

April 6, 2010

At the regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Prince Edward County, held at the Court House, thereof, on Tuesday the 6th day of April, 2010; at 7:00 p.m., there were present:

William G. Fore, Jr.

Don C. Gantt, Jr.

Robert M. Jones

Charles W. McKay

Howard F. Simpson

Jim R. Wilck

Mattie P. Wiley

Absent: Howard M. Campbell

Also present: Wade Bartlett, County Administrator; Sarah Puckett, Assistant County Administrator; Sharon Lee Carney, Director of Economic Development; Kevin Wright, Interim Residency Administrator, VDOT; Mark McKissick, Assistant VDOT Residency Administrator; and Keith Halbohn, Transportation Contract Administrator, VDOT.

Chairman Fore called the special called meeting to order and stated that its purpose is to hold a public hearing on the VDOT Six-Year Construction Program, to hear the presentation of the County Budget and hold a work session, and for closed session.

In Re: Public Hearing: Secondary Six-Year Plan for FY 2010/11 Through FY 2015/16

Chairman Fore announced this was the date and time scheduled for a public hearing on the Secondary Six Year Plan for Fiscal Year 2010/11 through 2015/16. Notice of this hearing was advertised according to law in the March 19, 2010 and March 26, 2010 issues of THE FARMVILLE HERALD, a newspaper published in the County of Prince Edward.

Chairman Fore opened the public hearing and called on Kevin Wright, Interim Residency Administrator, VDOT, to review the proposed Six-Year Plan.

Mr. Wright gave a brief overview of the proposed Six-Year Plan; he said \$51,000 is available each year for the next six years through the Tele-fee Funds, which are collected from the communications

companies for their facilities to be placed on the right of way. He then reviewed the regular construction program, which can include any primary and secondary road in the county that the Board has chosen for improvement:

The first two are essentially one project: the Back Hampden Sydney Road (Route 643) Project will be split into two projects due to money not accumulating quickly for this project. The existing funds will go towards the first half of the project, Priority #1, from 0.08 miles west of Route 644 to 0.57 miles east of Route 644. Priority #2 will be from 0.65 miles east of Route 643 to the Farmville Town limits.

Priority #3 is the Lockett Road (Route 619) Project has Federal Bridge Funds available; those will now be managed by the District Bridge Office and prioritized accordingly.

The Unpaved Road projects are: Priority #1, Route 751, which has gone to advertisement; Priority #2, Aspen Hill Road project, from US 460 to High Bridge Trail, will be surface-treated and the drainage will be updated as a pave-in-place. Priority #3 is the second portion of the Aspen Hill Road project which will continue from 0.8 miles west of Route 619 to Route 619 (High Bridge Trail).

Supervisor Jones asked for clarification on the Bridge Funds program. Mr. Wright said the Bridge Office looks at the sufficiency rating and the condition of the bridge to determine priority.

There being no one wishing to speak, Chairman Fore closed the public hearing.

Supervisor McKay made a motion, seconded by Supervisor Simpson, to adopt the Resolution – Six-Year Road Plan and Construction Priority List as presented. The motion carried:

Aye:	William G. Fore, Jr. Howard F. Simpson Don C. Gantt Robert M. Jones Charles W. McKay Jim Wilck Mattie P. Wiley	Nay:	None
------	--	------	------

Absent: Howard M. Campbell

RESOLUTION

**SIX-YEAR ROAD PLAN
AND CONSTRUCTION PRIORITY LIST**

At a special meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince Edward, held at the Prince Edward County Courthouse, Board of Supervisors Room, on April 6, 2010 at 7:00 p.m.

Members Present were: Chairman William G. Fore, Jr.
Vice Chairman Howard F. Simpson
Don C. Gantt
Robert M. Jones
Charles W. McKay
Jim Wilck
Mattie P. Wiley

Members Absent were: Howard M. Campbell

On motion by Mr. McKay, seconded by Mr. Simpson and carried:

Aye:	William G. Fore, Jr. Howard F. Simpson Don C. Gantt Robert M. Jones Charles W. McKay Jim Wilck Mattie P. Wiley	Nay:	None
------	--	------	------

WHEREAS, Sections 33.1-23 and 33.1-23.4 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended, provides the opportunity for each county to work with the Virginia Department of Transportation in developing a Secondary Six-Year Road Plan,

WHEREAS, this Board had previously agreed to assist in the preparation of this Plan, in accordance with the Virginia Department of Transportation policies and procedures, and participated in a public hearing on the proposed Plan (2010/11 through 2015/16) as well as the Construction Priority List (2010/11) on April 6, 2010 after duly advertised so that all citizens of the County had the opportunity to participate in said hearing and to make comments and recommendations concerning the proposed Plan and Priority List,

WHEREAS, Kevin B. Wright, Acting Residency Administrator, Virginia Department of Transportation, appeared before the board and recommended approval of the Six-Year Plan for Secondary Roads (2010/11 through 2015/16) and the Construction Priority List (2010/11) for Prince Edward County,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that since said Plan appears to be in the best interests of the Secondary Road System in Prince Edward County and of the citizens residing on the Secondary System, said Secondary Six-Year Plan (2010/11 through 2015/16) and Construction Priority List (2010/11) are hereby approved as presented at the public hearing.

In Re: Presentation of FY 11 County Budget

Mr. Wade Bartlett, County Administrator, reviewed the proposed budget presentation and distributed to the Board of Supervisors the following written comments:

"I am pleased to present to the Board of Supervisors my recommended budget for Prince Edward County for Fiscal Year 2011 (FY11). I look forward to the Board's feedback and response to the many difficult decisions that went into this recommendation. While this year was difficult, it was merely an extension of the same pattern we have now seen for three years. That is a pattern of reduced state funding and falling local revenues. With the current climate in Richmond, I do not see any will on the part of the General Assembly to provide additional revenue to local government, even when the economy turns around. This does not bode well for local governments and will place great pressure on us.

For the third year in a row the state has decreased funding to local governments. Enclosure (1) outlines the state reductions which total at least \$413,220. Other programs will see reductions, but the amounts are not available at this time. I expect once all information is known state reductions will approach \$500,000. These reductions are in addition to previous reductions. All totaled state revenue reductions over the last three years approach \$700,000.

For FY11 health insurance rates increased 16% or almost \$69,000; Virginia retirement program (VRS) increased 6% or \$27,500, and unemployment insurance increased by \$5,000, for a total of \$101,500. As compared with the amounts collected in FY09, personal property tax collections will decline \$238,764; local sales tax is forecast to decrease \$183,335 (on top of a \$142,824 decline from FY08 to FY09) and interest earnings will fall almost \$87,500. These cost increases combined with the revenue declines total almost \$758,000. Added to the state revenue reductions mentioned above, and we are facing almost \$1.5 million in reduced revenues or increasing costs.

The lost revenues and increasing costs, coupled with the desire to maintain the current funding levels for our Schools and non-profit organizations serving the most needy, and at the same time maintaining the same level of services for our citizens, have forced me to recommend a four cent tax increase on the real estate tax. This would take our tax rate from \$0.40 to \$0.44 and generate an additional \$600,000. That rate is still very competitive with our neighbors and would still be one of the lowest in the region. This \$600,000 is only 41% of the lost revenues and increased costs mentioned above.

Improved efficiencies, increased workloads and in some cases reduced service levels have been used to cover the remaining amount. To reduce expenditures more than that would have a profound impact on the ability of the County to provide the level of services our citizens expect and deserve.

After deducting the transfers between funds, the proposed budget totals \$44,508,499 for the county operations and the school system. The overall budget is balanced. Total fund balances are forecast to increase \$183,424 after falling slightly more than \$1.2 million in the current FY, enclosure (2) and (3).

The proposed budget includes \$26.7 million for the school system, \$11.1 million for general governmental operations, \$579,000 in local dollars for social services, \$1 million for landfill construction and \$2 million for the utility system. This represents an overall decrease of \$1.4 million in the General Fund from the FY10 budget.

Factors shaping the FY11 Proposed Budget

The FY11 proposed budget incorporates the Board's direction to present a budget that level funds the schools, little if any use of the fund balance, but at the same time maintain core service levels.

The FY11 proposed budget process comes amid the most challenging period of economic turmoil and uncertainty most of us have ever seen. Major factors shaping the proposed budget are declining business activity, rising unemployment, increasing health care and insurance costs and significant reductions in revenues received from the Commonwealth. One statistic which conveys the scope of this economic downturn is the unemployment rate. Unemployment in Prince Edward County reached 10.3% in January 2010, compared with 5.1% in February 2008. This is the highest unemployment level for the County since at least 1997.

In difficult economic times there is an inverse relationship between the demand for governmental services and the state of the economy. Thus, unlike businesses which see a reduction in demand, government experiences an increase in demand for services during recessions. Our residents who are facing economic distress look first to their local government to provide the support they need. Providing such support during this period of declining revenues represents a considerable challenge for the County in FY11.

There are a number of outside factors that may still impact the FY11 budget. Final decisions and implementing instructions regarding the Commonwealth's budget have not been received. Thus, there is

still great uncertainty regarding the final disposition of State and Federal funding at the local level, but we must proceed with the information we have at hand.

FY11 Reduction Strategies

The Board of Supervisors has expressed its concern for the citizens who are struggling during this period of economic uncertainty. You made it clear to me you wanted an FY11 Budget submission that funded education at the highest level possible and at the same time maintained the core services provided to the citizens of the County.

This was a daunting challenge, one which cannot be met by the actions of the County staff alone. Departments which report directly to me account for only \$4.5 million or approximately 10% of the entire County budget. To meet the challenge laid out by the Board of Supervisors required the help and sacrifice of the Schools and Constitutional Officers.

In addition to eliminating most capital purchases, the budget includes no cost of living/merit pay increases for county employees. This will be the third year with no pay increases.

The Prince Edward County School Board has requested \$7,913,044 in local funds for operations, which represents level funding after accounting for the decrease in debt service. Recognizing the education of our children is one of the cornerstones in fostering future prosperity for the County, the Board directed me to do all I could to level fund the schools. I have fulfilled your desires and am recommending level funding for the Schools.

As stated above, capital expenditures are being kept to a minimum. The General Fund contains only four recommended capital projects totaling \$141,500. The first is replacement of the County's AS400 computer system at a cost of \$45,000. This equipment runs all of the County's financial and tax systems. It is 13 years old and two years ago had a complete failure. The County was without any financial system for 10 days while repairs were made. These were not permanent repairs, and we have been living on borrowed time. I highly recommend this expenditure. The second item is \$24,000 for the replacement of various computers, printers and software. Third, is the purchase of a gasoline storage and dispensing system costing the County \$17,150. This system will be located at the School Bus Garage compound and will be used by both the County and School system. It will save the County approximately \$16,000 annually and the Schools \$8,000 for a total of \$24,000. I have had a conversation with the Chairman of

the School Board and he stated the School system is very interested in joining the County on this project. Finally, the Sheriff is requesting \$55,000 for the replacement of two patrol cars.

We have taken various actions over the last two fiscal years to reduce expenditures. Some of these are:

- 1. Eliminated a custodial contract – saved \$60,000*
- 2. Reduced hours of our convenience centers – saved \$60,000*
- 3. Implemented greater review of CSA cases – saved \$79,110*
- 4. Began an in-house building maintenance program – saved \$40,000*
- 5. In-house web design and maintenance – saved \$30,000*
- 6. Reduced various expenses to absorb increases in VRS/Health Insurance – saved \$106,000*

This Fiscal Year I am recommending additional reductions to include eliminating the bounty on coyotes (\$2,500), reducing telecommunications to reflect savings on with the new phone contract (\$22,000) and various other reductions. Almost every department and Constitutional Office submitted cost reductions from a wide variety of operational line items.

I am not recommending any increase in funding for any outside organization. In addition, I am recommending the elimination of funding for the Mary E. Branch Community Center (\$23,750). The majority of this funding (\$23,025) would be used to support a summer program for County youth. This is a duplication of service since the YMCA also provides a summer youth program. I recommend increasing funding for the YMCA summer program by \$20,000 with the stipulation the funds be used to provide financial assistance for disadvantaged children. The Board of Supervisors has a stated policy designating the YMCA as the provider of recreational activities on behalf of the County. This recommendation reflects that policy. In addition, more County residents will receive more services for less money. The YMCA's summer program runs from the day after school ends to the day before school begins, while the Mary E. Branch program has historically only operated for two weeks with a week break then run another two weeks. Thus, the program ran only 4 weeks, less than one-half the summer break. Plus the program has not been licensed by DSS. I recommend the Board of Supervisors strongly encourage the School Board to work with the YMCA in providing access to school facilities for the increased demands of this consolidation.

Tax Rates

The FY11 proposed budget contains a four cent increase in the real estate tax rate. That would bring our tax rate to \$0.44. Even at that rate only three of our 15 closest counties would have a tax rate lower than that amount. That assumes those three are not increasing their tax rates. I recommend all other tax rates be maintained at their current rates.

Revenues

The cash for clunkers program did succeed in getting people to purchase new cars. The net result is an increase in total personal property assessments. Thus, I forecast an increase in personal property tax revenues of \$458,616. While good news, it is still \$238,764 less than the amount collected in FY09. This reduced collection offsets 40% of the increase in the real estate tax. The chart below displays the changes in the major revenue categories, assuming the increase in the tax rate recommended, as compared to the FY10 original budget;

<i>General Property Taxes</i>	\$ 968,129
<i>Other Local Taxes</i>	(\$ 119,500)
<i>Permits and Fees</i>	(\$ 6,100)
<i>Fines & Forfeitures</i>	\$ 15,300
<i>Revenues from Use of Money & Property</i>	(\$ 65,649)
<i>Charges for Service</i>	\$ 14,450
<i>Miscellaneous Income</i>	\$ 63,900
<i>Recovered Costs</i>	(\$ 19,013)
<i>Transfers</i>	(\$ 60,000)
<i>Use of Fund Balance</i>	(\$ 610,106)
<u><i>Revenue from the Commonwealth</i></u>	<u>(\$ 334,492)</u>
<i>Subtotal</i>	(\$ 153,081)

Last FY we balanced the budget with the use of over \$600,000 from the fund balance. It was hoped the economy would rebound and future reductions would not be required. We now see that will not

be the case. We cannot continue to rely on the fund balance to fund ongoing operational expenses. Even with the tax increase I forecast General Fund revenues will decline by slightly more than \$153,000.

Conclusion

I look forward to our future work sessions and realize the Board may recommend changes to the proposed budget. That is understandable and expected. I recommend caution against the use of the County's fund balance to restore any funding reductions. This economic environment is unlike any we have seen. We cannot predict the future and when the economy may turn around or if the recession will become worse. If either of those happens we may very well have to use part of the fund balance to serve our citizens at the levels they will need. Thus, I highly recommend we maintain the current fund balance levels."

Supervisor Jones asked if the landfill construction project will be bid out and is it anticipated next year (FY11); Mr. Bartlett said that the engineering costs are a considerable portion and it would go to bid; he added there has not been a large reduction in usage as most of the refuse is generated by the residents of Prince Edward County.

Supervisor Jones then asked if the \$0.04 increase in the property tax rate would provide enough to keep from the need to tap into the General Fund; Mr. Bartlett said it would.

Discussion followed on the projected decrease in personal property revenues. Supervisor McKay suggested doing away with the license tax fee as a separate item and add the cost of the fee to the personal property tax. Further discussion followed.

Chairman Fore commented that the school's request to retain the \$360,000 in carry-over funding was not included in the budget; Mr. Bartlett stated it was not figured in as it would not change any figures.

Discussion followed on alternatives to an increase in real estate tax rates.

Supervisor Jones made a motion to advertise the proposed county budget with the proposed \$0.04 real estate tax increase as presented by the County Administrator, with an operating budget of \$53,704,429.00; the motion carried:

Aye: William G. Fore, Jr.
 Howard F. Simpson
 Don C. Gantt
 Robert M. Jones
 Charles W. McKay
 Jim Wilck
 Mattie P. Wiley

Nay: None

Absent: Howard M. Campbell

**COUNTY AND SCHOOL BUDGET AND TAX LEVIES
 FOR THE FISCAL YEAR COMMENCING JULY 1, 2010
 COUNTY OF PRINCE EDWARD, VIRGINIA**

- GENERAL FUND -

ANTICIPATED REVENUES:

Revenue from Local Sources:	
General Property Taxes	\$10,523,753
Other Local Taxes	3,565,500
Permits and Licenses	81,070
Fines and Forfeitures	46,000
Revenue from Use of Money & Property	361,848
Charges for Services	554,600
Miscellaneous Income	171,300
Recovered Costs	146,000
Revenue from the Commonwealth	<u>4,124,962</u>
TOTAL GENERAL FUND REVENUES	\$19,575,033

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES:

Board of Supervisors	117,900
County Administration	479,643
Legal, Audit, Assessor	117,897
Information Technology	74,000
Commissioner of Revenue	279,275
Treasurer	372,603
Board of Elections/Registrar	117,055
Circuit Court	51,745
Combined Courts	13,700
Magistrates	4,625
Clerk of Circuit Court	455,741
Law Library	4,650
Commonwealth's Attorney	617,449
Victim Witness	57,047
Sheriff	1,946,941
Emergency Services	20,000
Fire Departments	487,800
Rescue Squads	76,500
Forest Fire Service	14,448
Corrections and Detention	195,000
Building Official	96,606

Animal Control	121,559
Medical Examiner	500
Landfill Operations/Convenience Centers	1,156,700
Biosolids	65,270
Sandy River Reservoir	40,000
General Properties	661,678
Health Department	167,761
Crossroads CSB	62,643
Comprehensive Services Act	1,001,000
Donations to Community Programs	73,242
Contributions of Colleges (SVCC, LU)	14,030
Parks, Recreation, and Cultural	123,850
Library	166,559
Planning	187,549
Community Development	44,250
Economic Development & Tourism	179,554
Soil & Water	11,465
Extension Service	61,192
Cannery	56,076
Capital Projects	86,150
Transfer to Social Services Fund	578,943
Transfer to School Fund	7,913,044
Transfer to IDA Fund	154,532
Transfer to Retiree Fund	24,696
Debt Service	844,435
Donation to the Commonwealth of Virginia	<u>177,730</u>
TOTAL GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES	\$19,575,033

- SCHOOL FUND -

ANTICIPATED REVENUES:

Other Sources	\$260,290
Revenue from the Commonwealth	15,594,429
Revenue from the Federal Government	2,931,044
Transfer from County General Fund	<u>7,913,044</u>
Total Anticipated Revenues	\$26,698,807

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES:

Instruction	\$20,494,761
Administration, Health, Attendance	1,539,615
Pupil Transportation	1,785,334
Operations & Maintenance	1,930,175
School Food Program	11,436
Facilities	142,967
Debt Service	<u>794,519</u>
Total Proposed Expenditures	\$26,698,807

- SCHOOL CAFETERIA FUND -

ANTICIPATED REVENUES:

Cafeteria Sales	\$261,171
Revenue from the Commonwealth	16,884
Revenue from the Federal Government	<u>750,000</u>
Total Anticipated Revenues	\$1,028,055

Total Proposed Expenditures	\$1,028,055
-----------------------------	-------------

- SOCIAL SERVICES FUND -

<u>ANTICIPATED REVENUES:</u>	
Revenue from the Commonwealth	\$791,645
Revenue from the Federal Government	1,380,588
Transfer from County General Fund	578,943
Recovered Cost	<u>10,000</u>
Total Anticipated Revenues	\$2,761,176
Total Proposed Expenditures	\$2,761,176

- WATER FUND -

<u>ANTICIPATED REVENUES:</u>	
Charges for Service	\$ 958
Line of Credit	<u>2,000,000</u>
Total Anticipated Revenues	\$2,000,958

<u>PROPOSED EXPENDITURES:</u>	
Operations & Maintenance	\$11,300
Wholesale Purchase of Water	1,500
Capital Project	920,510
Debt Service	112,289
To Fund Balance	<u>955,359</u>
Total Proposed Expenditures	\$2,000,958

- SEWER FUND -

<u>ANTICIPATED REVENUES:</u>	
Charges for Service	\$ 1,054
From Sewer Fund Balance	<u>46,935</u>
Total Anticipated Revenues	\$ 47,989

<u>PROPOSED EXPENDITURES:</u>	
Operations & Maintenance	\$ 8,700
Wholesale Purchase of Water	2,000
Dent Service	<u>37,289</u>
Total Proposed Expenditures	\$ 47,989

- LANDFILL CONSTRUCTION FUND -

<u>ANTICIPATED REVENUES</u>	
Charges to Customers	\$ 275,000
From Landfill Construction Fund Balance	<u>725,000</u>
Total Anticipated Revenues	\$1,000,000
Total Proposed Expenditures	\$1,000,000

- RETIREE BENEFITS FUND -

Total Anticipated Revenues	\$24,696
Total Proposed Expenditures	\$24,696

- CDA SPECIAL LEVY FUND -

Total Anticipated Revenues	\$43,000
Total Proposed Expenditures	\$43,000

- PIEDMONT COURT SERVICES FUND -

Total Anticipated Revenues	\$524,715
Total Proposed Expenditures	\$524,715
TOTAL COUNTY OPERATIONS FOR FY11	\$53,704,429

PROPOSED TAX RATES

Notice is hereby given that the Board of Supervisors of Prince Edward County, Virginia, proposes the following tax levies for the tax year 2010:

Unit Levy—All Districts—Per \$100 Assessed Valuations

<u>Levy:</u>	<u>2009 Actual Levy</u>	<u>2010 Proposed Levy</u>
Real Estate	\$0.40	\$0.44
Tangible Personal Property	\$4.50	\$4.50
Machinery & Tools	\$4.20	\$4.20
Merchant's Capital	\$0.70	\$0.70
Farm Machinery & Livestock	\$0.00	\$0.00

Additional Special Levy—CDA District Only—Per \$100 Assessed Valuations

	<u>2009 Actual Levy</u>	<u>2010 Requested</u>
Poplar Hill CDA Real Estate Levy	\$1.00	\$1.00

In Re: Committee Report: War Memorial

Chairman Fore asked the Board members to recall the criteria for selection of the names to be placed on the new memorial. He said the names of those to be included have been provided by the Department of Defense based on their "home of record." Chairman Fore stated Andrew Saunders died in the Korean War; he was born in Prince Edward County in 1928 and was killed in June of 1951 in combat in Korea. His home of record is Baltimore, MD. His sister, Virginia Foster, of Rice, said he left home when she was young, and she is requesting that his name be entered on the Korean War section of the plaque for the Memorial Day service. Chairman Fore asked the Board members to consider the inclusion of his name on the plaque. After some discussion, the Board concurred.

Chairman Fore requested that Mrs. Sarah Elam Puckett research this further to ensure his native status. Supervisor McKay suggested all natives of Prince Edward County be added to the plaque.

In Re: Closed Session

Supervisor Wilck made a motion that the Board convene in Closed Session for discussion and consideration of the acquisition of real property for public recreational purposes, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position of the Board, pursuant to the exemptions provided for in Section 2.2-3711(A)(3) of the *Code of Virginia*. The motion carried:

Aye: William G. Fore, Jr.
Howard F. Simpson
Don C. Gantt
Robert M. Jones
Charles W. McKay
Jim Wilck
Mattie P. Wiley

Nay: None

Absent: Howard M. Campbell

The Board returned to regular session by motion of Supervisor McKay and adopted as follows:

Aye: William G. Fore, Jr.
Howard F. Simpson
Don C. Gantt
Robert M. Jones
Charles W. McKay
Jim Wilck
Mattie P. Wiley

Nay: None

Absent: Howard M. Campbell

On motion of Supervisor Simpson, seconded by Supervisor Wiley and carried by the following roll call vote:

Aye: William G. Fore, Jr.
Howard F. Simpson
Don C. Gantt
Robert M. Jones
Charles W. McKay
Jim Wilck
Mattie P. Wiley

Nay: None

Absent: Howard M. Campbell

the following Certification of Closed Meeting was adopted in accordance with the Virginia Freedom of Information Act:

WHEREAS, the Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors convened a closed meeting 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 this Board of Supervisors that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors hereby certifies that to the best of each member's knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered by the Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors.

Supervisor Simpson made a motion to place an option to purchase the SCOPE Building at 505 Griffin Boulevard, Farmville, VA at a cost of \$175,000, with \$2,000 down as the initial deposit to be held in escrow, and subject to the terms of the contract minus the three addenda, and that the contract be returned to the Board of Supervisors not later than April 12, 2010. The motion carried:

Aye:	William G. Fore, Jr. Howard F. Simpson Don C. Gantt Charles W. McKay Jim Wilck Mattie P. Wiley	Nay:	Robert M. Jones
------	---	------	-----------------

Absent: Howard M. Campbell

Supervisor Jones said he is in favor of the purchase of the SCOPE Building, but at a lower price.

On motion of Supervisor McKay and adopted by the following vote:

Aye:	Howard M. Campbell William G. Fore, Jr. Don C. Gantt, Jr. Robert M. Jones Charles W. McKay Howard F. Simpson Jim R. Wilck Mattie P. Wiley	Nay:	None
------	--	------	------

the meeting was recessed at 9:37 p.m. until Friday, April 9, 2010 at 10:00 a.m.