mr. Cole advised that he didn't know but he thought the question would be how a partial payment would be applied, and his sense was that the loan would be re-amortized.

Mr. Davis indicated he thought the RBC loan should be paid off because it was a lien on a building that was 80 years old and unoccupied. He stated that if "someone came in and wanted to do something" with the historic school property, a lien might be a hindrance.

Mr. Evelyn asked about plans for the extra cash if one of the loans were paid off. Mr. Davis stated that it would be needed next year. Mr. Trout commented that the only reason he could see was to have money for cash flow over the next couple of years. Mr. Budesky stated that the extra funds could be put towards ongoing expenses, or it could be put in the Fund Balance or the capital account. Mr. Evelyn stated that it would need to be made clear how it was going to be used.

Mr. Budesky advised that one of the recommendations was to use $2.7 million from the Fund Balance, but he would be comfortable recommending paying off $1.9 million in loans which would leave some money in the Fund Balance. He repeated that the Board did not have to decide at this meeting how those savings would be used. Responding to Mr. Sparks as to what he would recommend, he stated that if it was the Board's goal to free up cash, then he would recommend paying off the RBC loan, but if it wanted to pay off the highest interest loan, then it should pay off a portion of the C&F loan.

Mr. Davis stated that two of the loans were on new buildings, one of which was producing income, and he felt that the County should pay off the loan that would release the lien on the historic school property. Mr. Trout stated that he did not think it made a difference. Mr. Sparks agreed with Mr. Davis that the loan on the school property should be the one paid off.

Mr. Davis asked about the status of the deed on the historic school property. County Attorney Jeff Summers reported that the survey had been completed and the deed could now be prepared for the School Board to convey the property to the County. He added that there was always the possibility of substituting collateral for the loan that encumbered the school property in the event that was needed.

Mr. Cole indicated that he would look into whether RBC would accept a partial prepayment, if it would waive prepayment penalties, and how the pay off would be applied, and would have the additional information for the Board prior to its next budget work session.

Mr. Trout said that he had a concern as to how the county would use the possible $429,000 in debt service savings if it paid off the RBC loan.

There was more discussion regarding interest earnings and loan rates. Mr. Cole stated that it had made sense for the County to borrow the money when it did, and it made sense now to use the Fund Balance to pay off loans and get a sustainable benefit rather than use the money to plug gaps and still have the debt. He stated that the County would begin to see the benefits of a pay-off in FY10.

Mr. Burrell stated that he was ready to make a decision tonight.

Mr. Budesky reviewed the proposed budget schedule which included a public hearing on April 29. Mr. Sparks questioned the necessity of having the public hearing so soon. Mr. Budesky explained the reasons and advantages of following the proposed budget schedule.

Mr. Budesky summarized that it made sense to pay off $1.9 million in debt. Mr. Trout agreed that it made sense and it would give the Board some flexibility. Mr. Sparks repeated that he wanted the additional information from Mr. Cole. Mr. Evelyn stated that if the Board wanted to pay off $1.9 million in debt, then he would want a decision made on how the money would be used before he made his decision.

IN RE: FEES

The Board reviewed the proposed Fee Schedule. It was noted that the only increase in fees were for utilities. Mr. Davis reminded staff that the fees for burial of animals and fowl needed to be removed because the County did not provide those services.

Mr. Budesky pointed out that the fees marked with an asterisk under Building Permits, Land Planning and Zoning were those that would be waived or refunded for business or commercial development under the recent Economic Development Initiatives adopted by the Board. He reported that Parks & Recreation fees were not new fees but were being added to the Schedule as they had not been included in the past. Staff clarified that the Business-Professional-Occupational License (BPOL) charges were actually taxes and not fees and therefore would not be in the Fee Schedule. Mr. Budesky clarified that the new BPOL rates would become effective on January 1, 2010 and not on July 1, since they were based on the calendar year and not the fiscal year.

There was discussion regarding the legal review fee of $1,500. Mr. Summers explained that in the past, when documents such as homeowners' association (HOA) declarations needed to be reviewed, they were sent to outside counsel who would charge in the neighborhood of $3,000. He indicated that the legal review charge covered his review of documents that were often 34 to 40 pages and his resulting comment letter that averaged 13 to 20 pages. He admitted that larger developers normally had attorneys familiar with the proper language, but smaller developers tended to use lawyers who didn't know how to properly draft these kinds of documents. He indicated that when the HOA was turned over to the residents, the Board should not want them coming to the County because the documents were incorrectly drawn up.

Mr. Davis commented that it seemed the County was charging a developer for something that wasn't even required. Mr. Summers confirmed that the County did not require HOAs, but did require a deeded right-of-way that had to belong to some entity, and that was often an HOA.

Mr. Davis asked about road maintenance agreements. Mr. Summers indicated that he had never seen one of those since he came to work for the County.

Mr. Evelyn stated that he felt that the fee was too high or even unnecessary. He added that County ordinances required that if there were at least three houses on a road, then the road had to be taken into the State system for maintenance. Mr. Summers corrected that the ordinance only required that the road be built to State standards. Mr. Evelyn asked about the road bond that developers had to post. Mr. Summers indicated that calling a bond on a road was not "fast, cheap, or easy" and had not been done during his tenure.

Mr. Summers summarized that the purpose of the review fee was to pay for the County's Attorney to spend up to two to three days, eight hours a day, to review and comment on some other attorney's work, and that there would be no guidance if he did not make comments.

Mr. Davis stated that the County was not paying Mr. Summers to work for another lawyer. Mr. Summers responded that the Board did ask him to fix the problem and if he didn't tell the developer's attorney what was wrong with the documents, then the situation would be just as frustrating to the developer.

Mr. Evelyn asked why the reviews weren't being done by Planning or Zoning staff. Mr. Summers explained that it was not a zoning or planning issue and was a very complex task, and when residents complained to the Board, then the Board would look to him as to why this had been allowed to happen.

Mr. Evelyn asked if the roads were the main issue. Mr. Summers stated that roads were one area of concern and if a road was not turned over to the State, then often the HOA was responsible for its maintenance.

Mr. Sparks asked Mr. Evelyn if his concern was that Mr. Summers was doing these reviews or the amount of the fee. Mr. Evelyn admitted that it was both and he would like to look at some of the documentation. Mr. Summers indicated that he would be glad to show Mr. Evelyn the files and explain some of the issues, at which time it would be clear that roads were just minor issues.

Mr. Sparks asked if Mr. Evelyn would be more comfortable with an hourly rate. Mr. Summers responded that the fee could run to $3,000 to $4,000 if it were billed on an hourly rate.

Mr. Evelyn stated that he felt that County ordinances took care of the problem and he did not see the need for the review or fee.

There was discussion regarding some of the roads in Brickshire that had still not been accepted into the State system. Mr. Budesky reported that the roads in question were being fixed so that they could be accepted. He indicated that there were several instances in the past few years where a developer had not properly constructed roads in subdivisions which had resulted in problems with accessibility by school buses.

Mr. Trout asked if Mr. Summers' review and comments created a liability for the County. Mr. Summers explained that he did not tell a developer that his documents were approved, just that the County did not have any objections. He indicated that the items that were often commented upon were legal deficiencies, as well as other things he "stumbled over", such as misspellings.

Mr. Summers clarified that he did not re-write the documents, and again confirmed that the County did not require an HOA agreement. He went on to say that sometimes these organizations were "designed to fail", which would result in the amenities and road not being maintained.

Mr. Trout commented that it appeared that it might be in the best interest of the County to have good agreements in place, as they took forever to fix. He also asked if HOA documents were legally binding once recorded. Mr. Summers reviewed that declarations, covenants and restrictions were recorded in the land records, while bylaws and articles of incorporation were filed with the State Corporation Commission. He explained that often the things that went wrong were in the bylaws and articles of incorporation that dealt with fees and powers, and once the documents were filed, it took 100% of the residents to effect a change or correction.

The Board members did not voice any other objections over the proposed Fee Schedule. They took a break until 8 p.m. when the meeting was resumed.

IN RE: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN (CIP)

Mr. Budesky explained that every year the Board was asked to adopt its CIP budget, which was part of a larger, five-year Plan. He indicated that each year staff reviewed and made recommendations as to what should be in the CIP budget, and the next year they started the process by looking at what was left over and then developed a CIP budget around needs and funding. He reported that for FY10, they had to substantially reduce what was in the CIP and staff was recommending that the Board adopt a CIP budget of around $1.4 million. He noted that revenue sources included about $1.198 million from the General Fund and the remainder was from proffers and the enterprise funds. He indicated that over $11 million in projects were considered, and those that did not make it into the recommended budget would either be delayed to future years or be spread out over a number of years. He noted that one of those was the new elementary school which had been bumped back to 2013/2014. He pointed out that computers and vehicles were now in the CIP, which allowed staff to do a better job of planning for replacement. He reported that General Services would be assuming the management of all County-owned buildings, which should help with operations.

He reviewed some of the projects in the proposed CIP budget which included an obstruction study and replacement of a well at the Airport (combination of federal, state and local funding), some fire station improvements, ambulance replacement, Battalion 1 vehicle replacement, IT switches, Parks and Recreation facility improvements, Schools, Vehicles, Equipment, Computers, and for Public Utilities a small mower for the pump stations.

He reviewed that the Parks and Rec projects included meals tax funding to purchase land and remove trees for a parking lot expansion at Quinton Community Center; $50,000 for Criss Cross Park (a decrease from $250,000) for work to be committed at a future date; and funding for some improvements at the Wahrani Nature Trail.

School projects included $225,000 to cash fund the purchase of three buses and one drivers' education car, and a radio upgrade.

Replacement of vehicles included five for the Sheriff's Office, one each for Community Development, Fire Department and Utilities, and two for Social Services.

Other equipment funding included a mobile file cabinet for the Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court and new voting equipment.

There was an inquiry regarding the proposed lease/purchase of a Utilities' dump truck when funds for a purchase had been in last year's CIP budget. The Board was reminded that it had recently approved those funds being spent on a backhoe and tractor instead.

IN RE: AGENCIES

Mr. Budesky reviewed that most agency funding had been reduced by 10% across-the-board, except for those funded according to formulas. He confirmed that the proposed reductions had been shared with the affected agencies and to date concerns had been expressed by Meals on Wheels and the Heritage Public Library, but he expected there would be more. He indicated that all agencies were feeling the same “crunch” as local governments, but that staff wanted a process that was equitable and consistent and had decided on the 10% reduction. He reminded that the Board could make changes, but it might put the Board in an awkward position if it “did for some and not for others”. He indicated that other localities had made more dramatic cuts in agency funding, but that the Budget Team had been able to develop a balanced budget with a 10% cut. He reported that additional information had been requested from Providence Forge Volunteer Rescue Squad, but had not yet been received.

Mr. Sparks stated that he felt funding for Meals on Wheels should be restored to its current level or even increased, commenting that residents needed that service “now more than ever” and pointing out that there were many New Kent residents who used their personal time and resources to deliver meals.

Mr. Trout stated that he would need to see some justification before he agreed to that proposal, as he had concerns about “changing one without opening the door to others”.

Mr. Evelyn, Mr. Davis, Mr. Burrell and Mr. Sparks all agreed that funding for Meals on Wheels should be restored to $3,500.

Mr. Trout suggested that someone should follow up with James River Development Corporation as he thought there had been some changes in that entity.

Mr. Sparks complained that a one-time funding to the Heritage Library for equipment had been carried forward in subsequent years and he brought it up every year and would keep reminding the Board of that fact. Mr. Budesky indicated that the Library had sent in a letter with their concerns about the proposed allocation and how it was below what was recommended by the State, and he predicted the Board would continue to hear those concerns. Mr. Trout brought up the possibility of including what New Kent paid towards the Library’s lease as part of the local match to capitalize on matching State funding. Mr. Budesky advised that was a good point and he would check with the Library.

IN RE: SUMMARY

Mr. Budesky reviewed that Financial Advisor Ted Cole would check on the possibility of a partial pay-off of the RBC loan as well as whether RBC would waive the prepayment penalty; Mr. Evelyn and Mr. Summers would get together to review documentation on the legal review fee; funds would be taken from the contingency account to restore funding for Meals on Wheels to its current level; Mr. Trout would follow up with James River Development Corporation; and he would follow up with the Library on the lease amount being included in the local match.

He reported that the agenda for the next budget work session would include staffing, the General Fund and School funding, and whatever else that the Board wanted to review.

Mr. Sparks asked about updates on the stimulus funding. Mr Budesky advised that information would be available prior to the public hearing on April 29.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Sparks moved to adjourn the meeting. The members were polled:

David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.