

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on January 14, 2008, at 4:30 p.m., in Room 235 of the County Office Building on McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from January 9, 2008.

PRESENT: Mr. Ken C. Boyd, Mr. Lindsay G. Dorrier, Jr., Ms. Ann Mallek, Mr. Dennis S. Rooker, Mr. David Slutzky and Ms. Sally H. Thomas.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Robert W. Tucker, Jr., County Attorney, Larry W. Davis and Deputy Clerk, Meagan Hoy.

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Steve Koleszar, Ms. Diantha McKeel, Ms. Pamela Moynihan, Mr. Ronnie Price, Sr., Mr. Jon Stokes and Mr. Brian Wheeler.

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER ABSENT: Ms. Barbara Massie Mouly.

STAFF PRESENT: Superintendent, Pam Moran, Assistant Superintendent, Bruce Benson, Clerk Jennifer Johnston, Director of Human Resources, Kimberly Suyes, and Assistant Director of Human Resources, Lorna Gerome.

Agenda Item No. 1. The Supervisors' meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m., by its Chairman, Mr. Boyd. The School Board's meeting was also called to order by its Chairman, Mr. Wheeler.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. Revised Compensation Projections for FY 2008-09.

Mr. Tucker said the two boards met on October 11, 2007, to talk about the compensation and benefits package for FY '2009. Due to an anticipated revenue shortfall as a result of the housing market downturn, staff asked that nothing be adopted at that time, and that he and Ms. Moran look at where Albemarle salaries stood relative to the adopted market and the WorldatWork salary increase projections. If there were any changes in the market that information would be reported to the individual boards. Some members disagreed with that approach and agreed that this be brought back for a discussion by the joint boards.

Ms. Moran said she and Mr. Tucker have discussed a couple of outcomes. Her board would like to be sure that all are "on the same page" in terms of the process, and it is the same process that has been used by the boards over time. Also, her board has a lack of understanding of the County's Five-Year Financial Plan.

Mr. Tucker said the process of starting that Financial Plan for the Supervisors began last summer. The timelines have complicated the process. He asked if there were questions.

Mr. Koleszar said he was a member of the committee that originally developed a Board-Adopted Strategy for Compensation and Benefits. One of the purposes of that strategy was to choose an arbitrary number, WorldatWork, so that would always be the number and there would never be any argument about that number. By letting other numbers be calculated, the consistency of that program strategy has been "thrown out the window." If the boards make a decision based on a different set of numbers every year, the number will be open to debate by everybody. The purpose of the process was to get away from an argument every year about the number. When it was said that staff was going to monitor, he thought they would monitor whether the County could afford the raise. To say we don't have the money so we won't do it is one thing, and has always been part of the overall strategy. In his opinion, this is a whole step away.

Ms. Moran said she and Mr. Tucker sat down and reviewed staff's understanding, as well as the boards understanding of what was agreed to in October. Perhaps it was the definition of "is" and they walked away using the same language but some people had a different interpretation. Clearly, all need to be "on the same page." She believes everybody agrees that commonality is a critical part of this discussion because it allows the Schools and General Government to not be in competition with each other. There is enough competition in the market for positions that need to be filled without losing the commitment to something that has been important to General Government and the Schools. She agrees there may be different opinions about what happened in October, but she wants to make sure everybody is on the same page today so this matter can move forward.

Ms. McKeel asked if the WorldatWork data the boards received in October was for the past year or what staff was seeing for the next year.

Ms. Suyes said she would answer Mr. Koleszar's question first. She looked at the presentation made in January, 2001, which was actually prior to her employment with the County, and that committee came up with a great strategy and the process of meeting that strategy includes WorldatWork. The specific presentation in 2001 indicated that the County had to find a way to project increases. WorldatWork was one source but other sources were also needed to be identified. Other sources included the Bureau of Labor and Statistics and the Department of Labor. She was directed by Mr. Tucker and Ms. Moran to look at some of the other sources to determine what is going on in the market now. Obviously, the downturn in the economy drove them to look at other sources and also at the increase in the unemployment rate.

Ms. Suyes said that every October staff presents information which includes what the market did last year and whether the County is lagging the market. The County was lagging it by .35 last year. She said WorldatWork is a projection source and it said everything was going up four percent. In October staff presented some projections including an eleven percent increase in medical benefit costs. Later they looked at other sources to present better projections. She said WorldatWork is a great tool, and staff does not want to use another number. After the crisis in 2001, they asked WorldatWork if they would be doing anything differently. WorldatWork did another survey, and came back with a different number. Staff wants to provide accurate information, and if that information changes the closer it gets to the budgeting process, she would be negligent not providing the boards with that information.

Mr. Koleszar said the WorldatWork projections have been reliable. They have been used for the past six years and have at times been understated. He said the committee picked one arbitrary number so there would not be a discussion about the number each year. That number is thrown out once other factors are considered

Ms. Suyes said being committed to and maintaining the strategy is good. However, it was clearly her understanding at the end of the meeting in October that the boards wanted more information. She thinks it might have been that staff was just not clear on expectations.

Mr. Rooker said he thinks Mr. Koleszar's memory is not exactly right. The adopted policy says that WorldatWork is one source.

Mr. Boyd said he was also a member of that committee and he was not really in favor of using WorldatWork; that was a compromise.

Mr. Koleszar said for the last six years, there has not been an argument among the two boards because there was a concrete objective. Once the boards go away from that and look at other things, it is opened up for employees, the AEA and others to question what is considered. He said the County has undershot by five-tenths of a percent for the last six years and now is at risk of overshooting by some percentage, but employment is self-correcting.

At this time, Ms. Suyes made a PowerPoint presentation showing a chart displaying the adopted Compensation & Benefits strategies of the two boards. She displayed a chart showing the Staff's planning projections for FY 2008-09 as they were made in October, 2007. She said that since that time there has been a change in the economy, so staff needed to look at what is impacting the increases recommended. She knows the State is considering pushing salary increases back from 12 months to 18 months which means it is looking at waiting an additional six months before granting increases. Also, last October staff showed an increase of 11 percent in medical plan costs, and a six percent increase in dental plan costs.

Ms. Suyes said staff's revised recommendations for FY 2008-09 are: for classified employees they project a two percent classified salary scale increase and a 3.35 percent merit increase. For teachers, a four percent increase including both step and scale is projected. As to benefits, they project an eight percent increase in the cost of the medical plan, and a six percent increase in the cost of the dental plan. Staff has talked to a lot of other localities and school divisions, but did not get a definite answer as to what they will do, but there was an indication it would not be the same percentage as that given last year. This is now staff's recommendation to the joint boards based on their review of other projection data.

Mr. Wheeler said the way this matter was just described staff would have been negligent not to have looked at other information after that meeting in October. Ms. Suyes said the WorldatWork projections have been checked by staff and nothing significant has been found that would change the October projections except in the medical arena. In the past there has been no significant changes in projections except in 2001 when WorldatWork did the work for the County. This year, staff considered the 2.99 percent unemployment rate in the State compared to 3.2 percent at the end of November, and the fact that other large employers are looking at extending their increases; all of that has to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Slutzky asked why the budget was not presented with the baseline number with a caveat included that the number would likely not be that high; the boards would want to take that into account during the budget process. It appears to him that staff started off by doing the thinking for the boards by lowering the number. Is that the core problem?

Mr. Rooker said he disagrees. First of all, the budget has not even been presented to the boards yet. This is the basic decision on which the budget is built, so that could not have occurred yet. Second, the goal every year is not to adopt the WorldatWork number but to get as close as possible to it. Every year, a compensation decision is made and then the budget is built on that number. It is not the other way around.

Mr. Dorrier said it still depends on who makes up the workforce. For the teachers, there is a difference in salary based on their number of years teaching. He asked if this is the year when many teachers are retiring. Ms. Moran said there are some teachers retiring. The critical issue is that she has already developed the Superintendent's funding proposal. She has put it before her board, and at their direction, used the October data of 4.35 percent and four percent. That did not deviate from October for her. It may be that Mr. Tucker, in his process, has different directions from his board which would mean that they are off in commonality.

Mr. Stokes said that every year the boards vote on compensation is the building block for the budget. He does not think that is what happened this year. The boards were presented budget numbers last October and staff said it would go back and look at those numbers. There was never a discussion about the numbers presented today.

Mr. Rooker said based on the economy and because the market dynamic was changing, staff asked for additional time before making a final recommendation. He understands the Schools had to do a preliminary budget based on the best information available at the time. The reason no vote was taken in October was because of the change in the market.

Mr. Stokes said he thinks the confusion comes about because this year that was not done, and the issue is that this is the first time the boards have seen these numbers.

Mr. Rooker said the School Board is in a different position because it has already received a preliminary budget. The Supervisors do not have a budget proposal yet. He expected the Human Resources Department to come back with a recommendation that would get the County as close to the adopted strategy as possible.

Mr. Slutzky asked if that strategy includes commonality between the School Division and the County. If that is a fundamental underpinning, the boards are "in a tough spot" because in October nobody gave staff directions to adjust those numbers, but told staff to bring back updated information. He thinks it would have been helpful for everyone if this discussion had taken place earlier.

Mr. Tucker said he apologizes for the confusion. He thinks the Supervisors expected him to look at the data and make a report back to them, which he did, and which Ms. Moran did with the School Board. This should have been done at a joint meeting of the boards.

Mr. Boyd said the Supervisors told Mr. Tucker to move forward with the new numbers. That does not help with the commonality issue.

Mr. Slutzky said that explains how the two boards got to this point, now what should they do?

Mr. Koleszar said he is concerned about the process. In other years the boards adopted a number in October, the economy changed and salaries were going up. An analysis was done, and there was a change made in the percentage number. Staff did not choose to do that, and he wonders why it is being done now only because it appears the number should be less. As he remembers, every year the classified number has been the lone target and the only one where there was a mistake.

Ms. McKeel said she knows the market is down, but staff must have considered factors other than the market to make it move outside of the process. She said staff needs to help the boards understand what factors were considered besides the market. She needs to know what has generated this concern about what is just a little over where this would have been. Every year the County plays a little bit of catch-up. What is really generating this concern other than the market?

Mr. Rooker said for him it is a matter of asking the Human Resources Department to give the boards the best information available to arrive at the target. In October, staff felt the number presented was high. Ultimately, WorldatWork is not just doing the County's competitive market. They do a much broader market. The boards' goal is to adopt salaries that are as close to the objective criteria as possible. When staff said the number presented by WorldatWork might not be accurate this year, additional information was requested.

Ms. McKeel asked if anything else is compounding this matter.

Mr. Wheeler said he thinks it is important to get back to the question of process. He has heard new information about how staff viewed the process; information he had not heard before. He hears Mr. Rooker echoing that this is always fluid.

Mr. Rooker said it is not always fluid, but staff will use the best information available to make a recommendation to get the County as close to the salary objective as possible.

Mr. Wheeler said he saw the board taking comfort in the fact that the process was clearly confined and constrained to a point in time in October. There seems to be some difference now among the members in the room today.

Mr. Slutzky asked if staff found any disparity last year in the projections by WorldatWork.

Ms. Suyes said her staff feels the department has been making good projections.

Mr. Dorrier asked Ms. Suyes to repeat the numbers for last fiscal year.

Ms. Suyes said the projections were under for classified employees by .35 percent. She said she is hearing two things on process. It has been mentioned that the process they used to come up with projections only happened this year. The process used this year to get to and maintain the adopted strategy is what staff was directed to do in 2001. It is a good strategy and should be continued. The recent downturn in the economy has happened rapidly, and the data of WorldatWork was already over six months old in October, so the information used by staff is part of the process. The second process in question is whether or not the boards should have voted in October. At that time, staff told the boards of

their concern and said they needed additional information. She thought there was a clear understanding at that time about what would happen and apparently she was wrong.

Ms. Moynihan said she remembers that staff said it was not prepared to present a definite figure in October. She has no problem with what staff has presented today as being fair compensation. She has a problem with the way the process has been done because Ms. Moran has already presented her budget to the School Board based on those numbers. If the numbers were going to change, staff should have brought them back earlier in the process for action by the boards.

Mr. Koleszar said the County has not gone away from the WorldatWork figures during the last six years. If now the boards say they will consider other factors, there will again be a debate about the market and things will be back to where they were before this strategy was adopted. Everybody knows WorldatWork is not perfect, but it has been used and it saves the boards and the public a tremendous amount of headaches.

Mr. Boyd said he was a member of that committee and he remembers that the public was unequivocally opposed to using just the WorldatWork figures and never looking at any other factor. He thinks staff is saying that WorldatWork has been close to the other collected data over the last six years, but this time it was not. He does not think staff is getting away from WorldatWork as a benchmark; it is just one of the indices used to verify data.

Mr. Koleszar said if this is done, the County will be opening it up for everybody who is concerned about that number to come up with other indications of what it should be. It was a really messy situation before using the WorldatWork number. He thinks there will be a lot of wasted energy. This will change the rule and throw it open for everybody to change it.

Mr. Slutzky asked if besides looking at WorldatWork this year, staff also looked at data from all comparable jurisdictions. Ms. Suyes said they talked with directors of human resources and assistant superintendents for human resources at a recent conference and had a roundtable discussion. Then staff called every locality in the market.

Mr. Slutzky asked if any other variables were taken into account. Ms. Suyes said they looked at the increasing unemployment rate. They also looked at the state numbers. They test many different things, but there is not one single answer to this question. If staff feels there is something happening in the economy that is touching the employee base in the area and increasing the unemployment rate, they have to bring that information into this.

Mr. Rooker said that annually positions have been pulled out and treated differently. It has been done on both the School side and the General Government side. Compensation was increased for certain categories beyond the WorldatWork figures because it was difficult to fill vacancies.

Ms. McKeel asked if this is soft data, hard data or anecdotal data. What is actually being talked about? Ms. Suyes said she thinks all localities are in the same position as Albemarle. She is hearing that this is soft data. She hears the same information over and over from localities.

Mr. Wheeler asked when staff started getting the information. Ms. Suyes said they started getting new information right after the meeting in October, but they finalized it about three weeks ago.

Ms. Thomas said staff is recommending that the increase in teachers' salaries remain the same as the recommendation in October, but the merit increase and the increase for classified employees should be decreased from that October figure. She said there is quite a difference between teachers and classified. General Government only has classified employees and is currently down 16 positions so she feels this is stressing that staff. She needs to be able to defend this in her own mind and to the public. She is not comfortable with that big of a difference. The Supervisors have not said they want classified employees to be able to compete with Loudoun and Prince William and Buckingham because the School System has gone to the upper quartile of its peer group. That has not been said for General Government staff. Maybe the Supervisors should have said that because this is a very low increase for classified staff.

Mr. Slutzky said he wants to understand the process. In normal years, staff looks at WorldatWork data and that is checked against other localities in the County's market. If a disparity were to be found, staff would then look at other data sets. That is what made this year a little different because in recent years the data was fairly accurate so there was no need to go further. But, that puts staff in the position of making judgment calls that they might not be qualified to make. That gives rise to the concern Mr. Koleszar raised that staff was in the position of making these calls and then defending them to the boards and the public. The question may be whether the boards want to use the WorldatWork number. If that number appeared to be either understated or overstated any adjustment would require the boards to hold a dialogue with staff rather than having staff decide on a number based on its best judgment. If in October staff suspects the number might be off of the market, it should present a specific proposal for how to change the number and a decision would then be made by both boards before varying from the traditional use of the WorldatWork data.

Mr. Boyd said he disagrees. He thinks the Human Resources Department has a very professional staff which is trained to do exactly what it is doing. They won't "hit it all the time", and he does not think the WorldatWork people need to tell the boards what is happening in their own market.

Mr. Rooker said he does not think the current economic conditions can be ignored.

Mr. Stokes said if the Boards had gotten together in December and decided what the number should be, they would not be having this discussion today.

Ms. Moynihan said the County has a Human Resources Department which is highly professional. She thinks the boards should accept what they say is happening in the local community.

Mr. Boyd said he will admit that it was not done very well this year.

Mr. Tucker said if he had it to do over again, he would have asked the boards to adopt staff's recommendations last November. Then the staff could have brought back any information that was different from that action. Because staff did not have a number, they thought this would be a quicker way to move forward. Staff has learned from this procedure.

Mr. Rooker said this information was presented to the Supervisors at least a month ago. He is surprised that the Schools did not have the same information.

Ms. Moran said she shared the information with the School Board in December.

Mr. Slutzky said he likes Ms. Thomas' suggestion that there be some additional drafting to the non-school positions. Maybe there should be a policy of trying to target the top quartile because of the challenges in hiring and maintaining staff.

Mr. Rooker said the policy was that every position would be targeted at the median. Through a long series of discussions, it was decided that the teacher component of that policy would be changed. That decision was based on a lot of data about hiring and losing people. He would not be averse to entering into that conversation again next year about other positions. Staff has at times said that for certain positions, people cannot be found to fill them. These boards have responded by pulling those positions out and changing their compensation regardless of what WorldatWork said at the time. He thinks the boards are always open to having those discussions. He wants feedback from Human Resources about where the County stands with these positions, and if there is any difficulty in filling them.

Mr. Boyd said the system is working in that respect because there have not been changes wholesale. He said the boards are relying on Human Resources to bring back information on which to make a decision.

Mr. Slutzky said there are 16 frozen positions on the General Government side and he thinks that has an impact on retention. If these positions are frozen and existing staff is expected to work harder to cover those jobs, it is arguably a variable situation when deciding compensation and is not just a budget issue.

Mr. Rooker said there has been no report saying there is a retention problem. He asked if there is a problem. Ms. Suyes said that is a pretty open-ended question.

Mr. Koleszar said he can't see having Human Resources spend an inordinate amount of time to get what are very soft numbers. They were still talking with people two weeks ago about the huge change in the VRS rate. These numbers were obtained before that rate was changed. He said the boards are asking staff to make a guess and put in an inordinate amount of effort to make that guess as accurate as possible. In reality, they can't be any more accurate than WorldatWork because it is such a game.

Mr. Rooker said the boards asked staff to bring back a recommendation on salaries based on objective criteria including WorldatWork numbers. He is confident they are capable of doing that year-to-year within a reasonable parameter. That is what they were asked to do this year, and it is what they have done. He does not understand Mr. Koleszar's slavish adherence to a particular number in the face of staff saying the new numbers are a more accurate reflection of the market.

Mr. Koleszar asked what will happen if three weeks from now there is another factor that has not been calculated.

Mr. Rooker said that every year Human Resources goes back and determines how far the adjustment which was made is off of market.

Mr. Koleszar said he really feels this is a retreat from the agreement that has been in place and which has worked so effectively. Now, everybody will say "you have to consider these factors." He has talked to a lot of people who say this will "open a new can of worms." Although HR does a good job, they are dealing with squishy numbers because the political decisions have not been made.

Mr. Rooker said staff has said this is what they do every year. It has never resulted in a different recommendation because the back testing information did not suggest anything different.

Mr. Price said he had hoped the School System and the County would lead and not follow. Whenever you are in a position of following, you will always be behind. He said there will be more and more people leaving in the near future, and if the scale falls lower, the ability to attract more employees will require that the number be increased. For him, it seems the boards are just going in a circle. He does not know that anything further will be resolved today by just going around in a circle.

Mr. Boyd asked if Ms. Mallek had a comment.

Ms. Mallek said the question today is what the boards will do now. Then there is the question of what to do so this does not occur again next year.

Ms. McKeel said the reality is that Ms. Moran has to present a budget to the School Board in early December. When talking about making a decision in October, that is probably pushing her timeline as late as it can be pushed.

Ms. Moran said there are some sequencing issues. When the Five-Year Financial Plan came before the Supervisors it used 3.35 percent in that plan in early November. She and Mr. Tucker talked about that because compensation is jointly focused, so maybe staff may need to work out how the process works from October until the time the budgets are due.

Mr. Boyd said the boards need to decide now what to move forward with.

Ms. McKeel asked why the boards need to make a decision today. There is the recommendation from October on soft data. What is the driver that says today is when there must be a decision?

Mr. Rooker said if the boards leave today without making a decision that will be the same thing it has complained about not doing in October.

Ms. McKeel said there is a number from October that was used, so the boards can use that number and see what happens for a little while longer.

Mr. Rooker said staff had told the two boards in October that the number did not look good, and they wanted to wait and back test the numbers. After doing that, they are now making another recommendation.

Ms. Moynihan asked if the Supervisors will be using the new numbers.

Mr. Slutzky said he is not entirely in favor of those numbers.

Mr. Rooker said staff has said these numbers are a more accurate reflection. The boards asked them to do this in October for the purpose of building the budgets. He asked if the boards are now just going to ignore this recommendation.

Mr. Slutzky said staff might present a budget to the Supervisors that they might then want to adjust based on new considerations. In this instance, he values the suggestion from staff that the 3.35 percent appears to be a more credible number than the 4.25 number, but the considerations he has heard at the table today that give him pause are: 1) the State may have changed the dynamic significantly in the last few weeks, at least on the School side; 2) while staff has made the appropriate effort to see what their cohort is doing, it is still subject to uncertainty; and, 3) unemployment in anticipation of an economic downturn in the County's market is a factor that helped them end up with that number.

Mr. Rooker said he does not think it is up to the boards "to read the tea leaves." Staff was asked to make a recommendation that they think will get the County as close as possible to its goal. He reads a lot of economic information. He is not prepared to supplant staff's recommendation after they did the actual work in the marketplace to tell the boards what will get the County as close as possible to its compensation goal. If the boards are actually trying to change the compensation goals, then that conversation should be held at some point. It was done for the teachers and it has been done for individual positions. That is an entirely different discussion.

Mr. Stokes said he thinks everybody at the table agrees that there should be commonality. If that is wanted, the boards have to vote on a number because this is staff's recommendation. If the boards don't like this number, but like the WorldatWork number better, vote for that one. In order to have commonality, a number must be picked by the joint boards.

Mr. Dorrier said he thinks the most recent data is what should be used because it is newer by three months.

Mr. Rooker said he will **move** that the Supervisors adopt the staff's recommendation which is based on the most recent information staff has. The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Dorrier.

Ms. Mallek asked if this is "digging a hole for next year" because of the number of retirees, particularly school teachers. If the lower percentage is taken now, will this put the county two steps behind? Ms. Suyes said she does not think that will be the case. She believes this recommendation will maintain the strategy.

Mr. Boyd asked that roll be called at this time. The motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Ms. Mallek Mr. Rooker and Ms. Thomas.

NAYS: Mr. Slutzky.

(**Note:** The recommendation of staff was:

Classified:

Project two percent Classified Salary Scale  
Project 3.35 percent Merit Increase

Teachers:

Four percent increase includes step and scale

Benefits:

Plan on approximate eight percent increase in medical plan costs

Plan on approximate six percent increase in dental plan costs)

---

Ms. Thomas said she thinks the target needs to be looked at by staff, but that can't be done today.

Mr. Slutzky said Mr. Rooker had suggested that staff bring some suggestions to discuss and he thinks that is the right way to approach the matter.

---

Mr. Wheeler said the School Board does not have the same pressure on it because it already has a funding request before it.

Ms. Moynihan said it is a question of retaining commonality.

Mr. Wheeler said the spirit at the end of the day is one of commonality. He asked if the School Board wanted to continue this conversation.

Mr. Koleszar said that in past years there have been different percentage raises for classified employees of the School System.

Mr. Boyd said it has been a long time since that happened.

Ms. McKeel said right now the School Board funding request after holding all the work sessions could very well come through without commonality.

Ms. Moynihan said the point of the process is to have commonality. She thinks the School Board either adopts these numbers or it does not, and if it does not, there will not be commonality.

Mr. Stokes **moved** to adopt the numbers recommended by Human Resources, those just approved by the Board of Supervisors. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Moynihan. Roll was called, and the motion failed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Stokes and Ms. Moynihan.

NAYS: Mr. Wheeler, Ms. McKeel, Mr. Price and Mr. Koleszar.

Mr. Wheeler said he believes the conversation of the School Board on this question will continue.

---

Agenda Item No. 3. From the Boards: Matters not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Boyd said he would remind all members that the Conflict of Interests Statements is due to the Clerk by tomorrow.

---

Agenda Item No. 4. Adjourn. At 5:43 p.m., with no further business to come before the Board of Supervisors, **motion** was offered by Mr. Slutzky to adjourn the Supervisor's meeting until January 16, 2008, at 4:00 p.m. The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Rooker. Roll was called, and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Ms. Mallek, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Slutzky and Ms. Thomas.

NAYS: None.

Mr. Wheeler said the School Board would be in recess until 6:30 p.m. tonight.

---

Chairman

Approved by the  
Board of County  
Supervisors

Date: 07/02/2008

Initials: EWJ