

VIRGINIA:

A meeting of the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors was held at the Courthouse of said county on Thursday, February 24, 2000.

Present: B. Wally Beauchamp, Chairman  
F. W. Jenkins, Jr., Vice Chairman  
Donald O. Conaway, Board Member  
Patrick G. Frere, Board Member  
Cundiff H. Simmons, Board Member  
William H. Pennell, Jr., County Administrator

Others

Present: J. F. Staton, Carter White and C. C. Burgess, Department of Transportation representatives; Press

Mr. Beauchamp called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

**PRESENTATIONS**

County Audit - Paul Lee of Robinson, Farmer, Cox, presented the June 30, 1999 county audit to the Board. Mr. Lee said the audit went well, considering this was the first full year under the new accounting system. The tax collection percentage went up last year. Also, the general fund balance is now at 8.5%, which is up from last year but not at the 10% to 15% they would like to see.

Motion was made by Mr. Conaway to receive the June 30, 1999 county audit.  
VOTE: 5 - 0 Aye.

Response Time in Emergency Situations - Fred Ajootian spoke to the Board about the response time by Virginia Power and VDOT in emergency situations. In December of 1998 we had an ice storm which was widespread, but not unusual, not a catastrophe. The area of Ocran where he lives was without power for five and one-half days. After two days workmen came within one quarter mile from his area and then left. When they did come back it took forty-five minutes to repair. He thinks this is too long a response time. When he came here twenty-six years ago there was a workyard in Kilmarnock, and the response was better with that old equipment and the little yard in Kilmarnock than what we have today. It seems we are going backwards. His next door neighbor has a lane with trees on both sides. At the end of the hurricane this past fall we got heavy rain and wind. He was without power for six and one-half days. The problem was two 4'' hardwoods that fell against the line. It took six and one-half days to get a truck down there to do fifteen minutes work. The emergency was not the incident itself, but the lack of response. Twenty-five years ago it would not have taken six and one-half days. In January 2000 we had six inches of snow, which is not an unusual amount of snow in Virginia. Schools were closed for eight or nine days. To him that is intolerable for six inches of snow. We had thirteen inches of snow twenty years ago and the response time was better then. He does not think we are as well served by Virginia Power or the Virginia Department of Transportation as we were. What if any one of these three incidents had been a real serious catastrophe? What if there were thousands of lines down? These were normal occurrences. If we had something really serious we would be in bad shape. The fire departments and rescue squads know who has four wheelers and who can get in and out. How can they move if you have ice ruts four inches deep a week after an event because plowing was not timely? Without electricity we are incapacitated. He thinks the Board should act to take care of the county. He does not think we are getting the service we were even ten years ago.

Mr. Pennell said after the December 1998 storm he and representatives from other localities met with Virginia Power and expressed many of the same concerns expressed by Mr. Ajootian. Virginia Power was adamant that they are continuing with the same service as they always have. That meeting was later followed by a town meeting in Kilmarnock. There were only three citizens in attendance. He does not know what else we can do about it.

No action taken.

## **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

Emergency Response Time - Mr. Staton said VDOT is also concerned about the current level of service, but every storm is different. Normally they hire equipment to work on the secondary roads while VDOT concentrates on the primary roads. But, with this last storm and the volume of snow, they had all the equipment on the primary roads. By the time they got to the secondary roads the snow had gotten packed because so many people now have four-wheel drive vehicles. Once the snow is driven on it gets packed down. They brought in two snow blowers and eight motor graders, but were still nine days getting the roads open for school buses. He has heard from a lot of people who have the same concerns expressed by Mr. Ajootian. They are considering treating the high volume secondary roads with chemicals, which they do not do now for economic reasons. In order to do that they would have to have an additional five trucks and more storage capacity for each county. They have had a manpower reduction, and now have ten people to run the equipment in Lancaster County. The state provides more equipment and we get people to run it. During the last storm there were 120 pieces of equipment on the road. Also, they do not have enough state employees to cover the twelve hour shifts. They also have a service contract with equipment operators. Privatization has worked in some instances, but not in others. VDOT would like to do better, and can do better if they have the men and equipment.

Mr. Beauchamp said he saw more equipment on the road than he had ever seen before.

Mr. Burgess said there were seven tractors, two hired trucks with spreaders and three dump trucks in Lancaster County.

Mr. Simmons said he thinks VDOT did a commendable job with what they had. He knows the Virginia Power employees were doing everything they could with the equipment they had.

No action taken.

Pre-Allocation Hearing - Mr. Staton said the pre-allocation hearing scheduled in March has been postponed, with a tentative date of April 21, 2000.

No action taken.

Route 3 Project - Mr. Staton said the engineering for the Route 3 project is scheduled to be advertised in the spring of 2002. There will also be a public hearing on the location and design. There is a pond site that needs to be worked out and a contaminated soil site.

No action taken.

VSH 600 - Mr. Conaway asked for an update on the VSH 600 project. He has received a lot of calls and complaints. Prior to the washout there were five to six hundred cars per day traveling that road. People do not understand why it will take so long to repair a road as busy as that one.

Mr. Staton said they have begun negotiations for the right of way with the landowner. The plan design is ongoing, and they will have to advertise for a contractor. It will take at least twelve months. Studies have to be done on environmental impact and design aspects, which take time. They are diligently pursuing it.

No action taken.

## **CONSENSUS DOCKET**

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins to approve Items A through C on the Consensus Docket, and staff recommendations, as follows:

A. Minutes of January 27, 2000

Recommendation: Approve as submitted.

B. Grant Application - Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department

Recommendation: Adopt the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act establishes that the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Board is responsible for carrying out the purposes and provisions of Chapter 21 of the Code of Virginia, and

WHEREAS, the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Board has promulgated a Request for Proposals to the Local Assistance Competitive Grants Program; and

WHEREAS, the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors is the duly elected legislative body for Lancaster County, Virginia, an eligible entity under the Local Assistance Competitive Grants Program; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the 2001 Competitive Grants program Request for Proposals, it is required that a Resolution Authorizing the Submission of a Grant Application be received from all localities party to a grant proposal;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors that the Executive Director of the Northern Neck Planning District Commission be authorized to apply on the behalf of Lancaster, Northumberland, Richmond and Westmoreland Counties for a grant in the amount, not to exceed \$20,000 from the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department for the purpose of Agricultural Conservation Plan Coordination within the Resource Protection Areas of the Northern Neck Region.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if the grant is awarded the Northern Neck Planning District Commission hereby agrees to pay for the full costs of the grant project, not to exceed \$40,000 in total costs, providing that certain of these costs are subject to grant reimbursements not to exceed a total of \$20,000, which shall be payable from the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department in accordance with a contractual agreement to be executed between the Northern Neck Planning District Commission, the Counties of Lancaster, Northumberland, Richmond and Westmoreland and the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department, and that if the Northern Neck Planning District Commission subsequently elects to cancel this project, the Northern Neck Planning District Commission hereby agrees to reimburse the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department for the total amount of the funds expended by the Department through the date the Department is notified of such cancellation.

C. Private Industry Council - Workforce Investment Board

Recommendation: Adopt the following Charter creating a local Workforce Investment Board in the region and adopt the following resolutions:

of the  
Bay Consortium Local Workforce Investment Area  
under the

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT (P.L. 105-220)

THIS AGREEMENT, made and entered into between the JURISDICTIONS OF Accomack County, Caroline County, Essex County, City of Fredericksburg, King & Queen County, King George County, King William County, Lancaster County, Mathews County, Middlesex County, Northampton County, Northumberland County, Richmond County, Spotsylvania County, Stafford County, and Westmoreland County

In the Commonwealth of Virginia (hereinafter, the Jurisdictions):

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the County Board of Supervisors/City Council of the aforementioned jurisdictions did previously adopt resolutions authorizing the County Board Chairperson/City Mayor to sign a charter creating the Bay Consortium in order to administer the provisions of Public Law 105-220, the federal Workforce Investment Act, and

WHEREAS, the County Board of Supervisors/City Council of each of the aforementioned jurisdictions has adopted a resolution authorizing the County Board Chairperson or City Mayor to sign this Charter of the Bay Consortium under the Workforce Investment Act (P.L. 105-220) (hereinafter, the "Charter"):

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the above premises and the mutual covenants of the parties hereinafter set forth, the receipt and each party acknowledges sufficiency of which for itself, the Jurisdictions do hereby agree to the following Charter:

AGREEMENT

SECTION 1: That the Jurisdictions of Accomack County, Caroline County, Essex County, City of Fredericksburg, King & Queen County, King George County, King William County, Lancaster County, Mathews County, Middlesex County, Northampton County, Northumberland County, Richmond County, Spotsylvania County, Stafford County, and Westmoreland County, do hereby constitute themselves to be a consortium for the purposes of Section 117(c)(1)(B) of Public Law 105-220, the Workforce Investment Act..

SECTION 2: The chief local elected officials (the chairpersons of the County Board of Supervisors or City Mayor) or the designees of said officials of the jurisdictions shall constitute the Workforce Investment Area Consortium (hereinafter, the "Consortium") which shall appoint the Local Workforce Investment Board under Section 117(c)(1)(A) of the Act.

SECTION 3: The Consortium shall elect from its membership a Chairperson, a Vice-Chairperson and such other officers as may be provided in the by-laws to serve for a term of one year or until a successor is elected and qualified. Vacancies shall be filled by election for the residue of the unexpired term. The Chairperson shall appoint a staff person of one of the consortium member counties or the administrative entity to serve as board clerk.

SECTION 4: Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised, shall govern the procedures of the Consortium insofar as they do not conflict with applicable law or administrative rules or by-laws duly adopted by the Consortium.

SECTION 5: The Consortium may adopt operational and procedural by-laws consistent with this Charter, applicable federal and state laws, and rules or regulations pursuant thereto. By-laws or amendments thereto may be adopted by the affirmative vote of 2/3 of the entire membership of the Consortium at any regular meeting called for that purpose,

provided that written copies thereof are delivered to each member 15 days prior to consideration.

SECTION 6: The Consortium designates from its membership the local government jurisdiction of Richmond County to serve as the grant recipient for Title I funds of the WIA, and further designates The Bay Consortium, Inc. to serve as local fiscal agent and administrative entity for Title I funds of the WIA. It is the intent of the Consortium that all risks of liability for disallowed costs be reduced to the minimum extent possible. Involvement of local elected officials will be designed to fulfill legislated requirements of the WIA. Operational authority and responsibility will remain with the local fiscal agent/administrative entity. The local fiscal agent/administrative entity will be required to maintain insurance policies sufficient to protect the Consortium from potential errors and omissions in administering the use of these funds.

SECTION 7: The Consortium shall appoint the Local Workforce Investment Board of the area, under Section 117(c)(1)(A) of P.L. 105-220 and applicable rules thereunder.

SECTION 8: The Consortium shall execute an agreement with the Local Workforce Investment Board for the operation and functions of the Board under Section 117 of the Act, and shall approve all Local Plans under Section 118 of the Act. The Consortium shall review and approve any and all planning documents for WIA activities prior to its submission to the Virginia Employment Commission and U. S. Department of Labor.

SECTION 9: The Consortium shall perform all functions for local elected officials as contained in P.L. 105-220, the federal Workforce Investment Act.

SECTION 10: This Charter agreement shall be effective when approved by Resolutions adopted by the County Board of Supervisors/City Council of each jurisdiction party hereto and executed by the chief elected official thereof pursuant to said resolution and shall thereupon act to repeal and supersede any and all prior written or oral consortium agreements under P.L. 102-367, the Job Training Partnership Act.

SECTION 11: Amendments to the Charter agreement may be adopted with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors/City Council of each jurisdiction party hereto. The Consortium may be dissolved and this agreement may be rescinded only with the consent of all the Boards of Supervisors/City Council of each jurisdiction party hereto and the Governor.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Charter Agreement to be executed by the Chairperson of the County Board of Supervisors or the City Mayor of the aforementioned Jurisdictions.

#### RESOLUTION FOR JURISDICTIONS TO WORK TOGETHER

Authorizing the County Board Chairperson/City Mayor to execute a joint agreement between the jurisdictions in the workforce investment area to form a consortium under the federal Workforce Investment Act.

WHEREAS, the Congress of the United States adopted Public Law 105-220, the Workforce Investment Act, to replace the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA); and

WHEREAS, the purpose of this Act is to: streamline services through a One-Stop service delivery, empower individuals through information and access to training resources, provide universal access to core services, increase accountability for results, ensure a strong role for Local Boards and the private sector in the workforce investment system, facilitate State and local flexibility, and improve youth programs.

WHEREAS, under Section 116 of the Act the Governor has designated workforce development areas within the state to implement the provisions of the Act therein; and

WHEREAS, the Act and the state regulations adopted by the Governor under the Act allows the jurisdictions within a workforce development area to enter into a ``consortium agreement'' to define their roles and relationships in administering their responsibilities under the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Act requires the Chief Local Elected Official (County Board Chairperson or City Mayor) or his/her designee to perform several duties which assure local government control over the Local Plan adopted in our Workforce Development Area; and

WHEREAS, the jurisdictions in this Workforce Investment Area need to adopt a formal consortium agreement between them for filing with the Governor:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors that the County Board Chairperson be and hereby is authorized to execute the ``CHARTER CLEO CONSORTIUM AGREEMENT'' of the BAY CONSORTIUM WORKFORCE INVESTMENT AREA under the WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT (P.L. 105-220) which follows and is made a part hereof.

#### RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SIGNATORY AUTHORITY

WHEREAS, the Congress of the United States adopted Public Law 105-220, the Workforce Investment Act, to replace the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA); and

WHEREAS, the purpose of this Act is to: streamline services through a One-Stop service delivery, empower individuals through information and access to training resources, provide universal access to core services, increase accountability for results, ensure a strong roll for Local Boards and the private sector in the workforce investment system, facilitate State and local flexibility, and improve youth programs.

WHEREAS, under Section 116 of the Act the Governor has designated workforce development areas within the state to implement the provisions of the Act therein; and

WHEREAS, the Act and the state regulations adopted by the Governor under the Act allows the jurisdictions within a workforce development area to enter into a ``consortium agreement'' to define their roles and relationships in administering their responsibilities under the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Act requires the Chief Local Elected Official (County Board Chairperson or City Mayor) or his/her designee to perform several duties which assure local government control over the Local Plan adopted in our Workforce Development Area; and

WHEREAS, the jurisdictions in this Workforce Investment Area need to adopt a formal consortium agreement between them for filing with the Governor;

WHEREAS, the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors has authorized the County Board Chairperson to execute the ``CHARTER CLEO CONSORTIUM AGREEMENT'' of the BAY CONSORTIUM WORKFORCE INVESTMENT AREA under the WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT (P.L. 105-220).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Lancaster County Board of Supervisors that the county administrator be authorized to sign other such documents related to WIA and Consortium functions after consideration and approval from said Board of Supervisors, and that such considerations and approvals be documented within board minutes.

VOTE: 5 - 0 Aye.

## CONSIDERATION DOCKET

The Board considered the following items on its Consideration Docket:

1. Approval of February 2000 Salaries and Invoice Listings

Motion was made by Mr. Conaway to approve the salaries and invoices for February 2000 in the amount of \$501,306.37. VOTE: 5 - 0 Aye.

2. County Attorney Opinion - Private Operation of the Lancaster County Animal Shelter

Mr. Pennell said the County Attorney has determined that the procurement act does apply in this instance and we would have to go out for a request for proposals.

Mr. Conaway said if we need to do an RFP, he feels we should, if this is something we are going to consider.

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins to remove this item from consideration. VOTE: 2 Aye (Jenkins, Beauchamp), 3 Nay (Conaway, Frere, Simmons).

Motion was made by Mr. Conaway to issue a request for proposals.

Mr. Simmons said he does not feel we can know what the benefits or detriments are without getting some sort of proposal. We are doing a disservice to the citizens if we do not at least look at this.

Mr. Conaway said for us to know of the benefits we have to put this into action.

Mr. Jenkins asked Mr. Pennell for a thumbnail definition of the competitive negotiations; what are the aspects of it?

Mr. Pennell said you put out the request for proposal in which you identify the types of things to be responded to. You may have more than one entity that you choose from the proposal results. Then you sit down at a table and discuss it with each entity that makes the first cut. You then determine if you are prepared to do this and how you intend to do this. You would then fine tune the contract you are going to come up with. You do not have to pick the lowest bidder. Essentially, you are trying to select the most responsive, responsible bidder.

Mr. Jenkins asked if this is normally done before a jurisdiction has made a decision that it wants to do whatever the subject of the RFP is.

Mr. Pennell said if the RFP is approved, he feels you are saying you are prepared to consider it.

Mr. Jenkins said that this Board, as a body, has not directed our staff to look at this issue to advise us as to what minimal specifics should be involved. There are a number of issues that may come up related to the use of the shelter by county staff, the potential for conflict if we were to have a separate managing entity of the shelter, versus county employees under the direction of the County Administration, and through him, this Board. There is the issue of how animals are kept and the length of time they will be kept, how they will be observed and under whose control they will be for that observation. Also, what financial requirements would we make of the potential contractor to determine that the contractor is financially able to undertake such an operation.

Mr. Conaway said that at the same time, if we remove this issue from the docket we will never know the answers to those questions. The RFP is a process where we can get all that information. If there is a contract, a lot of that will be spelled out.

Mr. Jenkins said we are starting out with a blank paper and no concept as to what we are looking for. That is his concern with this approach. If the motion were to instruct

the county administrator, with staff, to develop a plan by which the county might do this, and present that for approval by this board to then go out for RFP, then he could agree.

Mr. Frere asked if the county chooses to not act on any proposal received, then that would act to drop this from consideration. And, in doing so, then we will be able to hear what each group that responds has to offer.

Mr. Pennell said yes. Also, he has had some conversations with Mr. Shirilla this past month in which he has given him some ideas for a complete submission of how they would handle all the things that Mr. Jenkins has talked about, and more. It was also suggested that Mr. Shirilla meet with other Virginia jurisdictions that have this type of relationship and possibly pick up their plan and submit it to see if this Board would accept it.

Mr. Jenkins said he feels this board is backing into an issue that it was never prepared to discuss or deal with for reasons that have never been made quite clear. This is as close as we get to meeting our direct responsibility for the safety, welfare and health of our citizens. That is what we are dealing with, with potentially dangerous animals. He would have felt better if we had asked our staff to work on proposals to advise us as to what the best course of action would be.

Mr. Simmons said that quite frequently RFPs go out for projects where the locality really doesn't know what to ask for, and that is the reason for the request for proposals. You give a general idea to the contractors as to the type of proposal you are looking for, with no specific details. You then leave it entirely up to the contractors to come up with a scope of services that fits what they feel they can offer the county. At that point we review it and if it did not answer whatever questions we might have, it can either be negotiated or dropped entirely.

Mr. Beauchamp asked that Mr. Conaway add to his motion that the RFP be brought back to this Board at its March meeting for review.

Mr. Conaway agreed. His motion is to have the request for proposals prepared by the County Administrator and staff and then brought to this Board for review.

VOTE: 4 Aye (Conaway, Beauchamp, Frere, Simmons), 1 Nay (Jenkins).

### 3. Jail Expansion Study

Mr. Beauchamp said the Sheriff has requested that a feasibility study be done to determine the cost of enlarging the present Lancaster County Jail and potential paybacks realized from the housing of federal prisoners.

Mr. Pennell said that Sheriff Crockett's request was rather specific in that he was dealing with the building that we currently have. If the Board is interested in pursuing this and getting some information, he suggested that we also look at the possibility of joining the Northern Neck Regional Jail. If you are going to hire a contractor to do a feasibility study, they could give you some idea of the benefits of joining or not joining the regional jail.

Mr. Conaway asked if Lancaster County had been approached, as Northumberland County was, to possibly join the jail.

Mr. Pennell said Northumberland County was not asked, they initiated it on their own. They had a different situation in that their jail is in much worse shape than ours.

Mr. Jenkins said a prior board was moved to squash the idea of a juvenile detention center in Lancaster County, due to citizen opposition. He suggested that we get public input on the possibility of bringing in federal prisoners to Lancaster County.

Mr. Beauchamp asked what a feasibility study might cost.



Mr. Pennell said his guess would be in the \$20,000 range.

Mr. Jenkins asked what the budget is for corrections.

Mr. Pennell said \$784,000 is what was spent last year for correction and detention.

Mr. Simmons asked if he is correct in assuming there is a financial benefit to the other counties; that they are actually making money from their participation in the regional jail.

Mr. Pennell said that is a correct statement.

Mr. Conaway said Northumberland County had a lot of concerns about jobs.

Mr. Pennell said he thinks that commitment was made. Everybody who has a job in Northumberland County will continue to have a job at the same salary. The negative benefit is that instead of driving to the courthouse to go to work, they would have to drive to Warsaw. They would lose their feeling of community.

Mr. Frere asked if we know what it would cost to fix the roof.

Mr. Pennell said it would cost about the same amount as the feasibility study.

Motion was made by Mr. Simmons to issue a request for proposals for a feasibility study for the possibility of expanding the existing jail or joining the regional jail. VOTE: 5 - 0 Aye.

#### **BOARD REPORTS**

Finance Committee - Mr. Beauchamp said the Finance Committee met to discuss the issue of twice-a-year tax collection. The committee recommended that the issue not be pursued. This puts the issue to a close.

No action taken.

Tidewater Resource Conservation and Development Council - Mr. Pennell said the Tidewater RC&D would like to have another board member from Lancaster County. They prefer that a citizen member be appointed, preferably from the minority community.

Mr. Beauchamp asked that the board members consider this request and possibly bring recommendations to the next board meeting.

No action taken.

Volunteers to Serve on Committees - Mr. Conaway suggested that the county advertise for volunteers to serve on committees and boards.

The Board agreed by consensus that the county administrator advertise for volunteers to serve on committees and boards.

Social Services Board - Mr. Jenkins said the county lost one of our citizen members on the Social Services Board in December. He feels this board should prepare a resolution acknowledging Mr. Joseph Ford's service to the County.

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins that resolution be adopted acknowledging Mr. Ford's service to Lancaster County. VOTE" 5 - 0 Aye.

Rescue Squad Task Force - Mr. Pennell said the Rescue Squad Task Force put together a request for a public service announcement to the Rappahannock Record and WKWI for people interested in joining the rescue squad.

**APPOINTMENTS**

Historic Resources Commission - Motion was made by Mr. Beauchamp to reappoint Dixie McCaig to serve on the Historic Resources Commission as a representative from District 5 for a three year term to expire December 31, 2002. VOTE: 5 - 0 Aye.

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR REPORT**

Community Services Board - Mr. Pennell said Chuck Walsh, Interim Director of the Community Services Board, has asked that the Board approve Lancaster County as the fiscal agent for a grant through the Department of Criminal Justice Standards with respect to violence against women. Also, that the County Administrator be authorized to execute the necessary documents.

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins that Lancaster County be the fiscal agent for the Department of Criminal Justice Standards grant and that the County Administrator be authorized to execute the necessary documents. VOTE: 5 - 0 Aye.

**CLOSED MEETING**

Motion was made by Mr. Beauchamp to enter into a closed meeting to discuss matters exempt from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act. The subject matter to be discussed in the closed meeting is personnel matters, in accordance with provisions of Section 2.1-344A.1 of the Code of Virginia. VOTE: 5 - 0 Aye.

**RECONVENE**

Motion was made by Mr. Beauchamp to reconvene open session. VOTE: 5 - 0 Aye.

**CERTIFICATION**

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 personnel matters in accordance with the Virginia Freedom of Information Act.

WHEREAS, Section 2.1-344.1 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 Mr. Beauchamp to certify the closed meeting. A roll call vote was taken:

F. W. Jenkins, Jr.	Aye
Donald O. Conaway	Aye
Patrick G. Frere	Aye
Cundiff H. Simmons	Aye
B. Wally Beauchamp	Aye

This certification resolution is adopted.

Action taken following Closed Meeting.

Planning District Commission - Motion was made by Mr. Beauchamp to appoint David Jones to serve as the citizen member on the Planning District Commission to fill an unexpired term until December 31, 2000. VOTE: 5 - 0 Aye.

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION**

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins to appoint Mr. Beauchamp and Mr. Conaway to serve as a review committee regarding for evaluation of the County Administrator. VOTE: 5 - 0 Aye.

Mr. Beauchamp asked that any Board member with questions or concerns contact either appointee for discussion with the County Administrator.

**BUDGET WORK SESSION**

The Board agreed by consensus to schedule a budget work session for March 14, 2000, at 6:00 p.m..

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion was made by Mr. Jenkins to adjourn the meeting until March 14, 2000. VOTE: 5 - 0 Aye.