

VIRGINIA:

At a recessed meeting of the Washington County Board of Supervisors held Monday, March 15, 2004, at 7:30 p.m., at the County Administration Building in Abingdon, Virginia the following were present:

PRESENT:

John B. Roberts, Sr. Chairman
Phillip B. McCall, Vice Chairman
Bobby D. Ingle
Dulcie M. Mumpower
Odell Owens
Anthony S. Rector
Kenneth O. Reynolds

Mark K. Reeter, County Administrator
Lucy E. Phillips, County Attorney
Naoma A. Mullins, Recording Clerk

ABSENT:

Mark W. Seamon, Accounting Manager

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mr. John Roberts, Chairman of the Board, who welcomed everyone in attendance.

2. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

Supervisor Phillip McCall gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Agenda

On motion of Mr. Rector, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to approve the agenda as presented.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

4. **Public Hearings**

a. **Public Hearing and Board Consideration of Adoption of an Ordinance to Amend Chapter Sixty-six, Article I, and Chapter Sixty-six, Article V, Divisions Twelve, Thirteen and Fourteen of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia (2002) Amending Sections Numbered 66-496 and 66-521 and Adding Sections Numbered 66-10, 66-473(25) and 66-498(6) Relating to Regulation by Special Exception of Substance Abuse Treatment Facilities or Any Facility, Use or Activity Subject to Regulation and Licensure Pursuant to Section 37.1-179.1 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended)**

County Attorney Lucy Phillips addressed the Board directing attention to a memorandum sent by County Administrator Mark Reeter to the Washington County Planning Commission that explained the history behind the proposed ordinance and outlined the text of the ordinance. Ms. Phillips explained the proposed ordinance came about as a result of the application for zoning compliance approval for a medically assisted substance abuse treatment facility that the County received earlier this year. County Administrator Mark Reeter acting as Zoning Administrator for the County issued a formal zoning determination that the substance abuse treatment facility at its proposed location was in a B-2 zone and not consistent with, nor contemplated within, the current provisions of the County's B-2 Zoning District regulations.

Ms. Phillips briefly reviewed the substantive proposed changes to the County Zoning Ordinance. She explained that a substance abuse treatment facility would be permitted via Special Exception Permit in the Business, General (B-2), Industrial, Limited (M-1) and Industrial, General (M-2) Zoning Districts subject to certain buffering requirements as specified in the proposed ordinance. The proposed amendment adds three new sections to the County Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 66 of the 2002 County Code): 66-10, 66-473(25) and 66-498(6). Proposed new Section 66-10 sets out a provision concerning how distance measurements may be calculated. Proposed new Sections 66-473(25) and 66-498(6) amends the list of uses permitted via Special Exception Permit in the B-2 and M-1 districts by adding the following language:

“Substance abuse treatment facilities or any facility, use or activity subject to regulation and licensure pursuant to § 37.1-179.1 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended, subject to the following restrictions as well as conditions or restrictions imposed by the legislative body as part of the special exception permit. No such facility shall be located within one-half (0.5) mile of any public or private K-12 school, public or private licensed day care center, church, synagogue or other place of worship, residentially zoned district (R-1 and R-2), nor within one thousand (1,000) feet of a residential dwelling.”

Ms. Phillips explained the proposed amendment modifies the language of Sections 66.496 and 66-521, the Statements of Intent of the B-2 and M-1 Zoning Districts, respectively, so as to make these statements consistent with the impact of the addition of Sections 66-473(25) and 66-498(6). She further explained that there is no specific language to modify Section 66-522(a)(1) of the Industrial, General (M-2) Zoning District regulations because this zoning district allows any use permitted and as regulated in the M-1 district within the M-2 district as well. This provision has the effect of allowing these type of facilities in the M-2 District via Special Exception and subject to the buffering requirements also.

Ms. Phillips explained that the net effect of the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment will be to allow substance abuse treatment facilities in the three zoning districts as outlined above subject to distance limitations. The purpose is to establish a compromise between the need for this type of facility and the public interest in not having a facility of this type located in a residential area or other areas where it might not have a positive impact on the uses allowed in those particular zoning districts.

County Administrator Mark Reeter advised the Board that the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing at 5:30 PM prior to this meeting and subsequently acted on a 5-0 vote to recommend Board of Supervisors adoption of the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Roberts opened the public hearing to receive comments both in support of and in opposition to the proposed ordinance to amend Chapter Sixty-six, Article I, and Chapter Sixty-six, Article V, Divisions Twelve, Thirteen and Fourteen of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia (2002) Amending Sections Numbered 66-496 and 66-521 and Adding Sections Numbered 66-10, 66-473(25) and 66-498(6) Relating to Regulation by Special Exception of Substance Abuse Treatment Facilities or Any Facility, Use or Activity Subject to Regulation and Licensure Pursuant to Section 37.1-179.1 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended)

The following people addressed the Board:

Mr. Mike Bragg on behalf of the Lowry Hills community expressed gratitude to the Board of Supervisors and County Administration concerning the professionalism in which this matter has been handled. Mr. Bragg stated that the proposed ordinance that allows a substance abuse treatment facility to be located in the three recommended zoned areas and with the proposed restrictions is a good compromise between the potential need for such a facility and taking into consideration the neighborhoods that could be affected, the community, public safety and property values. The ordinance is a good balance between all the interests that are involved

Mr. Patrick Mannix asserted that the proposed ordinance regulates substance abuse treatment facilities, which would include facilities that treat alcohol related problems. He inquired if there were any alcohol treatment facilities that would not be in compliance with the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Blake Andis, Chief Deputy for the Washington County Sheriff's Department, explained that he previously worked as a narcotic detective in the County and has dealt with all aspects of narcotic enforcement. Mr. Andis further explained that he has taught numerous classes to police officers working as drug task force officers and narcotic enforcement in general. He stated that he has been involved as an officer with the federal task force working with the Department of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. Mr. Andis spoke of his experience dealing with drug users, dealers and families affected by drugs.

Mr. Andis explained that methadone and methamphetamine have become the drugs of choice in Southwest Virginia. He advised the Board that the facilities located in Tazewell County, Galax, VA, Knoxville, TN and Boone, NC are having an adverse affect on Washington County in many ways from the law enforcement perspective. Mr. Andis explained that 80 percent of the drug cases developed in the County involve methadone, including the pill, wafer or liquid forms. He stated that Southwest Virginia is seeing an increased number of methadone overdose related deaths. Washington County is experiencing an increased number of methadone related deaths in teenagers and young adults in their early twenties.

Mr. Andis stated that patients attending methadone clinics are being given daily doses of the methadone drug that has many side affects. The drug can stay in the patient's system for up to 72 hours. Patients typically drive themselves to and from the clinics posing serious threats to other motorists and themselves. Law enforcement officers in Washington County have made several arrests of patients driving while intoxicated from the methadone. Mr. Andis advised the Board that the Sheriff's Department is not opposing treatment facilities that offer the best possible care for the recovering drug addict, but are opposing the convenience of these type clinics. The Department would like to see intensive drug treatment facilities that offer inpatient care, counseling, and programs setup to work with already proven local and state agencies.

There being no further comments, Mr. Roberts declared public hearing closed.

Supervisor Dulcie Mumpower requested that letter from Dr. Anne Kegley opposing the location of a methadone treatment facility in Washington County be included as part of the minutes for this meeting.

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to adopt the following ordinance:

ORDINANCE NO. 2004-03

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER SIXTY-SIX, ARTICLE I, AND CHAPTER SIXTY-SIX, ARTICLE V, DIVISIONS TWELVE, THIRTEEN AND FOURTEEN OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON, VIRGINIA (2002) AMENDING SECTIONS NUMBERED 66-496 AND 66-521 AND ADDING SECTIONS NUMBERED 66-10, 66-473(25) AND 66-498(6) RELATING TO REGULATION BY SPECIAL EXCEPTION OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT FACILITIES OR ANY FACILITY, USE OR ACTIVITY SUBJECT TO REGULATION AND LICENSURE PURSUANT TO SECTION 37.1-179.1 OF THE CODE OF VIRGINIA (1950, AS AMENDED).

WHEREAS, drug and alcohol abuse is one of the most pervasive problems facing Washington County, the Commonwealth, and our nation; and

WHEREAS, parents, school authorities, community leaders, law-enforcement officials, and legislators struggle to reduce drug and alcohol use among the general population, and, more particularly, among children and teenagers who are in impressionable years during which they are most likely to be attracted to or dissuaded from these life-threatening habits; and

WHEREAS, Justice Scalia, when addressing the governmental concerns for "detering drug use by our Nation's school children" in Vernonia School District v. Acton, spoke to its importance in strong terms, noting "[t]hat the nature of the concern is important--indeed, perhaps compelling—can hardly be doubted;" and

WHEREAS, thus, the Supreme Court of the United States has validated society's strong interest in ensuring that impressionable young people are protected from the temptations of drugs and are provided positive, rather than negative, role models; and

WHEREAS, the unfortunate presence of drug and alcohol abuse in society demands availability of treatment facilities to address this societal illness but the presence of treatment centers jeopardizes community efforts to discourage youth from experimenting with illegal substances; and

WHEREAS, substance abuse treatment centers introduce special needs in terms of security, traffic control, and other public services; and

WHEREAS, the County Zoning Ordinance does not include any provision to identify reasonable locations for substance abuse treatment facilities that best satisfy competing interests of the need for available treatment while at the same time protecting communities from undue exposure to substance abuse issues and providing public services uniquely required for substance abuse treatment centers;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Virginia:

1. That the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia (2002) is amended by revision to sections numbered 66-496 and 66-521 and adding sections numbered 66-10, 66-473(25) and 66-498(6), as follows:

Sec. 66-10. Measurements.

Where the provisions of this chapter call for distances between a permitted use or activity and another use or activity, the distance shall be measured from the nearest property boundary lines or to the nearest part of the main use structures on or in which the uses or activities are located or conducted, unless specified otherwise herein. The zoning administrator shall accept measurements taken using the county geographic information system database or field survey certified by a licensed engineer or surveyor.

Sec. 66-473. Special exception uses.

In the B-2 district, the following uses or structures may be permitted only if approved for the issuance of a special exception as provided in this chapter:

- (1) *Electrical power substations, electrical power transmission towers, telecommunication switching facilities and telecommunication towers and antennas.*
- (2) *Fire department offices and facilities, emergency medical rescue squad offices and facilities, and law enforcement offices and facilities.*
- (3) *Golf courses.*
- (4) *Hotels, motels, tourist courts, and bed-and-breakfast establishments, including restaurants and recreational facilities incidental thereto, with 200 or more guest rooms or with on-site meeting rooms or conference facilities, which in the aggregate seat 500 or more persons.*
- (5) *Indoor movie theaters; drive-in theaters.*
- (6) *Lumber and brick yards and building materials and equipment sales, rental, repair and services with exterior storage under cover.*
- (7) *Manufactured homes for use by a security guard on a business and subject to the provisions of article XI of this chapter.*
- (8) *Multiple-family dwelling units, such as apartments, townhouses, and condominiums and subject to other provisions of this chapter. Public water and sewer are required where ten or more dwelling units are proposed.*
- (9) *Nursing and personal care facilities with any on-site residency, single- or multiple-family dwelling units. Public water and sewer required where ten or more dwelling units are proposed.*
- (10) *Off-site uses related to airport safety as defined in section 66-610.*
- (11) *On-site material and equipment storage.*
- (12) *On-site storage above or below ground of 50,000 gallons or more liquefied petroleum or other fuel oil.*
- (13) *Privately-owned schools, colleges, junior colleges, universities, technical institutes and vocational schools.*
- (14) *Public and private hospitals.*
- (15) *Public skating rinks, bowling alleys, dance halls, pool halls, night clubs, lounges, video game arcade and similar forms of public amusement.*
- (16) *Radio and television stations, studios and offices with special exception.*
- (17) *Recreational facilities, including but not limited to tennis and basketball courts, baseball and softball fields, parks, swimming pools and gymnasiums.*
- (18) *Telecommunications-related industries.*
- (19) *Tobacco warehouses, storage warehouses and bulk petroleum plants.*
- (20) *Tractor-truck and trailer sales, rental, repair and services.*
- (21) *Truck stops and truck terminals.*
- (22) *Veterinary hospital or clinic.*

- (23) *Water and wastewater treatment plants.*
- (24) *Wholesale, distribution and processing operations.*
- (25) *Substance abuse treatment facilities or any facility, use or activity subject to regulation and licensure pursuant to § 37.1-179.1 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended, subject to the following restrictions as well as conditions or restrictions imposed by the legislative body as part of the special exception permit. No such facility shall be located within one-half (0.5) mile of any public or private K-12 school, public or private licensed day care center, church, synagogue or other place of worship, residentially zoned district (R-1 and R-2), nor within one thousand (1,000) feet of a residential dwelling.*

Sec. 66-496. Statement of intent.

The primary purpose of the M-1 limited industrial district is to permit certain industries and businesses that may have an adverse effect in the business districts, which with appropriate restrictions should not detract from adjacent residential uses. ~~which do not in any way detract from residential desirability to locate in any area adjacent to residential uses.~~ The limitations on or provisions relating to height of buildings, horsepower, heating, flammable liquids or explosives, controlling emission of fumes, odors or noise, landscaping, buffering requirements, restrictions on proximity to adjacent uses, and the number of persons employed in the M-1 limited industrial district are imposed to protect and foster adjacent residential desirability ~~while permitting industries locate near a labor supply.~~

Sec. 66-498. Special exception uses.

In the M-1 district, the following uses or structures may be permitted only if approved for the issuance of a special exception as provided in this chapter:

- (1) *Airports.*
- (2) *Day care center.*
- (3) *Fire department offices and facilities, emergency medical rescue squad offices and facilities, law enforcement offices and facilities and other governmental offices and facilities.*
- (4) *Off-site uses related to airport safety as defined in section 66-610.*
- (5) *Water and wastewater treatment plants.*
- (6) *Substance abuse treatment facilities or any facility, use or activity subject to regulation and licensure pursuant to § 37.1-179.1 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended, subject to the following restrictions as well as conditions or restrictions imposed by the legislative body as part of the special exception permit. No such facility shall be located within one-half (0.5) mile of any public or private K-12 school, public or private licensed day care center, church, synagogue or other place of worship, residentially zoned district (R-1 and R-2), nor within one thousand (1,000) feet of a residential dwelling.*

Sec. 66-521. Statement of intent.

The primary purpose of the M-2 general industrial district is to establish an area where the principal use of land is for heavy commercial and industrial operations, which may create some nuisance, and businesses that may have an adverse effect in the business districts, and which are not properly associated with, nor particularly compatible with, residential, institutional and neighborhood commercial service establishments. The specific intent of the M-2 district is to:

- (1) *Encourage the construction of and the continued use of the land for heavy commercial and industrial purposes and businesses that may have an adverse effect in the business districts.*

- (2) *Prohibit residential and neighborhood commercial use of the land and prohibit any other use which would substantially interfere with the development, continuation and expansion of commercial and industrial uses in the district.*
- (3) *Encourage the discontinuance of existing uses that would not be permitted as new uses under the provisions of this chapter.*

2. *That should any section or provision of this ordinance be decided to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section or provision of this ordinance or of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia.*

3. *That this ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its enactment.*

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Scrivener's Note: The correspondence referenced above is included as Minutes Exhibit 2004-03-15A.

Supervisor Dulcie Mumpower expressed appreciation to County Administrator Mark Reeter and County Attorney Lucy Phillips for their diligent work on this issue.

b. Public Hearing and Board Consideration of Adoption of an Ordinance to Amend Chapter Sixty-six, Article V, Division Twelve, Subsection 66-473(6) of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia (2002) to Remove the Mandatory Requirement of Cover over Exterior Storage of Materials for Lumber and Brick Yards and Building Materials and Equipment Sales, Rental, Repair and Services in the Business General, B-2, Zoning District

County Attorney Lucy Phillips addressed the Board explaining the proposed ordinance would remove the mandatory exterior storage under cover requirement of Section 66-473(6), Business, General (B-2) Zoning District regulation. This section permits lumber and brick yards and building materials and equipment sales, rental and repair and services to be located in the B-2 District with Special Exception Permit. Ms. Phillips further explained that the Board could place stipulations on the Special Exception Permits as they see necessary on a case-by-case basis.

County Administrator Mark Reeter advised the Board that the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing at 5:30 PM prior to this meeting and subsequently by a 5-0 vote to recommend Board of Supervisors adoption of the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Roberts opened public hearing to receive comments both in support of and in opposition to adoption of an Ordinance to Amend Chapter Sixty-six, Article V, Division Twelve, Subsection 66-473(6) of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia (2002) to Remove the Mandatory Requirement of Cover over Exterior Storage of Materials for Lumber and Brick Yards and Building Materials and Equipment Sales, Rental, Repair and Services in the Business General, B-2, Zoning District

The following people addressed the Board:

Mr. Dave McNeece, Legal Counsel for General Shale Brick expressed appreciation to the Board for their consideration of the proposed ordinance.

Patrick Mannix spoke in opposition of the proposed ordinance.

There being no further comments, Mr. Roberts declared the public hearing closed.

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. Rector the Board acted to adopt the following ordinance:

ORDINANCE NO. 2004-04

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER SIXTY-SIX, ARTICLE V, DIVISION TWELVE, SUBSECTION 66-473(6) OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON, VIRGINIA (2002) TO REMOVE THE MANDATORY REQUIREMENT OF COVER OVER EXTERIOR STORAGE OF MATERIALS FOR LUMBER AND BRICK YARDS AND BUILDING MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT SALES, RENTAL, REPAIR AND SERVICES IN THE BUSINESS GENERAL, B-2, ZONING DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the Zoning Ordinance of Washington County, Virginia, allows in the Business, General B-2 Zoning District lumber and brick yards and building materials and equipment sales, rental, repair and services if approved by the Board of Supervisors for special exception permit; and

WHEREAS, cover is not always necessary and appropriate for such operations but is currently a mandatory requirement; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors could impose as a condition of the special exception permit a requirement of cover over exterior storage required for such operations where such cover is necessary and appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds it in the best interests of the public health, safety, and welfare to remove the mandatory requirement of cover over exterior storage required for lumber and brick yards and building materials and equipment sales, rental, repair and services in the B-2 zoning district and, instead, require cover and/or other conditions, limitations and requirements as a provision in a special exception permit where it is found to be necessary and appropriate;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, by the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Virginia, after notice and public hearing, as required by law:

1. That Chapter 66, Subsection 66-473(6) of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia (2002 Republication) is amended as follows:

Sec. 66-473. Special exception uses.

In the B-2 district, the following uses or structures may be permitted only if approved for the issuance of a special exception as provided in this chapter:

- (1) Electrical power substations, electrical power transmission towers, telecommunication switching facilities and telecommunication towers and antennas.***

- (2) *Fire department offices and facilities, emergency medical rescue squad offices and facilities, and law enforcement offices and facilities.*
- (3) *Golf courses.*
- (4) *Hotels, motels, tourist courts, and bed-and-breakfast establishments, including restaurants and recreational facilities incidental thereto, with 200 or more guest rooms or with on-site meeting rooms or conference facilities, which in the aggregate seat 500 or more persons. Indoor movie theaters; drive-in theaters.*
- (6) *Lumber and brick yards and building materials and equipment sales, rental, repair and services with exterior storage under cover.*
- (7) *Manufactured homes for use by a security guard on a business and subject to the provisions of article XI of this chapter.*
- (8) *Multiple-family dwelling units, such as apartments, townhouses, and condominiums and subject to other provisions of this chapter. Public water and sewer are required where ten or more dwelling units are proposed.*
- (9) *Nursing and personal care facilities with any on-site residency, single- or multiple-family dwelling units. Public water and sewer required where ten or more dwelling units are proposed.*
- (10) *Off-site uses related to airport safety as defined in section 66-610.*
- (11) *On-site material and equipment storage.*
- (12) *On-site storage above or below ground of 50,000 gallons or more liquefied petroleum or other fuel oil.*
- (13) *Privately-owned schools, colleges, junior colleges, universities, technical institutes and vocational schools.*
- (14) *Public and private hospitals.*
- (15) *Public skating rinks, bowling alleys, dance halls, pool halls, night clubs, lounges, video game arcade and similar forms of public amusement.*
- (16) *Radio and television stations, studios and offices with special exception.*
- (17) *Recreational facilities, including but not limited to tennis and basketball courts, baseball and softball fields, parks, swimming pools and gymnasiums.*
- (18) *Telecommunications-related industries.*
- (19) *Tobacco warehouses, storage warehouses and bulk petroleum plants.*
- (20) *Tractor-truck and trailer sales, rental, repair and services.*
- (21) *Truck stops and truck terminals.*
- (22) *Veterinary hospital or clinic.*
- (23) *Water and wastewater treatment plants.*
- (24) *Wholesale, distribution and processing operations.*

2. *That should any section or provision of this ordinance be decided to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section or provision of this ordinance or of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia.*

3. *That this ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its enactment.*

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

At this time, Mrs. Jean McReynolds addressed the Board explaining that she and her husband own the property where General Shale Brick is proposing to locate a brick display facility. Mrs. McReynolds explained that she and her husband would be applying for a Special Exception Permit, which will be heard before the Planning Commission on April 26. She asked if the Board could hear their request for a Special Exception Permit at their April 27 regular meeting.

It was explained to Mrs. McReynolds that protocol is to hear planning and zoning requests at the first monthly meeting of the Board of Supervisors. Therefore, the Board will not be able to hear their request for Special Exception Permit until May 11.

5. Adjourn

On motion of Mr. Ingle, second by Mr. McCall, it was resolved to recess until 6:00 PM on March 23, 2004 to receive the revenue projection presentation for FY 2004-2005.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Prepared by:

Naoma A. Mullins, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Washington County Board of Supervisors:

John B. Roberts, Sr., Chairman