

VIRGINIA:

At a regular meeting of the Washington County Board of Supervisors held Tuesday, February 10, 2009, 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
- 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 Phillip McCall gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Agenda

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

Addition of New Item 6.a.3.

Consideration of Architect and Engineer Reports Concerning Former Robert E. Lee Motel Property

Move 6.b. - Presentation by Bristol Virginia Utilities to a new Item 5.c.

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*

4. Consent Agenda

a. Approval of Minutes:

1. **January 13, 2009 Annual Meeting**
2. **January 27, 2009 Regular Meeting**

b. Approval of Routine Financial Matters:

1. **Payment of Bills, January 2009**
2. **Request for Revenue Refunds – Washington County Sheriff’s Office – Animal Sterilization Fees**
3. **Request for Supplemental Appropriation – Washington County Sheriff’s Office Highway Safety Grant**
4. **Request for Supplemental Appropriation – Tax Revenue Sharing Distribution**
5. **Transfer from Reserve for Contingencies – County Reassessment Project**
6. **Budget Status Reports – January 31, 2009**

c. Award of Bids and Approval of Contracts

d. Authorization of Routine Business Matters:

1. **Approval of Records Destruction, Washington County Park Authority**

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*

5. Public Hearings:

a. **Public Hearing and Consideration of Adoption of an Ordinance to Amend Chapter 58, Subsections 58-86, 58-281, and 58-282, of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia to Establish Semi-annual Collection of Local Taxes and to Amend the Due Dates for Collection of Real Property Taxes and Personal Property Taxes**

Ms. Phillips explained that the ordinance came before the Board in draft form for initial review last fall. The proposed ordinance would establish semi-annual collection of real property taxes with a due date of May 20 and November 20 of each year. If adopted, the ordinance would become effective January 1, 2010. The collection of personal property taxes will continue to be collected on an annual basis and will be due on November 20, the same date as the second payment of real property taxes.

Mr. Reynolds opened the public hearing and invited comments in regards to the proposed ordinance.

- Mr. Lewis Loflin addressed the Board speaking in favor of the proposed ordinance.

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

Lengthy discussions ensued among the Board.

Mr. Taylor questioned the rationale behind the proposed ordinance specifically relating to how the costs of the billing service would be paid. County Treasurer Fred Parker explained that if the Board adopts the proposed ordinance the real estate tax rate must be set by the Board in the early part of March each year so the Commissioner of Revenue can get the real estate tax books printed. It currently takes the Treasurer's Office a month to get one tax billing prepared for mail. Semi-annual collection of real property taxes will require that the Treasurer's Office hire a firm to handle the tax billing. A billing firm could get the tax bills mailed in three days. The cost of the billing service will in part be paid from the interest earned on the first installment of tax revenue. There will also be savings realized by the Treasurer's Office for the costs of supplies and postage, which will also help pay the costs of the billing service. Overall, the interest earned should cover most of the costs of the billing service for the two billings per year that will be required.

Mr. Price inquired if the costs for the billing service were known. Mr. Parker explained that the cost for the billing of the first installment of taxes is estimated to be around \$15,000.00 and the billing for the second installment should be between \$30,000.00 and \$35,000.00. Currently, the cost to the Treasurer's Office for one billing is around \$15,000.00, which includes the costs for printing, supplies, postage and labor of the staff. Mr. Price asked exactly when the tax rate would need to be set by the Board. Mr. Parker replied that the tax rate needs to be set by the third week in March of each year. He stated that this is what other localities with semi-annual collection of real property taxes are doing.

Mr. McCall asked Mr. Parker if the Treasurer's Office would need additional staff. Mr. Parker explained that it is possible that one additional staff person would be needed. If this is the case, a person would be hired in January 2010, if the position is approved. Discussions ensued among the Board concerning the salary of a new position and how that salary would be paid.

Mrs. Mumpower stated that she has received many requests from citizens of the County to have the collection date for taxes moved, and that she believes the change to semi-annual collection of real property taxes would be acceptable to the citizens of the County.

Mr. Price said that by implementing semi-annual collection of real property taxes, the County will be making it mandatory for the taxpayer to pay taxes early, which is something the taxpayer can already do voluntarily. He suggested that instead of doing this, it would be better to encourage taxpayers to voluntarily take advantage of the monthly payment plan. Mr. Price stated that he had previously proposed that the due date for taxes be set for November 20 in order to get away from the Christmas holiday shopping season and also not be so close to the Town of Abingdon's due date for taxes. He proposed that a grace period be given to taxpayers during the first year. Otherwise, there could be hardships for some taxpayers. Mr. Price said he does not see how the change to semi-annual collection of real property taxes would benefit the taxpayer.

After further discussions, the following action was taken:

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

**AN ORDINANCE
TO AMEND CHAPTER 58, SUBSECTIONS 58-86, 58-281,
AND 58-282, OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON, VIRGINIA,
TO ESTABLISH SEMI-ANNUAL COLLECTION OF LOCAL TAXES AND TO AMEND THE DUE
DATES FOR COLLECTION OF REAL PROPERTY TAXES AND PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXES**

WHEREAS, Virginia Code section 58.1-3916 established that the governing body of any county may by ordinance establish the due date for payment of local taxes and that payment of taxes may be made in two equal semiannual installments; and

WHEREAS, upon due consideration, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Washington, Virginia, has found it in the best interest of the public welfare to amend the due date for payment of real property taxes to establish semi-annual tax collection dates and to amend the due date for collection of personal property tax to coordinate with the date for collection of real property tax;

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

- 1. That this ordinance shall become effective on January 1, 2010.*
- 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 Chapter 58, Subsections 58-86, 58-281, and 58-282, are amended, effective January 1, 2010, as set forth below:*

**CODE OF COUNTY OF WASHINGTON, VIRGINIA
CHAPTER 58 – TAXATION**

**ARTICLE II. AD VALOREM
DIVISION 3. REAL PROPERTY**

Subdivision II. Exemption from Taxation of Certain Elderly and Handicapped Persons*

Sec. 58-86. Forfeiture of exemption.

Failure to pay the difference between the exemption and the full amount of taxes levied on the property for which the exemption is issued by ~~December 20~~ the tax collection date of the year tax period for which such exemption is issued shall constitute a forfeiture of the exemption.

**ARTICLE VIII. PAYMENT, PENALTY, INTEREST, AND FEES ON DELINQUENT LOCAL LEVIES
DIVISION 1. GENERALLY**

Sec. 58-281. When treasurer to receive taxes and levies without penalty; when payable; how payments credited.

- (a.) The treasurer shall commence to receive the taxes and local levies as soon as he receives copies of the commissioner's book and continue to receive the taxes and local levies without penalty up to and including ~~December 20~~ of each year the applicable tax collection date, as set forth in this section. ~~The payment of taxes on all classes of property within the territorial boundaries of the county subject to taxation for county purposes under the constitution and laws of the state shall be due and payable to the county treasurer on or before December 20 of each year~~ Any payment of local levies received shall be credited first against the most delinquent local account, the collection of which is not subject to a defense of an applicable statute of limitations.*
- (b.) All taxes or levies on tangible personal property in the county shall be due and payable during the year for which the same are assessed and shall be paid to the treasurer of the county on or before November 20 of such year.*
- (c.) All taxes or levies on real property in the county shall be due and payable during the year for which the same are assessed and shall be paid to the treasurer of the county in two (2) approximately equal installments, as follows: one-half on or before May 20 and one-half on or before November 20 of such year.*

Sec. 58-282. Penalty for failure to pay taxes ~~by December 20~~ on time.

Any person failing to pay any county tax levies on or before ~~December 20~~ the tax collection date for the applicable tax period shall incur a penalty thereon of ten percent of the tax past due on such property ~~or the sum of \$10.00, whichever shall be the greater;~~ however, the penalty shall in no case exceed the amount of the tax due, which, when collected by the treasurer, shall be accounted for in his settlements. Any such penalty when so assessed shall become a part of the tax. No penalty shall be imposed for failure to pay any tax if such failure was not in any way the fault of the taxpayer, in the judgment of the treasurer of the county.

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>

b. Public Hearing and Consideration of Resolutions Amending the FY 2008-2009 County Operating Budget and Authorizing Supplemental Appropriations Thereto

Mr. Seamon explained that this public hearing to amend the FY 2008-09 County Operating Budget is required by Code of Virginia Section 15.2-2507, which says that any amendment which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures, or the sum of \$500,000.00 requires a public hearing. The FY 2008-2009 was amended on August 12, 2008, to take care of carryovers from the prior fiscal year. This time a year a second amendment is normally done to take care of large supplemental appropriations. Recently, a supplemental appropriation was approved for the Sheriff’s Office in the amount of \$699,722.00 for funds received from the Federal Asset Sharing Program and another supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$400,000.00 to the Traffic Enforcement Fund. The amendment will bring the FY 2008-2009 County Budget to \$131,858,582.00.

Mr. Reynolds opened the public hearing and invited comments regarding the proposed Resolution amending the FY 2008-2009 County Operating Budget.

- Mr. Lewis Loflin addressed the Board speaking in favor of the budget amendment.

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 adopt the following Resolution:

**RESOLUTION 2009-04
AMENDMENT OF COUNTY OPERATING BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

WHEREAS, pursuant to § 15.2-2507 of the 1950 Code of Virginia a locality shall amend its budget to adjust the aggregate amount to be appropriated during the current fiscal year which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures shown in the currently adopted budget or the sum of \$500,000, whichever is lesser, after advertising and conducting a public hearing stating the governing body's intent to amend the budget, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Virginia has determined the need to further amend the County Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2008-2009 as adopted June 24, 2008 in compliance with Virginia law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Virginia that the County Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2008-2009 is hereby amended as follows:

Amended FY 2008-2009 County Budget on August 12, 2008 \$130,552,075

Proposed Amendment of County Budget:

001 General Fund:

<i>General Government Administration</i>	\$	0	
<i>Judicial Administration</i>	\$	72,880	
<i>Public Safety</i>	\$	110,611	
<i>Public Works</i>	\$	0	
<i>Public Welfare</i>	\$	0	
<i>Education</i>	\$	0	
<i>Recreation & Cultural Enrichment</i>	\$	0	
<i>Economic Development</i>	\$	0	
<i>Non-Departmental</i>	\$	<u>0</u>	
Total General Fund	\$	183,491	
002 Federal Asset Sharing Fund	\$	699,772	
003 Law Library Fund	\$	0	
005 Capital Improvement Fund	\$	0	
006 Economic Development Fund	\$	8,694	
007 Utilities Fund	\$	0	
008 Traffic Enforcement Fund	\$	400,000	
010 Special Grant Projects Fund	\$	14,550	
108 County Library Fund	\$	0	
206 Virginia Public Assistance Fund	\$	0	
312 School Operating Fund	\$	<u>0</u>	<u>\$ 1,306,507</u>
Proposed Amended FY 2008-2009 County Budget			<u>\$131,858,582</u>

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the approval of this budget amendment shall not constitute an appropriation of funds.

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>

c. Presentation by Bristol Virginia Utilities

The Board received a presentation from Bristol Virginia Utilities (BVU) Board Chairman Paul Hurley, BVU President and CEO Wes Rosenbaum, BVU Vice President of Operations Jim Kelly and BVU Legal Counsel Walt Bressler concerning BVU's OptiNet services.

Mr. Hurley expressed appreciation to Supervisor Dulcie Mumpower for her representation on the BVU Board of Directors. He explained that key points of the presentation will include information on BVU's triple play (cable, telephone and internet service), the number of customers served by BVU and a description of the cable, phone and internet services provided in Washington County.

Mr. Kelly reviewed a map showing the BVU telecommunications infrastructure. He explained that BVU has infrastructure that runs along the right of way on Interstate 81 to Wytheville, VA then into West Virginia passing through both of the tunnels in Virginia on Interstate 77. This infrastructure goes through Bluefield, WV to Claypool Hill, VA then back to Abingdon, VA. BVU has infrastructure that runs from Claypool Hill, VA to Grundy, VA and from Hansonville, VA to Pound, VA to Clintwood, VA. Within the next three months a section of infrastructure will be completed from Vansant, VA to Grundy, VA. New infrastructure is being proposed for the Exit 19 area along Lee Highway that will go to Marion, VA and then from Marion, VA up US Route 16 to Grayson County. Mr. Kelly discussed the various sources of funding and partnerships that made the infrastructure currently in place possible and explained that the infrastructure is mainly backbone and serves commercial and industrial customers. Mr. Kelly provided a review of the reasons for each of the infrastructure loops outlined above.

Mr. Kelly next reviewed a map showing the areas of Washington County that BVU provides residential customers with cable television, phone and data (triple play) or with just phone and data. The map also shows the BVU electric service area. He explained that the BVU service area in Washington County is primarily in Abingdon and along the corridor between Abingdon and Bristol along the Lee Highway corridor. BVU's service area has been restricted by the Virginia General Assembly to areas that BVU already has infrastructure in place.

At this time, a question and answer period ensued among the Board, Mr. Rosenbaum, Mr. Kelly and Mr. Bressler. The discussions centered on exploring partnerships and means of funding to extend BVU's service territory in Washington County.

Mr. Rosenbaum provided a review of the BVU OptiNet telephone, cable and internet services. He explained that on the telephone side, BVU has a My Net Talk Free Program that allows calls initiated by OptiNet residential customers to any BVU customer for free. This means a BVU residential customer in Bristol can call a BVU residential customer in Abingdon and the call is free, or vice versa. On the OptiNet cable side, BVU is proud of the parental control technology. The BVU OptiNet internet service offers download speeds up to 16 mbps with upload speeds up to 2 mbps. Mr. Rosenbaum explained that BVU passes through 6,340 homes and businesses in Washington County. He next reviewed a breakdown of the number of customers subscribing to each of the BVU services. In conclusion, Mr. Rosenbaum reviewed accolades that BVU has received.

Mr. Hurley advised the Board that BVU and the City of Bristol were named to the Top 7 List of Intelligent Communities. The City of Bristol/BVU is the only city in America to make the final list.

At this time, further discussions ensued.

Mr. Taylor inquired about the status of his original question that led to tonight's presentation concerning BVU's infrastructure plan in relation to the County's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Bressler explained that he researched the matter and that comprehensive plans are applicable to public utilities and not municipal utilities. BVU is a municipal utility and are not shown on any comprehensive planning maps. Municipal and government utilities do not have to appear before a Planning Commission in regard to their plans.

Mrs. Mumpower commented that the people in the Wilson District are pleased to have the services offered by BVU. She expressed appreciation to BVU for their excellence and complimented the staff.

6. General Business:

a. Actionable Items:

1. Consideration of Recommendation of By-Laws Committee Concerning Public Comment Period

Mr. Reeter presented a recommendation from the By-Laws Committee concerning a public comment period. The Committee recommended that the Board establish a public comment period at the beginning of the Board's meeting agenda for the second regular monthly Board meeting only, limited to three minutes per speaker. The Committee further recommended that all regular monthly meetings begin at 6:30 PM should the public comment period be established. The proposed rules governing the public comment period state that the period shall not extend beyond 7:00 PM. The committee proposed that each speaker must be residents of Washington County or own property located within Washington County. The proposed rules say that if a speaker violates the rules of conduct they will have their privilege to continue to participate in the public comment periods suspended. The By-laws of the Board, Articles 6, 7, 8 and 9 have been amended to incorporate the draft form of the Committee's proposed structure of a public comment period.

Mr. Owens (member of the By-Laws Committee) explained that the Committee felt the start time for regular board meetings should be moved to 6:30 PM to allow ample time to for the public comment period and to conduct the business before the Board. He stated that for the last several months, the Board has had full meeting agendas and had trouble adjourning before 10:00 PM. The Committee also discussed the issue of the public comment period being a time when the public addresses the Board and there should be no dialogue between the Board and public, if so, it would take away time from the public. If an item is discussed during the public comment period that needs action, the Board could take the matter under advisement and place the issue as an item of business on a future Board meeting agenda.

Lengthy discussions ensued among the Board. The discussions focused around the rules stating that the public comment period shall not extend beyond 7:00 PM. It was proposed that the language be amended to give the chairman the discretion to allow a citizen to speak beyond 7:00 PM.

It was further discussed that the public comment period should be established using the rules proposed by the Committee and then if the Board sees the rules are not adequate the Board could make amendments. Therefore, the following action was proposed:

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. McCrady, the Board acted to amend and resubmit the proposed 2009 Board By-Laws with the addition of provisions for a Public Comment Period as part of the Board Meeting Agenda.

Discussions ensued concerning the proposed action particularly concerning amending the language to allow the public to speak past 7:00 PM, if necessary.

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>

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

2. Consideration of Recommendation of By-laws Committee Concerning Expense Reimbursement for members of Board of Supervisors

Ms. Phillips explained that the By-Laws Committee presents two options for Board consideration concerning expense reimbursement for members of the Board of Supervisors.

Option 1, the “Monthly-Cap Reimbursement Policy”, limits eligibility for reimbursement only to official functions of the Board and attendance at events related to participation resulting from an official appointment of the Board member to a committee, organization or other entity. Further, Option 1 limits the amount that may be reimbursed to any individual member of the Board to no more than \$50/monthly for travel within the County and \$150 monthly for travel outside the County. This is the same proposed policy that was presented to the Board at the January 13 organizational meeting.

Option 2 , the “No Monthly-Cap Reimbursement Policy”, allows reimbursement, without a monthly expense limitation, for attending meetings and functions of the Board, attending meetings and functions related to Board appointments, and attending meetings and functions related to performance of the office of Supervisor.

Ms. Phillips explained that neither proposed policy would allow reimbursement for travel to attend the regular semi-monthly meetings of the Board.

Discussions ensued among the Board.

Mr. Price inquired if he could have his salary for serving on the Board reduced by ten percent.

The following action was proposed:

On motion of Mr. Owens, second by Mrs. Mumpower, the Board acted to amend and resubmit the 2009 Board By-Laws with the provisions listed in Option 1 for Board mileage reimbursement expenses.

Discussions ensued regarding the proposed action. Mr. Taylor explained that there is too much control in the Option 1 Reimbursement Policy. He said that Option 2 was a simpler version of a reimbursement policy. Mr. Taylor suggested that should Option 2 not work out then the Board could make revisions.

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

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

Mr. Reeter explained that at the January 13 annual meeting, the Board took action to readopt the 2008 By-Laws pending resolution of a public comment period and an expense reimbursement policy for Board members. He stated that he would like to bring back to the Board a complete up-to-date set of 2009 By-Laws, General Policies and Operating Procedures that will include the adopted policies for reestablishing a public comment period and the expense reimbursement for Board members integrated into the text. Mr. Reeter proposed that these documents be a Consent Agenda item for the February 24 Board meeting. It was consensus of the Board for the County Administrator to place the revised 2009 Board By-Laws, General Policies and Operating Procedures in the Consent Agenda for the February 24 Board meeting for adoption.

The Board took a five minute recess at this time.

3. Consideration of Architect and Engineer Reports Concerning Former Robert E. Lee Motel Property

Ms. Phillips addressed the Board explaining that a site visit and structure inspection has been performed on the property of the former Robert E. Lee Motel. She reported that representatives from Beeson & Beeson Architects, Spoden & Wilson Consulting Engineers, E. Luke Green, & Company along with County Building Official Bill Cole and she were part of the site visit. The Board has been provided in the Agenda materials with the reports resulting from this site visit. Ms. Phillips reviewed photographs taken on the exterior and interior of the building. She explained that based on the findings of the report, it is determined that the structure is severely deteriorated and unsafe. It was further determined the costs to repair the building would exceed the costs of new construction and that the structure should be disposed of in a legal manner. Ms. Phillips commented that due to the number of doors and windows that provide access into the structure, it would be virtually impossible to secure it against intruders and, if securing the structure were attempted, it would require constant vigilance to maintain.

Ms. Phillips explained that now that the inspection has been completed and the results reported to the Board, the Board may authorize a public hearing for comment on the best course of action to protect public health and safety relative to the structure.

Discussions ensued among the Board, with the following action being proposed:

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. Price, the Board acted to authorize the County Attorney to proceed in accordance with the ordinance requirements to schedule a public hearing.

Mr. Taylor inquired if the costs to remove any vermin population were included in the proposal. Ms. Phillips explained that these costs were not included and that this was a good point.

Mr. McCall inquired if the owners of the property would be billed for the costs incurred by the County to demolish the structure, if that is the course of action. Ms. Phillips explained that the owners would be billed, but the debt would be secured by a lien that would receive the highest priority. If the property is sold, the County would recover the costs incurred to tear down the structure.

Mrs. Mumpower stated that the cost estimate does not include backfilling or “dressing” of the property.

Discussions ensued concerning the Robert E. Lee Motel sign.

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>

7. Board Member Reports

Mrs. Mumpower thanked Ms. Phillips for her work on the Robert E. Lee Motel Project.

Mr. Taylor reported that he received a call from a County resident who is interested in investing in the County by establishing a solid waste disposal business. He proposed that this person be invited to make a presentation to the Board of Supervisors and Industrial Development Authority.

Discussions ensued among the Board. Mr. Reynolds explained that he recently attended a meeting at the Small Business Incubator where a presentation was made concerning this proposed business. He reported that the proposed project requires a high investment. He recommended that the individual make a presentation to the Industrial Development Authority. Board members agreed with Mr. Reynolds recommendation.

Mr. Taylor reported on the VACo/VML Legislative Day recently held in Richmond, VA. He stated that he had several good meetings with the legislators from this region. However, there is no positive news to report. Mr. Taylor further reported that while in Richmond, he attended a meeting where one of the speakers was the new director of the Federal Reserve Bank in Richmond. Mr. Taylor said the new director projected confidence that he knew what he was talking about, and he also projected confidence in the national leaders and stated that they understand what is happening with the economy.

Mr. Owens reported that he has received numerous calls concerning the reassessment. He explained that the Commissioner of Revenue has extended an offer to come before the Board to discuss what is happening with the reassessments in order to give the Board a good understanding. Mr. Owens commended the Bristol Herald Courier and Reporter Debra McCown for their good work on the recent article concerning the reassessment. He stated that the article was fair and very informative.

Mr. McCrady asked for the status of the Resolution to the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) requesting \$25,000.00 in recreational monies for a floating dock at Washington County Park.

Mr. McCrady asked the County Administrator to meet with the County Treasurer concerning the payment in lieu of taxes paid by TVA. He stated that this payment was split with the City of Bristol and Smyth County instead of all the money coming to Washington County. Mr. McCrady said he believes the TVA owes the County in excess of \$100,000.00.

Mr. McCrady explained that he recently met with Senator William Wampler and learned that the Virginia Department of Transportation's funds for bonded monies for the US Highway 58 Project have been

furloughed. He asked the County Administrator to prepare a letter under the Chairman's signature to the Secretary of Transportation asking for the status of this issue.

Mr. McCrady proposed that a notice be posted that all cell phones should be turned off upon entrance to the Board meetings.

Mr. McCrady proposed that a plan be developed for the upcoming budget preparation and suggested that the Board look first at funding the essential agencies. Then with monies left see what can be budgeted for non-essential agencies/organizations.

8. Board Information and Reminders

Mr. Reeter reviewed the following Board Information:

- Mr. Reeter reminded the Board that the County Offices will be closed on Monday, February 16 in observance of the President's Day Holiday.
- Mr. Reeter reviewed a request from the Washington County Service Authority for a joint meeting proposed to be scheduled on Monday, March 2 at 7:00 PM at the County Administration Building. Discussions ensued among the Board concerning this request. Because of conflicts of several Board meetings, the Board asks that the joint meeting requested by the Washington County Service Authority be scheduled for Wednesday, March 4 at 7:00 PM.
- Mr. Reeter reviewed a Capitol Contract newsletter containing a broad summary of the General Assembly's status with the State's budget. He asked the Board to review this newsletter. Particularly pay attention to initiatives proposed in the Subcommittee on Education concerning a school employee only health insurance program modeled after the program for State employees, and an early retirement package for school employees that may cause potential budgetary problems in FY 2011.
- Mr. Reeter explained that the revenue presentations by the Commission of Revenue and Treasurer tentatively scheduled on the budget calendar for February 24 have been moved to March 10. The Board will be given a revised budget calendar at the February 24 Board meeting. He stated that he will tentatively deliver the proposed and recommended budget for FY 2009-2010 at the March 24 Board meeting.

Ms. Phillips reviewed the following information:

- Ms. Phillips distributed to the Board a copy of a pleading from Henry S. Keuling-Stout concerning the case involving the Highlands Community Services case. The County has been dismissed from the case.

9. Adjourn or Recess

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

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