

MINUTES
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF YORK

Regular Meeting
May 6, 2008

6:00 p.m.

Meeting Convened. A Regular Meeting of the York County Board of Supervisors was called to order at 6:10 p.m., Tuesday, May 6, 2008, in the East Room, York Hall, by Chairman Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr.

Attendance. The following members of the Board of Supervisors were present: Walter C. Zarembo, Sheila S. Noll, Donald E. Wiggins, George S. Hrichak, and Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr.

Also in attendance were James O. McReynolds, County Administrator; J. Mark Carter, Assistant County Administrator; and James E. Barnett, County Attorney.

WORK SESSION

FIREARMS DISCHARGE REGULATIONS

Mr. Carter gave a presentation regarding firearms discharge regulations, noting the staff was asked to look at the entire ordinance to see if the County was in line with state provisions. There were some specific questions raised about applicability to pneumatic and air soft guns, as well as the characteristics of the areas to see if there were any commonalities, and staff outlined some different options for the Board to consider. Mr. Carter then reviewed the history of the firearms ordinance dating back to 1975 and today's state code provisions. He displayed maps showing how the previous 300-ft criteria covered many parts of the County and explained the current restricted areas, stating they were a combination of neighborhood requests and population density assessments. He next displayed maps showing the areas currently under firearms restrictions and areas that have developed but were not listed in the ordinance.

Mr. Wiggins discussed the residents of Bay Tree Beach wanting to be included in the restricted areas.

Mr. Carter reviewed what other jurisdictions had done regarding firearms regulations and how they addressed the issue. He suggested definitions for "firearm" and "pneumatic gun" be agreed upon so that everyone would be thinking on the same level. He discussed adding the term "airsoft" to the definition, stating the Board would need to decide whether or not to keep it in the definition.

Discussion followed regarding spring-loaded weapons and how they would not be considered "pneumatic" guns.

Mr. Carter reviewed identified alternatives for firearms restricted areas in the County to include alternatives for pneumatic guns as follows:

Firearms:

- Add Lakes at Dare as a restricted area
- Add Lakes at Dare and other newly developed areas (and Bay Tree Beach)
- Expand coverage based on "so heavily populated" finding
- Identify by Zoning classification (e.g. all zones except RC and RR)
- Identify by distance from: dwellings, businesses, occupied structures

Pneumatic Guns:

May 6, 2008

- Allow countywide without restriction
- Allow countywide but only w/ supervision and permission when under certain age
- Prohibit in most/all of same areas restricted for firearms
- Prohibit in most/all of same areas and on small parcels (e.g., < 1 acre)
- Prohibit based on distance from dwellings, businesses

He then provided the following recommendations for firearms and pneumatic guns, and he reviewed maps showing the recommendations:

Firearms:

- Affirm currently listed areas.
- Add Lakes at Dare and Withrow (Bay Tree).
- Convert to zoning-based system (R20, R13, R7, RMF, YVA and PD) restricted; **plus** any RC and RR areas specifically listed; **plus** no discharge w/in 300 feet of any dwelling unit unless permission is secured
- Retain restriction on discharge of any rifle greater than .22 caliber

Pneumatic Guns:

- Define to include "air-soft" gas propelled.
- Establish zoning-based restriction (R13, R7, RMF, YVA and PD) restricted; **plus** no discharge w/in 300 feet of any dwelling unit unless permission is secured.
- Require minors under age 16 to be supervised by parent, guardian or other adult.

Chairman Shepperd asked if the proposals had to go back through the Planning Commission for public hearing.

Mr. Carter stated it would have to go to public hearing but not through the Planning Commission.

Discussion following regarding the last public hearing held on firearms restrictions and what other jurisdictions had done.

Chairman Shepperd suggested that the Board go with the staff's recommendation for the public hearing, hear from the citizens, and then make amendments as necessary.

Mr. Zaremba stated the Board would definitely have to address how the ordinance would be enforced and see that the citizens were educated about it.

Chairman Shepperd indicated that the consensus of the Board was to schedule staff's proposal for a future public hearing.

PHOTO RED IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. Carter made a presentation regarding a plan for photo red implementation in York County. He stated the legislation allowed the County to monitor up to 6 intersections, a traffic engineering study would be required, VDOT must approve the selected intersections, the estimated annual cost would be \$240,000 per intersection, and the maximum penalty for violations would be \$50. He reviewed considerations when selecting an intersection that included intersection traffic volume, accident rate, accident type and severity, rate of red light violations, difficulty to apprehend violators, and ability to safely apprehend with a reasonable distance. He then re-

viewed the intersections in the County, recommending the intersection of Victory Boulevard/Route 134 to be analyzed for photo red implementation.

Mr. Wiggins asked if the Sheriff had made any recommendation.

Mr. Carter stated the Sheriff had been a part of the study group, and he believed the Sheriff approved of the recommendation as the top candidate. Mr. Carter stated the Sheriff had concerns about the operation, cost, and other aspects of getting the program going.

Mr. Wiggins asked if there would be any State revenue for the program.

Mr. Carter indicated there would not be any State funding.

Discussion followed on crash rates at the two intersections that were reviewed. Discussion also took place regarding the factors considered in making the recommendation.

Mr. Carter stated that while staff was recommending the Victory Boulevard/Route 134 intersection, they would like to write the RFP to get some synergy of effort and perhaps study the Route 171/route 17 intersection as well if there were efficiencies for doing so.

Mr. Wiggins asked if there would be a public hearing on the implementation.

Mr. Carter indicated that there was no public hearing requirement but the Board could do so. He explained the next sequence of events included preparing an RFP, getting the proposals back, and going through the interview selection process before bringing the contract to the Board of Supervisors.

Chairman Shepperd spoke of the cost of implementing the program. He noted that it cost approximately \$250,000 for each intersection plus the cost of more manpower. He stated there was also an argument that this would actually increase rear-end collisions. Mr. Shepperd stated that photo red implementation had been on the Board's legislative package for many years, and the Board had heard from many people over the years.

Mr. Zaremba suggested that the Board could learn a lot from other jurisdictions that had already implemented photo red.

Mr. Carter noted that one thing the traffic consultant would do was look at the intersection in great detail on a movement-by-movement basis to identify whether there were certain movements that were causing the problems. He stated whatever the ultimate cost is, the engineering analysis as required by VDOT had to be done in order to get underway.

By consensus the Board directed staff to get a cost for the engineering analysis for the proposed intersection and the other one if possible.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chairman Shepperd asked that the Board discuss Items 4 and 5.

Discussion followed on Item No. 4 to purchase broadcast equipment that has been in the Capital Improvements Program for several years and the condition of the existing equipment making it necessary to go forward with the purchase at this time.

Discussion then followed on Item No. 5. to sponsor an amendment to the Subdivision Ordinance to revise the process for appeals of the requirement for interconnection of subdivision streets.

Chairman Shepperd stated he felt that the process should go through the Planning Commission for recommendation and then to the Board of Supervisors, which would have the final authority regarding the interconnection of streets.

Mrs. Noll indicated she hesitated taking the decision from the Planning Commission because it was a land use issue, and the Planning Commission should deal with land use issues.

May 6, 2008

Mr. Barnett indicated he wished to clarify a legal issue with the Board's ordinance. He stated the criteria for such decisions are included in the current ordinance whether the Planning Commission or the Board is the final authority. In order to take any action based on criteria other than that spelled out in the ordinance, the Board would have to amend the ordinance to change the criteria as well.

Mr. Hrichak stated he felt the Board should give the Planning Commission more leeway to look at these issues.

Chairman Shepperd suggested that perhaps the staff should come up with expanded criteria for both the Planning Commission and the Board to follow in making these decisions. He then expressed his concern about the VDOT proposal concerning connectivity and that it could come in and take the whole thing away from the Board.

Mr. McReynolds stated that as with any text amendment, this was a starting point. He recommended that staff look at different criteria to get the Board involved and keep the Planning Commission in its current role.

Mrs. Noll moved that the Consent Calendar be approved as submitted, Item Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6, respectively.

On roll call the vote was:

Yea: (5) Zaremba, Noll, Wiggins, Hrichak, Shepperd
Nay: (0)

Thereupon, the following minutes were approved and resolutions adopted:

Item No. 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the April 1, 2008, Regular Meeting, were approved.

Item No. 4. PURCHASE AUTHORIZATION: Resolution R08-61

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO PURCHASE VIDEO EQUIPMENT

WHEREAS, it is the policy of the Board of Supervisors that all procurements of goods and services by the County involving the expenditure of \$30,000 or more be submitted to the Board for its review and approval; and

WHEREAS, the County Administrator has determined that the following procurement is necessary and desirable, it involves the expenditure of \$30,000 or more, and that all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations have been complied with;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Board of Supervisors this 6th day of May, 2008, that the County Administrator be, and hereby is, authorized to execute procurement arrangements for the following:

Video Services Studio Equipment Replacement	<u>AMOUNT</u> \$227,474
---	----------------------------

Item No. 5. SPONSORSHIP OF TEXT AMENDMENT TO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE: Resolution R08-64

A RESOLUTION TO SPONSOR AN AMENDMENT TO SECTION 20.5-92, SUBDIVISIONS, YORK COUNTY CODE, TO REVISE THE PROCESS FOR APPEALS OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR INTER-CONNECTION OF SUBDIVISION STREETS

WHEREAS, Section 20.5-92 of the York County Subdivision Ordinance (Chapter 20.5, York County Code) requires that proposed subdivision streets be interconnected with those rights-of-way in adjoining subdivisions which have been platted to the common boundary line; and

WHEREAS, Section 20.5-92(c)5. establishes a process under which the Subdivision Agent's requirement to interconnect streets can be appealed to the Planning Commission, but provides for no further appeals from the decision of the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to consider an amendment to this section to provide that the Board of Supervisors would render the final decision on such appeals, subsequent to receipt of a recommendation on the matter from the Planning Commission; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Board of Supervisors, this the 6th day of May, 2008, that it does hereby sponsor an application for amendment of Section 20.5-92 of the York County Subdivision Ordinance revise the procedures for appeals of street interconnection requirements as proposed in the draft language set forth below.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that said application be, and it is hereby, forwarded to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation in accordance with applicable text amendment procedures.

Sec. 20.5-92. Alignment and layout.

- (a) In accordance with section 15.2-2241-2, Code of Virginia, all proposed streets shall be designed to coordinate with other existing or planned streets contiguous to or within the general area of the subdivision or within existing or future adjacent subdivisions as to location, width, grades, and drainage. Connections with existing or platted streets shall be continuous without offset.
- (b) The agent shall require that adequate rights-of-way are platted and dedicated for public use to the boundary line(s) of the subdivision which will afford desirable and safe street access to adjoining properties when such properties are of a compatible land use designation. In such cases, the following requirements shall apply:
- (1) These rights-of-way shall be clearly marked on the plats and labeled "Future Public Street" or "Future Public Street Extension" as appropriate. In addition, a sign shall be posted on the stub street right-of-way indicating that it is intended as a "Future Public Street Extension." Such sign shall be fabricated and installed by the County, with the costs of fabrication/installation to be paid by the subdivider.
 - (2) The following notation in, at a minimum, twelve (12) point lettering shall be incorporated into any plat showing a stub or future street:

THIS RIGHT-OF-WAY IS PLATTED WITH THE INTENT OF BEING
EXTENDED AND CONTINUED IN ORDER TO PROVIDE INGRESS
AND EGRESS TO AND FROM ADJOINING PROPERTIES.
 - (3) The following statement shall be included on the conveyance documents for any lot on a stub or future street:

THE RIGHT-OF-WAY UPON WHICH THIS LOT FRONTS HAS
BEEN PLATTED WITH THE INTENT OF IT BEING EXTENDED
AND CONTINUED IN ORDER TO PROVIDE INGRESS AND
EGRESS TO AND FROM ADJOINING PROPERTIES, AS SHOWN
ON THE PLAT RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK _____, PAGE
_____/INSTRUMENT NO. _____, CIRCUIT COURT FOR YORK
COUNTY.
- (c) Where a street right-of-way in an existing subdivision or development has been platted to the boundary line of a proposed subdivision, it shall be extended and continued into such proposed subdivision unless the extension is specifically precluded by an approval by the board of an overall development master plan for the proposed subdivision as part

of the establishment of a planned development district, or unless a waiver is granted by the agent after review by the department of transportation and upon the agent making one of the three findings enumerated in subparagraph (1) below:

(1) *Findings:*

- a. Such an extension would cause or contribute to a safety deficiency which could not be corrected in a practical or economically efficient manner as determined by the agent. In such cases, the subdivider shall be responsible for providing sufficient right-of-way and constructing within said right-of-way a permanent turnaround acceptable to the department of transportation to end the existing street.
 - b. The street right-of-way in the existing subdivision, although platted, has not had a street constructed within it, is not contained in the comprehensive plan, and it is unlikely that, in the foreseeable future, such a street will be so constructed. In such cases, the subdivider shall not be responsible for providing a turnaround acceptable to the department of transportation.
 - c. The existence of significant environmental conditions such as tidal or upland wetlands or severe slopes that, in the opinion of the subdivision agent, were not known or adequately considered at the time the potential extension was platted. The need for the installation of a permanent turnaround by the subdivider shall be determined by the agent on a case-by-case basis based on local site conditions.
- (2) A traffic operations and safety analysis of all connections shall be performed by a transportation planner or engineer or other professional qualified to perform such analyses. Such analyses shall be used by the agent in determining whether to require interconnection and, if so, whether traffic-calming measures should be included in the design, or whether to grant a waiver. The traffic operations and safety analysis shall be submitted by the developer with the preliminary subdivision plan.
- (3) Upon review of the proposed subdivision plan and relevant traffic operations and safety analyses, the agent shall render a decision concerning whether to require interconnection, to require interconnection with traffic-calming measures, or to grant a waiver from the interconnection requirement. If the agent decides to require interconnection and if the subdivision street(s) to which the connection would be made pre-dates the notice requirements specified in subsections (b)(1), (2) and (3) above, the agent shall, prior to approval of the Preliminary Plan, provide written notice of the decision to the developer and to the owners of record of parcels fronting on the road right-of-way to be extended and to any duly constituted property owners association representing adjacent lots or parcels. The notice shall state the location and times at which the plans and relevant traffic analyses may be examined. Inadvertent failure to provide such notice to one or more property owners shall not invalidate any aspect of the subdivision process.
- (4) No waiver may be granted if, by the granting of said waiver, any other provision of this chapter or the zoning ordinance would be violated, including specifically the requirement for two points of access required by section 20.5-92(e) of this chapter.
- (5) The decision of the Agent with respect to requiring interconnection and granting or not granting a waiver may be appealed by any person or persons individually or severally aggrieved to the planning commission within fifteen (15) days of notice of the decision having been mailed to the parties referenced above. The inadvertent failure to notify one or more property owners shall not extend the time frame for appeal. The appeal shall be in writing and shall be filed with the office of the Subdivision Agent prior to the expiration of the 15-day period.

Upon receipt by the Agent, the appeal shall be deemed referred to the planning commission and shall be scheduled for review and recommendation by the The

commission in accordance with the same procedures and notice provisions as are applicable to special use permit applications., After conducting a public hearing advertised in accordance with the terms of section 15.2-2204, Code of Virginia, the commission shall formulate a recommendation as to whether the Agent's decision should be upheld or overturned. In making its recommendation, the commission shall determine whether one or more of the findings enumerated in section 1, above, applies. The commission shall transmit its recommendation on the application to the board within 100 days of the first meeting of the commission after referral. Upon action by the commission, the application shall be scheduled for a duly advertised public hearing by the board of supervisors. Subsequent to the public hearing, and in consideration upon reaching one of the findings enumerated in subsection (1) above, the board may affirm or overturn the decision of the agent and may impose reasonable conditions as a part of its decision. The fifteen-day time limit notwithstanding, the developer of a subdivision may appeal the agent's interconnection requirement to the planning commission at any time during the course of development of the project. The application fee for an appeal of the agent's interconnection requirement shall be \$450.

- (6) In all situations where the agent or the ~~board/planning commission~~ grants a waiver to the street interconnection requirement, an alternative means for bicycle and pedestrian access shall be provided in close proximity to the otherwise required street. Such bicycle and pedestrian facilities shall be either within an existing right-of-way or in their own right-of-way and shall be designed and constructed in accordance with Figure VI-B in appendix A or with the standards used by the Virginia Department of Transportation for such facilities. Where the facility is designed to include the 16-foot wide base depicted in that figure, it will be deemed to satisfy the two points of emergency access required by section 20.5-92(f).
- (d) Street intersections shall be spaced and designed in accordance with the standards set forth in the Virginia Department of Transportation Subdivision Street Design Guide, dated January 1, 2005, and as may be amended from time to time.
- (e) All subdivisions of twenty-five (25) or more lots shall have two (2) means of ingress and egress. A boulevard type of street design providing a minimum ten-foot (10') wide median between lanes or other design generally achieving the same purpose may be accepted by the Agent, with the concurrence of the Department of Fire and Life Safety, as satisfying this requirement when the provision of two (2) separate means of ingress and egress is determined to be difficult or undesirable. Such boulevard type streets shall extend as far into the subdivision as the first cross street which provides an alternate circulation route. Median breaks shall be provided at street intersections and at other appropriate locations to ensure good traffic circulation and delivery of emergency services. Street trees shall be planted in the medians of boulevard-type streets at a minimum interval of one (1) tree for each forty feet (40') of median length.

Item No. 6. COMMENDATION OF 2007-2008 YORK COUNTY YOUTH COMMISSION: Resolution R08-40.

A RESOLUTION TO COMMEND THE 2007-2008 YORK COUNTY YOUTH COMMISSION AND TO EXPRESS THE APPRECIATION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO EACH MEMBER FOR THEIR DEDICATED SERVICE TO YORK COUNTY

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors established the York County Youth Commission in 1983; and

WHEREAS, the following youth,

Kyle Fiest, Chairman
Priyanka Ranganathan, Secretary
Jillian Berardini
Letitia Fowler

Dana Ryan, Vice Chairman
Nicole Asher
Rachel Donze
Jinah Lee

May 6, 2008

Abby Moul
Brennan Pritchard
Gabrielle Strike
Cody Williams

Anup Myneni
Michael Shin
Keith Waller

have served with distinction on the 2007-2008 York County Youth Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors is extremely pleased with the worthwhile activities undertaken by the Youth Commission this past year and wishes to publicly recognize the members for their accomplishments, which include:

Preparing for the year by attending training and teambuilding sessions during a two-day orientation last August;

Presenting quarterly activity reports to the Board of Supervisors and praying the invocation at these meetings, and also assisting at certain County functions, such as distributing American flags and programs during the annual Yorktown Day commemoration and helping at the annual York County Tree Lighting Ceremony by handing out programs and luminaries;

Co-sponsoring the County's eighth annual "Youth Week" event focusing on character development and featuring a nationally known youth speaker who spoke to high school students in assemblies throughout the week and to parents at an evening community meeting hosted by the Commission at Tabb High School;

Co-hosting with Parks and Recreation the annual Valentine's Party at the Senior Center of York, providing fun, prizes, and refreshments for all;

Sponsoring an enjoyable countywide high school Talent Show at Grafton High School, and donating the profits, on behalf of the County's youth, to the Boys and Girls Clubs of the Virginia Peninsula for the York County Capital Campaign's efforts towards establishing a new club in the County at the Yorktown Middle School campus;

Assisting the Historical Committee with its reception welcoming the 2008 exchange students from the county's sister city of Zweibrücken, Germany;

Making preparations for the second annual countywide "Outdoor Movie Night" at Riverwalk Landing's Chischiak Green in May;

Continuing to provide communication opportunities between the County's youth and elected officials by scheduling the fifth annual "Town Hall Meetings" in each of the County's public high schools this spring, bringing members of the Board of Supervisors and School Board together with high school students, presenting information about local government and current items of interest, and answering student questions and concerns;

Sponsoring a high school and middle school survey asking students to identify recreational activities and youth friendly stores and businesses they would most like to see come to York County;

Making further revisions and more frequent updates to the Youth Commission's website to increase student interest and further promote the visibility of the Youth Commission and its mission of serving as a communications' link between the County's youth and the Board of Supervisors;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Board of Supervisors on this the 6th day of May, 2008, that the 2007-2008 York County Youth Commission members be, and they hereby are, congratulated for their dedicated service to York County and commended for an outstanding year.

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the York County Board of Supervisors hereby extends its best wishes for continued success to these leaders of today and tomorrow.

EFFICIENCIES STUDY (Not on Agenda)

Mr. McReynolds indicated that staff was constantly looking at ways to improve efficiencies and services that the Board prescribes. He believed that the County was facing some out-of-the-ordinary times, and he stated he had asked the staff to start evaluating some things in preparation for the next budget session. He noted that he felt the County was very efficient, and he displayed for the Board some figures based on an article in last Saturday's newspaper comparing other jurisdictions with the County in terms of per citizen expenditure. Mr. McReynolds stated it showed that York County has the lowest per citizen expenditure in the Hampton Roads localities listed in the article. He also displayed another slide which showed employees per 1,000 residents, which indicated that York County had fewer employees than all the other jurisdictions in Hampton Roads per residents with the exception of Virginia Beach. Mr. McReynolds stated staff was always looking for ways to improve, and it had been a while since staff had a look at its efficiency, so he proposed that an RFP for an independent firm be placed to evaluate the County's efficiency prior to beginning next year's budget cycle.

Mr. Wiggins indicated he felt it was a good idea, stating the Board would be surprised what it found out by such a study.

Mr. Hrichak agreed, stating it would also be nice to get a citizen focus group to provide input on it also.

By consensus the Board directed Mr. McReynolds to proceed with an RFP to look at an efficiencies study for the County.

OPEN DISCUSSION

Mr. Zarembo indicated he had a meeting today with Bob Braxton and Jim Icenhour from the James City County Board of Supervisors on their projections for state revenue this year. He noted that they feel they would not be getting any kind of increase, and they would be labeling the decrement in the budget as "aid to the Commonwealth." He asked if the staff had heard anything that would indicate York County would be seeing a decrement from the Commonwealth.

Mr. McReynolds stated he knew the budget was not significantly different from what staff had projected and was reasonably accurate. He stated he was not certain about the school division in that its numbers were reasonably close depending on what its enrollment figures turned out to be.

Mr. Zarembo asked that staff prepare in the next week or two some kind of graph showing the increases and decreases for the Board to review,

Chairman Shepperd stated he and Mr. McReynolds attended a meeting of the HRMFFA on the 28th. He noted the County contributed about \$25,000-30,000 dollars, and it was a tentative start. He stated the organization deals with addressing the military alliance issues and coordinating efforts in the region to retain the federal facilities. He stated he was surprised at the tentativeness of the efforts to retain these facilities, and he was vocal in stating that the group was late in moving out on this. Mr. Shepperd stated the County may be asked to participate at a higher rate, and he indicated the program needed to be funded at a higher rate.

CLOSED MEETING. At 8:37 p.m. Mr. Zarembo moved that the meeting be convened in Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(a)(1) of the Code of Virginia pertaining to appointments to Boards and Commissions; and Section 2.2-3711(a)(3) pertaining to the disposition of public property.

On roll call the vote was:

Yea: (5) Noll, Wiggins, Hrichak, Zarembo, Shepperd
Nay: (0)

May 6, 2008

Meeting Reconvened. At 9:00 p.m. the meeting was reconvened in open session by order of the Chair.

Mrs. Noll moved the adoption of proposed Resolution SR-1 that reads:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY COMPLIANCE WITH THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REGARDING MEETING IN CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the York County Board of Supervisors has convened a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3711.1 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the York County Board of Supervisors that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Board of Supervisors this the 6th day of May, 2008, hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered by the York County Board of Supervisors.

On roll call the vote was:

Yea: (5) Wiggins, Hrichak, Zaremba, Noll, Shepperd
Nay: (0)

APPOINTMENT TO THE WILLIAMSBURG ARTS COMMISSION

Mrs. Noll moved the adoption of proposed Resolution R08-60 that reads:

A RESOLUTION TO APPOINT A YORK COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE TO THE WILLIAMSBURG ARTS COMMISSION

WHEREAS, the term of Genevieve Chis on the Williamsburg Arts Commission expires on June 30, 2008; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Chis has served two full terms on the Commission and is not eligible for reappointment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Board of supervisors this 6th day of May, 2008, that Lanette McNeil be, and is hereby, appointed as the York County representative to the Williamsburg Arts Commission, such term to begin July 1, 2008, and expire June 30, 2011.

On roll call the vote was:

Yea: (5) Hrichak, Zaremba, Noll, Wiggins, Zaremba
Nay: (0)

APPOINTMENTS TO THE COLONIAL SERVICES BOARD

Mr. Hrichak moved the adoption of proposed Resolution R08-55 that reads:

A RESOLUTION TO APPOINT YORK COUNTY REPRESENTATIVES TO THE COLONIAL SERVICES BOARD

WHEREAS, a vacancy for a York County representative on the Colonial Services Board exists due to the resignation of Ms. Joanne Smith, whose term expires June 30, 2009; and

WHEREAS, on June 30, 2008, the terms of Ms. Mary A. Clark and Ms. Barbara Burge expire, and they both have indicated their willingness to serve another term for which they are eligible;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Board of Supervisors this 6th day of May, 2008, that Charles R. McAdams, III, be, and he is hereby, appointed as a York County representative to the Colonial Services Board to complete the unexpired term of Joanne Smith, which expires June 30, 2009.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Mary A. Clark and Barbara Burge be, and are hereby, reappointed as representatives to the Colonial Services Board and for another term of three years, such term to begin July 1, 2008, and expire June 30, 2011.

On roll call the vote was:

Yea: (5) Zaremba, Noll, Wiggins, Hrichak, Shepperd
Nay: (0)

APPOINTMENTS TO THE 2008-2009 YORK COUNTY YOUTH COMMISSION

Mr. Hrichak moved the adoption of proposed Resolution R08-39 that reads:

A RESOLUTION TO APPOINT MEMBERS TO THE YORK COUNTY
YOUTH COMMISSION FOR 2008 - 2009

WHEREAS, the York County Board of Supervisors established the York County Youth Commission on March 3, 1983; and

WHEREAS, the revised bylaws of December 5, 2000, direct there shall be up to fifteen individuals appointed, three from each voting district, grades 9 through 12, to serve on the Commission;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Board of Supervisors on this 6th day of May, 2008, that the following individuals be, and they hereby are, appointed to the York County Youth Commission for 2008 - 2009.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Election District</u>
Casey Duggan	1
Gabrielle Julienne	1
Alex Wood	1
Katie Andleton	2
Courtney Carnevale	2
Prakriti Verma	2
Casey Bata	3
Elizabeth Greenwood	3
Brennan Pritchard	3
Nicole Asher	4
Joseph A. Voboril	4
Keith Waller	4

May 6, 2008

Todd Barnes	5
Erika Euker	5
Joshua W. Rivers	5

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the above-named individuals' terms will begin on July 1, 2008, and expire June 30, 2009.

On roll call the vote was:

Yea: (5) Noll, Wiggins, Hrichak, Zaremba, Shepperd
Nay: (0)

Meeting Adjourned. At 9:04 p.m. Chairman Shepperd declared the meeting adjourned sine die.



James O. McReynolds, Clerk
York County Board of Supervisors



Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr., Chairman
York County Board of Supervisors