

VIRGINIA:

At a recessed meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Northampton, Virginia, held in the former circuit courtroom, Eastville, Virginia, on the 27nd day of January, 2009, at 5:00 p.m.

Present:

Jeff Walker, Chairman

H. Spencer Murray, Vice Chairman

Richard Tankard

Laurence J. Trala

Dave Burden

Absent:

William A. Hughes

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman.

Board & Agency Presentations:

(1) Joel Knopp of Didawick & Knopp presented highlights from the County's FY 08 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. Two control deficiencies pertaining to the School Board were identified as well as one material weakness in the School Board's internal controls.

County Official's Report:

(2) The County Administrator presented the following report:

**I. Goals & Objectives**

Enclosed is a final draft of the proposed 2009 Goals and Objectives of the Board. Please review and confirm.

*The Board asked to see documentation relative to the admin renovation project which includes the renovation of the 1914 jail building.*

*No action was taken on the Goals & Objectives.*

**II. Purpose & Mission of IDAs**

Enclosed is the amended ordinance that created the County's Joint IDA. When this IDA was created originally, it was intended to serve solely as the financing entity for the Sustainable Technologies Industrial Park (STIP) as well as to oversee the development of the STIP. It was amended twice since its original inception to include additional towns and to remove the restriction that this IDA would serve solely for financing the STIP to allow this IDA to serve as the financing arm for other entities and projects in Northampton County.

Also enclosed is the Code of Virginia Chapter 15.2 which is the underlying authority for an Industrial Development Authority. Sections 15.2-4905 and 15.2-4908 detail the powers of an authority and the requirements of issuance of bonds.

In most of the localities in Virginia, Industrial Development Authorities are structured with either an Executive Director and associated staff support or are affiliated with the Economic Development Department of their locality in terms of day-to-day management. My research found that most localities had developed one or more locality-owned industrial parks which were under the authority of the IDA and/or the Economic Development Department of that locality. These IDAs were focusing their efforts on the development and expansion of businesses within the industrial parks. Additionally, many of the IDAs in Virginia have been instrumental in expansion of business outside of a locality-owned industrial park through the financing component of an IDA, especially in the expansion of health care services for a locality.

Finally, I have enclosed an article from the Journal of Local Government Law entitled "Show Me the Money – Local Governments and Industrial Development Authorities Work Hand-in-Hand for Economic Development" which was printed in March 1997.

With the transfer of the STIP to the County in 2007 and the County's sale of the STIP in 2008, the Joint IDA Board has indicated a concern with their purpose and mission. It is my recommendation that the Joint IDA (as well as the IDA of Cape Charles-Northampton County which is task oriented for hospital and nursing home facilities financing) should be coordinated with the County's Economic Development efforts as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. While neither IDA is managing any industrial parks at this time, they do offer substantial tools for economic development relative to their financing abilities which should be marketed and promoted to existing businesses for any future expansion of their own operations as well as one of the tools available to potential new business prospects. Lastly, the County needs to consider the establishment of an Economic Development Director position within the county management structure to oversee the implementation of the County's Comprehensive Plan relative to Economic Development and to work with our existing IDAs and new and existing businesses.

### **III. Subdivision Text Amendment**

As you may recall, the Board held a public hearing on September 9, 2008 on a proposed amendment to the Subdivision Ordinance that would have provided for an administrative variance process. The Board voted to table action on this item for additional review by the Planning Commission when they take up the Subdivision Ordinance as a whole.

Since then, there has been some discussion about looking at this item again or possibly amending the subdivision ordinance in a different fashion to address ROW requirements for industrial property.

I am requesting direction from the Board on this matter.

*It was the consensus of the Board to draft language which would address right-of-way requirements for industrial property.*

Action Item:

(3) Motion was made by Mr. Trala that the following proclamation be adopted. All members were present with the exception of Mr. Hughes and voted “yes.” The motion was unanimously passed. Said proclamation as adopted is set forth below:

**CHESAPEAKE BLITZ - SACK HUNGER DAY**

*WHEREAS*, the Foodbank of Southeastern Virginia was established in 1981 to obtain and efficiently distribute nutritious foods and other products to member agencies while developing programs and partnerships to help eliminate hunger; and

*WHEREAS*, the Foodbank of the Eastern Shore, a branch of the Foodbank of Southeastern Virginia was established in 1984; and

*WHEREAS*, the Foodbank on the Eastern Shore provides over 600,000 pounds of emergency food annually; and

*WHEREAS*, more than 20,000 working poor adults, children and senior citizens are served through 25 partner agencies on the Eastern Shore; and

*WHEREAS*, 35 percent of the members of households are children under the age of 18, 21% are elderly, and 43% are the working poor; and

*WHEREAS*, for every dollar donated, the Foodbank is able to distribute \$8 worth of food and can provide one meal for 29 cents; and

*WHEREAS*, often people find themselves in a position of need and are forced to make

choices between shelter, utilities, health care/medicine, transportation and food; and too often adequate nutritious food is the casualty of these choices;

*NOW, THEREFORE*, I, Jeffrey K. Walker, Chairman, on behalf of the Northampton County Board of Supervisors, do hereby designate

*January 31, 2009* as

CHESAPEAKE BLITZ - SACK HUNGER DAY

in Northampton County and urge all our citizens to commit to increasing awareness and understanding of the faces of hunger, and commit to assist in eliminating it from our community.

\*\*\*\*

Closed Session

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

Paragraph 3: Discussion or consideration of the condition, acquisition, or use of real property for public purpose, or of the disposition of publicly held property.

*Eastern Shore Community College*

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

*Possible appeals of BZA variances*

Paragraph 29: Discussion of the award of a public contract involving the expenditure of public funds, including interviews of bidders or offerors, and discussion of the terms or scope of such contract, where discussion in an open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body.

*Webtide Proposal*

All members were present with the exception of Mr. Hughes and voted “yes.” The motion was unanimously passed.

After Closed Session, the Chairman reconvened the meeting and said that the Board had entered the closed session for those purposes as set out in paragraphs 3, 7 and 29 of Section 2.1-3711 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended. Upon being polled individually, each Board

member confirmed that these were the only matters of discussion during the closed session.

Motion was made by Mr. Burden that Mr. Murray be allowed to pursue solutions in regard to the Stuart Oliver variance appeal; i.e., seeking the completion of the mitigation plan within twelve months as drafted by the County. All members were present with the exception of Mr. Hughes and voted “yes,” with the exception of Mr. Trala who voted “no.” The motion was passed.

Recess:

Motion was made by Mr. Trala that the meeting be recessed until 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, January 28, 2009 in the former circuit courtroom, 16404 Courthouse Road, Eastville, Virginia. All members were present with the exception of Mr. Hughes and voted “yes.” The motion was unanimously passed.

The meeting was recessed.

\_\_\_\_\_ CHAIRMAN

\_\_\_\_\_ COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR