



TOWN COUNCIL WORK SESSION

Monday, August 21, 2017 @ 7:00pm
Town Hall Conference Room

1. Continued Discussion of Ordinance Amendments Pertaining to Flea Markets – *Town Manager*
Agenda Item: Continued Discussion of Proposed Ordinance Amendment – Flea Market Regulations Pertaining to Licensing Fees

Summary: During the June 26, 2017 work sessions Council requested staff to review the Town's Flea Market Ordinance relating to the licensing fees. On the July 17, 2017 work session, Council discussed a flat fee and recommended moving forward with a public hearing on a \$250 flat fee. At the Town Council meeting on August 14th the motion died on the floor due to no second.

Council is requested to discuss if the Town should change licensing fees for flea markets to a flat annual licensing fee versus the per vendor fee that is currently associated with flea markets.

Staff Evaluation: Currently, Town of Front Royal Municipal Code 98-46 requires every vendor who is engaged in the sale or display of goods at a flea market to purchase a license and display the license. For every license to sell or display antiques or used or second-hand goods at a flea market there is a \$10 per year license tax or a \$1 per day license tax. Frederick County does not have a per vendor fee for flea markets and charges the flea market an annual license fee of \$500 as a whole.

Budget/Funding: Revenue collected from business licensing may be affected

Legal Evaluation: Ms. Linda Henry had earlier asserted at a Town Council Work Session that her father and a previous Town Attorney had agreed years earlier that Town Code Section 98-46 was illegal and unenforceable, and as a result, she and her vendors had not been paying the license tax imposed therein since that time. Ms. Henry was unable to state the legal or factual basis for this assertion. I have researched this matter and have not been able to confirm that there is any illegality to Town Code Section 98-46, but rather, this ordinance does appear to meet the requirements of the Code of Virginia's enabling legislation and thus, Section 98-46 does appear to be legal and enforceable. Likewise, a flat \$500 flea market licensing fee would be legal and enforceable, as Va. Code § 58.1-3717.C states: "Any tax imposed pursuant to § 58.1-3703 on peddlers and itinerant merchants shall not exceed \$500 per year."

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends to set a flat \$500 flea market licensing fee to the owner of the flea market that would cover all vendors who sell or display antiques or used or second-hand goods at the flea market.

Town Manager Recommendation: (The Town Manager will provide input on the issue and make his recommendations to council.)

Council Discussion:

Councilman Sealock's memo noted that:

It is this Councilman's position that we would like to enhance any business within ur community to include the flea market but some serious issues have come forth that needed further discussion prior to approval. It is more complicated than adding Friday on to the regulations of Flea Markets within

the town. I truly recognize the contribution and long-term value of this flea market to our community.

INSERT REST HERE

INSERT REST HERE

INSERT REST HERE

Councilman Connolly noted that enforcement of table fee collection and peddler license collection is a Town problem and that needs to be rectified. He added that the owner will be gouged while they are requesting something, while the Town “has them”. He expressed his disappointment that the Town could not move something forward

Meza – their business was evaluated when they came forward with a request, the Town did not gouge them

Their request triggered a request

Their special exception triggered a review of the business

Connolly noted that this is not a special exception, it is an ordinance amendment

There are a ton of businesses that could be open more days and if the goal is to make the businesses more expensive

Then the Town is doing more jobs

Councilman Sealock noted that the town is not holding anyone hostage

He does not like the terminology

The Town does not bill the restaurant

The business reports their sales

The flea market should be reporting their number of tables

Connolly the meal tax is very different from the flea market tables and the market owner is very different and they have talked to Town Staff and it has been clouded

Sealock would like them to succeed but there are issues to be resolved

Meza hear what Connolly is saying; however, he is not holding anyone hostage

Regarding the ordinance – it triggered the review

The \$1 per table was part of the discussion from the beginning and he understands why it was put in there from the beginning

Connolly noted that Council discussed the flat fee and now the \$1 per table is back and he questioned whether it was fair

Meza stated that it was different information that came to light

Councilman Sealock stated that it died at the last meeting and Council should discuss the matter to resolve

Napier suggested checking other localities to see how it works elsewhere

Mayor Tharpe described how the process worked previously and how the tickets per table and how the Friday request brought everything to light at this point. He noted that some processes could take place at the flea market but not at the farmer's market

Councilman Sealock noted that the ordinance says \$1 per table, and it either is correct or it goes to \$250/\$500 flat fee. Councilman Morrison noted that the current Code should be enforced, whether it is changing or not.

Councilman Meza noted that the Town needs to enforce the current Code while they review the matter. Mr. Morrison agreed.

Mayor Tharpe asked what Council would be doing in the future. Mr. Sealock stated that he could go with a \$250 or \$500 fee. He noted that the Town has a current Code that is not being honored. He voiced support of a \$500 fee versus \$1/table. He stated that the other issues with the flea market needs to be addressed. Mr. Camp stated that the flea market was grandfathered in and much of the items that Mr. Sealock noted were not applicable unless they applied for a special use permit to operate on Friday.

Councilman Tewalt noted that having someone working overtime was ridiculous and the \$1 per table and the flea market owner needed to be left alone to be honest and run their business.

Councilman Meza clarified the special use permit process and how it would affect the flea market.

Council chose to advertise for the flat fee of the \$500 for the flea market and then it would go to regular meeting. Staff will be reviewing the performance standards at the flea market. Mr. Camp noted that the applicant is aware that the grandfathering ends when the special use permit changes. Council discussed the funding that was not collected.

2. Request from Warren Heritage Society Pertaining to Utilities – Town Manager

Summary: In 2014 a councilmember requested that Council consider a reimbursement of the expense of utility services for the Warren Heritage Society located at 101 Chester Street in the amount of \$10,000 due to *“their campus of preservation has grown significantly and their outreach into the community has extended with greater need in the area”*. In accordance with the authority granted governments by Virginia Code Section 15.2-953, Council approved the request and for the money to come from Electric, Water, Sewer and Solid Waste Fund Reserves to be used toward payment of the respective portion of the utility bills beginning July 1, 2014. In 2015, Council received a similar request from the Warren Heritage Society for an in-kind donation to offset the utility expenses included by the Society in the amount of \$15,000 (*\$5,000 increase*). Council approved the donation beginning September 2015. In 2016 Council received another letter requesting the in-kind donation of \$15,000; however, Council approved the donation to begin September 2016, **but also requested that the Warren Heritage Society make efforts to improve the efficiency of their buildings and report these efforts prior to requesting continued donations in the future.** The 2016 request was also discussed at the November 2016 Liaison Committee Meeting.

Tonight Council is requested to consider the request from the Executive Director of the Warren Heritage Society for the abeyance on utility fees initially put in place by Town Council for services at 101 Chester Street for FY2018-2019.

Council will vote on final approval at the next regular Council meeting

Staff Evaluation: Minutes attached of the past meetings of work sessions and liaison. Regular meeting minutes are not attached as they were approved under consent and therefore only the motions are explained in the summary above.

Budget/Funding: Director of Finance will be available

Council Discussion: Mr. Farris thanked Council for the consideration of the request and noted that the first year the request was \$10,000 and the second year the request was \$15,000. He noted that the Foundation had freed up the funds to work on the Battle of Front Royal project and they have garnered the attention of many re-enactors and tourists. He stated that by freeing up the funding they have been putting more resources towards the Festival of Leaves and other events. Mr. Farris noted that the funds from the County were not granted from around 2007 and beyond though they have done other in-kind partnerships with Warren County as well as grants, such as the Civil War brochure. Mr. Farris noted that they are requesting the continued support of the utility assistance for the advance on the account for Warren Heritage Society. Mr. Santmyers, Warren Heritage Society Board Member, added that they draw many tourists to the community which assists greatly with overall tourism to the community. He noted that the lighting has been upgraded to LED bulbs and they do not have a huge electricity demand. Mr. Farris noted that Rappahanock Electric Co-Op gave recommendations and Warren Heritage Society followed through with appropriate changes. Mr. Wilson the Town's Finance Director, noted that the bill at the organization has been coming down for the last three years. Mr. Waltz described the minutes on record. Mr. Farris noted that he did not request funding during certain times, as it was obvious that the funding would be turned down. He added that the request would greatly assist the Heritage Society.

Councilman Tewalt questioned Council about where the funding would come from at this point. Then he noted that it would come from unbudgeted funds. Councilman Meza asked about what was different about Warren Heritage Society to other organizations who may request funding from the Town. Mr. Farris noted that they generate income and draw individuals to the community and they work in concert with the Town with tourist opportunities and send them to the Town's Visitor's Center. He added that the Heritage Society stays open 12 months per year to protect and preserve the Town's history and assist with other options and museums downtown. Mr. Farris stated that their work is greatly beneficial to the Town and the area economy.

Councilman Connolly noted that in the past the Town has considered that if the Heritage Society did not provide these (certain archival) services then the Town would have to cover portions of the historical services for the community and it would be a Town expense. Council and Staff discussed the fact that the revenue would not be recognized as income from the enterprise fund. Mr. Farris noted that they continue to strive to reduce their utility use.

Councilman Tewalt asked that it placed on the agenda for a vote. Mayor Tharpe noted that it would move forward for vote.

3. Continued Discussion of Charter Updates – *Town Attorney*

Summary: On November 26, 2012, Town Council passed certain proposed Town Charter amendments which Council requested the General Assembly to pass at the then upcoming 2013 Session. These proposed changes include: The change in the Town's elections for Town Council and Mayor from the first Tuesday in May in even numbered years, to the general election day in November in even numbered years (this has now been codified in the Town Code in Section 10-1; however, the General Assembly can undo this by change to State Code); allowing the Town Council to designate additional Town officers by ordinance; to cause elections to Town Council and Mayor to be non-partisan (so that federal employees would be able to hold local public office—historically, all Town elections, as are most local elections nation-wide, have always been nonpartisan); protections to the Town's ability to collect fees and taxes against future State general legislation; protections to the Town's ability to locally regulate its electric utilities; mesh its Charter provisions of Town Council appointing Town Council vacancies with State Code provisions, and giving Town Council appointees all powers of Town Council elected members, which they do not now have; allow minutes to be kept in electronic format in lieu of hard-copy minute books; allow the publication of proposed ordinances and other notices by any method allowed by law; to combine the duties of the Town Treasurer with that of Town Manager or Town Finance Director; and for the provision of a number of modernization of the Charter, and additional minor and clerical amendments to the Charter.

For reasons that are not completely clear, while in committee in the House of Delegates, the Town's proposed Charter amendments were not passed. There may be some additional Charter amendments that Town Council may wish to consider.

A full copy of the current Town Charter, as well as the entire Town Code, is available for inspection on the Town of Front Royal, Virginia, municipal homepage at <https://frontroyalva.com>, and is highly recommended reading, as specific issues arise.

Town Council is requested to consider and discuss any other amendments it would like to see to the Town's Charter.

Staff Evaluation: In an attachment, the Town Attorney has suggested a few Charter amendments that Town Council may wish to consider. Additionally other staff, such as Planning & Zoning, might be requested to also evaluate the Town Charter and give its recommendations to Town Council as to what staff recommends might be considered amended.

Budget/Funding: No recommendations or known impacts expected at this time, although in the future they will be significant.

Legal Evaluation: Legal evaluation of proposed Charter amendments will be on-going as they are proposed.

Staff Recommendations: See above. It is recommended that Town Council send its Charter amendment proposals to its General Assembly representatives by the first of November to be sure that they have enough time to digest its contents and to take whatever action is appropriate to advance Town Council's objectives.

Council Discussion:

Council voiced support of moving forward with the Charter changes to the General Assembly.

4. Continued Discussion of Proposed Ordinance Pertaining to Tethering of Dogs in Extreme Weather – *Town Attorney*

Summary: Proposed Section 66-11.1, Tethering Restriction for Dogs/Canines, a mirror ordinance to an ordinance proposed to be adopted by the County of Warren for ease of enforcement by Warren County Animal Control, is authorized by Virginia Code § 3.2-6543 *et seq.* to prevent cruelty to animals.

As proposed, dogs and canines (dogs and wild dog hybrids) are, in certain circumstances, or are not to be kept on a tether, or else are to be provided adequate shelter, so as to protect the animal from injury or from extreme weather conditions, such as extreme cold or extreme heat, to protect young dogs, or a or to protect female animals in heat from unwanted males. This proposed ordinance has come about as a result of practical observation and experience from both Animal Control Officers and from concerned citizens. A number of other jurisdictions have also adopted similar ordinances, including Alexandria City, Arlington County, Chesapeake City, Danville City, Fairfax City, Fairfax County, Fauquier County, Hampton City, Newport News City, Norfolk City, Northhampton County, Portsmouth City, Richmond City, Town of Smithfield, Staunton City, Suffolk City, and Virginia Beach City.

Council is requested to consider whether or not it wants to adopt a mirror ordinance to the County's proposed dog and other canines tethering ordinance.

Staff Evaluation: From a standpoint of law enforcement, as well as prevention of possible animal cruelty, adoption of a mirror ordinance to the County's tethering restrictions for dogs and other canines would be helpful.

Budget/Funding: As almost all Animal Control measures are enforced by Warren County's Sheriff's Office Animal Control Officers, direct Town budgeting and funding are expected to be minimal to nonexistent, instead being paid through County-wide (including within already within the Town) budgeting and funding.

Councilman Tewalt asked why it should be an ordinance rather than a resolution and whether the Town would be a charge to the Town. Mr. Napier noted that animal control needs an ordinance in the Town for ease of enforcement and fines would go into the Town accounts, not the County or the State. Mr. Napier stated that the County was going to adopt the matter, though there were some issues until Council's questions were resolved. Mr. Connolly noted that the County needed to take the first step in adoption to allow them to take the lead. Mr. Tewalt expressed his agreement, adding that the Town should have a resolution not an ordinance.

Councilman Meza expressed concern that the neighbors be tattling on one neighbor to the next rather than cruelty to animals. He noted that if the matter cannot be adequately enforced then it should not be enforced. Councilman Sealock noted that the ordinance is written that the Town shall be adopting State Code. He asked why the Town needs to adopt an entire ordinance, instead of just adopting by reference the Code of Warren County. Mr. Napier noted that the Town cannot adopt by reference the County Code – on by reference the State Code. He stated that the Animal Control Office would like to have it mirrored by so it is enforced Town/County wide.

Mayor Tharpe noted that the Council seemed ready to move forward when the County adopts the ordinance.

5. Continued Discussion of Proposed Ordinance for No Smoking at School Bus Stops – *Town Attorney*

Summary: Proposed Chapter 136, containing Section 136-1 of the Town Code, No Smoking within 50 Feet of School Bus Stops, is enabled by the following Sections of the Code of Virginia:

Va. Code § 15.2-2829. Mandatory provisions of ordinances. — If an ordinance is enacted by a locality in accordance with this chapter, it shall provide that it is unlawful for any person to smoke in any of the following places:

1. Common areas in an educational facility, including but not limited to, classrooms, hallways, auditoriums, and public meeting rooms;
2. School buses and public conveyances; and
3. Any of the places governed by § 15.2-2824 or 15.2-2825 [*NOTE, BOTH STATUTES DEAL WITH INDOOR PLACES NOT APPLICABLE HERE.*].

Va. Code § 15.2-2830. Optional provisions of ordinances. — If an ordinance is enacted by a locality

in accordance with this chapter, it may provide that management shall designate reasonable no-smoking

areas, considering the nature of the use and the size of the building, in the following places:

1. Retail and service establishments of 15,000 square feet or more serving the general public, including, but not limited to, department stores, grocery stores, drug stores, clothing stores, and shoe stores;
2. Educational facilities, except as provided in § 15.2-2824;
3. Health care facilities;
4. Rooms in which a public meeting or hearing is being held;
5. Places of entertainment and cultural facilities, including but not limited to theaters, concert halls, gymnasiums, auditoriums, other enclosed arenas, art galleries, libraries, and museums;
6. Indoor facilities used for recreational purposes; or
7. Other public places. [*EMPHASIS ADDED*]

Va. Code § 15.2-2832. Regulation of smoking; posting of signs. — Any person who owns, manages, or otherwise controls any building or area in which smoking is regulated by an ordinance shall post in an appropriate place, in a clear, conspicuous, and sufficient manner, "Smoking Permitted" signs, "No Smoking" signs, or "No-Smoking Section Available" signs. [*Emphasis Added.*]

Va. Code § 15.2-2833. Enforcement of ordinances. —

A. Any ordinance may provide a civil penalty of not more than \$25 for violations of any provision of such ordinance. [*EMPHASIS ADDED.*]

B. Any ordinance may provide that no person shall smoke in a designated no-smoking area and any person who continues to smoke in such area after being asked to refrain from smoking may be subject

to a civil penalty of not more than \$25.

C. Any ordinance shall provide that any law-enforcement officer may issue a summons regarding a violation of the ordinance.

D. Any civil penalties assessed under this section shall be paid into the treasury of the locality where the offense occurred and shall be expended solely for public health purposes. [*Emphasis*

Added.]

I sent out an email to every local government attorney in Virginia, requesting a copy of any ordinances their localities might have prohibiting smoking at bus stops. This is the only response:

Doug:

Fairfax has an ordinance to ban it in our metro bus shelters:

• Section 44-1-2.1. - Smoking prohibited in County-owned bus shelters.

It is unlawful for any person to smoke in any bus shelter owned by Fairfax County. Such shelters shall be posted with signs as required by Section 44-1-6. Any Fairfax County law-enforcement officer may issue a summons regarding a violation of this Section.

You should note that our ordinance is based upon the Virginia Indoor Clean Air Act, (Va. Code Ann § 15.2-2820 through -2833) to provide reasonable non-smoking areas, considering the nature of the use and the size of the building, in any building owned or leased by the Commonwealth or any agency thereof or a locality. (See § 15.2-2823(A)).

In this case we were dealing with Metro bus shelters. The Act does not define the word “building” but Black’s does: as a structure with walls and a roof, esp. a permanent structure. Since the Metro bus shelters are permanent structures with at least 3 walls and a roof, which incidentally, also qualify as “buildings” under the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code (See VUSBC, Part I Chapter 2, Definitions: 13 VAC 5-63-200, incorporating Section 202 of the International Building Code by reference,) we determined that the Act applies to them.

Once it was determined that the Act applied we had to determine how it would work. As a practical matter given the size of the Metro bus shelters only a complete smoking ban would be reasonable because anything else would not effectively provide the effective non-smoking area. The question came up later about the fact that folks smoke outside of the shelter and the smoke still comes in but we didn’t see any way to extend the Act to an open air area ban.

If you find out something to move it into the open areas please pass it along. If not hopefully I have given you something for consideration.

David L. Honadle

Assistant County Attorney

12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 549

Fairfax, Virginia 22035-0064

David.Honadle@fairfaxcounty.gov

703-324-2402

703-324-2665 (fax)

Based upon that response, it seems it is left to the Town’s own devices as to if, and how, we wish to proceed. I have somewhat arbitrarily chosen a distance of fifty (50) feet from a bus stop that smoking is prohibited. If Council wishes to proceed, some other reasonable distance, say 100 feet, can be chosen. It is also clear that Town Council would also have no authority to prohibit smoking on private property that is not open to the public, as would be a restaurant, for example. It is for that reason I confined the operation of the No Smoking at Bus Stops ordinance to public rights of way, such as on public sidewalks.

Council is requested to consider whether or not it wants to adopt an ordinance prohibiting smoking within 50 feet of school bus stops.

Legal Evaluation: There is some issue with whether simply posting this ordinance on the Town’s Municipal Homepage, and not “No Smoking” at each bus stop, is sufficient legal notice. However, from a practical standpoint, especially given only a \$25 civil penalty, the question is whether the

issue worthwhile to pursue, since most people would refrain from smoking is asked to stop if smoking in the presence of children.

Council Discussion:

Mr. Napier noted that it is only a \$25 civil penalty then signs may be best to just have the school send notes to remind notes to school children. Mayor Tharpe asked if an ordinance could state that the an umbrella ordinance could be imposed. Mr. Napier stated that an umbrella ordinance may be enough, as long as the Town does not rigorously enforce the matter.

Mr. Napier stated that no other ordinance was present in another locality in the State of Virginia.

Councilman Meza noted that he liked the idea of sending out the letters to families reminding them not to smoke around the children. He stated that he would like to see notices from the school system first before an ordinance enforcement. Mayor Tharpe noted that cigarettes are considered a drug. Vice Mayor Tewalt stated that this has nothing to do with Council's job and was a waste of time. He noted that the next step would be an ordinance "how to raise your children." Councilman Morrison noted that Fairfax County and Winchester had an ordinance.

Mayor Tharpe noted that

6. Budget Calendar for FY 2018-2019 – Town Manager

Summary: The FY2018-19 budget calendar that staff is proposing provides preliminary budget discussions beginning with the first work session in January 2018, along with providing the proposed FY18-19 budget to council by February 1, 2018. This will allow three work sessions to discuss the proposed budget before council is requested to vote on the 2018 tax rates and almost four months before voting on the budget appropriations.

Council is requested to give feedback to staff on the proposed FY2018-19 budget calendar.

Staff Evaluation: Staff feels that the proposed FY2018-19 budget calendar is a fair compromise for the time preparing the proposed budget, the time for the planning commission to review the capital improvement plan prior to presenting to council, and allowing council time to review the proposed budget before voting on the 2018 tax rates/appropriation ordinance.

Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Budget Calendar

Sept 5, 2017 Capital Improvement forms distributed to departments

Sept 25, 2017 Finance Department distributes FY19 Budget forms to Departments (FY17 Figures provided will not be final/audited figures)

Sept 30 2017 Departments requests for 5 year CIP due to Finance with justifications

Oct 6, 2017 Compiled CIP sent to Planning Commission for Review

Oct 31, 2017 FY19 Departmental spending requests due back to Finance

Nov 12-16, 2017 Town Manager preliminary review spending with Departments

Dec 15, 2018	Mid-year FY18 Budget transfers due from departments
Jan 2, 2018	Work Session – review of capital improvement plan from planning commission & other possible major items that may be included in FY19 proposed budget
Jan 15, 2018	Revenue Forecast Review
Feb 1, 2018	Town Manager’s Recommended Budget to Town Council
Feb 5, 2018	Work Session. Revenues & General Fund Expenditures Review
Feb 19, 2018	Work Session – Review Enterprise Fund Expenditures
Feb 20, 2018	Advertisement for annual tax rate for Real and Personal Property – rate has to be set prior to April 1
March 5, 2018	Budget Work Session to further discuss tax rate (If Necessary)
Mar 12, 2018	Public Hearing & First Reading of Town Tax rates for both Real Estate and Personal Property
Mar 26, 2018	Second and Final Reading of Town Tax rates for both Real Estate and Personal Property
April 2018	Council review proposed budget during scheduled work sessions (if requested)
May 28, 2018	Public Hearing & First Reading of Appropriations Ordinance and Rate Ordinances
June 4, 2018	Budget Work Session (if requested)
June 11, 2018	Second and Final Reading of Appropriation Ordinance and Rate Ordinances

Council Discussion:

Vice Mayor Tewalt noted that pay incentives, new employees, health insurance changes, CIP items, and major changes and staffing levels need to be provided to Council much earlier before the budget

is presented to Council. Councilman Sealock commended Mr. Wilson and Mr. Waltz for their work. He noted that dates should be honored and he would be checking. Councilman Connolly asked if the calendar would be updated if need be. Mr. Wilson stated that forecasting would be updated as need be. Mayor Tharpe noted that projections have been higher in the past and things have been much more conservative in the last year. Councilman Meza expressed his delight with the schedule. He asked for a session for the goal setting of Council in order to allow Staff to build the budget around the desires of Council and to shape the Capital Improvement Plan and perhaps even save 5% on the budget even. Mr. Waltz noted that the Council Retreat planned for September is the plan in order to accommodate the goals of Council. Mr. Wilson noted that Staff hopes to have more

7. Council Discussion/Goals

Council discussed possible retreat days.

8. CLOSED MEETING – Consultation with Legal Counsel

Motion to Go Into Closed Meeting

Councilman Connolly moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Tewalt, that Council convene and go into Closed Meeting for the purpose of consultation with legal counsel employed or retained by a public body regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel, such matters being the unauthorized appropriation of the Town's intellectual property and business interests, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711. A. 7. of the Code of Virginia.

VOTE HERE

Motion to Certify Closed Meeting at its Conclusion *[At the conclusion of the Closed Meeting, immediately*

re-convene in open meeting and take a roll call vote on the following:]

Councilman Connolly moved, seconded by Councilman Meza, that Council certify that to the best of each member's knowledge, as recognized by each Council member's affirmative vote, that only such public business matters lawfully exempted from Open Meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act as were identified in the motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the Closed Meeting by Council, and that the vote of each individual member of Council be taken by roll call and recorded and included in the minutes of the meeting of Town Council.

VOTE HERE

VOTE HERE

VOTE HERE