THE REGULAR WORK SESSION OF THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAS HELD ON THE 24th DAY OF APRIL IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND THIRTEEN IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 9:00 A.M.

---

IN RE: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order.

---

IN RE: ROLL CALL

| | |
|---|---|
| Thomas W. Evelyn | Present |
| C. Thomas Tiller, Jr. | Present |
| James H. Burrell | Present |
| Ron Stiers | Present |
| W. R. Davis, Jr. | Present |

All members were present.

---

IN RE: JOINT WORK SESSION WITH THE SCHOOL BOARD

School Board Chair Leigh Quick called the School Board meeting to order. Other School Board members present were Brett Marshall, Sarah Barber, Dean Simmons and Gail Hardinge. School Board staff present included Dr. Robert F. Richardson, School Superintendent, and Ralph Westbay, Director of Finance and Budget.

Mrs. Quick remarked that one of the things that put the two Boards "at odds" was the School Board's legal obligation to produce a budget of need. She advised that in order to adjust its budget to meet the proposed reduction of $647,402 in funding, the School Board had looked at unfunded mandates and the projected growth in student enrollment of 110 students for FY14, and had developed a list of cuts they would have to make. She advised that she was most concerned about the impact to pupil/teacher ratio, and the elimination of courses and textbooks.

She reviewed that the reduced funding would result in the elimination of a Kindergarten growth position. She explained that the School Board never knew for sure what enrollment would be and have had to add a new Kindergarten teacher every year for the past couple of years, and a request for supplemental appropriation might result if Kindergarten enrollment was greater than acceptable levels.

She identified additional class stipends as another item that would be eliminated, which would result in classes not being offered since stipends were mandated when teachers were required to teach additional classes.

She advised that the restoration of a Health/PE elementary teacher eliminated in FY12 would have to be cut, as well as a High school math teacher, which she felt was the most critical cut as it would result in a reduced number of dual enrollment classes and increased pupil/teacher ratios.

She indicated that they would have to eliminate some Special Education teachers, who already had more students than they should, pointing out that Federal and State funding for Special Ed had been decreasing but localities were required to maintain their spending levels.

She identified other items to be eliminated as a computer technician position and substitute teachers.

She indicated that the Science textbook adoption, which was already a year behind, would have to be delayed again, which could affect Standards of Learning (SOL) scores. Other items to be impacted were identified to be school based supplies, transportation fuel and parts, facility grounds keeping, and equipment replacement.

Mrs. Quick commented that the School Board understood that unfunded mandates were not just impacting the schools, but they felt that youth should be a priority and everyone benefited when children were educated.

Mr. Simmons remarked that New Kent Schools had cut its budget for the last four years, in spite of increasing enrollment, and that other school divisions were losing students and finding it easier to cut spending.

Mr. Evelyn asked if the proposed cuts were based on priority. Mrs. Quick clarified that they were not based on priority, but were the things that were not mandated.

Mr. Burrell expressed concerns about the elimination of the high school math teacher, noting the low rankings of U. S. students in the fields of math and science.

Mr. Davis pointed out that two-thirds of the revenue from new growth was proposed to be given to the Schools, although growth was also affecting County services. He noted that the Board of Supervisors would have to raise the real estate tax rate by six or seven cents in order to fully fund the Schools budget request, adding that "no one on this side of the table wants to do that". He remarked that although he felt the Schools had a "tight budget", the County had its own mandates and it was "tough all around".

There was discussion regarding the costs of Special Education and how the Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) office helped save money in that area. Ms. Hardinge agreed that was a good example of the partnership between the County and the Schools, and spoke about how they needed to partner in as many areas as possible. She spoke about how the success of its students and programs reflected how the School Board "had done a lot with what it had been given" over the years and was "doing the best it could with what it had", and they wanted the County to understand how the cuts would impact them. She indicated that they had to fund what was required and obviously they did not want their students using textbooks with outdated content, and spoke about how difficult it was to find math teachers.

Dr. Richardson reminded that the School Board had drastically reduced its health insurance costs by becoming self-insured. Mr. Davis advised that he had asked the County Administrator to look at a similar program for County employees.

Mr. Stiers noted that $380,000 was requested for four new school buses for FY14 and asked if the School Board could extend the use of the buses by another year. Dr. Richardson explained that the 15-year replacement cycle was a guideline and not a mandate; however, if they were to go beyond this and put a 16-year old bus on the road on a regular route, there was potential for injuries and liability. He indicated that those guidelines were based on federal highway safety standards, and that would be a safety risk for the students as well as liability risks for the County and School Board, and he felt it would be ill-advised to use that as an area to save money.

Chairman Davis commented that the School Board was doing its job and the Board would take everything into consideration. The School Board meeting was adjourned at 9:33 a.m.

---

IN RE: FIRE-RESCUE

Fire Chief Richard Opett reported on call statistics and staffing.

He noted a "startling" 30% increase in call volume in the current quarter, pointing out that only 11% were calls from interstate. He advised that EMS calls were their highest demand at 76% overall in 2011, 2012 and 2013. He indicated that he did not know if other localities were experiencing the same spike in EMS calls but would check and report back. He pointed out that two weeks earlier, they had 78 calls in one week and 18 times they had no available units. He explained that EMS calls took an average of three hours, and sometimes two ambulances were required on an Advanced Life Support (ALS) call. He did report some good news - revenue recovery would exceed what was projected for FY13.

He reviewed a three-year call type comparison that reflected that EMS calls were steady in 2011 and 2012, but spiked in 2013, with a 16% increase in EMS and a 28% increase overall.

He went over station quarterly reports, which showed a 6% increase at Station 1; a 16% increase at Station 2; a 55% increase at Station 3, and a 12% decrease at Station 4 (attributed to non-staffing). He indicated that the statistics for the calls answered by Black Creek/Station 12 were not included, and he felt the spike in calls answered by Station 2 were a result of the high number of wrecks on Route 60 in Bottoms Bridge.

He reviewed staffing plans for 2014 through 2018, as well as non-funded mandates from the National Fire Protection Agency (NFPA) and the Occupational Safety and Health Agency (OSHA). He explained that NFPA called for a minimum of four individuals in the initial stages of an incident in the hazardous area at a working structure fire, and that New Kent could currently only provide two. He indicated he was aiming for compliance and reducing the liability risk, and advised that OSHA standards echoed those of the NFPA.

He reported that the Insurance Services Office (ISO) ratings were based on manpower, level of training, equipment, availability of water and dispatching capabilities. He remarked that New Kent needed to "get a hold on this" because it impacted all residents. He explained that 50% of the rating was based on the department, 40% on water availability, and 10% on dispatching service. He noted that the ratings ranged from 10 to 1, with 1 being the best, and that New Kent had a 10/7 rating – the worst a locality could have. He reviewed that staffing was a problem; training he was building; availability was a struggle as two calls "put us out"; and strides were being made with dispatching.

Chief Opett reviewed current staffing levels and six options for the Board to consider.

He advised that he currently had 15 full-time staff with four full-time administrative positions, together with 14 part-time staff, a number that would be affected by the Affordable Care Act (ACA). He indicated that funding was currently broken down into $826,000 for full-time and $245,000 for part-time. He reported that Station 1 was fully staffed on all shifts; Station 2 was staffed Monday through Friday in the daytime, with reliance on part-time and volunteers for the rest of the time; Station 3 was fully staffed on all shifts; and Station 4 was staffed for one shift only (10 days a month).

Option 1 would add two additional staff, which would provide an extra 10 days coverage at Station 4. He advised that cost for full-time would rise to $890,000 and part-time would rise to $260,000.

Option 2 would add four additional staff, and would allow staffing for all shifts at Station 4. Full-time cost would be $955,000 and part-time would drop to $200,000.

Option 3 would add six additional full-time positions and would staff 10 days at Station 2. Cost for full-time would be at $1.02 million and part-time would drop to $167,000.

Option 4 would add eight additional full-time positions and would staff another 10 days at Station 2 (for a total of 20 days), at $1.08 million for full-time and $145,000 for part-time.

Option 5 would add ten additional positions, and cover all shifts at Station 2, with all stations being covered 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, at a cost of $1.15 million in full-time and $89,000 for part-time.

Option 6 would add twelve additional positions, allowing for a full-time Fire Marshal and a Deputy Chief of Operations, at a cost of $1.25 million for full time and $45,000 for part-time.

He advised that his goal was to add 46 positions over the next five years in order to be compliant, a plan which took into account two additional fire stations to handle increased call volumes in Bottoms Bridge and at the Vineyards. It was noted that cost estimates did not include benefits, but just raw labor. It was reported that a firefighter position cost around $60,000 a year, including benefits.

Mr. Burrell asked about equipment for the new positions. Chief Opett reported that his department would eventually need new equipment, but he felt they could get by with what they had and it would give him some time to “build some depth in the CIP” until we see some positive income”.

There were questions about why the County needed two fire marshals. Chief Opett explained that the Fire Marshals remained busy with plan reviews and building inspections, but both were also medics and ran calls when needed. He predicted that demand on the Fire Marshal’s office would continue to increase with growth in the County.

Mr. Tiller reported that he had received positive comments on the Chief and his job performance.

Board members thanked the Chief for his “good report”.

---

IN RE: ERP NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Before the Board for consideration was a request to approve a contract for ERP Needs Assessment Services and an appropriation for additional funds.

Assistant County Administrator Jonathan Stanger reviewed that the Board had previously been requested to approve a contract with BerryDunn for services identified as Task 1, and the Board had asked Staff to look at those services identified as Task 2. He reported that staff had further negotiated with BerryDunn after realizing that Task 2 would not result in a deliverable, and were now asking that a part of Task 3 be included, which involved providing a functional requirements matrix that would be included in any Request for

Proposals that might be issued. The Board's concern about potential change orders had been addressed with the vendor and it had been made clear that would not occur and that the proposed contract would get the County what it needed to make a decision.

Staff pointed out that this was actually a better price than what had been initially proposed.

Mr. Stanger explained that this would get the County to the point where it could decide if it wanted to handle the remainder of the tasks in-house or hire someone to do this "complex procurement", and he felt this would "give us a good idea of what we need" and the County would have a basis upon which to make a determination. Mr. Hathaway agreed, stating that he felt that Task 3 was one of the more important parts of the process as it would lay out the technical needs.

Financial Services Director Mary Altemus estimated that the process would take between three and six months.

County Attorney Michele Gowdy clarified that this was not a fixed priced contract as there was an option where the vendor could charge more.

Mr. Stanger confirmed that he was comfortable that the contract amount was what the County would be paying for the deliverables set forth in the contract and he had been very adamant with the vendor that there could be no more additional charges and that they could complete the project within the hours set forth in the contract. He confirmed that the committee that had screened the bids was very comfortable with BerryDunn.

Mr. Evelyn moved to authorize the County Administrator to enter into a contract with BerryDunn for ERP Needs Assessment Services in the amount of $71,980 and to appropriate an additional $22,800 from Fund 7 fund balance. The members were polled:

| | |
|---|---|
| Thomas W. Evelyn | Aye |
| C. Thomas Tiller, Jr. | Aye |
| James H. Burrell | Aye |
| Ron Stiers | Nay |
| W. R. Davis, Jr. | Aye |

The motion carried.

---

IN RE: RAPPAHANNOCK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Elizabeth Crowther, President of Rappahannock Community College (RCC), was present to update the Board.

She remarked that the $4,482 RCC requested from New Kent for operations was probably one of the County's smaller requests, adding that she hoped that the Board would continue to support RCC and thanking them for their past support.

She also congratulated and commended the Board on its investment in the Bridging Communities Technical Center (BCTC), which she advised was the "first of its kind" to be opened in the State for over 25 years. She commented that New Kent "had done it right" and spoke about how pleased RCC had been to have been a partner in the planning. She spoke about the success of BCTC and its dual enrollment program, and confirmed that adult evening classes were expected to begin in the summer.

She also thanked the Board for appointing Pam Nixon as New Kent's representative on the RCC Board, noting that she did a good job and was very focused.

She reported on improvements to their Glens Campus and invited the Board to hold meetings there if needed.

She advised that in her nine years as President, RCC had grown 53% in credit enrollment and work force enrollment. She indicated that RCC currently had 5,100 credit students and 3,500 noncredit work force students.

She indicated that she understood the financial situations that the localities were in and wanted to personally explain an adjunct request for capital improvements at the Glens campus. She advised that a much needed loop road and access and safety improvements had been delayed a few years back because of the economy, and they were now looking at a ten-year plan for the 12 counties they served, to come up with their respective portions for the project. She noted that New Kent's portion was $71,300 and, although she understood that the Board could not commit a future Board, she suggested that New Kent could set aside $7,130 a year. She explained that the project would not only improve safety for those accessing and leaving the campus, but would open up additional building sites.

Mr. Davis asked about New Kent enrollment. Dr. Crowther reported that last year, there were 160 credit students from New Kent and 77 work force students, and she felt that enrollment from New Kent had increased for the current year and would continue to increase. She indicated that those students enrolled in BCTC were not included in those numbers.

Mr. Burrell asked about the guaranteed enrollment program with Old Dominion University. Dr. Crowther advised that the program was going very well with all of the state colleges.

The Board members thanked Dr. Crowther for her report, and then took a short break before resuming the meeting.

---

IN RE: FINANCIAL POLICY GUIDELINES REVISION

Before the Board for consideration was a request to adopt a revision of the County's financial policies.

Financial Advisor Ted Cole reviewed that in 2006 the County had established an initial policy document to formalize practices already taking place, and the County had continued to be compliant with those policies since that time, and had "tweaked" the reserve policy in 2008. He indicated that the proposed revision under consideration would leave the core policies intact and merely expand some things where appropriate. He clarified that everything included in the revision was something that was already being done or something that staff was comfortable that the County could do, and would not commit the County to anything new - just putting some more detail in writing. He advised that the biggest change dealt with debt ratios. He indicated that those ratios were reviewed annually during the CIP process in order to determine the impact of proposed debt. He advised that non-compliance should not be the reason not to move forward with a needed project, and rather than change the policy, it was best to add language whereby the Board could, from time to time, allow for projects that would require debt that would put the County out of compliance for a certain period of time, as long as the Board acknowledged that fact.

Ms. Gowdy suggested a few changes in the proposed language, that included requiring annual reporting to the Board and Planning Commission, and that the Board would make any acknowledgement by resolution.

Ms. Altemus pointed out that the minimum contingency was set at $250,000 and cash reserves set at a minimum of $3 million. There was discussion regarding whether those were enough. Mr. Cole suggested that if there was an emergency that brought those levels below the minimum, the Board should adopt a plan to restore it within 36 months. Following discussion, there was consensus that the minimum contingency should be increased to $300,000. It was confirmed that that change would not impact the proposed FY14 budget.

Mr. Evelyn moved to adopt Revision 2 of the New Kent County financial policies with the following changes to the fourth paragraph on page 15 under Self-Imposed Debt Targets: “and reported to the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission” added to the end of the first sentence; and “by resolution” added to the last sentence. On page 5, No. 8, the General Fund Contingency shall be budgeted at not less than $300,000. The members were polled:

| | |
|---|---|
| C. Thomas Tiller, Jr. | Aye |
| James H. Burrell | Aye |
| Ron Stiers | Aye |
| Thomas W. Evelyn | Aye |
| W. R. Davis, Jr. | Aye |

The motion carried.

---

IN RE: GENERAL FUND DEBT OVERVIEW

Mr. Cole reviewed that New Kent’s existing tax-supported debt totaled $57,535,805, broken down between School-related debt at $50,961,015 and County debt at $6,574,790.

He advised that County policy required a Minimum Pay-Out Ratio of 50% (percentage of debt retiring in 10 years), and the County would be compliant for FY14 with a ratio of 57.4%, with the ratio increasing over the next ten years.

He reported that the Debt Per Capita amount for FY14 was $2,709, a figure that did not include any utility or Airport debt.

He reviewed that for FY14, New Kent’s Existing Debt Ratio (ratio of debt to assessed value) was 2.15%, well below the 4.5% policy, and took into account a 2% natural growth.

Regarding Debt Service v. Expenditures (amount of debt service as a percentage of the budget), he reported that New Kent would be compliant for FY14 at 10.96%, below its policy of 12%, and that amount would continue to decline over time.

He advised that there was no significant decline anticipated in existing debt service to provide any debt affordability until 2029, and any new debt would raise that level.

He reminded that the Debt Service fund balance would be depleted after 2017, at which time the Board would have to make up the difference, with the annual amount currently coming from that source equaling one cent on the real estate tax rate.

He then looked at proposed projects that might require debt and how each would affect the County's compliance with its policies.

He reviewed that renovating the Historic School for additional classrooms was projected to result in a borrowing of $5 million in FY14, with debt service beginning FY15. He noted that based on assumptions of level debt service and a 20-year borrowing at 4%, the County would not fall out of compliance with any of its policies; however, the resulting debt service would require a real estate tax increase of between 1.5 and 2 cents beginning in 2015 (would not include operating expenses).

He reviewed other projects as follows:

- New Kent Elementary renovation – borrowing of $11,650,000 in FY15, for debt service FY16, same assumptions
- Sheriff's Office – Animal Shelter – borrowing of $1.165 mil in FY15, for debt service FY16, same assumptions
- Public safety radio system, borrowing of $4 mil in FY15 for debt service FY16, same assumptions

He indicated that if the County borrowed funds for these other projects, it would still be in compliance with its 10-year Payout Ratio Policy, Debt Per Capita Policy, and Debt to Assessed Value Policy. However, there would be issues with its Debt Service v. Expenditures Policy because in FY16 it would be above the 12% policy at 13.26%, but would be back in compliance by FY21.

He advised that the County's policy did give the Board latitude to make a decision to fund all four capital projects with debt service, but it would require in an 8-cent increase in the real estate tax rate.

Board members noted that this would not leave the County "a lot of wiggle room". Mr. Cole agreed, adding that the biggest issue was affordability.

---

IN RE: CLOSED SESSION

Mr. Tiller moved to go into Closed Session pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.7 of the Code of Virginia for consultation with legal counsel pertaining to actual or probable litigation involving a former employee and the Department of Public Utilities, and pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.29 of the Code of Virginia for discussion of the award of a public contract involving the expenditure of public funds and discussion of the terms or scope of such contract where discussion in an open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Board involving the Historic School. The members were polled:

| | |
|---|---|
| James H. Burrell | Aye |
| Ron Stiers | Aye |
| Thomas W. Evelyn | Aye |
| C. Thomas Tiller, Jr. | Aye |
| W. R. Davis, Jr. | Aye |

The motion carried. The Board went into closed session.

Mr. Burrell moved to return to open session. The members were polled:

| | |
|---|---|
| Ron Stiers | Aye |
| Thomas W. Evelyn | Aye |
| C. Thomas Tiller, Jr. | Aye |
| James H. Burrell | Aye |
| W. R. Davis, Jr. | Aye |

The motion carried. Mr. Tiller made the following certification:

Whereas, the New Kent County Board of Supervisors has convened in a closed session on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

Whereas, Section 2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Board that such closed session was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

Now there be it resolved that the Board hereby certifies that to the best of each member's knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open session requirements by Virginia law were discussed in closed session to which this certification resolution applies and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed session were heard, discussed or considered by the Board.

The Chairman inquired whether there was any member who believed that there was a departure from the motion. Hearing none, the members were polled on the certification:

| | |
|---|---|
| Thomas W. Evelyn | Aye |
| C. Thomas Tiller, Jr. | Aye |
| James H. Burrell | Aye |
| Ron Stiers | Aye |
| W. R. Davis, Jr. | Aye |

The motion carried. Mr. Burrell requested and received permission to leave the meeting in order to attend a funeral, and left at 11:42 a.m.

---

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Social Services Director Vanesa Livingstone updated the Board on upcoming changes that would affect her department. She spoke about new Medicaid regulations as well as the impact from the transfer of cases from the Virginia Department of Medicaid Services to local departments with no additional funding. She spoke about an initiative to find foster homes in New Kent, as well as preparing for the upcoming hurricane season. She described a book drive being promoted in order to provide books to children in need. She reported on caseloads and new systems that would be put in place to help with prevention services.

Board members thanked her and her staff for the good jobs they were doing.

---

IN RE: WILCO HESS APPLICATION FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A TRAVEL PLAZA

Planning Manager Kelli Le Duc reviewed a conditional use permit (CUP) application that was scheduled to come before the Board for public hearing on May 13, 2013. Also present were Derrick Johnson, PE, agent from Timmons; Mark Kilduff, County Economic Development

Consultant; Scott Dunn, AICP, traffic engineer from Timmons; Marshall Toney, Associate Broker with Prudential; and Alan Shaia, property owner.

Ms. Le Duc advised that after a long public hearing at its April meeting, the Planning Commission had voted 6:4:1 to recommend approval of the application, with one amendment to the conditions that provided for a 30-year expiration on the CUP.

Mr. Johnson distributed a handout and reviewed that his client was proposing to develop a 16-acre portion of a 461-acre parcel in the southeast quadrant of Interstate 64 and Route 106 that would include an 8,000 square foot convenience mart, 20 fueling stations (12 for vehicles, 8 for trucks), 3,400 square feet for a fast food restaurant with a drive-through, and a 3-acre parcel for retail restaurant in the future. He explained that the application was for a “travel plaza” and not a “truck stop”, as there would be no tire or engine repair, no lounge, and no truck wash. He admitted that they would like to eventually add scales.

He reported that a Traffic Impact Analysis had been prepared, and reviewed and approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) which identified the improvements needed for the project. Those improvements included the construction of a full auxiliary turn lane on Route 106, and a continued right turn lane from the eastbound entrance of the existing Pilot station down to its entrance.

He advised that they had been able to answer the concerns about traffic at the Planning Commission’s public hearing, and in response to concerns about security, he indicated that the clean, well-lit site would be monitored 24/7 with closed circuit TV. He reported that the owner, Steve Williams, was “hands-on” with the many sites he operated in eight states, and would be in attendance at the May 13 public hearing.

It was reported that the travel plaza would not have showers but would have laundry facilities.

There were comments regarding limitations on how long a truck could remain on the site. Mr. Johnson advised that there was nothing in the conditions regarding that but it was their goal to get trucks on and off as quickly as possible.

It was confirmed that there were performance standards in New Kent’s Code that required electrical hookups for trucks so that they did not have to run their engines while on the site. Mr. Johnson remarked that the County’s Code was “pretty advanced and progressive” in dealing with truck stops.

He advised that his client was making a $7 million capital investment and that construction would create 30-40 jobs and there would be 35 permanent jobs once the facility was opened.

Mr. Kilduff reported that revenues to the County from the project were projected at $7 million - $5 million on real estate and $2 million on personal property - depending upon how the Commissioner of Revenue determined that tanks and canopies would be taxed. Mr. Johnson advised that the company believed that those items were personal property rather than real estate.

Mr. Kilduff projected a BPOL tax revenue, based on $3 million in gross receipts (fuel sales were not included in gross receipts tax) of $4,500 per year and sales tax revenue of $30,000. He noted that the projected $60,000 annual meals tax revenue only applied to the fast food restaurant and did not include the potential for the restaurant.

In summary, he projected approximately $175,000 annually for the first three years, and $841,125 over five years.

Mr. Johnson confirmed that all fuel tanks would be underground and, although they are considering it, there were no immediate plans to have natural gas fueling at this site.

He indicated that the conditions developed by staff initially had a 10-year sunset on the use, which the owner emphatically considered to be a "nonstarter", and that was changed to 30 years by the Planning Commission. He reported that his client would prefer 100 years but would be happy with 50 years and would ask for that change at the upcoming public hearing with the Board.

Mr. Evelyn referred that there was language concerning a two-year timeframe during which construction was to begin. Mr. Johnson advised that his client planned to "move quickly" and was ready to move forward and close on the property right away.

Mr. Stiers expressed concerns about environmental issues, noting that the subject property backed into Toe Ink and Woodhaven Shores Lake. Mr. Johnson advised that water quality and quantity runoff from the developed site would be handled through the use of Best Management Practices. These BMPs, designed to retain an amount of water to be produced in a ten-year storm, would provide compliance with County and State regulations and would include structural measures to control runoff from the site. He indicated that during construction and land disturbing activities, standard erosion control devices would be utilized to minimize erosion on the site and downstream siltation. He indicated that County Code required an oil/water separator for the fueling operations. He remarked that both State and County Codes were stringent on water release and assured that the applicant would meet all of those requirements.

Ms. Le Duc added that the development would also be required to have a 100-foot landscaping buffer.

Mr. Evelyn asked if a traffic circle would be of benefit to the project. Mr. Johnson responded that it work operatively, but the current speed limit would have to be reduced. He spoke about how there were plans to increase Route 106 to four lanes in the future and he felt a traffic circle would take more land than a traffic signal would.

---

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

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

| | |
|---|---|
| C. Thomas Tiller, Jr. | Aye |
| James H. Burrell | Absent |
| Ron Stiers | Aye |
| Thomas W. Evelyn | Aye |
| W. R. Davis, Jr. | Aye |

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:12 p.m.