

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 9, 2007**

At a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Floyd County, Virginia, held on Tuesday, January 9, 2007 at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Room of the County Administration Building, thereof;

PRESENT: David W. Ingram, Chairman; Jerry W. Boothe, Vice Chairman; Diane B. Belcher, J. Fred Gerald, Kerry W. Whitlock, Board Members; Daniel J. Campbell, County Administrator; Terri W. Morris, Assistant County Administrator.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. with the reading of the handicapping statement.

The Opening Prayer was led by Chairman Ingram.

Chairman Ingram led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. Deronda Thomas, Treasurer, appeared before the Board. She presented the invested cash and cash in office report as of January 9, 2007. She also presented a summary of collections of real estate and personal property for 2006. Real estate collections were at 96.6% and personal property at 88.6%.

Supervisor Belcher questioned if the collection percentage was higher in the first six months or second?

Mrs. Thomas - I really didn't run one. Because we get the book at the full amount, and I didn't run it that way.

Supervisor Belcher questioned the abatements - what does that consist of?

Mrs. Thomas - that is assessments that the Commissioner has made and the taxpayer comes in and proves that the assessment was in error. That could be for the sale of a vehicle before January 1, or things of that type.

Mrs. Morris presented the balance sheet and revenue/expenditure summary as of December 31, 2006. She reported that at 50% through the fiscal year, the General Fund shows expenses of 67% and revenues of 54%. She explained that the expense percentage is somewhat skewed because of large payments made this month, many of which are annual or bi-annual, such as the payment to Arrow Truck Sales, payments on the trash truck and brush trucks, etc.

Sheriff Shannon Zeman next appeared before the Board. He reported on the following:

- I have more information about the school entry team. Presented letter explaining the situation. The only thing that I really want to explain about that is the first paragraph. What I'm trying to say there is the fact that if we have a major incident at the school, we're going to be the ones to handle it regardless. If it happens today, we're going to have to respond and use resources we have and deal with the situation. As I explained last time, this is just equipment that I feel like would help us in our duties. I have several officers that have received training in this area, but I want to assign four officers to this specifically and get into more specialized equipment and training. As I told you last time, I'm going to continue this forward motion with this idea with or without funding, because I feel it is something that I feel we need to be doing. As I told you last time, we had already raised the money for a sniper rifle, have that. Since then, we have ordered two more assault rifles, have received those and paid for them with outside sources. It's been a slow process. Some of the hurdles that we faced - ammunition, is hard to get and it's expensive. My training officer just gave me the ammunition list yesterday and I ordered it to get us through the rest of the year was \$2900. We only have \$2500 in that account for the year, and I spoke with Terri and we're making some transfers out of some other accounts. Just want you to understand the expense of these types of things. If you're not familiar with what kind of weapons that I'm talking about here, I brought pictures to show you. It's a military style weapon. We'll have four per shift. These two rifles that we just got will give us one for the School Resource Officer and one for the office for several officers to use it. The four man team will consist of a sniper, the School Resource Officer, one at the office where several of us who work daylight will have access to that, and we'll pull one out of the patrol officers to be a part of that team. So, that's sort of where we're at there.

Supervisor Boothe - with the increased cost, have you given any thought to self-loading?

Sheriff Zeman - no, I couldn't take that risk. This ammunition that I'm talking about, it was for the rest of the year, to qualify with our handguns, the assault rifles, it's under State contract. There's a lot of liability with these rifles, and a lot of training. I would be afraid of some type of self-loading.

Supervisor Gerald - once you get this team together, what kind of response time would it be to a place like Indian Valley that's out of the main stream of things?

Sheriff Zeman - it would be better than it is today. If we have a situation in Indian Valley, we're going to take the resources we have and respond. Depending on the situation, as to whether we'd call the TAC team or not. My experience with the TAC team can be anywhere from an hour, two hours, or even more. You know as well as I do, if there's a major incident going on, I can't wait two hours. I'm not going to have our children being assaulted while we're waiting on a TAC team, we're going to do what we have to do. The training, the funds, the equipment, to give you a specific time on how much that would improve that, I couldn't say today, but I would hope that it would improve things.

Supervisor Gerald - just the way things are now, I'm really concerned about the security of Indian Valley, its so far out and isolated.

Sheriff Zeman - I understand. I think another thing that would help us tremendously is when we go to the individual schools and look at their particular situation and practice different scenarios. That's where we'll work with the schools closer, I've already spoken with them, they're all for it.

- Courtroom security money - I'm not pushing that issue, just update you a little bit. Presented copy of amount of funds that have been collected, what line item they are in, etc. If we decide that's something that the Sheriff's Office spends, we would need a line item for it at some point and I'm willing to discuss my ideas for those funds.

- Still waiting on DOC to certify the lockup. We are operating that lockup as a lockup under policy approved by DOC and I think we're making every measure to protect ourselves and the County as far as problems with someone in the lockup.

- Employees - we just hired a road officer who will start the 15th of this month and doing interviews today for one dispatcher. When we get those hires complete, we'll be back to full staff again.

- New business - I never mention much about the Academy, I have their audit and will leave it for you. We serve 21 member jurisdictions, 563 officers are being trained at the Academy. We moved into a new place in Draper and are continuing to develop that piece of property. We're proud of the Academy, they do a good job.

- Jail - I sit on the Board there, also on the Personnel Committee, and was recently appointed to the Construction/Design Committee.

- Task Force - I'm not here asking for any money, just want to share this with you. It costs \$9000/year to be in the Task Force, its time for the second payment. The majority of that money I have through drug seizure money. I was a little short, but we'll figure out how to get that money. Being in the Task Force is like being in the Jail, sometimes decisions are made for that group as a whole that affects each jurisdiction. I'll tell you what happened here. The Task Force applied for a Federal grant, I took it upon myself without your support, to be involved in the Task Force. I wanted to show you what we could do with that situation. We're going to raise the funds to pay the \$9000. During the course of the first year, the Task Force applied for a Federal grant for equipment and received that grant. Its like every other grant, there's some hitches to it. The hitch was that there was a certain amount of money that had to be put up and that got divided between all the jurisdictions. I'm working on raising that money to pay that bill. Just wanted to share that with you, because at some point in time if I ask you for some help, I want you to have a good understanding of it.

- We did join another Task Force, out of Bedford County, Blue Ridge Thunder. Hope to do a press release on that right away. Its an internet Task Force, and they have built that program, a lot of jurisdictions are coming on board, using their expertise, and we plan to do the same thing.

Supervisor Boothe questioned the off-duty officer program, how is it working?

Sheriff Zeman - its working well, no problems. The only thing we did different this year,

was where we did the Tech football games. The first year we had six slots for each game, this year we only had four. We did the Floyd Fest parking, we contracted for one officer to run the parking lot. We did some festivals at Chateau Morrisette. They all went real well, covered what we needed to do for the County, the officers were off that did these events. Everyone was billed, we received the funds, no incidents, no injuries. So far, its been a success. Our officers appreciate the extra income.

Commonwealth's Attorney Gordon Hannett next appeared before the Board. A heads-up about the budget. The State has completely stopped funding equipment for our office. But we were able to make purchases a couple of years ago that will keep us in good stead for a while, so I don't anticipate any needs this year. Should be level funding requested. The Sheriff mentioned the Drug Task Force, and I wanted to expand on his comments. That program has been such a huge benefit to the community. Before I left for Iraq, Shannon and I talked about the prospect of getting into the Task Force, and since I've been back, we've been in it for some time now, and I have seen a dramatic increase in the number of drug cases that the Sheriff's Office has generated because of the Task Force. As you know, just because of the nature of drug cases, when you get one drug case, it just expands exponentially, the number of drug cases you get. You get one person who rolls on other people, and you just get drug case after drug case after drug case. There's several benefits to that. It cleans up the County as far as drugs in the County, but we also get to keep their stuff, their money, their cars, and use those things for the benefit of the County when they're forfeited. I take part in the court part, and we've been able to sell some of their things and use that money for the benefit of the Sheriff's Office. Its been a great benefit to the County. What you may not know about the Task Force, is that the prosecutors who are in the Counties who participate in the program, are required to help out as well. What we do is go to Christiansburg, four times a year, and participate in a special Grand Jury, where we indict drug dealers who have been caught selling drugs to informants in the Drug Task Force, and I take part in that. All of us play a part in that and it benefits all of us.

At 9:00 a.m., the Chairman called for the Public Comment Period.

After no comments from the audience, the Chairman declared the Public Comment Period closed.

The minutes of December 12, 2006 and January 2, 2007 were presented to the Board for review and approval.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Gerald, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to approve the minutes of December 12, 2006 and January 2, 2007 as presented.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

The monthly disbursements were presented to the Board for review and consideration. Questions and discussion followed. A list of additional disbursements was also presented for the Board's review.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Belcher, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to approve the monthly disbursements, plus additions, as presented, with appropriation clarifications, as discussed.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Mr. Carl Ayers, Social Services Director, next appeared before the Board. He reported on proposed legislation upcoming in the General Assembly, that affects the local office, as of yesterday. Most of the proposed legislation is just pulling adoption regulations in line with Federal regulations, there were some changes that were put in last year, so they're just pulling everything in line, that won't be a major impact on us, just making sure the State is following through with Federal regs. There are a couple of changes related to custody issues that I thought you might find interesting, of how the court is going to handle them. One is a House bill by Marshall, it provides that the circumstances that contributed to the dissolution of a marriage must be considered as a factor in determining the best interest of the child for custody and visitation. That's something that our courts have never considered before, so they're actually going to have to look at the factors of the marriage dissolving and consider that as part of the custody decision. That would be a pretty big change in how the court will look at those placements. I will be interested to see, for example, if you have an adultery case that led to divorce, what the court will be looking that in that type of case. Another bill by Marshall creates a commission on immigration. It will be an advisory commission in the executive branch to analyze the impact of immigration on the Commonwealth and make recommendations on policies regarding education and employment, in cooperation with the Federal government. Creates a central child care provider registry, so any of the providers in a locality, gives them the option of contacting the group and they can run background checks. Will make it easier for people to get licensed child care providers. On a House Bill by Rapt, exempts Federal, State and local officials from fees charged by the DMV for obtaining data, or other State agencies. We have to pay other State agencies when we access their records even though we're required to get that information, we pay them a certain fee, so it would mean less cost for our office if they would exempt that. There's also a House Bill by McQuigg that requires the preparation of parenting plan for any actions involving custody/visitation of a minor. It doesn't say how the parenting plans will be written, it just says that they will specify the allocation of parenting responsibilities and establishes a parenting time schedule. If the court does approve the plan, then they should proceed to determine visitation and custody. The way that I'm reading that is that it should speed up the process, we wouldn't have to go through a full court proceeding for every visitation and custody matter, that the attorneys would develop the parenting plan and submit to the Judge,

and if its appropriate, the Judge could approve the parenting plan instead of having to go through the whole custody and visitation process. That has, of course, other issues, such as tax implications and where the child would reside, and all those other things. I don't necessarily know how this would play out. There's also a Senate Bill that repeals the current law which provides that in any case in which visitation/custody of a child is at issue, that the mental records concerning the parents shall be privileged and confidential and the mental health provider may not be required to testify on behalf or against the parent or relatives. What that means right now, it makes somebody that is doing psychological testing on somebody, come into court and testify against someone they're treating and examining. It appears that you're opening information that was not open before. Everything is being referred to committees right now. The last one is Senate Bill 835 which provides an exemption to receive TANF benefits who've been convicted of a felony drug offense pursuant to certain Code sections, and comply with criminal court orders for programs for treatment. Federal law changed last year whenever they changed TANF to allow anybody that's been convicted of a drug offense, if they've completed their treatment and had been so many years from the drug offense, that they could receive TANF benefits. This is bringing the State laws into compliance with Federal laws.

Mrs. Lydeana Martin, Director of Community and Economic Development, next appeared before the Board.

Agenda Item 10(a) - Subdivision plats as approved by Agent for December 2006. She reported that 143 lots were created in the 2006 calendar year, which was down dramatically from previous years. Down about 10% from 2004. The number of surveys signed overall is staying pretty consistent. The number of lot lines continues to inch up each year. 555 lots created in the last three years.

Mrs. Martin also presented a copy of the advertisement in the 2007 Virginia Travel Guide for the Board's information. She commented that the committees for the 175th County anniversary, in connection with Virginia's 400th anniversary, and Harvest Festival are both meeting to plan events for the upcoming year.

Mr. Dennis Anderson next appeared before the Board to give an update on the committee that is meeting concerning greenways/trails in Floyd County. He reported that a grant had been received from the Virginia Division of Forestry for a study of the trails, performed by Virginia Tech. Four public hearings have been held on the proposed trail corridor study, and things that they would like to see included. In sharing the proposed trail map with the Board, he commented that this would be strictly a volunteer program, with no eminent domain, property would be donated. The committee is now in a position to apply for additional grants for research, property acquisition, bricks/mortar, etc.

Sheriff Shannon Zeman and Mr. Bill White, with Thompson & Litton, next appeared before the Board for discussion of the proposed expansion of the communication center.

Sheriff Zeman - reminded the Board of discussion of the expansion of the communication

center that began in 2005. The Board has been to the existing dispatch center and knows that it is around 500 square feet, and over-crowded. We are dealing with new equipment issues that we all have, with no space to incorporate this equipment. We met in January of 2006, George, myself and you all. The decision we were trying to make was location. On February 2, 2006, you all had given George the authority to move ahead with Thompson & Litton to do a study as to which site would be the most feasible from several views. Since then, I have worked with Thompson & Litton. We had one proposal, just briefly mention, don't really want to get into it, we felt it wasn't something we thought would work. Was probably two times the amount of money we're looking at now. To summarize the main issue, we would have the possibility of three floors at some time for expansion. It didn't really work architecturally for the building, and I know when we talked at our meeting in January, we were looking at current needs. When Dan came on board, he'd been here about a week, we got together, we met with Mr. White and looked at this thing again, and that's what we have for you today. We hope today to be able to answer any questions that you have. Mr. White can answer questions as to how we came to the option that we have for you today.

Mr. White - we took the existing space, expanding it to make it an equipment room, all the telephone lines and everything for the communications is already there, and won't have to be moved. It would also be used for a backup station, if something happened and the two main stations had to be evacuated, some kind of threat or environmental problem, it could be moved into that space. We basically looked at two locations, putting an addition on the back of the Courthouse, or going into the building behind us. The space back here is not exactly ideal. You could put the communication center there, but there's a couple of things that just don't work. Its more for an office space and communication centers are special and different in that its good to have a raised access floor so that you can run all the wiring, and its miles of it, going to the computers, each station has five screens, the communications all through the County, phone lines coming in and out, we probably would not want to do that here. We'd have to dig the floor up, and its hard to say how deep the foundation is, and it probably would not be feasible to have the raised access floor here. Its basically a basement space, so you don't have very much floor to floor height in there. You've got to get all the mechanical equipment in there, the ducts, lighting, all that sort of thing, you can't have a very high ceiling in there. Right now, there is a duct that runs down through the middle of it, I think it serves the upstairs. You've got a space that's probably only 7' in there. If you have people working 24/7, they're pretty much chained to their desk and it doesn't make for a very good environment, as far as a closed ceiling with no light. If you put it at this location, we need a room for emergency services, like if you have a task force that comes in for some type of emergency, you can set up a conference room that they can work in. We already have a conference room at the Courthouse, so we wouldn't have to duplicate that space here. The other thing you'd need here that we wouldn't need at the Courthouse is the Coordinator's Office. We already have a space in the Courthouse for the Coordinator's office. If we did that, the space there has a big chunk taken up for the heating/air conditioning equipment for the space upstairs. We'd probably end up with a new addition on the back of this building. So, one way or another, we'd probably have to be adding to the building. I'm not sure how familiar you are with construction, but basically to get a contractor to show up costs you a certain amount of money no matter how big/small the project is. The actual square

foot cost might be more at this location than at the other. You might want to consider that aspect. The facts of the low ceiling, the addition for the equipment, etc. all add to the consideration. If the dispatchers are located here, sometimes the Sheriff uses them to work other jobs when they're not needed for dispatch, such as surveying the people in the jail cells who are being held, sometimes they're used as backup for officers when they're doing the video magistrate, they wouldn't be able to do that. The other aspect is, say a person has a domestic problem going on. Where does the person go? To the Sheriff's Department. Well, the Sheriff's Department is not manned 24 hours a day. People go there and Dispatch can help them. If you move the Dispatch Center over here, most people are not going to be able to find it. There might be some delay in getting help. At the Courthouse site, we eliminated the conference room and dispatch office, so there is a smaller area of need. Keeping all communication equipment in one area, so you won't have to relocate the phone lines, don't have to do anything about the microwave tower. There is also already emergency power at the Courthouse with a generator. If we come to this location, we'd have to have a new generator and it would take at least one parking space. The way it would work at the Courthouse is that we would build it at the level of the entry at the back of the Courthouse. It would look like the rest of the Courthouse, one story lower. With the raised access floor, there would be plenty of room to run the wiring, it would come directly out of the equipment room, which is a half level below that level, plenty of space to raise the ceiling, plenty of space to run the duct work. Basically, what you'd have, is a vestibule where the people would enter. The communication center is secure, but there would be glass that is bullet resistant where the dispatcher could look out the glass, through the vestibule, to see who is there. There would be some connection to the outside. If someone comes there after hours, the door is locked, but the dispatcher could buzz them in and the door locks behind them. If you have some guy chasing his wife, you could let her in, keep him out, until an officer could be called to take care of the situation. There are also public bathrooms in that area, and I suppose a person could lock themselves in that bathroom, if they were being chased. We're looking at security on that level as well. The Sheriff's Department would have an entrance just where it is now. That would be one entrance to Dispatch. That's all laid out pretty well.

Sheriff Zeman - the entrance from the parking lot is the main entrance because realistically, that's where 95% of the traffic flow comes in. It's an easy area to architecturally do. You remember from our discussions, that the Judge has no objection to building on as long as it connects somewhat. We've got the green roof and other things that can be matched up. It will be ground level, incorporates the entrance for the dispatch, my staff, and the public all in one area. The things that I like as far as the changes are it's at ground level, that cuts the possibility of another story if it's ever needed, but I think it makes it match better. It puts the entrance where it needs to be. The other way we would have to use the existing entrance or the entrance from the bank side, which wouldn't work well for us.

Mr. White - when you take all those things into consideration, the cost between one site and the other site as far as construction, are pretty much equal, especially if you consider the long-term costs of operating the facility and maybe getting a little extra use out of the dispatch staff to help with Sheriff's Department duties.

Sheriff Zeman - when we talk about being at different levels, lets talk about problems with the existing dispatch center, and wiring is one of the main problems. As this area continues to grow, with more equipment and technology, it's a wiring nightmare. Whichever location we decide on, putting it at the Courthouse will put the addition above ground, with plenty of room for raised floors. Something else to think about, if we have 9-10' ceilings, it will help us incorporate all the monitors. That also leads back to the Dispatchers doing other duties. Their primary function is to be dispatchers, but we always look at ways to be more efficient. Currently, they monitor our doors in/out of the booking area, monitor cameras in the Sheriff's Office, at some point in time there will be more cameras around the Courthouse and Courtroom that they will monitor, lockup duty, two Dispatchers that work on warrants and administrative duties when time allows. There is another issue that has recently come up about video magistrates. As you will recall, I have no control over the video magistrates. They did away with a full-time magistrate in Floyd County. The video magistrate is behind locked doors. If someone in the community wants to see a magistrate, its hard to tell them to drive to Christiansburg or wait until tomorrow. We have to have an officer drive in, unlock the door, and help with the procedure. I've spoken with the Chief Magistrate and that's something that we're working on right now, is the possibility that under certain conditions, that a Dispatcher would be able to unlock the door and assist the citizen. As far as the actual floor plan, Bill worked with me in the design. We worked on a couple of issues, wiring being one, the other being traffic flow. We want the employees to be able to work with the Dispatchers but we want to limit access to our new communication center, make some changes there, so there was some thought put into how this is laid out. You know that we planned for this as far as cost and square footage, considering these things, we tried to take space that was available within the Courthouse. To clarify the Coordinator's Office, it should be called the Supervisor's Office. Originally the plans showed that there would be an area for training and we would use the existing area that we have in the Courthouse for training. The Supervisor's office is the Supervisor that works for the Sheriff's Office and we have an office in the Courthouse that we've already equipped and that Supervisor is already using. So that's how we could do away with some square footage at the Courthouse site.

Mr. Campbell questioned Mr. White as to his recommendation.

Mr. White - my gut feeling is that the Courthouse site would work better and it lends itself more to the communication center, just in the fact that physically we would have a wire way, a high ceiling, plenty of room for equipment, etc. It seems to be more convenient for the staff and citizens.

Sheriff Zeman - we looked at other sites, other communication centers, there are different concepts. There are areas where they take their communication center and put it off in the middle of nowhere and fence it in. It has a lot of security benefits. But it really doesn't work for Floyd County. I was thinking about the dispatch center being a 24/7 operation, there's not even a fuel station in Floyd County open those hours. The only thing I could think of that you could call in the middle of the night would be H&V, they have a third shift, there's nothing but the Sheriff's Office. The dispatch center is not just for the Sheriff's Office, it benefits the fire,

rescue, County offices that we monitor and dispatch, the Game Warden, the State Police has their own dispatch in Salem, but we work with them, they're assigned here, its just the hub of all communications in the County. I can't stress enough how important it is. Something I would like to mention if I was in your shoes, when you think of the cost. What about equipment, what follows this? Ford Wirt has worked very well in maintaining our equipment, he's working on upgrading our consoles right now. I spoke with him recently as to the grant that is available to us, around the \$200,000 mark. I know we're talking about the building right now, the location, but I feel like if we can move forward with the construction, it looks like we have a really good grasp on the equipment. When we build a new facility and have to ask for equipment too, it would be difficult, but we have a decent handle on the equipment situation, where if we can get the building built, we have enough upgraded equipment already to take care of everything in one budget period.

Mr. Campbell - so what you need from the Board is concurrence on the site selection and authorization to proceed with final design?

Sheriff Zeman - that and I hope that the Board will allow us to start budgeting for construction of the center.

Mr. Campbell - of course the first part would be bids for final design.

Supervisor Boothe - I think with all the different considerations, the site at the Courthouse is the best for many reasons.

Sheriff Zeman - I don't know if I told you or not, but I have recently talked with the Judge and keeping him updated on the situation, there's still no change with him as far as an addition being built onto the Courthouse.

Supervisor Whitlock - how many parking spaces and entrances will this addition affect?

Mr. White - it won't affect any entrances, they will be maintained the way they are. We will lose 3-4 parking spaces.

Sheriff Zeman - the addition is only 36' out into the parking lot, and the addition doesn't reach the first parking space, but we would have to leave space for traffic flow into the parking lot. Not a lot of loss. This plan is looking at about 1450' of new addition, with renovation of around 600' that we currently have, not to include the training area and the Supervisor's office. It addresses our current needs, we did reduce some because of cost, but I do feel like it addresses needs for another ten years.

Discussion followed on the layout of the building and parking lot, with the Sheriff and Mr. White displaying same on paper copies with the Board.

Mr. Gene Dalton, EMS Operations Manager, next appeared before the Board. He

reported 45 patients for the career staff for the month, with 31 transported, 13 refusals, 1 DOA, no transfer of care, 8 standbys for fire calls. 61 total calls responded to by EMS, with 19 calls with volunteers.

In reporting for the volunteer side, for the Rescue Captain, Mr. Dalton reported 65 calls total, 32 transported. All calls have been answered by either career or volunteer staff, no calls were missed.

Mrs. Myra Grim, EMS Administrative Clerk, next appeared before the Board. She presented the EMS financial report for the month, indicating that deposits are down somewhat, but it is common State-wide, according to Diversified. The new quarterly collection rate is 73%, which is down from the 77% collection rate last quarter. She reminded the Board that this figure does include cash and non-cash collections, which includes write-offs and bad debt.

Mr. Ford Wirt, Emergency Services Coordinator, next appeared before the Board. He reported:

- Regional jail - have appointed a committee for the design/construction for the expansion; proposal was accepted from Thompson & Litton for architectural/engineering services from bids received.
- Grant for radio equipment was approved in the amount of \$192,940.80 from the Virginia Rescue Squad Assistance Fund, will need a 20% match.
- Station #4 Rescue is expected to be completed in early February.
- On Thursday of this week, we will be touring the Henry County communication center if any Board member would like to join us.

Dr. Terry Arbogast, School Superintendent, next appeared before the Board. He presented the school enrollment report as of December 31, 2006, indicating 2060 students.

The Board recessed for lunch at Indian Valley Elementary School.

Mr. Bob Beasley, VDoT Residency Administrator, next appeared before the Board. He commented that he would like to discuss particulars of the secondary construction plan with the Board at a future date. There are more funds being put toward Federal projects, such as connector routes, while the State portion decreases. There are thirteen collector routes in Floyd County. The Federal funds must be used toward these collector routes. We can do several small projects or accumulate the funds to do a large project. There will be around \$200,000 in this category for the coming year. After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board for Mr. Beasley to provide a list of the collector routes and whether these funds could be applied to bridges. Mr. Beasley will attend a meeting with the Board on January 31, 2007 to discuss the matter further.

Supervisor Boothe - appreciate the work you are doing; Route 810, the washed out spots - any schedule yet for ditching?

Mr. Beasley - we are trying to obtain the environmental permit.

Supervisor Boothe - what work they have done, the silt fences are catching water and running it into the road. When we have cold weather, we may have freezing problems. Route 710 from Route 8 to the landfill - needs shoulder work and patching. Baker Street from Route 8 to the High School - another place has washed out and is causing problems, also at the stop sign at Woods Gap Road is another bad place.

Supervisor Belcher - dirt roads are in bad shape with all the recent rain; grading did help but then rain messed up all your work - a lot of water washed; ditches need to be cleaned out before ice/snow comes; will get specific road numbers for you and call with problems.

Supervisor Whitlock - a thank you letter needs to be sent to the tree trimming folks that AEP has hired, they are helping your roads also; also have roads in my area that need scraping but it may not be the time to do it.

Supervisor Gerald - nothing to report this month.

Supervisor Ingram - secondary gravel roads need attention when you can.

Ms. Marty Holliday, Workforce Investment Board, next appeared before the Board. She presented their annual report for 2006, highlighting the various programs that they offer. Their dislocated worker program is administered through the VEC. They are handling four cases in Floyd County at the present time. Their adult and youth programs are administered through Goodwill Industries. A summer intern program is also available for eligible students. A tremendous amount of work is also done in cooperation with the local schools, both at the administrative level and at the schools themselves.

Mr. Gerald Gallimore and Mr. Eddie Bowers, Citizens Telephone Cooperative, next appeared before the Board concerning a co-location request from their company.

Mr. Gallimore - This request is part of the fiber network that Citizens has committed to the Virginia Tobacco Commission to complete the access connection from their southern to the southwest project. The Mid-Atlantic broadband program was Southside's fiber project and it runs basically from Patrick County East to Nottingham County, then West from Grayson and Wythe Counties to Bristol is the Southwest section, which is made up of Bristol Utilities and then the Lenniwisco/Cumberland Gap coalfield coalition. Those fiber networks are pretty much under construction now, to the point that Southside has become operational this year, Southwest about 75% is operational. We are building the ties to the existing network that Citizens had in place so that we will tie all three of those networks, plus the North Carolina network, made up of some small independent cooperatives down there, called Access On. We are building a major connection into Virginia Tech for another project, and it will also tie Virginia Tech back into the Crossroads Institute in Galax and to the Danville Center of Virginia Tech. Virginia Tech is very much into economic development in those regions. The project as a whole is an economic

development project and the design, with the major players being Bristol Utilities, us, and Mid-Atlantic Broadband, have attempted to also pass by any higher education facilities in the process of building these projects, so we will be able to tie all those institutions in, although they were not the fundamental guise for the project, its all economic development. The original design plan called for all of the industrial parks in the Southwest and Southside areas of the State to be tied together with this fiber network and to have co-location, or access, points at each of these industrial parks. From a telephone cooperative standpoint, what we're actually doing is building the facility to bring in our competition. But State-wide, that is the goal is to have a network that will guarantee anybody who has an economic interest in moving into one of these industrial parks, that they can get services beyond what is offered by the local franchise holder. The second page shows pictures of a couple of installations that are in place to give you an idea of what we're proposing on these sites. The one with the generator is the actual site in Stuart at the community college down there. That is a NBC site, but its also where we tie our network to them. The one with the backhoe showing in the edge of the picture is on Route 100 up in Carroll County, and that's one of Citizens' installations. That picture was taken earlier so the generator and propane tank are not in place, and its not graveled at this point. Most of these sites can easily be fitted on a 40x50' site. I think the largest site we have is about 75'x75'. Its roughly a 12'x18' building with room for a generator, 250 gallon propane tank, and then enough area there to park a vehicle or two. Its relatively small sites. These units are called co-locations, in that you see on the two door unit, one side of that is for the company to put in our facilities and equipment and control them. There's literally a dividing wall in that building, the other side is for anybody else who wants to come in so if they have equipment, they can have 24/7 access to it, without some of our people having to come out. That allows them then, to have access to come in and serve the customers in a general area.

Mr. Campbell - do you negotiate lease agreements with the other providers? Negotiate fees?

Mr. Gallimore - oh yes, the fees are based on a cost of recovering over a 60-month time frame. They negotiate the transport fee based on how much transport they need over fiber or whether they need the whole fiber, or several fibers, or just a piece of spectrum over a fiber. A lot of the cases, particularly in the Southside quadrant, where these sites are at places that are conducive, we're going in beside them and putting up towers so we can invite in wireless operators to get on those towers. The next two pages show sites we have obtained for this project on US Route 58, you see a small, unusual shaped area. That is right up against I-77 in Hillsville. That little piece of property will simply have a hut site, the generator, propane tank and parking space. Carroll County is conveying that to us to get us to come in. That is directly in front of one of their industrial parks. The Wythe County one is a slightly larger quad, it is 75'x75', plus a 250' road and right-of-way to get into it. What we did there is the property next to the road is committed to a high volume water tank on the project that they're bringing over from Austinville, so we're dropping in right behind the water tank and putting in this installation. We had to pay \$7500 for that lot and part of the reason was they had to cut it off the big lot and get the water folks to agree. They also had to change some of their ordinances for us, in order for us to have that size lot, at that point they didn't have anything set up in their zoning ordinance for

utility use. Plus, in our case, we liked the idea of being beside that water tower because it just happens that its going to a 100' or more tall, and we might mount something on top of it. It doesn't create as much problem for the folks in the neighborhood that way, and its also a matter of economics, that water tower is going up anyway. For a few thousand dollars, we can super structure it, and add a few antennas. When you go from the ground up, it costs you every foot. Then we move to the Floyd Regional Park pictures, shown on the last three sheets. We're looking at a spot on Lot #5, just past the drive down to the cul-de-sac at the Phlegar house. The photos are of that particular rise. That particular lot has a small flat area that drops away fairly sharply. We looked at moving out of the flat area, to an area before the drop-off, it gets very narrow in there, where possibly a triangle of property could be cut off, as long as we can get a vehicle in there, kind of behind the guardrail and behind the embankment. It would add some protection for us from a traffic mishap going into that building. Those building are pre-fab, not substantial like something built out of concrete. At the same time, it's a very good location as far as our electronic needs, tying fibers together and being there in the industrial park. It looks like we could do the least amount of damage to the existing lots by utilizing an area that presently doesn't look usable. The secondary reason we went there is to give a little distance between us and the AEP substation. The substation generates a tremendous amount of electromagnetic interference and the fiber optics are not affected by it, but the equipment that you put on the end are. That's our story and we're asking for the County to give us that spot, but we're open to anything that is available. We'd like to get it at no cost, but we'll deal with that based on your decision and the value of the real estate that we'd be taking is.

Chairman Ingram - I think the Board would be more than willing to consider this request. I think it might be good if we take a field trip there and look at the exact spot. To see if it works in our plans or another spot that might work better. We can discuss the matter with you again soon.

Supervisor Boothe - as far as your service road, what is the minimum width that you'd need.

Mr. Bowers - 10', just enough to get a truck in there.

Mr. Gallimore - we might need room to get a lift truck in there at some point, 10' would be plenty wide.

Mr. Bowers - and room to park a truck there when we're working.

Consensus of the Board was to tour the site, discuss the matter further, and confer with Citizens again at a later date.

Mr. James Cornwell, County Attorney, next appeared before the Board. In reference to the recent payment by the County to VDoT for the industrial park road, Mr. Cornwell commented that he and Mr. Campbell had contacted Senator Reynolds and Delegate Dudley to submit a budget amendment to the General Assembly for those funds. One will be submitted

today and one the day after. We're making the pitch like we did to VDOT that we were too late on the qualifying period, and too early when they changed the regulations for receiving half of the funds back. Since we were in that gap, we should get some consideration. VDOT's budget would be amended to give us the money.

Agenda Item 10d - Thompson & Litton addendum for Library project. Mr. Campbell presented the addendum for the Board's consideration and commented that the addendum is for relocation of a sewer line; additional surveying/certifying of plats; additional meetings with the various committees related to this project - some have already occurred and some are upcoming. The adjacent property owner is still being contacted and discussions held concerning the sewer easement. There is some language concerning change in financial sources, I thought that was somewhat overboard since we are going an easier route, but nevertheless, it does represent some additional work for the architect. The amount is \$15,700, I do not think it affects the contribution from the Board of Supervisors. It seems appropriate as we're getting ready to bid the project that we have this addendum in place.

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, seconded by Supervisor Whitlock, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to approve the addendum as presented, with Thompson & Litton, in the amount of \$15,700, for additional work for the Jessie Peterman Memorial Library expansion.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Agenda Item 10e - Appointment to Workforce Investment Board, business representative, 3 year term. The letter from the Workforce Investment Board indicates Mr. Stephens' willingness to serve another term.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Boothe, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to reappoint Mr. Samuel Stephens to the Workforce Investment Board as a business representative, for a three year term, contingent upon his acceptance of same.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

After discussion that the position had not been advertised, the motion and second was withdrawn. Staff will advertise the position.

Agenda Item 10f - New River Health District Agreement. Mr. Campbell presented the proposed agreement for the Board's review, and indicated that the agreement reflects the current year's approved budget amount.

On a motion of Supervisor Belcher, seconded by Supervisor Boothe, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to approve the agreement with the New River Health District, as presented, for the total of \$133,925 for the FY07 budget ending June 30, 2007 (Document File Number).

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Agenda Item 10g - Resolution for signing of County warrants. Mr. Campbell presented the proposed resolution with the change in Vice Chairman, for the Board's consideration.

On a motion of Supervisor Belcher, seconded by Supervisor Whitlock, and carried, it was resolved to adopt the resolution, as presented, for signing of County warrants (Document File Number).

Supervisor Boothe - abstain
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - abstain

At 4:00 p.m., the Chairman called for the public hearing on the proposed abandonment of 1.2 miles of State Secondary Route 748, which is now discontinued.

The County Administrator read the call for the public hearing.

Mr. Cornwell gave a brief synopsis of the request - This began with a request from Virginia Land Ventures, LLC, who is a property owner on this discontinued Route 748. We have reviewed the road. You have seen pictures of the road, or lack thereof, of discontinued State Route 748. Based upon the records in the Circuit Clerk's office, and working with Mr. Jim Shortt, on behalf of his client, Virginia Land Ventures, LLC, the only property owners that we could determine that would be affected by the abandonment, are Virginia Land Ventures, LLC, which is requesting the abandonment, and Justin A. Parker. Both Mr. Parker and Virginia Land Ventures have access to their property from Route 740, as well as this previously discontinued road. It appears that all other properties adjoining Virginia Land Ventures and Mr. Parker have access from Routes 740, 743, and 750. None of the property owners have used this Route 748, because both ends are grown up and not passable by vehicles. You have previously abandoned a section of Route 748, from Route 730 to .60 southwest in December 1964, this is a continuation of an additional abandonment. We listed the property owners that we thought should be notified, and I understand they were notified as required. We know of no reason why it shouldn't be abandoned.

The Chairman called for comments from the audience.

Mr. James Shortt - I represent Virginia Land Ventures and we have nothing to add except like Mr. Cornwell stated, the road apparently hasn't been used for at least 20, if not 30 or 40 years and it parallels the existing public lane. It doesn't cut off access to anybody that we can tell. For that reason, we request that the road be abandoned completely.

After no further comments from the audience, the Chairman declared the Public Hearing closed.

On a motion of Supervisor Belcher, seconded by Supervisor Boothe, and carried, it was resolved to adopt the resolution for abandonment of a 1.2 mile section of State Secondary Route 748 as presented (Document File Number).

Supervisor Boothe - abstain
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - nay
Supervisor Ingram - aye

At 4:30 p.m., the Chairman called for a Public Hearing on repeal of certain sections of the Floyd County Code: Dogs and replacement with State Code section.

The County Administrator read the call for the public hearing.

Mr. Cornwell gave a brief synopsis of the proposed repeal and replacement - In Section 3.1-796.93:1 of the Code of Virginia provided that the governing body of any County, City, or Town may enact an ordinance regulating vicious and dangerous dogs and it has provisions that if jurisdictions decided to adopt such ordinance, it had provisions in there as to what the ordinance would contain. In July 2006, the General Assembly, in its wisdom, decided to amend that section of the Code to basically say that a jurisdiction may adopt a dangerous/vicious dog ordinance, but rather to say that the dangerous/vicious dog ordinance was a statute of the Commonwealth of Virginia. In other words, the statute was changed to be enforceable and to be a State law concerning dangerous/vicious dogs. It has specific requirements in it which define dangerous/vicious dogs and those requirements were a little bit different than what was in the ordinance that had been previously adopted by this Board and what had been in the statute. The statute went on to say that the governing body of any locality may enact an ordinance parallel to the statute regulating dangerous/vicious dogs provided however that no locality may impose a penalty for such violations of ordinances. The question that the Board had was two-fold. One, it had to, if it was going to keep the dangerous/vicious dog ordinance in effect, it would need to amend its ordinance to bring it into conformity with the new State statute, which was different in some particulars. Or, it could, as was advertised to be done, repeal the County's dangerous/vicious dog ordinance and allow the State Code, which is of course, in effect, as a State law, to be in effect, so that if an animal was dangerous or vicious, it would be prosecuted as a State offense by State Code. The State law allows for enforcement of this State law by law

enforcement officers or animal control officers. The County's Animal Control Officer can enforce the State law as it relates to dangerous/vicious dogs. The overall effect of this change in the County Code is simply to repeal the County's dangerous/vicious dog ordinances so as to allow the State Code to be in effect. The only other option is to amend the County's ordinances to bring them into conformity with the State law, and then you have local ordinances as well as the State law, when either could be enforced. This way, the State law takes effect, State law is enforceable by the Animal Control Officers, and the County does not have to continually re-adopt or amend its ordinances when the State law changes. It would be just like a driving offense and regulated by State law. That's the reason for this consideration for Floyd to repeal its ordinance. That means that there will still be a dangerous/vicious dog law in Floyd County, it will simply be a State law.

The Chairman called for comments from the audience.

Mr. J. C. Holden - from down in Copper Hill. I wanted to ask the Attorney a couple of questions on this thing that I didn't understand. We got caught up in a situation with one of our dogs that was charged under the State and County law. If the County law was still in force, it doesn't make sense as to exactly what happened. They differ. I'm sure you're aware of the differences. The County law says that you can't call a dog a dangerous dog if its fighting another dog. It has to be a cat or something else. The State says another companion animal. So in Section 10-76 of the County ordinance says that a dangerous dog means a canine or canine cross-breed which has bitten, attacked, or inflicted injury on a person or companion animal other than a dog or killed a companion animal. We had a dog that attacked another dog on our property, protecting the kids, and the charges were brought, both ordinances were used. One place it is already declared a dangerous dog by the Dog Warden, which he could under the County ordinance, but you can't under the State ordinance, the Judge has to do it. So we ended up in Court with two ordinances stating the case. I guess this will clarify that, but I don't know where we stand and where the County stands on their ordinance.

Mr. Cornwell - the State law that was in effect until July last year had the same language in it which you comment, had the County language. The County ordinance had adopted the State law. When the General Assembly decided to amend the State law, they changed the definition of a dangerous dog as you cited. We had not changed our ordinance. We have to change our ordinance to bring it into conformity with State law. We have not. That's the purpose of this, to repeal our ordinance and let the State law take effect. We either have two choices, we can amend our ordinance to bring it into conformity with State law, or we can repeal our ordinance and let the State law take effect.

Mr. Holden - I agree with the State law. I'm 100% for getting this straightened out, but I was wondering where it left us when we were caught up in the thing, if we hadn't been charged both ways.

Mr. Cornwell - I can't speak to that, but it really set up a situation where you could have been charged under the County ordinance or under the State law, either one.

Mr. Holden - under the County ordinance, and I suppose its under the old ordinance, the Animal Control Officer has the authority to declare it a dangerous animal, but not under the new one?

Mr. Cornwell - that's right, that's part of why we're repealing the ordinance.

Mr. Holden - that's where we don't know where we stand. My dog was declared a dangerous dog by him before it went to court under the new State law.

Mr. Cornwell - I don't know anything about that, all I can tell you is that..

Mr. Holden - I just wondered how that could be if this is not the case. In other words, we've been under State law since they changed it and our County ordinance has been no good. Right?

Mr. Cornwell - no, that's not exactly true. The State law has a specific paragraph in there that says you can adopt an ordinance parallel to the statute regulating dangerous/vicious dogs. It doesn't exactly say that our ordinance has to be identical to the State law, it just says it has to parallel the statute. I think the issue was whether or not we wanted to deviate from the new State law or not. When the Board authorized the advertisement for this hearing, the advertisement was brought with the idea that we would repeal our ordinance so the State law would be effective and our ordinance would not deviate.

Mr. Holden - if we're following the County ordinance, I mean if the County ordinance is still running parallel with the State ordinance before its changed, then the County ordinance in effect would still be applicable to this?

Mr. Cornwell - that would be a decision for the Judge. The statute says the governing body of any locality may enact an ordinance parallel to this statute, regulating dangerous and vicious dogs. It goes on to say, provided however, that no locality may impose a penalty for violation of such local ordinances. Which causes me to be led to believe that if they make a specific thing that we can't do, then there seems to be some indication that we could do something different in other parts of the ordinance, from the State. But again, we're not at that point right now. We're at the point to simply repeal our ordinance so the State law is applicable and there's one set of rules.

Mr. Holden - so if this is done, the County would go under the State law, from here forward.

Mr. Cornwell - right, and there would be one set of rules.

Mr. Holden - I really don't understand how the Dog Warden could use both sets of rules in charging our dog. Under the State, will the Animal Control Officer be, in order to declare a

dog a dangerous dog, he'll have to follow the rules and do an investigation?

Mr. Cornwell - he'll have to follow the State law which says he has reason to believe a canine or canine cross-breed within his jurisdiction is a dangerous or vicious dog prior to a Magistrate of the jurisdiction issuing a summons.

Mr. Holden - that means that he can't declare it a dangerous dog.

Mr. Cornwell - that's what the State law says.

Mr. Michael L. Sizemore - 300 Buffalo Lane, Floyd - I had some occasion to be involved with a dog biting case. The Dog Warden said that my dog was dangerous and impounded him and kept him for 30 some days. When I went to Court with the Judge, he said that the ordinance, as I read it to him, was correct and my dog should not have been called a dangerous dog by the Dog Warden unless a Judge has said that. I'd like to have it that when our new laws are done that this is cleared up a little bit and make sure that our Dog Warden know the ordinances that they're enforcing. I would like to have it, that if it follows the State law, that it should be good for all of us. I think that we do need some clarification as to exactly who declares it a dangerous dog. And that will be done as the State does?

Mr. Cornwell - yes.

Mr. Sizemore - the Judge does it.

Mr. Cornwell - or the Magistrate issues the probable cause hearing, the Animal Control Officer can hold the dog until it gets to the Judge.

Mr. Sizemore - he can hold it or the owner can hold it. But he wouldn't let me hold it.

Mr. Cornwell - I can't talk specifics, but that's correct.

Mr. Sizemore - these things needs to be straightened out and cleared up. I received my dog back in miserable, terrible shape. He had a terrible urinary infection, he stunk, I've never had a home animal smell like that, he smelled like urine. I had to call the vet, it cost me about \$400 to get him back to health and I could have just as well held my dog during the period until it went to court. I think there ought to be a little more said into this, so we can decide how this is going to be enforced, and what is going to be enforced.

Mr. Garland Nester - I'm the Chief Animal Control Officer here in the County. I would like to touch a little bit on this. Yes, the County ordinance is obsolete as far as the State law goes. It does say if law enforcement officers or animal control officers have reason to believe that a canine or canine cross-breed in his jurisdiction, could be dangerous or vicious, as State law says, we do have the right to seize this animal and hold him at our shelter until a Judge renders a decision. We do have the right to let the owners keep the dogs at their property, but its up to us

to make the decision as to whether they are capable of keeping this dog under control until the Judge renders a decision. We do not declare these dogs dangerous or vicious on the spot, we let the Judge do that. We do not go out and say your dog is dangerous or vicious. We do an investigation, take care to investigate the problems, we take pictures, we take the person or persons to court and the Judge makes the decision. We do not make the decision. We do take into consideration whether this person or persons can properly house the animals and keep the citizens in Floyd County safe, or whether we do pick the dog up and bring him in. On certain occasions, we do allow that. If they do not comply, we pick them up and keep them at the shelter. We do take and hold them until the Judge renders a decision as to whether the dog is returned to the owner, or whether if the dog is ordered as dangerous, there have been several times that the Judge ordered the dog out of state. Several times the Judge has ordered the dog to be destroyed immediately. We do have the authority to charge under State law as well as County ordinance. That's what we've been using since the County ordinance is obsolete, since the new laws have changed. We do not have the authority, like Mr. Cornwell said, as far as being a felony unless the dog has actually killed someone, being vicious. As some of you know, last year, the lady in Spottsylvania County was killed by a pit bull. That's what has brought on all these changes at the beginning of July. We do bring them in and hold them, some of them we do not.

Mrs. Carolyn Holden - I live in Copper Hill. I'm not up here to argue today, but I'm up here to share the facts. Mr. Nester stated that he never declared a dog dangerous, but in fact, he got a summons on our dog before it went to the court, and it says, "owns a dangerous dog that injured another dog". Its right here on this summons if you want to see it. Even in our State, we don't call a thief a thief unless he's been proven to be a thief. If he's been to court and had his chance, then he's a thief, not on a summons. Also, I didn't know if Mr. Cornwell, did you call the County ordinance obsolete?

Mr. Cornwell - I did not, no ma'am.

Mrs. Holden - well Mr. Nester did, I believe. He declared our dog a dangerous dog before it even had its day in court.

Ms. Cathy Shot - Indian Valley District - I just want to clarify, FYI more or less, with just as few people that are here today and the confusion that everyone seems to have, I think that other County residents, as well, that are pet owners, are going to have the same conclusion. I just think that you all need to make this clear and precise. If we are going to take the State law, then are things charged under the State law, are they then, if we accept the State law into the County, that we need to do that. In talking with a lot of individuals here in the County, I'm just asking you to really make sure that things are put down explicitly so that the County residents will be aware of that, and so there won't be a lot of confusion between the general public and the animal control folks.

After no further comments from the audience, the Chairman declared the Public Hearing closed.

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, seconded by Supervisor Belcher, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adopt an ordinance repealing Sections 10-76 through 10-82 of the Floyd County Code:Dogs, with Section 3.1-796.3:1 of the Code of Virginia, 1950 as amended, being the controlling statute (Document File Number).

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

On a motion of Supervisor Belcher, seconded by Supervisor Gerald, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adjourn to January 31, 2007 at 6:30 p.m.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye