

A REGULAR WORK SESSION WAS HELD BY THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE 20TH DAY OF MAY IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND FIFTEEN IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 9:00 A.M.

IN RE: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Tiller called the May 18, 2015 Board of Supervisors meeting which had been a continuation of the May 11, 2015 Board of Supervisors meeting back into session.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

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

All members were present.

IN RE: TENNIS COURT CONSTRUCTION PROJECT

New Kent County School Superintendent Dr. David Myers was present to provide the Board with an update on the School Board's search for the best location for new tennis courts. He reported the School Board had narrowed the locations down to three sites and RRMM Architects had reviewed and prepared cost estimates for each of them. He noted the architect had cautioned that actual cost would not be known until the project was put out for bid. Options to be considered included the following.

Option 1: Reconstruction of tennis courts at the existing location at an estimated cost of \$244,970.

Option 2: Building new tennis courts at a location to the front side of the high school property at an estimated cost of \$399,500.

Option 3: Building new tennis courts at a location behind the high school at an estimated cost of \$416,000.

Dr. Myers indicated he believed architectural and engineering fees included in Option 2 and Option 3 were high and could be reduced by \$30,000 to \$40,000. He also noted the \$220,000 price tag for tennis courts listed in each estimate included a \$20,000 contingency.

Dr. Myers indicated there were pros and cons to each of the options and began to elaborate.

Option 1: The biggest pro with Option 1 was the cost. Although the price was the lowest of the three, the School Board had a number of concerns regarding rebuilding in this location. Included in those concerns were the possible future need for this area to be available for the expansion of New Kent Elementary School or the addition of classroom trailers; the need to address parking and traffic issues and existing drainage issues.

Option 2: Pros associated with this option included the property being located adjacent to an existing parking lot, lighting already being on site and its easy access for students and guests. Dr. Myers noted students who were currently driving to the Option 1 location were adding to the parking and traffic issues and would be able to walk to courts at the Option 2 location. The downside included the probability that someone designing a school would not

have selected this location for tennis courts, the middle school was using this area for football practice and the high school was using this area for shot put and discus.

Option 3: The most significant pro with this option was it would not detract from the appearance of the main entrance to the high school. Negatives included the remote location, the need to run electricity and install lighting and the need to build a parking lot. It was noted paved handicapped parking would be required and if the parking lot included more than 20 spaces, paving would be required for the entire lot.

Mr. Davis questioned the stormwater infrastructure costs in Option 2. Community Development Director Matthew Smolnik noted if there would be any increase in the impervious area, the need for additional stormwater management would come into play. Mr. Davis asked if a site other than the current tennis court location was selected, would there be a need to remove the existing courts. Mr. Smolnik indicated it would not be necessary to remove existing courts. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway also indicated leaving the existing courts in place would be recommended because the paved surface could be used as the pad site for possible future mobile units. He also noted removal of the paved surface would bring up additional stormwater issues as well.

Mr. Evelyn asked how Option 3 would impact the geothermal wells located behind the high school. Dr. Myers noted there were over 630 geothermal wells but the proposed location was located beyond the area of those wells. Mr. Evelyn noted Option 3 was obviously the most expensive to build and suggested if a tennis court facility was built at that location, it would also be desirable for the access road to be paved.

Dr. Myers asked the Supervisors for their opinions in regard to Option 2. Mr. Davis indicated he felt it was the most feasible. Mr. Evelyn indicated he could support Option 1 or Option 2 and then asked if the School Board was leaning toward Option 3. Dr. Myers indicated the School Board had been going back and forth between the options but they were very leery of rebuilding the courts at their current location. Mr. Evelyn noted he was very leery about building the courts at the Option 3 location. Mr. Tiller indicated he felt the Option 3 location was too isolated.

Mr. Stiers asked how long tennis courts were expected to last. Dr. Myers pointed out the existing courts had been built forty years ago but should have been replaced several years ago. Mr. Stiers suggested anyway you looked at the project it would cost \$500,000. He went on to note Pine Fork Park would be looking for funding for tennis courts in a few years and that would cost an additional \$500,000. He asked what if the high school had a bowling team. Dr. Myers suggested a swim team would be a better example and noted most high schools did not have swimming pools for their teams and New Kent County Schools were currently transporting swim team members to a facility outside of the County for practices. He noted tennis courts were necessary for a comprehensive high school in a community such as New Kent. Mr. Stiers noted this was his fourth budget since becoming a Supervisor and commended Dr. Myers and the School Board for not coming to the Supervisors asking for \$10,000,000.

Mr. Burrell asked if most high schools had tennis courts as a part of their facilities. Dr. Myers indicated most high schools did have tennis courts and noted many localities shared the use of the facilities with courts being available not only for school use but also for parks and recreation programs and public use.

Director of Parks and Recreation Kim Turner and Park Operations Supervisor Jason Baldwin shared information on a company called Game Time which had constructed basketball courts located in some County park facilities. Mr. Baldwin noted engineering was included

in this company's pricing and he suggested this vendor may be able to save the County some costs in this area. Ms. Turner spoke in response to Mr. Stiers' comments regarding tennis courts at Pine Fork Park. She noted tennis courts would be one of the last things to be built if they were in fact included in the Pine Fork Park plan.

Mr. Evelyn indicated he was comfortable with Option 1 or Option 2 but noted he had concerns regarding the use of taxpayer money to build courts behind the high school. Dr. Myers reported the School Board would be meeting on May 21st and suggested he would share the input from the Supervisors at that meeting. He asked Supervisors for guidance regarding which of the three options they most preferred. The general consensus was that Option 2 would be the most feasible and the Board of Supervisors supported the School Board moving forward with preliminary engineering work at this site.

Mr. Hathaway suggested if the Board was authorizing the schools to begin the process, they may need to authorize funding for the initial work to be done. Dr. Myers suggested the first step would be to bring in a civil engineer and he believed this would be a fairly simple project and should not cost too much. He indicated the School Board currently had some CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) funds left from other projects which could be used to begin this work. There was no need at this time for the Board of Supervisors to authorize any additional funding.

IN RE: ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION R-16-15(R1) TO ADOPT AND APPROPRIATE THE
FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016 BUDGET

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-16-15(R1) to adopt and appropriate the fiscal year 2015-2016 budget.

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway noted the proposed FY2015-2016 Budget totaled \$55,649,986 and the real estate tax rate had been held at \$.84. He pointed out Supervisors had been provided with a copy of a revised resolution which had been adjusted to address recent changes in health benefits for directors and constitutional officers. Mr. Hathaway noted IRS law prohibited the practice of treating one class of employees differently than others and, as had been previously discussed, benefits for directors and constitutional officers would be changing effective July 1. He indicated these changes would result in an added expense to the impacted individuals and asked the Board to increase salaries across the board by \$10,000 for directors and constitutional officers. He pointed out this increase would not make all impacted individuals whole but it did help to fill the gap. If Board members were in agreement with this proposal, he asked that they consider taking action to approve Resolution R-16-15(R1).

Mr. Burrell asked how many individuals would be impacted and for confirmation that some of the impacted individuals would still have to pay additional funds out of pocket to keep their current levels of benefits. Mr. Hathaway indicated fifteen positions would be impacted and that some would not be fully covered by the recommended salary increase. Mr. Burrell noted this change was being recommended because of current IRS law and the County was required to offer equal benefits to all employees. Mr. Hathaway indicated this was correct and noted the County and the directors and constitutional officers could be required to pay a penalty if this practice was not stopped. He also noted the Affordable Care Act would be enforced beginning in FY17 and, given our current practice, we would not be in compliance.

Mr. Davis asked how long the County had been providing these benefits to directors and constitutional officers. Mr. Hathaway indicated he believed this had been the practice for fifteen or more years. He also suggested this practice had initially been started because

salaries for those positions had not been in line with those in other localities. He noted the \$10,000 salary increases would result in a net impact of \$52,000 to the County.

Mr. Burrell pointed out he had previously suggested all full-time employees receive a flat salary increase of \$690 this year and that part-time employees receive a 1.5% increase. Mr. Hathaway indicated this change would not affect the budget since the proposal was to take the total amount required to give all full-time employees a 1.5% increase and divide it equally among those eligible to receive that raise. He noted this flat salary increase could be implemented if it were the Board's pleasure. Mr. Evelyn noted this would help employees at the lower salary tiers but would hurt those at the upper levels. Mr. Burrell suggested this would keep the distance between levels from springing upward.

Mr. Hathaway asked if there were any other budget items to be discussed.

Mr. Stiers indicated he had reviewed the initial budget document and began to share his findings in regard to areas he felt could be reduced. He suggested that since the County had hired a private firm to serve as County Attorney, a number of items totaling \$27,250 in the County Attorney's budget could be cut. Mr. Evelyn noted his concerns with this recommendation and pointed out that the Hefty firm had been on the job only three weeks and if the Board decided to go back and hire a full-time County Attorney, this funding would be needed. Mr. Hathaway reminded the Board the County's arrangement for legal services was a handshake deal which allowed either party to easily terminate the agreement. Mr. Stiers indicated he had "assumed the marriage would last at least a year" and the funding would not be needed. Mr. Davis noted that some of the funding for outside counsel could be cut but the Board may find the need to put it back into the budget down the road.

Mr. Hathaway pointed out that although the County would be using a private firm for legal services, there would still be the need for copying, preparing letters, postage and various other office expenses and he recommended this funding be left in the budget. He did note there was some additional funding (approximately \$35,000) in the County Attorney salary line item but suggested there could be outside legal expenses that may require those funds.

Mr. Stiers moved on with his budget reduction recommendations. He suggested both the New Kent Sheriff's Office and Fire-Rescue reduce their budgets by one percent. He also questioned the need for \$10,000 for professional services in the Emergency Management and Preparedness Services budget, a \$57,000 health insurance contingency line item and \$20,000 for professional services in the Social Services budget and suggested they all be removed. Mr. Hathaway noted the health insurance contingency had been set aside until the insurance rates for FY16 were received and because the rates had not increased, these funds would be moved to general contingency. He also noted the Social Services professional services line item covered a variety of services in addition to attorney fees and he pointed out just one lawsuit could be very expensive. He also noted that in a number of cases, funding for Social Services line items was fronted by the County and then reimbursed by the State. Mr. Stiers continued his review of the Social Services budget and asked why \$450 was budgeted for books that were available on line. He also asked why \$26,000 was needed for a new car. Mr. Hathaway indicated a revenue line item for the purchase of this vehicle was also included in the budget because a portion of the cost would be paid by the State. Financial Services Assistant Director Larry Clark reported the actual cost to the County for the purchase of this vehicle would be \$4,030.

Mr. Stiers asked for an explanation of the \$4,500 budgeted for the Central Virginia Legal Aid Society. Mr. Clark noted this funding was for an outside agency providing free legal services for County residents. Financial Services Director Mary Altemus noted residents were receiving far more services than the \$4,500 in funding covered.

Mr. Stiers asked for an explanation of the \$47,000 budgeted for ALS (Advanced Life Support) incentives. Mr. Hathaway indicated for some time employees who had received ALS certification were paid the same as employees who had not. This line item had been added to provide pay increases for employees with ALS certification and also as a means to encourage others to go through the program. Mr. Evelyn noted in the past many New Kent employees would earned their ALS certification would leave for positions in other departments where the pay would be better.

Mr. Stiers noted the Fire and Emergency Management budget included \$24,000 for maintenance service contracts on two printers which he felt was extremely high. Fire Chief Rick Opett indicated this item was actually for five printers and not two as had been noted.

Mr. Davis indicated he believed Mr. Stiers had pointed out approximately \$80,500 in reductions he agreed could be cut. He pointed out however, this was not enough to change the tax rate. Mr. Hathaway noted the budget would have to balance and asked if the budget were to be reduced by this amount, was the Board proposing the savings be moved to contingency.

Mr. Evelyn asked if the Sheriff's Office had not already cut their budget in support of the radio project. Mr. Hathaway noted the Sheriff's Office had attempted to cut their budget but had ended up with a budget request for a one percent increase.

Mr. Davis noted if the Board could not find enough reductions to cut a penny from the real estate tax, he didn't believe the Board wanted to go to a fractional rate. He asked what the Board wanted to do with the savings.

Mr. Evelyn asked how much money the Sheriff's Office had given back to the County CIP fund. Mr. Clark indicated he did not know but could check. It was noted any funds not expended on CIP items would go back into the CIP fund. Ms. Altemus also noted the funds in question could be transferred to contingency after the budget was adopted if they were found to not be needed.

Mr. Davis pointed out it was the Supervisors' responsibility to make cuts wherever they could be made. He again asked what would be the best thing to do with the savings. Mr. Evelyn indicated he felt staff had done a good job with the budget and the schools had come in with a reasonable request and he was happy with the budget as it was. Mr. Hathaway pointed out if the savings were put into contingency and it was not spent, it would roll over into the CIP and it was his recommendation if the cuts were made the savings be put into contingency.

Mr. Davis asked how much money had been rolled over into contingency this past year. Mr. Clark indicated the figure was \$1.3 million but pointed out the amount was dwindling each year. Mr. Davis then asked how much the Board was required to hold in the CIP fund. Ms. Altemus indicated the County policy was one million dollars. Mr. Davis recommended the savings be placed in contingency.

Mr. Clark asked if the Board approved cuts to the Sheriff's Office and the Fire-Rescue budgets would they consider cutting a set amount and then allow those departments to decide from where those reductions should come.

Mr. Evelyn commended Mr. Stiers for taking the initiative to go over the budget and for sharing his recommendations but noted in the end, the Board would not be making any

substantial cuts. He again indicated he was happy with the budget as it had been presented.

Mr. Burrell noted he understood Mr. Stiers' point and applauded him for his review of the budget but noted the recommended reductions were not enough to save on the tax rate. He also noted staff had done an excellent job on the budget and he recommended it be adopted as presented with the noted changes to salaries.

Mr. Burrell moved to adopt Resolution R-16-15(R1) to adopt and appropriate the New Kent County, Virginia Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Budget totaling \$56,649,986 which included recommended changes in the salaries of Directors and Constitutional Officers, a \$690 salary increase for full-time employees and a 1.5% salary increase for part-time employees. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

Mr. Tiller called for a brief recess at 10:20 a.m. The Board reconvened at 10:28 a.m.

IN RE: ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION R-17-15 TO ADOPT AND APPROPRIATE THE
FISCAL YEAR 2016 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-17-15 to adopt and appropriate the fiscal year 2016 Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Mr. Hathaway reviewed the Fiscal Year 2016 Capital Improvement Program recommendations which included \$14,140 for the Airport, \$193,000 for the Fire Department/ Radio Towers, \$85,000 for Information Technology, \$25,000 for Parks and Recreation, \$900,000 for the School Board, \$368,030 for Vehicle Replacement and \$101,190 for Computer Replacement. He also noted revenue totaling \$174,895 would be received from proffers and grants for CIP purchases and \$419,360 in CIP funds would be transferred to other funds. As noted in the proposed resolution, total capital projects equaled \$1,267,000. Mr. Hathaway asked the Board if there were any questions.

Mr. Evelyn asked if the schools were allowed to keep unspent CIP funds at the end of the year. Mr. Hathaway indicated they were allowed to keep funds left from projects completed under budget. Financial Services Assistant Director Larry Clark indicated generally only a small sum was left in the schools' CIP at the end of the year. Financial Services Director Mary Altemus also noted all School Board requests to transfer CIP funds for other purchases were presented to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

There being no other questions or comments, Mr. Hathaway asked the Board to consider taking action to approve Resolution R-17-15 as presented.

Mr. Stiers moved to adopt Resolution R-17-15 to adopt and appropriate the New Kent County, Virginia Fiscal Year 2016 Capital Improvement Program totaling \$1,267,000. The members were polled:

James H. Burrell	Aye
------------------	-----

Ron Stiers	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE O-10-15 AMENDING APPENDIX A - FEES

Before the Board for consideration was Ordinance O-10-15 amending Appendix A – Fees of the New Kent County Code.

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway noted all proposed fee changes had been reviewed at the business meeting on May 11th and those changes had been included in proposed Ordinance O-10-15. He indicated there had been no changes since the original presentation and he asked the Board if there were any questions.

Mr. Davis pointed out a list of fees for cost recovery for emergency response had been included on the third page of the proposed ordinance and he asked if these were new fees. Mr. Hathaway noted the County was currently charging for emergency response but the fees associated with those services had not been included in the previous fee schedules.

Mr. Davis moved to adopt Ordinance O-10-15 as presented, amending Appendix A (Fee Schedule) of the New Kent County Code. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

IN RE: ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE O-11-15 TO IMPOSE TAX LEVIES ON REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY FOR THE 2015/2016 TAX YEAR

Before the Board for consideration was Ordinance O-11-15 to impose tax levies on real and personal property for the 2015/2016 tax year.

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway noted all tax rates contained in the proposed ordinance were the current rates and no increases were proposed. He further noted the Board was required by State Code to set tax rates annually even if there were no changes from the previous year. He asked the Board to consider taking action to approve Ordinance O-11-15 as presented.

Mr. Stiers noted staff had chosen not to include a reduction in the boat tax as he had suggested at a previous meeting. Mr. Hathaway indicated taxes on boats were generating very little revenue for the County. Mr. Davis reported the Board had looked at reducing boat tax rates a few years ago and had found there were not many boats moved from the County as a result of the tax rate. Mr. Davis asked Mr. Stiers if he was also proposing a similar tax rate reduction for motor homes. Mr. Evelyn noted changes to the boat or motor home rates would require changes to the tax bills. Mr. Hathaway pointed out tax rates could be decreased without the need to readvertise.

Mr. Burrell brought up the topic of airplane taxes and noted he was not proposing the Board make any changes in this regard now but suggested the Board consider this issue in the future. He noted airplanes were not a necessity but were charged only a fraction of the tax rate charged on automobiles which he considered to be a necessity.

Mr. Davis moved to adopt Ordinance O-11-15 as presented, to impose tax levies on real and personal property for the 2015/2016 tax year. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

IN RE: ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION R-18-15(R1) TO ADOPT AND APPROPRIATE THE FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016 PUBLIC UTILITY FUND BUDGET

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-18-15(R1) to adopt and appropriate the fiscal year 2015-2016 Public Utility Fund budget.

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway pointed out Supervisors had been provided with a copy of a revised resolution which had been adjusted in the same manner as Resolution R-16-15(R1) to address recent changes in health benefits for directors. He noted the only position in Public Utilities to be impacted by this change was the Director. He further noted any costs associated with this salary increase would be paid from the Public Utility Fund which he was recommending for adoption and appropriation at \$4,866,527.

Mr. Evelyn moved to adopt Resolution R-18-15(R1) to adopt and appropriate the New Kent County, Virginia Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Public Utility Fund Budget totaling \$4,866,527. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

IN RE: ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE O-09-15 AMENDING PUBLIC UTILITY FEES IN APPENDIX A - FEES

Before the Board for consideration was Ordinance O-09-15 amending Public Utility Fees in Appendix A – Fees of the New Kent County Code.

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway pointed out the proposed ordinance included a four percent increase in user fees. He noted there were no changes recommended to availability or connection fees.

Mr. Tiller asked if New Kent was higher on connection fees than most localities. Public Utilities Director Larry Dame indicated New Kent's connection fees were higher than the State average but were not the highest. Mr. Dame reported the average customer in New

Kent was paying approximately \$32 for water service and using approximately 5,000 gallons of water each month which averaged out to about a half cent per gallon. He suggested this cost compared to that of bottled water, was a bargain. Mr. Burrell noted given the cost of a gallon of water at the grocery store, a consumer could pay \$6,000 for 5,000 gallons of water.

Mr. Davis moved to adopt Ordinance O-09-15 as presented, amending Public Utility Fees in Appendix A – Fees, of the New Kent County Code. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS – Ordinance O-02-15 – FLOODPLAIN DISTRICTS

Mr. Davis noted proposed Ordinance O-02-15 regarding Floodplain Districts had been presented to the Board for consideration at a meeting convened on May 11, 2015. He noted the proposed ordinance had been voted down by a 3:2 vote. He pointed out this meeting was a continuance of the May 11, 2015 meeting and he noted his desire that the Board revisit this issue. He indicated he had not been pleased with the burden being placed on the property owner to prove they were not in a floodplain but he understood there were many citizens in the County who may not be able to afford flood insurance other than what was provided through FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency).

Mr. Davis moved to reconsider the vote on Ordinance O-02-15 repealing Chapter 98, Article II, Section 57 "FMO, Floodplain Management Overlay District" and establishing Chapter 18, Article IV "Floodplain Districts" to the New Kent County Code of ordinances which had been taken at the initial May 11, 2015 meeting and of which today's actions were a continuation. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

Mr. Davis asked for confirmation that New Kent's Floodplain ordinance needed to be approved by DCR (Department of Conservation and Recreation) and FEMA by August 3, 2015. Building Official Clarence Jackson indicated the Floodplain Maps would become effective August 3, 2015 regardless of what action the Board decided to take.

Mr. Davis moved to adopt Ordinance O-02-15 repealing Chapter 98, Article II, Section 57 "FMO, Floodplain Management Overlay District" and establishing Chapter 18, Article IV "Floodplain Districts" to the New Kent County Code of ordinances. The members were polled:

W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye

James H. Burrell	Aye
Ron Stiers	Nay
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: BOTTOMS BRIDGE AREA MEETING

Mr. Tiller noted he had set up a Town Hall meeting for property owners in the Bottoms Bridge area to share information on the proposed Bottoms Bridge Corridor Overlay ordinance. He indicated it had been his intention for this meeting to be informal without the need for all staff and the Deputy Board Clerk to be present. He noted many Board members had expressed an interest in attending and while he appreciated their interest, if three or more of them were present, it could be considered a meeting. In response to Mr. Tiller's concerns, several Board members indicated they would not be attending.

IN RE: BUDGET COMMENTS FROM MR. BURRELL

Mr. Burrell applauded staff for the wonderful job they had done on the budget this year. He indicated he felt this had been one of the best budget adoption processes in all of his years of serving as a Supervisor.

IN RE: MEETING SCHEDULE

Chairman Tiller announced the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors would be held at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, June 8, 2015 and the next work session would be held at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, June 24, 2015. Both meetings would be held in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:59 a.m.