



TOWN COUNCIL WORK SESSION

Monday, October 16, 2017 @ 7:00pm
Town Hall Council Chambers

1. Presentation from Town's Health Insurance Carrier – *The Local Choice (TLC)*

Mrs. Bush introduced Mr. Norman with The Local Choice, who gave a presentation to Council on the TLC program in Virginia. Councilman Meza asked about the options of the five choices available. Mr. Norman stated that the Town can choose 3 of the 5 plans offered. Mr. Norman presented the following to Council:

The Local Choice Health Benefits Program

TLC HISTORY

- Established by Legislature in 1990
- Self-Funded Program with a Fully Insured Regional Plan Option
- Exclusively for Schools and Political Subdivisions
- Managed by DHRM
- Premium Represents Entire Funding

Effective Dates and Renewal Dates

- Groups May Join at Any Time
- School Groups May Choose to Renew on July 1 or October 1
- All Non-School Groups Renew on July 1

FY 2017 TLC Statistics

- Over 345 Groups
 - ◆ 435+ Distinct FEINs
- 40,000+ Employees
- Over 71,000 Total Insureds

Group Sizes 1 to 1,600 Employees

- 54% of groups have less than 50 Employees
- 36% between 50 and 300 Employees
- 10% have more than 300 Employees
- 2017 Statewide Self-Funded Total Annual Plan Cost - \$433,788,673
- 2017 Annual Fully Insured Regional Premium - \$5,982,739

Self-Funded Plans Have Stop Loss Protection

Specific Stop Protection is Provided for All Groups

Attachment Points

Under 300	\$100,000 * (Front Royal)
300 to 999	\$125,000
1000 to 1499	\$175,000
1500 +	\$200,000

Carriers and Plans

For Active Employees and Early Retirees

- ☐ Administered by Anthem
 - ❖ Key Advantage Expanded
 - ❖ Key Advantage 250 *
 - ❖ Key Advantage 500 *
 - ❖ Key Advantage 1000
 - ❖ High Deductible Health Plan *
- ☐ Administered by Kaiser Permanente
 - ❖ Fully Insured Regional HMO Plan

*Front Royal Selections

Regional Plan

- ☐ Regional Plan Is Fully Insured and Experience Rated with All Groups Paying the Same Rate Regardless of Location, Demographics or Experience
- ☐ Kaiser Permanente HMO Provides Our Regional Plan and Is Available in Northern Virginia (Live or Work)
- **Virginia Counties:** Arlington, Caroline, Culpeper, Fairfax, Fauquier, Hanover, King George, Louisa, Loudoun, Orange, Prince William, Stafford, Spotsylvania, Westmoreland
- **Cities:** Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Fredericksburg, Manassas, Manassas Park

Pooled Benefits

State Wide – Self-Funded

- ❖ Active Employee and Early Retiree Medical/MHSA by Anthem with Dental by Delta Dental
- ❖ Rx by ESI through Anthem
- ❖ Medicare Eligible Retiree Medical and Dental Coverage by Anthem

Plan Availability

1-15 employees	1 plan
16 – 100 employees	2 plans One of which may be the HDHP or the regional plan
100+ employees	2 KA plans + HDHP and/or the regional plan

Rating Pools

- ◆ In Addition to Group Demographics,
TLC Groups Fall in 1 of 3 Pools
 - Community or Pooled - 1 to 49 EEs
 - Credibility Factor Rated – 50 to 299 EEs *
 - 100% Credible Experience Rated –
300 + EEs

Community Rated or Pooled

- Experience for all 1 to 49 Employee Groups is Pooled Together
- Individual Group Experience is not a Factor in Rating
- Dental, Rx and Medicare Supplemental Components Are Fully Pooled

Credibility Factor Rated

<u>Group Size</u>	<u>Credibility Factor</u>
■ 50 - 99	41% of group's medical experience
■ 100 - 149	58% of group's medical experience
■ 150 - 199	* 71% of group's medical experience
■ 200 - 249	82% of group's medical experience
■ 250 - 299	91% of group's medical experience
■ Remainder of Experience Rate Comes From Pooling All Groups between 50 and 300 Employees	
■ Dental, Rx and Medicare Supplemental Products Are Fully Pooled	

100% Credible Experience Rated

- Rating for 300+ Employee Groups Considers 100% of the Group's Medical/MHSA Experience
- Dental, Rx and Medicare Supplemental Products Are Fully Pooled

Optional Retiree Coverage

State Wide, Self-Funded Plans for

Medicare Eligible Retirees

(Administered by Anthem)

- ❖ Advantage 65 *
- ❖ Advantage 65 with Dental/Vision
- ❖ Medicare Complementary Available as Grandfathered Plan

(An Employer May Select Only 1)

* Front Royal Selection – Closed Group

Underwriting and Eligibility Requirements

- Group Created by or of an Act of GA (enabling legislation required)
- No Minimum Participation Requirement
- 80% Minimum Employer Contribution for F/T Employees
- 50% of F/T Employer Contribution Required for P/T Employees
- No Required Dependent Contribution if 75%+ Participation
- No Required Contribution for Retirees
- Employers May Fund from Average Plan Cost

Adverse Experience Adjustment Protection (AEA)

- Terminating Groups May Be Accessed AEA
- No Adjustment Applied if No Deficit Exists
- 300+ Based on Actual Employer Plan Losses
- 1 to 299 Based on Exposure % of Pool Losses
- AEA Assures Current Member Groups Will Not Be Penalized for a Terminating Group's Losses

TLC Highlights

- Dedicated customer service unit
- Benefits similar to state employees
- Procurement Savings
- Multiple Plan Choices
- Shared Risk Concept
- Low Administrative Costs
 - 225,000 + Insureds with State and TLC (8th largest Anthem account nationwide)
- AEA Protection

Stable Premiums

- 6.46 % Last 5 Year Average Adjustment
- 5.26 % Last 10 Year Average Adjustment

TLC Highlights

Stable Composition

- 100+ Original Group Members
- 99%+ Persistency

Adverse Experience Adjustment Protection situation – Mr. Norman explained that the Town could experience this and how this liability could be adjusted and how the Town could be penalized. He noted that the claims experience for the Town is about 140% for Front Royal, meaning that the Town employees claim experience is higher than other localities in the area.

Councilman Tewalt requested a breakdown of what is paid for each plan sent to the Town Council. Mayor Tharpe asked that it be sent to Council via email and it would return to the worksession table in November. Mr. Meza noted that it appreciated the information greatly.

2. Blue Ridge Heritage Project Request for Memorial Site – Darryl Merchant

Summary: Chairman of the Front Royal/Warren County Chapter of the Blue Ridge Heritage Project, Darryl Merchant is seeking permission from the Town Council to locate a memorial on town-owned property located on the north side of Criser Road between the Burrell Brooks Park and Happy Creek. The memorial is to acknowledge and honor those individuals who were displaced when the Commonwealth of Virginia used eminent domain to acquire their land to create the Shenandoah National Park. A flagpole, two benches and information signage will also be included on the site. Construction costs are to be paid for through fundraising efforts of the local chapter.

Council Discussion: Vice Mayor Tewalt asked about the maintenance of the site. Mr. Merchant asked if the Town would consider the site in their annual maintenance program. Mr. Tewalt voiced support in the project. Mr. Merchant noted that Warren Beatty's family was linked to the area and has been contacted. Council voiced strong support of the project.

3. Continued Discussion of Proposed Adoption of Tethering Restrictions for Dogs

Ordinance – Town Attorney

Summary: Proposed Section 66-11.1, Tethering Restriction for Dogs/Canines, a mirror ordinance to an ordinance which was adopted by the County of Warren on September 19, 2017, mirrored 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) either 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 canine 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, according to the County's Animal Control.

Budget/Funding: As Animal Control measures which involve housing canines which need to be picked up and housed are enforced by Warren County's Sheriff's Office Animal Control Officers, direct Town budgeting and funding are expected to be relatively minimal, instead being paid through Countywide (including within already within the Town) budgeting and funding.

Council Discussion: In response to Mr. Meza's question, Mr. Napier noted that the County's ordinance would only apply in unincorporated portions of the Town and there are multiple ordinances in place for animal cruelty though it would be more difficult for animal cruelty to be proven without the proposed ordinance. Mr. Napier stated that the proposed ordinance would bring the matter to clearer measures for Animal Control.

Vice Mayor Tewalt asked how adequate shelter is determined; Mr. Napier noted that it was determined by the State Code as noted in the attached handout. Mr. Tewalt stated that the Animal Control Officer would decide how matters would be determined. Mr. Napier stated that the Animal Control Officers are licensed and trained and would be able to properly determine the measure.

Councilman Meza noted that his concern was that the ordinance was specific about leash weight and time and temperature and shelter requirements and it was quite specific. He stated that how animals were treated and he was unsure why Council would be so specific when they would not be so specific on other matters in the Town. He expressed concern that it was not the best approach. Vice Mayor Tewalt stated that he tended to agree with Mr. Meza, noted that when the Council began to provide specifications for how to handle your animals it went beyond the measure of what the Council should be doing.

Councilman Sealock stated that the Town discussed chickens, rabbits and bees before he was elected to Council and now the Town is endorsing an ordinance to protect dogs. He noted that if anyone had called for help from the County Animal Control, they would find out that the County does not have a whole lot of say on some matters. He added that while most take care of their animals and children, some constituents do not and that is the intent of this ordinance.

Mayor Tharpe noted that it should move forward on the agenda and be advertised.

4. Continued Discussion of Proposed Adoption of Towing Board Ordinance – *Town Attorney*

Summary: The Town's Police Department and the County's Sheriff's Office each have need of using commercial tow company operators, both to tow disabled vehicles and to tow traffic infractors who for whatever reason are then-disabled to drive. Currently, both law enforcement agencies use "Tow Company Rotation Agreements", whereby local tow company operators who wish to be placed on a list to be used by the law enforcement agencies are called on a rotating, 24 hour on-call basis to make tows. Unfortunately, both agencies have encountered difficulties with this mechanism, particularly to regulate tow companies who over-charge citizens for tows in relation to what are standard fees in the industry locally, tow company operators who do not have proper equipment to make particular tows such as when a tractor trailer needs a tow, and no mechanisms in place to ensure that tows are made in a timely fashion, and to properly regulate tow parking facilities. The proposed ordinance seeks to address all these issues. In order to do so, the Code of Virginia requires the adoption of a towing advisory board appointed by the governing body, which Va. Code § 46.2-1217 states: "*Prior to adopting an ordinance or entering into a contract pursuant to this section, the local governing body shall appoint an advisory board to advise the governing body with regard to the appropriate provisions of the ordinance or terms of the contract. The advisory board shall include representatives of local law-enforcement agencies, towing and recovery operators, and the general public.*" State Code further allows for the appointment of joint towing boards where the towing ordinances are to be mirrored between the Town and the County and to cover mutual geographic territories (Town and County), and to be used by multiple law enforcement agencies, in this case, the Town Police Department, the County Sheriff's Office, and the State Police. Warren County adopted its Joint Towing Board ordinance on September 19, 2019, contingent on Town Council adopting its. It is my understanding that the Front Royal Police Department is in solid agreement with this proposed ordinance, as it has been asking for the adoption of this ordinance for some time.

Council is requested to consider whether or not it wants to adopt a mirror ordinance to the County's Joint Town Board ordinance.

Staff Evaluation: From a standpoint of law enforcement, as well as to prevent confusion by towing operators, adoption of a mirror ordinance to the County's ordinance, would be helpful, to both law enforcement agencies as well as tow operators and the general public.

Council Discussion: Mayor Tharpe stated that this arose a few years back when someone was charged over \$1,000 and the vehicle was taken out of town and stored. Mr. Tewalt noted that the Towing Board would be working on rates. Mayor Tharpe and Mr. Napier stated that Council would not be involved in the picture in any way shape or form.

5. Special Use Permit for amendment of an existing special use permit related to a garage at 8 W. 14th Street – Seymour Robinson, Jr. – *Director of Planning/Zoning*

Summary: Attached with this coverage is a Staff Report with detailed information on the request, including the recommendations of the Planning Commission. Also attached is a copy of the application submittal from the applicant.

Staff Evaluation: The Planning Commission recommended approval of the special use permit application, with the following conditions. The Planning Commission also made a recommendation to Town Council that the Town consider adding a sidewalk along the front of the property and marking the alley.

SUP Conditions (recommended by Planning Commission)

1. This special use permit is only valid for the purpose of authorizing an automobile garage with NO body work and painting services.
2. No more than sixteen (16) vehicles shall be kept or parked on the site at one time.
3. At least ten (10) parking spaces shall be striped for customer parking.
4. Outdoor Storage shall NOT be allowed on the property, except in conformance with Town Code 175-44.
5. The adjacent alley and travel lane through the front parking area shall be kept free and clear of vehicles.
6. Vehicles shall NOT be kept or parked within 5 feet of the curb along the property frontage. Furthermore, for the life of the special use permit, the public shall have right-of-passage over the 5-foot wide area and the Town shall have the authority to paint a line on the existing asphalt to delineate the walkway.
7. Town Council, or other designated representative, may inspect the property at any reasonable time to ensure compliance with local regulations, including, but not limited to, the conditions placed on this special use permit. Upon inspection of the property, if it is found that the property is not in compliance with local regulations, including but not limited to, the conditions of this special use permit, the Town may revoke this special use permit after notice to the applicant and public hearing.

Council Discussion: Mayor Tharpe suggested that the sidewalk actually be installed. Vice Mayor Tewalt noted that current tags should be on the vehicles that are sitting on the lot rather than being sitting there for 6-8 months. Vice Mayor Tewalt asked if the SUP could be transferred to another business. Mr. Camp stated that it could transfer with another business.

Council chose to move the matter forward.

6. Special Use Permit for permission to develop a nonconforming lot in R-1 District on E. 13th Street Dwight Dunton, Jr. – Director of Planning/Zoning

Summary: Attached with this coverage is a Staff Report with detailed information on the request, including the recommendations of the Planning Commission. Also attached is a copy of the application submittal from the applicant.

Staff Evaluation: The Planning Commission recommended approval of the special use permit application, as submitted. The Planning Commission's motion also included the following statements for the record:

- 1) The applicant is advised to purchase the adjacent vacant lot if it becomes available and consolidate it with the subject lot. This will increase the property value of the future house and allow the house to be expanded in the future.*
- 2) It is recommended that any future applications for a house on the adjacent vacant lot, whether made by the current or future owner be denied. A house on the vacant adjacent lot cannot meet the minimum corner lot setback requirements.*

3) *The applicant is advised to decrease the front se setback of the proposed house to more closely match the setback of the adjacent house, while still meeting minimum setback requirements of the Town Code.*

FROM PLANNING STAFF REPORT:

Town Code 175-128.A. establishes special rules for developing on nonconforming lots in the R-1 District. These rules differ from the rules for other districts, which pursuant to Town Code 175-125.B., do not include rules related to the existing lot size and lot width, provided that the setback and other requirements of the Town Code are complied with. In the R-1 District, nonconforming lots must meet special criteria if they are to be developed, and in cases where the minimum lot width or minimum lot area are less than 80% of the R-1 District Standard, a special use permit is required. The applicant's lot is less than 80% of the minimum standards for the R-1 District, therefore a special use permit application is required.

Below are the minimum lot width and minimum lot area requirements for the R-1 District, as specified under Town Code 175-13 for lots serviced by public water and public sewer:

- **Minimum Lot Width: 75 feet**
- **Minimum Lot Area: 10,000 square feet**

175-128 NONCONFORMING LOTS OF RECORD

A. Except as hereinafter provided, the minimum lot width and lot area shall be required for the establishment of any new lot, or use of a lot, in the R-1 Residential District. Wherever possible, the consolidation of existing nonconforming lots is encouraged to meet the minimum lot size requirements. All new construction shall conform to the yard dimensions and all other regulations for the R-1 Residential District.

1. The Administrator may issue an administrative variance of up to twenty percent (20%) of the required lot width and/or area, where it is found that the proposed new construction is consistent with the structure size, orientation and pattern of development on the street and in the immediate neighborhood.

2. On lots with an area or lot width of less than eighty percent (80%) of the minimum required, approval for construction may be granted by special permit by the Town Council, where the Council finds the application meets the following conditions:

- a. The proposed structure has a finished floor area of not less than ninety percent (90%) of the amount of finished floor area prevalent in comparative homes. Finished floor areas do not include basement areas.**
 - b. The proposed structure is compatible with comparative homes in terms of building orientation, scale, proportion and site layout.**
 - c. The site grading provides for adequate drainage on and off the site, without any adverse impact onto adjoining properties.**
- 3. For the purpose of this section, comparative homes shall mean characteristics that are present in at least sixty percent (60%) of the homes**

located on both sides of the street in the immediate block where the proposed structure is located.

4. The Council may approve a reduction of the side yard requirement, by not more than forty percent (40%), where necessary, to achieve increased compatibility with other structures in the immediate block.

B. In any other residential district, a single dwelling may be erected on any single lot of record, notwithstanding limitations imposed by other provisions of this chapter. This provision shall apply even though such lot fails to meet the requirements for lot area and/or lot width, that are generally applicable in the district, provided that yard dimensions shall conform to the regulations for the district in which such lot is located. All other uses, except a single dwelling, are required to meet the minimum lot area requirements for the district in which it is located.

The Town is authorized to require a special use permit for certain uses within any zoning district under Virginia Code §15.2-2286. Some specific uses are granted protection from regulation from localities by the Virginia Code, including agriculture uses, small scale conversion of biomass to alternative fuel, certain residential uses, private tents, farm wineries, assisted living facilities, and group homes.

The issuance of a special use permit is subject to such conditions as are deemed necessary by the Front Royal Town Council after recommendations of the Front Royal Planning Commission. Prior to an action by Town Council or a recommendation by the Planning Commission, a public hearing is required for special use permits.

Review

175-128.A. allows for new development of nonconforming lots in the R-1 District when certain criteria are met. These criteria are shown below with commentary from Town Staff.

a. The proposed structure has a finished floor area of not less than ninety percent (90%) of the amount of finished floor area prevalent in comparative homes. Finished floor areas do not include basement areas.

The proposed house exceeds 90% of the amount of finished floor area prevalent in comparative homes.

b. The proposed structure is compatible with comparative homes in terms of building orientation, scale, proportion and site layout.

Building Orientation – *The applicant's proposed house faces the front of the lot.*

Scale – *The proposed house appears to have a similar scale to other comparative houses and lots in the area. The Lot for Comparative 1 is about the same size as the applicants. The other lots are a little larger but all are nonconforming.*

Proportion – *The applicant's proposed house has similar proportions to the comparative houses. All of the comparative houses are either 1 ½ or 2 stories.*

The applicant's proposed house has a proposed setback of 35.5 feet, which is setback greater than comparative homes on the same street. Staff would recommend the applicant moving the house forward to the extent allowed by the Town Code to create a more consistent street frontage.

No driveway or parking is shown for the proposed house.

c. The site grading provides for adequate drainage on and off the site, without any adverse impact onto adjoining properties.

The applicant has submitted no information regarding drainage.

Staff has forwarded the following questions to the applicant, and the applicant will be prepared to address these before or after the meeting with the Planning Commission.

- 1) How will stormwater be managed on the site to prevent drainage issues?
- 2) Where will the driveway and parking spaces be located?
- 3) Can you acquire the lot to the east? If this property could be consolidated into the proposed house lot there would be no need for a special use permit.

If the applicant addresses the above issues adequately Staff does not object to approval of the special use permit. Additional housing in the Town is needed, provided that the development is done appropriately. Before issuance of a zoning permit for construction, the applicant will be required to obtain approval of this special use permit. In addition, the applicant is required to submit for a zoning permit application and complete the house location plan to address all requirements of the Town Code, and to pay all applicable utility connection and other fees that are required by Town Code.

Following a public hearing and discussion, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the special use permit by the following motion:

Vice Chairman Jones moved to recommend approval to Town Council of special use permit application FRSPU-000484, as submitted, to allow construction of a single-family dwelling on Tax Map 20A3-4-55, lot 25. I further move that the following conditional recommendations be made part of the record:

1) The applicant is advised to purchase the adjacent vacant lot if it becomes available and consolidate it with the subject lot. This will increase the property value of the future house and allow the house to be expanded in the future.

2) It is recommended that any future applications for a house on the adjacent vacant lot, whether made by the current or future owner be denied. A house on the vacant adjacent lot cannot meet the minimum corner lot setback requirements.

3) The applicant is advised to decrease the front setback of the proposed house to more closely match the setback of the adjacent house, while still meeting minimum setback requirements of the Town Code.

Seconded by Commissioner Gushee.

Council Discussion: Council chose to move the matter forward.

7. Solid Waste Update – *Director of Public Works*

REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA

8. Discussion of Land Exchange Agreement between the Afton Inn & the former Town Hall
Summary: Discussion on the covenants and conditions with the land exchange between the Afton Inn and the former Town Hall. One of the items for discussion tonight is the placement of an historical plaque on the former Town Hall. According to the Land Exchange Agreement, Town Council will have to approve the plaque's appearance, informative content, and place of placement.

Discussion on the covenants and conditions in the agreements along with the overall design appearance, informative content, and place of placement for the historical plaque for the former Town Hall

Council Discussion: Council chose to discuss only the matter of the plaque. Mr. Waltz stated that Patrick Farris was under the assumption that the plaque was to be erected on the grounds and it was not the desire of the Council. Mr. Napier stated that the plaque should be placed on the old Town Hall. Mr. Sealock stated that Mr. Farris' wording should be placed on the plaque and then put it on the building.

9. Continued Discussion of Property Maintenance Code Amendments and Establishment of a Rental Inspection District

REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA

10. Continued Discussion of Curb and Gutter Assessments

REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA

11. Resubmission of Ordinance Amendment to Chapter 170 "Weeds and Debris" – *Mayor Tharpe*

Summary: Mayor Tharpe has asked that Council consider reviewing the proposed amendments to Chapter 170 "Weeds and Debris" that were denied by Town Council on November 9, 2015. Attached is the Ordinance Amendment as submitted to Council in 2015 and minutes.

Council Discussion: Mr. Brock noted that the season adjustment would allow him to address the matter even past the dates noted in the Town Code. Council stated that the dates were ones they were in agreement to change. Council chose to move forward with the amendments in order to assist Staff with their work in the community.

12. Sidewalks and Street Lights on Progress Drive – *Councilman Morrison*

REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA

13. Council Discussion/Goals

none

14. CLOSED MEETING – 1) Potential Development and 2) McKay Spring

Motion to Go Into Closed Meeting

Councilman Connolly moved, seconded by Councilman Gillispie that Council convene and go into Closed Meeting for the following purposes: (1) Discussion and consideration of a potential public-private partnership under the provisions of The Public-Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act of 2002, related to potential development at or near the intersection of Shenandoah Avenue and the new bridge at the south end of the South Fork of the Shenandoah River, under the following specific provisions of the Freedom of Information Act: (A) Discussion or consideration of the investment of public funds where competition or bargaining is involved, where, if made public initially, the financial interest of the governmental unit would be adversely affected, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711. A. 6. of the Code of Virginia; and (B) Consultation with legal counsel employed or retained by a public body regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711. A.7. of the Code of Virginia; and, (2) The disposition of publicly held real property, specifically, the McKay Springs property, pursuant to Section 2.2- 3711. A.3., where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body.

Vote: Yes – Connolly, Gillispie, Meza, Morrison, Sealock and Tewalt

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

(Mayor Tharpe did not vote as there was no tie to require his vote)

(By Roll Call)

Motion to Certify Closed Meeting at its Conclusion

Councilman Connolly moved, seconded by Councilman Sealock, 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: Yes – Connolly, Gillispie, Meza, Morrison, Sealock and Tewalt

No – N/A

Abstain – N/A

Absent – N/A

(Mayor Tharpe did not vote as there was no tie to require his vote)

(By Roll Call)
