

THE REGULAR WORK SESSION OF THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAS HELD ON THE 25TH DAY OF JUNE IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND SEVEN OF OUR LORD IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 6:00 P.M.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Mark E. Hill	Present
David M. Sparks	Present
James H. Burrell	Present
Stran L. Trout	Present
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Absent (arrived at 4:03 p.m.)

The Chairman called the meeting to order.

IN RE: OPERATIONAL MEDICAL DIRECTOR

Chairman Trout introduced Dean Williams, M.D., Operational Medical Director (OMD) for New Kent County, to provide an overview of the OMD position, commenting that he had worked with Dr. Williams for many years in his association with the Providence Forge Volunteer Rescue Squad (PFVRS).

Dr. Williams explained that emergency medical service and the public's expectations had changed over the last 20 years, and the OMD was a liaison between practitioners and the State, serving as a "watch dog" to make sure that practitioners had the right skills and performed within approved policies. He spoke about how emergency care in the field had evolved and how patient care had changed.

He confirmed that all New Kent agencies worked under his license and that he was also the OMD for PFVRS, as well as for Henrico Volunteer Rescue. He indicated that he worked at Bon Secours Community Hospital, St. Mary's Hospital and St. Francis Hospital.

Dr. Williams commented that he had recently noticed more enthusiasm from volunteer providers in New Kent, and that the new training requirements should make them "more portable" and able to get paid jobs in other places.

There was a discussion regarding protocol for deciding to which hospital to transport patients. Dr. Williams explained that the decision should be based on a patient's needs and, although providers tried to accommodate patient requests, emergency personnel had to make judgment calls depending on the patient's vital signs and needs. He noted that there was a diversion system in place that notified emergency responders which hospitals were open and accepting patients and commented that patients should trust the emergency personnel to make the right decision.

Dr. Williams was asked about his experience in localities charging for ambulance transport. He noted that most localities experienced "heartburn" during the first year of its program, but in reality it was a service that had to be paid for. He commented that it was not anything new and was commonplace around the nation.

He noted that the ambulance billing policy in Richmond had "few teeth" and had not significantly reduced the number of calls for minor incidents.

There was discussion regarding the need for non-emergency medical transport services. Dr. Williams agreed to provide information about some programs that were already in place that might assist New Kent residents.

Dr. Williams commented that PFVRS was getting updated equipment but had to decide where it wanted to go as far as an organization. It was noted that Charles City County had a different OMD.

The Board members thanked Dr. Williams for his time and services.

IN RE: PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE COUNTY CODE REGARDING COMMERCIAL
 WASTE

General Services Director Jim Tacosa and Maintenance Supervisor David Bednarczyk reviewed with the Board some proposed changes to the County Code regarding the acceptance of commercial waste at the Route 618 main transfer station and requested that the Board authorize staff to move forward to advertise for public hearing on changes to the Code that would restrict commercial dumping.

Mr. Budesky commented that the current ordinance that restricted the dumping of construction debris had not been enforced, the dumping of construction debris had increased dramatically, and its cost was being subsidized by the residents. He predicted that people who had been dumping commercial debris at the Route 618 site for years would not be pleased with the change, but noted that these were often not County residents. He warned that the County would be accused of not being "business friendly" but he pointed out that the current practices were not "resident friendly". It was noted that some of the commercial haulers were charging homeowners to haul away debris, and then disposing of it at the 618 site at no cost.

Staff indicated that the new regulations would allow staff on site to be better able to identify and control commercial dumping and emphasized that this would not in any way restrict dumping by homeowners.

Mr. Sparks asked about any tracking that might have been done at the Route 618 site. Mr. Tacosa and Mr. Bednarczyk described some of the commercial dumping they had personally observed at the site. Mr. Tacosa estimated that 60% of the volume was created by 10 – 15% of the population.

There was discussion regarding the characteristics of vehicles and trailers that would identify them as commercial in nature, and other methods that site attendants could use to make a determination.

There was consensus to advertise more stringent requirements (2 ton truck with 10 foot trailer with raised sides) for public hearing and then, based upon public comments, the Board could adopt less stringent requirements without having to re-advertise.

Mr. Sparks suggested that the Board spend sufficient time to review this issue before making any decisions.

Mr. Davis asked that staff conduct a survey at the Route 618 site, noting what size trucks dump there and what they were dumping, over the course of a week and have it available for the next work session.

Mr. Summers warned that these restrictions would likely increase the incidents of illegal dumping around the County which was a Class I Misdemeanor, and that the County should prepare itself for increased enforcement actions.

There was discussion regarding the illegal dumping of tires. Mr. Bednarczyk indicated that he would check with Central Virginia Waste Management Authority regarding a program to deal with tire disposal.

It was agreed to advertise the changes for a public hearing in August and review the matter again at the July work session.

IN RE: BRUSH COLLECTION AND PROCESSING

General Services Manager Jim Tacosa reviewed the bids that were received for brush collection and processing.

He reported that three bids had been received, with two of the bidders submitting proposals to accept brush at sites not owned by the County (one on Route 33 and the other on Stage Road near Route 33), and one bidder proposing to handle the brush at the Route 618 site.

He reviewed that the bidder who proposed to handle the brush at the 618 site had offered two options. Under the first option, the contractor would have a staff person at the site to put the brush into the containers on Mondays through Fridays from 7 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and on Saturdays from 7 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. The second option involved having a container on the site which County employees would fill and the County would pay a tipping fee. Mr. Tacosa recommended that if the operation was going to be outsourced, it needed to be away from the 618 site and managed independently.

He advised that of the other two bidders, one was expensive and one (located on Stage Road) was reasonable.

Mr. Budesky reminded that staff had reviewed the possibility of an eastern site with the Board at a prior work session and no changes had been requested in the RFP before it was advertised. He noted that if the low bid was accepted, citizens would be required to haul their yard debris to the site. He pointed out that the low bidder was able to meet all requirements of the RFP and most importantly would be open during the same hours as the 618 site.

It was also pointed out that changes would need to be made to the ordinance that was just approved for public hearing in August.

Mr. Trout expressed his concern that the proposed site was not in the center of the County's population. He predicted that there would be an increase in the number of forest fires and debris along the roadside and that residents would not want to haul their debris such a long distance. He commented that if the County was going to restrict yard debris, it needed to provide a reasonable alternative and he did not feel that a 40-mile round trip was reasonable.

Mr. Hill asked if the low bidder could locate a second site in the western end of the County. Mr. Summers cautioned that if the Board attempted to alter what had been advertised, then the process would have to start all over again.

Mr. Budesky commented that it would likely be cost prohibitive for the vendor to operate two sites.

Mr. Hill asked if the low bidder could operate at the 618 site in a manner similar to what was proposed by one of the other bidders. Mr. Summers advised that the Board was required to take the proposals as they were received and to either authorize or not authorize award of the contract.

There was a discussion of the County's costs to process brush itself. Mr. Tacosa advised that the costs varied but noted that the amount of brush was increasing and that there was little interest on the part of the public in obtaining the mulch. He advised that the low bidder had agreed to take all of the existing mulch at the 618 site.

Mr. Tacosa advised that the equipment recently purchased to push the brush was being used to compact the contents of the containers, thereby reducing the number of pulls.

It was confirmed that bagged leaves and branches less than four feet long would continue to be accepted at all of the transfer stations.

Mr. Tacosa pointed out that the proposed site on Stage Road was a good, user-friendly site with easy access from Route 249 and I-64. He indicated that one of the advantages would be that the large mulch piles at 618 would be gone.

Mr. Hill commented that in order to move the process along and because it was the only current avenue for the County, he would support awarding the contract to the low bidder, but would ask staff to look for an option of getting a second location in the west end of the County.

Mr. Tacosa confirmed that there would be no charge for County residents to take their brush to the contractor's site.

Mr. Hill moved that a contract with G & M Wood Processing, Inc. to handle debris for a five-year period be accepted. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried. Mr. Burrell explained that he had abstained because of his relationship with the contractor.

Mr. Trout commented that having a site in the western end of the County would make sense and asked that the staff explore that option.

IN RE: REQUEST FOR BOND REFERENDUM FOR PARKS & RECREATION

Parks & Recreation Manager Matt Spruill and General Services Director Jim Tacosa reviewed the request from the Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee (PRAC) for a November 2007 bond referendum for \$11.8 million for development of the 100 acres donated by Farms of New Kent as a park.

Mr. Budesky and Mr. Summers clarified that it would not be necessary for the Board hold a public hearing in order to authorize a bond referendum.

Mr. Budesky advised that staff was looking for direction from the Board as to whether it wanted to move forward with a bond referendum in November; consider it at a later date; or deny the request. He indicated that although staff recognized the need for amenities, there was concern that a November 2007 referendum would not be successful without an opportunity to complete engineering studies and provide definitive information as to what could be delivered for a specific dollar amount. He advised that the \$11.8 million was just a projection.

Mr. Hill noted that a successful bond referendum in that amount would result in a six cent increase (equivalent) in the real estate tax rate. Mr. Budesky confirmed that figure, noting that the current value of one cent on the tax rate was \$152,000.

Mr. Davis reminded that taxes were already increasing by 20 cents to service the debt for the new high school.

Mr. Burrell recognized the presence of PRAC members Charles Moss and Pete Sweet. He commented that surrounding jurisdictions had held similar bond referenda based upon concepts and not master plans, and that if citizens felt that it was too much, then they would vote against it. He emphasized that it was a decision that citizens should make and not a decision for the Board to make for them. He commented that this should be a democratic process and the Board should not deny the citizens the right to tax themselves. He indicated that although he was a member of the PRAC, he had not voted on this issue because he recognized that it would be coming to the Board of Supervisors. He advised that some of New Kent's sports teams were being required to practice in other jurisdictions because of the lack of adequate facilities in the County.

PRAC member Charles Moss reported that the PRAC was concerned that there were not enough recreation facilities and that having a central park would provide for all of the citizens. He pointed out that they were asking only that the Board give citizens the opportunity to decide for themselves. He spoke about the revenue that would be generated for the County if it had facilities that could draw softball tournaments and similar events. He clarified that this was not just about ball fields but about giving citizens the opportunity to decide what they would like to have.

Mr. Burrell recounted remarks from an expert on juvenile crime at a recent criminal justice meeting he had attended that a good way to keep youth out of gangs and out of trouble was to give them something to do, and he felt that having park facilities would help with that.

Mr. Budesky excused himself from the meeting in order to attend a class in Richmond.

Mr. Hill commented that he had spent his first three years in office working with the PRAC and he was aware of the desperate need to have recreation facilities for youth and adults in the community; however, he felt that a six cent tax increase would be difficult for many of the citizens. Recognizing that a portion of the meals tax revenue was committed to Parks & Recreation capital needs, he indicated that with the increasing number of eating establishments opening, there should be more revenue to spend on park facilities and perhaps a referendum for a smaller amount would be more appropriate.

Mr. Sparks recognized that there was a variety of needs in the County, including the need for recreation facilities and a new library; however, he felt that moving forward with a bond referendum at the present time would be premature. He suggested that other options be identified and explored.

Mr. Trout agreed that the meal tax revenue would be increasing. He also pointed out that the new high school included athletic fields and that perhaps something could be worked out to share their use. He expressed his concern with having a referendum that wasn't fully backed by the Board.

Mr. Sparks remarked that the Board had not had sufficient time to review the request and that he'd like to defer a decision to a later date in order that he could have time to talk with his constituents.

Mr. Summers advised that a decision would have to be made at least 60 days prior to the election, which would mean a vote no later than the August business meeting.

Mr. Davis commented that he felt the request was premature, and that there were other options to consider, including a PPEA. He reminded that two previous school bond referendums had failed by a large margin.

Mr. Trout suggested that staff and the PRAC put together a plan as to what it wanted to do.

Mr. Burrell advised that if the Board did not choose to put it on the ballot, citizens could do by petition.

Both Mr. Davis and Mr. Sparks advised that they had not heard anything from any of their constituents on the issue.

Mr. Moss said that the concerns of the PRAC was that with the \$250,000 the Board was budgeting each year for park development and improvements, it would take forever to complete the park and would cost the citizens much more in the long run.

Mr. Sparks stated that he would have preferred that the PRAC had come to the Board with an itemized list of the facilities that were needed and how much they would cost. Mr. Hill added that he would like information as to whether the use by the County of the school facilities would reduce those needs, although he commented that it was his information that the new school fields would be "eaten up" by school activities and youth sports.

Mr. Trout added that another consideration that needed to be addressed was the cost of operations and how that would affect the tax rate.

PRAC Chairman Pete Sweet summarized the Board's requests as he understood them:

1. other options
2. time to talk with citizens
3. details on what was needed
4. answers on whether school fields would be available

There was discussion regarding the park property itself. It was reported that even though the civil engineering studies were not yet complete, it appeared that 65% of the land would be usable. Staff indicated that a right-of-way had been obtained from Route 618 but not from Poindexter, as that property was not under the control of Farms of New Kent.

Mr. Davis suggested that staff find out if there might be some grant money to establish an access from Poindexter.

Mr. Sparks asked that staff and the PRAC give the Board information on what the County's needs were, i.e., how many ball fields, walking trails, etc., and how everyone could work together to make that happen.

Mr. Hill noted that Dorey Park had been developed in stages.

Mr. Trout suggested continuing the discussion until the July work session. He also asked that it be determined what kind of meals tax revenue was projected and any other proffers that might be expected.

The Board members were asked to send any other questions and concerns to Mr. Spruill so that they could be addressed.

IN RE: WATER SUPPLY

Public Utilities Director Alan Harrison, Britt McMillan from Malcolm Pirnie, Tracy Fee from URS and Roger Hart of R. Stuart Royer, were present to give an overview of water supply and conservation in New Kent.

Mr. Harrison advised that permits were required from the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for withdrawal of 10,000 gallons or more of water per day; that New Kent was currently in various stages of renewal and new permits; and with each permit, DEQ was expressing its concern as to what New Kent was adding and using its groundwater for.

By way of PowerPoint, Mr. McMillan demonstrated that groundwater use had increased to the extent that it had become "threatened", with the areas of greatest impact being in the Potomac Aquifer closest to the fall line east of I-95, as well as in the Chickahominy-Piney Point Aquifer (CPPA) in James City County. He noted that in Williamsburg and James City County, the CPPA was overdrawn to the point that dewatering was occurring. He advised that the bulk of DEQ regulations were to prevent dewatering.

He pointed out that industrial, commercial and municipal uses were regulated by DEQ were but not residential uses.

He advised that current withdrawals from the CPPA exceeded 100 gallons per day, with roughly one-half being used by two paper mills and the bulk of the rest being used by municipalities from James City County to Suffolk. He noted that most of the residential wells in New Kent County drew from the CPPA.

It was reported that DEQ gave priority to existing users over new or expanding users, and that with all new and renewal permits, DEQ was requiring justification, focusing on reducing the permitted amounts to the minimum for all users, with human consumption being given the highest priority.

Mr. McMillan advised that there was an under-use of the water in the Water Table, explaining that 90% of water in the Water Table flowed into streams, with very little making it to the lower aquifers. He also advised that silty clay layers between the aquifers prevented the flow of water from one aquifer to another. He advised that there was no documented fluoride intrusion, but that the recently observed dewatering in observation

wells in Toano was what had prompted DEQ to tighten the permitting process.

He advised that groundwater withdrawal permits were issued for a maximum of ten years and that a one-time aquifer test would be required for the current permit cycle.

Mr. Hart explained that DEQ was looking to localities to do whatever they could to conserve water.

Mr. Harrison indicated that New Kent was currently working on a Water Supply Plan, even though it was not required until 2010, as a sign that the County was being pro-active. He indicated that staff planned to identify things that the County was already doing, such as encouraging drought-resistant native landscaping and rain sensors on irrigation meters. He also suggested that residents be discouraged from using domestic water for irrigation but instead be permitted to drill irrigation wells into the Water Table, noting that most of the irrigation water would seep back into the Water Table. He reported that Virginia Beach had instituted a similar program.

Mr. Harrison indicated that he would be returning to the Board with some recommendations for its consideration, which would include no longer mandating the installation of irrigation meters for new development and permitting residents to drill irrigation wells. He commented that this would encourage developers to come up with new and innovative ways to irrigate. He advised that he was also considering requesting a steeper block billing rate to discourage consumption.

He reported that in Brickshire, domestic water demand per household was about 200 gallons per day, with irrigation demand in the winter months at 100 gallons per day and in the summer at 500 gallons per day. He predicted that the irrigation usage would not be considered for renewal of the permit that covered Brickshire.

Mr. Hill noted that using the Water Table instead of one of the aquifers was not really conserving the resource, but Mr. Harrison reminded that the use would be shifted to a source that recharged itself.

In summary, Mr. Harrison advised that DEQ would not accept irrigation uses of potable systems which will affect the permit for Brickshire. Mr. Davis asked if this would result in having to amend the Kentland PUD Agreement. Mr. Summers advised that the PUD agreement would have to be amended anyway because of the proposed Weingast development.

Mr. Harrison advised that he took Mr. Weingast's engineer with him to the last meeting with DEQ so that he would be aware of the situation.

He clarified that New Kent was not running out of water, but that he was taking steps to maximize what the County had now for as long as possible, and was looking at options to use surface water from other areas as potential sources.

He also suggested that New Kent contact its General Assembly representatives for their help in adding New Kent to the list of localities allowed to regulate well depth and well construction.

Mr. Trout advised that he had some concerns with re-opening the PUD agreement.

Mr. Summers indicated that there was an additional issue in that some developers were into the design phase and had spent money. If the regulations were changed, then there would be additional costs. He suggested that the changes be options but not requirements, and that Mr. Harrison address as many of these issues as he could in the utility design standards.

Mr. Harrison indicated that he would like to have a consensus to stop mandating irrigation meters for new development and allow irrigation wells to be installed. Mr. Davis indicated that he needed more information as well as time to poll his constituents.

Mr. Harrison conceded that staff needed to meet with residents and provide some education and inducement.

Mr. Trout admitted that "encouraging" was different than "mandating", and residents would still be allowed to have irrigation meters as an option.

Mr. Davis cautioned about "getting into the Water Table" and the effects that a drought would have.

All of the Board members except for Mr. Davis were in consensus to move forward with Mr. Harrison's suggestion to stop mandating irrigation meters and permit residents to drill irrigation wells.

IN RE: HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING

General Services Director Jim Tacosa reported on the status of the Human Services building.

He advised that four bids had been received under PPEA from qualified contractors, two of which were high and two were reasonable. He advised that bids were based on an 18,000 square foot building with a 100% back up generator, with \$3.4 million having been budgeted. He advised that the project was still in the conceptual stage and was beginning to enter the detailed stage, and that the low bid was around \$2.8 million.

Mr. Summers advised that staff's intention was to obtain a sense of the Board that it was comfortable with the \$2.8 million cost - not to approve a contract with a particular vendor. He advised that once a contract had been negotiated, it would require approval of the Board

There was consensus of the Board to move forward.

Mr. Tacosa also provided updates on some of the other projects.

He advised that the Sheriff's Annex site had been filled and the column locations chalked, and the building was scheduled to arrive in mid-August. He reported no changes in the budget and estimated completion in about six months, with no delays anticipated.

Regarding renovations of the second floor of the Courthouse, he reported that three bidders had submitted concept proposals which he was still in the process of evaluating.

He advised that proposals on the conceptual phase of the Vehicle Maintenance Facility were due this week and that he had received positive feedback from the bidders. He reminded that the project would be done in phases.

He advised that demolition at the former VDOT site had been completed and slabs repaired and poured, and framing underway. He estimated a move-in date of September 1.

IN RE: NEW KENT VINEYARDS UPDATE

Pete Johns, Partner in New Kent Farms, and Charles Riedlinger of Resources International, were present to report on the status of the New Kent Vineyards project.

Mr. Johns advised that utility work and work inside the land bays was progressing, and that Land Bay V was ready for pad sites.

Drawings of utility lines and infrastructure that had been completed were reviewed. It was reported that installation of the utility lines to Watkins Elementary should start soon and be ready to go on-line in October. He advised that the water tank was assembled and almost ready to be lifted. Aerial photos taken on May 28 of interior work were distributed. He advised that home construction would be started by September 1 and available for residents by the first of the year. He reported that the construction of the 29,000 square foot clubhouse would start one year earlier than planned.

Mr. Johns advised that 92 acres of commercial property was under contract, and that the Visitors Center would be ready for occupancy in the next couple of months. He reported that seven holes on the golf course had been timbered and that the sales trailer would soon be moved into Land Bay I.

He advised that events were scheduled every week in October, culminating with the Harvest Festival on the last weekend. He reported that a launch of Land Bay I (estate homes) would be held on October 20, and that they will have a selected builder's program for these homes that will range from \$800,000 to \$3 million. He indicated that they were using the services of two advertising agencies, and were under contract with SB&A for management of the golf course, country inn, café, and spa. He reported that SB&A managed 1,500 properties, including The Homestead.

He indicated that homeowners would have the opportunity to have privileges at over 1,500 golf courses across the country.

He advised that their wine would be moved down from Northern Virginia at the end of July and he was looking at the first of the year for it to be ready for bottling. He projected that they would be processing 44 tons of wine at the Winery this year.

He advised that in Land Bay IV, homes would be in the \$350,000 to \$500,000 range. Regarding Land Bay II, he indicated that they were negotiating with two developers, and had a contract with one on a 11.25-acre parcel. He noted that one of the developers was concerned with the slow market for town homes. He advised that they had three years to start building the affordable housing units at a rate of five per year.

He advised that the amenities at New Kent Vineyards would serve as amenities for other K. Hovnavian properties.

He invited all of the Board members to come for a tour.

IN RE: COUNTY REIMBURSEMENT FROM BORROWINGS

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-27-07 wherein the Board declared its intent to reimburse itself from the proceeds of one or more financings for certain expenditures made or to be made in connection with capital improvement projects.

Financial Services Director Mary Altemus advised that this was an action that was taken by the Board every year to allow the County to reimburse itself from the proceeds of the borrowings for various projects.

Mr. Sparks moved to adopt Resolution R-27-07 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: FINANCE MATTERS

Before the Board for consideration were the following Supplemental Appropriations and Inter-departmental Budget Transfers:

Appropriations

1. Funds expected from Hanover Tavern Foundation for the Virginia Department of Historic Resources Revolutionary War Road and Transportation Survey, \$500.00
2. Funds received from Ausland Homes, Inc. as reimbursement for repairs & maintenance expenditures, \$1,450.00
3. Funds received for participation in the Eltham Bridge 5K Run, \$845.00
4. EDA funds received for the Eltham Battlefield project, \$425.00
5. State Fair of Virginia funds received for law enforcement coverage at the Strawberry Hill Races on Apr 14, \$26,296.00
6. State Fair of Virginia funds received for fire-rescue ambulance standby May 1 – Jun 3, \$3,400.00
7. County of Henrico funds received for FESCO repair of damages to a New Kent ambulance that occurred while on a rescue call at Henrico Jail, \$1,633.00
8. Parks & Recreation donation from Ann & Kent Bradshaw, \$31.00
9. Animal Shelter donation from Michelle Philbates, \$100.00
10. Funds received in the Treasurer's Office for DMV collection fees, \$20.00
11. Funds received in the Treasurer's Office for Discovery charge card fees, \$37.00
12. Additional funds received for utility irrigation connection fees, \$2,550.00

\$(37,287.00)	Total
\$ 37,287.00	Money in/Money out

Inter-departmental budget transfers

1. *Sheriff's Office*: \$500 from part-time wages to overtime
2. *Airport*: \$500 from overtime to hospital/medical plans
3. *Economic Development*: \$200 from repairs & maintenance to overtime

4. *Voter Registrar*: \$50 from mileage to part time salaries & wages

Mr. Burrell moved to approve the Supplemental Appropriations and Inter-departmental Budget Transfers as requested, and that they be made a part of the record. 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: MEETING SCHEDULE

The Chairman announced that the next meeting of the Board of Supervisors would be held at 6:00 p.m. on July 9, 2007, and the next work session at 4:00 p.m. on July 23, 2007, both in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building, New Kent, Virginia.

IN RE: CLOSED SESSION

Mr. Trout moved to go into Closed Session to discuss a personnel matter pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.1 of the Code of Virginia involving a Board employee's contract; Mr. Davis moved to go into closed session for discussion of plans to protect public safety pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.20 of the Code of Virginia. 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. The Board went into closed session.

Mr. Hill moved to return to open session. 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.

Mr. Sparks 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:

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: E-911 CALLS FROM COX CUSTOMERS

Mr. Davis expressed his concern about a problem with E-911 calls made from customers of Cox Communications. Mr. Budesky advised that he had spoken with Tom Prevette of Cox who acknowledged that there was a problem in New Kent and elsewhere and that they were working to get it resolved.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Hill moved to adjourn. 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.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:14 p.m.