

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
REGULAR MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2004**

At the regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Floyd County, Virginia, held on Tuesday, March 9, 2004, at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Room of the County Administration Building, thereof;

PRESENT: David W. Ingram, Chairman; J. Fred Gerald, Vice Chairman; Diane B. Belcher, Jerry W. Boothe, Kerry W. Whitlock, Board Members; George W. Nester, County Administrator; Terri W. Morris, Assistant County Administrator.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

The Opening Prayer was led by Supervisor Gerald.

Chairman Ingram led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Nester presented a proposed resolution in recognition of the service of Mr. Robert Britt as Building Official. Mr. Britt will be retiring at the end of March 2004.

On a motion of Supervisor Gerald, seconded by Supervisor Belcher, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adopt the resolution in recognition of Mr. Robert Britt, Building Official, as presented (Document File Number            ).

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Mrs. Deronda Thomas, Treasurer, appeared before the Board. She presented the invested cash as of March 9, 2004.

Supervisor Gerald questioned the procedure for antique tags purchase.

Mrs. Thomas stated that the person pays a one-time fee, but most people are not buying them. The Board may want to obtain a ruling on the matter.

Mrs. Morris presented the balance sheet as of February 29, 2004 and the

revenue/expenditure report as of February 29, 2004, for the Board's information. She reported that, for the General Fund ending February 29, 2004, 82% of revenue has been collected and 70% of expenses have been used.

Sheriff Shannon Zeman appeared before the Board and reported on several items:

- have met with the insurance risk manager to discuss preventative measures - out of 19 claims we've had, eleven have been deer related;
- answered 700 calls in January, 500 in February;
- the academy that our officers attend is discussing the construction of a new building, property has been purchased in Dublin. There are nine regional academies which receive State funding. Twenty agencies are involved in our academy, we pay \$225/officer/year to attend any and all schools. The Board will vote in April as to construction of a new building. Our cost will increase to \$265/officer/year if the new construction is done.
- met with Senator George Allen's representative last month and contacted people he recommended for funding. Hope to receive some grant funding, with no local match. One grant application we submitted was for \$15,000 for Selective Enforcement, overtime for deputies; another was for alcohol detection and radar equipment. We have one radar unit and are really working on the speed complaints especially with the eleven fatalities we've had in the last twelve months. Have an officer who is certified as a radar instructor who can train the other officers.
- applied for Federal grant funding for the SRO - we lost the State funding for this position, but the School Board is researching how they can keep the position.

Commonwealth's Attorney Gordon Hannett next appeared before the Board. He commented that he is 100% behind the initiatives of the Sheriff's Office, especially the radar enforcement, to stem the tide of horrific accidents. Also, the cases handled by the School Resource Officer really assists my office. He does great work.

- One budget issue - the Sheriff's Office and my office both have VCIN (to check criminal histories) computers. They are independent computers. After July 1, the State is changing the system to an encrypted system. There is a special router that has to be attached for the encryption to work. We are researching the possibility of our two offices networking the systems, hopefully at no cost to the County.

At 9:00 a.m., the Chairman called for the Public Comment Period.

Mr. S. G. Bolt - I was very upset, very disturbed the other night at the meeting. Number one, was the raises that I see here, which is a potential raise that's coming up for all these people in the County. When we came to the latter part of it, it says and others. I'm wondering who these others are, and if I recall last year, what is the situation here with this? Where is this going to? Who are these people that are involved? The others, who are they? I see here where it says the School Board, you added funds to bring part-time teacher assistants to full-time status for handicapped kids. More compensation for staff from 4.79 to 6.5% for teachers and 5% for administrators and others. More insurance, cost of buying textbooks. And on down, we find, and others. Who are the others who are in line for these raises? Do you have an answer?

Chairman Ingram - we don't provide answers during the Public Comment Period, Mr. Bolt, but someone will get in touch with you. We just listen during the Public Comment Period.

Mr. Bolt - if I had known this, I would have asked for a time during your regular meeting.

Chairman Ingram - we will be glad to listen to your comments, and someone will get in touch with you and answer your questions.

Mr. Bolt - the raises that I see here, when we are living on a fixed income, we got a 1% or a little bit more, and with this type of percentage and the bills that you all are fixing to send out. I recall several years ago when Appalachian, we were paying every two months, and then they went to one month, and it wasn't six months until we were paying the same amount in one month that we had been paying in two months. I'm afraid this here is going to involve the same situation within a very short period of time. I checked in my church Sunday a week ago. I asked how many, and we had 50 plus people there, how many of you work out of the County and then how many of you work in the County, that is, the head of the house that works in the County. Fifty plus people, I had one person to raise their hand that they worked in the County and I recognized that I had two other men that were working that day that are working in the County. A total of three that I have working in the County out of my congregation. I said, now, how many are working out of the County and you are paying taxes and living in the County? And we had upwards of 25. If I'd have asked the same question this past Sunday, 60 plus people and it would have been the same thing as far as in-County head of the house working. This bothers me to think that we are coming onto this, because if it was not for what the church provides for me, I would have to sell my home to meet the obligations that we are under because my income from Social Security between the wife and me together is not enough to provide the payments and obligations that I have, and I would have to move out. And I've talked with others that are moving out and I have four children, and all four of them are having to work out of the County, one of them is living in the County, the other three are living out of the County, and working out of the County. Here is something that I think is very important. In the last assessment that we had which we had three years ago, I'd like for you all to make a better check on who's doing our assessing. The fellow assessing my house drove by and never stopped. My mother was standing on the porch next door, 500' away, and he drove by my house and never stopped. When I got my assessment, my house was assessed on new vinyl siding, car deck and a porch, and a full basement. Now, the vinyl siding, car deck and porch were assessed in the assessment before that. And I do not have a full basement. I have only less than half a basement under my house. Basically, this man sat on the side of the road over on 221, smoked and drank his coffee and part of the time slept, making our assessments. And of course he and I had a run-in over that. I think this is something worth looking in to. And I will go to court with raised hand under oath. That needs to be brought to light of how the assessment was made on my house. Would you answer one question? Do you think this is a fair situation? I'm sorry that you can't answer but I will be looking for one very soon, and unless I do get one pretty soon, I will be back at the next meeting. I would like to be in the main meeting next time. One other thing concerning the students of small communities. There has been a grant that has been placed out there for three years, I think

it is. Maybe you can answer this. I have a daughter that has been teaching those kids under this grant in Carroll County schools that are small tots that cannot make it in the classroom with x number of students. She has a room by herself where they bring these students to her and there's a grant that has been provided to pay for this. I understand that it is a three year grant that has been provided, this was the first year that it was available. Are you aware of that, do we use it in Floyd County?

Mr. Nester - I don't know, Mr. Bolt, the schools would handle that program.

Mr. Bolt - but please people, consider us in this tax situation.

Mr. Roger Abshire - I live in the Burks Fork District. I was at the tax hearing and had a lot more than three minutes worth on my mind at that time, as I still do. During the past 2-3 weeks, again after the tax hearing, I requested a copy of the budget proposal so that I could intelligently discuss what was proposed to be done with the tax increase or why in fact the tax increase was needed. I was told that the budget had not been finalized. I have questions in my mind as to how anybody could determine that a tax increase is needed if we don't know how much money we've got to spend over the next biennium. The thing is, as representatives of the people, I'm under the impression that you folks are obligated, as well as managing funds for the County expenditures, to take into consideration what the people who elected you to represent us, want to be done in this County. I don't think it should be 5-6 people in the County, without any other consideration, to make a determination on how this money will be spent. I know for a fact that there have been some expenditures that are about as unpopular as the plague in this County. Money that was spent that the majority of people in this County would have preferred not to have been done. There is apparently no consideration for the average income of taxpayers in this County and what you are about to do with this huge increase is going to make a devastating, long-range effect. This won't happen over just one year, but for the rest of their lives for young people as well as old people, who have less than average incomes in some cases. I'm sure that the people who are paid by the taxpayers in offices in the Courthouse here, are making, even though I have not seen the figures I've been told some figures which are astonishing to me, for a rural County with limited income like Floyd County is. You can select a few people to pay probably three times what the average income is in this County to do work that most any of us could do and would be willing to do for a lot less money. It frustrates me that I feel I 'm talking to somebody who is not considering the ramifications over the long-range, we are looking at a short-term solution to a problem that didn't come overnight and in my estimation, it won't be solved overnight. I think these burdens for excess taxes or any increase whatsoever should be spread over a period of time to get ourselves back on sound foundation rather than trying to do it at one step. We're going to multiply this tax increase in rates next year when the reassessment takes effect so I implore you to take a look at this thing and not go overboard on expenditures.

Mr. Jim Wilson - I live in Martinsville and I'm a property owner in Floyd County and have been for quite a few years. My hobby and interests are in forestry. I appeared before the Board about 10 years ago and I was real disappointed when I learned that land use was not

included in forestry. In talking to some of the people at Tech who helped do the ground rules for land use, especially the past five years in the legislature, they couldn't believe Floyd County did not include forestry in with their land use plan. I put no demand for your services here, for your infrastructure, or anything like that. But my property taxes here for forestry and timber is a long-term project, as you well know, not a short-term. So when you exclude the type of ownership of land that I have and a lot of other people that do, you encourage clearing of the land to go into pasture or farming, mostly cattle farming, in order to get land use. It really takes away from the aesthetics of Floyd County, in having a good balance for good forestry and cleared land for farming. So it would seem to me that you might want to consider either doing away with land use completely, making it more equitable for all your land owners, and let everything basically pay the same proportionate part, or either do what land use was originally intended to do, and that would be to include forestry in with land use because it helps me as a property owner to be able to continue to own my property for long-term. I pay more taxes in Floyd County than I do the other three Counties that I own property in where I'm involved in forestry. Franklin County has a wonderful land use program, and they do include forestry, and it encourages me to keep adding on property. I see more and more of the your land here in Floyd County being fragmented with subdivisions because it encourages the turn-over of the land because the taxes become prohibitive. My taxes, I consider, are prohibitive here, especially for the services that I don't need. I love Floyd County, have a lot of friends here, and so I'm in support of a lot of what you do here in the County, but I would like you to consider that. I would appreciate it and I think it would be more equitable and let everybody pay their fair share and that way, it would actually lower my taxes a little bit when you spread those taxes out more evenly to the people. Because when you consider the farming operations, you usually have family and home there, and you are supplying the infrastructure for that family, the schools, the fire department, all of that to support that family on that farm, which is actually paying less taxes than I am, and I'm not requiring any of your services. You have a hard job and it takes a lot of hours. I'm involved as a Trustee on the Western Virginia Land Trust. I'm involved a lot with conservation. I have had one of my parcels in Floyd County in conservation, I want to put them all in, and I will eventually in the next 10 years. So I want to get away from the fragmentation and subdividing of a lot of land that really shouldn't be subdivided. I think you can see in some areas of the County where its starting to have a negative effect on your aesthetics and a lot of what you see in Floyd County. I got a little nervous when you all bought this building because I know with the facilities and everything that you had before were inadequate. But still when you bought this building, which is a pretty elaborate situation with a lot of square footage and a lot of maintenance, I had a feeling that the taxes were going to go up. Because when you start supporting something like this, and you spread out and you've got to fill these offices, and what have you. And when you have an administrator with a salary that he's getting today, or what I understand that he is getting, and the benefits and everything, and I'm not taking off on that, but what I'm saying, we are still a rural County here and maybe some of the development and everything and the cost of what you are doing might not be in keeping with what you really have here in Floyd County. I appreciate the time and I hope you will consider what I've had to say. Taxes are high here when you compare the other Counties around you.

After no further comments from the audience, the Chairman declared the Public

Comment Period closed.

Mr. Garland Nester, Animal Control Officer, next appeared before the Board. He presented a livestock claim from Mr. Leroy Richardson, County Line Church Road. Mr. Richardson had five cows and one calf killed by dogs. One dog was shot, traps were set out that night, one dog caught, and then another dog shot the next day while chasing livestock. None of the dogs were tagged and no one will claim the dogs. Claim was submitted for \$2090, \$400 for each cow, which is the maximum allowed by the State per claim, and \$90 for the calf. This claim is included in the Board's list of disbursements.

The minutes of February 10, 11, 23, 26 and March 2, 2004 were presented to the Board for review and consideration.

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, seconded by Supervisor Whitlock, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to approve the minutes of February 11, 23, 26 and March 2, 2004 as presented.

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Boothe, and carried, it was resolved to approve the minutes of February 10, 2004 as presented.

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - abstain  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

The monthly disbursements were presented to the Board for review and consideration. A list of additional disbursements was also presented. Questions and discussion followed.

Mr. Robert Britt, Building Official, appeared before the Board. The Board presented Mr. Britt with a resolution and a gold pocket watch honoring his service to the County. Mr. Britt will retire from County employment March 31, 2004.

Mr. Junior Goad, Resident Highway Engineer, next appeared before the Board. He reported on several items:

- lots of roads are breaking up along the edges - crews will be working on them as soon as possible but it will take time to get them all fixed;
- Route 8 South - beginning complete restructuring of bridge, will be basically like a new bridge;

- Route 8 North - bridge will be re-done, going out on bid this Spring;
- Route 221 bridge at Beaver Dam - will be re-patched and new overlay;
- two other bridges on Route 221 will be going out to contract in the next two years;
- working on sidewalks in Town, hope to get them caught up soon;
- Intersection of Route 221/615 is being studied;

Supervisor Boothe - appreciate all the work you are doing.

Supervisor Belcher - guard rail on Route 8 South, this side of Fairview Church Road, have you found out anything?

Mr. Goad - Mr. Beasley is checking on it.

Supervisor Belcher - Ferney Creek Road - lots of potholes, erosion at culverts - a few days later it had been scraped and taken care of before I could call, appreciate that. When will the stop sign at Route 221/750 intersection be changed?

Mr. Goad - we will take care of it this Spring.

Supervisor Whitlock - how much ditching work will you be able to do?

Mr. Goad - I want crews to start early and get them done, then start the patching, then mowing.

Supervisor Whitlock - Route 670, Goff Road, pipe carrying creek under the road is stopped up. Route 610, is there any tree trimming being done?

Mr. Goad - I don't know.

Supervisor Gerald - Route 655, bridge was washed out and was fixed very quickly, appreciate that. Route 751, appreciate the work there, it really looks good. Intersection of Route 619/754, toward cemetery, on the left side of the road there is a cone there where road was washed out, it is now cutting into the road. Same situation up next to the old church on Route 754.

Supervisor Ingram - my district has the same problems as everyone else and I know you will get to them as soon as possible.

Supervisor Gerald - Route 751 - adopt a highway sign was gone, but found about half-way down the road. When your crews put it back up, it was put up where it was found, and it needs to be put back where it originally was.

Supervisor Belcher - when snow was pushed, a lot of our road name signs were bent or damaged. You may want to talk to Mr. Wirt to learn the exact places. It is our cost to take care

of it, but you may want to talk to your crews to be more careful.

Supervisor Whitlock - when you pipe water onto someone else's property, do you have to get permission from the landowner?

Mr. Goad - sometimes we have to get an easement, it depends on the situation.

Supervisor Whitlock - Route 888 in Supervisor Ingram's district, a pipe there is not carrying the water, it crosses the road and runs down the road and causes a speed bump on a State road.

Supervisor Ingram - have you heard anything about the speed study for Route 795?

Mr. Goad - has not been completed yet.

Further questions and discussion followed on the monthly disbursements.

On a motion of Supervisor Belcher, seconded by Supervisor Boothe, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to approve the monthly disbursements and additions, as presented.

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Agenda Item 8a - Subdivision plats as approved by Agent for February 2004 - Mr. Nester reported that 15 new lots were created.

Agenda Item 8b - Appointment to Workforce Investment Board - term ends March 31, 2004. Mr. Nester reported that according to earlier Board action, Mr. Jack Wall was appointed, if he was willing to serve. For the Board's information, Mr. Wall will serve as the Board's representative to the Workforce Investment Board.

Agenda Item 8c - Authorization for advertisement for vacancies on various Boards and Commissions.

On a motion of Supervisor Belcher, seconded by Supervisor Gerald, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to authorize the County Administrator to advertise for letters of interest for the following positions: New River Community College Board of Directors; Floyd - Floyd County Planning Commission - Courthouse District; VASAP Advisory Board; Montgomery-Floyd Regional Library Board - two appointments, all terms end June 30, 2004.

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye

Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Supervisor Gerald questioned the status of appointment of an additional elected official to the New River Valley Planning District Commission. Board deferred for discussion later in the day.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Belcher, and carried, it was resolved to appoint the Courthouse District Supervisor to the Floyd County Social Services Board, for a four year term.

Supervisor Boothe - abstain  
Supervisor Belcher - nay  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Agenda Item 8d - Report - Compliance Inspection for CDBG Grant - Floyd Regional Commerce Center. Mr. Nester reported that the inspection is scheduled for March 18 and should be the last inspection. \$1.8 million private investment and job creation were required. Legacy Linens was the job creation section and Branwick should be able to be used for the private investment section.

Agenda Item 8e - Report - CDBG Compliance Inspection for Individual Investment Accounts. Mr. Nester reported that this inspection is also scheduled for March 18. This program is administered by the Highland Cultural Coalition for low to moderate-income individuals. State matches \$1 for \$1 saved by the individual saving for college, start of a new business, or purchase of first home. Fourteen citizens from Floyd County participated in the four-year program. We are eligible to re-apply for another grant, but that decision has not been made.

Agenda Item 8f - Report - General Assembly decision on Music Trail designation. Mr. Nester reported that a decision has not been made at this time on the designation. The request had been made to them to include Ferrum in the trail. If that is approved, Ferrum would be the front door of the trail, and not Floyd County.

Agenda Item 8g - Setting of tax rates - defer for discussion later in the day.

Agenda Item 8h - Request to purchase tractor for mowing and maintenance of Commerce Center. Mr. Nester reported that funds are in the proposed budget for this purchase, and would like to start this program in the Spring. Board deferred the matter for discussion later in the day.

Agenda Item 8i - Tire Amnesty Program - Mr. Nester questioned if the Board was interested in having this program again in conjunction with the Green/Clean Day. He also reported that a new incinerator is going on-line South of Martinsville. The County had already

been contacted to obtain our tires. They will haul them away at no cost to the County. It should go on-line in July. Board's consensus was to delay the tire amnesty program until details on the incinerator program are received.

Dr. Terry Arbogast, School Superintendent and Mr. Douglas Phillips, School Board Chairman, next appeared before the Board. Dr. Arbogast reported on several items:

- presented copies of State report cards for all five County schools;
- presented copies of School Board meeting highlights from February 2004 meeting;
- received approval for pre- Labor Day school opening from the State;
- presented copy of proposed school calendar, ten snow days are included;
- The State had lowered requirements for Social Studies and History classes for 9-12th grades, and only require three now instead of four. School Board voted to continue requirement for four classes. Since this was above the State requirements, special approval had to be received. This approval was received from the State this week.
- presented copy of school enrollment for January 2004;
- presented preliminary end-of-course scores for high school for first block.

The Board recessed for lunch at Indian Valley Elementary School.

Mr. James Cornwell, County Attorney, next appeared before the Board.

Agenda Item 7h I) - Proposed Manufactured Home Park Ordinance - public hearing has been held and the Board is awaiting a decision from the Planning Commission. They will discuss again at their March meeting.

Supervisor Gerald questioned what a Recreation Subdivision was.

Mr. Cornwell - they usually turn into a regular subdivision. Usually for people with summer homes. Carroll County has it in their ordinance.

Supervisor Boothe - so our ordinance precludes that?

Mr. Cornwell - yes, you do not have it in your ordinance.

On a motion of Supervisor Gerald, seconded by Supervisor Belcher, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to go into closed session under Section 2.2-3711, Paragraph A.1, discussion of personnel; Paragraph A.3, discussion or consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose, or of the disposition of publicly held real property, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body; Paragraph A.7, consultation with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel; Paragraph A.30, discussion of the award of a public contract involving the expenditure of public funds.

Supervisor Boothe - aye

Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Boothe, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to come out of closed session.

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, seconded by Supervisor Belcher, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adopt the following certification resolution:

### **CERTIFICATION RESOLUTION - CLOSED MEETING**

WHEREAS, this Board convened in a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote on the motion to close the meeting to discuss personnel, acquisition/disposition of real property; legal matters; public contracts in accordance with Section 2.2-3711, Paragraph A.1, A.3, A.7 and A.30 of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act;

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board 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.

Before a vote is taken on this resolution, is there any member who believes that there was a departure from the requirements of number (1) or number (2)? If so, identify yourself and state the substance of the matter and why in your judgement it was a departure.

Hearing no statement, I call the question.

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

This Certification Resolution was adopted.

Agenda Item 8h - Tractor for mowing/maintenance - consensus of the Board was to delay purchase of this tractor because of the County's financial position and to continue with contract

labor.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Gerald, and carried, it was resolved to appoint Chairman David Ingram as the one-year elected official to the New River Valley Planning District Commission.

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - abstain

Mr. Nester presented a proposed resolution in recognition of Agriculture Week as requested by the Floyd County Farm Bureau.

On a motion of Supervisor Belcher, seconded by Supervisor Boothe, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adopt the resolution as presented, in recognition of Agriculture Week in Floyd County (Document File Number ).

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Mr. Nester also presented a proposed resolution, as requested by VACO, for the Board to officially support the Senate version of the State budget.

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, seconded by Supervisor Whitlock, and carried, it was resolved to adopt the resolution as presented, in support of the Senate version of the State budget (Document File Number ).

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - nay  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Agenda Item 8g - Setting of tax rates. The Board spent several hours discussing proposed rates, budget needs and available resources.

The Board recessed for dinner.

Discussion continued on the tax rates and proposed budget.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Boothe, and carried, it was resolved to go into closed session under Section 2.2-3711, Paragraph A.30, discussion of the

award of a public contract involving the expenditure of public funds.

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - nay  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, seconded by Supervisor Whitlock, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to come out of closed session.

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Gerald, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adopt the following certification resolution:

#### **CERTIFICATION RESOLUTION - CLOSED MEETING**

WHEREAS, this Board convened in a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote on the motion to close the meeting to discuss contractual matters in accordance with Section 2.2-3711, Paragraph A.30 of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act;

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board 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.

Before a vote is taken on this resolution, is there any member who believes that there was a departure from the requirements of number (1) or number (2)? If so, identify yourself and state the substance of the matter and why in your judgement it was a departure.

Hearing no statement, I call the question.

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

This Certification Resolution was adopted.

Further discussion followed on tax rates and the proposed budget.

On a motion of Supervisor Belcher, it was resolved to set the FY05 real estate rate at \$0.66/\$100 and personal property rate at \$2.80/\$100.

Motion died due to lack of second.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, it was resolved to set the FY05 real estate rate at \$0.63/\$100 and personal property rate at \$2.70/\$100.

Motion died due to lack of second.

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, it was resolved to set the FY05 real estate rate at \$0.61/\$100 and personal property rate at \$2.18/\$100.

Motion died due to lack of second.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, it was resolved to set the FY05 real estate rate at \$0.63/\$100 and personal property rate at \$2.50/\$100.

Motion died due to lack of second.

On a motion of Supervisor Gerald, seconded by Supervisor Boothe, it was resolved to set the FY05 real estate rate at \$0.61/\$100 and personal property rate at \$2.18/\$100.

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - nay  
Supervisor Whitlock - nay  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - nay

Motion failed.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, it was resolved to set the FY05 real estate rate at \$0.63/\$100 and personal property rate at \$2.48/\$100.

Motion died due to lack of second.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, it was resolved to set the FY05 real estate rate at \$0.62/\$100 and personal property rate at \$2.40/\$100.

Motion died due to lack of second.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, it was resolved to set the FY05 real estate rate at \$0.63/\$100 and personal property rate at \$2.35/\$100.

Motion died due to lack of second.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, it was resolved to set the FY05 real estate rate at \$0.63/\$100 and personal property rate at \$2.30/\$100.

Motion died due to lack of second.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, it was resolved to set the FY05 real estate rate at \$0.62/\$100 and personal property rate at \$2.30/\$100.

Motion died due to lack of second.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Belcher, and carried, it was resolved to set the FY05 real estate rate at \$0.64/\$100 and personal property rate at \$2.70/\$100.

Supervisor Boothe - nay  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - nay  
Supervisor Ingram - aye

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Gerald, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adjourn.

Supervisor Boothe - aye  
Supervisor Belcher - aye  
Supervisor Whitlock - aye  
Supervisor Gerald - aye  
Supervisor Ingram - aye