

A REGULAR WORK SESSION WAS HELD BY THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE 30th DAY OF APRIL IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND FOURTEEN IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 9:00 A.M.

IN RE: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Evelyn called the meeting to order.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Thomas W. Evelyn	Present
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Present
James H. Burrell	Present
Ron Stiers	Present
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Present

All members were present.

IN RE: KENTLAND TRAIL INTERSECTION

Chairman Evelyn asked Marshall Winn, Interim Residency Administrator of the Ashland Residency, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to provide an update on safety improvements recommended for the intersection of Kentland Trail and North Courthouse Road, which was the scene of a deadly traffic accident a few weeks earlier.

Mr. Winn advised that there had been a recent comprehensive meeting held on site, attended by Mr. Stiers, staff from the Sheriff's office, as well as engineers from different residencies around the State, in order to get a broader perspective. He indicated that they discussed the turn lanes, speed limit and various suggestions on how to improve safety, and had come up with a "good" plan that had been endorsed by Sheriff Howard and Sgt. Lee Bailey.

Mr. Winn distributed drawings showing various options, including the preferred recommendation that called for hashing out the middle lane along Kentland Trail and installing double stop signs at the intersection with North Courthouse Road. He explained that drivers could use the left lane to go straight or turn left, and the right lane would be for traffic turning right. He indicated that an in-depth speed study was underway on both Kentland Trail and Courthouse Road, and that they were also looking at ways to improve traffic flow from the eastbound exit ramp from I-64.

There was discussion involving the left turn lanes from both Kentland Trail and from the Dairy Queen. Mr. Winn admitted that there was a hill as well as a blind spot looking north and the unique characteristics of that area was one of the reasons for the more in-depth speed study. He added that they were also considering rumble strips for Kentland Trail.

There was a discussion regarding the number of accidents that had occurred at that intersection. Although Sheriff Howard agreed that he preferred the recommended option, he did not think it would do any good if the speed limit was not substantially reduced. He advised that a speed limit in the neighborhood of 35 mph would give drivers more reaction time.

Mr. Davis reminded that the developer was responsible for paying for the cost of any traffic light deemed necessary, and there were comments regarding how the lack of thoroughbred racing in the summer of 2014 would reduce traffic in the area.

Mr. Winn explained that this recommended option was probably a short term fix and they were looking at long term options as well. Mr. Stiers asked about the possibility of installing a roundabout and Mr. Tiller asked about a four-way stop.

There was also discussion regarding how the exit coming out of Dairy Queen did not match up with Kentland Trail, as well as about the confusion caused by some of the road signage.

Mr. Winn advised that the recommended changes could be done in the next 30 to 45 days and the speed study should be completed in 30 days as well. Board members seemed to be in consensus that a reduction in the speed limit should be a part of any fix.

IN RE: FY2015-2020 SECONDARY SIX YEAR PLAN

Mr. Winn reviewed the proposed Secondary Six Year Plan for 2015 – 2020 that provided for an allocation of \$73,015 for FY15, of which \$55,682 would be allocated to the Dispatch Road improvement project and \$17,333 toward a Rural Rustic Road improvement project on Stage Road.

He explained that there were few changes other than the addition of the Stage Road project. He indicated that Stage Road was only partially paved and instead of trying to put the remainder of the road on the Plan as one project, it was his recommendation that it be broken up into smaller increments so that portions of it could be paved sooner. The portion recommended in the FY15 Plan would cover that area between Route 634 (Polish Town Road) and Route 620 (Homestead Road), and would require a total of \$65,000 which would be available in July of 2017. Mr. Davis noted that Stage Road was so narrow that school buses could not safely pass each other and there were problems with the ditches, and he did not think that a pave-in-place project would help with safety issues. Mr. Winn advised that they would work with maintenance forces to ditch the area and do everything they could with maintenance funds prior to paving.

There were comments regarding shortfalls in transportation funding.

There was discussion regarding park-and-ride lots. Mr. Hathaway advised that the County had applied for a grant for a new lot and that the MPO was in the process of reviewing applications and making awards. Mr. Winn advised that in another locality, VDOT performed site work and the locality paid for paving and lighting.

Mr. Tiller asked about the possibility of marking parking spaces in the Bottoms Bridge park-and-ride lot. Mr. Winn advised that it was possible, but it was hard to keep vehicles out of the lots when they were trying to get the work done.

Sheriff Howard asked about VDOT's intention to divert traffic from Interstate 64 onto Route 60 and spoke about the impact that would have on his office. Mr. Winn admitted that he didn't have any information about it and agreed to get an update for the Board at the next meeting. He did remind the Board that concrete repair work was scheduled for Route 60 during the day and paving work on I-64 at night.

IN RE: "WATCH FOR CHILDREN" SIGN PROGRAM

Mr. Hathaway explained that a recent request for "Watch for Children" signs had brought to the County's attention that there had been a change in the process. In the past, those requests were passed on to VDOT who used SSYP funds to install the signs which they continued to maintain. The new process required that the County enter into an agreement with the State wherein the locality would pay for the sign and its installation and agree to take care of its maintenance. He advised that it would cost approximately \$850 per sign and he wanted feedback from the Board as to how it wanted to handle these requests.

Following discussion, staff was directed to come up with a procedure to bring back to the Board for consideration, whereby a requestor would be responsible for the costs.

IN RE: WATER ISSUES

Public Utilities Director Larry Dame, along with Arcadis engineers, Roger Hart and Kris Edelman, were present to discuss water issues facing New Kent.

Mr. Dame reviewed that New Kent obtained all of its drinking water from groundwater, most of which was pulled from the Potomac Aquifer. He indicated that New Kent had thirteen independent water systems stretching from Bottoms Bridge in the west to The Colonies in the east, along with Parham Landing and others in between. Eleven of those systems operated under groundwater withdrawal permits, with the permit for the Quinton Park system set to expire in March of 2015 due to low usage, and the ones for systems in Quinton Estates, Kenwood and Greenwood would expire with the interconnection with the Farms of New Kent system. Two systems were small enough not require a permit.

He reminded that the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) had been urging New Kent since 2008 to find alternate water sources. He spoke about how groundwater withdrawal permits were getting harder to obtain and were allocating less water. He indicated that with the expansion of the Eastern Virginia Groundwater Management Area to include all localities east of Interstate 95, DEQ was now requiring permits from all of those localities and reducing allocations. He remarked about how some felt that the new groundwater model being used by the State to determine water allocations did not accurately project groundwater impacts of withdrawals and was not compatible with the permit process. He explained that other states who used water from the Potomac Aquifer included North Carolina, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and that Virginia had 235 monitoring wells, with only five showing recovery and the rest showing a decline in water levels. He advised that the Potomac Aquifer was rated to supply up to 69 million gallons per day (MGD) for Virginia, and was now averaging between 60 and 64, with permitted usage at 120 MGD. He reported that all of the other states using this aquifer had caps on usage.

He reviewed recent reductions in allocations on the Route 33 and Brickshire permits.

He spoke about DEQ options that included placing caps on withdrawals; reducing the number of permits; giving a locality one allocation and letting it decide where to use the water, which would likely not be enough to meet future demands, but would "take the heat off" of the State and place it squarely on the County; requiring pumps to be moved to the top of the aquifer, which could reduce production rates, would cost \$10,000 per well, and would use more electricity; enacting stricter water conservation laws, which the County would probably have to enforce, and would likely include the reduction and/or elimination of

irrigation (which would impact County revenues); and imposing extraction fees. He confirmed that any of these actions would require General Assembly action.

He confirmed that private wells, which accounted for nearly 30% of usage, would not be affected, nor would systems that didn't require permits or geothermal heat pumps.

He suggested that New Kent do some long-range planning and evaluate future surface water options. Those options included an offer in the past by the City of Richmond to bring water to the New Kent line for \$38+ million, which did not include the cost of the water or the cost for infrastructure to get the water to the customers; obtaining water from nearby Henrico County at an unknown cost sometime after 2020 when its Cumberland reservoir was complete; and obtaining water from the City of Newport News, again at an unknown cost.

Mr. Hart suggested that New Kent look at long terms costs and reliability, and recommended moving forward with some type of study. He noted that the most pressure was in Bottoms Bridge, and based on some previous studies conducted for another locality, he felt one option was to pull water from the far end of the Pamunkey River where there was an area that was not salty and was 18 feet deep, thereby lending itself well to a deep, oversized intake that would allow the County to get enough water for 50 years. He indicated that they would have to look at environmental and social issues, and work with DEQ, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Virginia Marine Resources Commission.

Mr. Burrell asked about a treatment plant. Mr. Hart suggested that he would recommend a 2 MGD plant with a capacity to expand to 5 MGD when needed, which he estimated would cost approximately \$11 million in today's dollars. He explained that the location of the plant would make a difference and that DEQ would support it if it was practical.

Mr. Burrell asked if New Kent could keep the water allocations it already had. Mr. Dame explained that the State could reduce the "per house" allocation, which would likely affect firefighting capability. He pointed out that the Potomac Aquifer was shallower in New Kent than in other places, and a five foot drop made more of an impact.

There was discussion regarding the significant amount of groundwater used by the paper mills.

Mr. Davis asked about pulling water from the Chickahominy. Although it was recognized that Newport News would object to that, Mr. Hart advised that they would look at everything.

Mr. Dame talked about the importance of moving forward with the study, in light of the looming renewals for the Bottoms Bridge and Farms of New Kent permits in 2019.

There was discussion regarding water treatment as well as fluoride levels.

Mr. Dame asked for the Board's approval to use the funds he had budgeted for a borrow pit study for a long range supply study. None of the Board members expressed any objection.

IN RE: NEW FLOODPLAIN MAPS

Building Official Clarence Jackson updated the Board on the new floodplain map process. He explained that the new maps were more accurate and that the major change for New Kent involved wave action on property along the York River.

It was explained that the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) depicted coastal flood hazards in two different zones on its Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs): zone VE where the delineated flood hazard included wave heights equal to or greater than 3 feet; and zone AE where the delineated flood hazard included wave heights of less than 3 feet. It was noted that post-storm field visits had confirmed that wave heights as small 1.5 feet could cause significant damage to structures that been constructed without additional consideration to the coastal hazards. To help community officials and property owners recognize this increased potential for damage due to wave action in the AE zone, FEMA issued guidance and had identified and mapped the 1.5 foot wave height line referred to as the Limit of Moderate Wave Action (LiMWA), which would alert property owners on the inland side of the line that although their property was in an Zone AE area, their property might also be affected by waves 1.5 feet or higher. Communities adopting the Zone VE and referencing the LiMWA could receive credits that would lower insurance premiums for residents and businesses.

Mr. Jackson advised that the Board needed to decide what it wanted to do, indicating that the County's actions could affect insurance for everyone in the floodplain. He explained that the NFIP was losing money and its goal was to get everyone insured for the proper amount. He stated that premiums were expected to increase.

He indicated that notices would be mailed to all affected property owners, who would be invited to attend an open house at the end of August 2014, to come in and look at the maps and determine whether they needed to do anything different.

He confirmed that New Kent would have to update its ordinance. He advised that the State had looked at the County's current ordinance and recommended that, because so many things needed to be changed, New Kent consider its model ordinance. He indicated that he would work with the County Attorney on that.

He reported that there would be a final map determination in February 2015 and the County would have six months after that to adopt. He explained that FEMA would advertise a 90-day appeal process for property owners, and that the County should look to adopt its new ordinance and flood plain maps in by August of 2015.

IN RE: VIRGINIA STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Present were County Attorney Michelle Gowdy, Assistant County Administrator Jonathan Stanger, and County Administrator Rodney Hathaway to review aspects of the latest Virginia Stormwater Management Program.

Ms. Gowdy explained that General Assembly House Bill 1173 allowed localities to opt out of having their own stormwater management program but did require those localities to do several things: update their ordinances to bring them into compliance with the regulations; provide notice to applicants that there was a State permit required; provide monthly reporting to DEQ for any land disturbing activity over one acre; and follow all Chesapeake Bay Act regulations.

She reported that New Kent had received a letter from DEQ dated April 9, asking that the County advise by May 1, 2014, as to whether it would opt in or out. She clarified that the May 1 deadline for a decision was not a mandate; however, the County still needed to have its new regulations in place by July 1, 2014, whether the County would be managing its own program or not.

Mr. Stanger explained that the State would only manage those permits where there was more than one acre of land disturbance - the County would still be managing the permits for smaller projects. Mr. Hathaway added that he was not sure how much a burden this would take off of County staff since most of the applications New Kent received were for land disturbance of less than one acre.

Mr. Stanger indicated that since New Kent would also be responsible for the permits for the smaller projects, it would still have to have staff certified in stormwater review and inspection. However, he felt that the County would lose a lot of control and the ability to use discretion where appropriate and expedite reviews on the larger projects. He admitted that if the County ran its own program, there were some unknown future costs. There was discussion regarding BMPs and how those maintenance agreements would be affected under the new regulations.

Mr. Stiers asked if the County would be required to enforce every regulation if it had its own program. Mr. Stanger explained that there would be regular reviews of the program, similar to what was done for the Chesapeake Bay and Erosion and Sediment (E&S) programs, but the important thing was that the County would be able to use its own discretion on how to handle issues that arose, and would not have that ability if it opted out. He also pointed out that it made sense to review E&S and stormwater at the same time and not separately.

There was discussion regarding how long the State might take to do an inspection, and how sites could be shut down for an extended period of time waiting for a State inspector.

There was discussion regarding the fee schedule. Mr. Stanger explained that the State received a percentage of the fee, even if the County managed its own program.

Mr. Hathaway spoke about how businesses were looking to fast-track their projects and having the State manage New Kent's program might have a detrimental effect on the County's ability to attract new projects. He indicated that the State would have a 15-day review period to determine if a project was compliant, and then another 60 days to review the application. If changes were needed, then it would have another 60 days, and that would be a "huge" problem for economic development projects.

There was a discussion on fees. It was explained that if the County ran its own program, it would keep 72% of the fee and the State would receive 28%. The State would receive 100% of the fee if the County opted out.

Mr. Stanger advised that even if the County did not opt in, it would still have new reporting requirements, new tracking requirements, and new certification requirements. The County would still have to do stormwater inspections and reviews for the smaller projects.

Staff also pointed out that no building or land development permits could be issued until the State had completed all of its inspections.

Environmental Planning Manager Matt Venable pointed out that New Kent handled about 200 applications in a year, and only about 20 of those would be handled by the State. He warned that New Kent was not appropriately staffed for the July launch and that he felt that citizens would be the ones to suffer.

There was discussion regarding certifications. Mr. Stanger explained that no one in the State was certified yet because the programs had not yet been developed. However, once someone was enrolled in the program, that person was deemed "certified". He indicated that New Kent staff had attended the inspector and basic classes and were waiting for the others to be scheduled.

Mr. Hathaway remarked that the State was still trying to figure out how to implement the program. Board members asked why the County couldn't defer its decision until the State "had all of this worked out". Ms. Gowdy advised that the regulations set forth that localities "shall" comply and non-compliance could affect grants.

Mr. Stanger pointed out that localities could change their options on an annual basis.

Mr. Evelyn asked what would happen to an application that was filed on July 2. Ms. Gowdy advised that staff knew what the regulations were and could review the applications and apply those appropriately. Mr. Stanger added that New Kent could call on DEQ for assistance but he felt that staff should be able to handle it and determine whether or not an application met the regulations.

Mr. Evelyn commented that he felt that the State was passing on to the localities something that they could not get their hands around. Mr. Stanger admitted that everyone was struggling, including DEQ, and he felt that the program reviews would be more to tweak rather than any kind of enforcement.

It was confirmed that no locality in Virginia was exempt from the program.

Mr. Hathaway advised that what was currently a one-page application would change to a four-page application, and that the State would issue the permit number.

Mr. Evelyn stated that he wanted to know what he was voting on. Mr. Stanger explained that would be to change the ordinance to adopt the new technical criteria.

Board members looked at the latest version of the ordinances. Mr. Stiers commented that he felt that the regulations would give a lot of power to an unelected official, and asked if New Kent could write its own program. Ms. Gowdy advised that it could but it would have to meet State Code and be approved.

Mr. Hathaway summarized that there were three things for the Board to look at: whether to opt in or out; whether to agree to hold a public hearing on the ordinance change in June after a May review by the Planning Commission; and staffing issues. He pointed out that classes would become available in May and if New Kent was going to hire new staff, it needed to get them hired and trained.

Mr. Burrell suggested opting in and changing it later if it didn't work out.

Mr. Davis advised he would rather opt out and then opt in if "we see that it's hurting us".

Following discussion, Mr. Burrell moved to opt in the Program in order to keep control.

Mr. Stiers asked if the County could waive its portion of the fee. Ms. Gowdy advised that the State Code required that a locality use the fees to run its program but she would have to check on whether any part of the fee could be waived. Mr. Stanger advised that one of the requirements was that the fees be adequate to run the program. Ms. Gowdy indicated that for those localities who did not establish its own program, there would be a statewide fee schedule.

Mr. Davis clarified that if New Kent opted out, then as of July 1, 2014, DEQ would retain the entire fee and would do the permitting; if New Kent opted in, then it would keep 72% of the fee and would do its own permitting.

Mr. Burrell explained that his concern would be that the State would "drag its feet" on the permits.

The members were polled on Mr. Burrell's motion:

C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Nay
Thomas W. Evelyn	Nay

The motion carried.

Mr. Tiller moved to refer the proposed ordinance changes to the Planning Commission. The members were polled:

James H. Burrell	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Nay

The motion carried.

Mr. Hathaway advised that the new stormwater inspector position could wait until December to be filled but that the part-time administrative position should be filled by June, and he wanted to make sure that the Board members were comfortable with that timetable. There were no objections.

IN RE: CLUSTER SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE

Mr. Stanger, Planner Kyle Flanders, and Ms. Gowdy reviewed proposed changes to the Cluster Subdivision ordinance.

Ms. Gowdy explained that this had been "batted around for a while now" and staff had a proposal on how to fix the ordinance. She indicated that the proposed changes would prevent cluster subdivisions from being used in *R-1* zoning; would require that the proposed property be designated as *Rural Land* in the Comprehensive Plan and the minimum size would change from ten to fifty acres; that public utilities would have to be used if available; and that a deed restriction would be allowed in lieu of a conservation easement. She indicated that this was just a "starting point for discussion".

Mr. Evelyn asked about sending it to the Planning Commission to get feedback. Mr. Stanger commented that changes to the family subdivision could be reviewed with the Planning Commission at the same time.

Mr. Davis moved to send the Cluster Subdivision ordinance changes to the Planning Commission. The members were polled:

Ron Stiers	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: AMBULANCE REVENUE RECOVERY BILLING SERVICES

Before the Board for consideration was a request from Fire-Rescue to authorize execution of an agreement for outside ambulance billing services.

Fire Battalion Chief Lisa Baber explained that they were asking permission to enter into an agreement with EMS Management and Consultants to perform third-party billing for the County's Ambulance Revenue Recovery Program. She advised that the company would be paid a fee of 7.5% of its net collections on a monthly invoice.

Mr. Davis reminded that the County "went through this before" and because the billing company wasn't "following through", the County went to in-house billing. Ms. Gowdy explained that the proposed contract with the new company provided that it would return to the County those accounts that it could not collect so that the County could handle the collection process. Ms. Baber indicated that EMS Management would accommodate the County's compassionate billing program, had no affiliation with the former billing company, and had a reputation for good customer service. She added that the company also had the advantage of being able to access the hospital data bases in order to obtain needed demographics, which should help to increase the percentage of collections. She advised that it offered a 48-72 hour turnaround in filing claims and had an 85% success rate on denials and resubmittals. She indicated that this company worked with larger locations like Chesterfield and Hanover as well as smaller ones like King William.

Mr. Davis asked about the time period for the proposed contract. Chief Baber advised that the County was trying to get a one-year contract. Ms. Gowdy explained that she was still in negotiation on the language of the contract.

Mr. Stiers asked why Fire-Rescue wanted to contract for these services instead of doing them in-house. Chief Baber explained that the Fire Chief had looked at the department's organization and felt that it could do as well or better by using an outside agency, and use those funds for another position that better served the citizens.

Mr. Stiers asked if the Fire Chief had considered using a volunteer for these services. Ms. Gowdy explained that with the privacy issues required, any such individual would have to have specific training and it would be a pretty substantial burden.

Mr. Tiller moved to approve a one-year cooperative procurement contract, with options for renewal, with EMS Management and Consultants, Inc. and authorize the County

Administrator to execute the contract after it had been approved by the County Attorney and County Administrator. The members were polled:

W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: FY15 BUDGET

Mr. Tiller advised that he had asked the County Administrator to see if there was any way possible to add one more new firefighter position to the budget. Mr. Hathaway reviewed three options to cover the \$52,544 needed for salary and benefits. The first involved a partial reduction to the proposed Debt Service Transfer reserve for FY17; the next involved eliminating the upgrades for the Human Resources and General Services director positions, eliminating the part-time Environmental position, and eliminating the upgrades for the building inspectors; and the last involved additional reduction in School funding.

It was explained that the funding for the Ambulance Billing Specialist was being redirected to a new Captain's position. Mr. Hathaway confirmed that the County had applied for funding for six new firefighters under a 2014 Staffing for Adequate Fire & Emergency Response (SAFER) grant but had not received an award. Mr. Tiller commented on SAFER grants and how the County was required to pick up the funding when they ended.

Mr. Hathaway distributed a summary of major expenditures as well as an outline of the adjustments requested at the April 23 budget work session to deal with the \$402,200 loss of Off Track Betting revenue by eliminating the Community Development Director position and a reduction in school funding. Other adjustments included the elimination of the Marine Patrol Craft from the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) for the Sheriff's Office and an additional \$43,212 identified in school state/federal funding.

IN RE: CLOSED SESSION

Mr. Davis moved to go into closed session pursuant to §2.2-711A.7 of the Code of Virginia for consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members for consultants pertaining to actual or probable litigation, where such consultation or briefing in open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the public body; and consultation with legal counsel employed or retained by the Board regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision legal advice by such counsel involving the Historic School PPEA and pursuant to §2.2-3711A.29 of the Code of Virginia for discussion of the award of a public contract involving the expenditure of public funds and discussion of the terms or scope of such contract where discussion in an open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Board involving the Historic School PPEA. The members were polled:

C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye

The motion carried. Chairman Evelyn announced that there may be Board action taken after the Closed Session. The Board went into closed session.

Mr. Burrell moved to return to open session. The members were polled:

James H. Burrell	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Davis made the following certification:

Whereas, the New Kent County Board of Supervisors has convened in a closed session on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

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

Now there be it resolved that the Board hereby certifies that to the best of each member's knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open session requirements by Virginia law were discussed in closed session to which this certification resolution applies and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed session were heard, discussed or considered by the Board.

The Chairman inquired whether there was any member who believed that there was a departure from the motion. Hearing none, the members were polled on the certification:

Ron Stiers	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: HISTORIC SCHOOL RENOVATION PROJECT

Chairman Evelyn asked if there was any discussion regarding information provided to the Board during the closed session.

Mr. Stiers moved to accept the letter dated April 28, 2014, from Marengo Management requesting withdrawal of the PPEA proposal for the next phase of the Historic School. The members were polled:

W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye

Thomas W. Evelyn Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: MEETING SCHEDULE

The Chairman announced that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors would be held at 6:00 p.m. on May 12, 2014, in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Burrell moved to adjourn the meeting. The members were polled:

C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye

The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 12:44 p.m.