

AT A WORK SESSION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY  
VIRGINIA, HELD IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING,  
150 SOUTH MAIN STREET LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA,  
ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 2015, AT 4:30 P.M.

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN J.M.HIGGINS  
MEMBERS: R.R.CAMPBELL, A.W.LEWIS, JR. D.W.HINTY, JR.,  
R.S.FORD  
CLERK TO BOARD: SPENCER H. SUTER  
COUNTY ATTORNEY: VICKIE L. HUFFMAN  
STAFF: STEVEN BOLSTER, JEREMY GARRETT, BRANDY WHITTEN  
OTHER: LYNN KLAPPICH OF DRAPER ADEN ASSOCIATES

**Called to Order**

Chairman Higgins called the meeting to order at 4:31 P.M.

**Landfill Update**

County Administrator Spencer Suter explained that work continues on planning for a new lined landfill and that the current landfill is slated to close by June 2017. He advised that the plan remains the same as it has over the past 18 months for the County and City of Lexington to join as members of a new regional authority that will operate the new lined landfill. In moving towards this goal, he explained, the County and City have been paying additional tipping fees for the last and current years to build funds in anticipation of the expenditures required to start up the new lined landfill. He noted that the City of Lexington wavered some this past summer as they weighed their options, and as a result, there has been much activity at the staff and consulting level over the past 60 to 90 days. He also noted that City staff had requested that previously created

financial models be revisited, working with Draper Aden Associates (DAA) and Davenport and Company, to complete another round of detailed study. He advised that multiple scenarios were looked at because it is not possible to predict the future with 100% accuracy. Those scenarios included rising inflation, increased costs of borrowing money in out years, and both an increasing and decreasing waste stream. He noted that, in each case, maintaining some control via a regional landfill provided more benefit than transfer of waste.

Mr. Suter then reviewed the Comparison Assumptions provided by Draper Aden Associates, as seen below, noting that the "Growth Rate" is the growth rate of the tonnage coming into the landfill.

OPTION	5.0	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.4
Growth rate	1.0%	0.0%	-1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Inflation	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Interest rates	1.6% - 5.0%	1.6% - 5.0%	1.6 - 5.0%	1.6% - 5.0%	3.6% - 7.0%
Earnings rate	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	2.25%

Mr. Suter also noted that, to ensure equity in comparison, DAA looked at transfer from a very conservative perspective. He stated that transfer was examined at a 0.0% growth rate; 2% inflation; hauled at \$525 per load; disposal at \$20 per ton; and with a load being 21 tons. He further stated

that based on research of the issue, hauling 21 tons on a truck was very optimistic.

Mr. Suter then reviewed the second slide, as seen below, noting that the chart covers the range from 2017-2040, providing a short to mid-term look at estimates.

Mr. Suter briefly reviewed the third slide, as seen below, noting that the chart covers the range from 2017-2078, providing a longer-term overview.

In conclusion, Mr. Suter advised that Lexington City Council met on Thursday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, and according to the Lexington City Manager Lexington is in agreement that landfilling is the best option. He advised that the next step would be to refine the draft agreement the County and Lexington worked on over a year ago - to work out several points and to bring a final agreement back to the Board and Lexington City Council in December.

Chairman Higgins asked Mr. Suter for confirmation that the City of Lexington is ready for an agreement.

Mr. Suter confirmed.

Supervisor Lewis asked for clarification as to who would be included in the new agreement.

Mr. Suter explained that the current agreement includes the County, Lexington, and Buena Vista - and that the new agreement would include only the County and Lexington.

Mr. Suter then introduced Lynn Klappich of DAA while commending Ms. Klappich, Jeremy Garrett, and Steven Bolster for their diligence in working long hours and even weekends on this project.

Ms. Klappich reviewed the last slide, as seen below, entitled "Schedule".

ACTIVITY	FY 2016												FY 2017											
	2015						2016						2017											
	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J
<b>PERMITTING - LANDFILL EXPANSION</b>																								
Sample wells (4 background including lab costs)																								
<b>PART A - FINAL APPROVAL</b>																								
Part B - Revisions to SWMP - 5923-106D																								
<b>PART B - REVIEW BY DEQ</b>																								
Public comment period and final permit																								
<b>OTHER PERMITS</b>																								
Air permitting - submitted - November																								
Wetland permitting																								
<b>CELL 1 CONSTRUCTION</b>																								
<b>Phase 1 - Well abandonment</b>																								
<b>Phase 2 - Liner construction</b>																								
Construction document preparation																								
E&S plan and storm water management submittals																								
Bidding																								
Construction - grading, liner, leachate pond, road																								
Certificate to operate																								
<b>Phase 3 - Gas Probe Construction</b>																								

Ms. Klappich then reviewed the following milestones that occurred this month; these events set the pace of the schedule going forward:

- DAA responded to DEQ's Part B review comments this morning at 8:30 A.M.
- The hope at this point is that, by the end of January 2016, we will receive some indication from DEQ as to whether they are ready to approve the responses or whether there will be another round of comments.
- It is helpful to know that, after DEQ technical review comments, there were no fatal flaws identified and therefore no set-back of the project.
- Part A should be approved by the end of December, although it is shown on the schedule as January.
- The Air Permit was filed in November.
- In October, we received the final approval from Army Corps in regard to U.S. waters and small stream to the leachate pond.

Supervisor Ford stated that he has been reading getting updates from the National Association of Counties about Waters of the U.S. (WOTUS) standards and how some of these are still being revised in Congress. He asked Ms. Klappich if there were any chance that Congressional action any of that could change the conditions of our Army Corps permit.

Ms. Klappich assured Supervisor Ford that there would be no impact because this was just a small intermittent stream.

Ms. Klappich then stated that, as soon as DEQ confirms the permit is

complete, they will develop a draft permit that will have a 30 day public comment period. Should a lot of comments be received, DEQ would have the option to hold a public hearing; however, significant numbers of comments are not anticipated. She noted that, according to the schedule, construction bidding for the project would be published in April, 2016, with a June contract award.

Supervisor Campbell asked why the Part B Application took so long for approval.

Ms. Klappich explained that the County submitted the application around December, 2014. Following submittal, she noted, DEQ did not submit a formal response until the end of September, 2015. She also noted that the County just recently sent back to DEQ its responses.

Director of Solid Waste Jeremy Garrett briefly noted that there has been great communication between the County, Draper Aden, and DEQ, and that each major comment sent from DEQ has been addressed in great detail by the County.

Chairman Higgins asked Mr. Garrett if he anticipated any air space remaining in the current landfill cell come June, 2017.

Mr. Garrett replied that he anticipates there will be.

Supervisor Campbell asked if there will be overlapping permits.

Ms. Klappich responded that, yes, the permits will overlap, allowing the County to place an initial "soft" fill layer in the new cell while "hard" fill can be placed in the existing cell. This will provide better protection for the liner of the new cell.

Supervisor Ford asked if the County will be maximizing its savings in the financing of the project and also in selecting the type of filter stone that will be used.

Mr. Garrett replied that, yes, he feels that the nearby source of stone is "very promising". He then asked the Finance Director to speak in regard to the financing of the project.

Finance Director Steven Bolster stated that he is working with the Virginia Resource Authority (VRA), and that the process is going well. He explained that VRA is understating of the fact that the existing Solid Waste Authority (SWA) may not be the same entity which submits application.

Supervisor Ford asked where the negotiations stand on the final agreement with the City of Lexington, noting that recent discussions included several key points which were important to the City.

Mr. Suter confirmed that those points are currently being examined and addressed.

Chairman Higgins closed the Work Session at 5:12 P.M.

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY  
VIRGINIA, HELD IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING,  
150 SOUTH MAIN STREET LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA,  
ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 2015, AT 5:30 P.M.

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN J.M.HIGGINS  
MEMBERS: R.R.CAMPBELL, R.S.FORD, A.W.LEWIS, JR., D.W.HINTY, JR.  
CLERK TO BOARD: SPENCER H. SUTER  
COUNTY ATTORNEY: VICKIE L. HUFFMAN  
STAFF: STEVEN BOLSTER, SAM CRICKENBERGER, JEREMY GARRETT,  
HEIDI CONNER, JULIE WHITESELL, BRANDON MITCHELL,  
ROBERT FORESMAN, BRANDY WHITTEN

**Call to Order**

Chairman Higgins called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

Supervisor Campbell delivered the invocation and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Recognitions and Presentations**

Chairman Higgins called for recognitions and presentations.

County Administrator Spencer Suter recognized Supervisors Lewis and Hinty for working together to provide new art pieces for the hallways of the County Administration Building. He noted that about 14 or 15 historical photos were reproduced and will be positioned in various ground floor locations.

Supervisor Lewis stated that he had been thinking for a long time now that the hallways needed "a little something more". He noted that there were around 3 or 4 photos from each district.

The Board of Supervisors asked the County Administrator to work with the Buildings and Grounds Committee to help determine the placement of each photo throughout the building.

### **Citizens Comments**

Chairman Higgins called for citizens comments. There were none. Chairman Higgins noted that a citizen present would be commenting during the Chessie Trail update later on the Agenda.

### **Items to be added to the Agenda**

Chairman Higgins called for items to be added to the Agenda. There were none.

### **Approval of November 9, 2015 Minutes**

Supervisor Ford moved to approve the November 9, 2015 Minutes. Supervisor Campbell provided the second, and the Minutes were approved by the unanimous roll call vote by the Board.

AYES: Ford, Campbell, Lewis, Hinty, Higgins

NAYES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: None

**School Appropriation Resolution**

Finance Director Steven Bolster presented the School Appropriation Resolution, noting that the items listed were for New Grants.

Supervisor Hinty moved to approve the School Appropriation Resolution. Supervisor Ford provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board.

AYES: Hinty, Ford, Campbell, Lewis, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, HELD AT THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING, 150 SOUTH MAIN STREET, LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA, ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 2015 AT 5:30 P.M.

On motion by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, the Board, by record vote adopted the following appropriation resolutions:

**APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION**

**BE IT RESOLVED:** By the Board of Supervisors of Rockbridge County, Virginia, that the following appropriations are, and the same hereby are made, for the period ending **June 30, 2016** in **FUND 50, SCHOOL FUND** and expended as follows:

**New Grants**

**Youth Development 2016**

4-50-61100-1130-390-010-851	Grant Coordinator.....	\$5,500.00
4-50-61100-1321-390-010-851	Part-time Teachers.....	\$4,600.00
4-50-61100-2100-390-010-851	FICA.....	\$775.00
4-50-61100-3160-390-010-851	Purchased Services.....	\$6,350.00
4-50-61100-4000-390-010-851	Indirect Costs.....	\$3,500.00
4-50-61100-5540-390-010-851	Travel.....	\$9,250.00

4-50-61100-6013-390-010-851 Materials & Supplies.....	\$29,622.00
4-50-61100-3161-390-010-851 PMHS Part.....	<u>\$8,300.00</u>
<b>TOTAL FUND 50 APPROPRIATIONS</b>	<b>\$67,897.00</b>

**Convene Solid Waste Authority**

Chairman Higgins convened the Solid Waste Authority at 5:35 P.M.

**Heavy Equipment Update**

Mr. Garrett briefly reviewed the Agenda Item: "As you are aware, the Board has previously approved the regularly scheduled procurement of two major pieces of essential heavy equipment under the Capital Improvement Plan and Annual Operations Budget for Fund 19. Currently, the landfill is operating a 2004 CAT 730 Articulating Dump Truck and a 2005 John Deere Excavator. Both pieces of equipment are in need of major repair that would likely exceed their total value, and they no longer offer the reliability needed to ensure proper and compliant landfill operations. Solid Waste Authority staff has conducted an extensive review of multiple major brands (CAT, John Deere, Hitachi, Doosan, Bell, and Volvo) that have some regional presence and proven experience in the waste handling industry. Equipment reviews included on-site multi-day demonstrations, warranty review, proven service performance, parts availability, anticipated maintenance costs, fuel efficiency, lease terms and sales pricing. Based on this comprehensive review, we plan to move ahead with

procurement of (1) 2015 Volvo A30G Articulating Haul Truck and (1) 2015 Volvo EC350E Excavator.

Name	NJPA Price	Budget Amount	Lease Terms
Volvo A30G	\$403,699	\$544,870	60 Payments / 2.67%
Volvo EC350E	\$278,528	\$282,575	60 Payments / 2.67%

The above equipment is to be procured and leased under a cooperative procurement agreement via National Joint Powers Alliance. All supporting documentation is on file with the Rockbridge County Director of Finance (NJPA Membership, Volvo/NJPA Contract, Lease Agreements)." Mr. Garrett asked for the Board's approval to move forward.

Supervisor Campbell asked where these two pieces of equipment are manufactured.

Mr. Garrett replied that both are made in the U.S.

Supervisor Campbell asked if/how the old pieces of equipment will be disposed.

Mr. Garrett replied that the plan is to run the old equipment until each is non-repairable and then sell them.

Chairman Higgins asked what the anticipated life expectancy is of the new equipment.

Mr. Garrett replied that they are expected to last 10 years.

Supervisor Campbell noted that the Solid Waste Committee had talked about these purchases several times.

Chairman Higgins asked Mr. Bolster if these pieces of equipment are budgeted as a lease purchase.

Mr. Bolster replied that they are.

Supervisor Campbell moved to moved ahead with the purchases. Supervisor Ford provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board.

AYES:	Campbell, Ford, Lewis, Hinty, Higgins
NAYES:	None
ABSENT:	None

Chairman Higgins closed the Solid Waste Authority at 5:47 P.M. and reconvened the Board of Supervisors meeting.

**Consideration of Salary and Benefits Recommendations from Springsted Associates**

Mr. Suter explained that the Board contracted with Springsted and Associates last January to conduct a Classification and Compensation Plan and Performance Evaluation Study. He stated that this effort was assisted by a staff and Board Committee team including Sam Crickenberger, Wayne Nicely, Supervisor Hinty, and Supervisor Campbell. Ultimately, he explained, 6 major areas were identified:

- Competitiveness of our salary and benefit offerings in the regional market;
- Review of current compensation practices;
- Development of a compensation strategy which is fair both internally and externally;
- Review of our current performance evaluation policies and practices;
- Evaluation of the internal ranking of current positions based on job responsibilities;
- Development of overall recommendations for us to improve our system in order to retain existing employees and recruit quality new staff members when positions became vacant.

Mr. Suter further explained that work started with review and suggested revamp of our position descriptions and then led into a classification and compensation study. He noted that 19 organizations in our peer market were surveyed and only 11 responses were received. He further noted that several main observations were included in Springsted's presentation to the Board during the October 13<sup>th</sup> Work Session. These were:

- Changing from a step system to an open range system;
- Updating all position descriptions;
- Revising the existing performance evaluation system;
- Revising the current pay plan based on the findings of the market study.

Mr. Suter stated that Springsted offered three options in regard to the revision of the pay plan as seen below. He noted that only salary was considered in each of the three options; however, the information presented below shows estimated cost of adding associated benefits including FICA, VRS, Group Life, and Workers Comp which collectively add approximately 25% to the listed salary costs. The three options were:

- o Option 1 - Bring all existing positions up to at least the minimum pay grade of the position range:
  - Salary costs - \$73,573
  - Benefits costs - \$18,393
  - Total Cost - \$91,966
  
- o Option 2 - Bring all existing positions up to at least the minimum pay grade of the position range and provide all those who are not otherwise impacted a 2% increase:
  - Salary costs - \$100,809
  - Benefits costs - \$25,202
  - Total Cost - \$126,011
  
- o Option 3 - Bring all existing positions up to at least the minimum of the position range of the pay grade and provide all employees with a 0.25% increase for each year of prior service:
  - Salary costs - \$114,861
  - Benefits costs - \$28,715
  - Total Cost - \$143,576

Mr. Suter advised that the Board should be aware of three things when considering taking action. They were:

1. Any cost associated with such an action would result in an ongoing base budget increase;
2. If implementing in the current year, the cost would need to be handled via appropriation, in that it was not in the budget;

3. The proposed system provides for future Board determination as to whether or not merit increases will be offered in any given budget.

Mr. Suter asked that the Board consider adopting the new position descriptions and performance evaluation system which is linked to a merit system. He also asked that the Board consider which, if any, of the three options Springsted provided.

Supervisor Lewis asked if it would be a novel concept to go from a step scale to open range.

Mr. Suter replied that other localities have made this move in recent years.

Supervisor Lewis asked if there is a certain percentage of those surveyed who will move to open range.

Mr. Suter replied that Springsted presented it as a "trend" to move to open range. He noted that the step system used in the past began to get confusing. He further noted that open range systems have been implemented across the Commonwealth.

Supervisor Lewis asked the County Attorney for her opinion.

County Attorney Vickie Huffman stated that she does not recall the County ever using a step system unless an employee moved up in his/her position.

Supervisor Lewis asked for clarification on how the raises would be given and at whose discretion.

Mr. Suter replied that the entire scale can be adjusted at the Board's discretion.

Chairman Higgins asked that the Board look at consideration of the performance evaluations and job descriptions only.

Supervisor Campbell agreed with Chairman Higgins and recommended that the Finance Committee look at the three options once more and bring a recommendation back to the Board in December with implementation of one of the three options to follow in January or February.

Supervisor Hinty agreed with Supervisor Campbell's recommendation.

Supervisor Campbell moved: that the Finance Committee review the Pay Plan to further discuss the three (3) options and bring a recommendation back to the Board; for approval of the position descriptions and performance evaluation systems; and that the County Administrator and Personnel Committee be authorized to make adjustments to the recommended salary changes for several of the positions. A second was provided by Supervisor Hinty, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board.

AYES:	Campbell, Hinty, Ford, Lewis, Higgins
NAYES:	None
ABSENT:	None

#### **Update on Rockbridge Middle School Negotiations**

Community Development Director Sam Crickenberger briefly reviewed the Agenda Item: "We are still in negotiations with staff from Centra Health over some of the finer points of the performance and lease agreements. Hallmark Properties has completed their appraisal of the building and surrounding 2.7 acres on behalf of Centra. They have valued the property

and improvements at \$800,000, considerably less than the \$7 million assessed value. In discussion with the Commissioner, it appears that since the property was public and not subject to a tax, previous assessors did not put much effort in determining a true value. The entire property and improvements escalated from \$2.4 million in 2001, \$4.1 million in 2006 and \$7.8 million in 2011. The annual tax value at current rates for \$800,000 would be \$5,720 - which is what is being requested as a payment in lieu of taxes which may be further adjusted based on subsequent County assessments. In addition to the acreage directly surrounding the school, we have defined an area immediately around the sewage treatment facility to include in the deal. Revised documents were forwarded to Centra's attorney for his review on November 12<sup>th</sup> ."

#### **Update on the Chessie Trail**

Mr. Crickenberger reviewed the Agenda Item: " The City of Lexington, with the support of the County and VMI, applied for an enhancement grant through VDOT approximately 20 years ago. The County and VMI contributed \$15,700 each to the 20% match of a \$380,000 grant. The purpose of the grant was to connect the Woods Creek Trail and Jordan's Point to the Chessie Trail. At the time of the initial grant, the Trail was owned by the VMI Foundation, having being gifted to them by the Nature Conservancy - but it is now under ownership of VMI. The primary objective of the grant was to create a direct connection of the trail systems through Jordan's Point, across the Maury River to the Chessie Trail. Many

of you may remember the footbridge that the VMI cadets tried to maintain over the old railroad piers that crossed the river when the Park was the home of Lexington's waste water treatment plant. Many options for the new pedestrian bridge were considered, from a timber arch to a low water concrete structure, and the costs for all were excessive. The final cost of a flood-proof, low water, handicapped-accessible, multi-use bridge exceeded \$850,000. At about that time, following the summer floods of 1995, VDOT began the engineering to replace the East Lexington bridge, which had been compromised by the floods. Through a community review process, their design incorporated sidewalks and bicycle lanes. As a result, it began to make more sense to utilize this new bridge for trail access by improving the pedestrian and bicycle connections to it from both the City and County sides of the river. LPDA, a design and engineering firm based in Charlottesville, was hired to develop a plan. Their plan called for a small pedestrian bridge from Jordan's Point Park across Woods Creek, extending the sidewalk to the new East Lexington Bridge (now the Veterans' Bridge), utilizing the sidewalk and bike lane across the bridge and connecting down to the Trail from Furrs Mill Road with a ramp system. With the project back on track and confirmation that the grant funds are still available, new eyes are studying this and have determined that all of the proposed elements cannot be achieved within the current budget. Important to note is that the essential elements can be achieved: to make connections from the City to the Veterans' Bridge and from the County to the Chessie Trail. The new plan, hopefully to break ground by next spring, proposes to extend the path system from the new City parking lot at

Jordan's Point - which is directly across the road from the terminus of the Woods Creek Trail - to the sidewalk on the Bridge, and to build the paved ramp from Furrs Mill Road down to the Trail. A more affordable bridge over Woods Creek, outside of Federal guidelines, could be built at a later date, possibly as a timber frame project or some other such effort. This bridge is not critical to make the trail connections but does contribute to better overall park connectivity. While this project is advancing, VMI has received a \$320,000 grant through the DCR Rails and Trails Program to make repairs and improve accessibility throughout the length of the trail. This will include items such as culvert and bridge repairs, expanding parking lots, and gate improvements. In addition, the City of Buena Vista has applied for a Federal Enhancement Grant to improve trail connections under the Robey Bridge at Rt. 60 to the City side of that bridge. We hope a future project will supply the missing link, a pedestrian bridge over the South River which had been washed out by Hurricane Isabel in 2003."

Supervisor Lewis stated that the Tourist Board fully endorses this concept because their regional goal is to build up outdoor recreation, and he thanked Mr. Crickenberger for his diligence in working on this for 20 years.

Chairman Higgins stated that this was a project that had been approved before he became a Board Member. He asked Mr. Crickenberger if any other money will be needed in the future for this project.

Mr. Crickenberger advised that the money is already in place for what they have proposed to do, but that the most recent revisions require elimination of some of the elements of the project. The key element being dropped, he noted, was the pedestrian bridge across Woods Creek.

Supervisor Ford asked why the Woods Creek bridge was dropped from the project.

Mr. Crickenberger replied that it exceeds the limit of the grant.

Supervisor Ford agreed with Mr. Crickenberger's statement that the current vehicular bridge over Woods Creek is sufficient for now.

#### Citizen Comment

Dave Walsh of Kerrs Creek District, Chairperson for the Friends of The Chessie Trail Group, shared his full support of this project. He encouraged the Board to support the project in hopes that it will encourage more people to use the trail.

#### **Closed Meeting**

At 6:23 P.M., Supervisor Campbell moved to enter into a Closed Meeting as Permitted by Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(6), discussion or consideration of a matter involving the investment of public funds where competition or bargaining is involved, and where, if made public initially, the financial interest of the governmental unit would be

adversely affected, namely the Regional 911 Center. Supervisor Ford provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board.

AYES: Campbell, Ford, Lewis, Hinty, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

Supervisor Lewis moved to reconvene in open session following the Closed Meeting. Supervisor Hinty provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board.

AYES: Lewis, Hinty, Ford, Campbell, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

Supervisor Ford moved that the Board certify that, in the closed meeting just concluded, to the best of each member's knowledge, nothing was heard, discussed or considered except the matter or matters (1) specifically identified in the motion to convene in closed session and (2) lawfully permitted to be so discussed as exempt from open meeting requirements under the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act cited in that motion. Supervisor Lewis provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board.

AYES: Ford, Lewis, Campbell, Hinty, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

The meeting was continued to Monday, November 30th at 5:00 PM, for a joint meeting with the School Board in the Board Meeting Room located on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor at 150 South Main Street.