

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAS HELD ON THE 8th DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND TEN OF OUR LORD IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 6:00 P.M.

IN RE: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Sparks called the meeting to order.

IN RE: INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Thomas W. Evelyn	Present
David M. Sparks	Present
James H. Burrell	Present
Stran L. Trout	Present
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Present

All members were present.

IN RE: COUNTY ATTORNEY, PART 1

Chairman Sparks announced that Jeff Summers had resigned as County Attorney effective February 8, 2010. He expressed the Board's appreciation for Mr. Summers' dedicated service to the community. He indicated that no decision had yet been made regarding his replacement and until then, Assistant County Attorney Michele Gowdy and former County Attorney Phyllis Katz were available to fill in. He introduced and welcomed Ms. Katz who had been asked to serve as legal counsel for the meeting.

Mr. Davis moved to accept the resignation of Jeffrey Summers as County Attorney dated February 8, 2010. The members were polled:

James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: CONSENT AGENDA

The Consent Agenda was presented as follows:

1. Approval of Minutes
 - a. January 4, 2010 special meeting
 - b. January 11, 2010 regular meeting
2. Miscellaneous
 - a. Resolution R-08-10 encouraging participation in the 2010 Census

- b. Request for authority to enter into Airport Maintenance Shop lease with most responsible/responsive bidder
 - c. Mutual Aid Agreement with Hanover County dated February 1, 2010
 - d. Road Name Additions:
 - i. Lofty Retreat Drive
 - ii. BiCounty Way
3. Refunds
- a. \$9,618.91 to ACP, Inc. for cancelled building permit(s), with \$6,400.49 being credited to its outstanding utilities account and the remaining \$3,218.42 refunded to the builder
 - b. \$235.50 to Wayne F. Hartman for subdivision review fee (withdrawn family subdivision application)
4. FY10 Appropriations
- a. Funds for FY10 Fire-Rescue revenue recovery to cover bank fees, \$42.00
 - b. Funds received to date for Fire-Rescue revenue recovery for Fire-Rescue personnel, \$26,526.00
 - c. Funds donated to the New Kent Animal Shelter, \$1,347.00
 - d. Funds donated for various items, \$5,823.00
 - e. Funds received for insurance proceeds for repairs to the dugouts at Quinton Park that resulted from storm damage on December 19, \$1,100.00
 - f. Funds received for restitution for a blanket destroyed in a jail cell, \$25.00
 - g. Funds received from vending machine sales for employee Christmas parties, \$212.91
 - h. Funds for public safety coverage at school sports events in December and January, \$888.00
 - i. Adjustment of appropriation for Reclaimed Water Fund grant to actual amount awarded, \$3,258,604.00
 - j. State funds for a Virginia Department of Health, Office of Emergency Medical Services grant for the purchase of 1,900 surgical masks to combat the H1N1 virus, \$1,140.00
 - k. State funds for a Virginia Department of Health, Office of Emergency medical Services grant for the purchase of 12 EZ intraosseus devices, \$4,626.20
 - l. Additional/reduced funds expected from the State for schools, \$150,087.00
 - m. Funds received for DMV Stop Fees in the Treasurer's Office, \$720.00
 - n. Charge card fees collected in excess of budget for off-setting expenditures associated with charge card fees, \$2,473.00
 - o. Program income received to date for FY10 from CDBG Plum Point grant participants, \$660.04
- Total Supplemental Appropriation:
- | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| \$ (3,062,933.85) | Total |
| \$ 3,062,933.85 | Money In/Money Out |
5. FY10 Inter-Departmental Budget Transfers
- a. *Circuit Court*: \$31 from Part Time to Overtime
 - b. *Schools*: \$5,100 from Building Services Uniforms to Vehicle Maintenance Uniforms

- c. *Board of Equalization*: \$23,660 from Reserved for Contingency to various line items for Board of Equalization
- d. *Commissioner of Revenue*: \$1,200 from Gasoline to Part-time
- e. *Community Development*: \$180 from Planning Vehicle Insurance to Environmental Vehicle Insurance
- f. *Human Resources*: \$1,377 from Reserved for Contingency to Professional Services
- g. *Gasoline*: \$1,000 from IT to Central Purchasing
- h. *Fire Rescue*: \$5,634 from Grant Funding Contingency to OEMS Grants – Rescue Squad Assistance
- i. *Fire Rescue*: \$26,169 from Grant Funding Contingency to VDH-OEMS-SHSH Grant (ToughBooks)
- j. *Sheriff's Office*: \$3,776 from Insurance Damage to Vehicle
- k. *Training*: \$8,471 from Training Contingency to training line items in budgets of Board of Supervisors, Clerk of the Board, Commissioner of Revenue, Financial Services, IT, Electoral Board, Sheriff, E911, Community Development Administration, Litter Control, Water, Parham Water, Sewer, & Social Services

6. Treasurer's Report: Cash in Bank as of December 2009: \$65,820,805.67

Regarding the January 11 minutes, Mr. Burrell corrected the location of the potholes he had reported as being in the area of Interstate Exit 214.

Mr. Trout moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, subject to Mr. Burrell's correction to the minutes regarding pothole locations, and that it be made a part of the record. The members were polled:

Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: CITIZENS COMMENT PERIOD

Chairman Sparks opened the Citizens Comment Period.

Joe Mehlbrech, Jr. distributed a handout about problems on Old River Road caused by trucks from the Basic Construction quarry. He advised that the trucks posed serious safety hazards and were destroying a road that was not built for their use. He stated that complaints had been made to the Sheriff's Office but nothing had been done. He reported that Basic Construction was not abiding by the conditions of the conditional use permit that was previously issued to Luck Stone and he asked that operations be halted until the road was upgraded.

Mr. Sparks advised that the Board was aware of the situation and staff was in the process of arranging a meeting of all of the parties to address the problems. Mr. Evelyn noted that it was his information that Basic had suspended operations until it made improvements to the road. Mr. Mehlbrech responded that Basic had stopped operations before and then resumed without making the proper road upgrades. He spoke about the hazards to

occupants of vehicles sharing the roadway with the dump trucks. He also asked if Board members who were serving at the time that the Luck Stone CUP was approved could attend the upcoming meeting.

William G. Hodges, on behalf of the New Kent County Citizens Coalition, advised that although his group did not disapprove of the Heritage Public Library's plan for a new home in the historic school, it did not think that it was an appropriate time to spend money on that project, and that it should be "put on the back burner".

Chairman Sparks clarified that the Board had received a basic review of what a public library might look like at the historic school but had made no commitment to move forward with the project.

There being no one else signed up to speak, the Citizens Comment Period was closed.

IN RE: GAME WARDEN

Mr. Davis introduced and welcomed Philip Baker, the new game warden assigned to New Kent. Mr. Baker explained that he was one of six officers assigned to the region that included the counties of New Kent, Charles City, James City and York.

IN RE: WEATHER UPDATE

Chief Tommy Hicks was asked to provide an update on an upcoming weather event. Chief Hicks indicated that the predictions for the following day had changed from rain to snow/sleet and parents of students in the New Kent school system were being alerted that schools might close early. He advised that he would continue to consult with the Weather Bureau and work with the School Superintendent to provide current information.

Mr. Trout thanked Chief Hicks for maintaining fire and rescue protection services during the recent weather events and for keeping the Board informed.

IN RE: RESIDENCY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Chairman Sparks announced that there would be no report from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) because its staff was still busy dealing with road issues resulting from the recent snowstorms.

IN RE: ELECTED OFFICIALS' REPORTS

Mr. Davis thanked the citizens for helping out their neighbors during the recent weather events, noting that there had been few power outages in New Kent.

Mr. Trout talked about the icy conditions and suggested citizens stay home if they could.

Mr. Burrell acknowledged the presence of G. Cabell Lawton IV, who would start as new County Administrator on February 16, 2010.

Mr. Sparks complimented VDOT for all of its hard work on the roads during the recent snow storms.

IN RE: STAFF REPORTS

Interim County Administrator Bill Whitley recognized the hard work of Chief Hicks, commenting that citizens were not aware of all of the things that he did for the community, including early morning consultations with the School Superintendent regarding road conditions.

He also recognized staff in the General Services Department for all of their work in clearing the parking lots and sidewalks so that County operations could continue.

IN RE: DISTRICT APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Trout moved to appoint Earlyne Leary as District Four's representative to the Clean County Commission to serve a four-year term ending December 31, 2013.

Mr. Davis moved to appoint E. Wayne Davis as District Five's representative to the Agricultural and Forestal District Advisory Committee to serve a four year term ending December 31, 2013.

The members were polled:

Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye

The motions carried.

IN RE: NON-DISTRICT APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Trout moved to appoint Rodney Hathaway as New Kent's alternate representative to the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission to serve a term ending December 31, 2011.

Mr. Trout moved to appoint Edward Pollard as New Kent's Planning Commission representative to serve a one year term ending December 31, 2010.

The members were polled:

W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye

The motions carried.

IN RE: BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

Mr. Davis moved to nominate E. Baird Jones for Circuit Court appointment as a member of the Board of Equalization to serve a term ending December 31, 2010.

The members were polled:

Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: CLOSED SESSION

Mr. Davis moved to go into Closed Session to discuss a personnel matter pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.1 of the Code of Virginia involving performance and for consultation with legal counsel pursuant to Section 2.2-3711a.7 of the Code of Virginia on specific legal matters that require advice. The members were polled:

James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye

The motion carried. The Board went into closed session.

Mr. Davis moved to return to open session. The members were polled:

Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Burrell made the following certification:

Whereas, the New Kent County Board of Supervisors has convened in 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.

The Chairman 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:

W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: COUNTY ATTORNEY, PART 2

Mr. Trout moved to authorize the Board Chairman to negotiate and enter into a severance agreement with the former County Attorney. The members were polled:

Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Evelyn moved to appoint Michele Gowdy as Interim County Attorney. The members were polled:

James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: APPLICATION TO AMEND FARMS OF NEW KENT PLANNED UNIT
DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

Before the Board for consideration was Ordinance O-01-10 amending the Farms of New Kent Planned Unit Development (PUD) ordinance and proffers.

Community Development Director George Homewood advised that the applicants had requested a number of things that were the "hallmark of a PUD" and he reminded that PUDs were used because of their flexibility to respond to changes in the market, conditions, tastes and circumstances, and it was not unusual to expect that PUD owners would request changes. He noted that the subject application was the third request for amendments, with the key change being to allow reductions in house sizes for a number of units in Land Bays IV and V.

He stated that there were other changes requested, including the shifting of 30 units between Land Bays III and I, which would not change the maximum number of units in the overall development. He noted there were some provisions that would change the time in which recreational facilities would have to be provided -- from the platting of lots to the issuance of certificates of occupancy -- which staff felt was more of a traditional trigger

since the lots themselves did not generate the need for recreational facilities – it was the people residing in the homes.

He indicated that there was also a request to allow some of the affordable dwelling units (ADUs) that had been planned for Land Bay III to be located elsewhere, in light of the fact that Land Bay III was developing slower than anticipated and the timeframe for having those units constructed was fast approaching. He explained that the idea was to allow those ADUs to be constructed in the commercial or multi-family section of Land Bay IV. He reminded that at the time that the PUD was approved, staff had made a strong case not to locate all of the ADUs in a single land bay in order to avoid any stigma that might be attached, and staff was supporting this change.

Mr. Homewood reviewed that another change requested was to allow the temporary relocation of the Farmers Market from Land Bay III. He indicated that the Farmers Market was the “cornerstone” of Land Bay III but, again, as that particular land bay was slow to develop and the timeframe in which to construct the Farmers Market was approaching, the applicants were asking to temporarily locate it in either Land Bay IV or V -- however, the permanent Farmers Market would have to be in Land Bay III.

Regarding the request to reduce house sizes, he recapped that at the previous work session, it had been suggested that fixed numbers be used rather than percentages if the Board approved those reductions.

He reviewed the reduction requests as they applied to Land Bays IV and V and the Board reviewed maps which showed the different “pods” in Land Bay IV where lots were grouped according to lot widths. Mr. Homewood reminded that if the requests for reductions in home sizes were approved, the reductions would be permitted but not required, and the developer could build homes sized to meet market demands.

He reported that a request for some last minute changes had been received from the developers which staff had not included in the latest version of the ordinance. The first was to allow for the relocation of some of the lakefront cottages to areas near the golf club or swim and racket club. The second related to concerns expressed by the applicants related to lot widths set forth in the ordinance because they did not want to be strictly held to those widths when the lots were platted. Mr. Homewood remarked that change did not comply traditional zoning techniques and would be difficult to administer.

He addressed the concerns that having smaller homes would result in a decrease in value and a change of character of the development. He indicated that staff did not believe that to be the case and that having a few smaller houses in the development might improve the character of the project because it would provide a mix of use and make the development more accessible to a greater percentage of the population. He advised that staff had “run the numbers” against the 2003 analysis and found that the requested reduction in square footage would, in the worst case, result in a 1% change in the total value of the development and have minimal impact on total County tax revenues.

He reported that the applicant was present and prepared to address those issues not yet addressed and those issues where there was disagreement with staff.

Mr. Davis asked about reductions in minimum house sizes requested in Land Bay V. Mr. Homewood advised that the request was that the minimum house size for up to 250 of the Single Family Dwellings (SFD) could be reduced from 1,500 square feet to 1,200 square feet.

Mr. Trout had questions regarding lot widths and how they were measured. Mr. Homewood confirmed that County ordinance provided that lot widths were to be measured at the setback line.

There was more discussion and review of Land Bay IV, where the smaller and affordable units could be located, as well as the transfer of units between land bays. Mr. Homewood confirmed that if more than a few lots were transferred, then the Area Plan would have to be modified and re-approved.

Chuck Rothenberg, attorney for the applicants, reported that the community meeting held by his clients had been well attended and had resulted in good information, feedback, and questions. He reviewed that the application had been amended substantially through a lot of discussion and negotiations and his clients had "backed down on a lot of provisions". He remarked that his clients appreciated County staff and the Board working with them to come to agreement and he apologized for the late nature of their most recent revisions.

He admitted that his clients felt that most of the recent revisions were technical in nature, and he addressed the two items that staff had not included in its proposed ordinance. Regarding the mean lot width, he stated that the approved Area Plan was not an engineering plan and they wanted to make sure the lot widths were understood to be an "average" and not an exact width, to provide flexibility needed in dealing with topography when the lots were platted.

The other concern was the request to relocate some of the cottage units. He explained that the concept plan had been to place those units in areas close to the lakes and other recreation areas, but there was room for only about 22 of the cottage units around the lakes and they wanted the flexibility to put the rest somewhere that made sense, such as close to the golf course or racket club. He indicated that it also made sense to add a definition of these "detached cluster dwelling units" that they would agree to locate in close proximity to the recreational facilities. Mr. Evelyn pointed out that the original ordinance called for these units to be around the lake. Mr. Rothenberg reminded that this was discussed at the work session and at no time had the Board expressed any preferences or raised issues about the location of these units, and they had not anticipated that there would be any objection. It was confirmed that cluster units may or may not be attached.

Mr. Davis asked Mr. Rothenberg who was paying his legal fees. Mr. Rothenberg reminded that his fee arrangement with his clients was confidential, but did confirm that the fees were not being paid by the County.

Mr. Davis asked about the construction schedule for the two remaining roundabouts on Route 106. Mr. Rothenberg advised that his clients wanted to complete that construction as soon as possible, but needed funds from the sale of lots in order to pay for it. He indicated that it was his information that there was not sufficient Community Development Authority funding available for that.

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing.

William G. Hodges, on behalf of the New Kent County Citizens Coalition, thanked Mr. Homewood for his explanation of what had been requested. He indicated that his group was against reducing the minimum home sizes and they felt that the Board should stick with the original plan and that changing what was required could affect the Board's integrity.

Douglas Houston of 8635 Historical Path Road advised that he had attended the community meeting held at the Winery and he felt that the developers are trying to "make the best of a bad situation". He indicated that he was of the opinion that most of the amendments were reasonable; however, he still had a problem with reducing the minimum square footage. He reminded that the Board had promised the community that it would hold the developers "feet to the fire" and he believed that there would be a decrease in home values if the smaller homes were permitted. He rejected staff's analysis on the impact on County tax revenues. He asked how this had become the County's problem and asked what the County had to lose if the Board did not approve the changes.

There being no one else signed up to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Trout suggested cutting the number of units allowed to have reduced square footage. He also had concerns about changing the trigger for recreational facilities to the time when certificates of occupancy had been issued for 50% of the homes, noting that it was not fair to the first 50% of the homeowners having to wait so long for the amenities that had been promised, and he felt a more appropriate trigger would be 25%.

Mr. Evelyn spoke about his concerns with moving the Farmers Market and the delay in the development of the commercial areas of the project. Mr. Rothenberg clarified that the relocation of the Farmers Market would only be temporary and it was his client's intention and obligation to put the permanent facility in Land Bay III.

Mr. Evelyn suggested changing the language in several places from "as little as" to "minimum." The applicants had no objection to that change.

Mr. Sparks stated that he shared Mr. Trout's concerns about the recreational facilities.

Mr. Burrell wondered how a delay in constructing the amenities would affect the development's appeal. Mr. Rothenberg agreed that it was a "two-edged sword" but noted that if the amenities were constructed earlier, then it would be a greater burden on a fewer number homeowners by way of homeowners' association fees and dues. He indicated that if the Board was not inclined to change the trigger to the time of issuance of certificates of occupancies for 50% of the lots, then his client would prefer to leave the trigger where it was originally – at the time when 50% of the lots had been platted. Mr. Sparks commented that position did not match the developers' previous emphasis on the amenities. The applicants reminded that both the Winery and golf course had been built ahead of schedule, which had been when 500 homes had been completed. Mr. Sparks remarked that the Board was trying to work with the applicants and wanted the development to be successful but he felt that the amenities that had been represented needed to be in place.

Mr. Trout asked about the timing of the platting of lots in relation to actual construction. Jim Evans of Republic Land Development, developer in Land Bays IV and V, stated that they could plat anywhere from one lot to all of them at one time; however, they generally platted lots only in anticipation of development in a sequential format, and he would expect to plat lots in Land Bay V in groups of 25 to 50 at a time, which was more economical, as parcels became taxable as lots once they were platted.

Mr. Trout commented that he did not want the Board to force the developer to plat less lots at a time than it had planned, but he was concerned with the quality of life of citizens, including those "not here yet". He felt that it would be a problem if homeowners had to

wait ten or fifteen years for the amenities that were promised. Mr. Evans indicated that they would prefer that the trigger remain where it was, tied to the platting of 50% of the lots.

Mr. Davis admitted that "things had changed" since the original PUD was approved and he didn't have a problem with putting some smaller homes in Land Bay V because the market had changed, and he had no problem with temporarily moving the Farmers Market until Land Bay III started development, or the rest of the changes. However, he did have a problem in Land Bay IV where residents had built homes and now the "rules are being changed" and he did not think the house sizes there should be reduced.

Mr. Trout reviewed the changes requested for Land Bay V, stating that those reductions made sense and would be line with the other housing in that land bay, where no homes had yet been built.

He then reviewed each of the pods in Land Bay IV and what had been requested. Mr. Evans reported ten homes that Land Bay IV, six of which were occupied, one was awaiting its certificate of occupancy, and three were under construction. There was discussion regarding the various pods and how the smaller sized homes could impact the development of the remainder of the land bay. Mr Evans reported that 75% of homes sold in New Kent in the recent past had been \$200,000 or less, and in the current market, people were more interested in buying smaller homes. He indicated that the initial model to be offered in Land Bay V would sell for around \$230,000. Mr. Burrell reported that the median price of a home in the Richmond Metropolitan Area had increased from \$190,000 in October to \$215,000 in December. Mr. Evans explained that builders advertised their base models but often talked people into upgrades.

Mr. Evelyn stated that the changes requested would affect his district and he had some of the same concerns about Land Bay IV as Mr. Davis. He stated that he was not confident that the amendments would help and asked what the developers ask for next. Mr. Evans responded that they were "not 100% sure anything would work" and they had not indicated that they would ask for anything else. He reminded that this was the first request for a reduction in home sizes.

Mr. Homewood reviewed the changes that had been requested since the initial application. The first was to allow for a faster development pace which was required in order to meet the needs of the Community Develop Authority in marketing its bonds, and included cash proffers to be increased by 50% for any increased units within a year. The second was to allow the Mirbeau Spa development. He confirmed that this was the first request to change the development parameters in any significant way.

There was discussion regarding recent homes sales in New Kent, and the market in general. Mr. Evans stated he expected that many of the houses for which they are asking for a reduction in minimum size would range between 1,500 and 2,000 square feet, and that they were all hoping for an improvement in the market and to be able to sell as large a house as possible.

Board members discussed possible changes to the numbers of homes allowed reduced square footages. It was agreed that because of the number of suggestions that had been discussed, it would be best to delay any vote and give staff time to develop a new version of the ordinance for the Board's consideration at a future meeting. It was clarified that there would not be another public hearing.

IN RE: MEETING SCHEDULE

The Chairman announced that the next meeting of the Board of Supervisors would be held at 6:00 p.m. on March 8, 2010, and the next work session at 3:00 p.m. on February 24, 2010, both in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building, New Kent, Virginia, and that the Board would also hold a budget work session retreat at 10 a.m. on February 19, 2010 at Fire Station No. 1 in Providence Forge.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

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

W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
David M. Sparks	Aye

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.