

THE REGULAR WORK SESSION OF THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAS HELD ON THE 28<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MARCH IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND FIVE OF OUR LORD IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING AT 6:00 P.M.

---

IN RE: ROLL CALL

|                  |         |
|------------------|---------|
| Mark E. Hill     | Present |
| D. M. Sparks     | Present |
| James H. Burrell | Present |
| Stran L Trout    | Present |
| W. R. Davis, Jr. | Present |

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order.

---

IN RE: JOINT MEETING WITH THE SCHOOL BOARD REGARDING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RENOVATION PROJECT

Board Chairman Van McPherson called the School Board meeting to order.

Mr. McPherson reviewed the list prepared through value engineer between Kenny Evans of Evans Construction and the architect. The list included site work savings from several areas, including obtaining fill material from a site borrow, burying of old concrete and asphalt on site (covered with topsoil), revised grading to 2" max topsoil everywhere on site, and eliminating the relocation of the ball field, for a total savings of \$122,779. However, there some add-ons did result from revising the bus loop and other items, totaling \$74,240. Omitting the canopy in several of the areas will save \$58,000; omitting a concrete retaining wall (install fill on 3 to 1 slope instead) will save \$62,000; and substituting a 4' black vinyl fence for the 8' fence will bring the net savings to \$172,139.

Suggested changes to the building included using a snap-lock roof system instead of a seamed roof system; changing the voltage from 208 to 480 (reduces number of lines and wires needed and will save on electrical consumption); Mr. Evans' agreement to purchase material in bulk and store on his premises; substituting fire lite glazing in doors with double paned glass with wire; reducing the size of the depth of the windows from 4½" to 3¼"; some mechanical changes (described as "overkill"); and deletion of metal studs in the roof (as there are already metal braces there) bringing the cost savings to \$577,990.

However, those savings are offset by increased architect fees of \$92,000 and increased contingency (from \$310,982 to \$461,000). Mr. McPherson stated that Architect Henry Shriver has agreed that the suggested changes make good sense and he can redraw the plans to incorporate them. The net resulting cost savings is \$330,972, or a total revised project cost of \$10,527,505.

There was discussion about the significant difference between the approved budget (\$8,295,086) and the low bid (\$10,858,477). Mr. Evans attributed the difference to the increased cost of steel, copper, insulation and fuel costs.

---

Mr. Evans and Mr. Shriver maintained that these changes will not affect capacity or the safety of the school.

It was also reported that there would be no additional savings if water and sewer were available at the school. The health department has accepted the County's agreement to place the school on pump and haul in the event that the existing drain fields (30 years old) should fail prior to the time that water and sewer service are available.

Mr. Evans reported that it will be a tough project with the children on site but it can be done and he has completed similar projects in other localities ahead of schedule.

Mr. Sparks complimented the School Board, builder and architect for a good collaborative effort, but asked if there was anything that was cut that should not have been. Mr. Evans stated that he is comfortable with the changes and indicated that that he was still looking at the project and working with Tim Pollock to make sure that they understand what impacts the changes will have.

Mr. Ellyson asked if the changes in the heating and air conditioning systems would increase the noise level in the classrooms. Mr. McPherson stated that one of the School Board's requirements was that the noise level not be distracting to the students. Additionally, Mr. McPherson indicated that Mr. Shriver represents that these updates to the systems should be good for 30 years. The chillers will have automatic cut-offs which should prevent them from having the same problems experienced recently at the high school.

Mr. Hill asked about leveling the area behind the soccer fields. Mr. Evans stated that the area will not be leveled, but he will be adding 2" of topsoil, and is looking at taking out the "hump" in the parking lot.

The construction schedule was discussed. Mr. Evans reported that the project will take 21 months (2 summers) and, if it is started by May of 2005, should be finished in time for the 07/08 school year.

County Building Official Clarence Jackson asked if there would be any cost savings in using fire retardant wood trusses instead of steel. Mr. Evans stated that there is not enough of a cost savings to make the change.

Mr. Evans recommended that in the event that he is able to work with the subcontractors to obtain additional cost savings, 25% of the cost savings be shared with the subcontractor who identified the savings.

Mr. Hill moved that the Board of Supervisors appropriate an additional \$2,232,419 for a total of \$10,527,505 to be used to reconstruct Watkins Elementary School. The members were polled:

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| Mark E. Hill           | Aye |
| D. M. "Marty" Sparks   | Aye |
| James H. Burrell       | Aye |
| Stran L. Trout         | Aye |
| W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr. | Aye |

---

The motion carried.

---

IN RE: COX CABLE FRANCHISE

County Attorney Phyllis Katz reviewed the process needed to respond to the request from Cox Communications to initiate formal and informal proceedings to renew the current franchise that will expire on October 12, 2007. This process must be commenced within six months after Cox's request, or no later than August 16, 2005. Ms. Katz distributed a proposed letter to be sent to Cox agreeing to their request to commence renewal proceedings. The Board will also need to authorize the County Attorney to begin the process.

That process includes conducting a needs assessment of the County's current and future needs. The Board can designate staff to conduct this analysis, hire a consultant or form a committee. She would suggest that this group contain a representative from the school, County staff, and others with knowledge of technology.

The second part of the process involves an assessment of Cox's past performance and should have input from customers throughout the community.

After these two processes have been completed, then the County will be in a position to meet with Cox and renegotiate its franchise. She admitted that this was a big job for a new County Administrator but would need to be started soon, and the Board will need to tell the new Administrator how involved it wants to be in the process.

Ms. Katz indicated that the County could choose to shorten the length of the next franchise. The current one is for 15 years. It might also be able to negotiate reduced rates for the elderly or low income residents.

Mr. Hill moved to allow the County Administrator to send a letter that says that the County is interested in beginning the process to renegotiate its contract with Cox Communication. The members were polled:

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| D. M. "Marty" Sparks   | Aye |
| James H. Burrell       | Aye |
| Stran L. Trout         | Aye |
| Mark E. Hill           | Aye |
| W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr. | Aye |

The motion carried.

Ms. Katz asked the Board to advise the County Administrator as to the names of any individuals they would like to serve on these either of these two groups.

---

IN RE: FINANCING EDA PURCHASE OF THE FISHER PROPERTY

County Attorney Phyllis Katz reported that although her firm is still trying to determine some of the closings costs for the EDA's purchase of the Fisher property, it appears

that the costs may exceed \$700,000. Updated documents were distributed, approving a loan of up to \$800,000. She stated that the only thing required of the Board is to authorize the County Administrator to sign the closing papers. There were some other typographical corrections that Board members pointed out to Ms. Katz.

Mr. Hill moved to go into closed session for discussions relating to real property pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.3 of the Code of Virginia involving acquisition of real property, and for consultation with legal counsel pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.7 of the Code of Virginia regarding specific legal matters that require advice regarding Section 15.2-2298. The members were polled:

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| James H. Burrell       | Aye |
| Stran L. Trout         | Aye |
| Mark E. Hill           | Aye |
| D. M. "Marty" Sparks   | Aye |
| W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr. | Aye |

The motion carried. The Board went into closed session. Mr. Burrell moved to emerge from closed session. The members were polled:

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| Stran L. Trout         | Aye |
| Mark E. Hill           | Aye |
| D. M. "Marty" Sparks   | Aye |
| James H. Burrell       | Aye |
| W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr. | Aye |

Mr. Sparks 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 Davis 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:

|                      |     |
|----------------------|-----|
| Mark E. Hill         | Aye |
| D. M. "Marty" Sparks | Aye |
| James H. Burrell     | Aye |
| Stran L. Trout       | Aye |

---



He explained that the main problem with running the sewer line along Route 60 and then up Route 106 to Talleyville was its impact on development. It has always been the Board's main goal to provide utilities at the interstate interchanges in order to promote business development in those areas, and the I-64 route is the shortest to the Parham plant and the least costly. He indicated that about 100 property owners are impacted by the I-64 route.

The 40-foot easement needed by the County would start at the fence that runs along the interstate. Mr. Davis reminded that there is a 35-foot County setback line from the fence and that the County's easement would only extend 5 feet beyond that setback line. Property owners will be able to use the property in the same way they do now: as a driveway, cart path, garden, but no permanent structures would be permitted. Public Works Director Alan Harrison stated that trees no larger than a crepe myrtle could be replanted over the line and stressed that no buildings with a permanent foundation would be allowed.

Mr. Hill asked if Mr. Hart had any numbers on what it might cost to run the line up Route 60, or along the north side of I-64. Mr. Hart stated that he did not.

Chairman Davis opened the public comment period.

Joe Ralston, a resident of Five Lakes, stated that no one in Five Lakes knew about the sewer route. He asked who wanted it, why it was being pushed, and who was going to pay for it. He urged the Board to think about its impact.

Chairman Davis stated that one-half of the cost of the sewer line was being paid for with the ad valorem taxes being collected from landowners in the Bottoms Bridge Service District, and it will not be paid for with tax dollars.

Mr. Hill stated that the reason the Board chose to install sewer was to increase the commercial tax base to help reduce the real estate tax rate.

Gilbey Campbell stated that the Board's actions regarding the sewer project do not comply with their Mission Statement. She maintained that the Henrico option was the most cost effective. The second option, using Route 249, would cost less but require more easements and increase development on Route 249. The third option, along I-64, is the most expensive and the most invasive. She described how the contractor would have to gain access to her golf course, and spoke of the 29 wetlands that would be impacted by that route. She also commented that the construction costs that are being used are over a year old. The last option, along Route 60, was dismissed by the Board because they did not want to encourage development; however, she questioned how the County could commit to a water and sewer project and not need development to pay for it. She indicated that the County plans on running sewer to the Star Motel, which is only 4.8 miles from the intersection of Route 106. She stated that the I-64 option will create a hardship to residents along its path and admonished the Board that if it had invited discussion throughout the process, a lot of animosity could have been avoided. She called on the Board to live up to its Mission Statement and take time to consider this decision.

---

Mr. Burrell countered that the Board had had numerous meetings and the issue had been put out to the public even before 2003. He stated that there was a lot of misconception that the sewer system was being subsidized by the taxpayers.

John Kinder stated that he was from a golfing family and chose to live in New Kent because of the location, value and quality of life he found at Brookwoods Golf Course. He believes the proposed route for the sewer system will significantly dilute the value of the course, and the thinning of the trees will make it less enjoyable. He stated that the course is already facing significant competition, and this will affect its ability to compete. He spoke about the sewer project coinciding with the peak golf season.

Dan McElroy stated that he can find "few pros" from the utility system, and the "cons are many", including increased noise from traffic and decreased real estate values. He asked what the perceived benefits were for the residents.

Mr. Sparks stated that residents will not be able to connect to the system, and therefore would have no direct benefit. However, it will bring conveniences to the Bottoms Bridge area which would be an indirect benefit.

Mr. Burrell added that the Board's goal was to bring in highway commercial business to help pay for the increasing cost of government without having to rely solely on real estate taxes. These businesses have to have sewer.

Jim Maguire expressed his displeasure at the "cavalier" reasons given for the route. He stated that the Board had the power to control growth along Route 60. He stated that it was a fact that some people did not know about the sewer route until the past couple of weeks. He feels the Board should more fully examine Route 60 for the line. He described the choice of Route 60 over I-64 as a "no brainer".

Holly Matthews spoke in opposition to the sewer route. She was upset that a Board member had remarked that it "was a done deal and there's nothing you can do about it". She stated that Five Lakes residents had supported Bottoms Bridge businesses in their quest for sewer but no one ever said anything about running the line through the golf course or cutting down trees. She indicated that the developers of Five Lakes had donated land to the County for a school or park. The County later sold that land to a developer for homes and now wants to take that land back and deface it. She stated that it was wrong for the line to come in and disrupt homes and current businesses. The County has other options and should revisit the Henrico County option and avoid the court cases that may result. She quoted a former Supervisor as saying that the County's dismissal of that option was "like leaving money laying on the table". She asked the Board not to ruin the natural barrier between Five Lakes and I-64 and change the entire neighborhood. She stated that it is only five miles between the motel and Route 106. The County can control development, and needs to look at other options before disrupting businesses and a housing development.

Mr. Hill stated that the Henrico option was studied for a long time. Capacity available from Henrico County would have been 500,000 gpd, which would have been filled by Patriots Landing alone, and the County would have had to negotiate a price for additional capacity. Goochland County chooses to send its wastewater to Richmond, across Henrico County, because it is cheaper than sending it for processing in Henrico.

New Kent would have had to negotiate for easements from Henrico County landowners. He emphasized that all options had been reviewed and it was decided that it was in New Kent's best interest to control its own destiny. If Henrico was required to expand their plant because of New Kent's wastewater, then New Kent would have had to pay for it. He went on to say that the contract with Henrico County regarding the jail was made 12 years ago, and that was the right time at which to install sewer in Bottoms Bridge.

Becky Maguire stated that the proposed project affects the entire Five Lakes neighborhood. She complained about the lack of information from the Board, and the lack of response to e-mails and telephone calls. She suggested that the north side of I-64 or Route 60 would be better options.

Tim Harris stated that the 40-foot easement is equal to one acre of his property, and serves as a sound barrier. He spoke about the reasons he came to New Kent, and described the shrubs and trees he had planted in the area. He referred to the "dictatorship government" and resented having been told to "shut up" by Board members earlier in the meeting. He stated that he received a letter from the County just two weeks ago and he complained about the way that the residents have been treated.

Kevin Gregory stated that he closed on his house at Henpeck and I-64 in October and was unaware of the sewer route. He commented that he had received no satisfactory answers from the Public Works Department, and he would not have picked this lot on which to build if he had known that the trees were going to be cut down. He stated that additional construction is going on around him. He is concerned about the increase in sound from I-64, especially if the interstate is widened to six lanes and the trees in the median are removed by the State for that project.

Mr. Davis stated that Mr. Gregory's builder should have notified him about the sewer route.

Connie Kukla stated that if the trees are removed, her backyard will look out onto I-64. She indicated that a real estate agent had told her that the County never "costed out" the Route 60 option because of the decision by the Board. She suggested that the County hook up to Henrico County for a period of time. In that way it wouldn't have to build anything until the demand required it and the County would have more opportunity to come up with options. She said that the information about previous meetings did not match up, and that there was a different Board with a different plan in 2003. She indicated that it didn't make sense for the route to be down I-64 instead of Route 60. She would like to work in partnership with the Board, and wants communication. She asked the Board to go back and look at the other options, cost out the Route 60 route, and provide that information to the citizens if they want their support.

Kenny Wilbourne, builder, expressed his strong displeasure with the sewer route. He said he had heard about sewer on Route 60, and the County had sold him property on which to build homes in Five Lakes in 2000. No one told him that the sewer was going down I-64, and he has built homes that now have garages and septic fields in the proposed easements. He stated that he had received misrepresentation from the

County. He questioned why the County is asking for a 40 foot easement when all they really need is 16 feet.

Mr. Davis stated that the Board was told one year ago that everyone had been sent letters.

Mr. Wilbourne asked why the County had issued septic permits to be installed in a proposed easement, and where was the breakdown in communication between departments?

Arthur Gnaegy stated that he owns 5.5 acres on the golf course, 85% of which is lakefront along I-64. He asked for a show of hands among the Board members as to who voted for the plan. When all five board members raised their hands, he stated that he would vote against each one of them in future elections. He asked the Board to start from scratch and deal honestly and with integrity with their constituents. He stated that the only correspondence he received from the County was a request for easement. Compensation is not important to him. He is concerned about the destruction of his sound barrier and that the easement will take ½ acre of his property, including 150 feet of hardwood trees. He stated that the Board had been derelict in its duty to work with the citizens. He bought his property for its peace and serenity. He can't see his neighbors nor can he see or hear I-64, but that will change if the trees and his shed are removed. He feels that the Henrico option is the best.

Craig Pridemore stated that he is having a home built by Kenny Wilbourne. It was started in December and the easement is running right through the garage.

Bruce Halsey asked about sound barriers, and spoke of the decrease in value, beauty and security. He stated that the trees not only buffer the noise from I-64, but serve to protect his children who play in the back yard. He stated that no one knew about the proposed route.

Dru Gillie stated that the first time he heard about the sewer route was from Gilbey. He feels that there are going to be people unwilling to sell their land for easements and the County will have to take them to Court. He stated that although the project does not affect his property, the Board will be creating a group of activists whom he will support in whatever way he can.

Brenda Mula stated that she and her family were affected by the I-64 project 30 years ago. She asked if the County has considered what will happen when the State widens I-64 through New Kent. Mr. Davis stated that the widening will take place in the median rather than on the sides. She stated that it was her understanding that Williamsburg was fighting the use of the medians for the added lanes. She indicated that her driveway runs straight down the proposed easement and asked about having her plat re-drawn to show that she can put her driveway back. She mentioned that when the State took its easement for I-64, one of her neighbors became landlocked and was given an easement across her property for access; that is the same property that the County now wants for its easement. Ms. Katz stated that she would address that problem with Ms. Mula and the other property owner and asked Ms. Mula to provide her with contact information before the end of the meeting. Ms. Katz stated

that the County would work with any property owner to minimize inconvenience where possible.

Ms. Mula asked if the contractor will have time limits during which they can work, and she expressed her concerns about work being done at night under spotlights and with loud equipment. Mr. Hart stated that there will be restrictions placed on the contractors. They will be working only during daylight hours five days a week and on some Saturdays. No working on Sundays will be permitted without special permission.

Phil Morris stated that there was no plat included with his letter and he does not have any idea where the easement on his property is proposed to be. Is his property even on the route? He stated that there has been no response to the questions about sound barriers, and asked about cement walls.

Mr. Hill stated that this Board has not decided to put in any kind of sound barrier.

Wesley Milnes stated that the first he knew about the route was when he received a letter December 28. He tried to get information by telephone and had trouble reading the plat he received. He stated that one-third of his property is wetlands that are teaming with wildlife, and the easement runs right through it. He asked if any environmental impact studies had been done. He cannot see that this route is cost effective and he'd be interested in looking at the Henrico or Route 60 options again.

Roger Hart responded that those studies are included in the budget and have been completed with DEQ and with the Army Corps of Engineers. At the moment, he is waiting until May 20 when it can be determined if the swamp pink or small whorled pogonia are present. Wetlands have been delineated and they will be directionally drilling underneath. He offered to work with any individual property owner to resolve specific issues.

Mr. Trout stated that the figures on the handout from Gilbey Campbell are not the same ones the Board has and that the correct information can be obtained from Mr. Hart.

Wayne Miles stated that he is not against the sewer project but is concerned about the destruction of the sound barriers in Five Lakes and on the golf course. He asked about the cost analysis of the Route 60 option as to the distance and number of properties. He questioned how the Route 60 option would promote development when one cannot tap onto a forced main. He also asked why correspondence to landowners was not sent by registered mail, and encouraged the Board to look at the other options.

Mr. Davis stated that the Board is trying to comply with the Comp Plan but there is no guarantee that a future Board wouldn't want more residential development along Route 60.

Mr. Trout stated that the line that will run to the motel will not be a forced main and would not be a "head start" towards Route 106. The shortest route is along I-64.

---

Mr. Hart asked that everyone keep in mind that within that 40 foot easement will be two parallel pipelines. Using the Route 249 option would require tearing up the pavement two times which is not feasible.

Paula Snell expressed her concern about destruction of the trees and stated that concrete walls as sound barriers are better than nothing. This will reduce the property values which will in turn affect real estate tax revenues to the County and the owner's ability to sell. She does not feel that this was very well thought out.

Brian Campbell asked about a forced main down Route 60. Mr. Hart stated that because of the lay of the land, the pipe will only accommodate a certain amount of growth.

Teresa Shaw stated she has not been notified of this project. A neighbor received a letter about her property. She works two hours away and wants the peace and quiet of the trees that buffer her property. Forty feet from the interstate fence is ten feet from her back door and right down her driveway. She expressed her concern about breaks in the sewer pipe and the resulting clean up.

Alan Harrison stated that the County could not guarantee that there would never be a break but it would repair and clean up if it did happen. Mr. Burrell asked about the nature of any such leaks. It was reported that few leaks explode.

Mr. Hill stated that the Board made a decision to control its own destiny and would rather spend \$13 million here than in Henrico County. It was not a careless decision but he admitted that the Board does not have a crystal ball. It makes decisions based on the best information it can get. Every decision impacts somebody in the County. The Board was elected to make those tough decisions. This Board met 47 times last year and eight times on this issue alone. In July of 2004 the route was chosen by a Board that had three new members. The Board wants to attract business development to ease the burden of real estate taxes on the residents. He admitted that the Board may need to look at the route again and he asked Mr. Hart how much the County has invested in the project to date. Mr. Hart estimated engineering fees to date are \$500,000. Mr. Hill went on to say that no matter what route is chosen, the Boardroom would fill up with unhappy people. He is sorry for the residents who will be affected but he guaranteed that the Board will evaluate all of the comments received tonight.

It was asked what happens now. Al Dorin of KDR Real Estate reported that his company has been hired by the County to contact each of the property owners who will be impacted and he asked everyone to save their questions and he and his staff will review them with each individual owner when they are contacted over the next 4 – 5 weeks.

Mr. Sparks acknowledged that many of the speakers tonight were from his district. He recognizes that they are unhappy but he wants them to understand that the Board has spent a lot of time looking at the water and sewer issue. He doesn't want to affect anyone in his district or anyone down the line, but he still believes that this is the right way for the line to go. Development follows sewer lines and if it is run down Routes 60 or 106, New Kent will have every developer around trying to build houses. This is

the safest way to go. He stated that he is very disappointed in the lack of communication between the citizens and the County, especially those affected by the sewer line. It is inexcusable that a resident would receive his first notice a few weeks ago, and the Board needs to work on that. There is no excuse that the County didn't send registered letters. He went on to say that he lives in Five Lakes and can hear traffic from both I-64 and from Route 60. He'd like the Board to look at what can be done to minimize the sound impact to the residents. He'd also like to go back and look to see if the County really needs a 40 foot easement. He expressed his appreciation to everyone who attended tonight's meeting.

Mr. Burrell stated that the Board had spent a great amount of time and thought on this project and takes everyone comments seriously. However, no matter what route is taken, there are going to be some people who are disappointed. The Board does not make these decisions lightly. Government works best when citizens stay involved, and the Board respects the speakers' concerns.

Mr. Hart distributed construction schedules.

Mr. Trout stated he was concerned about people that may not have received notice. He urged that if anybody in attendance knows of someone who might need to be advised, to please let the Board know. Mailing addresses may not be correct, and the Board wants to make sure that everyone has received the proper notice. He said the great thing about New Kent is that people come out, send e-mails and make telephone calls, and he asked that they continue to do that.

Mr. Ellyson stated that all mailings were sent to the legal property owners as recorded in the Courthouse and checked against the property records. He confirmed that Mr. Wilbourne had received notices. There may be some individual cases where the addresses or information was wrong.

One speaker complained about the public hearing advertising, and stated that it needed to be simpler and not so complex that people can't understand it.

Someone else asked if the Board was going to reconsider the Route 60 route.

Mr. Ellyson interjected that this Board is very conscientious, will take all comments under advisement, and always wants to have every bit of information.

Gilbey Campbell thanked the Board for this opportunity, and stated that she hoped it was not a monologue but the beginning of a dialogue. She stated that the shortest route is not always the best and the Board would do well to work with people and there is a lot to be said for looking at the other options. She maintained that she never got a letter telling her that the sewer line was going through her property. That it was "going down 64 didn't register with a soul".

Mr. Hill stated that since the ground cannot be disturbed until after May 20, he asked if Mr. Hart could give the Board a cost projection on the Route 60/106 option and the North side of I-64.

---

Wimpy Isgett asked that if the County has to wait until after May 20, why not let the bids go out now and be ready to go? Mr. Harrison explained that if the endangered plants do indeed exist, then the County will need 8 access points from the VDOT right-of-way. VDOT has given the County 3 but will not consider any additional until it is determined that the plants exist.

---

IN RE: BUDGET

Mr. Ellyson provided information regarding airplane taxes charged in surrounding and competing localities. The Board decided to raise New Kent's airplane tax from \$.50 to \$1.00.

There was a discussion about collection of delinquent taxes. Mr. Ellyson explained that Attorney James Elliott, whom the County uses for this, does a good job.

The budget has been re-adjusted to reflect no change in the personal property tax rate but does include an increase of \$5.00 in the decal fee.

Ms. Altemus reported that with the adjustments that were requested at the last meeting, there should be \$11,302 left over to be added to the contingency account.

Mr. Davis indicated that he had talked with Dr. Geiger and members of the School Board about having all capital projects, including schools, handled by the County staff beginning July 1, 2005, in order to maintain better control and help the Accounting Department. There was no objection by the School Board. Negotiations on sharing human resources are still taking place.

There was a discussion about Fund 98 projects, including Phase II of the sewer project and expansion of the Parham plant. Included in the budget is a loan for \$9.975 million for these two projects. There will also need to be a borrowing of \$1.9 million for the Courthouse sewer project. There was discussion as to when to borrow. Mr. Hart will get the Board some additional information.

Ms. Altemus reported that it has been determined that the current value of one cent of real estate tax is \$138,466, rather than the \$133,000 that has been used or the \$139,650 used by the financial advisor.

The Board was in consensus to move forward to advertise the budget as proposed. Ms. Altemus will report back on advertising and approval dates at the April 11 meeting.

---

IN RE: CLERK OF THE BOARD

Mr. Hill moved to appoint John A. Budesky as Clerk of the Board effective April 1, 2005. The members were polled:

|                      |     |
|----------------------|-----|
| James H. Burrell     | Aye |
| Stran L. Trout       | Aye |
| Mark E. Hill         | Aye |
| D. M. "Marty" Sparks | Aye |

---

W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr.                      Aye

The motion carried.

---

IN RE:                      ADJOURNMENT

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

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| Stran L. Trout         | Aye |
| Mark E. Hill           | Aye |
| D. M. "Marty" Sparks   | Aye |
| James H. Burrell       | Aye |
| W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr. | Aye |

The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 10:37 p.m.

---