

VIRGINIA: AT THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE DINWIDDIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE MULTI-PURPOSE ROOM IN THE PAMPLIN ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, IN DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, ON THE 7TH DAY OF JULY, 2009 AT 4:00 P.M.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
PRESENT:

DONALD L. HARAWAY – CHAIR	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
HARRISON A. MOODY – VICE CHAIR	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
MICHAEL W. STONE	ELECTION DISTRICT #5
DORETHA E. MOODY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
JOHN V. TALMAGE	ELECTION DISTRICT #3

ADMINISTRATION

PRESENT: W. KEVIN MASSENGILL, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
ANNE HOWERTON, DIVISION CHIEF OF FINANCE & GENERAL SERVICES
JOHN C. BLAIR II, COUNTY ATTORNEY

=====

1. ROLL CALL

The Chairman of the Board of Supervisors called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m., followed by the roll call.

PRESENT: Mr. Stone
Mr. Talmage
Ms. Moody
Mr. Moody
Mr. Haraway

2. AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA

W. Kevin Massengill, County Administrator, stated that there was a need to amend the agenda to add the following to Item 6. Closed Session: §2.2-3711 (A) (1) Personnel: County Administrator Review and County Attorney Review.

Mr. Stone stated that he felt the Board should add a moment of silence for the passing of Robert Pamplin.

Mr. Haraway stated that would be done right after the amendments to the agenda were approved.

Upon motion of Mr. Talmage, seconded by Mr. Moody,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the agenda is amended as stated.

Ayes: Mr. Stone, Ms. Moody, Mr. Talmage, Mr. Moody, Mr. Haraway
Nays: None

Mr. Haraway stated that as Mr. Stone had indicated, Mr. Robert Pamplin had passed away, and that he had contributed greatly to the County of Dinwiddie.

All stood in a moment of silence regarding the passing of Mr. Robert Pamplin.

Mr. Massengill stated that he had been in contact with Mr. Will Greene, Executive Director of Pamplin Historic Park and Foundation, directly after the passing of Mr. Pamplin. Mr. Pamplin was born and grew up in Dinwiddie County. The Pamplin family had asked that no one try to make the trek to Washington State for the funeral; however, knowing how much Mr. Pamplin meant to this county, a memorial service is being planned. Mr. Massengill stated that he would pass along further information as it was forthcoming.

3. CELL PHONE POLICY

Mr. Massengill stated that there would be no action taken at this meeting regarding the cell phone policy. He stated that through the efficiency review process, there was review as to which County employees should have cell phones. A number of cell phones were taken

away from individuals except for public safety. 70 – 75% of the remaining cell phones are in public safety – Sheriff’s Office and Fire & EMS. Some of the field workers in the County also have cell phones.

Mr. Massengill asked whether the Cell Phone Policy needed to be amended to include a prohibition against any non-public safety employees who have been given County cell phones talking on the cell phones while driving.

Mr. Talmage replied that he would like to see the Cell Phone Policy amended to include that statement. He said that he and Delegate Dance had worked together last year at the General Assembly regarding this issue; and they are hoping that this year the General Assembly will enact a law against talking on cell phones while driving.

Mr. Massengill stated that the prohibition against talking on County owned cell phones while driving would be added to the policy. He requested that the Board members review the draft and forward any other comments or changes to him before the July 21st regular Board meeting when the policy will be on the agenda for recommended adoption.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULE - CELL PHONE POLICY

PLEASE READ THIS ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS POLICY CAREFULLY. IT ESTABLISHES THE RULES AND PROCEDURES WHICH GOVERN THE USE OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY CELL PHONES BY DINWIDDIE COUNTY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

Section 1

GENERAL

The objective of this Cell Phone Policy is to establish rules and procedures to govern the use of Dinwiddie County cell phones by the officers and employees of Dinwiddie County. All Dinwiddie County employees will receive a copy of this Policy when they receive County cell phones, and it is the responsibility of each Dinwiddie County employee to read and understand this Cell Phone Policy and to comply with its terms.

Section 2

OWNERSHIP AND USE

Dinwiddie County provides cell phones to certain Dinwiddie County employees to assist them in the performance of their jobs, primarily for public safety and field work. The County Administrator or designee shall determine the business necessity of each cell phone provided. The cell phone must significantly increase the efficiency or effectiveness of the department’s operations, and other means of communication should be evaluated as well (pagers, radios, etc.) The cell phones and accounts are the property of the County.

The cell phones shall be used for appropriate County business purposes only.

Confidential conversations should not be held over cell phones.

If cell phone is lost, the employee should immediately notify the Information Technology department so that the phone number can be deactivated to prevent fraudulent use of the phone. Any lost, stolen or damaged cell phone shall be replaced at the expense of the employee.

Section 3

MONITORING

As the owner of the cell phones, the County (through authorized employees and representatives) has the right to monitor, access, and review the phones and individual phone accounts. The County may conduct such monitoring of the phones for any business reason, including, without limitation, to monitor usage patterns, to detect employee wrongdoing or misconduct (including violations of this Cell Phone Policy), or otherwise to protect the rights or property of the County.

Section 4

MISUSE OF CELL PHONES

Cell phone bills will be monitored on a monthly basis for compliance with the “for business use only” policy. If any personal use is detected, the entire amount of that month’s cell phone bill will be added to the employee’s W-2 as taxable income. Additional disciplinary action may also be taken for continued personal use.

4. SPORTS COMPLEX

Mr. Massengill stated that Joy and Brett Cobb were in attendance at the meeting, and wished to present the County with a trophy. Ms. Joy Cobb presented the County with the trophy won by the Girl’s Dixie Youth Softball 11 and 12 year-old team that they had won as runner-ups at the District Championships. The 8-10 year-old team won the regional tournament, and are going to the State Championship games on July 17th.

Mr. Massengill discussed the Sports Complex project. He stated that at the May 19th meeting Mr. Stone made a motion that \$1.7 million be transferred from the General Fund to the C.I.P. Fund to be expended for the Sports Complex construction project. As the full board was not there, Mr. Stone caveated the motion with the statement that there was no authorization to expend any of the funds until the full board could meet to discuss and vote on the motion.

Mr. Stone stated that the motion he made at the May meeting was made because in 2005 when the County began working on the Comprehensive Plan, he was on the Parks and Recreation subcommittee for that Plan. At that time, there were a lot of public meetings with a lot of residents in attendance who were in support of the Sports Complex project. He said the County has been working on this project since 2005. He said funding was taken off the table early in 2009 because of the budget shortfall; however, right before the May meeting in conversation with Gene Jones, Director of Public Works, he had learned that due to budget cutbacks the project could not be brought as far as they would like. Mr. Jones had given him an estimate of \$400,000 – \$500,000 to keep things stabilized. Mr. Stone said that his thought was that if the County was going to have to expend that amount just to stabilize, why not take an amount from the General Fund and do further work. He said that since Mr. Haraway was not at that meeting, he had asked that action not be taken until a full board was present.

Mr. Talmage stated that he was in total support of the Sports Complex project. He said he had two granddaughters who are playing in Dixie Youth Softball, and practices have to take place at the middle school. Every time it rains, practices have to be cancelled because it does not drain well and floods. He said this Sports Complex is badly needed in the county. He stated that if the County has to invest \$500,000 just to keep the ground stable, we should go ahead and put more in it to get more done.

Mr. Talmage added that at last month’s board meeting Sheriff Rhodes had requested funding for more vehicles for the Sheriff’s Office. Mr. Talmage stated that at this time that request cannot be granted because of budget constraints. He said that if the revenue picks up, he thought the Board should revisit the Sheriff’s request. He said it was also his opinion that selective enforcement should be closely examined to make sure that it is not costing the County more than it is bringing in.

Mr. Haraway asked if the additional \$1.7 million allows the County to match the grants and contributions that require match.

Mr. Massengill stated that it will. The total grant amount received for the Sports Complex project from a foundation was \$150,000. The grant was for \$50,000 a year over the next three years – \$50,000 was given immediately upon the first vote to go forward with the Sports Complex; there was already \$100,000 in the account, and they will give the County another \$50,000 next year. The foundation also pledged an additional \$150,000 match if the community itself raises \$150,000 (Mr. Massengill, Mr. Stone and Mr. Jones are on a fundraising committee for the Sports Complex project).

Mr. Haraway stated that the County is not only looking at the \$500,000 that we would have to spend if transfer is not approved, but also at \$300,000 worth of matching funds that could potentially go away.

Mr. Haraway stated that he understood that a lot of citizens were concerned about spending this funding and he understood where they were coming from – this is an increase of \$3.2 million since the original budget was discussed. However, he said Dinwiddie’s Park and Recreation expense for 2008 was a little over \$500,000 which means that the County

spent \$19 per resident which is 35% of the state average of \$55 per resident. Dinwiddie spends 65% less per person than the average county in Virginia for parks and recreation. For education the County spends \$1,600 per resident – 88% of the state average. For law enforcement \$127 per resident – 79% of the state average. He stated that Dinwiddie County has really fallen behind when it comes to Parks and Recreation. He stated that he was in agreement with the other board members regarding the Sports Complex project.

Mr. Moody stated that he was in favor of completing the Sports Complex; however, he had always had concern for the budget. He said he didn't want anything to slow down regarding the project and if the County had to spend dollars in order to keep Southside College able to continue the work they were doing, he wanted to do that. He stated that he wanted to do it as conservatively as possible. He said he had talked with Mr. Jones also regarding stabilization of the grounds, and some of the funds mentioned also included utilities, etc.

Mr. Jones stated that was something that had to be done in order for the College to complete their work (approximately \$200,000). It was money that already had to be spent, not extra.

Mr. Massengill stated that in talking with staff the day of this meeting that with the \$1.7 million, the \$300,000 from the IDA, the additional funds from the prior C.I.P. accounts and donations (over \$4,000 in private donations that have been received from citizens) the following could be completed: the four ballfields; the concession stand; the multi-purpose field; the football field; the access road around the facility; two parking lots; the fence; and potentially pavement and lights. The only thing that would not be included that was in the original plan, is a field house/office space by the football field.

Mr. Jones addressed what would happen from this point forward if this is approved. He stated that his plan was to break ground in the next two to three weeks to put footings in to start the concession stand. That would probably take four to five months with all the other things he has going as well. While that is being built, work will be done on the fields. The Community College is willing to come back in the spring to put down topsoil. The underground utilities pre-bid was done the morning of this meeting, and is due back July 24th. Mr. Jones stated that the ballfields should be sprigged the first of June of 2010, and the possibly opened for play in July of 2010.

Upon motion of Mr. Stone, seconded by Mr. Talmage,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia to authorize W. Kevin Massengill, County Administrator, to expend the funds that have been appropriated in the FY 09/10 Capital Improvements Project Budget for the Sports Complex project.

Ayes: Ms. Moody, Mr. Talmage, Mr. Stone, Mr. Moody, Mr. Haraway

Nays: None

5. A. ACTION ITEM: CHANGE ORDER TO ADD WATERLINE – COMMERCE PARK ACCESS ROAD PROJECT

The Board received the memo below from Stephanie Allman, Director of Economic Development.

BACKGROUND

The Commerce Park Access Road Project is the first infrastructure project within the approximately 245 acre site that the County purchased for Economic Development purposes. This access road will be the main entrance point into the park from US. Route 460 and is directly opposite Beck-Chappell Drive. The project consists of approximately 1,200 linear feet of four-lane roadway with curb and gutter, causeway, raised grass median, multi-use path, turn lanes, enclosed storm sewer system, new sanitary sewer and waterline work. When complete, the road will open up parcels at the front of the park for retail development, in the center for office space development, and at the back of the park for light industrial development.

The County applied to the Virginia Tobacco Commission in 2003 and 2004 and was awarded funds for infrastructure development within the park. The remaining balance of Tobacco Commission funds that can be used for this road project is \$771,095.40. Tobacco Commission funds are to be spent within three years of the award of funds to a locality. In October 2008, Dinwiddie County requested and was granted an extension so that the remaining funds can be used for this project. The County also applied for VDOT Economic Development Access Road Funds for this project and was awarded the full amount available: \$450,000 from VDOT with a \$150,000 match from the locality for a

total of \$600,000. There is also \$100,000 set aside in the Dinwiddie County Capital Improvement Plan for this road project. Therefore, the County has \$1,471,095.40 set aside for the project. FG Pruitt was the lowest responsive and responsible bidder with a lump sum bid of \$1,383,000.00.

During the process of completing Requests for Information (RFI) from companies interested in being tenants in the park, we have learned that the water line at 460 will have to be looped through the park to the water line located at the back of the park. Any light industrial or industrial user will need the water looped through the park so there will be enough pressure to satisfy the fire suppression requirements.

Since the road is currently being constructed, it would be less expensive now to loop the water line through the park in conjunction with the road project. It would cost more time and money if the water is looped through the park as a separate project due to the wetlands crossing requirements. It takes three to six months to get a wetlands permit and it cost the County \$30,000 to mitigate the wetlands impact for the road work. If we put the water line through the causeway area during the road project, we will be acting within the current DEQ designated wetlands impact area that we have already paid to mitigate. If we add the waterline loop outside of the road project, we could be required to get a secondary impact permit and the County would have to wait for the permit and possibly pay another mitigation cost.

If the waterline work is added to the road project as a change order, it will only add a few weeks to the current road project instead of becoming a 6 to 8 month project of its own including time for procurement, permitting, engineering design, and construction.

The lump sum cost estimate of the waterline project before official VDOT approval is \$212,869. The cost includes \$19,500 for engineering and design and \$193,369 for construction. The Dinwiddie County Water Authority has already reviewed the plans and added items to the design to make it easy to provide water to future tenants within the park easily and without having to cut into the road. Those additions are included in the construction cost and make up about \$30,000 of the total construction amount. The updated road design to include the waterline work as well as the design for the waterline itself is currently being reviewed by VDOT. While we are not yet sure if VDOT will request any design changes that will affect the construction cost of the project, we are sure that waterline project will not exceed \$225,000 for both engineering and construction.

LAST BOARD ACTION

February 13, 2009 award of the contract for the road construction work to F.G. Pruitt, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder with a lump sum of \$1.383 million.

REQUESTED ACTION

Staff is asking for the approval of the following resolution.

Ms. Allman stated that since the memo that the Board received had been written, the last paragraph has changed. At the time of the memo VDOT had not made their comments on the final plans. They have now made their comments and approved the final plans. The final cost for construction is \$176,632. The total project cost is \$196,132 - \$19,500 for engineering for redesigning the road and designing and waterline; and \$176,632 for construction of the waterline in conjunction with the road project. (It could be up to 50% higher to put the waterline in separately from the road project.)

Mr. Massengill stated that after Ms. Allman had written the memo, the County received the bid opening on the Ford Volunteer Fire Department. With that project there were two separate years of C.I.P. funding that equated to \$2.3 million that was set aside to do the Ford Volunteer Fire Department project. He said there was a good turnout to bid on that project and much to the staff's shock, the lowest apparent bidder is \$1.086 million which is significantly less than anticipated. Due diligence is now being done; however, the highest bidder was \$1.29 million. Mr. Massengill suggested that instead of appropriating the funds out of the General Fund Balance, that being as there would be a left-over amount from the Ford Volunteer Fire Department project, that those funds be transferred to the road project. He stated that even using a very conservative contingency to the Ford project, it will still end up being several hundreds of thousands of dollars to the good. He added that he didn't think it would be prudent to go further into the Undesignated Fund Balance if there is a project that will be under budget.

Upon motion of Mr. Moody, seconded by Mr. Stone,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, does hereby authorize W. Kevin Massengill, County Administrator, to execute the necessary documents to an amendment to the contract with VHB for engineering and design work for the waterline project of \$19,500 as well as approve of a construction change order request by F.G. Pruitt for construction of the waterline not to exceed \$176,632.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia does hereby transfer \$196,132 from the Ford Fire Station designation in the FY 09/10 Capital Improvement Project Budget to the Commerce Park Road Construction Budget.

Ayes: Mr. Talmage, Ms. Moody, Mr. Stone, Mr. Moody, Mr. Haraway
Nays: None

Mr. Haraway asked how many weeks this would add to the project.

Ms. Allman answered three weeks.

5.B. ACTION ITEM: CHANGE ORDER – TURBIDITY CURTAIN – COMMERCE PARK ACCESS ROAD PROJECT

The Board received the memo below from Stephanie Allman, Director of Economic Development.

BACKGROUND

The Commerce Park Access Road Project is the first infrastructure project within the approximately 245 acre site that the County purchased for Economic Development purposes. This access road will be the main entrance point into the park from US. Route 460 and is directly opposite Beck-Chappell Drive. The project consists of approximately 1,200 linear feet of four-lane roadway with curb and gutter, causeway, raised grass median, multi-use path, turn lanes, enclosed storm sewer system, new sanitary sewer and waterline work. When complete, the road will open up parcels at the front of the park for retail development, in the center for office space development, and at the back of the park for light industrial development.

The Commerce Park entrance road includes a box culvert causeway for the road to cross the wetlands to extend to the industrial area at the back of the park. As a condition of using the \$450,000 VDOT Economic Development Access Funds, the road must reach the industrial area at the back of the park and the County must locate a qualified tenant on the road within 5 years or must return the funds to VDOT. Since the roadway work included wetlands crossing, the County was required to apply for a permit from DEQ to perform the work in the wetlands. The permit DEQ issued required that the causeway construction work be done in completely dry conditions so there would be no long term impact to the wetlands system. The County had proposed to DEQ that a Port-a-Dam would be installed in order to create the dry working conditions and DEQ approved the plan.

However, unforeseen conditions at the Commerce Park made the Port-a-Dam product unusable. When the Port-a-Dam company representatives came out to the park at the request of the construction firm to plan for the installation of the Port-a-Dam, they found that it would be impossible for the Port-a-Dam to seal the water out. When they climbed into the pond water for measurements, they found large stumps throughout the floor of the pond on the right side of the causeway area. They also found that the left side of the causeway area did not have enough water to properly seal the system on that side. The company provided an estimate to make the Port-a-Dam system work that was approximately \$75,000 more than the bid estimate of \$115,723. F.G. Pruitt proposed using a turbidity curtain solution that they have used on other jobs. Since the turbidity curtain was not the solution provided to and approved by DEQ, we invited DEQ to the construction site to discuss the issue and determine if DEQ would amend the permit to allow use of the turbidity curtain. David Grimes with DEQ came to the site and agreed that we could use the turbidity curtain without amending the DEQ permit and paying more to mitigate the work in the wetlands as long as we regularly test the water and provide the results to DEQ. The turbidity curtain solution cost \$33,879.60 over the original bid estimate of the Port-a-Dam. The DEQ required testing that also cost the County \$6,000 for services performed by an environmental engineer. The total extra cost for the turbidity curtain solution is \$39,879.60 instead of the approximate \$75,000 extra cost to make the Port-a-Dam product work. Several pages of detailed cost analysis from F.G. Pruitt are attached.

LAST BOARD ACTION

February 13, 2009 award of the contract for the road construction work to F.G. Pruitt, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder with a lump sum of \$1.383 million.

REQUESTED ACTION

Staff is asking for the approval of the following resolution.

Mr. Massengill stated that as in the previous matter, staff would recommend that in this matter the funds be transferred from the Ford Volunteer Fire Department project.

Upon motion of Mr. Moody, seconded by Mr. Stone,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, does hereby authorize W. Kevin Massengill, County Administrator, to execute the necessary documents to amend the County's current contract with Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. for an environmental engineer to perform required DEQ testing for \$6,000.00, and approve the construction change order request of \$33,879.60 by F.G. Pruitt for the turbidity curtain.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia does hereby transfer \$39,879.60 from the Ford Volunteer Fire Department designation in the FY 2009/10 Capital Improvements Project Budget to the Commerce Park Road Construction Budget.

Ayes: Ms. Moody, Mr. Talmage, Mr. Stone, Mr. Moody, Mr. Haraway

Nays: None

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Massengill, County Administrator, stated that although the following he was going to discuss was not on the agenda, it was related to the Commerce Park Road project. He discussed the following regarding the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) as relates to traffic control: the County had an approved plan through VDOT (the local Dinwiddie/Petersburg residency) and a part of that plan was the MOT (Maintenance of Traffic Plan); the contractors have submitted the process to begin the right turn lane into the Park and will be working in VDOT's right-of-way (and have some impact on that right most western bound lane); the County has now learned that due to extra requirements of VDOT it appears that worst case scenario could be a \$50,000 - \$60,000 change order; this dovetails in the conversation staff had earlier last week regarding the Virginia MotorSports Park – they were notified on July 2nd by Thomas Hawthorne, District Administrator of VDOT that VDOT would no longer be providing traffic control for Virginia MotorSports Park for the American Drag Racing League event that will be held on July 24th; neither will they provide traffic control for the major NHRA event held in October; for the Virginia MotorSports Park these two races represent the biggest spectator races that they draw; typically VDOT would set up two inward lanes to do traffic movement into the race – at the conclusion of the race they would switch and have two lanes going out; VDOT strongly recommended that Virginia MotorSports Park pay for their own private traffic control; if the racetrack decides not to do that, there are two agencies in the Commonwealth of Virginia vested with highway safety requirements (one is the Virginia State Police and the other is VDOT); Mr. Massengill contacted Sgt. Newby with the Virginia State Police – the proposal for them to pick up the additional requirements needed for highway safety is estimated at \$86,000; what VDOT would be saving in a total of two days is \$6,566; Mr. Massengill contacted Delegate Dance who worked with the County to contact the Governor's Office; Mr. Massengill received a call from the Secretary of Transportation as it relates to this particular issue and is hopeful that some of this can be worked out; concern regarding the Commerce Park is that the County had an approved Maintenance Of Traffic project; of the \$50,000 - \$60,000 that VDOT is adding, a substantial cost associated is having a State Police car parked in the daylight with their lights on in order to bring awareness to the intersection (a cost of nearly \$21,000); another potential issue is a pavement issue that could result in a high-end change order (currently the County's third party engineer and the engineering firm are working with VDOT to try to get a solution there).

Ms. Allman gave a brief overview of the pending pavement issue. There may be a potential of having to put more pavement on the road. The County is waiting for the person from VDOT (who is on vacation and will be back next week) who will make the decision.

Mr. Massengill stated that Secretary Homer had asked for the name of the original authorization of the MOT plan and who was now requiring the additional work. Mr. Massengill stated that regarding the Virginia MotorSports Park, that according to State Department of Tourism research, the Park brings in state revenue of \$6 – \$8 million regionally with the one race. If too many people have problems getting to the race (the nightmare of having 25,000 – 35,000 people on one lane roads coming and leaving) it would

definitely impact the future of the racetrack being able to sell tickets to the biggest spectator event in the tri-city, tri-county area.

6. CLOSED SESSION

At 5:05 p.m. upon motion of Mr. Stone, seconded by Ms. Moody,

The Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia convened in a closed meeting under:

- a. *§2.2-3711 (A) (7) Consultation With Legal Counsel*
 - Possible Litigation
- b. *§2.2-3711 (A) (5) Business and Industry Development*
 - Prospective Business and Industry
- c. *§2.2-3711 (A) (3) Real Property*
 - Disposition of Government Owned Property
- d. *§2.2-3711 (A) (1) Personnel*
 - County Administrator Review
 - County Attorney Review

Ayes: Mr. Talmage, Ms. Moody, Mr. Stone, Mr. Moody, Mr. Haraway

Nays: None

At 6:30 p.m. upon motion of Mr. Talmage, seconded by Mr. Stone, the Board reconvened into open session.

CERTIFICATION

WHEREAS, this Board convened in a closed meeting under:

- a. *§2.2-3711 (A) (7) Consultation With Legal Counsel*
 - Possible Litigation
- b. *§2.2-3711 (A) (5) Business and Industry Development*
 - Prospective Business and Industry
- c. *§2.2-3711 (A) (3) Real Property*
 - Disposition of Government Owned Property
- d. *§2.2-3711 (A) (1) Personnel*
 - County Administrator Review
 - County Attorney Review

AND WHEREAS, no member has made a statement that there was a departure from the lawful purpose of such closed meeting or the matters identified in the motion were discussed,

NOW BE IT CERTIFIED, that only those matters as were identified in the motion were heard, discussed or considered in the meeting.

Upon motion of Mr. Stone, seconded by Mr. Moody, this Certification Resolution was adopted.

Ayes: Ms. Moody, Mr. Talmage, Mr. Stone, Mr. Moody, Mr. Haraway

Nays: None

7. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Stone to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Moody,

The meeting was adjourned at 6:36 p.m.

Donald L. Haraway, Chairman

ATTEST: _____

W. Kevin Massengill
County Administrator
Clerk to the Board

/wjn