

A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAS HELD ON THE 28th DAY OF JANUARY IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND SIX OF OUR LORD AT THE ROYAL NEW KENT GOLF COURSE IN PROVIDENCE FORGE, VIRGINIA, AT 9:30 A.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.	Present

Chairman Sparks reconvened the meeting at 9:35 a.m., which had been continued from January 23, 2006.

IN RE: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Larry Forbes, Chairman of the New Kent Economic Development Authority was present to recommend that the Board increase the amount of compensation paid to EDA members.

Mr. Forbes pointed out that the Code of Virginia, under Section 15.2-4904, permitted members to be paid up to \$200 per meeting. He reported that the current State Code Section represented a change enacted last year as a result of the efforts of Hanover County to increase compensation for its EDA members.

He reviewed the work and accomplishments of the New Kent EDA and reported that in order to manage its work load, the Authority had created subcommittees and each member had agreed to chair a subcommittee. Those subcommittees and respective chairs were identified as Weir Creek and Zoning – Larry Haislip; Visitors Center – Milton Brown; Fisher tract – Paul Robinson; Tourism, 2007 Committee & Eltham Battlefield – David Sisk; General – Charles Davis; and New Accounting System – Conway Adams.

Mr. Forbes indicated that EDA members attend no less than 12 meetings per year, and that this request was his and not from the other members. He clarified that he was not requesting that the EDA members be paid \$200 per month plus \$200 per meeting, but asking that the monthly payment be increased from its current level of \$100 per month. He further represented that as long as the EDA had sufficient funding (reporting that it had approximately \$300,000 in its accounts), he would recommend that the EDA reimburse the County (in advance) for the amounts paid to its members for meeting compensation.

Mr. Forbes was asked if the EDA was willing to pay for the salary of the Economic Development Assistant. He responded that there could be an opportunity where the EDA might assist with that expense.

Mr. Forbes was asked if the EDA was going to repay the loan to the County for the purchase of the Fisher tract. Mr. Forbes stated that he would like to do some research to see if it would make more sense to use its funds in a different way to earn more revenue for the County; however, that possibility had not been ruled out. It was pointed out that the loan was to be paid off in three years.

Mr. Forbes reviewed the EDA's need for a more formal accounting package that would better track its purchases, as well as the need to develop a better investment policy.

Mr. Forbes was asked if he was recommending payment for additional meetings. He indicated that he would like for the EDA members to discuss that and make their own recommendation, but he would suggest \$50 for any additional "substantial subsequent" meetings, similar to what members of other boards and commissions receive. It was reported that none of the EDA members claim reimbursement for mileage.

Mr. Forbes was asked what was paid to EDA members in other localities. He indicated that the only one of which he was certain was Hanover, whose members receive \$200 per meeting.

Mr. Sparks requested that the EDA members define "substantial subsequent" meetings so that the Board would have a clear understanding before making a decision. He clarified that he did not think what Mr. Forbes was asking was unreasonable and that he thought the EDA was doing a good job, but the request needed to be clarified. Mr. Forbes indicated that he would discuss this with the EDA members and get back with the Board.

It was confirmed that the earliest time that any change would take place would be with the new budget.

Mr. Forbes thanked the Board members for their attention and departed the meeting.

It was pointed out that Mr. Forbes was the only EDA member that wanted this increase in compensation. It was agreed that the EDA members did a lot of work and should be paid on the same scale as the Planning Commission members. One of the Board members commented that an increase could result in the necessity of filing W-2 forms. Another stated that any of the EDA members could decline their meeting compensation. It was noted that the County does receive something back from the EDA and the EDA was willing to fund the meeting payments. It was agreed that no action would be taken until the Board heard back from Mr. Forbes. It was suggested that the Board determine if increasing the EDA meeting compensation would affect other board or commissions that produce revenue.

IN RE: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

County Administrator John Budesky reviewed the proposed Capital Improvement Plan for FY2007 – 2011.

He pointed out that the total cost of the plan had been decreased by over \$19 million in recent weeks by either removal or delay of projects. He indicated that of the \$115 million left, only \$30,161,000 was to be funded by local dollars. He represented that if the anticipated grants for some of the projects were not successful, then that particular project would not take place. As examples, he cited that neither the YMCA nor the library would move forward until the necessary funds had been raised.

Mr. Budesky stressed that the CIP was not a "wish list" but an accurate representation of the needs of the County. He indicated that the CIP would be a part of the actual budget approval process, as no one would know what the County could afford until budget time.

There was an item-by-item review of the proposed CIP. Regarding the amount budgeted for a new accounting software package, Mr. Budesky described how the current system was not meeting the County's needs, including its inability to communicate between departments or to track proffers. He cautioned that the \$900,000 budgeted might not be

sufficient, and that staff was looking into other options in order to decrease the cost. One of the Board members inquired if the School Board would be able to use the new system as well. Mr. Budesky indicated that he thought so, but he would have to check and confirm that.

Mr. Burrell indicated that the boardroom upgrades should be done before 2008/2009 and described the technology used in one of Virginia's other localities that he had visited, which included a curved dais and snap-in lap tops. Other recommendations included lapel mikes and cordless mikes to better facilitate public hearings. Mr. Budesky stated that under the current cable franchise renewal negotiations, cash from the cable contract renewal would not be available until 2008/2009. He stated that he could break out those improvements and focus on boardroom improvements and leave the broadcast improvements in later years. Mr. Trout spoke about the pending legislation regarding localities' authority to negotiate with cable companies and suggested that New Kent try to complete its process with Cox before July 1. Mr. Budesky was requested to get additional information for review at the next meeting and he indicated that he would work with staff to get itemized information for the Board. It was the Board's consensus to move this item into the upcoming budget.

There was discussion regarding the YMCA and whether the current middle school might be a suitable location. It was pointed out that the School Board had no intention of relinquishing any of the athletic facilities (including the gym at the current middle school). Mr. Hill stated that he considered the YMCA to be a competitor to the parks & rec programs and he would like to move that out into future years. Mr. Budesky indicated that he felt that a YMCA would complement the County's parks & rec program, and would provide an opportunity for a pool, swimming lessons and a place for the high school swim team to practice. Mr. Burrell indicated that he had found in his work with the correction system and criminal justice programs that YMCAs have proven to be beneficial to children. Mr. Sparks stated that he had issues with spending \$2 million in local money, considering the other critical needs of the County.

Mr. Budesky pointed out that a new General Services Director had just started work and that there may be some changes in the recommendations once he had had the opportunity to review it. He reminded that there was no building maintenance plan in place and that there were a lot of needs that may change now that the County has someone with a technical background in that position.

There was discussion about whether there was a need for another trash transfer station. Mr. Budesky indicated that the new transfer station was proposed for Bottoms Bridge, contingent upon a site being donated. That would most likely be moved forward. One of the Board members inquired about Patriot's Landing and it was reported that they will be required to have curbside trash pickup.

Mr. Davis noted that development of a commuter parking ride lot proposed for Angel View Road was not in the plan.

The Board members commented on the high cost of a courthouse generator. Mr. Budesky reported that a bid was put out for a generator to serve all three buildings, but apparently no one could provide that setup. Bids were put out again for individual generators and the only one that could be afforded under the current budget was for the Old Courthouse (around \$125,000). He explained that the generators needed to have enough capacity so that the buildings could open for business as usual. Mr. Davis asked if the County had

discussed this project with Dominion Virginia Power, who had installed the last three generators on County wells. Mr. Budesky indicated that he did not recall Dominion Virginia Power being one of the bidders but he would check on that further.

There was a discussion whether a new loader was needed at the Route 618 site. There was consensus among the Board members to budget for a used loader rather than a new one, or to consider a small track loader.

Regarding Purchase of Development Rights, it was pointed out that those figures represented 1¢ on the tax rate, and that the County needed to develop a program in order to accept proffers from developers. Mr. Trout reported that there was legislation under consideration by the General Assembly where 50% of certain court fees would be earmarked for this program. Mr. Budesky indicated that the Board would have to decide if it was willing to commit 1¢ to fund this program or did it want to look to other sources. Mr. Trout stated that if the County could find other sources, it would free up County funds for other needs. It was agreed not to make any changes for the time being.

It was noted that the amount for Village improvements represented money for lighting and sidewalks.

There was discussion regarding VDOT Revenue Sharing. Mr. Davis emphasized the need to pave the dirt roads that were already in the State system. There was consensus to leave this line item the way it was.

Regarding the Economic Development projects, Mr. Budesky spoke to the safety of having more than one employee at the proposed Visitors Center at all times. Following discussion, it was agreed to move the site development funding for the Fisher tract out to 08/09. Mr. Trout brought the Board members up to date regarding the request for changes to the nexus provision of the State's Tax Code, reporting that there was currently no bill pending.

Mr. Burrell asked for an update on the old jail camp. Mr. Budesky reported that he would be meeting with Henrico's County Administrator to further discuss that issue.

Regarding the Fire Department line items, there was discussion about the need for an aerial truck in New Kent. Mr. Budesky pointed out that there were some hazardous scenes where the County was required to bring in such equipment from other localities. Furthermore, this would be a recruitment tool to help the County attract new businesses because having this equipment would result in reduced insurance rates. Mr. Davis asked about considering a used aerial truck. Mr. Trout commented on the use and mileage and indicated that there was a small ladder truck at Company 3, but admitted that it was not long enough to be effective. Following further discussion, there was consensus to move that into 08/09.

Mr. Burrell commented that rural area fire departments were rarely able to save buildings but kept the fires from spreading. He stated that rescue was more important and was where the County should be spending its money.

Mr. Trout indicated that the need for an aerial truck and other different equipment would be generated by the villages and Land Bay 3 of the Farms of New Kent.

The request for \$375,000 for a fire engine during 07-08 precipitated a discussion about the practice of sending fire engines on medical calls. Mr. Davis commented that if the reason given was that staff would be prepared to respond to a fire call, then it would be cheaper to

have more paid firemen. Mr. Trout suggested not funding any more fire engines until there were changes in the policy and he pointed out that in none of the rescue calls on which he was involved was there ever any need for a fire truck. It was agreed that fire trucks do need to respond to accidents on interstate. It was also noted that the County needed to stop its volunteers from driving the equipment up and down the roads. Mr. Hill pointed out that \$375,000 would fund more staff. It was reminded that Farms of New Kent had proffered toward the cost of a new fire engine. Mr. Budesky suggested that the Board leave the fire engine in for now and he would bring back a policy for the Board's consideration to eliminate waste and misuse of equipment.

Mr. Trout confirmed the need for a heavy duty rescue truck in some instances.

There was discussion regarding the need for new chiefs' vehicles. Mr. Budesky indicated that past practice of using recycled vehicles from the Sheriff's office had resulted in some reliability problems.

There was discussion regarding the request for new ambulances. Mr. Trout indicated that Company 1 had only one ambulance, and did not take calls if the unit was out. He reported that there were two at Company 2, one of which needed replacement. He stated that he felt the County needed ambulances more than it needed fire trucks.

Regarding the request for a tanker truck, Mr. Trout stated that there was a small one at Company 3, but admitted there was a need for one at each of the other stations. Some of the members asked why one tanker couldn't serve the whole County. Mr. Budesky indicated that it was the intent to have one 350,000 gallon tanker at each station. Mr. Davis stated that it was his understanding that there was a tanker truck at each station. Mr. Budesky agreed to look into this further.

Regarding the Information Technology requests, it was noted that the Board had committed to fund the update of aerial photography through the State for a lesser amount, which would adjust the amount of that request. Mr. Budesky explained the need for a new telephone system, and he indicated that, depending on what the bids are, funding may be spread out over a number of years if the County borrowed the money and budgeted the debt service.

There was discussion regarding the Parks and Recreation funding requests. It was pointed out that the Kentland park property (located beside the fire station) had not yet been deeded over to the County. It was reported that the vehicle proposed to be replaced was the van that transports equipment and children. One of the Board members suggested that maybe the County could use Bay Transit to help with that. Mr. Budesky indicated the new 100 acre park property was not under consideration at the time the CIP was developed, but would be developed and added. Regarding the Quinton Community Park, it was noted that donations to date included \$1,000 from New Kent in Motion, a \$25,000 pavilion (Rotary Club) and under \$1,000 in other donations.

There was discussion regarding the funding for park property at Diascund Reservoir. Mr. Budesky indicated that he thought that the County would be required to adopt the overlay protection before they would receive the park property or the promised funding.

Mr. Davis brought the Board up to date on the Eltham Fishing pier. He reported that he and Mr. Budesky had met with personnel from Game & Inland Fisheries and Virginia Marine Resources, who were interested in helping the County plan and operate the facility as well

as obtain grants, and that development of a Memo of Understanding was currently underway. It was clarified that the bridge would extend 800 feet out from where the road ends and the bridge begins.

Mr. Burrell expressed his concerns about the need for a \$3 million rec center if a YMCA was opened in New Kent. Mr. Budesky confirmed that if a YMCA opened in New Kent, then the need for a County owned rec center would be revisited.

The Board reviewed the CIP requests from Public Utilities. Mr. Budesky explained the need for a reliable backhoe to handle problems with the public water and sewer systems coming on line. The proposed cost would include a trailer that could be pulled with existing department vehicles.

There was discussion regarding the high school project, middle school conversion project, proposed field house and school bus replacements, as well as the possibility of receiving unsolicited proposals under the Public Private Education Act (PPEA).

There was discussion regarding the \$5 million request for the Sheriff's Annex, and it was clarified that it did not cover renovations of the second floor of the courthouse – that project was set forth separately at \$850,000. Mr. Budesky reported that the Sheriff had indicated that he needed 15,000 square feet as well as additional outside fenced storage. Mr. Davis suggested using space at the old jail camp for an impound lot. Mr. Budesky pointed out that the impound lot was a small part of the project, which included renovations in the existing building to expand the holding cells. He indicated that a large part of the cost to renovate the second floor was in retrofitting for the elevator. If an addition was made to the building, the elevator could be located at the back of the building which might reduce the cost. He stated that plans were to get the design ready and bids out in the near future and be ready to break ground when financing becomes available next year.

Mr. Davis asked about rural development grants. Mr. Hill pointed out that there was a grant writer for hire that lives in the County and he agreed to get contact information for Mr. Budesky.

IN RE: REVENUE SHARING

The Board of Supervisors continued discussions on revenues sharing plans.

Regarding the Rural Addition program, Mr. Davis stated that the County should not use taxpayer money to work on private roads, and that there were enough public roads that needed improvement.

There was discussion regarding Shooters Run Road and ways to help the homeowners along that private road that had been ruled to be a public right-of-way by a local judge.

Mr. Hill moved that the County Administrator advise the Virginia Department of Transportation that New Kent County wished to release the funds reserved for Rural Addition and understood that those funds would be returned to the State for distribution and would not be available for New Kent's use. The members were polled:

Mark E. Hill	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye

W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye

The motion carried.

The Board discussed the four graveled roads that were included in the current Secondary Road Six Year Plan for surfacing under the Rural Rustic Road program. It was noted that there were no homes on Route 624. There were comments regarding the need for a second access for residents of Brickshire.

Mr. Hill moved that the County delete the Route 624 project from the Rural Rustic Roads program list and pay the balance of \$85,040.82 from the amount currently budgeted for Revenue Sharing. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

IN RE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

County Administrator John Budesky suggested that the Board move forward to establish an advisory committee to set the guidelines and goals for what was expected. That committee would need to define "affordable housing" as it related to New Kent. He indicated that many communities were defining this as "work force housing" that would be affordable to teachers and deputies, and not "projects". He admitted that any recommendation that came back to the Board could provide that affordable housing may include low income or no income housing. He spoke on the use of inclusionary zoning, where affordable housing was integrated into the community rather than "lumped all together".

Mr. Trout distributed a handout outlining some of his thoughts and suggestions. He recommended that the goal should be to increase the number of homes available to families earning an income of \$35,000 or less (23% of New Kent's population), which would include current residents, County employees, employees of existing county businesses, and younger residents who want to own their own homes. He indicated that those goals could be accomplished through construction of affordable homes (through Habitat for Humanity and agreements with developers which could include rental apartments, condos and town homes) as well as improvements of existing homes (through Habitat for Humanity, community block grants, and a revolving loan fund for no or low interest loans). It was pointed out that Farms of New Kent had agreed to contribute \$200 for each home constructed, towards New Kent's affordable housing program. Mr. Hill inquired whether Habitat for Humanity could access those funds.

There was consensus to create an advisory board and appoint members at the February 13 meeting. The board will contain an appointment made by each supervisor, but appointees would not have to live in the district or the County. Also included on the advisory board should be the Social Services Director and a representative from the local ministerial association.

Mr. Burrell moved that the Board create an Affordable Housing Advisory Committee, whose duties would be defined at a later date, with ad hoc members consisting of the Social Services Director and a member of the ministerial association, to be appointed at the February meeting. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS

There were no appointments. There was a request to advertise the current openings in the various Boards and Commissions on the government access channel and website.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS

Requests for the Board of Supervisors FY06/07 budget and anticipated expenses were discussed. Staff was asked to include a \$1,000 request for funds to host officials and others at events in New Kent. Mr. Davis suggested that New Kent consider hosting the July meeting of the Virginia Peninsula Mayors & Chairs at Colonial Downs.

IN RE: LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. Trout provided information regarding the status of legislation in the General Assembly, reporting that New Kent had no legislation introduced on its behalf.

He stated that a bill (either HB963 or HB936) had been introduced that, if approved, would require that septic tanks be approved by an engineer, which would add \$500 - \$1,000 to the cost of installation.

He indicated that there was currently no bill pending regarding a change in the nexus provision of the State sales tax code.

He reported that bills HB169 and HB315 addressed restrictions on real estate taxes.

He indicated that an increase in fees for courthouse security from \$5 to \$20 was requested in HB177 and HB378. An increase in the courthouse maintenance fee from \$2 to \$12 was requested in HB379.

He reported that pending legislation regarding communication tax reform (SB1335 and HB568), would fix the amount received by localities based on their 2006 tax rates, and commented that the fact that New Kent increased its rates last year was to its advantage. He indicated that there was a study being conducted regarding those localities with an increase in population and expressed his concern that the date could be moved back to an earlier year, which would hurt New Kent.

He stated that he could find no legislation regarding tax credits for construction of green buildings or development.

He reported that there were several bills that related to the purchase of development rights (HB67, HB1422, HJ133, SB238, SB409 and SJ94), one of which included that 50% of state recordation tax would be earmarked for PDR programs.

Regarding New Kent's request to be added to those localities that may compel connection to public water and sewer, he reported that there was nothing pending but that it might not be too late to have something introduced.

He indicated that it was possible that New Kent could be added in an amendment to SB199 and HB915 which were filed to permit Newport News to be able to require screening of automobile graveyards.

He spoke about pending legislation (HB2534 (2005), HB881, HB1404 and HB707) to take away the localities' ability to negotiate cable television franchises. He reported that if the bills were adopted and went into effect July 1, 2006, they would allow existing contracts to continue. He indicated that was an excellent incentive to complete negotiations with Cox Cable prior to July 1. He stated that cable companies were opposed to the legislation but that Verizon was pushing for its adoption in that it would permit Verizon to "cherry pick" the areas where it wanted to provide cable television services. He commented that satellite TV could become the primary provider. Mr. Budesky indicated that it was his understanding that if the legislation was adopted, and New Kent had an agreement in place with Cox, that Verizon could still offer cable services in the County. Mr. Trout pointed out that the bill was heavily supported by VACo and VML on behalf of the larger counties but it would not be to the benefit of the smaller growing communities.

Mr. Trout reported that SB393 would provide that the State would reimburse localities for Law Enforcement Officers Retirement System (LEOS) coverage for state-funded deputies. Sheriff Howard had indicated that this would cover about 60% of his deputies.

He also indicated that HB535 would add a jurisdiction to the list of those that could establish a real estate lien for water and sewer fees. There was some question as to whether that was already allowed and the County Attorney agreed to look into that.

Mr. Trout indicated that there were two bills pending that related to impact fees.

The other Board members thanked Mr. Trout for his work in keeping them advised on the status of the various bills in the General Assembly. Mr. Budesky confirmed that there were three areas where New Kent needed to be added: screening of auto graveyards, the water/sewer bill, and LEOS.

IN RE: CLOSED SESSION

Mr. Davis moved to go into closed session to discuss a personnel matter pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.1 of the Code of Virginia involving discipline of an employee, and for discussion relating to real property pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.3 of the code of Virginia involving acquisition of real property for public purpose. The members were polled:

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

David. M. Sparks

Aye

The motion carried. The Board went into closed session.

Mr. Davis moved to come out of Closed Session. The members were polled:

Mark E. Hill

Aye

James H. Burrell

Aye

Stran L. Trout

Aye

W. R. Davis, Jr.

Aye

David. M. Sparks

Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Burrell made the following certification:

Whereas, the New Kent County Board of Supervisors has convened 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.

Chairman Sparks 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

Stran L. Trout

Aye

W. R. Davis, Jr.

Aye

Mark E. Hill

Aye

David M. Sparks

Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Hill moved that the County Administrator continue to work with the Ruritan Club in the acquisition of the Quinton Community Center. The members were polled:

Stran L. Trout

Aye

W. R. Davis, Jr.

Aye

Mark E. Hill

Aye

James H. Burrell

Aye

David M. Sparks

Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Hill moved to allow the County Administrator to continue the acquisition of the 100-acre park property site off Criss Cross Road (near Olivet Church Road) with a 50-foot right-of-way on all property controlled by Farms of New Kent that accesses the site, and to execute the Availability Fee Agreement with the Farms of New Kent. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

IN RE: VISION STATEMENT

Mr. Budesky distributed a handout with a revised Vision Statement, Core Values, Key Performance Areas and Goal Statements.

The Board was in consensus that staff was on the right track and discussed ways to communicate the document once it was ready for public consumption. Suggestions included articles in the newspaper and/or press releases, on the website, and on the public access channel.

IN RE: RETREAT

Mr. Budesky distributed a handout entitled "Zoning Ordinance Way Forward – Some Suggestions" that was generated in the Community Development Department. He pointed out that staff was continuing to work on a matrix to outline the difference between the existing ordinance and the proposed changes.

The Board members agreed with the suggestion of creating the village and hamlet districts and, rather than zoning any property into those districts, letting developers request rezoning.

There was some discussion regarding the conflicts and inconsistencies regarding horses in R-1 and livestock in A-1. It was reported that there was never any intent to impose the current R-1 restrictions regarding horses in the A-1, and that staff was meeting with State officials to help craft appropriate language.

There was discussion regarding the Reservoir Protection Overlay in the proposed zoning ordinance revision, and it was pointed out that those provisions resulted from agreements previously entered into with the City of Newport News wherein New Kent agreed to protect the Diascund Reservoir. The County Attorney was directed to review the agreements and determine what was required by those agreements, as well as what would be required to effect the transfer to New Kent from Newport News of the promised park property along the Diascund and payment of funds.

There was general discussion on how to best to move forward with the zoning ordinance revision process. The Board was encouraged to make certain that any committee that was created be fairly representative of the County and not heavily stacked with developers or other groups. The importance was emphasized of ensuring that members of this proposed

committee had a clear understanding of what was expected of them as well as the committee's goal.

There was discussion regarding the wide range of definitions of a "village". Recommendations were made to break the process down into pieces, consider standards for each "village" individually, and work on each in order of priority. It was recognized that each proposed village in New Kent differed from the others and should have its own unique standards and character. It was suggested that the order of priority for consideration should be Bottoms Bridge, then Providence Forge. It was also agreed that the Courthouse village should need the least effort.

There was discussion regarding the creation of a committee to consider individual villages and/or areas, and be a smaller committee composed of individuals who were connected to or had interest in that particular area. Mr. Budesky indicated that he and the County Attorney would insert themselves into the process as well.

The Chairman asked Mr. Budesky to develop a proposal to review with him so that he could in turn discuss with the Planning Commission Chairman.

There was discussion about the importance of grandfathering existing businesses and being prepared to work with them to avoid or lessen any impact that might result from any zoning revisions. As an example, Mr. Budesky reported that the wood products company that was considering locating in New Kent would not be a permitted use under the proposed revisions.

Mr. Budesky indicated that he would work with staff, but emphasized that it was important to communicate that the project was not pulled because of lack of faith in the process but because the questionable likelihood of success.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mr. Trout moved to adjourn the meeting. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 p.m.
