

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MET ON THE 14TH DAY OF MAY IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD NINETEEN HUNDRED NINETY-SEVEN IN THE BOARD ROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING BEGINNING AT 7:00 P.M. FOR A PUBLIC HEARING RECONVENING FROM THE MAY 12TH MEETING.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Gary L. Green	Present
James H. Burrell	Absent
Frederick G. Bahr	Present
Julian T. Lipscomb	Present
Mark A. Hennaman	Present

Mr. Hennaman asked that the record show Mr. Burrell is unable to here tonight due to his mother=s emergency open heart surgery. Mr. Hennaman lead the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING - FY 97-98 BUDGET. The Board will hear public comments on the proposed budget.

Mr. Hennaman asked Mr. Emerson to give his report. Mr. Emerson gave an overview of the proposed FY 97-98 Operating Budget and stated that Ordinance O-09-97 enacting tax levies for the 97-98 tax year reflects the same tax rates as FY 96 - 97.

GENERAL FUND	\$ 6,563,806
SCHOOL FUND	12,417,123
SCHOOL FOOD	366,370
AIRPORT FUND	96,760
E-911 FUND	160,000
WATER FUND	720,900
TOTAL	\$20,324,959

Mr. Hennaman asked if the Board had any questions. Mr. Bahr asked Mr. Emerson to explain how the food program works - is it a federal program? Mr. Emerson replied that no, it has some federal and state monies in small amounts, it's generated funds from the sale of the school lunches. Mr. Green stated that he would like to see the schools retain the monies left over from this year to cover purchases, debt retirement, and repairs.

Mr. Hennaman opened the public hearing. The first citizen to speak was Jennifer Caldwell, 4301 Old Nottingham, New Kent, Virginia. Ms. Caldwell stated that she had some questions for Mr. Emerson. Concerning the half million dollars that was awarded to Mr. Worley, is it included in the budget this year. Mr. Hennaman told Ms. Caldwell that generally they are not in a position to answer questions posed during the public hearing - Mr. Emerson can respond by either telephone or in writing as early as possible. Ms. Caldwell asked where any legal fines other than that paid to Mr. Cornwell would come under the public budget. Mr. Hennaman asked her to clarify the question. Ms. Caldwell said that she understood that the County has incurred some legal fees due to the lawsuit and she couldn't find it in the budget and she would like to know where it was. Mr. Emerson answered that the legal fees are included under the office of County Attorney. A quick answer on the Worley question, there has been an award and that has been appealed; therefore, no funds have paid and no monies are budgeted to be paid because it is currently awaiting hearing in the Supreme Court. Ms. Caldwell asked if that meant that no legal fees

had been paid in addition to what is paid Mr. Cornwell. Mr. Emerson answered, No, legal fees have been paid and if she would like to come by his office or submit a request in writing, he would provide her with the legal fees that have been paid - they are not in the current budget because they are not going to be paid out of the upcoming budget year - some of them were not paid in this last budget year, they were in the year previous. Ms. Caldwell asked if it came under the judicial administration or the general fund. Mr. Emerson answered that it came under litigation, which is funded out of the general fund. Ms. Caldwell asked if there was a breakdown of those figures in the budget as to which law firm are paid or is she right in assuming that Mr. Cornwell is not the sole practitioner and that other legal firms receive money? Mr. Emerson answered that the question was quite in depth, but the budget contains one lump sum of money under the litigation line. Bills are paid according to the register and they are allocated to whomever the service provider is. If she would like to view it, it can be provided. Ms. Caldwell stated that as a citizen of New Kent County she doesn't appreciate paying higher taxes for the law suit and she feels like they have resulted from poor judgment on someone's part and if she was running a business and somebody cost her a half million to three-quarters of a million dollars, she'd find out where that problem was and would evaluate that person's job. She thinks that is a problem that needs to be identified and taken care of. She would like more information on the subject and will get in touch with the Administrator. The next person to speak was Mr. James Norton, 8901 Sedbergh Drive, New Kent, Virginia. Mr. Norton stated that he would like to see more harmony in the boards and less finger pointing to get a better education. He felt like everyone was headed that way but he doesn't like to see the nitpicking. He feels the school board should be commended for a good belt tightening. He would like to see more money designated for schools. Mr. Hennaman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bahr stated the Mr. Burrell spoke with him and he (Mr. Burrell) feels very strongly with downsizing industry generally and states might well take under advice limiting the COLA raises and having only merit raises considered. He also felt that buying cars on a lease purchase basis should be thoroughly investigated the possibility of refurbishing the old cars with engines and transmissions and making do for another year until we can afford to spend significantly less money in financing the purchase of these vehicles. Mr. Hennaman stated that Mr. Burrell had additionally said that overall generally as proposed he had no significant problems, but he did specifically mention the items Mr. Bahr brought forward. Mr. Lipscomb stated that on the refurbishing of the vehicles, it was discussed thoroughly last year and got all the cost estimates and found out that it would be better to go ahead a buy the new vehicles under the lease purchase - not to be extended over two years. Discussion followed about the feasibility of refurbishing verses purchasing new vehicles. Mr. Hennaman stated that Mr. Burrell had also requested that the Board consider after adoption if in fact the proposed revenues come in stronger than anticipated that an additional appropriation be considered for the schools. Mr. Hennaman also stated that looking down the road (it is not feasible for this year), based on some input from constituents and survey results from the Commissioners Survey, for next fiscal 98-99, we consider moving the tax deadline date away from December. He suggested September. Also, a plan for implementing the reduction in the real estate and/or personal property tax rate - which could be phased in over a couple fiscal years. Mr. Bahr asked Mr. Emerson about the list of revenues coming into the County, under which category was Colonial Downs. Mr. Emerson answered that they are under Parks & Recreation, where the accounting manual says they should be placed. Mr. Bahr also stated that in relation to continued betterment of communications with the school board, what progress has been made on answering questions as to whether the school or the County is going to put the schools on the Bright System and are those funds included in the budget. Mr. Emerson answered that he and the superintendent have had discussions about this, but there has not been a final decision. It is Mr. Emerson's understanding that it's not a question of if, but when they go on the Bright System. Mr. Green stated that after several conversations, perhaps money should be set aside for a study or consulting work done toward hiring a fire chief. Mr. Lipscomb agreed with Mr. Green.

IN RE: MEETING SCHEDULE.

The Board of Supervisors will consider the adoption of the FY 97-98 Budget on May 21, 1997 at 6:00 p.m.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Lipscomb made a motion to adjourn. There was no discussion. The Members were polled.

Gary L. Green	Aye
James H. Burrell	Absent
Frederick G. Bahr	Aye
Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Mark A. Hennaman	Aye

The meeting was adjourned to be reconvened on May 21, 1977 at 6:00 p.m.