

VIRGINIA:

A meeting of the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors was held in the courthouse of said county on Thursday, February 22, 2007.

Present: Peter N. Geilich, Chair
Jack S. Russell, Vice Chair
B. Wally Beauchamp, Board Member
F.W. Jenkins, Jr., Board Member
Ernest W. Palin, Jr., Board Member
William H. Pennell, Jr., County Administrator

Others

Present: Sean Trapani, Clifton Balderson, and Robert Harper, Virginia Department of Transportation; Charles Costello, Friends of Lancaster County; Jack Larson, Planning/Land Use; Joan McBride, Rappahannock Record; Starke Jett, Northumberland Echo

Mr. Geilich called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PUBLIC INPUT

Ordinance Regulating Sexually Oriented Businesses

Ms. Fabiola Gergerich stated she wanted to talk about the King George County ordinance regulating sexually oriented businesses. She provided the board with a revised ordinance which was adopted by King George County on February 20, 2007. She said she was representing the people of Lancaster County who would like to have the Board of Supervisors adopt a similar ordinance. The purpose of the ordinance is to allow the citizens of Lancaster County to preserve a quality of life and protect their community. A common misconception is that this ordinance attempts to ban the content of certain types

of material, rather it simply recognized that because research and common sense indicate that sexually oriented businesses are a direct cause of increase crime rates, declining property values, and harm to minors, some basic precautions must be taken. With the arrival of Wal-Mart, the Board of Supervisors along with the Planning Commission have an important responsible to look to the future of other businesses arriving and be proactive by heading off potential problems. This ordinance will give the board and commission much needed tools to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens. She stated Caroline County, Henrico County, and Stafford County already have a similar ordinance in place and Northumberland County and the Town of Urbanna are currently working on a similar ordinance. The citizens of Lancaster County are asking the Board of Supervisors to join King George and set precedents to safeguard our community.

Mr. Geilich requested that the ordinance adopted by King George be sent to legal counsel for review.

By consensus, have legal counsel review the ordinance adopted by King George.

Mrs. Terry Beatley stated she is in favor of adopting the ordinance regulating sexually oriented businesses similar to the ordinance adopted by King George. She said that pornography has a cause and effect relationship with violence against women and children and we want to keep our county as safe as possible. The materials are degrading to women, children, etc. and are available in our county. The Supreme Court has established that obscenity is not protected in the First Amendment so it does not constitute censorship. The county government needs to implement a strict ordinance to regulate these types of businesses.

Mr. Geilich informed Mrs. Beatley that the Board of Supervisors has no jurisdiction within the incorporated towns of the county.

Ms. Mei Li Beane stated she too was in favor of adopting the ordinance regulating sexually oriented businesses similar to the ordinance adopted by King George. She said

she echoes the comments of the other two citizens who spoke on this ordinance. The government has two jobs; to protect from invasion and protect us from each other by enforcing some type of public morality. The board needs to review this ordinance in the view of public morality.

PRESENTATION

1. Auditor Report of the Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006 – Mr. Paul Lee commended the staff for a job well done. This is the fourth year of GASB34 reporting. There were no problems experienced with the audit this year. The tax collection for the county is at 99.9% that is when you take the current taxes assessed and compare to current collection as well as any delinquent. The tax revenue is one of the few revenues that can be controlled, which speaks well to the tax payers and collector.

Mr. Lee stated the general fund balance ended at \$644,000 and would like to see a 10% – 20% reserve of the operating budget suggested by the end of the year.

Mr. Jenkins stated that the county officials page is incorrect.

Mr. Lee said that would be corrected.

Mr. Geilich asked if the Lancaster County Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006 can be put on the county's website.

Mr. Lee stated a PDF will be provided to the county.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Public Hearing on the Six-Year Plan

Mr. Trapani stated the purpose of this joint public hearing was to get input from the Board of Supervisors and citizens of the county. He supplied handouts of the Draft Secondary System Construction Program - Projected Fiscal Year Allocation for 2007-08 through 2012-13. Mr. Trapani presented and informed the board that the county-wide project items include rural additions, traffic and safety services, private entrance pipes, preliminary engineering, seeding, fertilization, subdivision, and site planning. The incidental budget items are small projects such as drainage improvements, clearing of intersections and improving alignment.

The first priority is VSH 604/Merry Point Road, at the VSH 611 intersection, to improve alignment. Second priority is Rte 607/Good Luck Road, a County Line Project with Northumberland, to improve the alignment a quarter of a mile west of Rte 200. Third priority is Rte 614/Devils Bottom Road that runs past the primary school to a quarter of a mile east of Rte 669 to improve the alignment and replace the bridge. Fourth priority is Rte 605/Lankfords Corner near Pickardsville Road to improve the vertical and horizontal alignments. Priority five is to install a new right turn lane from VSH 3 unto VSH 1026/School Street.

Unpaved road projects include existing state maintained dirt roads that need to be paved under the Rural Rustic Road program. The first item is Route 632/Indiantown Road to surface treat approximately 0.97 mile. The second item is Route 789/Hadlea Drive to reconstruction and surface treat a non-hard surface road.

Chairman Geilich opened the public hearing.

Mr. Costello presented the board with a petition of 700 names who do not want VSH 614/Devils Bottom Road to be the list. He stated he does not believe the road is dangerous, however; the 25' long bridge does need maintenance. The road is a scenic road and the citizens from that area would like to have this removed from the list.

Mr. Palin asked if they believed the bridge was safe.

Mr. Costello said there has been slight flooding, but feels the bridge is very safe with the posted 25 mph speed limit. The road is scenic and not heavily traveled and to continue with this project would be in vain.

Mr. Ajootian concurred with the scenic nature of this road.

Mr. Jerry Hamm said he lives in Weems and expressed his agreement with Mr. Costello. Living near but not on Taylor's Creek Road, but can say with experience that what was done on that road was a disgrace. And he hopes that will not happen to the beautiful scenic Devils Bottom Road. He stated he also an Indiantown Road resident and thanked VDOT and the board for keeping the Indiantown Road paving project at the top of the list.

Mr. Beauchamp asked Mr. Trapani when Indiantown Road would be paved.

Mr. Trapani stated it is on the schedule for August 2007.

Mr. Trapani stated that federal dollars must be matched and there are very few state dollars left.

Mr. Geilich asked about VSH 614/Devils Bottom Road, he said after hearing the public comments, what happens at this point?

Mr. Trapani said there are zero previous dollars and this is the first budget year that this project will be financed. The VSH 614/Devils Bottom Road was the next priority and does quality for federal dollars. This priority can be placed on the back burner and can program those funds elsewhere.

Mr. Beauchamp asked if the bridge was safe.

Mr. Trapani said yes, however; it is a timber structure and need to be replaced.

Mr. Palin asked if the bridge meets the standards of two car passing.

Mr. Trapani said it does not meet the standards for two cars to pass now.

Mr. Jenkins said whereas this is a scenic route, he has concerns about school buses using the bridge.

Mr. Costello said it is an alternate route and there are no houses at Devils Bottom near the bridge.

Dr. Russell said if the citizens in the area are not interested in having the VSH 614/Devils Bottom Road on the list, the funds should be spend elsewhere in the county as needed.

Mr. Palin stated he believe that this should be looked at further, because there are some families on the Merry Point side of the bridge that do have school children. The buses would need to have a place to turn around.

Mr. Trapani said it is a lot of money when you think in relation to road construction. There is a \$169,000 financed on this year's budget. The only time the county would lose money, would be if funds were expended on a project.

Mr. Bob Westbrook of Irvington stated he enjoys traveling the road and requests that it be removed from the list, however; make the necessary repairs to the bridge. Don't turn this unique road into an "anywhere" USA. He asked if there have been any school bus accidents on that road.

Mr. Ernest Callis, Merry Point resident stated he enjoys traveling the road and requests that the road not be changed.

Mrs. Anne Owens said she uses the road and love the scenic drive, however; there is not enough warning at the top part where the deepest drop is located.

Chairman Geilich closed the public hearing.

Mr. Jenkins said the two issues from before is the safety for the school buses and the fact that it was in the proximity of the primary school and the exchange point where buses then go onto the middle school. His other concern is that from the public perspective. The project has been described as a changing of the entire road for approximately a quarter of a mile.

Mr. Costello stated it is one mile and a half.

Mr. Jenkins said the major thrust of this issue is that some people feel it is dangerous and some lean to the more scenic. On the Merry Point Road side there is a curve and steep hill and a lesser grading on the other side. He said they have learned from the Mohan Run bridge experience when the covert washed out, it was out for about three years. He suggested that the VDOT take the funds to install the much needed stop light in the county.

Mr. Palin stated he feels especially responsible because this issue is in District 2; he hears and understands the concerns of the citizens. He does have a concern about the safety of the bridge and prefers not to vote on this issue until it is further evaluated to gather more facts and details.

Mr. Beauchamp asked what is the earliest that funds would be expended.

Mr. Trapani said with the way if program is funded, it will not be scheduled for a number of years.

Mr. Beauchamp asked if the pavement was wide enough for double lines to be painted.

Mr. Trapani said the pavement is not wide enough and he can only paint edge lines, no center lines.

Mr. Jenkins asked when would the latest an adopted plan would be needed from Lancaster County.

Mr. Trapani said by the March 29, 2007 regular Board of Supervisors meeting.

Mr. Pennell asked if they could reduce scope of plan and use federal funds.

Mr. Trapani said it could be done in sections.

By consensus of the board, table the Virginia Department of Transportation Six Year Plan until the March 29, 2007 regular Board of Supervisors meeting and authorize the county administrator to talk with VDOT to advise the board of what else can the funds from VSH 614/Devils Bottom Road be used if the project is reduced. In addition, Mr. Pennell was asked to obtain the Schools' perspective regarding the proposed work on Devil's Bottom Road.

Speed Study Request/Town of Weems

Mr. Beauchamp asked about the status on the requested speed study in the Village of Weems.

Mr. Trapani stated the speed study was complete and signs erected.

Traffic Light Study

Mr. Beauchamp asked if the traffic light study for VSH 688/James Jones Memorial Highway and VSH 200/Irvington Road intersection had been reviewed yet.

Mr. Trapani said the request was still being reviewed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Application for Change of Zoning District Classification – White Stone United Methodist Church – Mr. Larson presented an application for Change of zoning classification from R-1, Residential, General to C-2, Commercial, Limited by White Stone Methodist Church on property described as Tax Map #34-61. This property is off VSH 3, Mary Ball Road, near White Stone, Virginia and is in Voting District 4.

Mr. Larson said the Women of White Stone United Methodist Church currently operate a thrift store in the town of White Stone with proceeds going towards benevolences supported by them. Their business has expanded to the point that this location no longer serves their purposes. They wish to relocate the shop to the subject property.

Planning Commission members agreed with staff that the subject property was sufficiently close to the town of White Stone and other commercially zoned properties as to be consistent with the uses of those properties if it were conditionally zoned C-2. It was, however, the feeling of the Planning commission that a rezoning should stipulate that the proposed use be the only permitted use.

Mr. Larson said the public hearing of the issue has been advertised, and adjoining property owners (APOs) have been notified as required by law. To date the county office has received no input from adjoining property owners or interested members of the public.

Chairman Geilich opened the public hearing.

Ms. Maxine Summerville, Chair, Board of Trustees and Building Committee and she would be speaking on behalf of the church, however; the minister and church members were present.

Mr. Larson said the Planning Commission approved for “limited use”.

Mr. Jenkins asked if that was a formal request of the petitioner that has been supplied to the Board, in writing, 24 hours prior to review as “conditional” zoning.

Mr. Pennell said a formal request is needed in order for the board to proceed.

Mr. Jenkins said the board can go against the Planning Commission approve a blanket C-2 zoning designation, deny the zoning request or continue the matter leaving the petitioner the opportunity to meet the requirements need in order for the board to recognize this as a conditional zoning.

Mr. Geilich said they need to vacate the building in White Stone. Can the board approve a blanket C-2 zoning designation and modify at a later date.

Mr. Jenkins said the Board of Supervisors can not vote on this issue as presented. It is a technicality because of the way Virginia State Law reads and will be an inconvenient for the town and the church.

Mr. Jenkins asked Mrs. Summerville as Chair of the Board of Trustees and Building Committee if she was authorized to speak to the Board of Supervisors on behalf of the zoning application.

Mrs. Summerville said yes.

Mr. Jenkins asked if it was the intent of the White Stone United Methodist Church that this application is for the conditional use as Thrift Shop “only”.

Mrs. Summerville said yes.

Chairman Geilich closed the public hearing.

Dr. Russell made a motion to approve the Conditional Application for Change of Zoning District Classification for the White Stone United Methodist Church as it was clearly voluntarily submitted and the comments on the application satisfied the “in writing before the public hearing” requirements of the law.

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye
	B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye
	F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
	Ernest W. Palin, Jr.	Aye

2. Update to the Comprehensive Plan – Chapter 1 – 6 – Mr. Larson presented the update to the Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan, Chapters 1-6.

Mr. Larson stated a copy of the advertised draft was provided to the members of the Board of Supervisors on February 12, 2007 to allow additional time for review.

Mr. Larson said this public hearing of the issue has been advertised as required by law. To date this office has received no input from interested members of the public.

Chairman Geilich opened the public hearing.

Dr. Bob Westbrook stated he had a few concerns:

- 1) Chapter 2, Page 2-13 – First paragraph talks about the ordinances of the county. Would like to see a statement saying the ordinances of the county reflects the goal of preserving and protecting rural character of the county.
- 2) Chapter 2, Page 2-16 – Goal #1: Objective 3 should read “*open space of sufficient size and quality to maintain the rural character of the County*”.
- 3) Chapter 3, Page 3-25 – Goal #2: Groundwater - consistency needed throughout plan.

Mr. Jenkins said he wanted to get clarification on Chapter 2, Page 2-16 – Goal #1. He believed it was dealing with two different areas of development, Goal #1 was dealing designated as growth areas vs. Goal #3 for areas outside the designated growth areas.

Dr. Russell stated maybe the issue is not the goals or objectives, but how the ordinance is worded.

Mr. Larson said he agreed with Mr. Jenkins and the ordinances still need to be worked out and feels his concerns will be addressed.

Mr. Costello said he would like to publicly thank the Planning Commission and especially Mr. Larson for the hard work and effort as they addressed the concerns given to them from the public input meeting held throughout the county. He said you can have open spaces without “clusters”. “Open space” and “Rural Character” are important and the Comprehensive Plan is a “living document” and can be continually work on.

Mr. Adjootian stated he has lived in Lancaster County for 35 years and people are continually trying to develop waterfront property. He requested that Chapter 6 be read very carefully because the future of the county will be away from the water and there no access to the Chesapeake Bay because of waterfront development.

Mrs. Sue Donaldson, Windmill Point Road said she was on the original Parks and Recreation Commission in 1981 and a group is needed to pinpoint and seek out public access property for county residents.

Mr. Wayne Cannon, Windmill Point Road resident asked if in Chapter 2 will there be limits on tracks of land to transfer that could be an incentive for lower cost housing.

Mr. Larson stated Mr. Cannon is referring to a planning tool discussed by the Planning Commission and will be in Chapter 7 with public hearing at a later date.

Mr. Cannon said Chapter 4 refers to obtaining shoreline protections. Guidelines should be available to homeowners and to the Wetlands Board, because owners don't get the information that the agents receive.

Mr. Larson stated the wetlands permitting process does occur and Mr. Marshall Sebra, Environmental Codes Compliance Officer meets with people on a daily basis. The county does have a program to encourage people to take a soft approach vs. hard approach shoreline protection. We have knowledgeable people addressing the environmental point of view, better information for the property owners, and costs and any other interests that may exist, such as the Wetlands Board, VIMS Reports, County Staff, etc.

Mr. Cannon has concerns with the wording of Goal #3 - Page 4-13 – Objective 1: “density credits to developers...”

Mr. Larson said Goal #3 - Page 4-13 – Objective 1 said “density credits” was intended to be taken out. The following Objective should be removed, “*Propose changes to the Subdivision Ordinance that will offer incentives such as density credits to developers who initiate appropriate, coordinated, on-site shoreline protective measures*”.

Mr. Tom Smith, a Palmer resident stated public access is a problem in the county and the county should consider leasing property, repairs being made to the existing property and upgrade under-utilized facilities.

Mr. Barry Kennedy, Irvington resident said he is new to the area and has concerns about the limited access. The public beach has parking spaces for three cars and for a county surrounded by water the beach is a “joke” and embarrassing.

Mr. Costello stated the Reverend Gail Fowler put in a lot of assistance on Chapter 3 regarding the safe water aspects.

Chairman Geilich closed the public hearing.

Mr. Palin stated the Planning Commission and Jack Larson did an excellent job on Chapters 1-6 of the Comprehensive Plan, along with the public input, which is why the update of the Comprehensive Plan has gone so smoothly.

Dr. Russell said in the introductory section of the Comprehensive Plan it should spell out the purpose of the Plan and how it is used by the county so that the Comprehensive Plan is not mixed up with the County Strategic Plan. The Comprehensive Plan a policy document that provides guidance for growth and development over the next 10 – 15 years, not much will happen until the

ordinances are written and approved. He said there needs to be a section to talk about the characteristic and trends of the county, general demographic data, and recent information (population, income, poverty, employment base, etc.) to be added in Chapter 1. He believes that a look at the wording for some of the goals as he is concerned with “discouraging” wording used. Dr. Russell prefers a positive tone to the language contained in the Plan. How will this be implemented with a small county staff? This is great start, but still has a long way to go.

Mr. Jenkins said he can’t emphasize his appreciation to the Planning Commission, Jack Larson and other people who have given input. He does have one concern, which he had when LandDesign came and did their first input session. That is much of this document deals with goal described as “the Rural Nature”. This sets false expectations, because there are many different opinions of what this means, there is no common definition.

Mr. Beauchamp said he complimented the Planning Commission and Jack Larson on an outstanding job and implementation of concerns from the public input sessions. The Comprehensive Plan does require some fine-tuning.

Mr. Geilich asked what the process was for the Board of Supervisors making modifications to the Comprehensive Plan and how long does the Board of Supervisors have to review.

Mr. Pennell said there is no time frame, because the public hearing has been held and the Board of Supervisors can now work on fine-tuning the plan.

Mr. Geilich said the Planning Commission, Jack Larson and the public input sessions have provided the Board with an excellent document. He read part of the **Vision Statement** “*Elected and appointed County officials will be visionary and proactive in ensuring the natural resources of the county are*

available and accessible to all citizens now and for future generations". He stated that some of the suggestions cost money and those funds come from taxes.

Mrs. Beatley stated that Belle Isle is great access to the water. The park needs to be marketed better.

Mr. Jenkins said with all the fund raising done in the county for other projects, very little has been channeled to Belle Isle which is a great water access spot.

By consensus of the board, table the Updates to the Comprehensive Plan – Chapter 1 – 6 until the next regular Board of Supervisors meeting on March 29, 2007.

CONSENSUS DOCKET

Motion was made by Mr. Beauchamp to approve the Consensus Docket and recommendations as follows:

A. Minutes for October 5, 2006, January 22, 2007 and January 25, 2007

Recommendation: Approve the minutes.

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye
	B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye
	F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
	Ernest W. Palin, Jr.	Aye

CONSIDERATION DOCKET

The Board considered the following items on its Consideration Docket:

1. Approval of February 2007 Salaries and Invoice Listings

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins to approve the Salaries for February 2007 in the amount of \$175,575.02 and Invoice Listings for February 2007 in the amount of \$471,976.08.

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye
	B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye
	F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
	Ernest W. Palin, Jr.	Aye

2. James R. Shoemaker – Request for Bay Act Formal Exception – Mr. Larson presented a request for a Bay Act Formal Exception by Alistair J. Ramsey, agent for James R. Shoemaker, to encroach eighteen feet into the 100’ protective buffer to construct a single family residence on property described as Tax Map #5-43N. This property is off Sycamore Lane in the Edgewater subdivision near Morattico, Virginia and is in Voting District 1.

Mr. Larson said this issue was the subject of a public hearing at the December 28, 2006 regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors. The Board heard public comment that were unanimously opposed to the application but continued consideration until this meeting, honoring a request by the applicant’s agent, Mr. Ramsey, made on December 22, 2006. The applicant requested an on-site visit with me to “properly evaluate the merits of Mr. Shoemaker’s project.” This visit was conducted on January 19, 2007. When it became apparent that Mr. Ramsey, speaking on behalf of the applicant, was not willing to modify the proposed development in any way, shape, or form, I advised him that my position was also unchanged and that I would again recommend disapproval. Subsequent to the meeting, Mr. Shoemaker, the applicant, called him arguing for the site plan as submitted. I advised him that my position on the issue would remain unchanged. Since that conversation, I have had no further contact with Mr. Shoemaker or his agent.

Mr. Jenkins made a motion to Deny the Request for Bay Act Formal Exception for James R. Shoemaker.

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye
	B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye
	F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
	Ernest W. Palin, Jr.	Aye

3. Belle Isle State Park Funding Request – Mr. Pennell stated Belle Isle State Park and the Wetlands Board have submitted a funding request for educational signs. The funds would be used to install educational signs along the “Marsh Walk” at Belle Isle State Park and is viewed by the Wetlands Board to be justified, providing wetland education to the public. Sufficient funds are available in the Wetlands Board “Special Project” account. He said the Wetlands Board does collect fines and penalties and there is over \$12,000 in that account.

Mr. Pennell said the Wetlands Board recommends approval to grant Belle Isle State Park funding in the amount of \$2,000. If approved, this funding would be withdrawn from the Lancaster County Wetlands Board “Special Project” account.

Mr. Palin made a motion to Approve the Belle Isle State funding request in the amount of \$2,000 from the Lancaster County Wetlands Board “Special Project” account to install educational signs.

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye
	B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye
	F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
	Ernest W. Palin, Jr.	Aye

BOARD REPORTS

Mr. Geilich said last month that a citizen committee be formed to work with the Taylor's Creek Park Project which has water access and the county property located at the end of Brightwaters Lane (VSH 695/Windmill Point Road).

Mr. Pennell stated the citizens who volunteered for the Taylor's Creek Park Project are: Jane Higgins, Besty Rounds, Jeannie Peck, William Blocher, and Paula Greenwood, and Carl Oliver.

Mr. Geilich said the following citizens who volunteer for the VSH 695/Windmill Point Road Project are: Lester Hoyle, Wayne Cannon, Fred Adjootian, Jennifer McCann, and Rod Barrack.

Mr. Geilich stated the purpose of the citizen committees is to determine the best way to develop these areas.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR REPORT

None

CLOSED MEETING

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins to enter into closed meeting to discuss matters exempt from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act.

- 1. The subject matter to be discussed in the closed meeting is a contract with SBA Network Services.**
- 2. The purpose of the closed meeting is the discussion or consideration of the investment of public funds.**

3. **This subject and purpose falls within the following exemption(s) under § 2.2-3711.A of the Code of Virginia:**

§2.2-3711.A. 6 of the Code of Virginia. Discussion or consideration of the investment of public funds where competition or bargaining is involved, where, if made public initially, the financial interest of the governmental unit would be adversely affected.

CERTIFICATION RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors convened in a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote on the motion to close the meeting to discuss the investment of public funds for the purpose of a potential contract with SBA Network Services in accordance with §2.2-3711.A.6 of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act;

WHEREAS, §2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the board of supervisors that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act were heard, discussed or considered in the closed meeting to which this certification applies and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the meeting to which this certification applies.

Motion was made by Dr. Russell to certify the closed meeting.

Before a vote is taken on this resolution, is there any member who believes that there was a departure from the requirements of number 1 and number 2 above? If so,

identify yourself and state the substance of the matter and why in your judgment it was a departure. There was no comment.

Hearing no further statement, Mr. Geilich called the question. A roll call vote was taken:

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye
	B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye
	F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
	Ernest W. Palin, Jr.	Aye

This certification resolution is adopted.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins to adjourn the meeting.

VOTE:	Peter N. Geilich	Aye
	Jack S. Russell	Aye
	B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye
	F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
	Ernest W. Palin, Jr.	Aye