

**VIRGINIA:**

At a regular meeting of the Washington County Board of Supervisors held Tuesday, March 26, 2002, at 7:00 p.m., at the County Administration Building in Abingdon, Virginia, the following were present:

**PRESENT:**

Joe W. Derting, Chairman  
John B. Roberts, Sr., Vice Chairman  
Jack H. Barker  
Bobby D. Ingle  
Phillip B. McCall  
Anthony S. Rector  
Dulcie M. Mumpower

Mark K. Reeter, County Administrator  
Lucy E. Phillips Bright, County Attorney  
Naoma A. Cook, Administrative Supervisor  
Mark W. Seamon, Accounting & Purchasing Manager

\*\*\*\*\*

**1      Call to Order**

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

**2      Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance – Supervisor Phillip B. McCall**

Mr. Phillip B. McCall gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3      Approval of Agenda**

*On motion of Mr. Rector, second by Mr. Ingle, it was resolved to approve the Agenda with the following addition:*

**Item 10      Consideration of Parade Permit for Greenfield Baptist Church**

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

*Mr. Derting                      Aye*  
*Mr. Barker                      Aye*  
*Mr. Ingle                        Aye*  
*Mr. McCall                      Aye*  
*Mrs. Mumpower                Aye*

*Mr. Rector*                    *Aye*  
*Mr. Roberts*                   *Aye*

**4        Approval of Minutes – March 12, 2002 Meeting**

*On motion of Mr. Ingle, second by Mr. McCall, it was resolved to approve the minutes of the March 12, 2002 meeting as presented.*

*The vote on this motion was as follows: (6-0-1)*

*Mr. Derting*                    *Aye*  
*Mr. Barker*                    *Abstained*  
*Mr. Ingle*                        *Aye*  
*Mr. McCall*                    *Aye*  
*Mrs. Mumpower*              *Aye*  
*Mr. Rector*                    *Aye*  
*Mr. Roberts*                   *Aye*

**5        Public Hearing to Review the Washington County Planning Commission's Decision Relative to the Edwards Wood Products, Inc. (Owner, Carroll Edwards) Application to review an 18 foot right-of-way (Casey Hollow Road) beginning at the intersection of State Route 689 and running in a northerly direction 14,520 linear feet as required by the County Code, Chapter 54; Article IV. Withholding of Streets from Public Dedication**

Mr. Derting opened the public hearing and invited comments both in support of and in opposition to the review of the Washington County Planning Commission's decision relative to the Edwards Wood Products, Inc. (Owner, Carroll Edwards) Application to review an 18 foot right-of-way (Casey Hollow Road) beginning at the intersection of State Route 689 and running in a northerly direction 14,520 linear feet as required by the County Code, Chapter 54; Article IV. Withholding of Streets from Public Dedication.

Mr. Derting asked those in favor of the application to address the Board.

- Randall Eads, Legal Counsel for Edwards Wood Products and Carol Edwards addressed the Board explaining that he is representing his client on the application for approval to withhold a road from public dedication. Mr. Eads stated that his client owns approximately 5,000 acres of mountainous land at Brumley Gap and is requesting to develop, at his own expense, a private road, 14,520 feet in length, from an existing forestry road.

Mr. Eads stated his disagreement with the Board's decision to hold a public hearing as part of its review of the Planning Commission's determination on his client's application. Mr. Eads stated that the Planning Commission had already conducted a public hearing and there is no statutory authority to provide for the Board of Supervisors to conduct another public hearing. He stated that another public hearing creates an element of unfairness to his client because people had the opportunity to speak against the proposal at the Planning Commission's public hearing and further that another public hearing will give the people another opportunity to voice public opinion for consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Eads gave a presentation of the reasons his client is proposing to construct the private road. He explained that a private development was the exclusive objective of Edwards Wood Products in purchasing the property. Mr. Eads stated that the tracts are in the size range of 450-900 acres. The position of Edwards Wood Products is that anyone purchasing a tract this

large in size would want to retain privacy and be able to access their property without the public having access. Therefore, Edwards Wood Products is proposing to develop a private, gated community. The private road being proposed would serve only six tracts of land. There is another road off Clinch Mountain that provides secondary access to two of the tracts.

Mr. Eads commented regarding an editorial in today's newspaper that reported plans of Edwards Wood Products to develop a 500 single-family dwelling subdivision. He stated that the editorial was not accurate and that restrictions had been placed on the proposed development to allow only one single family dwelling per 100 acres. Mr. Eads said the restrictions proposed by Edwards Wood Products for the property were superior to the County's requirements. Further, he explained that to build a road to meet state standards is impossible due to the grade of road, site distance, width and topography of the land. Mr. Eads commented that the restrictions proposed by his client are good for the County, the community and the environment.

Mr. Eads explained that the reasons his client has placed tough restrictions on the land to protect it are because he likes the land, he enjoys the outdoor environment and wants to protect the natural beauty of the scenery and his client has read the County's Comprehensive Plan and knows the goals of the Plan. His client feels his restrictions comply with maintaining quality of the environment, avoiding soil erosion, conserving the water table, preventing unsightly eyesores; such as you would have with clear cutting. He pointed out that his client's restrictions prohibit the cutting of timber on the property. Mr. Eads further stated that the restrictions would provide protection of future landowners. Mr. Eads said the proposed restrictions of Edwards Wood Products were specifically tailored to the County's Comprehensive Plan, Subdivision and Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Eads stated that the Subdivision Ordinance under 54-65 states the private road shall be granted if there is a valid reason therefore and it presents no safety hazard to landowners. Mr. Eads said that there is no evidence that the proposed private road would present a safety hazard to any landowner. Mr. Eads further stated that a valid reason exists. First his client wants a private, gated community for future landowners and second, due to the topography it would be impossible to build a road to State standards. Mr. Eads noted his concern that the Planning Commission did not provide written reasons for its denial, as required by the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Eads further pointed out that on Page 26 of the Comprehensive Plan it states that if the Planning Commission disapproves a plan, they are to provide suggestions for modifications and this requirement was not complied with. Mr. Eads stated that according to minutes the Planning Commission's denial was because of the land's natural beauty and that the land was in a CR zone. Mr. Eads further stated that a CR zone allows family dwellings. Mr. Eads commented that he found no valid reason for the Planning Commission to deny the request of his client. He further commented that based on a review of similar cases brought before the Planning Commission, this was the first time a request to withhold a street from public dedication had been denied.

In closing, Mr. Eads stated that his client is not being treated fairly according to the standards of the County's Subdivision Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan. He further stated, that the Planning Commission has approved other similar developments and he identified the Virginian as an example. Mr. Eads stated his opinion that the request of Edwards Wood Products was denied by the Planning Commission because of politics.

Mr. Eads requested the Board follow the Comprehensive Plan, Subdivision Ordinance and the requirements of a CR zone on this matter and reverse the decision of the Planning Commission. He asked the Board to remember their oath of office. He further requested that if the Board voted to follow the recommendation of the Planning Commission that he be provided with the reasons. Likewise, if the Board voted to reverse the decision of the Planning Commission that the citizens be provided with the reasons.

- Mr. John Howard of Woodland Hills Road, addressed the Board in favor of the Edwards Wood Products proposal because it will preserve the natural beauty of the land. Mr. Edwards stated that it is an individual's right to choose to live in a gated community.

Mr. Derting invited comments in opposition to the proposal.

- Patrick Mannix of Ivy Road, spoke in opposition of the proposal.
- Jane Oaks of 21025 Brumley Gap Road addressed the Board in opposition to the proposal. She commented that approval of the application would cause problems for future residents of the property, and the County would have to solve these problems for them. She said the local community is opposed.
- Jack Kestner of Hayters Gap addressed the Board and said that the property under discussion is located behind his property. Mr. Kestner stated his concern that the homes in the proposed development will require septic systems, and if one is built at an elevation above the aquifer from which he gets his water it could cause bacteria in his water supply. Second, Mr. Kestner said that the impact on the wildlife is a concern to him. Third, he noted that an expansion of the road to the property would be required if the development were allowed, and Mr. Kestner was concerned about where the funds would come from to complete the project. Mr. Kestner asked the Board to take into consideration the concerns of the Clinch Mountain Community and reject the Edwards Wood Products Proposal.
- Ed Morgan, 259 Bradley Street, appeared before the Board. He explained that he was a member of the Abingdon Town Council, but his opinions expressed on this issue were his alone and not necessarily the position of the Town of Abingdon.

Mr. Morgan noted the natural beauty of the Clinch Mountain area. He pointed out that approval of the request of Edwards Wood Products would be was a waiver from the existing County restrictions in order to accommodate a residential development on the mountain. He said the applicant has the burden of showing why a variance would benefit the public, but in this case, applicant has not done so. He stated his concern with long-term implications of allowing the road to be privately maintained.

- Charles Kennedy of Hayters Gap addressed the Board. He stated he lives on top of the Clinch Mountain. Mr. Kennedy commented on the issues of safety, wear and tear, and maintenance expenses for the proposed road based on his personal experience with the long and steep driveway to his own home, which is shared with four other landowners. He said the proposed road couldn't be compared to the roads in the Virginian Subdivision because of extreme differences in road quality and terrain.

Mr. Kennedy noted that the use restrictions proposed by Edwards Wood Products allow the landowners to change, amend, or eliminate the restrictions with agreement of seventy-five percent of owners. He discussed the possibility that the restrictions could be changed without any review by the County.

He agreed with Mr. Kestner's comments about risk to the aquifer and he said he had discussed his concerns with a professional geologist who affirmed the possibility of aquifer contamination.

Mr. Kennedy said that safety was a big concern due to conflicts between hunting and residential use and the remote location. He has had intruders shoot at him and cause damage to his property. He calls the Sheriff's Department, but due to the terrain of the land, it takes a long time for a deputy to arrive and most likely the intruder is gone. He expressed concern about delayed response of emergency services due to remote location and rough terrain and whether such circumstances were appropriate for development as proposed.

Mr. Kennedy noted the high likelihood future residents would have problems with water sources. He explained he encountered many problems when trying to dig a well on his

property. He talked with three companies before finding one that would take the job. He now has a 650 ft. well that only produces a gallon of water per minute.

Finally, Mr. Kennedy explained that development would cause increased runoff to the Brumley Gap area, which would cause storm water drainage problems. He appealed to the Board to affirm the decision of the Planning Commission.

- Rees Shearer of Porterhouse Lane in Saltville addressed the Board. He stated that, though he is not a current resident of Washington County, he is originally from the Clinch Mountain area and wants to see its natural beauty protected. He further stated the mountain was a crown jewel of nature and not meant for a residential subdivision.

Mr. Shearer said he attended two sessions of visioning for the County Comprehensive Plan and heard public consensus to protect and preserve mountains, forests, streams and rural areas in Washington County. He said CR zone was the best tool to meet that goal. He asked all people in opposition to stand, and about two-thirds of the audience (approximately 120+ people) stood.

- Bill Wasserman of State Route 80 in Russell County appeared before the Board. He explained that his property adjoined the 5,000 acres being proposed for development, and he has concerns about the affects to his property and the potential endangerment to his water supply. Mr. Wasserman stated that the Planning Commission considered and protected the health and safety of the community with its decision.
- Jim Widener of Moccasin Circle addressed the Board. He explained that he does not live in the Clinch Mountain area, but his reasons for speaking tonight are to inform the Board of the difficulties of living on a private road based on his personal experience living on a nearby private road. He said that school buses will not serve private roads, and postal delivery will not be made on a private road. He said he shares his private road with eleven other landowners, and they have never been able to get all eleven landowners to agree on anything, which makes ongoing maintenance of the road extremely difficult. He said the Virginia Department of Transportation estimated expense of \$120,000 to bring the road to standards acceptable for State maintenance. Without cooperation of all landowners, he said that improvement will never happen. He stated that residents are required to have wells and if the well happens to go dry, they will be without a water source and likely seek government assistance.

Mr. Derting noted the time and asked that only people who had comments regarding issues not previously addressed to raise their hand to indicate desire to speak to the Board. There being no hands raised, Mr. Derting declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Ingle highlighted and noted his agreement with many comments made in opposition. He expressed his concerns:

- County could not enforce private restrictions on land use.
- The restrictions and covenants could be changed or eliminated by landowners.
- The property under discussion is one-sixtieth of the County's entire landmass, which makes this proposal unique from any others considered by the Planning Commission and worth very close attention by the Board.
- The fact that the private road would not be served by school bus, postal delivery or public snowplow is not good for potential residents.
- The soil and bedrock in the area is not suitable for use as a residential road based on information from the County Geographical Information System database and consultation with an expert.
- Public interest is in protecting mountains and green space and the property under discussion has unique characteristics such as Crevices, that should not be threatened with development.

- He expressed strong concern for safety and welfare of potential residents based on difficulty of road maintenance, grade and nature of terrain, difficult access for emergency vehicles, and general unsuitability for proposed development.

Mr. McCall said that because this request is for a withholding of a private road that the County would have no control over what happens with the land. He explained that if it were a special use permit request, the County would be able to place conditions on allowed use of land.

Mr. Derting commented in support of private property owners' rights to use land. He pointed out that the issue to be decided is a request to withhold a street from public dedication. He further stated that it has been his experience that it is generally a mistake to allow the withholding of a road from public dedication because eventually residents will want their children to have school bus service, they will want mail service and fire protection to name a few services not provided on a private road. He stated that the landowner and developer should pay the cost of developing the road to meet state standards. He noted the remote nature of the property as an additional consideration relative to infrastructure required for residential use and that residential development should occur where the infrastructure already exists.

Mr. Derting said that in the comments of the public hearing it was alluded to that the Planning Commission had never denied a request to withhold a street from public dedication. He wanted to clarify that the Planning Commission has never before had a request regarding a property as large as the 5,000 acres of public land now being considered.

Mr. Derting commented that there are counties in Virginia that have no roads withheld from public dedication and that they require all roads be built to State standards. Mr. Derting commented that one of the real challenges for the Board on planning and zoning issues is to project what the best decisions may be for development in the future. He stated one of the purposes of the CR zoning district was to prevent indiscriminant development and protect geographically sensitive land. Mr. Derting explained that the Board has done its homework and is prepared to make the best decision for the citizens of Washington County.

Mrs. Mumpower stated that she has personally experienced the challenges of living on a private road. She said that 25 years ago she purchased land where the road was not maintained by the State. Years later the road became impossible for the residents to travel to their homes. The residents had to pay thousands of dollars out their pockets to have the road properly developed.

***On motion of Mr. Ingle, second by Mrs. Mumpower, it was resolved to affirm the determination of the Planning Commission and deny the application submitted by Edwards Wood Products, Inc. to withhold from public dedication an eighteen foot right-of-way (Casey Hollow Road) beginning at the intersection of State Route 689 and running in a northerly direction 14,520 linear feet for purposes of approval of a proposed subdivision of the property as required by the County Code, Chapter 54; Article IV. Withholding of Streets from Public Dedication for reasons as stated in opposition to the application in the public hearing and comments by members of the Board of Supervisors.***

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

<b><i>Mr. Derting</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Barker</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Ingle</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. McCall</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mrs. Mumpower</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Rector</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Roberts</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>

7. Recess

*On motion of Mr. Barker, second by Mrs. Mumpwer it was resolved to take a ten-minute recess.*

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

<i>Mr. Derting</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Barker</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

6 Consideration of Resolution Concerning Proposed Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Proposal to be Submitted to the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development for the Gladeview Subdivision Project.

Ms. Angie McCall representing People, Inc. provided a status report on the proposed Gladeview Subdivision Project. She reported that the Glade Spring Town Council voted to maintain the subdivision's streets, but had requested that another access road be added to the project.

*On motion of Mr. Rector, second by Mr. Barker, it was resolved to adopt the following resolution:*

**RESOLUTION 2002-07**

**AUTHORIZING APPLICATION FOR VIRGINIA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDS FOR THE WASHINGTON COUNTY AFFORDABLE BUILDING SITES - GLADEVIEW SUBDIVISION PROJECT**

*WHEREAS, Washington County in coordination with People, Incorporated of Southwest Virginia have developed and propose to undertake the Washington County Affordable Building Sites - Gladeview Subdivision Project (the Project), and*

*WHEREAS, the Project proposes to develop 22 home sites in a residential subdivision setting available for purchase by low- to moderate-income families, resulting in the construction of 22 new homes for qualifying families within the Gladeview Subdivision, and*

*WHEREAS, Washington County wishes to apply for a Virginia Community Development Block Grant (VCDBG) from the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development in the amount of \$626,150 for the purpose of final design and construction of the Project as more specifically set forth in the Application for VCDBG funding, and*

*WHEREAS, the total Project cost as set forth in the Application for VCDBG funding is \$2,360,850;*

*NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Virginia that the County authorizes the application for VCDBG funds in the amount of \$626,150 for the Project.*

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County has conducted the two required public hearings meeting the public notice requirements of the VCDBG program.*

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Project as set forth in the Application will meet the National Objective of providing benefit to persons and households of low- to moderate-income.***

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors authorizes its Chief Administrative Officer, County Administrator Mark K. Reeter, to execute all documents required for the submittal of this VCDBG Application.***

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

<b><i>Mr. Derting</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Barker</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Ingle</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. McCall</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mrs. Mumpower</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Rector</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Roberts</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>

## **8 Consideration of Request for Financial Assistance to Attend the 2002 Global Young Leaders Conference**

Mr. Mark Reeter, County Administrator, reported that pursuant to discussion at the March 12, 2002, Board meeting his office had contacted the other high schools in Washington County and there were no other Global Scholar nominees.

***On motion of Mr. McCall, second by Mr. Ingle, it was resolved to appropriate \$1,100.00 from Reserves for Contingency to Nicole Cartier for the purposes of assisting with the tuition and expenses to attend the 2002 Global Young Leaders Conference.***

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

<b><i>Mr. Derting</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Barker</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Ingle</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. McCall</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mrs. Mumpower</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Rector</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Roberts</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>

At this point, Mr. Reeter informed the Board that he had discovered the following item had been inadvertently omitted from the Agenda:

## **9 Utility Tax Refunds**

***On motion of Mr. Roberts, second by Mr. Barker, it was resolved to approve refunds for taxpayers that have applied for and met the qualifications for the local utility tax refund.***

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

<b><i>Mr. Derting</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Barker</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Ingle</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. McCall</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mrs. Mumpower</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>

*Mr. Rector*                      *Aye*  
*Mr. Roberts*                    *Aye*

**10      Consideration of Requests to Virginia Department of Transportation:**

**a.      FY 2003 Virginia Department of Transportation Revenue Sharing Request**

Ms. Christianne Parker, Assistant County Administrator, addressed the Board explaining the Virginia Department of Transportation's (VDOT) "Revenue Sharing Program. She said that under this program, the state would provide funds up to \$500,000 to match local funds for the construction, maintenance or improvement of primary and secondary highways. Ms. Parker stated that Mr. Steve Buston, Resident Engineer for the local VDOT office had suggested requesting \$500,000 of revenue sharing money for the proposed State Route 1717 Relocation Project. Ms. Parker said this would provide a total of one million dollars for the project.

*On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. Ingle, it was resolved for Washington County to participate in the Virginia Department of Transportation's Revenue Sharing Program for Fiscal Year 2002-03. It was further resolved to authorize the appropriate County staff to prepare the necessary correspondence to request \$500,000 of revenue sharing funds to be used for the proposed State Route 1717 Relocation Project.*

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

*Mr. Derting*                      *Aye*  
*Mr. Barker*                      *Aye*  
*Mr. Ingle*                         *Aye*  
*Mr. McCall*                     *Aye*  
*Mrs. Mumpower*              *Aye*  
*Mr. Rector*                      *Aye*  
*Mr. Roberts*                    *Aye*

**b.      Recommendation of Transportation Advisory Board Concerning FY 2003 Interstate and Primary Highway Improvements**

Ms. Parker addressed the Board explaining that the Washington County Transportation Advisory Board met with VDOT representatives and Mark Reeter to discuss the development of the list of Primary, Urban and Interstate Projects that it recommends be presented to the Commonwealth Transportation Board. Ms. Parker further explained that the list of projects had been the same for the last five years and none had received funding.

The Transportation Advisory Board recommends that the same list of projects again be presented for Fiscal Year 2002-03, as last year with one additional request of funding for improvements to State Route 725. The Commonwealth Transportation Board is scheduled to hear requests for the Bristol District on April 4 at the Southwest Virginia Higher Education Center.

*On motion of Mr. Ingle, second by Mr. Roberts, it was resolved to accept the Transportation Advisory Board's recommendation to submit the same list of projects for Fiscal Year 2002-03 as last year with the addition of improvements to State Route 725.*

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

*Mr. Derting*                      *Aye*  
*Mr. Barker*                      *Aye*  
*Mr. Ingle*                         *Aye*  
*Mr. McCall*                     *Aye*

*Mrs. Mumpower*        *Aye*  
*Mr. Rector*            *Aye*  
*Mr. Roberts*          *Aye*

**Scribner's Note:** A copy of the letter to Secretary of Transportation Whittington Clement conveying Washington County's requests for interstate and primary highway improvements is included as Minutes Exhibits 03-26-02-A

**11        Consideration of Parade Permit for Greenfield Baptist Church**

*On motion of Mr. Rector, seconded by Mr. Roberts, it was resolved to approve the parade permit for Greenfield Baptist Church for an Easter celebration on March 29, 2002.*

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

*Mr. Derting*            *Aye*  
*Mr. Barker*            *Aye*  
*Mr. Ingle*              *Aye*  
*Mr. McCall*            *Aye*  
*Mrs. Mumpower*       *Aye*  
*Mr. Rector*            *Aye*  
*Mr. Roberts*          *Aye*

**12        Consideration of Resolution Confirming Declaration of Local Emergency**

Mr. Reeter explained to the Board that in his capacity as Director of Emergency Services that he had taken action to declare a state of emergency due to the flooding that had occurred last week. He further explained that the law requires the local governing body to take formal action within 14 days of the declaration.

*On motion of Mr. Roberts, second by Mr. Barker, it was resolved to adopt the following resolution:*

***RESOLUTION 2002-08***

***CONFIRMING DECLARATION OF STATE OF LOCAL EMERGENCY  
AS OF MARCH 18, 2002***

***WHEREAS, due to the flood event experienced throughout Southwest Virginia beginning March 18, 2002 Washington County faced a condition of extreme peril to the lives, safety and property of the citizens of the County, and***

***WHEREAS, that as a result of this peril, the County Director of Emergency Services declared a state of local emergency for Washington County beginning 12:01 AM March 18, 2002, and***

***WHEREAS, pursuant to §44-146.21 (a) of the 1950 Code of Virginia, the governing body of Washington County must confirm the declaration of local emergency within fourteen days of the declaration;***

***NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Virginia that it hereby confirms the declaration of the state of emergency by the County Director of Emergency Services.***

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

<b><i>Mr. Derting</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Barker</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Ingle</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. McCall</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mrs. Mumpower</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Rector</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Roberts</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>

### **13 Consideration of Renewing Employee Health Insurance with the Local Choice Program**

The Joint County Employee Health Insurance Committee during the last several months worked with Akridge Insurance Services to review health insurance coverage for County employees. As a result of this work, the Committee recommended renewing the Local Choice Program with the Key Advantage and Cost Alliance Plans.

Based on the recommendation of the Joint County Employee Health Insurance Committee the following action was taken:

***On motion of Mr. Rector, second by Mrs. Mumpower, it was resolved to recommend to the Washington County School Board to renew the employee health insurance plan with the Local Choice Program - Key Advantage and Cost Alliance Insurance Plans for FY 2002-03.***

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

<b><i>Mr. Derting</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Barker</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Ingle</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. McCall</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mrs. Mumpower</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Rector</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>
<b><i>Mr. Roberts</i></b>	<b><i>Aye</i></b>

### **14 County Administrator Reports**

Mr. Mark Reeter, County Administrator, informed the Board that the last community input meeting for the Comprehensive Plan will be held April 4, 2002, at 7:00 PM at Abingdon High School.

Mr. Reeter reported that the Planning Commission held a public hearing on March 25, 2002, to receive comments on the Southwest Virginia Regional Jail proposal. The Planning Commission acted to find the proposal consistent with the Washington County Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Reeter stated that the Board had been provided with a letter from Fred Crowell, County Planner, outlining the actions of the Planning Commission.

**15 County Attorney Reports**

There were no County Attorney reports.

**16 Consent Agenda**

There were no Consent Agenda items.

**17 Board Member Reports**

Mr. Ingle requested that the County temporarily provide ten cots and blankets to the Clinch Mountain Fire Department to be used should the fire department need to be utilized as an emergency shelter due to the recent flooding. It was consensus of the Board to approve the request.

Mr. Barker requested plaques be made to recognize several members of the Mendota Community Association for their efforts during the recent flood. The individuals are:

- Howard and Vivian Clark
- Kim Sproles
- Shannon Nunley
- Steve Rachael, Goodson Kinderhook Fire Department

**18 Adjourn**

*On motion of Mr. Rector, second by Mr. McCall, it was resolved to adjourn the meeting.*

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

<i>Mr. Derting</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Barker</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

\*\*\*\*\*

**Prepared by:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Naoma A. Cook, Recording Clerk

**Approved by the Washington County Board of Supervisors:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joe W. Derting, Chairman