

**VIRGINIA:**

At a joint recessed meeting of the Washington County Board of Supervisors and Washington County Planning Commission held Tuesday, October 16, 2007, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Administration Building in Abingdon, Virginia the following were present:

**PRESENT:**

**Board of Supervisors:**

Kenneth O. Reynolds, Chairman  
Jack R. McCrady, Jr., Vice Chairman  
Phillip B. McCall  
Dulcie M. Mumpower  
Odell Owens  
Paul O. Price

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

**Planning Commission:**

Dr. Stephen L. Fisher, Chairman  
Joe H. Hutton, Vice Chairman  
Bill S. Canter, Jr.  
Dr. John Lentz  
Phillip L. McCroskey, Sr.  
Jack C. Phelps, Jr.  
Mickey E. Tyler

**ABSENT:**

**Board of Supervisors:**

Anthony S. Rector

\*\*\*\*\*

**1. Call to Order**

**Board of Supervisors:**

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Kenneth Reynolds, Chairman of the Board.

**Planning Commission:**

Dr. Stephen Fisher called the Planning Commission to order.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

**Board of Supervisors:**

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

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

<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>

**Industrial Development Authority:**

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

<i>Mr. Canter</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Dr. Fisher</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Hutton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Dr. Lentz</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCroskey</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Phelps</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Tyler</i>	<i>Aye</i>

- 3. Joint Public Hearing and Consideration of Ordinances: (1) to Amend Sections 66-1, 66-472, and 66-473 of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia, to Require Special Exception Permits for New General Advertisement Signs in the Business-General (B-2) Zoning District of the County; and**
- (2) to Amend Sections 66-1, 66-472, and 66-473 of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia to Prohibit New General Advertisement Signs in the Business-General (B-2) Zoning District of the County**

Ms. Phillips reviewed with the attendees the materials provided to them related to the proposed ordinances. She advised that two applications for signs were received by the County Zoning Office today, in addition to the eighteen applications currently pending with the County and shown on maps provided to the attendees. Ms. Phillips distributed a map showing the locations for the two new sign applications. Mrs. Freeman reviewed this map explaining that the two new applications are for signs to be installed on Route 19 near Food Country, and on Old Jonesboro Road (SR 647) adjacent to Westwood Subdivision. Ms. Phillips explained that the current provisions of the County Zoning Ordinance allow all types of signs in a B-2 Zoning District. Ms. Phillips stated that the B-2 Zoning District is presently the only district

where location and general advertising signs are permitted as a use by right. She explained that the ordinances were prepared at the direction of the Board of Supervisors after consideration of the County Land Use Ordinance Committee's recommendation. Ms. Phillips said that an unusually large number of applications had been filed by one entity and that occurrence inspired discussion by the Committee.

Mr. Price inquired if the pending applications for signs would be reviewed under the current County Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Phillips explained that should the Board adopt one of the proposed ordinances, the Board would have the option to have the newly adopted ordinance control review of pending applications. Mr. Price asked if applications for signs other than those submitted by "Hey You!" had been received and approved by the County. Ms. Freeman stated that no sign applications had been approved by the County in the time period after the first six "Hey You!" applications were filed.

Ms. Phillips presented a thorough review of the first ordinance. The ordinance proposed that applications for placement of signs proposed falling under the category of location and general advertising signs would be permitted only if approved for issuance of a special exception permit. Ms. Phillips explained that the significant change from the current regulation is that current provisions allow for identification, location, business and general advertising signs as an "allowed by right" use. Under the proposed ordinance, applicants for location and general advertising signs would have to apply for special exception permits, which require public hearings before the Planning Commission for recommendation and the Board of Supervisors for action on the Special Exception Permit request.

Ms. Phillips explained that the second ordinance being proposed includes the same definitions and preamble. The purpose of the second proposed ordinance would be to disallow location and general advertising as permitted uses in the B-2 Zoning District.

Ms. Phillips explained that the two ordinances are mutually exclusive. If the Board chooses to adopt one of the two ordinances, then it cannot adopt the other one. If the Board chooses not to adopt either ordinance, then the current allowance of location and general advertisement signs as permitted by right use in the B-2 Zoning District would continue.

Ms. Phillips addressed signage regulations of other localities in Virginia. She explained that the Town of Abingdon prohibits general advertisement signs. Hanover, Loudon, and Montgomery Counties have extensive signage restrictions and the City of Virginia Beach completely prohibits general advertisement signs. City of Lynchburg has very strict signage regulations. Further, Ms. Phillips reviewed excerpts from the Virginia Code and Virginia Administrative Code concerning regulation by the Commonwealth of outdoor advertising. These regulations do not pre-empt the County from distinguishing where signs can be placed in the County through zoning regulation.

Mr. Price asked if VDOT must approve a sign application before the County can grant their approval. Ms. Phillips explained that sign applications have to be approved first by the County before they are submitted to VDOT. Also, the Virginia Highlands Airport must give overlay protection approval on signs. Mr. Price questioned whether the VDOT review would satisfy the need for consideration of driving safety issues relative to sign placement. Ms. Phillips responded that the County's review, based on zoning regulation, was not limited to safety issues but would also address other concerns, such as aesthetics and compatibility with other proximate uses.

a. Joint Public Hearing on Both Proposed Ordinances

Dr. Fisher opened the public hearing to receive comments both in support of and in opposition to the proposed ordinances.

Mr. Bill Roop, President, Hey! Outdoor Billboards made a presentation. The following is an overview of Mr. Roop's presentation:

- Mr. Roop addressed some comments made by Ms. Phillips. He explained that Virginia Code allows for digital and LED signs with a minimum of a four second flash. There can be scrolling words and letters, but no pictures are permitted. Further explaining the comment made that the Town of Abingdon does not permit signs, Mr. Roop stated that Food City located on Cummings Street in Abingdon was given a special exception permit by the Town of Abingdon for an LED sign because Food City offered the use of the sign for public safety in case of an emergency.
- Mr. Roop explained that signage in a B-2 Zoning District is a right based on the County's current Zoning Ordinance. He cited certain parts of the Virginia Code that speaks to outdoor advertising. Virginia Code Section 33.1-356 requires that all outdoor advertisers have a license. Mr. Roop stated that he has his license for calendar year 2007. Virginia Code Section 33.1-360 requires permits for signs. Virginia Code Section 33.1-368 requires that advertising structures display an identification number furnished by the Commission of Outdoor Advertising and have the company name.
- Mr. Roop reviewed VDOT's rules and regulations for outdoor advertising. He explained that sign sizes are a maximum of 1200 square feet (face) a maximum height of 25 feet (face) and a maximum length of 60 feet (face). Double face structures will be permitted with the maximum area being allowed for each facing. The spacing of signs is to be no less than 300 feet from another sign. Mr. Roop discussed the Certified Comprehensive Zoning.
- Mr. Roop explained that it is not his intent to be adversarial with the County and that he brings these points out only for Board consideration. He explained that he approached VDOT about his sign business and was provided with some excellent locations for signs. Mr. Roop further explained that several other points to keep in mind is that that VDOT rules for signage must meet current zoning codes, outdoor signs are allowed only in a B-2 Zoning District and no signs are allowed on a designated scenic highway. Further trees on a State right-of-way may not be cut without a permit from the State, which they will not issue for a live tree. This eliminates a lot of land from being used for signs because a sign will not be installed in a location where there is not proper viewing by traffic.
- Mr. Roop stated that LaMar Advertising has signs in the County and they have generally been accepted.
- Mr. Roop mentioned a comment by City of Bristol Mayor Jim Rector which stated that Bristol needs business to be on equal footing with Washington County as it has no restrictions on signage. This shows that signage is needed.

- Mr. Roop explained that his last point for consideration is that signage brings income to property owners, therefore, the property owners will spend more money in the County. Mr. Roop stated that he hires people in the County and is a resident of the County.
- Mr. Roop noted that he has followed all rules required in preparing and submitting his applications for signs. He has met with County staff concerning signage regulations and building codes. Further he has met with VDOT staff and with Bristol Virginia Utilities and American Electric Power. The applications were approved by the Virginia Highlands Airport for overlay protection. Mr. Roop stated that he submitted his applications prior to these ordinances being considered and asserted because of this fact they have to be approved. He further asserted that he is protected and if need be will go through other means for approval of his sign applications. Mr. Roop stated if both Boards wish to amend the County Zoning Ordinance relating to signs from this point forward it is their prerogative.

Dr. Fisher asked if there were questions.

Dr. Lentz asked Mr. Roop to summarize his position on the proposed ordinances.

Mr. Roop explained that if the County would like to change their Zoning Code to ban signs or to require special exception permits from this point forward that he is not arguing that point. What he is saying is from this meeting prior that he has met all rules regarding to signage and has obtained contracts for the signs. Mr. Roop further explained that he would have a financial loss if the contracts are held up. He stated that the County Zoning staff has been good to work with. However, if there were problems with his applications he should have been told.

Discussion ensued concerning the proposed ordinances and if adopted tonight could the new regulations apply to the pending signage applications. Mr. Roop asserted that Ms. Phillips indicated the ordinance could be back dated.

Ms. Phillips explained that if one of the proposed ordinances is adopted tonight that the ordinance would be effective immediately. Pending applications could be considered based on the newly adopted ordinance.

Mr. McCroskey asked Mr. Roop how long he had been a resident of the County. Mr. Roop replied that he had been a resident since June of this year. Prior to that time he resided in Chicago. He further stated that he is doing the signs to supplement his retirement income.

Mr. Owens asked Mr. Roop how many contacts or leases have been obtained for signs. Mr. Roop explained that he has contracts and leases for all signage applications that have been turned into the County Zoning Office. The leases have been signed and notarized. In addition the applications turned into VDOT have been signed and notarized.

Mr. Tyler asked Mr. Roop if he had a preference regarding the proposed ordinances. Mr. Tyler explained that the Planning Commission is considering the affect of signage on all citizens of the County. Mr. Roop stated that from this point forward he has no objections to the proposed ordinances. His only concern is in regards to the signage applications he has turned in to date. Mr. Roop explained that Mrs. Freeman had told him that signage issues were going to be addressed by the County. He further explained that he suggested to Mrs. Freeman that there should be a permit fee, and if he did not have the best interest of the County in mind he would not have suggested a permit fee.

Mrs. Mumpower inquired about how many residential properties along Highway 11 will have signs or will be affected by the signs. Mr. Roop explained that The Smith's were the only residential property owners. The other properties where the signs would be installed are business properties and there are no homes adjacent to these properties.

Mr. McCrady stated that it would be advantageous and he supports the prohibition of signs from this point forward. He explained that once the skyline is gone you can never get it back.

Mr. Price asked Mr. Roop to clarify his statement about there not being a permit fee. Mr. Roop explained that there is not a permit fee for signs. Mrs. Freeman explained that there is a fee charged for a building permit and a fee for an electrical permit for the lighted signs.

Mr. Price asked for clarification that there were no applications for signs approved in the last 90 days.

Mr. Roop replied that two signs were approved for RC Storage. Mrs. Freeman stated this is the reason she earlier said she would have to check the records. Ms. Freeman confirmed that the RC Storage applications were approved prior to Mr. Roop turning in his applications.

Mr. Reynolds explained that in summarizing the way things have been presented that he wonders if Mr. Roop had for example only submitted three applications for signs if the proposed ordinances would be considered at this time. He further explained that he believes things have been accelerated with the proposed ordinances because of the number of applications Mr. Roop has submitted to the County. It appears that Mr. Roop's applications are legal and that he has followed the regulations. Further, he has obtained approval from American Electric Power.

There being no further comments, Dr. Fisher declared the public hearing closed.

At this time discussions ensued among the Planning Commission.

Mr. Hutton addressed remarks made by Mr. Reynolds. He explained if the County had received only a few applications that the Board and Planning Commission may not be asked at this point to consider the proposed ordinances. However, the issue of signs needs to be addressed.

Mr. McCrady explained that over a year ago the issue of amending the signage regulations was discussed in the Joint Land Use Steering Committee. He further explained that tourists visit Washington County for its scenic beauty. To take away from the scenic beauty by the placement of billboards is not good. Mr. McCrady stated that he could understand the monetary benefits to property owners that receive lease payments for the billboards and that in some instances the landowners can benefit from land that would otherwise not be usable.

Ms. Phillips addressed issues concerning the pending signage applications for Mr. Roop. She explained that she determined through research the pending applications could be reviewed according to any action the Board may take tonight. Ms. Phillips further explained that she would continue to research the issue for a definitive answer. However, research to-date shows that any regulations that may be adopted tonight could apply to pending applications. Alternatively, she explained that the Board could direct that pending applications be decided based on the law in place prior to adoption of the new ordinance. Ms. Phillips stated that the question before the Board is consideration of the proposed ordinances and not on Mr. Roop's pending applications.

Mr. Tyler explained that he is member of the Joint Land Use Steering Committee. Signage regulations were discussed sometime back. At the time the discussions were held, the Steering Committee was led by a full time County Planner that is no longer here. The departure of the County Planner has slowed the process of amending signage regulations. He stated that Mr. Roop made a good presentation and that he respected his right to earn a living. Mr. Tyler explained that he has been taught in making decisions concerning planning and zoning matters not to consider financial gain or loss. The Planning Commission must represent all citizens of the County.

Mr. Price stated that he would like to go on record opposing ordinances that restrict a person's right to use their property. Each time the County adopts an ordinance regarding land use it imposes upon property owners restrictions and hinders a landowner's ability to earn money. Mr. Price commented about how the Town of Abingdon's sign ordinance is causing a hardship on realtors. He further commented that he does not believe the County can deny the applications for signs that have already been submitted.

Mr. McCall commented that he is a member of the Joint Land Use Steering Committee and that signage issues have been reviewed. He stated that the number of sign applications submitted to the County is the reason for the two ordinances being proposed at this time. Mr. McCall explained that signage regulations in the B-2 Zoning District need to be reviewed and that the size of the signs needs to be addressed. He made reference to the map showing the location of the proposed signs and the signs appear to be large in size. VDOT regulations states that signs can be no less than 300 feet apart. Mr. McCall stated that the County could control the distancing requirement.

Mr. Owens inquired about the location of the proposed LED signs. Mr. Roop explained two of the signs would be installed in front of Target on US Highway 11 and the third sign would be installed on Route 19 near the American Electric Power substation. The signs will be 300 feet apart and on separate properties.

Ms. Phillips explained that the proposed ordinances could be amended to provide direction as to whether the pending applications shall be reviewed under the County's current zoning ordinance pertaining to signs or under the newly adopted ordinance.

Dr. Lentz explained that the County is rapidly growing and that the Planning Commission has to address the direction they would like the County to go in the future. He stated that Mr. Roop has justifiable issues; however the County must deal with the signage issues. He encouraged the Commission to consider the future of Washington County and how they would like the County to look 20 or 30 years down the road.

b. Consideration of Recommendations on Ordinances by Washington County Planning Commission

Dr. Fisher reviewed the actions being requested by the Planning Commission regarding the proposed ordinances. The Planning Commission can consider one of the following recommendations:

1. The Planning Commission could take no action.
2. Recommend adoption of the ordinance that location and general advertising signs in the B-2 Zoning Districts are subject to special exception permits.
3. Recommend adoption of the ordinance prohibiting location and general advertising signs in B-2 zoning districts.
4. Make a recommendation if the pending sign applications should be reviewed under the County's current zoning ordinance pertaining to signs.

Dr. Fisher stated that the final action will be taken by the Board of Supervisors.

Further discussions ensued among the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. The following action was taken by the Planning Commission:

*On motion of Dr. Lentz, second by Mr. Canter, the Planning Commission acted to recommend the adoption of an ordinance to prohibit any new general advertising and location signs in the B-2 Zoning Districts.*

<i>Mr. Canter</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Dr. Fisher</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Hutton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Dr. Lentz</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCroskey</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Phelps</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Tyler</i>	<i>Nay</i>

*At this time a motion was made by Mr. Tyler, second by Mr. Phipps to adjourn the meeting of the Planning Commission.*

<i>Mr. Canter</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Dr. Fisher</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Hutton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Dr. Lentz</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCroskey</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Phelps</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Tyler</i>	<i>Aye</i>

*On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. McCall, the Board acted to take a five minute recess.*

<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>

c. Consideration of Adoption of Ordinances by Washington County Board of Supervisors

At this time, Mr. Reynolds asked the Board to consider the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

A motion was made by Mr. Price to approve the applications for signs already submitted to the County and to table action on the proposed ordinances for further review.

Ms. Phillips asked for a clarification to the motion presented by Mr. Price.

Mr. Price amended his motion to state that the current sign applications be reviewed under the current County zoning ordinance and to table action on the proposed ordinances to allow time to study all of the issues. Discussions ensued among the Board concerning the motion.

Mr. Price offered a second amended motion to adopt the ordinance pertaining to the special exception permit and that the ordinance be amended to say that the current pending applications shall be reviewed under the County's current zoning ordinance. There was no second offered to the motion; therefore, the motion dies.

A motion was introduced by Mr. McCrady to prohibit all general advertising and location signs in B-2 Zoning Districts. No second was offered to the motion; therefore, the motion dies.

Mr. McCall made a motion to adopt the ordinance requiring special exception permits for location and general advertising signs in B-2 Zoning Districts, that no new applications for signs shall be accepted until the Joint County Land Use Steering Committee has reviewed the regulations to determine size of the signs and to consider language to keep signs from being visible from other zoning districts, a second was made by Mr. Owens.

Mr. McCrady offered a substitute motion to place a temporary moratorium on approving signs including the pending applications for signs in order to obtain a recommendation from the County Joint Land Use Steering Committee or a special committee should the Board decide to establish one to draft a recommendation to be presented to the Board within 60 days, a second was made by Mrs. Mumpower.

Mrs. Mumpower explained that it is obvious that the Board is not ready to make a decision about signage regulations and that more time is needed to review the issues. She further explained that she does not want Mr. Roop think the County is trying to "railroad" him. Mrs. Mumpower stated that Mr. McCrady's motion is reasonable.

Mr. McCrady stated that he would remove himself if need be from the County's Joint Land Use Steering Committee.

Mr. Reynolds inquired if Mr. McCrady's motion was approved could the County comply with the 90 day required review period on the pending sign applications. Ms. Phillips explained that State law requires zoning determination within 90 days. If the 90 day period is exceeded then the applicants can go to circuit court to ask that a determination be made.

Mr. Reeter provided a review of the work on signage regulations that was done by the Joint Land Use Steering Committee. He explained that the County Planner left after writing revisions to the B-1 and B-2 Zoning Districts, and the recommendations on signs were not completed. Mr. Reeter further explained that as he recalls the plan was that rewrites to the other zoning districts would be completed and then if needed the supplemental regulations on signage may be changed before anything was presented to the Planning Commission and Board. He stated that he could take a look at the work that was done prior to the County Planner leaving to determine if a recommendation for signage regulations could be made from that work. Mr. Reeter further stated that he is concerned that the Joint Land Use Steering Committee could not have a recommendation in 60 days given the fact that the holidays are rapidly approaching.

Ms. Phillips asked to clarify the motion made by Mr. McCall. She explained that as she understands the motion has three parts: the first part would be to adopt the ordinance requiring special exception permits; the second part is that any pending sign applications be considered by the County Administrator, County

Attorney and reviewed according to State law; the third part is that no further applications would be accepted until the Joint Land Use Steering Committee had reviewed the regulations. Ms. Phillips recommended eliminating the third part of the motion because it essentially prohibits any new zoning applications and by approving the special exception permit ordinance the Board would have the opportunity to review sign applications.

After further discussions the following motions were considered by the Board:

*Mr. McCrady offered a substitute motion to place a temporary moratorium on approving signs including the pending applications for signs in order to obtain a recommendation from the County Joint Land Use Steering Committee or a special committee should the Board decide to establish one to draft a recommendation to be presented to the Board within 60 days, a second was made by Mrs. Mumpower.*

*The vote on this motion was as follows (3-3):*

<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>Nay</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Nay</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Nay</i>

The motion failed.

*Mr. McCall made a motion to adopt the ordinance requiring special exception permits for location and general advertising signs in B-2 Zoning Districts, that no new applications for signs shall be accepted until the Joint County Land Use Steering Committee has reviewed the regulations to determine size of the signs and to consider language to keep signs from being visible from other zoning districts, a second was made by Mr. Owens.*

*The vote on this motion was as follows (3-3):*

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

The motion failed.

Mr. McCall inquired if the pending sign applications would automatically be approved if they were not reviewed by the County in 90 days. Ms. Phillips explained that the issue would go to Circuit Court.

Mr. Roop addressed the Board explaining that he does not want to be confrontational with the County and further that he does not want to loose money. He asserted that he would take the issue to court. Mr. Roop offered for Board consideration that a contract be drawn up stating that no further applications would be submitted to the County and that the size of the signs be no larger than 14, X 25'. He stated that the

contract could be drawn up by the County Attorney and reviewed by his attorney. Mr. Roop noted that a representative from Lamar Advertising was present.

Mr. Buddy Sheer representing Lamar Advertising made comments to the Board concerning outdoor advertising.

After continued discussions among the Board, the following action was taken:

*On motion of Mr. Owens, second by Mr. Price, the Board acted to table further action on the proposed ordinances and that the pending sign applications shall be considered under the present County Zoning Ordinance.*

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

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

**6. Consideration of Authorization for Sale of Surplus County Property**

*On motion of Mr. Price, second by Mr. McCall, the Board acted to declare County property surplus and authorize its sale at auction.*

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

<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>

**7. Adjourn – Board of Supervisors**

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

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

<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>

\*\*\*\*\*

**Prepared by:**

---

Naoma A. Mullins, Recording Clerk

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

---

Kenneth O. Reynolds, Chairman