

THE REGULAR WORK SESSION OF THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAS HELD ON THE 29TH DAY OF MAY IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND SEVEN OF OUR LORD IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 4:00 P.M.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Mark E. Hill	Absent (arrived at 4:05 p.m.)
David M. Sparks	Present
James H. Burrell	Present
Stran L. Trout	Present
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Present

The Chairman called the meeting to order. He noted the recent death of Ray Burnett and expressed condolences to the family.

IN RE: FY07 APPROPRIATIONS AND INTER-DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET TRANSFERS

Before the Board for consideration were FY07 appropriations and inter-departmental budget transfers.

Mr. Davis posed some questions regarding DMV collection fees which Financial Services Director Mary Altemus explained.

Mr. Burrell moved to approve the supplemental appropriations and inter-departmental budget transfers as requested. The members were polled:

Mark E. Hill	Absent
D. M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: ADDING HOMESTEAD ROAD TO THE RURAL RUSTIC ROADS PROGRAM

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-25-07 adding Route 620/Homestead Road to the Rural Rustic Road program, for improvement and hard-surfacing.

County Attorney Jeff Summers explained that since the time that the meeting materials were distributed, information on the beginning and ending points had been supplied by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and would be inserted into the resolution.

Mr. Davis expressed his reluctance to rely upon VDOT's information. After consulting a County road map, Board members were satisfied that the information on the proposed beginning and ending points were correct.

Mr. Burrell moved to adopt Resolution R-25-07 as presented. The members were polled:

David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye

W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: COURTHOUSE SECURITY FEE

Before the Board for consideration was Ordinance O-10-07 authorizing an increase in the costs assessed in criminal and traffic cases for the funding of courthouse personnel from \$5.00 to \$10.00 effective July 1, 2007. It was noted that a public hearing was held at the May 14 meeting after proper advertising.

Mr. Sparks moved to adopt Ordinance O-10-07 as presented. The members were polled:

James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: AMENDMENTS TO APPENDIX A – FEE SCHEDULE

Before the Board for consideration was Ordinance O-08-07 amending Appendix A of the New Kent County Code (Fee Schedule) to change certain fees charged for County services under the authority granted in Sections 15.2-2286 and 36-105 of the Code of Virginia. It was noted that a public hearing was held at the May 14 meeting after proper advertising.

County Administrator John Budesky explained that the subscription fee for the ambulance billing program was not a fee that the County collected and that was why it was not on the Fee Schedule. He confirmed that all fees set forth in the proposed ordinance were the same ones reviewed at the prior meetings.

Mr. Hill moved to adopt Ordinance O-08-07 as presented. The members were polled:

W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: TAX LEVIES FOR FY07/08

Before the Board for consideration was Ordinance O-09-07 imposing tax levies on real and personal property for the 2007/2008 tax year in the County of New Kent. It was noted that a public hearing was held at the May 14 meeting after proper advertising, and that there was no change proposed in any of the tax rates.

Mr. Sparks moved to adopt Ordinance O-09-07 as presented. The members were polled:

Mark E. Hill	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Before the Board for consideration was a request to adopt the proposed Capital Improvement Plan for FY08 – 2012.

Mr. Hill moved to adopt the proposed Capital Improvement Plan as presented. The members were polled:

David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: FY07/08 BUDGET

Before the Board for consideration was a request to adopt and appropriate the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 budget as submitted by the County Administrator.

Mr. Hill moved to adopt and appropriate the Fiscal Year 2007/2008 budget as submitted by the County Administrator in general categories as follows:

General Fund	\$ 14,678,001
Social Services	\$ 993,615
School Capital	\$ 1,700,000
Grants	\$ 0
Capital Projects	\$ 6,335,097
Human Services	\$ 2,205,602
Wireless E-911	\$ 44,122
E-911	\$ 0
Schools	\$ 24,367,204
School Food	\$ 775,000
Litter Control	\$ 7,300
Meals Tax	\$ 0
Debt Service	\$ 4,587,956
Airport	\$ 488,846
Water/Sewer	\$ 29,599,175
Bottoms Bridge Sewer	\$ 1,252,700
Total Proposed FY07/08 County Budget:	\$ 87,034,618

There was some discussion as to whether the utility budget should be adopted separately. It was also reported that the local portion of the airport budget was \$30,526.

The members were polled:

James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: AMBULANCE BILLING

Before the Board for consideration was a request for approval of a proposed agreement with Diversified Ambulance Billing, Inc. (DAB) to handle the billing for ambulance transport services rendered by New Kent Fire-Rescue, and its authorized agencies, beginning July 1, 2007.

Fire Chief Tommy Hicks reported that DAB providing billing services for 32 other localities in Virginia, including James City County, Charles City County and Hanover County, and was the vendor of choice for New Kent.

Mr. Summers explained that New Kent was able to join the contract between Fairfax County and DAB and was not required to issue its own request for proposal. He indicated that the Fairfax contract was written so that other counties could "piggyback" on it, noting that other counties had also taken advantage of that opportunity. He advised that he was not aware of the number or amount of the bids that Fairfax County had received when it initially put its contract out for bid, and noted that this would be the first time that New Kent had "piggybacked" on the contract of another locality. It was reported that the proposed agreement between New Kent and DAB would expire in 2011.

Mr. Hill moved to approve the proposed Agreement for Services with Diversified Ambulance Billing, Inc. with the following changes: in Section 5.11.b, change Fauquier County to New Kent County, and completion of the Notice information in Section 5.4.1. The members were polled:

W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR BUSINESS & INDUSTRIAL USES

Planning Manager Rodney Hathaway reviewed with the Board members some proposed performance standards for business and industrial uses.

He indicated that this would not be set for public hearing until the Board was comfortable with the proposals.

He explained that the intent was to have consistent written rules so that everyone would be aware "up front" of the County's requirements and expectations prior to the time that fees were paid.

He advised that this was a new provision although there were some standards set forth in the conditional use section of the current Code.

Mr. Hathaway noted that many of the sections had received the unanimous approval of the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee (ZORC) and that staff had concurred with all of their recommendations. He admitted that initially that had not been the case, but that staff and the ZORC had been able to work through the individual concerns and had developed a "very good document".

He reported that the recommendations had been reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission, who had made only a few minor language revisions.

He advised that a copy of the proposal had been provided to the Chamber of Commerce but that no comments had been received. It was noted that the ZORC was a diverse committee and had a good representation from the business community.

Mr. Hathaway indicated that ZORC had reviewed the document "line by line" and had a lot of discussion, and that although the proposal was a different document from what staff had initially prepared, it had the same intent and would achieve the same goal.

Board members expressed their appreciation for the hard work of the ZORC.

Mr. Hathaway noted that the proposed standards would apply only to new and expanding businesses and that existing businesses would be grandfathered.

It was noted that unless there was some objection, the proposed ordinance would be advertised for a public hearing at the July meeting.

IN RE: INCLUSIONARY DWELLING ORDINANCE (WORKFORCE OR AFFORDABLE HOUSING)

Planner Jeremiah Christopher reviewed the first draft of an ordinance developed by the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC). He indicated that the AHAC wanted to determine what recommendations the Board was comfortable with before proceeding any further.

There was a discussion on the preferred term. Mr. Christopher advised that the committee preferred "inclusionary" housing but also had considered "workforce" housing.

He advised that the AHAC had received input from both the Richmond and Williamsburg realtor associations as well as some non-profit agencies, including Housing Opportunities Made Equal, but had not had any input from either the Partnership for Workforce Homes or Habitat for Humanity.

Mr. Hathaway pointed out that the proposed ordinance was modeled after ones adopted by Falls Church and Fairfax County in that the programs in those localities "had been around a long time" and had been successful.

Mr. Christopher admitted that AHAC had not come up with a "hard number" as to what exactly an affordable home in New Kent was, but had determined that it would need to be affordable to a family earning between 50% and 80% of the median household income for the Richmond- Petersburg Metropolitan Statistical Area, of which New Kent was a part. That median salary was identified to be \$52,000 and it was noted that New Kent's median salary was somewhat higher at \$58,000.

Mr. Budesky reviewed that when the Board had appointed the AHAC, it was for the purpose of defining "affordable" and to determine whether or not New Kent needed a program. He noted that the AHAC was composed of some "ambitious folks" and that the proposed ordinance established a lot of programs, including a housing authority, that might be a good idea at a future time and place in New Kent, but would require a great deal of administration as well as some funding. He expressed his concern that this might not be what the Board wanted or the direction in which it wanted to go, and before staff or the AHAC spent any more time, there was a need for some clear direction from the Board.

County Attorney Summers commented that the proposed ordinance was written for an urban county and would "work against the market". He advised that if individuals bought a home at the low end, upgraded it, and added on, their sweat equity would be capped and they would have little incentive to invest in their own home. He also expressed some concern with the mechanism of the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Trout expressed his concerns that the ordinance would set up a housing board and establish price controls, and home buyers would not get the benefit of an increase in value of their homes when they sold them.

Mr. Burrell advised that he understood the argument but it was not a reason not to have a program. He indicated that the ordinance could be written to provide a certain percentage of profit, but emphasized that the County needed to do something to provide housing for its teachers and deputies.

Mr. Hill commented that he liked the housing chart contained in the ordinance, noting that after 25 years, a homeowner would be entitled to 100% of the appreciation.

Mr. Budesky asked if this was the mechanism that the Board wanted to get to that goal.

Mr. Sparks asked about other options.

Mr. Hill suggested leaving it up to the private sector. Mr. Summers advised that the Board could allow greater density and commented that there were ways to keep affordable housing coming into the market place.

Mr. Trout reminded that Farms of New Kent was required to provide 40 affordable housing units in its village area and would also be paying \$200 per home to the County to be used towards affordable housing. He suggested that those funds could be use to upgrade and/or maintain existing affordable homes, and that the County could seek assistance from agencies that performed renovation work.

Mr. Summers cautioned that in the past, the County's "intrusion into the market place" often resulted in a "great hue and cry" from the private sector.

Mr. Hill pointed out that the City of Richmond was the only locality in the area that had adopted an affordable housing ordinance, noting that both Hanover and Henrico had

declined to adopt programs. He again indicated that he would like to see the Board be more willing to work with private developers who wanted to establish affordable housing; however, it was important to establish what "affordable" was and give developers some guidelines.

Mr. Sparks commented that affordable housing was not just "a house on a lot" but would include apartments and other kinds of housing. He suggested that it be determined how many affordable housing units were available and how many were needed.

Mr. Christopher commented that with the nature of the developments in Patriot's Landing and the Farms of New Kent, the AHAC had been concerned that teachers and deputies would not be able to afford to live here. Mr. Hathaway spoke about the importance of having a proper balance or mixture of homes in the community.

Mr. Hill reported that he had spoken with a workforce housing representative who had indicated that none of the counties were establishing enough affordable housing to maintain their teachers and sheriff's deputies and enable them to live in the county in which they work.

Mr. Summers surmised that if a locality built enough affordable housing, it would attract persons from surrounding counties where there was little or no affordable housing.

It was also noted that it would need to be determined how much affordable housing New Kent needed for its business prospects and employees. Mr. Hathaway suggested that the number should include graduates who wanted to return to New Kent to live.

Mr. Sparks expressed his concern that the proposed ordinance would take significant manpower, funding, follow-up and tracking, and questioned whether this was what the Board wanted.

Mr. Hill reported that Richmond had spent over \$1 million just in the administration of its program. He commented that New Kent had initially been "on the right path" by working with developers who would agree to build a certain amount of affordable housing, and that the County just needed to "fine tune" that process.

Mr. Trout commented that much could be done through proffers with developers with as little interference from County as possible, and that cash proffers could be used to upgrade the current stock of affordable houses.

Mr. Hill suggested that the AHAC work with some of the private agencies and come back with recommendations as to what it thinks would work and what would be best for New Kent.

There was another discussion about the preferred name. Mr. Davis indicated that he preferred "work force housing".

Mr. Christopher advised that it was clear that the Board wanted something a little less "top heavy" in administration. Mr. Hathaway stated that they would review the Board's comments and concerns with the AHAC and report back to the Board at a future meeting.

Board members asked that it be determined how many New Kent families would fall into the category of needing affordable housing, as well as the number of New Kent teachers and employees who lived elsewhere because they couldn't afford to live in New Kent.

IN RE: RESIDENTIAL DRIVEWAY STANDARDS

Planning Manager Rodney Hathaway and Fire Chief Tommy Hicks reviewed with the Board the proposed ordinance setting standards for residential driveways, which was scheduled for public hearing on June 11, 2007.

It was explained that the proposed changes grew out of a need to provide unimpeded access for emergency vehicles to reach residences in the County as well as to provide clarification to the development community.

It was noted that the Board had adopted an initiating resolution in March, and that the issue had been reviewed by the Planning Commission at its April meeting, which body had forwarded it to the Board with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. Trout commented that through his work with the Providence Forge Volunteer Rescue Squad he understood about the problems in getting rescue vehicles to some of the homes in the County but he was concerned about the expense of installing a driveway to the proposed standards.

Chief Hicks explained that the problem was more prevalent with fire apparatus. He reported that an ambulance weighed 26,000 pounds, a ladder truck 73,500 pounds, and engines and tankers weighed 50,000 – 60,000 pounds.

Mr. Davis commented that a road that could carry 75,000 pounds was “pretty significant”.

It was explained that “carry” meant that a vehicle could travel over the driveway without sinking.

Mr. Sparks asked how one would test a road to determine if it could carry that kind of weight. Mr. Hathaway explained that one would look at the fill material in the sub base to make that determination, and that the road would have to be inspected prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Hathaway confirmed that a property owner would be required to remove and replace poor soils before installing a driveway, noting that a driveway consisting of gravel that had been laid over poor soils would have a short lifespan and would require early replacement.

Mr. Trout noted that the 75 foot driveway trigger would not apply to many subdivisions. Mr. Hick noted that the biggest impact would be on some of the extended roads that served four to six homes, where the road was very poor and not well-maintained.

Mr. Hathaway pointed out that there were a significant number of large lot subdivisions; however, the proposed changes would not force residents to upgrade existing roads to the new specifications, and the standards would apply only to new roads and to anyone who needed a permit. He clarified that a homeowner paving over an existing graveled road would not need a permit and therefore would not need to upgrade to the new standards.

Mr. Davis asked if these standards would be triggered by the third home on a road. Mr. Hathaway said that it would apply to the first house that was more than 75 feet off of a public road. He clarified that the third “use” on a road required that the road be designated as a street and be named, but would not require that the road be improved to these standards.

There was discussion regarding how much a driveway built to these specifications would cost. Mr. Hathaway indicated that a paved driveway cost about \$150 per foot.

It was noted that a home's assessed value did take into account whether or not there was a paved driveway.

Mr. Davis commented that there were some State roads that did not meet these standards.

IN RE: TRAFFIC IMPACT SAFETY REQUIREMENTS

Community Development Director George Homewood reviewed with the Board two proposed ordinances scheduled for public hearing on June 11 relating to traffic impact safety requirements.

He reported that as a result of action taken during the 2006 session of the General Assembly, as of July 1, 2007, localities were to require traffic impact analyses for any development where the number of vehicle trips per day exceeded certain thresholds. He explained that these studies and an accompanying fee were to be collected from the developer by the localities and then submitted to VDOT within five working days. He advised that VDOT would then review the studies and have an opportunity to provide comments, and a locality could choose to deal with those comments as it saw fit; however, VDOT would still be in a position to require the suggested improvements before issuing the entrance permit to the use. He advised that these analyses would be required for all Comprehensive Plan amendments, plat reviews, re-zonings, conditional use permits, site plans and subdivisions.

He indicated that although staff would spend some time reviewing the analyses and the comments from VDOT, it would not retain any of the review fee; however, if an independent outside review of a study for a large or complex development were needed, then the County could pass that cost on to the developer.

There was discussion on how much confidence and trust the Board had in information that it received from VDOT.

Mr. Homewood advised that New Kent had no choice but to require these traffic impact studies as of July 1. He explained, however, that there was one difference in what the State was requiring and what was being recommended by staff. He advised that the State had established separate thresholds for residential (100 peak hour trips) and non-residential (250 peak hour trips) uses. He indicated that staff had recommended that New Kent defer to the measure of 100 peak hour trips for any use on the premise that "traffic was traffic", no matter what generated it. He pointed out that the Comp Plan leaned heavily towards village-style and mixed-use development and it was unclear whether mixed-use development would be classified as residential or non-residential. He added that non-residential uses were likely to locate along a major traffic artery, making a traffic impact study even more important.

Mr. Homewood confirmed that the State permitted and encouraged localities to have more restrictive ordinances, especially those in rural areas where there was less infrastructure.

It was noted that the County's current ordinance required traffic impact studies for all Planned Unit Developments.

Mr. Homewood reiterated that the County had no choice but to adopt the proposed ordinances at its June meeting, but did have options as to whether to set 100 peak hour trips for all uses. He indicated that two separate ordinances were needed, one for the subdivision ordinance and one for the zoning ordinance.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS

County Administrator John Budesky reported that the County had official ownership of the former VDOT property and praised the demolition work performed by custodian Calvin Sutherlin. He advised that footers had been poured and construction work was scheduled to soon begin.

He indicated that he had previously discussed with the Board the possibility of renting out the salt barn(s) on the property. He advised that it had been his intention to rent out one of the barns and retain the other for storage of County materials and equipment.

Mr. Davis expressed his concern that the structures were not appropriate to use for storage of County equipment because of corrosion problems. Mr. Budesky advised that General Services Director Jim Tacosa had researched the issue and had found that there was a way to clean and neutralize the salt in the structures and be able to use them for storing utility pipes and hydrants as well as some other equipment.

He advised that Infrastructure Corporation of America (ICA), who had the maintenance contract for I-64, was still interested in leasing the barns for salt storage and had offered to pay a monthly rent of \$1,500 for one or \$3,000 for both.

There was discussion regarding the feasibility of using one of the barns for County storage and an appropriate monthly rental. It was noted that there would be some advantage to having ICA's storage of salt in New Kent as it might result in more timely attention to the County's roads.

Mr. Sparks advised that if he was convinced that the salt could be sufficiently neutralized, he felt that the County should retain one or both of the barns for equipment and material storage. Mr. Budesky indicated that he had identified a County need for only one of the structures.

There was consensus that Mr. Budesky continue to negotiate with ICA.

Financial Services Director Mary Altemus reported that both the communications tax and sales tax being collected by the State for New Kent were on track to meet the budget.

Mr. Budesky asked for confirmation regarding reassessment services. He noted that the budget that had been adopted earlier in the meeting included funds to provide a supplement to the Commissioner of the Revenue, upgrades to some of her staff, and two new positions, all effective January 1, 2008, in return for her office assuming responsibility for reassessment on a two-year cycle. He reminded that at a previous meeting, there was a 2:2 split among the Board members, in Mr. Burrell's absence, on whether to move forward with that option. At that time, it was agreed that the budget would be adopted with full funding for that option and that the Board could make a final decision at budget adoption time and select one of the other options if it decided to do so.

Mr. Sparks and Mr. Hill indicated that they had previously explained their preference and that their positions had not changed.

There was no further discussion.

Public Utilities Director Alan Harrison asked for the Board's input on the water storage tanks in the Courthouse area and at Farms of New Kent. He explained that the elevated tank in the Courthouse area would be visible from the high school and may well be visible from John Crump's development when the trees were bare. He indicated that he had asked the School Superintendent if the School Board had any interest in adding a logo to the tank, at its own cost, but had not yet heard back from him. Following a discussion on colors, the Board was comfortable with painting the Courthouse tank slate grey, and was agreeable to the School's adding a logo if it wanted to. Regarding the Farms of New Kent water tank, Mr. Harrison was instructed to work with Pete Johns to choose the color.

IN RE: CLOSED SESSION

Mr. Sparks moved to go into Closed Session to discuss a personnel matter pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.1 of the Code of Virginia involving employee compensation and for discussions relating to business and industry development pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.4 of the Code of Virginia involving prospective business or industry. The members were polled:

Mark E. Hill	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried. The Board went into closed session.

Mr. Davis moved to return to Open Session. The members were polled:

David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Nay
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Davis 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:

James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: LAND EXCHANGE WITH NEW KENT COURTHOUSE VILLAGE

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-26-07 relating to a land exchange with New Kent Courthouse Village in connection with the courthouse utility project.

County Attorney Jeff Summers advised that the proposed resolution would approve the exchange of one acre off Egypt Road owned by the County for one acre on the southern end of John Crump's property which would be used for placement of some water facilities. He advised, however, that when he had reviewed the deed, he discovered that Delmarva Properties had donated the land on Egypt Road to the County for use as a volunteer emergency services organization and that the deed contained a reversion clause. He indicated that he was in the process of contacting Delmarva's attorney to obtain a release.

Board members expressed their concern that the Board was being asked to do something that couldn't be done. Mr. Summers explained that the proposed resolution would give the County Administrator the authority to sign the documents if the issue could be worked out.

Mr. Budesky advised that this matter could delay the courthouse utility project.

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing. There being no one signed up to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Budesky explained that if the matter could not be worked out, then the County would be faced with a decision of whether to buy the land or move the location of the water facilities. Mr. Summers added that a third option would be condemnation.

Mr. Hill moved to adopt Resolution R-26-07 as presented. The members were polled:

W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: MEETING SCHEDULE

The Chairman announced that the next meeting of the Board of Supervisors would be held at 6:00 p.m. on June 11, 2007, in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building, New Kent, Virginia.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

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

Mark E. Hill	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:06 p.m.