

VIRGINIA:

At a regular meeting of the Washington County Board of Supervisors held Tuesday, July 13, 2004, at 7:00 p.m., at the County Administration Building in Abingdon, Virginia the following were present:

PRESENT:

John B. Roberts, Sr. Chairman
Phillip B. McCall, Vice Chairman
Bobby D. Ingle
Dulcie M. Mumpower
Odell Owens
Anthony S. Rector
Kenneth O. Reynolds

Mark K. Reeter, County Administrator
Mark W. Seamon, Accounting Manager
Naoma A. Mullins, Recording Clerk

ABSENT:

Lucy E. Phillips, County Attorney

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mr. John Roberts, Chairman of the Board, who welcomed everyone in attendance.

2. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

Supervisor Dulcie Mumpower gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Agenda

On motion of Mr. McCall, second by Mr. Rector, it was resolved to approve the agenda with the following amendments:

New Item 9a. Award of Contract for Mobile Command Center and Crime Scene Vehicle

New Item 15a. Request for Closed Meeting pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(7) for consultation with the retained legal counsel Richard Cranwell pertaining to the matter of Circuit Court Case No.: CL-03-11: County of Washington, Virginia v. City of Bristol, Virginia, et. al., and the related landowner-initiated petition for annexation currently pending before the Commission on Local Government where such consultation and briefing in open meeting would

adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the Board of Supervisors and which require the provision of legal advice by legal counsel

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

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

4. Approval of Minutes

June 21, 2004, Joint Recessed Meeting

On motion of Mr. Ingle, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to approve the minutes of the June 21, 2004, joint recessed meeting as presented.

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

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

June 22, 2004, Regular Meeting

On motion of Mr. Rector, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to approve the minutes of the June 22, 2004, regular meeting as presented.

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

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

5. **Public Hearings**

(1). James Potter and Dexter Ramey, Property Tax Map # 106-7-12: Request for a Special Exception permit to expand an existing Rest Home located on the south side of State Route 58 near the intersection of State Route 58/F029 in an A-2 (Agricultural, General) zone, Madison Magisterial District

Mr. Roberts opened the public hearing to receive comments both in support of and in opposition to the application of James Potter and Dexter Ramey for a Special Exception Permit.

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

On motion of Mr. Reynolds, second by Mrs. Mumpower, it was resolved to follow the recommendation of the Washington County Planning Commission and approve the application of James Potter and Dexter Ramey for a Special Exception Permit to expand an existing Rest Home located on the south side of State Route 58 near the intersection of State Route 58/F029 in an A-2 (Agricultural, General) zone, Madison Magisterial District

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

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

(2). Bobby C. Gray and Thomas VanDyke, Property Tax Map # 106B-4-4: Request for a Special Exception permit to construct and operate a privately owned school on property located on the north side of State Route 58 near the intersection of State Route 58/F029 in a B-2 (Business, General) zone, Harrison Magisterial District

Mr. Roberts opened the public hearing to receive comments both in support of and in opposition to the application of Bobby C. Gray and Thomas VanDyke for a Special Exception Permit.

Mr. David Sullins addressed the Board explaining that he and his wife Valerie currently lease the building from Bob Gray to operate a daycare center (Graceland Daycare). Mr. Sullins further explained they would like to expand this building to operate a Christian academy grades K-8. He stated their plans are to eventually expand classes through grade 12.

Ms. Kim Johnson addressed the Board explaining that the A Beka Curriculum on DVD would be taught at the academy. There would be non-certified teachers on site to answer the students' questions and provide them guidance.

Mrs. Cheryl Hodock addressed the Board explaining that she has a son that attends the Graceland Daycare Center, and when he is ready to begin kindergarten she would enroll him in the Christian academy. Ms. Hodock asked the Board to approve the Special Exception Permit.

Discussion ensued among the Board.

Responding to inquiries from the Board, Ms. Johnson explained that the school would begin with 25 students. When the students complete the eighth grade they would be ready to enter ninth grade in the public school system. Ms. Johnson further explained that parking at this facility would not be a problem.

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

On motion of Mr. McCall, second by Mr. Rector, it was resolved to follow the recommendation of the Washington County Planning Commission and approve the application of Bobby C. Gray and Thomas VanDyke for a Special Exception Permit to construct and operate a privately owned school on property located on the north side of State Route 58 near the intersection of State Route 58/F029 in a B-2 (Business, General) zone, Harrison Magisterial District with the stipulation that the school be limited to grades K-8.

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

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

b. Public Hearing and Board Consideration of Adoption of an Ordinance to Amend Chapter 58, Sections –331 and –351, of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia, to Establish a Tax on Purchases of Local Mobile Telecommunication Services

County Administrator Mark Reeter addressed the Board explaining that the adoption of the proposed ordinance would impose a tax on purchases of mobile telecommunication services. The State statute limits the tax to ten percent of the taxable purchase amount but no more than three dollars per month. Mr. Reeter stated that this form of consumer utility tax is currently be levied on electric and telephone bills.

Chairman John Roberts opened the public hearing to receive comments both in support of and in opposition to the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Patrick Mannix addressed the Board speaking in opposition to the proposed ordinance.

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

On motion of Mr. Rector, second by Mr. Reynolds, it was resolved to adopt the following ordinance:

An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 58, Sections -331 and -351, of the Code of the County of Washington, Virginia, to Establish a Tax on Purchases of Local Mobile Telecommunication Services

WHEREAS, mobile telecommunications services have become increasingly commonplace and in many instances are used by consumers in lieu of non-mobile telecommunications services; and

WHEREAS, section 58.1-3812 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended, established that any county may impose a tax on a taxable purchase of mobile telecommunication service if the consumer's service address is located in such county and, further, that the rate of tax shall be equal to ten percent of the monthly gross charge to a consumer of local mobile telecommunication but no more than three dollars (\$3.00) monthly; and

WHEREAS, having considered the public health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of the County;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, by the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Virginia:

1. That the Washington County Board of Supervisors, after notice and public hearing, as required by law, hereby amends Chapter 58, Subsections 58-331 and 58-351, of the Washington County Code (2002), as set forth below:

*Chapter 58. Taxation.
Article IX. Utility Taxes.
DIVISION 1. GENERALLY
Sec. 58-331. Definitions.*

The following words, terms and phrases, when used in this article, shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section, except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning: ...

Local mobile telecommunication service means any two-way mobile or portable local telecommunication service, including-commercial mobile radio service, as defined in 47 C.F.R. section 20.3, as in effect on June 1, 1999.

Local telecommunication service means, subject to the exclusions stated in this article, without limitation, the two-way local transmission of messages through use of switched local telephone services; telegraph services; teletypewriter; ~~local cellular mobile radio telecommunications services; specialized mobile radio; stationary two-way radio; or any other form of two-way mobile portable eommunications~~ or local mobile telecommunications service.

Local telephone service means, subject to the exclusions stated in this article, any services subject to federal taxation as local telephone service as that term is defined in section 4252 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, or any successor statute. As it applies to an E-911 system, the term "local telephone service" shall mean switched local exchange access service.

~~Mobile local telecommunication service means any two-way mobile or portable local telecommunication service, including cellular mobile radio telecommunication service and specialized mobile.~~

Mobile service consumer means a person having a telephone number for local mobile ~~local~~ telecommunication service who has made a taxable purchase of such service or on whose behalf another person has made a taxable purchase of such service.

Mobile service provider means every person engaged in the business of selling local mobile local communication telecommunications service to consumers.

Place of primary use means the street address representative of where the consumer's use of the mobile telecommunications service primarily occurs, which must be the residential street address or the primary business street address of the consumer and within the licensed service area of the home service provider.

...

Service address means, for purposes of local telecommunication service, the location of the telecommunication equipment from which the telecommunication is originated or at which the telecommunication is received by a consumer. However, if the service address is not a defined location, as in the case of ~~mobile telephones~~, maritime systems, air-to-ground systems and the like, the term "service address" shall mean the location of the subscriber's primary use of the telecommunication equipment within the licensed service area. In the case of mobile telecommunications service, the term "service address" shall mean the consumer's place of primary use. A mobile service provider may obtain a signed statement from a consumer indicating which county, city or town within the licensed service area is the location of the consumer's primary use of the telecommunication equipment. A mobile service provider shall be entitled to rely absolutely on a consumer's signed statement and shall remit the taxes collected to the county, city or town identified by the consumer. In the absence of a signed statement by a consumer, a mobile service provider shall identify the county, city or town of the consumer's primary use and shall remit the tax to such county, city or town based on any other reasonable method, including, without limitation, the consumer's billing address, service address or telephone number within the licensed service area. For purposes of utility service, service address shall mean the location at which the utility service is received by the consumer.

...

DIVISION 2. LOCAL TELECOMMUNICATION SERVICE AND ELECTRIC OR GAS HEAT, LIGHT AND POWER SERVICE.

Section 58-351. Levy; amount of tax on local telecommunication service.

- (a) There is hereby imposed a tax on taxable purchases by a consumer of local telecommunication service whose service address is located in the county in the amount of 20 percent of the monthly gross charge made by a service provider against such consumer for such taxable purchases. The tax imposed by this subsection shall not apply to mobile local telecommunication service. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the tax on taxable purchases of local mobile telecommunication services shall be in the amount of ten percent of the monthly gross charge for each mobile telecommunications service number billed to a mobile service consumer whose service address is located in the county.*
- (b) The tax imposed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section on the monthly gross charge made by a service provider against a residential consumer shall not be more than \$3.00 per month. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the tax imposed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section on the monthly gross charge made by a service provider against a consumer of local mobile telecommunications services shall not be more than \$3.00 per month.*
- (c) The tax imposed by subsection (a) of this section, with the exception of the tax imposed on taxable purchases of local mobile telecommunication services, shall be applicable to the first \$50.00 of the monthly gross charge made by a service provider against a commercial or*

industrial consumer. For the monthly gross charge in excess of \$50.00, if any, made by a service provider against a commercial or industrial consumer, a tax in the amount of two percent of such additional gross monthly charge is hereby imposed. Provided, however, the tax imposed on the total of the monthly gross made by a service provider against a commercial or industrial consumer shall not be more \$100.00 per month.

State law references: Telegraph and telephone companies, Code of Virginia, § 58.1-3812.

* * *

2. That, pursuant to Va. Code § 58.1-3812(B), the tax imposed by adoption of this ordinance and the duties of the service provider to collect the tax, remit same to the County and keep and furnish the records required by this ordinance shall be effective one hundred and twenty (120) days subsequent to written notice by certified mail being received by the registered agent of the service provider that is required to collect the tax.

3. That should any section or provision of this ordinance be decided to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section or provision of this ordinance or the Washington County Code.

4. That this ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its enactment.

The vote on this motion was as follows: (5-2)

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Nay</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Nay</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

6. Consideration of Approval of Facility Use Agreement with Meadowview Senior Citizens, Inc. for Clinchburg Community Center

County Administrator Mark Reeter addressed the Board explaining that the Facility Use Agreement is a lease between Washington County and Meadowview Senior Citizens, Inc. for the use of the Clinchburg Community Center. The Clinchburg Community Center is one of four County-owned Community Centers (Hayters Gap, Mendota and Green Cove), and this agreement may serve as a model with which to begin working on similar agreements with the users of these other facilities.

On motion of Mr. Ingle, second by Mr. Rector, it was resolved to approve the Facility Use Agreement between the County and Meadowview Senior Citizens, Inc. as presented.

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

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

Mrs. Mumpower *Aye*
Mr. Owens *Aye*
Mr. Rector *Aye*
Mr. Reynolds *Aye*
Mr. Roberts *Aye*

Scrivener’s Note: The Facility Use Agreement referenced above is included as Minutes Exhibits Item 2004-07-13A.

7. Consideration of Appointments to Boards and Commissions Expiring June 30, 2004

Washington County Service Authority Board of Commissioners

<u>Appointee</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Term Expires</u>
Gerald W. Cole	Wilson District	June 30, 2004

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to reappoint Gerald W. Cole to represent the G-01 “Wilson” Election District on the Washington County Service Authority Board of Commissioners for a four year term that begins July 1, 2004, and expires on June 30, 2008.

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

Mr. Ingle *Aye*
Mr. McCall *Aye*
Mrs. Mumpower *Aye*
Mr. Owens *Aye*
Mr. Rector *Aye*
Mr. Reynolds *Aye*
Mr. Roberts *Aye*

Mount Rogers Planning District Commission – Town of Damascus Representative

<u>Appointee</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Term Expires</u>
Marianna Farmer	Town of Damascus	June 30, 2004

On motion of Mr. Reynolds, second by Mr. Rector, it was resolved to reappoint Marianna Farmer to represent the Town of Damascus on the Mount Rogers Planning District Commission for a four year term that begins July 1, 2004 and expires June 30, 2008.

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

Mr. Ingle *Aye*
Mr. McCall *Aye*
Mrs. Mumpower *Aye*
Mr. Owens *Aye*
Mr. Rector *Aye*
Mr. Reynolds *Aye*
Mr. Roberts *Aye*

8. Request for Authorization to Dispose of Certain Records of the Accounting Department

On motion of Mrs. Mumpower, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to approve records disposal for the Accounting Department as requested.

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

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

9. Consideration of Rail Solutions Request Concerning Star Solutions I-81 Improvements Proposal (tabled from June 22 meeting)

The Board of Supervisors held discussions regarding the request from Rail Solutions for the County to be a co-signatory on a letter to the County’s Congressional representatives requesting that they stop the Star Solutions Plan. It was the feeling of most Board members that the County had already provided their recommendations to the Virginia Department of Transportation concerning I-81 improvements.

A motion was made by Tony Rector for the County to be a co-signatory on a letter to the County’s Congressional representative to stop the Star Solutions Plan but died for a lack of a second.

9a. Award of Contract for Mobile Command Center and Crime Scene Vehicle

Accounting Manager Mark Seamon addressed the Board explaining that the Accounting Office had assisted the Sheriff’s Department in obtaining bids for a mobile command center and crime scene vehicle. Three bids were received. Speciality Vehicles of Forth Worth, Texas submitted the low bid of \$92,825.00. Mr. Seamon further explained that the funding for this purchase would come from the Sheriff’s Office Federal Asset Seizure Funds.

On motion of Mr. Ingle, second by Mr. Rector, it was resolved to award a contract for a Mobile Command Center and Crime Scene Vehicle to Specialty Vehicles of Fort Worth, Texas in the amount of \$92,825.00.

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

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

10. Recess

It was consensus of the Board not to take a recess.

11. County Administrator Reports:**a. Request for County Participation in Recreational Development of Nature Conservancy Property on Brumley Mountain**

County Administrator Mark Reeter addressed the Board explaining that he had received correspondence from the Matthew Crum, Director of the Clinch Valley Program of the Nature Conservancy requesting the County's participation and input in exploring avenues of possible development of the Conservancy's recently purchased Clinch Mountain property. Mr. Reeter proposed the following options for the Board's consideration:

1. Assign County Parks & Recreation Committee to work directly with the Conservancy and bring back recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.
2. Establish a separate Board Committee specifically for this purpose.

Discussions ensued among the Board regarding the request. The Board expressed optimism concerning the development potential of the Clinch Mountain property for recreational use. It was suggested by the Board that the County Parks and Recreation Committee be asked if this is a project they would have time to handle.

After further discussions, it was consensus of the Board to forward the request from the Nature Conservancy to the County Parks and Recreation Committee for their input and direct them to bring a report back to the Board.

12. County Attorney Reports

No report.

13. Board Information

Mr. Reeter drew attention to materials in the Board Information section. Particularly correspondence reminding them of the Employee picnic on August 1, e-mail correspondence from the Department of Social Services regarding space for the free dental clinic, a letter from the Department of Forestry announcing regional meetings for landowners to discuss concerns and recommendations regarding forest preservation incentives, a letter to Dr. David Dawson outlining the County Utilities Committee recommendation concerning construction of a County-owned waster water treatment facility, and a letter from the Department of Social Services concerning the Clear Creek Mobile Home Park

14. **Consent Agenda**

On motion of Mr. Rector, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to approve the following Consent Agenda items:

- a. Payment of Bills – June 2004*
- b. Revenue Refund – Building Permit Fee*
- c. Supplemental Appropriation – Forfeited Asset Sharing Fund*
- d. Revenue Refunds – Animal Sterilization Fee*
- e. Supplemental Appropriations – Sheriff's Grants*
- f. Approval for Payment – Remaining Balance of County FY 2003-2004 Contribution*

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

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

15. **Board Member Reports**

Supervisor Odell Owens addressed the Board regarding Louden Drive located in his district. The Board appropriated \$50,000 in the FY 2004-2005 budget to assist with construction expenses to bring this road up to state standards so that it could be incorporated into the State System of Secondary Highways. Mr. Owens explained that the property owners along this road have informed him that they were not aware that they had to reimburse the County for a portion of the construction expense and was not willing to participate. He stated that he would need to circulate a new set of petitions.

Chairman John Roberts reported that he attended a reception at the Virginia Highlands Airport to recognize outgoing Airport Commission members. Mr. Roberts stated that he was impressed with the facilities.

15a. **Closed Meeting:**

- a. Request for Closed Meeting pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(7) for consultation with the retained legal counsel Richard Cranwell pertaining to the matter of Circuit Court Case No.: CL-03-11: County of Washington, Virginia v. City of Bristol, Virginia, et. al., and the related landowner-initiated petition for annexation currently pending before the Commission on Local Government where such consultation and briefing in open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the Board of Supervisors and which require the provision of legal advice by legal counsel.**

County Administrator Mark Reeter requested a convening of a Closed Meeting and advised that Attorney Richard Cranwell would be participating in that meeting via teleconference.

On motion of Mr. Ingle, second by Mr. Reynolds, it was resolved to convene in Closed Meeting pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(7) for consultation with the retained legal counsel Richard Cranwell pertaining to the matter of Circuit Court Case No.: CL-03-11: County of Washington, Virginia v. City of Bristol, Virginia, et. al., and the related landowner-initiated petition for annexation currently pending before the Commission on Local Government where such consultation and briefing in open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the Board of Supervisors and which require the provision of legal advice by legal counsel and to include County Administrator Mark Reeter and Assistant County Administrator Christy Parker. It was further resolved to take a fifteen-minute recess.

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

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

On motion of Mr. Ingle, second by Mr. Rector, and unanimous vote in favor, the Board of Supervisors now reconvenes in open meeting. At this time, any participant in the closed meeting who believes that there was a departure from the requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act during the closed meeting, please state the substance of the departure that you believe has taken place.

Hearing no such statements, on motion of Mr. McCall, second by Mr. Rector, it was resolved to certify the closed meeting in accordance with the requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act. By vote in favor of this motion, each member certifies 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 were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting.

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

<i>Mr. Ingle</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. McCall</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Mumpower</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Owens</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Rector</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Reynolds</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Roberts</i>	<i>Aye</i>

16. Adjourn

On motion of Mr. Rector, second by Mr. Owens, it was resolved to adjourn the meeting.

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

Mr. Ingle *Aye*
Mr. McCall *Aye*
Mrs. Mumpower *Aye*
Mr. Owens *Aye*
Mr. Rector *Aye*
Mr. Reynolds *Aye*
Mr. Roberts *Aye*

Prepared by:

Naoma A. Mullins, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Washington County Board of Supervisors:

John B. Roberts, Sr., Chairman