

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAS HELD ON THE 8TH DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD NINETEEN HUNDRED NINETY-NINE IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING AT 6:00 P.M.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Mark A. Hennaman	Present
Julian T. Lipscomb	Present
Rebecca M. Ringley	Present
James H. Burrell	Present
Frederick G. Bahr	Present

IN RE: INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Burrell gave the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Emerson reviewed the consent agenda, which consisted of the following: Approval of minutes from January 11, 1999 work session with Constitutional Officers and the regular meeting; Resolution R-2-99 honoring Jerry L. Sprouse, Resolution R-3-99 recognizing Robert Brandon Jenkins on his achievement of becoming an Eagle Scout, Resolution R-4-99 for application for Chesapeake Bay Preservation Program Technical Assistance Funds, Resolution R-5-99 declaring New Kent County a "Money 2000 County", Resolution R-6-99 honoring Harold K. Seitz, Resolution R-7-99 authorizing the issuance and sale of general obligation refunding bonds for VRS, the school system's early retirement program, Ratification of Declaration of Local Emergency; Refunds for personal property tax totaling \$840.94; Appropriations for additional funds for Social Services Legal Fees - \$10,000.00 from Revenue to Expenditures, Additional funds for audit fees - \$50,000.00 from Revenue to Expenditures, Funds for new courthouse renovations - \$140,700.00 from Revenue to Expenditures; Finance Report showing monthly expenditures for January 1999 of \$1,648,048.04; and a Treasurer's Report showing total cash of \$11,555,884.70 as of January 31, 1999. Mr. Lipscomb made a motion to approve the consent agenda as presented.

Mark A. Hennaman	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Frederick G. Bahr	Aye

FOR RESOLUTION R-2-99 AS ADOPTED, SEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ORDER BOOK, APPENDIX SIX, PAGE 174.  
FOR RESOLUTION R-3-99 AS ADOPTED, SEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ORDER BOOK, APPENDIX SIX, PAGE 175.  
FOR RESOLUTION R-4-94 AS ADOPTED, SEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ORDER BOOK, APPENDIX SIX, PAGE 176.  
FOR RESOLUTION R-5-99 AS ADOPTED, SEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ORDER BOOK, APPENDIX SIX, PAGE 177.  
FOR RESOLUTION R-6-99 AS ADOPTED, SEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ORDER BOOK, APPENDIX SIX, PAGE 178.  
FOR RESOLUTION R-7-99 AS ADOPTED, SEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ORDER BOOK, APPENDIX SIX, PAGE 179.

IN RE: ELECTED OFFICIAL'S REPORTS

Mr. Richard Ellyson, Treasurer, reported they have been working on the records for the auto reduction tax. They will forward this information to the state which will issue rebate checks in May. After this year the rebate will be deducted before the taxes are paid.

Mr. John Crump, Commissioner of Revenue, reported on the meeting he attended regarding cellular towers and personal property.

IN RE: CITIZEN'S COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Bahr announced the public hearing for C-2-98 on Maplehill Associates had been rescheduled to the April 12, 1999 meeting.

The only citizen signed up to speak was Mr. David Kittner. Mr. Kittner said he had come to speak on the Maplehill rezoning and he asked the Board to please announce the postponement again when the public hearings started at 7:00 p.m. as there would be people coming in tonight to speak on this issue and due to it being pulled at such a late time he could not notify all of them that it had been postponed.

IN RE: STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Larry Gallaher reported on volunteer day, in April. Per the Board's direction he has been working on a County-sponsored event to recognize the volunteers. He understood they would be including all volunteers – fire and rescue, boards, and commissions. The fire and rescue volunteers feel their volunteerism is in a different category than the boards and commissions. Costs and locations were discussed. Ms. Ringley made a motion to hold recognition events for the two groups – fire and rescue separately from the boards and commissions.

Mark A. Hennaman	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Frederick G. Bahr	Aye

Mr. Emerson stated he received a letter from Ms. May O'Leary and Ms. Gilda Black regarding their proposal that was made to the Board on October 12, 1998 concerning a community-built playground. They are requesting a commitment from the Board as to whether or not the County would be willing to maintain the facility once it is built by accepting ownership. Mr. Burrell made a motion that the County undertake annual maintenance of the playground. Mr. Hennaman offered a friendly amendment that approval be contingent upon it being put in place in 18 months. Mr. Burrell accepted the friendly amendment.

Mark A. Hennaman	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Frederick G. Bahr	Aye

IN RE: ELECTED OFFICIAL'S REPORTS

Mr. Lipscomb asked staff to contact First Commonwealth Communications regarding audio problems with the tapes of the Board Meetings.

Ms. Ringley was concerned about addresses in her district that are confusing and in the event of an emergency, the emergency services may go to the wrong address. She asked if staff would look into this issue.

Mr. Burrell announced he planned to have more growth forums dealing with rapid sprawl from the cities (as a private citizen not as a Board member).

Mr. Hennaman was concerned about advertising litter throughout the county. He requested staff to investigate these small signs/advertisements for compliance with the county's ordinances.

Mr. Bahr stated a letter has been sent to Senator Robb and Congressman Scott (regarding the previous letter requesting their help in forgiving the grants on the airport) asking that this issue be put on the back burner in order to let the County try to make the airport a viable entity. The County has investigated the possibility of closing the airport and having the Capital Region Airport Commission manage the airport. The Capital Region Airport Commission has responded they have too much on their plate right now to consider this option. Mr. Bahr handed out a draft resolution to the Board members for their consideration on the future handling of the airport. Mr. Bahr presented Mr. Lipscomb with a plaque commemorating his year as Chairman of the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Ringley asked if it would be appropriate to give Mr. Emerson direction on looking into hiring a manager for the airport. Mr. Lipscomb felt they should authorize the advertising for the airport manager and maintenance services. Mr. Emerson said the funds for an airport manager were not currently budgeted and the Board would be committing future revenues. Mr. Lipscomb made a motion for Mr. Emerson to advertise for a manager and maintenance services at the airport.

Mark A. Hennaman	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Frederick G. Bahr	Aye

IN RE: RESIDENT ENGINEER'S REPORT

Mr. John Neal, gave a summary of work performed by VDOT during the month of January. The Board members brought their concerns to Mr. Neal's attention.

IN RE: STAGGERED TERMS FOR BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. Bahr asked for the Board's comments on staggered terms for the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Burrell was opposed to this because it would not allow the citizens the ability to throw them out at one time and he did not see any advantage to staggered terms. Ms. Ringley said she had not heard any comments from her constituents on this issue. Mr. Hennaman concurred with Mr. Burrell and Ms. Ringley. He felt the system was working and saw no need to change it. Mr. Burrell made a motion to continue four year terms unstaggered as they have been in the past.

Mark A. Hennaman	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Frederick G. Bahr	Nay

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING – WEST END AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN – Amendment to the New Kent County Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The Board will take public comment on the West End Area Management Plan.

Mr. Maloney reported the County has been working on this plan for over a year and a half using the consultant services of Greenhorne & O'Mara. The plan was presented to the public both during its formulation in the fall of 1997 and the spring of 1998 in addition to the public work shops the Planning Commission held. The Board of Supervisors has also held two workshops on this issue. During the Board's work session the Board requested two modifications to the plan – removal of language regarding the possible conversion of the airport to a recreational facility and changing the future land use map to show the airport, elementary school, and Fire Station No. 2 as public facilities. These changes have been made. Mr. Marty Crahan and Mr. Joe Wiltse were present and they reviewed the plan for the Board. Mr. Hennaman asked if the village designation would be the most harmonious to residential land use as opposed to the other land uses that would allow business opportunities. Mr. Crahan said the village use would have a predominately higher density component – townhouses or apartments which are more compatible with retail and business uses. Mixed development is focused on non-residential, and there is a limited opportunity for residential. Mr. Hennaman clarified that land use was not zoning. Mr. Burrell stated the plan will come up for review periodically. Mr. Bahr opened the public hearing. The first person to speak was Mr. Stran Trout. Mr. Trout presented an unofficial minority report from the Planning Commission. There were concerns with the plan and four items were brought up for amendments - all four failed to pass. One involved the airport being indicated as recreational property, mixed development along Route 60 by the Five Lakes subdivision, protection of subdivision entrances to make sure there isn't a lot of businesses around the entrances, and the opportunity for residences in the village area. The next person to speak was Mr. David Kittner. Mr. Kittner said he supported the plan without the issues around the Route 60 area. The density is focused around the two interchanges, which he agreed with. He didn't want to see the plan held up because of the Route 60 corridor controversy. As a taxpayer he wanted the infrastructure to concentrate and go out, which was the most economical way. The next person to speak was Mr. John Fisher. Mr. Fisher agreed with the previous speakers and thought the Board needed to look at the changes that are coming regarding Virginia Power. There is a bill in front of the legislature regarding aggregation where groups can increase their opportunities to lower electric rates. He is not opposed to growth or progress, but he was concerned about the impact on the infrastructure the mixed development may cause in the Route 60 area. He would support the village area. The next person to speak was Mr. Mark Phaup. Mr. Phaup was in support of the plan. He felt the sewer and water should be used to their fullest extent. The next person to speak was Mr. William T. Dickerson. Mr. Dickerson was opposed to building along the Five Lakes community. He did not want a 7-11 by his home. He had a petition from his neighborhood to stop development (he gave the petition to the Board). The next person to speak was Mr. James M. Faucett. Mr. Faucett said he moved here for the rural nature of the County and was concerned about the commercial area along Route 60. The next person to speak was Ms. Holly Matthews. Ms. Matthews is a resident of the Five Lakes subdivision. She was opposed to the changes shown for Route 60. District Two citizens have not supported uncontrolled mixed development, and they attended several public meetings voicing their opinions. She questioned why the Planning Commission would approve the plan – and said the answer is “money.” She stated that two people on the Planning Commission have relatives that own property and would profit from it. She felt this was a conflict of

interest. She felt that Greenhorne & O'Mara's recommendation for the village concept and to leave the other area low density residential and three small sections of commercial in the Five Lakes area, was a good plan, but the Planning Commission felt it didn't allow enough money in the County and they needed it (money) for schools. She commended the two Planning Commission members from District Two, who were turned down repeatedly by the rest of the Planning Commission. The next person to speak was Mr. Robert Throckmorton. Mr. Throckmorton is a Five Lakes resident and agreed with Ms. Matthews' speech. The next person to speak was Mr. J. I. Ralston. Mr. Ralston stated he thought Holly spoke for a majority of those present. He said most of the citizens present were not at the meetings that really counted – the Planning Commission. He said he didn't know about it – he felt it (meetings) should be published in the papers that are read by the people of the County. He felt the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission picked this corridor because they thought “they were a weak bunch of voters who didn't pay attention or they think their representation did not meet the qualifications they desire.” He suggested on voting day to “put your money where your mouth is”. Go out and get somebody to run against these people who vote for putting commercial next door to his grandchildren. He said they had to pay more attention to what “these people up here” do and how they spend your money and how the property values are going. If not, they could end up next to a 7-11 or a live industry. The next person to speak was Dr. Dan Dye. Dr. Dye was opposed to the plan. He thought it was a slip shod method of getting what you want while making others think you're doing something else. He moved here from Midlothian to get away from this type of development. The next person to speak was Mr. Dave Trickey. Mr. Trickey stated he was opposed to the plan. The next person to speak was Mr. Michael Coleman. Mr. Coleman was opposed to the plan. He said he moved here for the tranquility. He is not opposed to development, but is opposed to it all down Route 60. He complained about the tractor-trailer traffic on Route 60 and the McDonalds being crowded by out of state people. He said litter has increased, crime has increased, and the road can't handle the traffic. He didn't want any industry on the corner. The next person to speak was Mr. Arthur Gnaegy. Mr. Gnaegy is a resident of Five Lakes. He is opposed to the plan. He moved here for the tranquility and serenity of the lake, trees, and land. He felt the speed limit on Route 60 was too high and there is more trash on the highway. He is not opposed to growth, but you have to keep everything inclusive in a particular area. He didn't want filling stations and McDonalds. The next person to speak was Mr. Pete D. Sweet. Mr. Sweet lives in Five Lakes and was concerned about the Route 60 corridor. He said he was certified by the Executive Board of the State Planning Commission and he was an architectural representative. He is not opposed to growth. He thought the citizens should have input as to the aesthetics on that corridor. He suggested there should be an architectural review board from the citizens of that area. He also suggested there should be written guidelines and approval before building can take place. The next person to speak was Cheryl H. Kimball. Ms. Kimball is a resident of Five Lakes. She agreed with the prior speakers. She asked the Board to respect the area and set up guidelines on limited growth. The next person to speak was Mr. Michael Hall. Mr. Hall said he agreed with all his neighbors in Five Lakes on the Route 60 corridor. He was concerned about development that would back up to his property and the devaluation of his property. He strongly opposes the plan. The next person to speak was Ms. Donna Miles. Ms. Miles agreed with everyone. She was concerned about the traffic on Longview. She never envisioned having commercial outside her development, which would deface the front of their area and traffic would cut through the streets. The next person to speak was Ms. Carman Tuttle. Ms. Tuttle moved here recently from Indiana. She loves the country atmosphere and wants to keep it that way. The next person to speak was Ms. Janie Philbates. Ms. Philbates is a lifetime resident currently residing in the Five Lakes area. She was very opposed to the plan. She attended some of the meetings and she heard over and over again “I came to New Kent because it was a rural area, please keep it that way, I came to New Kent because of the friendliness, the view, etc.” She would like to see it remain that way. The next person to speak was Ms. Ann Mihalik. Ms. Mihalik said she was not aware of what was going on. There is already a problem with traffic in the area. She is opposed to the light industrial and medium density. The next person to speak was Mr. Steve Matthews. Mr. Matthews said it was great to see people stand together and to fight for what they believe in. He agreed with the previous speakers. He felt the little bit of revenue the County would receive from new

businesses would not solve the County’s financial problems. He asked the Board to not approve the plan. The last person signed up to speak was Mr. A.C. “Jim” Worley. Mr. Worley was not present to speak. Mr. Bahr closed the public hearing. The Board discussed the plan and their views. Ms. Ringley felt they should encourage development within the village area and not encourage the hop, skip, and jump development along Route 60. She recommended removal of commercial and mixed development designation from the north side of Route 60 between the Winn Dixie shopping center and the commercially designated triangle at Routes 640 and 60. She also recommended the plan be amended to hold out as conservation the south side of Route 60 from the Bottoms Bridge village eastward with the realization this plan will be revisited in five years. She felt the commercial designation on Route 249 and the village designation at Bottoms Bridge provide ample acreage for commercial development. She also felt the need for architectural standards must be addressed in this plan if they are to be considered in the highway overlay plan. Mr. Burrell was concerned about sprawl and rapid growth and the commercial designation on Route 60, which needs to be controlled. The Planning Commission did have five public hearings, which were all advertised, and he didn’t want the public to lay the blame on them for not knowing about it. He concurred there should be a review before building takes place to make sure the designs are architecturally pleasing. Mr. Hennaman said he expressed concerns in both work sessions about the commercial and mixed use development along Route 60. He felt most people understood there was a need to develop business in the County, but they also have to ask themselves “at what cost”. Knowing the fact they can review this plan again in five years, then having the commercial designations where they and the mixed use are, puts the horse too far in front of the cart. Mr. Lipscomb said he did not want the Five Lakes project when it was done, but they still have to look out for the County as a whole. He felt the plan needed some adjustments, but if there was any road in the County that should be business, that is a four lane road, Route 60 is it. Mr. Bahr stated that as far as notice is concerned, the only paper of general circulation throughout New Kent County is the Tidewater Review, therefore, notices are placed in the Tidewater Review. Ms. Ringley made a motion to approve the West End Area Management Plan with the following changes: An amendment to remove the commercial and mixed development designation from the north side of Route 60 between the Winn Dixie shopping center and the commercially designated triangle at Routes 640 and 60, and hold out as conservation the south side of Route 60 from the Bottoms Bridge village eastward to Route 106 and leaving the L-R in there with the realization this plan will be revisited in five years. Also, in Section D, #3 in the Implementation Policies and Strategies they provide for the allowance of architectural regulations and guidelines in the Highway Overlay District. Mr. Burrell asked if Ms. Ringley would accept a friendly amendment to include the small triangle by the entrance to Woodhaven Shores in the amendment to remove the commercial designation. Ms. Ringley accepted the friendly amendment by Mr. Burrell.

Mark A. Hennaman	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Nay
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Frederick G. Bahr	Aye

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING – C-6-98 – FINNEY AND SONS – Application to rezone Tax Map and Parcel 27-12 located on the north line of Route 33 (Eltham Road), approximately two miles east of the intersection of State Route 249 (New Kent Highway). The property is currently zoned A-1, Agricultural. The proposed zoning of the property is M-1, Light Industrial. The Future Land Use Map contained in the Route 33 Area Management Plan Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan designates this area for light industrial use.

Mr. Maloney stated no specific uses have been identified at this time; however, environmentally clean, employment-generating industrial uses are the preferred forms of development per the Route 33 Area Management Plan Amendment. The surrounding properties are zoned C-1, Conservation, A-1, Agricultural, and M-2, Heavy Industrial. The majority of the parcel is uplands and is a non-Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area. The application has been reviewed by the Virginia Department of Transportation, which has asked to review the final site plan and will require adequate site distance; New Kent County Health Department, which had no comments at this time; the New Kent County Department of Public Safety, which points out there may be an effect on the County's ability to provide emergency services depending upon the types of industry that locate in the office park; and the New Kent County Department of Public Works, which had no comments. The Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the application at its December 21, 1998 meeting. The applicant, Mr. Sam Finney, was present and told the Board the boundary dispute with Mrs. Taylor has been resolved. Mr. Bahr opened the public hearing. There was no one signed up to speak, and the public hearing was closed. Mr. Lipscomb stated in order to address, protect, and promote public convenience, necessity, general welfare, and good zoning practices in the County, he moved to approve C-6-98 as presented.

Mark A. Hennaman	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Frederick G. Bahr	Aye

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING – C-5-98 – CHESAPEAKE FOREST PRODUCTS - Application to rezone a portion of Tax Map and Parcel 27-7 from C-1, Conservation to M-1, Light Industrial. They have also applied to rezone approximately a 10 acre portion of Tax Map and Parcel 27-14 from C-1, Conservation to M-2, Heavy Industrial for the existing Sawlog Concentration Yard, and an additional portion of Tax Map and Parcel 27-14 from C-1, Conservation to M-1, Warehousing and Limited Industrial. The proposed use of the property is the continued use as a wood yard and future development of the M-1, Light Industrial property as an industrial park. The properties are located approximately ½ mile east of the intersection of State Routes 33 and 249 on the north line of Route 33. The Future Land Use Map contained in the Route 33 Area Management Plan Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan designates the area for light industrial land uses.

Mr. Maloney reported the purpose of the rezoning for the wood yard is to bring it into compliance with the zoning ordinance. The surrounding zoning is predominately C-1, Conservation, A-1, Agricultural, and M-2, Heavy Industrial. The majority of the parcel is classified as uplands. The area does lie within the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area. The application has been reviewed by the Virginia Department of Transportation, which has requested to review the final site plan; the Department of Health had no comments; the Department of Public Safety points out there may be an effect on the County to provide emergency services depending upon the types of industry that locate in the office park; and Department of Public Works has no comments. It is the Planning Commission's recommendation to approve this application. Mr. Charles Kerns, a representative of the applicant, displayed maps to show the Board the rezoning request. Mr. Bahr opened the public hearing. There was no one signed up to speak and the public hearing was closed. The Board discussed the possible problem with emergency services. Mr. Burrell stated in order to address, protect, and promote public convenience, necessity, general welfare, and good zoning practices in the County, he moved to approve C-5-98 as presented.

Mark A. Hennaman	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye

Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Frederick G. Bahr	Aye

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING – CUP-3-98 – SPRINT PCS – Conditional Use Permit application to construct a communication tower, not to exceed 199 feet in height, on a portion of the property shown on Tax Map and Parcel 30-(3)-13, located on the south line of U. S. Route 60 near the Toe Ink Wayside. The property is zoned A-1, Agricultural.

Mr. Maloney reported that Section 9-245 of the New Kent County Zoning Ordinance sets forth site development criteria for this use. The application has been reviewed by the Virginia Department of Transportation, which requires adequate site distances be maintained, entrance improvements be installed, and the appropriate land use permits be obtained prior to actual construction; the Department of Health, which had no comments since it will be unmanned, the Public Safety Department, which will require all building, electrical, and fire prevention codes be complied with, and the Department of Public Works, which had no comments. The proposed tower did require an Aeronautical Study from the Federal Aviation Administration and the result of that study shows the tower will not require any lighting nor will it be a hazard to aviation. The Planning Commission recommended approval of this application with the condition that the Aeronautical Study Report by the FAA be submitted to the Department of Planning and Community Development prior to approval, which has been done. The applicant's representative, Ms. Phyllis Rubinstein, was present and clarified some items for the Board. Mr. Bahr opened the public hearing. There were no people signed up to speak and the public hearing was closed. Mr. Burrell stated in order to address, protect, and promote public convenience, necessity, general welfare, and good zoning practices in the County, he moved to approve CUP-3-98 as presented.

Mark A. Hennaman	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Frederick G. Bahr	Aye

IN RE: DISCUSSION – Mr. Hiram Johnson, General Manager, External Affairs for Virginia Power will speak with the Board regarding the ice storm power outage and the efforts made to restore power to the County.

Mr. Hiram Johnson and several of his colleagues gave a brief presentation on the effects of the ice storm and the steps taken by Virginia Power to restore power. The Board voiced their concerns.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS TO STANDING COMMITTEES – The Chairman will appoint committee members to any permanent or temporary committee established by the Board.

Mr. Bahr appointed Mr. Burrell to serve on the Finance Committee.

Mr. Bahr appointed Ms. Ringley to serve on the Public Safety Committee.

Mr. Bahr appointed Mr. Hennaman to serve on the School Board Liaison.

Mr. Bahr appointed Ms. Ringley to serve on the Legal Affairs Committee.

Mr. Bahr appointed Mr. Hennaman to serve on the Personnel Policy and Management Committee.

Mr. Bahr appointed Mr. Lipscomb to serve on the Water Resources Committee.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS - The Board will continue to make appointments to various committees.

District One had no appointments.

Ms. Ringley made a motion to appoint Mr. William Chandler as District Two's representative of the Board of Zoning Appeals. (Mr. M. Conway Adams resigned)

Mr. Burrell made a motion to appoint Deputy Clark as District Three's representative to the Transportation Safety Commission to complete a four year term ending December 31, 1999.

Mr. Burrell made a motion to reappoint Reverend Raymond Otey as District Three's representative to the Agricultural & Forestal Advisory Commission for a four year term ending December 31, 2002.

Mr. Hennaman made a motion to appoint Ms. Kirstin Steele as District Four's representative to the Board of Trustees for the Heritage Library to complete a four year term ending June 30, 2002.

Mr. Lipscomb made a motion to confirm these nominations.

Mark A. Hennaman	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Frederick G. Bahr	Aye

Mr. Burrell received a request from a citizen for the Board to adopt a resolution designating April as Alcohol and Drug Prevention Month in New Kent County. Ms. Ringley asked if tobacco would be included – Mr. Burrell said it could. It was the consensus of the Board to bring a resolution before the Board at the March meeting.

Ms. Ringley asked if staff could check into advertising public hearings in the New Kent Chronicle as well as the Tidewater Review and report back to the Board.

IN RE: MEETING SCHEDULE

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors will be held Monday, March 8, 1999 at 6:00 p.m. The Board of Supervisors will have a joint meeting with the School Board on Tuesday, February 16, 1999 at 5:00 p.m. in the courtroom of the old courthouse. The Planning Commission will meet on Tuesday, February 16, 1999 at 7:00 p.m.

IN RE:           ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Hennaman made a motion to adjourn.

Mark A. Hennaman	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Frederick G. Bahr	Aye

The Board adjourned at 10:07 p.m.