

VIRGINIA:

At a regular meeting of the Washington County Board of Supervisors held Tuesday, February 26, 2008, at 7:00 p.m., at the County Administration Building in Abingdon, Virginia the following were present:

PRESENT:

Kenneth O. Reynolds, Chairman
Jack R. McCrady, Jr., Vice Chairman
Phillip B. McCall
Dulcie M. Mumpower
Odell Owens
Paul O. Price
Thomas G. Taylor

Mark K. Reeter, County Administrator
Lucy E. Phillips, County Attorney
Mark W. Seamon, Accounting Manager
Naoma A. Norris, Recording Clerk

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Kenneth O. Reynolds, Chairman of the Board, who welcomed everyone in attendance.

2. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

Supervisor Tom Taylor gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Agenda

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. Price, it was resolved to approve the agenda as presented.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

Mr. McCall Aye
Mr. McCrady Aye
Mrs. Mumpower Aye
Mr. Owens Aye
Mr. Price Aye
Mr. Reynolds Aye
Mr. Taylor Aye

4. Approval of Minutes

On motion of Mr. Owens, second by Mr. McCall, it was resolved to approve the minutes of the following meetings as presented:

*January 28, 2008, Joint Recessed Meeting
February 12, 2008, Regular Meeting*

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

5. Public Hearings:

a. Public Hearing Concerning Virginia Department of Housing & Community Development 2008 Community Development Block Grant Program

Mr. Reynolds opened the public hearing and invited comments relating to the Virginia Department of Housing & Community Development (DHCD) 2008 Community Development Block Grant Program.

Mr. Rob Jones with the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development addressed the Board explaining that this public hearing is the first of two required public hearings in relation to the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) application for the Southwest Virginia Regional Artisan Center. Mr. Jones explained that the purpose of this public hearing is to solicit any public comment or suggestions regarding the CDBG Program. He further explained that the second required public hearing will be scheduled for sometime in March at which time the specifics of the project will be presented. The specific project components will be advertised to the public and copies of all project related documents such as the detailed business plan and the performa plan will be made available to the public.

Discussion ensued among the Board. Mr. McCall inquired if the Artisan Center Project would be placed on hold should the grant application not be approved. Mr. Jones explained that DHCD feels comfortable that the grant application will be approved. However, the project can be phased according to availability of funds. Mr. McCall inquired if a final cost to construct the Artisan Center had been determined. Mr. Jones explained that costs are estimated to be \$16,000,000.00. He further explained that a third party estimator has been hired to review the plans for the Artisan Center to assure that the cost estimates are correct. Mr. Jones advised the Board that because the Artisan Center is a regional project there will be an advertisement for public hearing scheduled with the Town of Abingdon.

There being no further comments, Mr. Reynolds declared the public hearing closed.

6. Presentation by United Way of Washington County, Inc.

Mr. Travis Staton, Executive Director, United Way of Washington County, Inc., Mr. Kenneth Shuman, President, United Way of Washington County Board of Directors and Mr. Sam Cassell, First Vice-President, United Way of Washington County Board of Directors appeared before the Board to present a proposal concerning the distribution and administration of County funds to certain organizations through the United Way.

Mr. Staton addressed the Board to present the proposal. He explained that the United Way of Washington County is a non-profit organization that provides financial support to 24 agencies, and in 2007 served over 30,000 county residents. Many of these agencies such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Abuse Alternatives, Appalachian Independence Center, Ecumenical Faith in Action, Children's Advocacy Center, SWVA Second Harvest Food Bank and the American Red Cross-Mountain Empire Chapter receive funds from both the Washington County Board of Supervisors and the United Way of Washington County. The United Way of Washington County presents to the Board a proposal on how the United Way could provide a valuable service by managing the section of the County's operating budget for "Other Contributions." Through this partnership, the United Way of Washington County could assist the County by providing an effective needs assessment, efficient distribution system, and increased agency accountability for County expenditures while still meeting the County's goal to support these essential services.

Mr. Staton explained that the proposal before the Board contains three fundamental principals for the proposed partnership between the United Way and Washington County. They are as follows:

- Achieve efficiencies and economies of scale that are incorporated into a partnership plan while serving the common good of both parties involved.
- Provide leadership in identifying needs and planning strategies to solve health and human service problems in Washington County.
- Utilize a defined system of stewardship and accountability to the community by measuring the success of strategies supported by United Way.

Mr. Staton explained there are four steps of how the partnership would work. They are as follows:

Step 1 Agency Application Process:

Agencies listed in the "Other Contributions" section of the County Operating Budget would apply for County funds through the United Way of Washington County application process.

Step 2 Agency Review Process:

Agencies will have an onsite review by the United Way, and programs will be evaluated using the following criteria:

- The ability to address critical needs
- Target higher-risk population
- Link to community goals

- The ability to achieve measurable outcomes
- Delivery of cost-efficient services

Step 3 Agency Funding Process:

- Agencies receiving County funds through the United Way will enter a contractual agreement with the United Way not to solicit the County for additional funds throughout the year. “Double Dipping Provision.”
- Agencies will receive four quarterly payments from the United Way of Washington County through the scheduled funding year.
- Throughout the year the United Way will monitor each funded program by evaluating it’s effectiveness and measuring results achieved.

Step 4 Agency Eligibility Requirements:

Each agency will be required to meet the following criteria for partnership status:

1. Must be registered with the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Affairs.
2. Must be a 501 (c) (3) non-profit health and human service organization, governed by a volunteer board, meeting at least quarterly.
3. Must submit a yearly fundraising plan, current IRA 990 form, independent audit, and annual funding request, which are reviewed by expert volunteers.
4. Must conduct quarterly financial and narrative evaluation reports and report results to the United Way Board of Directors and fund distribution volunteers.
5. Non-compliance with partnership standards results in review before an executive, volunteer panel which decides the appropriate disciplinary action.

Mr. Staton explained that the United Way of Washington County maintains a staff of two; Executive Director and Assistant Director. The management and general overhead expense for these two positions is 7.8% of total revenue based on the most recent audited IRS Form 990 year ending June 30, 2007.

The Board devoted substantial discussion to the proposal.

Mr. McCall inquired if the agencies in the “Other Contributions” section of the County Budget were also funded by the United Way. Mr. Staton replied yes, but that the County is funding a few agencies that have not gone through the United Way application process.

Mr. Reynolds inquired if all agencies were required to be 501 (c) (3) non-profit in order to receive funding from the United Way. Mr. Staton replied yes. He reviewed the agencies the County is currently funding that are registered with the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Affairs (Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Abuse Alternatives, Appalachian Independence Center, Ecumenical Faith in Action, Children’s Advocacy Center, SWVA Second Harvest Food Bank and the American Red Cross-Mountain Empire Chapter).

Mrs. Mumpower asked about the affect the proposal would have on the amount of monies received by agencies currently funded by both the United Way and the County. Mr. Staton explained that the United Way would use the money allocated by the Board of Supervisors to fund the agencies. He further explained that the United Way would like to develop a plan where they would review each agency requesting County funds and make a recommendation to the Board as to what agencies should receive funds. The agencies would subsequently be monitored by the United Way through the year to assure that the funds are being used as intended. Mrs. Mumpower asked if the United Way would continue to providing funding to these agencies in addition to what the County funds. Mr. Staton replied yes.

Mr. McCrady inquired about the 7.8% administrative fee. Mr. Staton explained it is the plan and intention of the United Way not to charge an administrative fee for the first year of the proposed program. In subsequent years if there was a need, the United Way would approach the County asking for the administrative fee.

Mr. Shuman addressed the Board explaining that the United Way hopes the administrative fee will be less than 7.8%. He explained that as a United Way volunteer one thing that the United Way is good at is taking time to evaluate agencies requesting funds to make sure that those agencies are operating efficiently. The United Way must be accountable to its donors. Mr. Shuman further explained that once an agency is awarded funds from the United Way, the United Way does a good job with monitoring the agencies to assure money is being spent appropriately.

Mr. Taylor inquired about the United Way's monitoring of the agencies and what is involved. Mr. Shuman distributed to the Board a copy of the United Way's funding request application. He explained that the United Way has been aggressive with cutting off funds to agencies that do not spend the funds as they stated in their application to the United Way.

Mr. Taylor inquired if the United Way of Washington County was part of the national United Way. Mr. Staton explained that the United Way of Washington County has an affiliated membership with the national United Way, but that each United Way chapter is individual with its own board of directors. He further explained that the United Way of Washington County pays the national chapter 1% of the funds raised. Mr. Taylor inquired if the 1% is part of the 7.8% overhead. Mr. Staton explained that the 1% paid to the national chapter is reported to the IRS on the 990 form.

Further discussions ensued among the Board. Mr. Reynolds explained the United Way's presentation at this time was for informational purposes and no action is required by the Board. He suggested the United Way submit a request in writing to address the Board again at a later date. Mr. Reeter stated that he would notify the United Way when the Board reviews the "Other Contributions" section of the budget for FY2008-2009.

Mr. Price commented that Faith in Action provides food and helps those in need pay water and electric bills. He explained that names are kept of people who receive food. Mr. Price expressed his concerns about how much of the funds are used for administrative costs, and how much funding is actually going to benefit people in need. He said that this information needs to be obtained before the Board appropriates additional tax dollars. Mr. Shuman explained these types of questions would be addressed in the United Way's recommendation about funding to the Board.

Mr. McCrady commented that after the Board appropriates money to and agency, the County has little means of monitoring how the funds are being spent. He stated that the United Way was better equipped to monitor the agencies.

Mr. Castle addressed the Board explaining that he is the Superintendent of Utility Trailer. He explained that each year when his employees are presented with the United Way Fundraising Campaign they have questions about how their money is being or will be spent. The United Way has to be prepared to answer these questions.

Mr. Owens commented that the United Way's proposal might be what the Board needs for monitoring the appropriations by the County to health and human services agencies. He asked that this proposal be brought back to the board for consideration during budget time.

Mr. Staton distributed to the Board a letters of support for the proposal.

7. Consideration of Request for Appropriation by The American Legion

Mr. Mike Wimmer, Vietnam Veteran and representing The American Legion, John Ratliff Post 164 in Grundy Virginia Vietnam Veteran and with John Ratliff Post 164 PO Box 602, Grundy, VA and Mr. Anthony Holmes, a Veteran of the Iraq war made a presentation to the Board requesting an appropriation to The American Legion to be used for the purchase of phone cards to send to the local National Guard Units serving overseas.

The program was established by the Ladies Auxiliary, who initially raised \$500 and purchased \$20 phone cards. Mr. Wimmer explained that funding has been requested from localities in Southwest Virginia that have both active and reserve personnel. To-date, \$13,000 in contributions has been received. Mr. Holmes explained that The American Legion Post was a 501 (3) (c) non-profit organization. He further explained that each phone card purchased is for 43 minutes at the cost of \$25 per card. The phone cards are distributed to both reserved and active duty personnel. There are about 251 soldiers in Southwest Virginia that are currently deployed with an additional 41 soldiers getting ready for deployment out of the National Guard unit in Tazewell County. Mr. Holmes advised the Board that any funds appropriated by the Washington County Board of Supervisors would not be used to purchase phone cards for service people in other localities.

Both gentlemen commented about their military service.

The Board discussed this request at length. They commended the service of Mr. Wimmer and Mr. Holmes to their country.

Mr. Owens inquired if the Department of Defense provides a telephone allowance to military personnel. Mr. Holmes replied that they do not. He explained that the only line of communication out of Iraq for the soldiers is provided by AT&T, or an Iraqi that has been cleared by the United States to set up a telephone service via satellite. Mr. Owens further inquired if the phones used are cell or land lines. Mr. Holmes explained that the phones are satellite phone systems. He further explained how the phones are position through lines established by AT&T and the Iraqi phone system. Mr. Holmes advised the Board that he has been working with members of the General Assembly regarding possible legislative action against AT&T because of the outrageous fee they charge for military personnel to call home. He stated that AT&T should have a flat fee, or offer free calls for the solders. Further discussions ensued about military personnel's telephone or e-mail communication while serving overseas. It was suggested to Mr. Holmes that he contact the Southwest Virginia members of the United States Congress asking that they propose legislation to the United States Congress.

Mrs. Mumpower asked Mr. Holmes if other localities had appropriated money to The American Legion for the phone card program. Mr. Holmes listed several localities that have contributed money including the Buchanan County Board of Supervisors, Tazewell County Board of Supervisors, Russell County Board of Supervisors, Town of Tazewell and the Town of Lebanon. Also, Consol Energy has contributed money.

After further discussions, the following action was taken:

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. Price, the Board acted to appropriate \$2,000.00 from reserve for contingencies to The American Legion for the purchase of phone cards for local National Guard units serving overseas. It was further resolved to send a Resolution to federal legislators addressing the outrageous charges by AT&T or any other providers of phone services to military personnel making phone calls to their families while serving overseas and to state that these charges should no longer be tolerated.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Mr. McCrady requested that a copy of the Resolution be forwarded to The American Legion.

8. Presentation by Washington County Sheriff’s Office – Divisions of Litter Control and Animal Control

The Washington County Sheriff’s Office – Division of Animal Control and Division of Litter Control made a presentation to the Board concerning the activities of their respective Departments.

Sheriff Newman addressed the Board explaining that the Animal Control was transferred to the Washington County Sheriff’s Department in January 2004. Since that time, a lot of improvements have been made. The staff now works 12 hour shifts seven days a week including holidays.

Sergeant Eric Hinchey addressed the Board explaining that from January 1, 2004 to January 31, 2007, approximately 15,000 visitors have toured the Washington County Animal Shelter. The Animal Control officers answered approximately 2,109 calls in 2006 and approximately 2,388 calls in 2007. Sergeant Hinchey explained that Animal Control has seen a steady increase in their workload due to puppy mills, animal neglect and seizure cases, as well as an increase in the surrender of animals at the animal shelter from the year 2007 to the present. There were two large animal cases in the later portion of 2007 resulting in the surrender of 12 horses. In 2008, there have been four felony charges issued that are awaiting trial and three charges of animal neglect that are awaiting trial. Sergeant Hinchey concluded his presentation and asked the Board for any questions.

Discussion ensued about legislation pending in the General Assembly regarding euthanasia programs at local animal shelters. There were also discussions about the continuing problem in the County with dogs running at large. The Board commended the Animal Control Division for their outstanding work and commented about how much more efficient the Animal Control Division has become since it was transferred to the Sheriff's Department.

Sheriff Newman introduced the two employees of the Litter Control Division, Tom Chapman and James Matney, stating that both gentlemen are now sworn law enforcement officers.

Mr. Chapman explained that the Litter Control Program was established in August of last year and it took about three months to establish the Assign-a-Highway Program. Probationers assigned by the Circuit Court began picking up trash in November. He further explained that to date, there have been 87 litter complaints and 26 calls regarding inoperable vehicles. Mr. Chapman stated that in addition to the litter control duties, the Litter Control Department works the highways and issues traffic summons.

Discussions ensued among the Board. The Board inquired about the appropriate channel for reporting litter control complaints. Sheriff Newman asked the Board to contact the Sheriff's Department with litter complaints. If it is a complaint the Litter Control Division could handle they would, and if not, the complaint would be forwarded to Mr. Lee Noble, Superintendent of the Southwest Virginia Regional Jail Authority. Sheriff Newman explained that prisoners at the regional jail are utilized to pick up trash.

9. Recess

No recess was taken.

10. County Administrator Reports:

There were no County Administrator Reports.

11. County Attorney Reports:

a. Status Reports on Litigation and Legislative Matters

Ms. Phillips provided the Board with updates on the following litigation and legislative matters:

Don A. Harry v. Board of Supervisors

Judge Lowe ruled in favor of the County in this lawsuit. He noted that the reasons for the Board's denial of Mr. Harry's application to include public opposition based on detrimental effects on harmonious community among other specific concerns and found the Board's decision to be "not unreasonable" and the question of whether to grant the permit to be "fairly debatable;" therefore, the Board's decision was sustained. Ms. Phillips explained that the Court asked her to prepare the Final Order for entry in this matter.

Stephanie Rowe v. Washington County et al.

Ms. Rowe notified the parties that she no longer wished to pursue this matter, which primarily involved the Washington County Sheriff’s Office; therefore, she voluntarily dismissed her cause of action against all defendants.

Legislative Issues

Ms. Phillips explained that she submitted comments to Delegate Joe Johnson on two pending legislative matters: House Bill (HB) 119, which would have required local government attorneys to provide legal representation for the Soil and Water Conservation Districts and HB 519, which would have required local governments to pay the attorneys fees and expenses for persons who successfully appealed decisions of the Board of Zoning Appeals. Both of these proposed pieces of legislation did not make it out of committee consideration. Ms. Phillips stated that she was honored that Delegate Johnson provided responses directly to her on her comment letters.

Voting Rights Act

Ms. Phillips explained that after discussion of the issue with Voter Registrar Mary Ann Compton, she contacted attorney Gerald Hebert to initiate discussions of possibly retaining his services to take the County through the procedures necessary to exempt the County from requirements of the Voting Rights Act. Mr. Hebert has specialty in this area and has successfully helped many other localities through the process.

Discussions ensued among the Board.

12. Board Information

Mr. Reeter mentioned a VACo newsletter wherein it explains that that the Homestead Exemption is dead for this session of the General Assembly.

13. Board Member Reports

Mr. Price explained that he would like to make an appointment to the Service Authority for the Jefferson District. The term of the current person representing the Jefferson District expires June 30, 2008.

On motion of Mr. Price, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to appoint Mr. Kenneth Taylor to represent the B-01 “Jefferson” Election District on the Washington County Service Authority Board of Commissioners for a four year term beginning July 1, 2008 and expiring June 30, 2012.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Mr. Price explained that he would like to see citizen's comments reinstated with restrictions. He proposed the Board consider this issue after July 1, and also to consider establishing a committee charged with drafting guidelines for a citizen's comments period.

Mr. Price addressed the Board regarding the request from the Glade Spring Fire Department for matching grant funds for the purchase of jaws-of-life equipment that was tabled from the February 12 meeting. He explained that the Glade Spring Fire Department received an estimate from Singer Associates for this equipment in the amount of \$47,756.14. Mr. Price stated that he has never known the jaws-of-life equipment to be this expensive. He advised the Board that he contacted another vendor and received a quote in the amount of \$30,579.50 for another brand of jaws-of-life. There is a difference in price of \$17,176.64. Mr. Price stated that there is \$21,347.00 remaining in the Fire & Rescue Facilities and Equipment for FY 2007-2008. He explained that the Damascus Rescue Squad has submitted a request in the amount of \$9,167.40 to be used as matching funds for a grant in the amount of \$18,334.80 for purchase of portable radios, pagers and chargers. Mr. Price explained if the revised estimate for the jaws of life equipment in the amount of \$30,579.50 were accepted then half of the matching funds would be a revised figure of \$15,289.98 for a total of \$24,457.38 to fund the requests of both Glade Fire Department and Damascus Rescue Squad. He proposed that the Board proportionately appropriate the \$21,347.00 remaining in the Fire & Rescue Facilities and Equipment to Glade Springs Fire Department and Damascus Rescue Squad to assist with funding their respective matching grant fund requests. Mr. Price stated that there is a difference of only \$3,110.38 between the \$24,457.38 total requests and the remaining balance in the Fire & Rescue Facilities and Equipment of \$21,347.00 that the departments would have to fund.

Discussions ensued among the Board concerning Mr. Price's proposal. Mr. Reynolds inquired if the Board should ask representatives from these departments to speak to the Board about the proposal. Mr. Price replied that if the Board would like to table action on the proposal and invite the departments to address the Board that would be fine. He explained however that the departments have three ways of raising money; county contributions, fund raising and contributions from individuals.

Mr. Taylor commented that two Board members were appointed to serve on the Emergency Services Committee, and that the Board should honor their service and support their proposal.

Mr. McCrady asked if Mr. Price had contacted Glade Spring Fire Department and Damascus Rescue Squad. Mr. Price replied that he had not, but thought there would be a representative attending tonight's meeting.

Discussions ensued about possible changes to future funding of matching grant fund requests where the county would only obligate 50% of the request and require the requesting organization to fund 50%, which would be 25% of their request. After further discussions among the Board the following action was taken:

On motion of Mr. Price, second by Mr. McCrady the Board acted to proportionately appropriate the \$21,347.00 balance of the Fire & Rescue Facilities/Equipment to the Glade Spring Fire Department and Damascus Rescue Squad as follows to be used as matching grant funds for the purchase of jaws-of-life equipment; and radios, pagers and chargers respectively:

Glade Spring Fire Department \$13,345.50 (87.28%)
Damascus Rescue Squad \$ 8,001.50 (87.28%)

Total \$21,347.00

It was further resolved to direct County Emergency Services Coordinator Mary Fraysier to send a letter to the chief of the Glade Spring Fire Department and captain of the Damascus Rescue Squad advising them of the Boards action, and to advise them that if this action is not acceptable to their respective departments that the money would be placed back into the Fire & Rescue Facilities/Equipment. Also, to advise both departments that if they accept the Board's actions then the Fire and Rescue Facilities/Equipment line item is exhausted for the remainder of FY 2007-2008.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Mr. Taylor addressed the Board concerning Embarq’s application to the State Corporation Commission to bundle their services. He explained that he read through the application and did not understand all of the language, but is sure it is language that the SCC has to respond to in a certain way. Mr. Taylor proposed the following comments for Board consideration to be sent to the SCC:

“That there is nothing in the plan that addresses when, where or how the infrastructure is going to be deployed that will provide broadband services to Washington County or Southwest Virginia. When and how bundled services will be provided is not addressed. Embarq should be required as a minimum to work with the leaders of each county in its service area to say when the fiber optics and wireless infrastructure will be in place within the next five years to provide the bundled services county-wide in each county in its service area.”

Discussion ensued among the Board. Subsequently, the following action was taken:

On motion of Mr. Taylor, second by Mr. McCrady, the Board acted to direct the County Attorney to submit the following comments to the State Corporation Commission regarding Embarq’s application to bundle their services, and further to request that their comments be included in what is approved for Embarq by the SCC:

That there is nothing in the plan that addresses when, where or how the infrastructure is going to be deployed that will provide broadband services to Washington County or Southwest Virginia. When and how bundled services will be provided is not addressed. Embarq should be required as a minimum to work with the leaders of each county in its service area to say when the fiber optics and wireless infrastructure will be in place within the next five years to provide the bundled services county-wide in each county in its service area.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Mrs. Mumpower *Aye*
Mr. Owens *Aye*
Mr. Price *Aye*
Mr. Reynolds *Aye*
Mr. Taylor *Aye*

Mr. Taylor reported to the Board that he has submitted comments to members of the General Assembly about various pieces of legislation, including the proposed legislation regarding reappraisals on real estate. He stated that he opposed this legislation.

Mr. Taylor reported that the County Joint Land Use Steering Committee has begun work on the revisions to the County Comp Plan.

Mr. McCrady asked that the County Engineer make contact with County Recreation Manager Keith Owens to work on the little league program in Damascus.

Discussions ensued at this time concerning the reinstatement of a citizen’s comments period to future Board Agendas.

14. Closed Meeting(s):

Request for Closed Meeting pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(3) for discussion or consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose, or of the disposition of publicly held real property, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body, specifically new industrial park property

On motion of Mr. McCrady, second by Mr. Taylor, the Board acted to convene in Closed Meeting pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(3) for discussion or consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose, or of the disposition of publicly held real property, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body, specifically new industrial park property. It was further resolved to include County Administrator Mark Reeter, County Attorney Lucy Phillips, Assistant County Administrator Christy Parker, Industrial Development Authority members Russell Owens and Henry Snodgrass; and John Mahaffey with Mahaffey and Associates in the closed meeting

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

Mr. McCall *Aye*
Mr. McCrady *Aye*
Mrs. Mumpower *Aye*
Mr. Owens *Aye*
Mr. Price *Aye*
Mr. Reynolds *Aye*
Mr. Taylor *Aye*

After returning to the meeting, the Chairperson noted that upon motion of Mr. Owens, second by Mr. McCrady, and favorable vote, the Board of Supervisors reconvened in open meeting. The Chairperson

called for any participant in the closed meeting(s) who believed that there was a departure from the requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act during the closed meeting(s), to state the substance of the departure that they believed took place. No members of the Board responded to the Chairperson's call for statements.

On motion of Mr. McCrady, second by Mr. Owens, the members of the Board certified the closed meeting(s) in accordance with the requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act. By vote in favor of this motion, each member certified that the closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law, and that only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements and identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened was heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

15. Recess to 7:00 PM Thursday, February 28, 2008 for Presentation of Proposed & Recommended County Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2008-2009

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to recess to 7:00 PM Thursday, February 28, 2008 for presentation of proposed & recommended County Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2008-2009.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (7-0)

<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCrady</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Price</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Taylor</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Prepared by:

Naoma A. Norris, Recording Clerk

2-26-08 15222

Approved by the Washington County Board of Supervisors:

Kenneth O. Reynolds, Chairman