

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD A WORK SESSION ON THE 4th DAY OF NOVEMBER, IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND TWO OF OUR LORD IN THE COURTROOM OF THE OLD COURTHOUSE IN NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 4:05 P.M.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Julian T. Lipscomb	Present
Rebecca M. Ringley	Present
James H. Burrell	Present
Dean E. Raynes	Absent (arrived at 4:10 p.m.)
W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr.	Present

Chairman Davis opened the meeting.

IN RE: CLOSED SESSION

Mr. Burrell made a motion to go into closed session for consultation and briefings by legal counsel, consultants, or staff members pertaining to actual or probable litigation or other legal matters pursuant to §2.2-3711A.7 of the Code of Virginia, and also for discussions related to prospective business or industry, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.5 of the Code of Virginia. The members were polled:

Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Ayes
James H. Burrell	Aye
Dean E. Raynes	Absent (arrived at 4:10 p.m.)
W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr.	Aye

The Board went into closed session at 4:06 p.m.

The Board ended closed session at 4:40 p.m. Mr. Lipscomb made the following motion in certification of the closed session:

Whereas, the New Kent County 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. Members were polled on the certification:

Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye

Dean E. Raynes	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: REASSESSMENT SERVICES

Mr. William Coalson, of Tri-County Appraisals, Inc. addressed the Board regarding his company's response to the RFP for 2004 General Assessment Services. He stated that his company has been in business for approximately 10 years, and has two assessors, four licensed appraisers, fifteen appraiser trainees and eight to ten clerical staff. He has been in the assessment business for approximately sixteen years, mostly working in rural counties, although he worked for the City of Richmond for five years. He is a licensed appraiser and also has a CAE designation.

He explained the two mandates for a reassessment as provided by the State Code: the first is to assess property at 100% of market value and the second is to make sure that properties are equalized. He explained how his company would accomplish this in New Kent, including verifying sales, determining changes since sales, quality of construction and condition of property. He will review all of the work of his appraisers, and will also review the property again after data entry is complete. All homes and outbuildings are measured and homeowners are interviewed. He will also be present for all hearings.

Mrs. Ringley inquired as to his experience in assessing unusual properties, such as Colonial Downs. He explained the three approaches to determining value: market approach (sales comparison), cost approach (what it costs for the bricks and mortar) and income approach (net income to the real estate). He reported that he would use the income approach to assess a property like Colonial Downs. Net income is determined by subtracting all expenses to the real estate from the gross income. In the instance of Colonial Downs, the income of the OTBs would apply. If Colonial Downs will not provide the figures, then one option would be to look for similar properties to determine what income properties like that should generate. For homes, a market approach is best, and location is an important factor. For properties like a church, a cost approach is used.

Mr. Coalson would be able start work as soon as possible. His needs would include one room (16x16) with at least 3 desks or tables on which to spread out maps. He will require at least 2 data entry stations (computers) and one phone line at first, and the use of a second phone once notices go out in order to handle the calls. He will be using the County's new software only. He estimates office supplies to cost no more than \$100 per month- paper is the largest cost.

Mrs. Ringley made a motion to authorize the County Administrator and/or Board Chairman to act on the County's behalf in executing a contract with Tri-County Appraisals, Inc. The members were polled:

James H. Burrell	Aye
Dean E. Raynes	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: WATER & SEWER STUDY

Mr. Christie reported that Resource International had responded to the Board's request to expand the water and sewer study, indicating that it will cost an additional \$2,800 to include the Eltham and Courthouse areas to the study. He suggested that the Board consider slowing down this process, perhaps waiting until Spring in order to look at the bigger picture once the Comprehensive Plan has identified future growth areas. Mr. Lipscomb was agreeable to delaying this until December (after the election) but does not see the need to delay the decision until Spring. He thinks the County does need to have this information.

Mrs. Ringley stated that that she had requested that the area on Route 33 to the interchange be included, and had also asked for the present usage figures for businesses in Bottoms Bridge to see if there would be enough usage to fuel the system. She does not know if that would be included in the \$2,800 quote.

Charles Loving suggested that the Board might want to decide whether to continue with the feasibility study being done by Resource International or to obtain an objective comprehensive utility plan which would mirror the comprehensive plan.

Mrs. Ringley agreed that a comprehensive plan will be needed. She also stated that another item that had been left out was her request to include the business properties between Bottoms Bridge and Talleyville in the study, and it would be acceptable to her to abandon this study, and proceed with the plan suggested by Mr. Loving, although she thinks there will be some unhappy people.

Mr. Christie suggested that staff put together a report for the December meeting.

IN RE: DONATION OF TREASURER'S SALARY

Mrs. Ringley inquired why it was necessary to have an agreement for this proposal. Ms. Katz responded that there was no legal requirement for an agreement. Mr. Christie reported that Mr. Jones wanted the agreement in order to make sure that the donated funds are used in the specific areas that he has designated. There was a consensus to proceed with the Agreement, which will be effective on the date that it is signed.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS

Regarding an RFP for a financial advisor, Mr. Christie reported that he believed that, regardless of the outcome of tomorrow's election, the County would need a professional on board to give advice on long-term borrowing. The RFP provides for a contract term of 3 years, with an optional 2 one-year terms. He was given the approval to proceed with soliciting proposals.

Regarding a legislative agenda, there is a request from the Industrial Development Authority for a change of name to "New Kent County Economic Development Authority", which will have to be done through the General Assembly. The Board will also need to consider whether to endorse the VACo legislative package as well as that of the Virginia Racing Commission. Any new bill filings must be submitted in December. The County will also need to continue to support the bill to keep the weigh station at its present site.

Mrs. Ringley moved that the Board pursue legislation in the General Assembly to change the name of the IDA to the New Kent County Economic Development Authority. The members were polled:

Dean E. Raynes	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. "Ray" Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Christie reported that the Health Department had inquired as to the County's position regarding irrigation wells used for non-agricultural purposes, particularly one applied for at Brickshire. The Planning Director has indicated that an irrigation well is not permitted under the storm water management system approved for Section L of Brickshire, and that information has been transmitted to the Health Department. Mr. Christie asked whether the Board wanted to consider this issue now, or wait until another application is received. It was the consensus to consider each application on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Christie reported on the unexpected costs incurred by the Sheriff's Animal Protection Unit, in disposing of animal carcasses in Charles City County since both Counties have switched from gas euthanasia to injections. It was the consensus that the County take care of these expenses for the rest of this year and address this in the next budget process.

Mr. Christie reported that information had been received from the State Compensation Board regarding funding reductions for four of the Constitutional Officers, and that based on staff analysis, no action is needed by the County after this round of cuts because revenues were under-budgeted. He indicated his willingness to ask these Officers to develop some plans in case there is another round of cuts. The Board asked Mr. Christie to keep on top of this.

Regarding scheduling the Retreat, it was the consensus of the Board to wait until the first of January.

Mr. Christie shared copies of the proposed budget calendar which received the approval of the Board. He also mentioned the possibility of considering capital projects in the late summer thereby separating it from the operating budget process. There was also discussion about the necessity and usefulness of the budget brochures. It was the consensus that it was the County's responsibility to provide the information to the citizens, but perhaps the brochure could be revised and reduced. After discussions about the large budget books, it was decided that the information could be "pared down".

RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.