

VIRGINIA:

At a recessed meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Northampton, Virginia, held in the former circuit courtroom, 16404 Courthouse Road, Eastville, Virginia, on the 22nd day of March, 2010, at 5:00 p.m.

Present:

Laurence J. Trala, Chairman

Willie C. Randall, Vice Chairman

Richard Tankard

H. Spencer Murray

Oliver H. Bennett

Samuel J. Long, Jr.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman.

Consent Agenda:

(1) Consider A-95 Review entitled, "Regional Approach to Increase Recycling in the Mid-Atlantic States"; applicant: Institute for Local Self-Reliance (SLR)

Motion was made by Mr. Murray, seconded by Mr. Tankard, that the A-95 Review be approved as presented. All members were present and voted "yes." The motion was unanimously passed.

With the concurrence of the Board, the Chairman rearranged the agenda in order to conduct the public hearing at this time.

The Chairman called to order the following public hearing:

Public Hearing:

(3) Conduct a public hearing to solicit public input on the proposed community development block grant (CDBG) proposal to be submitted to the Virginia Department of Housing & Community Development for the Culls Community Housing Rehabilitation Project. Residents of the community are encouraged to attend. The Culls Community Housing Rehabilitation Project Proposal will include the repair or replacement of houses occupied by low- and moderate-income persons within the project area, and drainage improvements to existing ditches. A fact sheet summarizing the draft CDBG proposal will be available for

comment along with information on projected beneficiaries and plans to minimize displacement. Citizens will also be given the opportunity to comment on Northampton County's past use of CDBG funds.

The Chairman asked if there were any present desiring to speak.

Mr. John Aigner of the Accomack-Northampton Planning District Commission presented the following "Fact Sheet" with regard to the proposed Culls Project:

Northampton County
Culls Community Housing Rehabilitation Project
2010
Fact Sheet

The Culls Community Housing Rehabilitation Project will provide for the replacement or the rehabilitation of 15 substandard houses within the project area. The work includes installing first-time plumbing to 1 house. One tenant-family will be converted to a homeowner with the help of purchase mortgage money provided by VESEEHHC, and CDBG funds providing the housing improvements. Five families will receive new deep wells and 2 failing septic systems will be repaired. There will be drainage improvements provided to Raymond Lane.

Source of Funds

Community Development Block Grant	\$655,000.00
VESEEHHC	\$30,000.00
Northampton County (administrative in-kind)	\$2,300.00
Total	\$687,300.00

Description of Project Activities

- The demolition of 8 abandoned structures
- The total rehabilitation and repair of 12 occupied, substandard houses.
- The construction of three new houses to replace occupied, un-repairable houses.
- The installation of first-time plumbing for 1 family
- The installation of 5 new deep wells and 2 septic systems
- Homeownership opportunity for 1 tenant family.
- 2,000 lineal feet of existing ditches on Raymond Lane will be re-graded.

Mr. Tankard asked for clarification of the project area boundaries and Mr. Aigner replied that Culls Drive and Raymond Lane were included.

Mr. Bennett indicated that he owns property in Culls and while his property would not benefit from the Culls Project, he would be abstaining from action on this matter.

There being no further speakers, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mr. Randall, seconded by Mr. Murray, that the following resolution be adopted. All members were present and voted "yes", with the exception of Mr. Bennett who abstained. The motion was passed. Said resolution as adopted is set forth below:

**COUNTY OF NORTHAMPTON
RESOLUTION**

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Housing and community Development is administering the Virginia Community Development Block Grant Program; and

WHEREAS, one of the objectives of the Virginia Community Development Block Grant Program is to assist local governments by providing funds to address housing and infrastructure needs; and

WHEREAS, the County of Northampton would like to contribute to the redevelopment of the housing, onsite water and sewer systems, and the storm water drainage infrastructure of the Community of Culls.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County of Northampton is making application to the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development for Virginia Community Development Block Grant funds in the amount of Six Hundred Fifty Five Thousand Dollars (\$655,000) to support the redevelopment of Culls.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the project will be called the Culls Housing Rehabilitation Project and will benefit approximately 15 low and moderate-income households, and 34 low and moderate-income persons by providing housing rehabilitation for 12 families, replacement houses for 3 families, first-time indoor plumbing for 1 family, and first-time homeownership for 1 tenant family.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Northampton County acknowledges the allocation of \$30,000.00 from the Virginia Eastern Shore Economic Empowerment and Housing Corporation to help create first-time homeownership in Culls.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that two public hearings have been held soliciting comments and input from residents of the County, on March 9, 2010, and March 22, 2010.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Administrator of Northampton County is hereby authorized to sign and execute all necessary forms and documents required to submit

said application, and to sign and execute all necessary forms and documents required to enter into a great agreement with the Department of Housing & Community Development.

* * * * *

County Administrator's Report:

The County Administrator presented the following report:

TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Katie H. Nunez, County Administrator
DATE: March 19, 2010
RE: 3-23-10 Work Session Report

Enclosed are the following items for our review and discussion:

- A. Revised PSA Articles of Incorporation: The PSA Exploratory Committee met on Wednesday, March 10, 2010 and continued work on the PSA Articles of Incorporation. Enclosed is the draft document – items highlighted in yellow are the changes that have reached concurrence by all parties and items highlighted in red are the changes that I am requesting review and discussion by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Randall stated that the County should have input in who would actually represent the County, referring to the two at-large PSA members who would be appointed by the first five members.

Mr. Murray read the following statement:

*Northampton County Board of Supervisors
March 22, 2010
PSA Structure and Membership*

Mr. Chairman and fellow supervisors:

Over the last two years I have been a strong proponent for a structure to promote sewer and water infrastructure through cooperation between the county and incorporated towns. I authored a proposed regional structure in May of 2008 which has been discussed widely. I understand that economic growth for both the county and towns depends on sound infrastructure. My belief was and continues to be that the County must be involved in order to maximize state and federal funding and to be certain that infrastructure expansion follows our Comprehensive Plan. I had hoped that leadership in this effort would come mostly from the county.

The new proposed Public Service Authority (PSA) membership structure resulting from recent meetings with the towns places the county and BOS in an extreme minority position. I cannot support this membership structure for that reason. I would like to remind my fellow BOS members that this decision is not a short-term one. The PSA, with all its powers of eminent domain, borrowing, and fee-setting authority will be in place long after this and future BOS terms have expired. Having only one PSA member appointed by the BOS is unacceptable, especially when millions of dollars of infrastructure debt will be transferred into the PSA and will ultimately be the obligation of all county taxpayers if subscriber fees fail to cover operations and debt service.

This proposed PSA membership structure will not promote cooperation between the county and towns. It will set up further conflict and lead to additional cries for town boundary adjustments at the expense of county revenues. Citizens residing outside the towns will be under represented and rightfully feel disenfranchised. I cannot speak for the citizens of the towns, but my constituents will not have the opportunity to comment on this membership structure or the entire PSA until the public hearing, after the fact, if we approve this proposal tonight.

I hope this BOS will reject the proposed PSA membership structure and ask Supervisors Long and Randall to revisit the membership issue with the towns. I am ready to provide suggestions, if desired. Please include my remarks in the official record.

*Respectfully,
H. Spencer Murray
Supervisor, District #4*

* * * * *

Mr. Tankard distributed the following history of the PSA and associated questions:

History of standing PSA:

- 1. Joint effort between Accomack and Northampton begun in 1999*
- 2. Withdrawal by Accomack, early 2005*
- 3. Reconstituted as solely a Northampton entity.*
- 4. Present representative configuration adopted 2005.*
- 5. Nassawadox area, with specific target of Hospital 2005*
- 6. Nassawadox dropped out end of 2005.*
- 7. Money from STAG grants redirected to Cape Charles for their upgrades. (\$470,500 + \$192,400 = \$662,900)*
- 8. Dormant ever since.*

General Questions about PSA:

1. *Should the PSA reflect the population of the entire County, with its membership proportioned to reflect population numbers in incorp. Towns and those outside incorp. Towns? (3:1)*
2. *As we learned at the recent meeting in Exmore, Exmore's system is losing money, its users are not covering expenses, is a PSA willing to raise rates to cover expenses? Or will they pass this on to all County residents.*
3. *Should the PSA absorb any debt associated with any Town's present sewage/water system?*
4. *In FY 2011, how much are we going to budget for the PSA?*
5. *Is it safe to say that Cape Charles does not need County or PSA help?*
6. *If ARRA funds are not received, does the PSA continue to operate?*
7. *Is the Hospital/Heritage Hall our top priority for PSA involvement?*

General comments:

I have supported the concepts and possibilities that a PSA can achieve for the County since 2004 and have had the luxury of looking at it from many different angles during my active time on the PSA. Today is much the same as I found it in 2004—hurry up and make a decision because the grant money will quickly disappear.

I am disappointed at the lack of representation by the two County Supervisors appointed to the exploratory committee. Attending 1 of 3 meetings is unacceptable and may explain the complete acquiescence to the representatives to the Towns. As Supervisors, we are charged with looking out for the interests of the County, this is stated clearly on page 5 of our Board Member Manual, "Place loyalty to a moral principle of ethical conduct to the County above loyalty to self, other individuals, groups, districts or sections of Northampton County."

This PSA could, without proper County guidance, be just as large an albatross as the regional jail or STIP. Both were undertaken in the name of "regionalism", with very distressing results. Both did not place enough emphasis on County control that was commensurate with County financial risk.

Lastly, nothing is wrong with the present PSA configuration. Let's take it off the shelf and use it. It will ensure proper County representation and leadership in the decision process. It will place responsibility where responsibility lies—with us. It also places the onus of leadership on you. That's what you were elected to do. Lead. Not get run over.

* * * * *

Mr. Long said that the Board should not keep "batting this issue" back and forth and that the Towns need equal or greater representation on the PSA Board.

Mr. Trala suggested that the questions posted by Mr. Tankard be referred to the PSA Exploratory Committee for consideration.

Ms. Nunez indicated that timeliness was a factor in these discussions with the next Committee meeting taking place on tomorrow.

Mr. Long requested the Board to provide other suggestions for PSA membership structure to be taken back to the Committee for consideration.

Mr. Murray recommended a 10-member PSA board with 4 town members (one from each of the four participating localities), and 6 at-large members appointed by the Board of Supervisors. These six members are envisioned to represent pertinent disciplines, such as planning, waste water, engineering, finance, etc. and would not have to be elected officials.

Mr. Long indicated that he would be glad to present Mr. Murray's recommendation and also offered another option to consider in that some of the Board's appointees could serve in advisory capacities only (with no voting ability). He said that he wanted to insure that the residents most directly affected have a voice.

Mr. Randall indicated that he supported Mr. Murray's recommendation.

I have also issued a Request for Qualifications for Engineering Services, Grant Administration and Community Facilitation Services with a due date of April 5, 2010 in order to develop the necessary work products under the DHCD Planning Grant that would allow us to be in a position to apply for construction funding by mid-summer through USDA-RD, if all parties are in concurrence with the project(s).

- B. Broadband Project – Resolution: Pat Coady, Executive Director of the Eastern Shore of Virginia Broadband Authority, will be in attendance to discuss the proposed resolution and the upcoming grant that the ESVBA is submitting an application for under the ARRA funding allocated for broadband deployment. The Board has previously pledged support for a similar grant application last summer that the ESVBA pursued through the ARRA funding. The ESVBA was only recently notified that they had not been awarded the grant; however, they were strongly encouraged to submit the application again for Round 2 with some modifications to the application that would improve their chances. A similar resolution has been presented to the County of Accomack for their consideration and action. The deadline for submission of this grant application is Friday, March 26, 2010.

Mr. Pat Coady, Executive Director, updated the Board on the Broadband Project, noting that construction of fiber is complete from Wallops Island to Virginia Beach. He said that a similar resolution was adopted by the Accomack County Board of Supervisors last week. Northampton's cash match requirement would equate to approximately \$502,000. Motion was made by Mr. Randall, seconded by Mr. Murray that the following resolution be adopted. All members were present and voted "yes." The motion was unanimously passed. Said resolution as adopted is set forth below:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Northampton County Board of Supervisors, together with the Accomack County Board of Supervisors, formed the Eastern Shore of Virginia Broadband Authority in April 2008 to oversee the planning, funding, construction and deployment of high speed data and internet access network for local businesses, local government, and the public to support, promote and provide expansion opportunities for economic development; and

WHEREAS, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act has identified certain funding for the advancement and deployment of broadband in underserved areas; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Northampton County Board of Supervisors, in conjunction with Accomack County, strongly supports the application by the Eastern Shore of Virginia Broadband Authority for Economic Stimulus funds available through the NTIA Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (EasyGrant #6302).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that any project funds are to be used to further extend the current network and to leverage the considerable investment the County and our Towns have already made to provide needed broadband access to our citizens.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County of Northampton agrees to guarantee the commitment of 28% of the grant's required cash match as loan or loan guarantee.

* * * * *

C. FY2011 County Budget: I have attached a separate memorandum devoted to the FY2011 County Budget discussion.

TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Katie H. Nunez, County Administrator
DATE: March 17, 2010
RE: Discussion of Preliminary Draft FY2011 Budget

I want to take this opportunity to provide an overview of the budget to date as Finance Director Glenda Miller and I work to develop a draft budget for your consideration.

The Fiscal Year 2010 Budget, when adopted last June 2009, contained reductions for the majority of all departments, ranging from 2% to as high as 15% from the prior year's budget. The state revised revenue productions in August 2009 which led to a round of local reductions to

address these state projected shortfalls. We implemented reductions through contract reductions in audit expenses and insurance coverage (\$12,000), reductions in the Board salary and travel expenses (\$16,500), utility savings at the former Middle School Property (\$6,000), furloughs for County staff (\$27,000), reduction of hours of operation for solid waste operations (\$36,000), reallocation of the remaining merit pool funding (\$14,000) and increase of solid waste fees (\$25,000). In addition, the state imposed reductions of approximately 2-5% for the constitutional officers which totaled \$228,000. In December 2009, Governor Kaine released a proposed biennium budget for the state for the upcoming fiscal years as well as proposing further reductions for the Fiscal Year 2010 budget. These reductions would shift long-standing state funding of certain benefits for the constitutional officers and their employees to the localities as well as proposing a furlough day for the constitutional officers and their employees. Within Governor Kaine's proposed biennium budget (FY11 & FY12), there were numerous reductions or eliminations of long-standing funding obligations by the state over to the localities.

This is the background in which we have been operating as we issued the budget call for the County departments and outside agencies to submit a budget request. The departments were told to submit a budget, assuming no increase, but to also identify any issues and/or obligations that would have an impact on the budget request (maintenance contract increases, upcoming projects, certifications, etc). My office has also been pursuing the final payment from the state regarding their share of the regional jail construction costs which required a budget amendment to the state budget. I worked with Representative Lynwood Lewis in preparing this request along with supporting documentation (approval from the Board of Corrections regarding the cost increases and completion of project) which totals \$3,116,122.

On Sunday, March 14, 2010, the state passed a budget for the biennium. While we are still receiving analysis of the impact of the budget on the various facets of local government, there are several items that have been identified that will have a significant impact on our budget process.

- 1) Regional Jail Construction Costs – Additional Reimbursement: This item was NOT funded in the budget. Our debt schedule was crafted in anticipation of these funds forthcoming no later than FY2011. With the failure of the state to meet this obligation, we will need to provide an additional \$794,768 from the general fund to the debt service fund.
- 2) Reinstatement of “Flexible” Reductions in Aid to Localities: For Fiscal Year 2009 & 2010, the state imposed reductions in aid of \$50 million for each year (approximately \$192,000 impact annually to us over the last two years). Each locality was provided the choice of imposing the reductions directly to the local departments (Constitutional officers, registrar, social services, etc) or to make a payment directly to the state or some combination of the two. We chose to make a payment directly to the state by funding this as a line item in our budget. When we began our budget process for FY2011, we were not aware that this “program” would be continuing. With the inclusion of this program in the state budget again and at an increased level of \$60 million of reduction in aid for each of the upcoming budget years of FY2011 and FY2012, we will be required to include this within our budget process. Until we

receive the specific locality impact from the VA Department of Planning and Budget, we have now inserted the amount of \$230,415 as a place-marker.

- 3) School Aid: I am going to defer discussion on school aid until further in this memo in a specific section devoted to the school budget.
- 4) Funding for Constitutional Officers & Employees: Restores a portion of funding to Commonwealth Attorney, Circuit Court Clerk, Commissioners of Revenue and Treasurers that had been proposed for reduction/elimination under Governor Kaine's budget proposal. The Compensation Board will release the locality specific restorations on March 26, 2010. Our draft FY2011 budget was based upon Kaine's budget proposal so we will need to incorporate these positive budget items into our draft budget.
- 5) Funding for Sheriff & Regional Jail: Restores the law enforcement ratio to 1: 1,500. Our budget is currently based upon the proposed revised law enforcement ratio of 1:2,000 so we will need to incorporate this positive budget item into our draft budget. The state budget also restores a portion of the reductions to sheriffs (and our jail) which we will need to incorporate into our budget once locality specific figures are released by the Compensation Board on March 26, 2010. Jail per diems have been significantly altered. I have **attached additional information** on this item for your review and discussion. This information has not been incorporated yet into our budget but it will have a positive & negative impact on our jail fund budget.

Positively, we had utilized the reduced per diems from Governor Kaine's budget for the local inmates and state responsible inmates in our draft budget so this will increase revenue projects for the jail fund by \$33,000.

Negatively, the state has eliminated all per diems for any state felons or jail contract beds which is a project that the jail has recently become involved with as a new revenue stream. The requested operational jail budget reflects this program but we had not made any accounting for revenue from this program. So we will be revising the requested operational budget to remove the cost impact of housing these types of prisoners. This still leaves a structural deficiency in our jail budget as we continue to struggle to find revenue streams to offset the fixed costs of operating this facility.

- 6) VRS Benefits: There have been substantial alterations to VRS which impact state employees, school employee, and local government employees, as contained in HB1189. I have **attached the specific details** of that bill for your review and discussion.

The state budget includes language giving school boards and localities the option of requiring current employees to pay a portion of the 5% employee retirement contribution, up to the full 5%. Up to this point, once a locality opted to pay the 5% employee retirement contribution in addition to the employer retirement contribution, then there was no "turning back" from that decision. However, this new language

does now allow a re-consideration of that decision by a locality and/or school board regarding the employee retirement contribution and who is responsible for payment of that contribution. We have prepared a spreadsheet detailing the cost of this item for the County for your review and discussion.

- 7.) OTHER POINTS OF CONCERN/NOTE CONTAINED IN THE STATE BUDGET
- Changes the funding mechanism for the Line of Duty Act through an 18 cent surcharge on E-911 fee.
 - Increases fees for solid waste and water pollution permits
 - Provides only \$500,000 in state funding dedicated for land conservation efforts.
 - Reduction to regional library funding
 - Reduction to planning district commissions

COUNTY BUDGET – DRAFT: ITEMS FOR REVIEW/DISCUSSION

1. Local Revenue Discussion: Glenda will review our draft revenue estimates in greater detail during the meeting.
2. Ambulance Billing Revenue: With the anticipated arrival of an ambulance (received funding from the VA Rescue Squad Assistance Fund to cover the majority costs of purchase and have applied for funding from USDA for the remaining match money), we have included a new revenue stream in the amount of \$65,000.
3. This budget transitions the Sheriff's vehicle request from a straight purchase (which is how he submits it in his budget request) to a lease arrangement. In his requested budget, the vehicles' replacement costs are \$106,219 (which includes the replacement of the Animal Control Truck as well as the police cruisers, per the schedule); the financing schedule results in an annual budget requirement of \$13,572, thus bringing this item down by \$92,647.
4. This budget currently holds the line on the County contribution towards health insurance that was established in the FY09 budget. We are in the process of negotiating premiums for the upcoming benefit year (October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011) and will need to discuss this matter further with the Board.
5. This budget does not contain any increases (no COLAs, no merit increases) for any of the staff.
6. This budget does continue funding of two items that were introduced in the FY2010 budget: A) \$7,000 for Volunteer Firefighter Incentive Program (under Fire Prevention); and B) \$85,000 for Economic Development (under General, Economic Development).
7. Regional Agency Funding: I have enclosed a spreadsheet detailing the regional agency funding levels for your review and discussion.

8. Reassessment: Anticipated cost is \$344,000. If we adhere to a 4-Yr Cycle for Reassessments, then the next cycle would need to be effective for January 1, 2012 thus requiring the work to commence 14-18 months prior to the effective date. This puts the calendar at August/September 2010 to issue and award a contract for reassessment services and the bulk of the work occurring in Fiscal Year 2011. Please note that reassessments are intended to capture market activity and to ensure that your assessed values are fair and equitable across all classes of real estate throughout the county based upon sales data. Since our last reassessment, there has not been significant sales activity which may be a factor of consideration for the Board to determine if they would still wish to proceed with the 4-Yr. Cycle for the Reassessment. At this time, I have not included a cost for the reassessment in the draft budget.

9. Redistricting: Following the 2010 Census, the County will receive new population counts in March/April 2011 from which we will need to implement a redistricting for the County. During the last redistricting, the County attempted to do the work in house, including the submissions to the Department of Justice. This process started in spring 2001 and was not accepted by the Department of Justice until early 2004. This impacted the election of the County Board of Supervisors, delaying that election by more than 9 months. We have estimated a budget ranging from \$15,000 up to \$100,000. The low end of the budget scale is the minimum expenses associated (mailings, advertisements, etc.) and the work being conducted in-house. The high end is a guesstimate for use of outside consultants (legal assistance, etc.) – we are in the process of obtaining quotations but do not have these at this time. In the draft budget, I have inserted the low end figure as a place-marker for this project.

SCHOOL BUDGET

The state budget that was passed on 3/14/2010 did retain the recently revised Composite Index figures which has a positive impact for increased state aid for education for our locality. In addition, they established a hold harmless clause for those localities that lost funding due to the updated composite indexes – since our index changed to increase our state funding, we are not included in the hold harmless clause. Please note that this is the very request we forwarded two years ago when we were so severely impacted by the change in the Composite Index and were told that nothing could be done because the funding formula was so complex and the General Assembly was not in favor of making those sorts of accommodations.

Overall, the state reduced educational funding as a whole by \$253 million over the biennium so we are still experiencing a reduction of state aid as compared to the adopted FY2010 budget. In addition, the state re-categorized expenses to remove them from the SOQ funding formula (leases, rental equipment and travel, changing the methodology for accounting for federal funds). Technology funds are restored in the state budget, eligibility for K-3 class size reduction funding has been changed as well as a decrease in total funding and the enrollment loss program is eliminated; textbook funding has been reduced; and the replacement schedule for school buses has been amended from a 12 yr. replacement schedule to a 15 yr. replacement schedule.

From the perspective of local contribution, we have prepared several approaches of funding - **see attached spreadsheet**. Since we have engaged with the school in a comprehensive replacement cycle for the school buses and have been providing funding to cover the school bus financing payments, I would recommend removing that figure from our “base contribution for school operations” and factoring any changes from that corrected base contribution and then add back in the actual costs of the bus financing payments. The number for the bus financing payments of \$325,000 for FY2011 is lower than what was budgeted in FY2010 (\$363,200 because we had been estimating these costs in FY2010 but now have the actual costs in hand for each of the lease/purchase schedules from the school for the last three years and have developed an estimate for the upcoming bus purchases to maintain the replacement cycle.

Within our draft budget, we did utilize the same contribution amount from FY2010 but was done to insert a place-marker. In our conversations and meetings this past year with school administration, we have indicated that they need to consider budgets that reflect a 5% reduction in local contribution as well as a 10% reduction in local contribution as well as the potential reductions at the state level. We will need to discuss this further with the Board.

{Enclosures as referenced are on file in the Office of the County Administrator.}

* * * * *

In response to the County Administrator’s request for guidance from the Board relative to the FY 2011 budget, Mr. Murray suggested that the County Administrator and Director of Finance should continue their work and bring back a balanced budget to the Board, starting with the premise of no tax increase and justifying any increase from there. He said that “there will be draconian cuts”. Mr. Murray also stated that he would be happy if the School Board could work with a ten percent (10%) reduction in local contribution for FY 2011.

Mr. Bennett asked that the County Administrator look for cuts “across the board”, noting that in his opinion some areas of the County budget have been less affected than others. He also asked to see a listing of cuts being proposed in order to effect a balanced budget.

After the Chairman suggested appointment of a budget committee consisting of Mr. Randall and Mr. Murray, Mr. Randall shook his head in the “negative” and Mr. Murray declined, indicating that he was satisfied with the work being done by staff but that he would be glad to

help if it was the Board's consensus.

Closed Session

Motion was made by Mr. Murray, seconded by Mr. Randall, that the Board enter Closed Session in accordance with Section 2.2-3711 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended:

Paragraph 5: Discussion concerning a prospective business or industry or the expansion of an existing business or industry where no previous announcement has been made of the business' or industry's interest in locating or expanding its facilities in the community.

Paragraph 7: Consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members, consultants, or attorneys pertaining to actual or probable litigation, and consultation with legal counsel employed or retained by the Board of Supervisors regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel.

All members were present and voted "yes." The motion was unanimously passed.

After Closed Session, the Chairman reconvened the meeting and said that the Board had entered the closed session for those purposes as set out in paragraphs 5 and 7 of Section 2.1-3711 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended. Upon being polled individually, each Board member confirmed that these were the only matters of discussion during the closed session.

The Board selected Tuesday, April 20, 2010 commencing at 5:00 p.m. to meet with the Building Official with regard to the rental property inspection ordinance and to meet jointly with the County Planning Commission with regard to its work tasks for this year.

Recess:

Motion was made by Mr. Murray, seconded by Mr. Bennett, that the meeting be recessed to 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 5, 2010, at 15527 Lankford Highway, Eastville, Virginia, in order to conduct joint meeting with the Northampton County Farm Bureau at Farm Bureau's request.

All members were present and voted "yes." The motion was unanimously passed.

The meeting was recessed.

_____CHAIRMAN

_____ COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR