

**MINUTES
KING WILLIAM COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2014**

At a regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors of King William County, Virginia, held on the 28th day of April, 2014, beginning at 7:00 p.m. in the Conference Room of the County Administration Building, with the following present:

O. O. Williams, Chairman
T. S. Stone, Vice-Chairman
C. T. Redd III
T. J. Moskalski
S. K. Greenwood

T. L. Funkhouser, County Administrator
D. M. Stuck, County Attorney - Absent

RE: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman O. O. Williams called the Board of Supervisors meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call vote.

Those members voting:

C. T. Redd III	Aye
T. J. Moskalski	Aye
S. K. Greenwood	Aye
T. S. Stone	Aye
O. O. Williams	Aye

RE: REVIEW OF MEETING AGENDA

There was general discussion of the meeting agenda items.

The Board recessed and moved to the Board Meeting Room of the County Administration Building to continue the meeting.

Chairman Williams called the meeting back to order at 7:30 p.m.

RE: ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA

On motion by C. T. Redd III, seconded by T. S. Stone, with the following roll call vote, the Board adopted the agenda for this meeting as presented by the County Administrator.

Those members voting:

T. J. Moskalski	Aye
S. K. Greenwood	Aye
T. S. Stone	Aye
C. T. Redd III	Aye
O. O. Williams	Aye

**RE: PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – SPEAKERS: ONE OPPORTUNITY OF
3 MINUTES PER INDIVIDUAL OR 5 MINUTES PER GROUP ON NON-PUBLIC
HEARING MATTERS**

The Chairman opened the Public Comment Period.

1. Cheryl Spurlock, Minister in King William, expressed her desire to bring a drive-in movie theater to King William.

The County Administrator clarified Bret Schardein, Community Development Director, has been working with Ms. Spurlock on this matter; Ms. Spurlock confirmed.

Mr. Schardein said he has met with Ms. Spurlock several times and explained to her the zoning requirements and the process she would need to follow for an outdoor theater.

Ms. Spurlock stated she is currently looking for property for the project.

2. Alvin Carter, of 18847 King William Road and Planning Commission member, spoke in favor of the B. W. White Funeral Home expansion and the TCO exception on the agenda tonight for Board consideration. He gave testament to the service the White family has extended to the community and to the county for many years. He urged the Board to vote in favor of the exemption of the buffer requirements in this project.

3. Ann Todd, of the 2nd District, is in favor of a flat budget tax with no increase in order to make King William County, to what she believes, more competitive with surrounding localities. She is not in favor of a three cent increase as proposed. In her opinion, the Board of Supervisors should work harder to cut the budget in order to attract new businesses and new growth in the county.

4. Molly Longest, of the 3rd District, grew up in this county, loves this county and wants it to be the best county possible. She is in favor of no user fees for senior programs that do not cost the county anything. She asked for clarification if a policy has been adopted to charge fees for senior programs. She also spoke in favor of the B. W. White Funeral Home expansion.

5. Bob Ehrhart, of the 5th District and speaking on behalf of the King William T.E.A. Party, asked for clarification of a report he requested in his written comments on the budget.

The County Administrator stated the report requested does not exist.

Mr. Ehrhart continued and speculated on the percentage of citizens that do not support a tax increase partially based on a survey he conducted and the recent budget article published in the *Tidewater Review*. In his opinion, if this budget is passed this will be the 9th time in 14 years this Board has passed some type of increase on homeowners either in the form of a tax increase or a property reassessment. He said the budget for this county cannot be balanced on the backs of homeowners.

6. Robert Shannon, of the 3rd District, commended Mr. Greenwood for consistently urging spending cuts. He feels a 10.5% increase in the overall budget is unconscionable. He is not in favor of public sector employee pay raises. He feels public schools are over staffed and used an example from a presentation presented at the School Board budget meeting. In his opinion the threat to the children at the middle school is not the lack of a resource officer it is the debt being imposed on them. He suggested paid fire and rescue should be put on a referendum.

There being no other persons to appear before the Board the Chairman closed the Public Comment Period.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

On motion by C. T. Redd III, seconded by T. J. Moskalski, with the following roll call vote, the Board approved the following items on its Consent Agenda:

- a. Minutes:
 - i. Regular meeting of March 24, 2014
 - ii. Budget Work Session of March 29, 2014
 - iii. Budget Work Session of March 31, 2014
 - iv. Budget Work Session of April 2, 2014
- b. Claims against the County for the month of April, 2014, in the amount of \$1,857,445.54 as follows:

(1) General Fund Warrants #79182-79253 in the amount of \$356,103.28; and ACH Direct Payments #4854-4928 in the amount of \$430,453.53; and General Fund Warrants #79261-79315 in the amount of \$330,709.00; ACH Direct Payments #4929-4967 in the amount of \$119,507.01; Direct Deposits #19269-19368 in the amount of \$187,136.92; and Electronic Tax Payment in the amount of \$75,575.51 for April, 2014.

(2) For informational purposes, Social Services expenditures for the month of March, 2014, Warrants #310038-310071 in the amount of \$29,053.86; ACH Direct Payments #1140-1168 in the amount of \$15,321.59; Direct Deposits #3218-3239 in the amount of \$30,148.07; and Electronic Tax Payment in the amount of \$12,009.13.

(3) For informational purposes, Comprehensive Services Act Fund expenditures for the month of March, 2014, Warrants #79173-79181 in the amount of \$212,286.64; and ACH Direct Payments #4850-4853 in the amount of \$59,141.00.

(4) There were no Tax Refunds for the month of April, 2014.

c. Resolution #14-20 – A Resolution directing the Treasurer of King William County to issue a real estate tax refund due to erroneous assessment on Tax Parcel 12-19A; was approved.

RESOLUTION #14-20
A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE
TREASURER OF KING WILLIAM COUNTY
TO ISSUE A REAL ESTATE TAX REFUND
DUE TO ERRONEOUS ASSESSMENT ON
TAX PARCEL 12-19A

WHEREAS, the Commissioner of the Revenue has determined an erroneous real estate tax assessment has been made on Tax Parcel 12-19A due to a factual error in the acreage of the property (207.65 acres instead of the actual acreage per recent survey of 173.6 acres) and certified the same to this Board; and

WHEREAS, the Commissioner of the Revenue has determined that the taxpayer paid all taxes due on the erroneous assessment and is entitled to a refund of excess taxes paid for the years 2011, 2012, and 2013, based on the corrected assessment as required by law, in the total amount of \$1,941.16 together with interest and such refund has been consented to by the County Attorney, all as provided for in Section 58.1-3981 of the Code of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Board is required to direct the Treasurer to issue a real estate tax refund together with the appropriate amount of interest calculated to the time of refund on the overpayment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors of King William County this 28th day of April, 2014, directs the Treasurer to issue a refund of

\$1,941.16, together with interest to the time of refund calculated in accordance with law, to the taxpayer(s) paying the same.

d. Resolution #14-21 – Road Abandonment – State Route 682 – Tidy Cat Road; authorization to advertise a public hearing to be held was approved.

RESOLUTION 14-21
EXPRESSING THE INTENTION OF THE COUNTY
TO ABANDON A PORTION OF STATE ROUTE 682 (TIDY CAT ROAD)

WHEREAS, it appears to this Board that Secondary Route 682 (“Tidy Cat Road”) from its intersection with Rt. 613 (“Dunluce Road”) to its terminus, a distance of approximately 0.14 miles, serves no public necessity and is no longer necessary as a part of the Secondary System of State Highways; and

WHEREAS, the Clerk of the Board is directed to post at the Circuit Court and publish notice of the Board's intent to abandon the aforesaid Route 682, pursuant to §33.1-151 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that a public hearing to consider this matter is to be held on Monday, May 19, 2014, at 7:30 p.m. in the King William County Administration Building Board Room at 180 Horse Landing Road, King William, VA;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Commissioner of the Virginia Department of Transportation.

e. Rezoning Requests – Z-01-14 and Z-02-14 – Referral to Planning Commission; was authorized.

Those members voting:

S. K. Greenwood	Aye
T. S. Stone	Aye
C. T. Redd III	Aye
T. J. Moskalski	Aye
O. O. Williams	Aye

RE: PRESENTATIONS TO THE BOARD

There were no presentations to the Board.

RE: OLD BUSINESS

a. Transportation Corridor Overlay (TCO) Ordinance – Review and Discussion – Ms. Stone asked for clarification the TCO changes before the Board for consideration were referred by the Planning Commission.

The County Administrator confirmed the TCO changes before the Board is a formal recommendation from the Planning Commission. He noted a public hearing will likely occur in June on this matter; due to the May meeting is early in the month due to the memorial holiday. He asked Board members to forward any recommended changes to the draft as soon as possible.

T. S. Stone motioned for the County Administrator to advertise a public hearing and place this matter on the next feasible meeting agenda; motion was seconded by C. T. Redd III.

T. J. Moskalski asked for clarification Board options are to adopt some, all or none of the recommendations from the Planning Commission; or completely repeal.

The County Administrator stated that is correct.

Upon completion of discussions motion carried with the following roll call vote:

Those members voting:

T. S. Stone	Aye
C. T. Redd III	Aye
T. J. Moskalski	Aye
S. K. Greenwood	Aye
O. O. Williams	Aye

RE: NEW BUSINESS

a. Resolution #14-22 – Claims for Damages to Fowls – Donald A. Oakley –
Animal Control Officer Deputy Koontz, Claimant Mr. Donald Oakley and Retired Game Warden and employee of the claimant, Mr. Marshall Stover, appeared before the Board and explained the details of the claimed damages to the numerous pheasants and chuckers on claimant's farm.

Mr. Stover noted he owns a company, Wildlife Control of Virginia, and is federally/state licensed and insured for nuisance animal complaints, and he is also nationally certified as a licensed tracker.

Ms. Stone asked how these damages were determined to have been done by a dog versus another animal.

The Claimant, Mr. Oakley, stated the tracks inside and outside of the pen where the birds were caged were dog tracks. He stated the dogs bit through the wire pen which could not have been done by a raccoon or a fox in his opinion. He said dog feces, with bird feathers, was found inside and outside the pen.

Ms. Stone asked how long the birds had been in the pen.

Mr. Oakley said the birds were put in the pen the same day the damages occurred overnight; each occurrence. He explained he operates a game farm and someone is at the location every day. He stated around 6,000 pheasants, 8,000

chuckers and 1,500 quail were raised at this location last year. He reviewed the timeframe of raising the chicks to full grown fowls.

Ms. Stone asked if the claimant is taking additional preventative measures at the site going forward.

Mr. Oakley stated electric wire will be installed on the flight pen this year.

Deputy Koontz stated several live traps are active onsite; no captures thus far.

Ms. Stone said the claim against the county is \$6,132 and asked if the Claimant has filed an insurance claim for the damages.

Mr. Oakley confirmed he has insurance but it does not cover these types of damages. He said the insurance covers mechanical damages such as a storm or loss of electricity.

Ms. Stone asked for clarification the Claimant has a business license in King William County.

Mr. Oakley confirmed the business license with King William County is under the name Beaver Creek Game and Birds.

Mr. Williams asked how many years the operation has been in business on this particular site.

Mr. Oakley stated they have conducted business at this location for approximately 15 to 17 years. He added they have never incurred this kind of problem with dogs. Every once in a while they have trouble with a raccoon or a fox; the recent incidents are totally different from those in the past.

Mr. Greenwood asked for clarification the three separate occurrences were reported within the notice period as required by code.

Deputy Koontz stated each occurrence was reported to animal control the following day after the damages were made.

Mr. Greenwood asked for clarification the Animal Control Officer determined the damages were done by dogs.

Deputy Koontz stated based on his experience and in part relying on the expertise of Mr. Stover, the damages were done by dogs. He noted none of the fowls killed were eaten and this is consistent with a canine.

Mr. Stover stated the photographs provided shows the birds were grabbed, crushed, dropped by the dog and they moved on to the next one. He said this is quite typically the problems you have with domestic dogs, not only with fowls but also with sheep. He noted he took photographs of individual tracks and compared them to coyote tracks. He said snow was on the ground on a couple of the occasions and they were not able to track the animals due to the snow melting. He stated it appeared there were two dogs involved, one had a missing nail on the left foot.

Mr. Moskalski asked if attempts have been made to locate these dogs.

Deputy Koontz answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Moskalski asked if we believe these are owned dogs or wild dogs.

Deputy Koontz stated he believes these are owned animals and further noted a feral animal would return to the site of the still birds.

Mr. Stover noted feral animals living in the wild, such as deer dogs, would have returned to feed and pointed out there was a lapse in time between the occurrences. He said some carcasses were left for bait but the animal did not return. In his opinion the animals did not kill the birds because they were hungry, the fecal matter found at the site contained domestic food along with undigested feathers.

Mr. Moskalski said hopefully the owners of the dogs will be found and held accountable because we have dogs causing damages to property and causing a loss to the County by virtue of the State Code.

Mr. Oakley stated he has a very small margin of profit and it is very disheartening to see the damages that occurred; especially when you put as much work into raising these birds as they do. He said Board consideration is greatly appreciated.

T. J. Moskalski moved to table Resolution #14-22 for further consultation with the County Attorney, motion was seconded by C. T. Redd III; motion carried with the following roll call vote:

Those members voting:

C. T. Redd III	Aye
T. J. Moskalski	Aye
S. K. Greenwood	Aye
T. S. Stone	Aye
O. O. Williams	Aye

Chairman Williams stated to the County will be back in touch with the Claimant after further discussions with the County Attorney; more than likely consideration will occur during the regular business meeting of May 19, 2014.

Mr. Moskalski reminded the Claimant if the dogs should return that by virtue of this same State Code section he is well within his rights to destroy these animals on site if they are caught.

Mr. Oakley said he understands.

b. Resolution #14-27 – Transportation Corridor Overlay (TCO) Exception – SP-04-10 – BWW Acquisition LLC – Bret Schardein, Community Development Director, explained TCO exception SP-04-10 before the Board for consideration is for two exceptions for buffer requirements; the first being a streetscape buffer and the second being buffers between development sites. He stated the applicant has stated redeveloping the pre-existing site into full compliance with the current TCO requirements presents difficulties and is therefore requesting an exception. He noted if the exception request is approved, the Planning Commission will review the proposed site plan and may act as early as during their May 6, 2014 regular meeting.

Ms. Stone asked for confirmation the primary conflict with the TCO requirement is the parking lot.

Mr. Schardein state that is correct, the rear and sides of the property are not developed so there is nothing there, but the parking lot is the major encroachment.

Ms. Stone also asked for clarification the expansion of the building is not a concern.

Mr. Schardein stated the expansion of the building is not a concern.

Mr. Greenwood noted the applicant has plans to add trees, bushes and a picket fence between the properties. He also said a beautiful brick monument sign is proposed to be placed in the front of the property.

Mr. Redd asked if there has been any correspondence with the adjacent landowner on the side of the property where the buffer is in question.

Mr. Schardein said there has not been any correspondence with the adjacent residential property owner.

Mr. Williams said the adjacent property owner should have been notified if a zoning hearing was conducted.

Mr. Schardein said that is correct and explained the procedures for a zoning public hearing to occur. He noted the front parking lot will meet the State right of way.

Mr. Greenwood stated the cost of the expansion will be absorbed by the applicant as a dedication to the B. W. White family for their many years of services to the community; there is no expectation for recovering any of the costs. He said the plans for the expansion are to beautify the property and to bring the building up to code compliance; such as handicap restrooms.

Mr. Moskalski feels the district supervisor should be referred to since he will be the one most intimately involved with the project and have the most local knowledge with the project and its impact on neighboring property owners. He asked Mr. Greenwood if he is comfortable and in favor of this expansion plan and TCO exceptions request.

Mr. Greenwood said his is in favor of the expansion and TCO exceptions request.

T. J. Moskalski moved for approval of Resolution #14-27(A) a Resolution approving the TCO Exceptions Request of BWW Acquisition, LLC for the B. W. White Funeral Home Building Expansion; motion was seconded by T. S. Stone.

Chairman Williams called for further discussion.

Mr. Redd feels, given the applicant's concern with the buffer, it would have been appropriate for him/her to have contacted the adjacent property owner. He said other than that the overall project looks good to him.

Chairman Williams stated he does not like approving something when the adjacent property owner has not been contacted, he feels it sets a bad precedent. Although, in his opinion, the proposed expansion is a great improvement.

Mr. Moskalski feels this is continuing what has been a historical use of this property; they are not changing the nature of the existing use or activities. He feels this proposed expansion is appropriate even if the adjacent property owner has not been contacted.

Mr. Williams clarified he would like to avoid any conflict with neighbors at the start of any activity at the site.

Ms. Stone stated the expansion will be on the opposite side of the adjacent property owner and should not affect their property. In her opinion any changes will be an improvement to the site. She is comfortable with the proposed expansion.

Mr. Greenwood said he is sure the neighbor has heard of the expansion plans.

There being no further discussion Chairman Williams called for a roll call vote for the following Resolution #14-27(A):

**RESOLUTION #14-27(A)
A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TCO EXCEPTIONS REQUEST OF
BWW ACQUISITION, LLC FOR THE B.W. WHITE FUNERAL HOME
BUILDING EXPANSION**

WHEREAS, BWW Acquisition, LLC applied for an Exception Request to the requirements of Sections 86-374(4)(a) and 86-374(4)(b) of King William County code and such request proposing the reduction and elimination of buffer requirements on Tax Map Parcel 22-11; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the King William County Board of Supervisors this 28th day of April 2014, approves the Exception Request to delete the streetscape buffer, rear yard buffer and side yard buffer to the property's south side and reduce the side yard buffer from 30' to 15' to the property's north side and requires the site be developed in substantial conformance with the site plan titled "Site Plan for Building Expansion B.W. White Funeral Home" dated April 20, 2014 prepared by Anthony Scott Thompson, P.L.S.

Those members voting:

T. J. Moskalski	Aye
S. K. Greenwood	Aye
T. S. Stone	Aye
C. T. Redd III	Aye
O. O. Williams	Aye

Mr. Moorehead, of B. W. White Funeral Home, thanked the Board for their consideration. He stated the neighbor next door to the site is aware of the expansion plans; they personally have not contacted them, but they are aware.

Mr. Moskalski thanked the B. W. White family, on behalf of the Board of Supervisors, for their many years of service to the community.

c. Resolution #14-28 – Transportation Corridor Overlay (TCO) Exception – SP-07-11 – Kennington Sales Office – Bret Schardein, Community Development Director, stated this particular planned structure is a real estate sales office which will also act as a model home for the Kennington subdivision. He said the TCO requires a certain set of building materials on the exterior of the building. The applicant requests

an exception to allow the use of vinyl siding in place of hardiplank as originally planned. The stone portions of the building would remain as depicted in the elevation drawing. The applicant has proposed the request so that the materials of the model home may match the material used on the homes within the subdivision that it represents, which have vinyl siding. He said the requested use of the vinyl material is within the TCO requirements.

Mr. Moskalski asked for clarification the sidewalk will be built as required by the TCO.

Mr. Schardein confirmed the sidewalk will be built as required by the TCO.

Ms. Stone asked if the home will be facing Route 360 or Kennington, with access to the home on Kennington.

The Applicant, Mr. Todd Rogers, stated you will enter Kennington subdivision and parking for the model home will be in the front. He said the home will face cattycornered; traveling east on Route 360 take the first Kennington entrance.

Ms. Stone asked when the subdivision is developed if the model home will be sold.

Mr. Rogers said the model home could be sold and used as an office or possibly torn down at some point.

T. J. Moskalski moved for approval of Resolution #14-28(A); motion was seconded by S. K. Greenwood.

There being no further discussion Chairman Williams called for a roll call vote for the following Resolution #14-28(A):

**RESOLUTION #14-28(A)
A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TCO EXCEPTION REQUEST OF
KENNINGTON PLACE, LLC**

WHEREAS, Kennington Place, LLC applied for an Exception Request to the requirements of Section 86-374(4)(d) of King William County code and such request proposing the use of vinyl siding in the place of hardiplank on the project known as the Kennington Sales Office located on Tax Map Parcel 22-12-2; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the King William County Board of Supervisors this 28th day of April 2014, approves the Exception Request to use vinyl siding on the project known as the Kennington Sales Office and requires no mitigating or alternative improvements.

Those members voting:

S. K. Greenwood	Aye
T. S. Stone	Aye

C. T. Redd III Aye
T. J. Moskalski Aye
O. O. Williams Aye

d. Resolution #14-23 – Adoption of Budget FY15 – the County Administrator said staff does not have anything further to add. He said the next three items on the agenda can be considered collectively or roll call on each item separately.

Chairman Williams called for any questions from Board members.

Mr. Moskalski addressed a question asked during public comments regarding Parks and Recreation user fees and how they relate to this budget. He said Mr. Williams is correct there is budget and there is policy. He clarified user fees are a matter of policy, that policy is being reviewed; the present budget does not set user fees. He said there have been a lot of comments and discussions of this fiscal year's budget and feels despite what some have said this Board has done an amiable job of going through this budget, line item by line item, over the course of three days. Initial proposals were considered and cut down to what we have now, a three cent tax increase. He said a lot of those increases are items we knew were expenditures coming this year such as the radio system and increased costs from Fire and EMS. He feels this budget is a good document and shows a good team effort.

T. J. Moskalski moved for approval of Resolution #14-23; motion was seconded by T. S. Stone.

Chairman Williams called for further discussion.

Mr. Greenwood said he has disagreed with this budget from the very beginning. He was considering voting in favor of the budget until the last budget work session; in good conscience he cannot agree with the adoption of this budget. He has heard from many constituents that are not in favor of any kind of tax increase; he has heard from only one citizen in favor of raising taxes. He feels no cuts were made to this budget, level funding is not cuts; all requests were given what they were given before; that is not cuts. He feels there should have been no increase in taxes. He also feels more should have been cut from the schools. In his opinion, they do not need irrigation systems for the track, if the funds were going to educate the children that is alright; but not for all the other requested items.

Ms. Stone said this was a very difficult budget and a lot was uncontrollable cost increases. The debt service, associated with the new courthouse that had been an interest only loan; now it is time to pay on the loan. She mentioned the radio system required by the FCC because banding requirements changed, we were forced into purchasing a new system and chose to partner with Hanover County; now it is time to pay. She also spoke of the outdated 911 system in the Sherriff's Office; if it fails tonight we do not have a 911 system. The fire and rescue system is in desperate need for assistance or doors are going to close and rescue calls are not going to be answered; and as a result property insurance will also go up significantly if this happens. She said the recent comments made by T.E.A. Party members, in the *Tidewater Review*, are exactly right, everything is breaking and coming due at the same time. The Board does not have control over these issues; but they have to be dealt with. She appreciates the fact no one wants a tax rate increase and all of the rate increases before; the speaker earlier failed to mention we had a two cent tax decrease in the current year. The speaker also failed to mention although income levels have decreased the past two years, according to the census bureau income levels have been increasing. She spoke of the average pay increases listed with social security for employees have been positive for every year except for one in the past five years. In her opinion the T.E.A. Party has very specific numbers they pick, choose and share; unfortunately this Board has to deal with all these numbers and they have to make tough decisions. She feels the Board has done a good job with making those decisions. She said she would like to see the Recreation Commission send a recommendation to the Board for specific program user fees.

Continuing Ms. Stone appreciates the fact Mr. Greenwood does not want to support this budget. She said while reviewing this budget she created at least ten pages of suggestions with specific details, which took a lot of time and effort; and shared them with all of her fellow Board members. She said this level of detail was not received from fellow Board member Greenwood; he wanted to see cuts with no suggestions where to cut from. Her questions asked the questions where are we going to cut and what are we going to cut. She said the budget was reviewed line by

line item and a consensus was reached on all items. She said there were a lot of cuts in this budget.

Mr. Greenwood disagreed with Ms. Stone and said there were no cuts from a ridiculous budget to begin with; he does agree this is cuts.

Ms. Stone added the proposed budget went from a 22 cent increase down to a 3 cent increase.

Mr. Greenwood said that was proposed, a crazy ass budget.

Chairman Williams called for order.

Mr. Redd recommended to the Recreation Commission, since they set user fees for programs, if the program poses no cost to the County to run then there would be no user fee for the program; if there is a cost to the County vice versa. He briefly spoke on the subject of paid EMS personnel and said some discussions have been had on this subject and he is not sure if this can be done. He would like to see Fire/EMS districts in the County. He explained if people in a certain district are serviced by a certain department and there is a need in that district, because of a lack of fund raising or extra expenses, and extra funding is required by the County then the extra expenses should be paid by those that are served by that department; not by the entire County. He feels this would put the County in the right direction and would eliminate a budget increase for the whole County just to help one area. He feels the Board worked hard on the budget and a lot of cuts were made to the proposed budget. He said, unfortunately, costs go up and to campaign on the fact you are not going to have a tax increase and taxes will be lowered is just impossible with what is being required by the state and federal governments. He said local governments are the bottom on this rung of these taxes and the burden falls on us. Some programs started by federal and state often fall on localities to pay for; there is nowhere else for localities to go. He said every budget year is tough and the same questions are dealt with. He said hopefully the Board comes up with answers for the citizens. In closing, he said tax increases are never popular, he reminded everyone we are getting ready to go through a reassessment; common sense tells you if property prices are lowered you have to get the money back some way.

Mr. Williams said this has been a hard budget but he would like to set one thing right, it is real hard for it to be his fault for the budget the past 14 years; he has only been here for 11 years. His wishes are the T.E.A. Party would at least get information correct. He said when signs are posted in his district that he has been doing something, for 3 years longer than he has been on the Board, really hurts. He said he has people yelling at him of how much the tax rate has been up since he has been on the Board. He clarified the first budget he worked on was the 2004 budget, which was a rough year too, but he was not on the Board all the other years quoted before that. Again he said this been a tough budget year and there are some issues he still does not see eye to eye on, but he feels the Board came to a consensus. He said a lot of things he may have wanted different but it has to be the majority of the Board, you win some and you lose some; you pick your battles. He said if there was one thing he could do to make us not have a tax increase he would be glad to support; but he supporting one thing is not the whole Board. He explained he has to work with the Board to get as much decreased from what was proposed while trying to give the constituents what they need. In closing, he said the budget is a balancing act and he has a hard time with it every year. He said wants and needs are a big problem because a lot of the things he sees go through look like wants instead of needs; there are needs also. With that being said he is going to have to support this budget.

There being no further discussion Chairman Williams called for a roll call vote for the following Resolution #14-23:

**RESOLUTION #14-23
KING WILLIAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
ADOPTION OF FY15 GENERAL FUNDS BUDGET
MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2014**

WHEREAS, the King William County Board of Supervisors has reviewed the General Funds, School Fund and Special Revenue Funds for the Fiscal Year 2015 Budget; and,

WHEREAS, the Board held a duly advertised public hearing on the Budget on April 21, 2014,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the King William County Board of Supervisors approves the FY15 General Funds Budget in the amount of \$22,065,123, which includes a transfer of \$10,534,920 to the School Fund from the General Fund, \$180,000 to the School Fund from the School Reserve Fund, \$119,720 to the School Fund from the Recordation Fund, approves the School Fund budget in the amount of \$24,607,610, the Special Revenue Funds in the amount of \$3,793,849, the Capital

Project Funds in the amount of \$834,230, the Debt Service Fund in the amount of \$3,198,323, and the Enterprise Funds in the amount of \$4,230,893.

Those members voting:

T. S. Stone	Aye
C. T. Redd III	Aye
T. J. Moskalski	Aye
S. K. Greenwood	Nay
O. O. Williams	Aye

e. Resolution #14-24 – Approval of Appropriation of Funds for FY15 –

T. S. Stone moved for approval of Resolution #14-24; motion was seconded by T. J. Moskalski.

Chairman Williams called for discussion.

There being no discussion Chairman Williams called for a roll call vote for the following Resolution #14-24:

**RESOLUTION #14-24
A RESOLUTION APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR
THE FISCAL YEAR BUDGET
BEGINNING JULY 1, 2014 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2015
FOR KING WILLIAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA**

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of King William County, Virginia, has heretofore prepared and, on April 28, 2014, adopted a budget for informative and fiscal planning purposes only, with the exception of the School Expenditure Budget, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2014; and,

WHEREAS, it is now necessary to appropriate sufficient funds for the contemplated expenditures as are contained in the Budget,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of King William County, Virginia, this 28th day of April, 2014:

SECTION 1. GENERAL FUNDS. That the amounts herein named aggregating \$22,065,123 or so much thereof as may be necessary, are hereby appropriated for the General Fund subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth in this resolution for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2014 and ending June 30, 2015, as follows:

Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, General Funds:	
General & Financial Administration	\$ 1,464,770
Board of Elections	160,583
Judicial Administration	563,031
Public Safety	4,012,100
Public Works	1,393,454
Health & Welfare	185,636
Community Colleges	7,814
Parks, Recreation & Cultural	581,656
Community Development & Environmental	339,540
Non-Departmental	650,791
Contingency	119,784
Transfers to King William School Fund	10,534,920
Transfers to West Point (Transfer + Local Sales Tax)	366,335
Transfers to Other Funds	1,035,461
Transfers to Debt Service	649,248
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, General Funds:	<u>\$ 22,065,123</u>

SECTION 2. SCHOOL FUNDS. That the amounts herein named aggregating \$24,607,610 are hereby appropriated annually by category for the School Fund subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth in this resolution for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2014 and ending June 30, 2015.

Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, School Fund:		
Operation	\$	22,298,548
Transfer to Debt Service		<u>2,309,062</u>
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, School Fund:	\$	<u><u>24,607,610</u></u>

SECTION 3. SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS. That the amounts herein named aggregating \$3,793,849 or so much thereof as may be necessary, are hereby appropriated for the Special Revenue Funds subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth in this resolution for the purposes hereinafter mentioned for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2014 and ending June 30, 2015, as follows:

Special Revenue Funds:

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Virginia Public Assistance Fund:		
Recovered Cost	\$	3,705
State Support		339,934
Federal Support		551,833
Local Support (Transfer from County)		<u>222,380</u>
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, VPA Fund:	\$	<u><u>1,134,129</u></u>

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Courthouse Maintenance Fee:		
Permits, Privilege Fees & Regulatory Licenses	\$	<u>8,000</u>
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, CMF Fund:	\$	<u><u>8,000</u></u>

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Courthouse Security Fee:		
Permits, Privilege Fees & Regulatory Licenses	\$	30,000
Use of Fund Balance		<u>8,000</u>
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, CSF Fund:	\$	<u><u>38,000</u></u>

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Regional Animal Shelter Fund:		
Charges for Services	\$	12,500
Donations		29,900
Recovered Cost (King and Queen County/Restitution)		125,299
State Support		400
Local Support (Transfer from County)		<u>120,299</u>
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, RAS Fund:	\$	<u><u>288,398</u></u>

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
School Cafeteria Fund:		
Charges for Services	\$	479,200
Recovered Cost		7,800
State Support		18,000
Federal Support		<u>475,000</u>
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, SC Fund:	\$	<u><u>980,000</u></u>

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
School Text Book Fund:		
State Support	\$	<u>144,050</u>
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, STB Fund:	\$	<u><u>144,050</u></u>

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Asset Forfeiture Funds:		
State Support	\$	<u>3,000</u>
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, AF Fund:	\$	<u><u>3,000</u></u>

Four for Life EMS Grant Fund:	Source of Funds	Expenditures
State Support	\$ 17,200	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, FFL EMS Fund:		\$ <u>17,200</u>
Fire Programs Grant Fund:	Source of Funds	Expenditures
State Support	\$ 40,800	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, FPG Fund:		\$ <u>40,800</u>
Victim Witness Fund:	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Recovered Cost (King and Queen County)	\$ 4,356	
State Support	51,560	
Local Support (Transfer from County)	4,356	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, VW Fund:		\$ <u>60,272</u>
Transportation Fund:	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Other Local Taxes	\$ 160,000	
State Support	45,000	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, Transportation Fund:		\$ <u>205,000</u>
Comprehensive Services Act Fund:	Source of Funds	Expenditures
State Support	\$ 410,000	
Local Support (Transfer from County)	315,000	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, CSA Fund:		\$ <u>725,000</u>
EMS Billings for KWVFD:	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Charges for Services	\$ 150,000	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, EMS Fund:		\$ <u>150,000</u>
Total Special Revenue Funds:		\$ <u>3,793,849</u>

SECTION 4. CAPITAL PROJECTS FUNDS. That the amounts herein named aggregating \$834,230 or so much thereof as may be necessary, are hereby appropriated for the Capital Project Funds subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth in this resolution for the purposes hereinafter mentioned for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2014 and ending June 30, 2015, as follows:

Capital Project Funds:		
Proffer Funds:	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Permits, Privilege Fees & Regulatory Licenses	\$ 35,500	
Use of Fund Balance	13,940	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, Proffer Fund:		\$ <u>49,440</u>
Capital Improvement Plan:	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Revenue from Use of Money/Property	\$ 5,000	
Local Support (Transfer from Fund 100, 214, & 305)	329,790	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, CIP Fund:		\$ <u>334,790</u>
Schools Capital Improvement Plan:	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Local Support (Transfer from Fund 190)	\$ 450,000	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, SCIP Fund:		\$ <u>450,000</u>
Total Capital Project Funds:		\$ <u>834,230</u>

SECTION 5. DEBT SERVICE FUND. That the amounts herein named aggregating \$3,198,323 or so much thereof as may be necessary, are hereby appropriated for the Debt Service Fund subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth in this resolution for the purposes hereinafter mentioned for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2014 and ending June 30, 2015, as follows:

Debt Service Fund:

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Debt Service Fund:		
Local Support (General Fund)	\$ 649,248	
Local Support (Utility Funds)	240,013	
Local Support (School Fund)	<u>2,309,062</u>	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, DSF Fund:		\$ <u><u>3,198,323</u></u>

SECTION 6. PROPRIETARY FUNDS. That the amounts herein named aggregating \$4,230,893 or so much thereof as may be necessary, are hereby appropriated for the Proprietary Funds subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth in this resolution for the purposes hereinafter mentioned for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2014 and ending June 30, 2015, as follows:

Proprietary Funds:

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Water Utility Fund:		
Charges for Services	\$ 133,000	
Permits, Privilege Fees & Regulatory Licenses	100,000	
Local Support (Transfer from County)	<u>27,719</u>	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, WU Fund:		\$ <u><u>260,719</u></u>

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Sewer Utility Fund:		
Permits, Privilege Fees & Regulatory Licenses	\$ 150,000	
Local Support (Transfer from County)	<u>40,581</u>	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, SU Fund:		\$ <u><u>190,581</u></u>

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Parks & Recreation Program Fees:		
Charges for Services	\$ <u>91,695</u>	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, P&RP Fund:		\$ <u><u>91,695</u></u>

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
School Health Insurance Fund:		
Premiums	\$ <u>3,064,800</u>	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, School Health		\$ <u><u>3,064,800</u></u>

	Source of Funds	Expenditures
Internal Service Fund:		
Internal Charges for Services	\$ <u>623,098</u>	
Total Expenditures & Other Uses of Funds, School Health		\$ <u><u>623,098</u></u>

Total Proprietary Funds: \$ 4,230,893

SECTION 7. All of the monies appropriated as shown by the items contained in Section 1 through Section 6 are appropriated upon the terms, conditions and provisions hereinafter set forth in this section.

(1) All appropriations are declared to be maximum, conditional and proportionate appropriations, the purpose being to make the appropriations payable in full in the amounts named herein if necessary, and then only in the event the aggregate revenues collected and other resources available during the fiscal year

ending June 30, 2015, for which the appropriations are made, are sufficient to pay all the appropriations in full; otherwise, said appropriation shall be deemed to be payable in such proportion as the total sum of all realized revenue is to the total amount of the revenues estimated by the Board of Supervisors to be available for appropriation in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015.

(2) No department, agency or individual receiving appropriations under the provisions of this resolution shall exceed the amount of its or his appropriation except with the prior consent and approval of the Board of Supervisors or as set forth in paragraph (5) of this Section 7.

(3) Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as authorizing any reduction to be made in the amount appropriated in this resolution for the payment of interest on or the retirement of the School Debt of King William County.

(4) It is expressly provided that this resolution, with the exception of the expenditures of the funds appropriated, shall apply only to the lump sum amounts which have been included in this resolution.

(5) The Board of Supervisors reserves the right to change at any time during said fiscal year the compensation so provided to any officer or employee and to abolish any office or position excepting such office or position as it may be prohibited by law from abolishing.

The County Administrator is authorized to make such rearrangements of positions and appropriations within the several funds under the control of the Board of Supervisors that may best meet the needs and interests of King William County, Virginia.

SECTION 8. All resolutions and parts of resolutions inconsistent with the provisions of this resolution are hereby repealed.

SECTION 9. This resolution shall be effective on and after July 1, 2014.

Those members voting:

C. T. Redd III	Aye
T. J. Moskalski	Aye
S. K. Greenwood	Nay
T. S. Stone	Aye
O. O. Williams	Aye

f. Ordinance #14-01 – Adoption of Tax Levies for Calendar Year 2014 –

C. T. Redd III moved for approval of Ordinance #14-01; motion was seconded by T. J. Moskalski.

Chairman Williams called for discussion.

There being no discussion Chairman Williams called for a roll call vote for the following Ordinance #14-01:

**ORDINANCE #14-01
AN ORDINANCE TO IMPOSE PROPERTY TAX LEVIES UPON REAL ESTATE,
MOBILE HOMES, TANGIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY, PUBLIC SERVICE
CORPORATION PROPERTY, MACHINERY AND TOOLS, AND AIRCRAFT
FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 2014**

WHEREAS, it is necessary for the Board of Supervisors to establish real estate and personal property tax levies for King William County for calendar year 2014, beginning January 1, 2014, and ending December 31, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Board has duly advertised and held a public hearing on April 21, 2014 on the subject tax levies;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, by the King William County Board of Supervisors this the 21st day of April, 2014, that the following general County property tax levies be, and they hereby are, imposed on all property not exempted by law located within King William County for the calendar year 2014:

General Fund Levy –

TAX RATES PER \$100 OF ASSESSED VALUES FOR ALL DISTRICTS		
		General Fund
Real Estate	\$	0.38
Mobile Home	\$	0.38
Mines and Minerals	\$	0.38
Public Service Real Estate	\$	0.38
Public Service Personal Property	\$	1.65
Personal Property	\$	1.65
Machinery & Tools	\$	1.00
Aircraft	\$	NA

School Fund Levy – (Applies only to geographic areas of the County within the King William County School Division – does not include the Town of West Point) –

TAX RATES PER \$100 OF ASSESSED VALUES		
		School Fund
Real Estate	\$	0.44
Mobile Home	\$	0.44
Mines and Minerals	\$	0.44
Public Service Real Estate	\$	0.44
Public Service Personal Property	\$	2.00
Personal Property	\$	2.00
Machinery & Tools	\$	1.25
Aircraft	\$	1.30

Those members voting:

- T. J. Moskalski Aye
- S. K. Greenwood Nay
- T. S. Stone Aye
- C. T. Redd III Aye
- O. O. Williams Aye

g. Resolution #14-25 – VML/VACo Finance – Authorization for County Administrator to Decline Offer of Financing to Refinance Engine 1 and Tanker 1 of the King William Volunteer Fire Department – the County Administrator said Resolution #14-25 closes the loop on the request for authorization to seek refinancing options with VML/VACo for Engine 1 and Tanker 1 of the King William County Volunteer Fire

Department. His understanding is the consensus of the Board is not to continue seeking refinancing options with VML/VACo Finance.

Ms. Stone said she and Mr. Williams had two opportunities to meet with officials from EVB to discuss the current loans with King William Volunteer Fire Department. She noted a balloon payment is due at the beginning of May for the remaining principal on the loan. She said for the second loan the volunteer organization contacted the bank and they were not in a position to negotiate the terms of this particular loan. EVB is now agreeable to renegotiating the terms of this loan with the volunteer organization and willing to lower the interest rate from 5.5% to 3.5%; basically refinance the two pieces of equipment over a ten year period. She said in light of this new information her personal recommendation is for the County not to move forward through the VML/VACo finance program; which would result in the County assuming all of the debt. She feels this is another opportunity for the organization to keep the equipment in their name. She said the organization may need some initial assistance with making the payments; the goal is for them to work their way into making the payments on their own.

T. S. Stone moved for approval of Resolution #14-25; motion was seconded by T. J. Moskalski.

Chairman Williams called for further discussion.

There being no further discussion Chairman Williams called for a roll call vote for the following Resolution #14-25:

**RESOLUTION # 14-25
AUTHORIZATION OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO DECLINE
OFFER OF FINANCING TO REFINANCE ENGINE 1 AND TANKER 1
OF THE KING WILLIAM COUNTY VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT**

WHEREAS, the County of King William, Virginia (the "County"), determined on January 27, 2014, by approval of Resolution #14-06, that it is advisable and in the interest of the County to refinance certain financial obligations for Engine 1 and Tanker 1 of the King William Volunteer Fire Department (to acquire these two vehicles from King William Volunteer Fire Department); and

WHEREAS, the County Administrator has previously received advice and analysis by the Virginia Local Government Finance Corporation, a Virginia non-stock, nonprofit corporation, (serving as Program Administrator for VML/VACo Finance) indicating sufficient debt service savings to make it economically beneficial and advisable to proceed with the refinancing; and

WHEREAS, the County received several finance offers and presented a proposal from PNC Equipment Finance, LLC as part of proposed Resolutions #14-16 and #14-17; and

WHEREAS, following review and discussion of finance options, the Board of Supervisors determined it is advisable to pursue options with EVB Bank regarding the terms of the current debt owed to EVB by the King William Volunteer Fire Department;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of King William County this 28th day of April, 2014, that the County Administrator is authorized to notify VML/VACo Finance, PNC Equipment Finance, LLC and the King William Volunteer Fire Department of the County's determination to not pursue the finance offer of PNC Equipment Finance, LLC.

Those members voting:

S. K. Greenwood	Aye
T. S. Stone	Aye
C. T. Redd III	Aye
T. J. Moskalski	Aye
O. O. Williams	Aye

h. Resolution #14-26 – Budget Amendment – King William Volunteer Fire Department (KWVFD) – EMS Billing – FY14 – the County Administrator stated the item before the Board for consideration is essentially a staff request on behalf of the department to appropriate funds they have earned. He said this is a budget amendment in terms of the way we run the EMS recovery money through our budget. The department has actually performed higher than what we have projected; we require budget authority to release the funds.

Chairman Williams asked for clarification the organization has recovered more money from the insurance company than was expected and this is the allocation portion of the process.

Mr. Redd clarified these funds are not more than the organization expected, this is their share. He said this dollar figure could have been a lot more had the organization not missed calls; fortunately Mattaponi Rescue picked up the missed calls and qualified to receive those funds.

Mr. Moskalski said the department is keenly aware of this, have taken steps and has improved the response rate and recovery; obviously there is still room for improvement, but they have made improvement. He added this is earned money and funds are not coming from the general fund.

T. J. Moskalski moved for approval of Resolution #14-26; motion was seconded by S. K. Greenwood.

Chairman Williams called for further discussion.

There being no further discussion Chairman Williams called for a roll call vote for the following Resolution #14-26:

**RESOLUTION # 14-26
BUDGET AMENDMENT - KING WILLIAM VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT
(KWVFD) - EMS BILLING - FY14**

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors wishes to amend the FY 13-14 County Budget to provide funds to the King William Volunteer Fire Department (KWVFD) for the purposes of maintaining Emergency Medical Services (EMS) capabilities at a cost of \$30,000 by appropriating EMS Revenue Recovery Funds collected from billing of EMS calls for service and transport; and

WHEREAS, the King William Volunteer Fire and Rescue Department (KWVFD) have been able to recover some of the costs associated with emergency medical response and ambulatory transport to medical facilities; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Supervisors of King William County hereby amends the FY 13-14 County Budget as follows:

REVENUES		
	Transport Billings	\$30,000
EXPENDITURES		
	EMS Supplies	\$30,000

and \$30,000 is hereby appropriated and is directed to be transferred to the above-referenced line items for the above-stated purposes

Those members voting:

T. S. Stone	Aye
C. T. Redd III	Aye
T. J. Moskalski	Aye
S. K. Greenwood	Aye
O. O. Williams	Aye

RE: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS – TRENTON L. FUNKHOUSER,

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

The County Administrator had no additional information to report.

RE: APPOINTMENTS

There were no appointments considered.

RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COMMENTS

Chairman Williams opened the Board of Supervisors comment period.

All Board members thanked citizens for their participation at the monthly Board meetings and wished everyone a safe trip home.

Mr. Moskalski said on the subject of the budget adopted this evening and his part and his efforts in it, he believes this budget is defensible, conscionable and is a good document. He said there are a lot of things coming in the future this County is

going to need to handle; they have been coming for quite some time such as the radio system. He said from the actions of the makeup of this Board and Staff we currently have, we took the initial cost estimate of 11 or 12 million dollars for the radio system to a much lower figure. He said although the radio system warranted a rate increase imagine what the increase would be had we not been creative and thought out of the box on how to procure that system.

Mr. Greenwood said again he could not, in good conscience, vote in favor of this budget. He agreed the Board worked on a lot of things, the pace was so fast and he feels a lot of stuff was skipped over. He said from the start changes needed in this County were spoken of such as working with the schools on combining the maintenance of vehicles and also computer needs. He feels there is a lot the County can do working with other agencies to save money. He said the County has hired more employees this year, he did not vote for, to try and fix things that were wrong last year, and are still not fixed. In his opinion, the audit last year was worse than before. He said he took the supervisor position to try and make changes; he doesn't feel changes are being made.

Continuing Mr. Greenwood addressed Ms. Stone's comments and said he does not make six figures and is on the low end of the median of the County. He shared this is the first time he has had to pay federal income taxes. He said he didn't make any changes in his income or spending habits and is not sure what happened. He said he has reduced his personal spending such as getting rid of his gym membership, cable and numerous other things in order to meet his expenses. He said the County is not going to pay his mortgage when it comes due if he can't make the payment. He agrees with the citizens of the County and he shouldn't have to make all these cuts in his personal budget. In his opinion ways to save money are not being looked at.

Ms. Stone revisited the survey results introduced by Mr. Ehrhart, during the public comments period in a recent Board meeting, and suggested in the future he give a thorough report when sending letters to the editor at the *Tidewater Review*. She also spoke of the recent comments made by T.E.A. Party member, Robert Shannon, regarding the style of a teacher instructing another teacher, presented during the joint budget work session between the Board of Supervisors and King

William County School Board. In her opinion, the intent of the instructional example was to show professional development. She said as technology changes approaching children and the needs of children change; instruction has to change also. She clarified the presentation depicted a reading specialist, whom is shared among all students, sharing teaching skills with a non-reading specialist to use with students so we are not required to hire additional reading specialists. She completely understands the desire to educate people but does not understand the desire to confuse people. In closing she wished everyone a Happy Mother's Day.

Mr. Redd agreed with Ms. Stone's comments. He has heard from several people in his district about the new tax rates, all of them said this is a whole lot better than last year. He said the budget is a process required every year and is never easy. He recognized the Mayor of West Point, the West Point Town Manager and fire and rescue representatives in the audience and said they too had to go through this difficult process and they know what it is like.

Chairman Williams thanked everyone for attending the meeting and for their participation, questions, concerns and wanting to be involved. He said the more citizens get involved the better the Board can see both sides. He wished everyone a safe trip home.

RE: ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

There being no other business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m. on motion by T. J. Moskalski, seconded by C. T. Redd III, and carried unanimously.

COPY TESTE:

O. O. Williams, Chairman
Board of Supervisors

T. L. Funkhouser,
County Administrator
Clerk of the Board