

VIRGINIA:

At a regular meeting of the Washington County Board of Supervisors held Tuesday, April 8, 2008, at 7:00 p.m., at the County Administration Building in Abingdon, Virginia the following were present:

PRESENT:

Kenneth O. Reynolds, Chairman
Jack R. McCrady, Jr., Vice Chairman (left at 9:00 PM)
Phillip B. McCall
Dulcie M. Mumpower
Odell Owens
Paul O. Price
Thomas G. Taylor

Mark K. Reeter, County Administrator
Lucy E. Phillips, County Attorney
Mark W. Seamon, Accounting Manager
Naoma A. Norris, Recording Clerk

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Kenneth O. Reynolds, Chairman of the Board, who welcomed everyone in attendance.

2. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

Supervisor Dulcie Mumpower gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Agenda

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. Price, it was resolved to approve the agenda with the following amendments:

15. County Administrator Reports:

- b. FY09 and FY10 State Budget Reductions Affecting Washington County***
- c. Surplus Vehicle Request, Mount Rogers Regional Adult Education Program***
- d. Proposed April 24 Board Worksession on Fiscal Policy and Capital Planning***

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

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>

<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

4. Approval of Minutes

On motion of Mr. Owens, second by Mr. McCall, it was resolved to approve the minutes of the March 25, 2008, regular meeting as presented.

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

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

5. Public Hearings:

a. Request(s) for Rezoning of Property

(1). Joseph H. King, Property Tax Map #123-C-2-21: Request to rezone approximately .92 acres of property located on the south side of State Route 869 near the intersection of State Route 869/State Route 11 from R-2 (Residential, General) and B-2 (Business, General) to B-2 (Business, General), Wilson Magisterial District

County Zoning and Subdivision Official Cathie Freeman appeared before the Board to provide introductory remarks on the request of Joseph H. King to rezone property. Mrs. Freeman explained that in Mr. King’s presentation to the Planning Commission, he requested that the property in question be rezoned from R-2 (Residential, General) and B-2 (Business, General) to B-2 (Business, General). Mr. King explained to the Planning Commission that he would like to construct a facility that would include professional office and retail space.

Mrs. Freeman explained that Mr. Sonny Wright addressed the Planning Commission in opposition to the rezoning request. Mr. Wright was concerned that a church could be built this property. Mrs. Freeman further explained that Mr. Wright had concerns with grading work that has been done on this property. In response to Mr. Wright’s concerns to the Planning Commission, Mrs. Freeman explained to the Board that the present zoning designation for this property would allow a church to be constructed. She further explained the County’s Chief Building Official Bill Cole went to the property to see the grading work that has been completed. Mr. Cole indicated that a soil and erosion permit would not be required at this time because less than 10,000 square feet of earth had been removed.

At this time, Mr. Taylor asked if the proposed rezoning request would be consistent with the County’s Comp Plan for that area. Mrs. Freeman replied that it would be.

Mr. Reynolds opened the public hearing and invited comments regarding the rezoning request.

Mr. Joseph King addressed the Board confirming the remarks made by Mrs. Freeman. Mr. King explained that the entrance to Lee Highway is 300’ from the property. He further explained that traffic to this property would not pass any residential property. Mr. King made comments about the concerns expressed by Mr. Wright.

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

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. McCrady, the Board acted to follow the recommendation of the Washington County Planning Commission and approve the application of John H. King to rezone approximately .92 acres of property located on the south side of State Route 869 near the intersection of State Route 869/State Route 11 from R-2 (Residential, General) and B-2 (Business, General) to B-2 (Business, General), Wilson Magisterial District with the stipulation that all appropriate permits be obtained.

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

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

b. Public Hearing and Consideration of Adoption of an Ordinance to Add Section 66-168 and to Amend Sections 66-1, 66-472, 66-497, and 66-522 of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia, to Prohibit New General Advertisement Signs and Location Signs in the Business, General (B-2), Industrial, Limited (M-1), and Industrial, General (M-2) Zoning Districts of the County

Mr. Reynolds opened public hearing and invited comments regarding the proposed ordinance.

Ms. Phillips addressed the Board providing introductory remarks. She explained that the County’s Land Use Steering Committee and the Planning Commission both recommend the adoption of the proposed ordinance. Ms. Phillips further explained the proposed ordinance would prohibit the placement of any new general advertising or location signs anywhere in the County after January 23, 2008. The County’s Zoning Ordinance currently allows identification, location, business, and general advertising signs as defined in Section 66-1 of the County code in the B-2 Zoning District as permissible uses by right and in the M-1 and M-2 Zoning Districts as accessory uses. The proposed ordinance if adopted would remove allowance of location or general advertisement signs in these zoning districts.

Ms. Phillips explained that general advertisement signs and location signs are defined to mean signs that advertise a business, product, or service that is not found on the same parcel on which the sign is located. The proposed ordinance would not eliminate the ability of a landowner to construct a sign to advertise a

business that is located on the same property as the sign. It also does not affect the right to place temporary signs, such as for-sale signs, auction signs or other seasonal signage.

Ms. Phillips provided an overview of the proposed ordinance explaining that the most substantive section is found in Section 66-168. Section 66-168 clearly states that effective January 23, 2008, that all signs not specifically permitted by provisions in this chapter are prohibited. Ms. Phillips explained that January 23, 2008, is the date the Board of Supervisors took action to direct County staff to suspend processing of signage permit applications for up to ninety (90) days, which is the time period allowed by state law for review of zoning matters. She further explained that Section 66-168 states that any signs that were constructed before January 23, 2008, or for which building permits or zoning compliance was approved before January 23, 2008, would be considered pre-existing, non conforming signage. If a sign was permitted but construction incomplete as of January 23, 2008, the sign must be fully constructed before January 23, 2010. This section further states that signage deemed pre-existing, conforming shall not be enlarged, extended, increased in height, raised in height, relocated on a parcel, or structurally reconstructed or altered in any manner, except a sign face may be changed so long as the new face is equal to or reduced in height, sign area and lighting. Ms. Phillips stated that the County now has an inventory of all signs located in the County.

Ms. Phillips explained that Section 66-168 says that any pre-existing nonconforming sign that is damaged or destroyed by a natural disaster or other act of God may be repaired to the sign's current stated. The time allowed to make the repairs is two years. However, if the area in which the damaged sign is located is designated as a federal disaster area then two additional years are granted to make the repairs. This section further states that any signs that fall into disrepair so as to threaten safety or for which one-half or more of the sign faces per sign structure remain vacant for a period of at least two years would be deemed abandoned and subject to removal action by the County.

Discussions ensued among the Board prior to receiving comments from the public. Responding to an inquiry from the Board, Ms. Phillips explained that the proposed ordinance would prohibit a pre-existing, nonconforming signs from being converted into a digital billboard. Further discussions ensued about the number of outstanding permits for general advertisement and location signs. Ms. Phillips made reference to action taken by the Planning Commission to recommend adoption of the proposed ordinance with a recommendation that a more comprehensive signage plan be considered to govern existing signage.

The following people spoke in favor of the proposed ordinance:

Teresa Harless addressed the Board explaining that she is dedicated to seeing that a strict ordinance to regulate signage is adopted and urged the Board to vote for the proposed ordinance. Ms. Harless explained that she works in advertising and knows that the number of new billboards that have been erected in the County is over kill. She explained that many of the new billboards remain vacant. Ms. Harless asserted that the billboards are not generating money. She further asserted that the Bristol Motor Speedway has refused to purchase the billboards for this year, and as of March 31 of this year, Bristol Virginia Utilities did not renew their contract to advertise on the billboards. Ms. Harless commented that a lot of people she has spoken with are driving Interstate 81 to get to the Exit 7 area because they refuse to drive Highway 11 because of the billboards.

Mr. Henry McCarthy explained that he served for many years on the Town Council for the Town of Boone, NC and they dealt with similar issues. He stated that on Highway 421 from Wilkesboro, NC to Boone, NC there are no billboards because of an ordinance adopted with the help of a group of people determined to preserve the scenic view of that area. Mr. McCarthy explained that people come from

places like Florida to see the scenic view of the mountains. He encouraged the Board in considering the proposed ordinance to think about where they would like the County to be in the next 20 to 30 years.

Ms. Katie Gifford addressed the Board explaining that she is one of the citizens that avoid driving Lee Highway now because of the billboards. Ms. Gifford commented that Lee Highway now reminds her of Las Vegas, NV. She explained that her young children have made negative comments about the billboards. Ms. Gifford further explained that her family traveled to Atlanta, GA recently and in this large city they only observed a few of the large digital billboards. One was in front of the CNN building and the other in front of Phillips Arena. She commented that the signs reminded her of home and that made her sad.

Ms. Laurel Flacavento addressed the Board explaining that she is very upset about the billboards. Ms. Flacavento explained that she viewed the County's 2002 Comp Plan and out of the 14 community input meetings the number one concern of the citizens was about sprawl and the County not become like northern Virginia. She asked if the Board cared about the input of the citizens of Washington County and requested that they consider a stronger ordinance along with other measures to preserve the County.

Ms. Carla Witten addressed the Board explaining that the issue of the billboards has become a concern to her. Ms. Witten stated she has many acquaintances that share her concerns, but because of job and family obligations were not able to attend this meeting. Therefore, she is speaking on their behalf to let the Board know that many people in the community urge the adoption of the proposed ordinance. Otherwise, they will feel that their government let its citizens down.

Ms. Annette Poore addressed the Board explaining that she grew up in the Tidewater area of Virginia and moved to Washington County 14 years ago primarily because of the beauty of the mountains. Ms. Poore explained that Washington County has always been distinct and not looked like "anywhere USA." She said now when you travel Lee Highway it looks like "anywhere USA" and not Washington County. Ms. Poore encouraged the Board to consider a stronger ordinance. She stated that she would like to see the County become more restrictive than the State in dealing with signage issues.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposed ordinance.

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

At this time the Board devoted substantial discussion to the proposed ordinance.

Mr. McCrady stated that he is adamantly opposed to the billboards and believes the County's skyline must be preserved. He explained that in the Taylor District tourism is becoming the number one industry. People visit Damascus to ride the Creeper Trail and are not interested in seeing the billboards.

Mr. McCall stated that he agrees with the Planning Commission's recommendation that the County needs to consider more signage restrictions.

Mr. Price inquired if other types of advertising such as banners flown behind airplanes or blimps with advertisements require a permit. Ms. Phillips explained that the County could not regulate the kinds of advertisements described by Mr. Price with a land use ordinance.

Mr. Price explained that if billboards are prohibited companies like Lowe's that are not located on a main road will not be able to advertise their business to let potential customers know where they are located.

He said this would give Home Depot an advantage over Lowe's because Home Depot is visible from Interstate 81. Mr. Price said that he does not think that the billboards are a deterrent to tourism and used the Smoky Mountains as an example. Mr. Price stated that prohibiting billboards takes more rights from the people. He further stated that he agrees Lee Highway is over saturated with billboards. Mr. Price explained that the Board should consider an ordinance that requires signage permits to be subject to special exception permit requirements. This way the Board could review each application on a case by case basis. Mr. Price stated that he could not support the proposed ordinance.

Mrs. Mumpower commented that most other localities in the region have addressed the billboard issue and have an ordinance in place. She explained that billboard companies have placed advertisements in the County for many years, but have not chosen to over saturate the county with advertisements like what has been done with the new billboards. Mrs. Mumpower commented that a lot of the new billboards remain vacant, and she questions if there is a lot of demand for advertising on billboards. She stated that the Board is forced to take action to regulate signage in the County.

Mr. Owens explained when the Board discussed the signage issues in October of last year that he never expected to see the number of signs that have been erected along Lee Highway. He said that the Board must take the necessary action to prevent this from happening in other parts of the County.

Mr. Taylor explained that the time for advertising on billboards has come and gone. Most companies do business and advertise via the Internet. Mr. Taylor referred to the bicycle business on Whitetop Mountain that appeared before the Board earlier this year to request a special exception permit. This business explained that the majority of their bicycle rentals are scheduled via the Internet. He explained that his church is in the process of designing a webpage to let people know about the church. Also, more people are shopping via the Internet. Mr. Taylor stated his concerns about how the billboards have marred the landscape in the County. He further stated he is concerned if the billboards are abandoned in the future it will be the responsibility of the County to have them removed.

After further discussions, the following motion was proposed:

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. McCrady, the Board acted to follow the recommendation of the Washington County Planning and adopt the following ordinance:

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan for the County of Washington, Virginia (County) opens its Conclusion section with the following statements:

The citizens of Washington County have stated through the Citizen Survey and Community Input Planning Meetings that they value the current rural character with importance placed on the economy, agriculture, forest, and open space. They do not want sprawl. They stated a desire for a plan for growth that includes effective land use regulations. (para.) As a place of regional and historical significance, Washington County needs to preserve its sense of place while encouraging new development at an appropriate scale, character, and location...

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Washington, Virginia, has expressed in its Vision Statement, "A Rich Past, A Promising Future" (2007), the following visionary statement for land use in Washington County:

Rural, residential, retail, and industrial endeavors prosper throughout Washington County in a mutually respectful and non-invasive fashion. Commercial and industrial developments prosper without interrupting the peace and quiet in residential and rural areas;

WHEREAS, increasing commercialization and proliferation of off-premises, outdoor advertisement signage threatens accomplishment of the Comprehensive Plan goals and the Board's vision for development of the County and the foregoing statements of intent because of the invasiveness of new technology in location and general advertising signs, commonly known as "billboards," "electronic billboards," "electronic message signs," with single-sided, double-sided, single-stacked, double-stacked or tandem signs, lighted display, and changing message boards, which were not considered in the current regulation of signage in the County's zoning ordinance;

WHEREAS, more than twenty-five applications for general advertisement signs and location signs, some of which would permit up to four billboard faces per application, have been received and permitted within the past nine months and, in that number, have saturated the market for such advertisement and threaten the overall character of the County, as such character was described in the Comprehensive Plan and envisioned in the Board of Supervisors' Vision Statement, "A Rich Past, A Promising Future" (2007);

WHEREAS, widespread display of outdoor advertising is inappropriate to the character and sound development of the County and detrimental to the interests of the County and the Towns located within the County, all of which is treasured for its historic significance and environmental beauty;

WHEREAS, the current inventory of general advertising signs and location signs as well as the allowances for business, directional, home occupation, identification, and temporary signs allow adequate communication through signage; and

WHEREAS, the Board, having considered these factors, has found it in the best interest of the public health, safety, and welfare to amend the zoning ordinance as stated herein;

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 66-168 is added and Subsections 66-1, 66-472, 66-497, and 66-522 are amended, as set forth below; underline and italic indicates language to be added; strikethrough indicates language to be deleted:

Sec. 66-1. Definitions.

Sign means any display of any letters, words, numerals, figures, devices, emblems, pictures, or any parts or combinations thereof, by any means whereby the letters, words, numerals, figures, devices, emblems, pictures or combinations thereof are made visible for the purpose of making anything known, whether such display be made on, attached to, or as a part of a structure, surface or any other thing, including but not limited to the ground, any rock, tree, or other natural object, which display is visible beyond the boundaries of the parcel of land on which the display is made. A display less than one square foot in area is excluded from this definition.

- (1) *Business sign means a sign which directs attention to a product, commodity or service available on the premises.*
- (2) *Directional sign means a sign, one end of which may be pointed, or on which an arrow may be painted, indicating the direction to which attention is called, four square feet or less in area, giving the name only of the firm or business responsible for the erection of sign.*
- (3) *General advertising sign means a sign which directs attention to a product, commodity or service not necessarily available on the premises.*
- (4) *Home occupation sign means a sign not exceeding four square feet in area directing attention to a product, commodity or service available on the premises, but which product, commodity or service is clearly a secondary use of the dwelling.*
- (5) Identification sign means a sign that identifies the name of the business or other entity located on the premises.
- ~~(5)~~ (6) Location sign means a sign which directs attention to the approximate location of an establishment from which the advertised product or service may be obtained, which is not on the same premises as the sign.
- ~~(6)~~ (7) Sign structure means and includes the supports, uprights, bracing and framework of any structure, be it single-faced, double-faced, v-type, or otherwise, exhibiting a sign.
- ~~(7)~~ (8) Temporary sign means a sign applying to a seasonal or other brief activity, such as, but not limited to, summer camps, horse shows, auctions or sale of land, which shall conform in size and type to directional signs.

Sec. 66-168. General advertisement and location signs.

- (a.) Effective January 23, 2008, all signs not specifically permitted by provisions in this Chapter are prohibited.
- (b.) Signs lawfully existing prior to the effective date or for which zoning compliance was approved prior to the effective date that do not conform to the provisions of this Chapter and signs that are accessory to and on the same premises as a nonconforming use shall be deemed to be preexisting, nonconforming signs and may remain except as qualified herein. Construction of any such signs, for which building permits or zoning compliance was approved but which remain unfinished as of the effective date, shall be completed prior to January 22, 2010, or they shall no longer be deemed preexisting, nonconforming signs pursuant to this subsection and shall be subject to removal provisions stated herein.
- (c.) Preexisting, nonconforming signs shall not be enlarged, extended, increased in height, raised in height, relocated on a parcel, or structurally reconstructed or altered in any manner, except a sign face may be changed so long as the new face is equal to or reduced in height, sign area, and lighting.
- (d.) The burden of establishing preexisting nonconforming status of signs and of the physical characteristics/location of such signs shall be that of the owner of the property. Upon notice from the zoning administrator, a property owner shall submit verification that sign(s) lawfully existed at time of erection. Failure to provide such verification shall be cause for the zoning administrator to order that such sign be removed.

- (e.) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent keeping in good repair a preexisting, nonconforming sign, subject to the qualifications herein.
- (f.) A preexisting nonconforming sign that is damaged or destroyed by a natural disaster or other act of God may be repaired, rebuilt or replaced to eliminate or reduce the nonconforming features to the extent possible, but if the sign cannot be repaired, rebuilt or replaced except to restore it to its original nonconforming condition, the owner shall have the right to do so. The owner shall apply for a building permit and any work done to repair, rebuild or replace such sign shall be in compliance with all applicable provisions of local, state, and federal law. Unless such sign is repaired, rebuilt, or replaced within two years of the date of the natural disaster or other act of God, such sign shall only be repaired, replaced, or rebuilt in accordance with the provisions of the zoning ordinance of the locality. However, if the nonconforming sign is in an area under a federal disaster declaration and the sign has been damaged or destroyed as a direct result of conditions that gave rise to the declaration, then an additional two years is allowed for the sign to be repaired, replaced, or rebuilt.
- (g.) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the county, after making a reasonable attempt to notify such property owner, from ordering the removal of a nonconforming sign that has been abandoned. For purposes of this section, a sign shall be considered abandoned if the business for which the sign was erected has not been in operation for a period of at least two years or if one-half or more of the sign faces on the sign structure has remained vacant of advertisement for an active product, business, or service for a period of at least two years, or if the sign has fallen into such disrepair as to constitute a safety hazard and has not been repaired for a period of at least two years. Following the expiration of the two-year period, the locality may order the owner of the property on which the sign is located to remove the sign, and the owner shall do so. If, following such two-year period and such notification by the county, the sign has not been removed, the county through its own agents or employees may enter the property upon which the sign is located and remove any such sign. The cost of such removal shall be chargeable to the owner of the property. Nothing herein shall prevent the locality from applying to a court of competent jurisdiction for an order requiring the removal of such abandoned nonconforming sign by the owner by means of injunction or other appropriate remedy.

Sec. 66-472. Permitted uses and accessory uses and structures.

(a) Permitted uses. In the B-2 general business district, structures to be erected or land to be used shall be for one or more of the following permitted uses:

* * *

(74) ~~Signs, identification, location, and business and general advertising.~~

* * *

Sec. 66-497. Permitted uses and accessory uses and structures.

* * *

(b) Accessory uses and structures. The following accessory uses and structures are permitted in the M-1 district:

* * *

(2) ~~Location, business and general advertising~~ Business signs.

* * *

Sec. 66-522. Permitted uses and accessory uses and structures.

* * *

(b) Accessory uses and structures. The following accessory uses and structures are permitted in the M-2 district:

(1) ~~Location, business and general advertising~~ Business signs.

* * *

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 the Washington County Code.

3. That this ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its enactment and shall be applied to any application for zoning compliance permit pending review by the County on and after January 23, 2008.

Mr. Price offered a substitute motion that the Board not receive further signage permit applications and to place the signage issue on a referendum in the November election. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Reynolds commented that the Planning Commission has recommended that the signage ordinance be revisited when the County's Comp Plan is revised. This would allow the Board another opportunity in the future to consider signage regulations.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (6-1)

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Nay</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

6. Presentation Concerning Various Library Projects

Dr. Mel Heiman, Chairman of the Washington County Public Library Board of Trustees, addressed the Board to provide updates on the following projects:

Damascus Branch Library

Dr. Heiman reviewed the preliminary plans for the Damascus Branch Library as prepared by Reynolds Architects Incorporated. He explained that the library expects to be awarded the grants that were applied for in the full amounts and most likely will not need to request additional funds from the Board. Dr. Heiman explained that the Library Board requests that the Board of Supervisors extend the original contract of Reynolds Architect to include professional services necessary to prepare final designs and bid-ready construction documents for the Damascus Branch Library Project.

Mr. Reeter explained that a determination will need to be made whether the current contract with Reynolds Architects may be extended as requested or whether a professional services procurement process will need to be undertaken to select a final design services provider.

Substantial discussions ensued among the Board concerning procurement issues relating to the Damascus Branch Library project.

Mr. Taylor explained that he believes the County must go through the procurement process because of the strict requirements of the funding agencies involved with this project. He proposed that the County consider contracting with Mount Rogers Planning District Commission (MRPDC) to manage this project. Currently, MRPDC is managing several transportation enhance grant projects and are very familiar with the requirements. MRPDC could also guide the procurement process.

Mr. McCrady explained that the Damascus Branch Library Project includes some \$450,000 in local dollars that are not restricted, and he sees no reason to further delay this project. He further explained that restrictions of the other funding agencies involved will be strictly adhered to. Mr. McCrady inquired that if there were procurement issues why they were not dealt with before now. Mr. Reeter explained that the current contract with Reynolds Architects was for preliminary design work and the fees associated with this work were below the amount required to complete the professional services procurement process. The costs for the final design work will be higher.

Further discussions ensued among the Board. Responding to an inquiry from the Board, Ms. Phillips explained that she would research the procurement policies pertaining to this issue and could have a recommendation for the Board at the April 22 regular meeting. Mr. Reeter explained that he is not sure the County needs to go through the professional services procurement process because this may be a sole source procurement. However, if it is determined that the County must do so, professional services procurement could be done within 30 days. The Library Planning Committee could serve as the selection committee and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. McCrady stated that he believes the County needs to look at someone within the organization to manage the Damascus Branch Library project.

Mrs. Mumpower recommended that the County Administrator speak to the County Engineer about managing the project.

Washington County Public Library Director Charlotte Parson addressed the Board to provide them with background information on the Damascus Branch Library Project.

After further discussions, the following action was taken by the Board.

On motion of Mr. Taylor, second by Mr. McCrady, the Board acted to authorize the County Administrator to determine if a professional services procurement is needed for the architectural and design services for the Damascus Branch Library project, and further if it is determined that the procurement process is in the best interest of the project that the County Administrator initiate the procurement process.

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

Mr. McCall Aye

Mr. McCrady *Aye*
Mrs. Mumpower *Aye*
Mr. Owens *Aye*
Mr. Price *Aye*
Mr. Reynolds *Aye*
Mr. Taylor *Aye*

Mr. Owens asked Ms. Parsons to make contact with someone from MRPDC about their management of the project and bring a report to the Board.

Hayters Gap Branch Library

Dr. Heiman explained that the Library Board requests that the Board of Supervisors authorize Thompson & Litton to reissue the Request for Proposal for the Hayter’s Gap Branch Library Improvement Project. He further explained that with the modifications to the project, it is anticipated that an affordable proposal will be received.

Mr. Reeter explained funding for professional services by Thompson & Litton to re-design and re-bid the project has been provided for by the Board in the current fiscal year’s budget; however, the Board has only tentatively approved the County’s share of the construction cost of the project (\$150,000) in the County Operating Budget for FY 2008-2009. He further explained that if the Board is prepared to give final budgetary approval to provide \$150,000 in County funding to the Hayter’s Gap Project in FY 2008-2009 this will allow him to authorize Thompson & Litton to proceed with the re-design and re-bid of the project.

Discussions ensued among the Board.

On motion of Mr. Price, second by Mr. Owens, the Board acted to give final budgetary approval to provide \$150,000 in County funding for the Hayter’s Gap Project in FY 2008-09.

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

Mr. McCall *Aye*
Mr. McCrady *Aye*
Mrs. Mumpower *Aye*
Mr. Owens *Aye*
Mr. Price *Aye*
Mr. Reynolds *Aye*
Mr. Taylor *Aye*

Main Library

Dr. Heiman explained that the Library Board requests that if the Board of Supervisors decides to evaluate Johnston Memorial Hospital as a potential site for the County Offices that the library be included in the evaluation.

Mr. McCall commented on the library’s recent fund raising event. Mrs. Parsons commented that the event, *A Tisket, A Tasket* brought in about \$25,000 and with other donations that total may increase to \$28,000.

7. Consideration of Application for Fireworks Display Permit, Bobby Moore Photography

On motion of Mr. Owens, second by Mrs. Mumpower, the Board acted to grant a Fireworks Display Permit to Bobby Moore on behalf of Solid Rock Climbing Wall for a private display on July 3, 2008.

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

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

8. Consideration of Dog Damage Claim, Elizabeth Blevins

Ms. Phillips explained Deputy Eric Hinchey was present and has investigated both dog damage claims. She reminded the Board that State law, which is incorporated into the Washington County Code, states that payment of a claim shall not exceed \$400 per animal or \$10.00 per fowl.

Deputy Hinchey addressed the Board explaining that he examined Ms. Blevins' sheep. Because of the area on the sheep that was attacked, it was most likely attacked by a domesticated animal.

On motion of Mr. McCrady, second by Mr. Price, it was resolved to authorize payment to Elizabeth Blevins in the amount of \$100 for a dog damage claim.

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

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

9. Consideration of Dog Damage Claim, Bob Gray

Mr. Bob Gray addressed the Board explaining that dogs broke down his fence and attacked his cattle. Mr. Gray explained that his veterinarian had to put down one of his cows. He further explained that the cow put down had a value of \$1,400, the cost to repair the fence is \$70, and his veterinarian bill is \$75.00. Mr. Gray asked the Board to assist him financially.

Deputy Hinchey explained that he investigated the attack and found one cattle hung in the fence. He further explained that he saw evidence of dogs and there were indications that the cows were attacked by

domestic dogs. Since the investigation several dogs running at large have been caught, but there is no proof that any of these dogs one the ones that attacked Mr. Gray's cattle.

Discussions ensued among the Board about circumstances where the Board paid a dog damage claim in excess of \$400. Mr. Seamon explained that the larger claims paid included more than one animal. Mr. Gray asserted that the County in the past has paid him more than \$400 for a heifer. Further discussions ensued. Mr. Seamon reviewed past records of dog damage claims paid to Mr. Gray and explained in November of 2000, a claim in the amount of \$1,000 was paid to Mr. Gray. He further explained that his records did not show if the claim was for more than one animal. Mrs. Mumpower suggested that Mr. Gray's past claims be researched further before the Board takes action on this request.

A motion was made by Mr. McCrady to authorize payment to Bob Gray in the amount of \$1,000. The motion died for lack of a second.

After further discussions, the following action was taken:

On motion of Mr. Price, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to authorize payment to Bob Gray in the amount of \$400 for a dog damage claim.

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

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Mrs. Mumpower asked that Mr. Gray's claim paid in November of 2000 be researched to see if the claim included more than one animal.

10. Consideration of Supplemental Appropriation for Additional Engineering Services for Drainage Improvements, Oak Hill Estates Subdivision

Assistant County Administrator Christy Parker presented the Board with a request for a supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$1,800 for additional engineering services for the drainage improvements for Oak Hill Estates Subdivision. Ms. Parker explained that the Board in December of last year appropriated \$18,500 for this project. Since that time, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) has agreed to participate in the final construction costs associated with this project and is requesting that the culverts under Mahogany Drive be replaced along with construction of new concrete headwalls on either side of Mahogany Drive. VDOT will contribute \$26,775 to the Project. However, the additions to the project proposed by VDOT will result in additional engineering costs to prepare pre and post-drainage calculations and two additional weeks of construction administration.

Ms. Parker explained that VDOT and Thompson and Litton now have cost estimates for the project. The additional engineering costs are included in the estimates. The cost estimate is \$20,300, which is \$1,800 more than was estimated in December of last year.

Mrs. Parker explained that once this project is designed, it will go out to bid through the procurement process. The low bid received will be brought back to the Board for approval.

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. McCall, the Board acted to contract with Thompson & Litton Engineers and approve a supplemental appropriation of \$1,800 from Reserve for Contingencies for drainage improvements for Oak Hill Estates Subdivision.

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

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

11. Consideration of Resolution Requesting Financial Assistance for Costs Associated with Project Mainstream

Ms. Parker addressed the Board explaining that between July and December 2007, the Smyth-Washington Regional Industrial Facilities Authority (SWIFA) and the Virginia Economic Development Partnership worked diligently to attract a large automotive related industrial prospect, called Project Mainstream. SWIFA expended a total of \$205,867.18 in site specific soils, topographic, geotechnical, appraisals and survey studies, as well as, costs associated with obtaining land options. SWIFA requested and received supplemental appropriations from Washington and Smyth Counties to cover these costs, \$102,933.59 from each jurisdiction. Ms. Parker explained that the Virginia Tobacco Commission encouraged Smyth and Washington County to submit a grant application to the Tobacco Commission for its consideration in reimbursing the counties for the reimbursement paid to SWIFA.

On motion of Mr. Owens, second by Mr. Price, the Board acted to adopt the following Resolution:

**RESOLUTION 2008-08
APPLICATION TO VIRGINIA TOBACCO COMMISSION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE**

WHEREAS, Washington County is committed to creating jobs and new private investment through the attraction of new industry to our region; and

WHEREAS, Washington County has worked in partnership with Smyth County through the Smyth-Washington Regional Industrial Facilities Authority (SWIFA) in efforts to create jobs and investment in the area; and

WHEREAS, Washington County provided a substantial amount of funds to SWIFA in 2007 to pay expenses incurred in a concentrated effort to attract a major automotive production facility to the area; and

WHEREAS, the funds were used to undertake a complete investigation of the proposed site for the project, including appraisals, engineering design, aerial photography and mapping, geotechnical investigation, environmental studies, and legal services.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Virginia that the Board requests financial assistance from the Tobacco Indemnification and Community Revitalization Commission for \$102,933.59 to cover these expenditures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board supports the application to the Tobacco Indemnification and Community Revitalization Commission and authorizes the County Administrator to sign the necessary application forms, and accept responsibility for the accuracy of the application and appropriate use of the funds, if granted.

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

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

At this time, Mr. McCrady left the meeting. Before leaving, Mr. McCrady asked for the Board’s support for the request from Mount Rogers Regional Adult Education Program for a surplus vehicle.

14. Recess

The Board took a ten minute recess at this time.

12. Consideration of Resolutions Concerning Abandonment of Portions of State Routes 645 and 802

On motion of Mr. Owens, second by Mr. Price, the Board acted to adopt the following Resolutions:

**RESOLUTION 2008-09
ABANDONMENT OF A PORTION OF STATE SECONDARY ROUTE 645**

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Transportation has provided the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Virginia with a sketch dated January 10, 2005, depicting the additions, discontinuances and abandonments required in the secondary system of state highways as a result of Project 0645-095-586, which sketch is hereby incorporated herein by reference,

WHEREAS, the new road serves the same citizens as those portion of old road identified to be abandoned and those segments no longer serve a public need, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Virginia that the Board abandons as part of the secondary system of state highways those portions of road identified by the sketch to be abandoned, pursuant to §33.1-155, Code of Virginia, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board requests the Virginia Department of Transportation to add to the secondary system of state highways those portions of road identified by the sketch to be added, pursuant to §33.1-229, Code of Virginia and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a certified copy of this Resolution be forward to the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

**RESOLUTION 2008-10
ABANDONMENT OF A PORTION OF STATE SECONDARY ROUTE 802**

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Transportation has provided the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Virginia with a sketch dated September 11, 2003, depicting the additions, discontinuances and abandonments required in the secondary system of state highways as a result of Project 0802-095-213, C501 which sketch is hereby incorporated herein by reference,

WHEREAS, the new road serves the same citizens as those portion of old road identified to be abandoned and those segments no longer serve a public need, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Virginia that the Board abandons as part of the secondary system of state highways those portions of road identified by the sketch to be abandoned, pursuant to §33.1-155, Code of Virginia, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board requests the Virginia Department of Transportation to add to the secondary system of state highways those portions of road identified by the sketch to be added, pursuant to §33.1-229, Code of Virginia and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a certified copy of this Resolution be forward to the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (6-0)

- Mr. McCall Aye*
- Mrs. Mumpower Aye*
- Mr. Owens Aye*
- Mr. Price Aye*
- Mr. Reynolds Aye*

Mr. Taylor Aye

Scrivener's Note: The sketches referenced above is included as Minutes Exhibits Item 2008-04-08-A.

13. Consideration of Appointments to Various Boards, Authorities and Commissions Expiring June 30, 2008

Bristol Virginia Utilities Board

On motion of Mr. Owens, second by Mr. McCall, the Board acted to recommend the reappointment of Dulcie Mumpower to the Bristol Virginia Utilities Board for a one year term beginning July 1, 2008, and expiring June 30, 2009.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (5-0-1)

Mr. McCall	Aye
Mrs. Mumpower	Abstained
Mr. Owens	Aye
Mr. Price	Aye
Mr. Reynolds	Aye
Mr. Taylor	Aye

Washington County Planning Commission

On motion of Mr. Owens, second by Mr. McCall, it was resolved to reappoint Phillip L. McCroskey, Sr., to represent the Tyler Election District on the Washington County Planning Commission for a four year term beginning July 1, 2008, and expiring June 30, 2012.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (6-0)

Mr. McCall	Aye
Mrs. Mumpower	Aye
Mr. Owens	Aye
Mr. Price	Aye
Mr. Reynolds	Aye
Mr. Taylor	Aye

On motion of Mr. Taylor, second by Mrs. Mumpower, it was resolved to reappoint Dr. Stephen L. Fisher to represent the Monroe Election District on the Washington County Planning Commission for a four year term beginning July 1, 2008 and expiring June 30, 2012.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (6-0)

Mr. McCall	Aye
Mrs. Mumpower	Aye
Mr. Owens	Aye
Mr. Price	Aye

Mr. Reynolds *Aye*
Mr. Taylor *Aye*

Virginia Highlands Airport Authority

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to reappoint Anthony Lambert to represent the Wilson Election District on the Virginia Highlands Airport Authority for a four year term beginning July 1, 2008, and expiring June 30, 2012.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (6-0)

Mr. McCall *Aye*
Mrs. Mumpower *Aye*
Mr. Owens *Aye*
Mr. Price *Aye*
Mr. Reynolds *Aye*
Mr. Taylor *Aye*

Virginia Highlands Community College

On motion of Mr. McCall, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to appoint William E. Chaffin to represent Washington County on the Virginia Highlands Community College Board for a four year term beginning July 1, 2008, and expiring June 30, 2012.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (6-0)

Mr. McCall *Aye*
Mrs. Mumpower *Aye*
Mr. Owens *Aye*
Mr. Price *Aye*
Mr. Reynolds *Aye*
Mr. Taylor *Aye*

15. County Administrator Reports:

- a. Draft Agenda for April 14 Joint Meeting with Abingdon

Mr. Reeter reviewed with the Board the draft agenda for the joint meeting with Abingdon Town Council on Monday, April 14 to discuss the sports complex project. Mr. Reeter asked for the Board’s input and explained that if the agenda is acceptable to the Board, it will be mailed out tomorrow (April 9).

- b. FY 09- and FY10 State Budget Reductions Affecting Washington County

Mr. Reeter provided the Board with correspondence from the Virginia Department of Planning and Budget and correspondence from Governor Tim Kaine concerning the FY 2009 and FY 2010 State budget reductions. He explained that the correspondence from the Virginia Department of Planning and Budget projects over \$190,000.00 in anticipated state revenue reductions in both FY 2009 and FY 2010 for Washington County as part of the proposed biennium budget for the Commonwealth. Mr. Reeter

further explained that because Washington County is a member jurisdiction of the Southwest Virginia Regional Jail Authority, the County can expect to receive additional revenue reductions across the various categories in order to make up its share of the \$605,000.00 reduction in state funding for the regional jail. It is estimated that the total reduction in state revenue for FY 2009 could be in the neighborhood of \$250,000.00.

Discussions ensued among the Board.

c. Surplus Vehicle Request, Mount Rogers Regional Adult Education Program

On motion of Mr. McCall, second by Mr. Price, the Board acted to donate a surplus 2000 Ford Crown Victoria motor vehicle to the Mount Rogers Regional Adult Education Program.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (6-0)

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

d. Proposed April 24 Board Worksession on Fiscal Policy and Capital Planning.

Mr. Reeter proposed that the Board consider scheduling a worksession on Thursday, April 24 to discuss Fiscal Policy Development and Capital Planning. The worksession would be conducted by representatives of Davenport & Company, the County’s financial advisors. Mr. Reeter asked the Board to let him know by the end of the day tomorrow, Wednesday, April 9 if they have a conflict with April 24. It was consensus of the Board that if the County Administrator does not hear back from Board members to proceed with scheduling the worksession on April 24.

16. County Attorney Reports:

Ms. Phillips discussed with the Board the appointments to Boards, Authorities and Commissions. She explained that the Board at one time had discussions about restructuring appointments to better align with a Board of Supervisor’s term of office. Ms. Phillips asked if the Board still had interest in her researching this issue. Discussions ensued among the Board. It was consensus of the Board to direct the County Attorney do the research and bring them a report.

a. Request for Authorization to Proceed with Ordinances

Ms. Phillips explained that she is seeking authorization to prepare ordinances and schedule public hearings on two ordinances. One ordinance is to vacate a lot in accordance with the application of Fred Leonard; and the second ordinance governs cable television system providers in the County.

Ms. Phillips explained that the state law that governs cable television system providers has changed substantially. The County no longer is able to collect a franchise fee directly from a cable television system provider. The State implemented a new communication and sales use tax and now collects fees

from the cable television system providers. A portion of this new tax is reimbursed to the County based on a formula. Ms. Phillips further explained that the Board has two options to consider relating to an ordinance. The first option is to adopt an ordinance that allows the County to offer negotiated cable franchise agreements. The second option is to adopt a uniform regulation of all television providers. She explained that Virginia law requires that the franchise agreements be consistent and not require a greater benefit or burden to one provider over any other.

Ms. Phillips stated that at this time there is one cable provider that is operating without a franchise agreement. This cable provider purchased a portion of an existing system and operates under the previous company's franchise agreement.

Substantial discussions ensued among the Board concerning an ordinance to govern cable television system providers in the County. The following actions were taken by the Board:

On motion of Mr. Taylor, second by Mr. Owens, the Board acted to authorize the County Attorney to proceed with negotiating a cable franchise agreement for the cable television system provider currently operating without a franchise agreement.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (6-0)

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

On motion of Mr. McCall, second by Mrs. Mumpower, the Board acted to authorize the County Attorney to prepare ordinances and schedule public hearings for the Boards consideration on the following items:

- 1. An ordinance to vacate in accordance with the application of Fred Leonard; and*
- 2. An ordinance to govern cable television system providers in the County.*

The vote on this motion was as follows: (6-0)

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

b. Update on Sewer Service Negotiations with Town of Abingdon and City of Bristol

Update provided in the Agenda materials.

17. Board Information

No Board information was reviewed.

18. Consent Agenda

Mr. Seamon explained that the County has a five year contract for Financial Auditing Services with Robinson, Farmer, Cox, which is now complete. The County has the option to negotiate a new contract for subsequent years (up to five years) without going back through the procurement process. He further explained that he has been in contact with the County Treasurer, the Clerk of the School Board, the Library Office Manager and the Social Services Office Manager concerning retaining Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates for subsequent years. These departments all indicated they were pleased with the auditing arrangement in place for the FY 2006-2007 Audit and feel comfortable with renewing the contract with Robinson, Farmer, Cox.

On motion of Mr. Owens, second by Mr. McCall, it was resolved to approve the following consent agenda items:

- a. Payment of Bills, March 2008*
- b. Request for Revenue Refunds-Washington County Sheriff's Office-Animal Sterilization Fees*
- c. Request to Extend Current Contract for Financial Auditing Services*
- d. Supplemental Appropriation-Washington County Sheriff's Office*
- e. Budget Status Reports-February 29, 2008*

The vote on this motion was as follows: (6-0)

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

19. Board Member Reports

Mrs. Mumpower reported that Ms. Phillips is working on the issues pertaining to the Washington County Little League fields (Noonkester Field). Hopefully there will be positive results. Mrs. Mumpower expressed her appreciation to Ms. Phillips for her work.

Mr. Price asked if a locally funded employee of a constitutional office is covered under the County's grievance procedure. Mr. Reeter replied that they would not be covered.

20. Recess to 5:30 PM April 14, 2008 Joint Recessed Meeting with Abingdon Town Council, Conference Room 1, County Administration Building

On motion of Mr. Owens, second by Mr. McCall, it was resolved to recess to April 14, 2008, 5:30 PM, for a joint recessed meeting with Abingdon Town Council, Conference Room 1, County Administration Building.

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

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Prepared by:

Naoma A. Norris, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Washington County Board of Supervisors:

Kenneth O. Reynolds, Chairman