

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF CORRECTIONS

Regular Meeting	October 21, 2009
Location	6900 Atmore Drive Richmond, Virginia
Presiding	Sterling C. Proffitt, Chairman
Present	Cynthia M. Alksne Jonathan T. Blank James H. Burrell Peter G. Decker, III Raymond W. Mitchell B. A. Washington, Sr.
Absent.....	Rev. Anthony C. Paige James R. Socas

1:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 21, 2009
6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia 23225

The meeting was called to order. The Chairman welcomed everyone, and the roll was called. Two members were absent from the verbal roll call and as indicated above. A quorum was present. The Chairman then asked meeting attendees to identify themselves for the record.

I. Board Chairman (Mr. Proffitt)

1) **Motion to Approve September Board Minutes**

The Chairman called for a Motion to approve the September Board Minutes.

By **MOTION** duly made by Mr. Washington and seconded by Mr. Decker, the Minutes were **APPROVED** as presented by verbally responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Burrell, Decker, Washington).

There were no questions and there was no discussion. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. There were two absences. Mr. Mitchell's vote was not considered as he was not present at the September meeting. The Motion carried.

2) **Report of Nominating Committee on Proposed Slate of Officers**

In September, Mr. Decker was asked to Chair the Nominating Committee with Messrs. Washington and Blank as Committee members. After a brief recess, Mr. Decker reported that he and the Committee had arrived at and proposed the following slate of Officers:

Mr. Mitchell, Secretary; Mr. Burrell, Vice Chairman; and Mr. Proffitt, Chairman.

There were no nominations from the floor; therefore, the proposed slate was voted on individually as follows:

By **MOTION** duly made by Ms. Alksne and seconded by Mr. Blank, Mr. Mitchell was **APPROVED** and elected Board Secretary by verbally responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Burrell, Decker, Washington).

There were no questions and there was no discussion. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. There were two absences. Mr. Mitchell abstained from the vote. The Motion carried.

By **MOTION** duly made by Ms. Alksne and seconded by Mr. Blank, Mr. Burrell was **APPROVED** and elected Board Vice Chairman by verbally responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Decker, Mitchell, Washington).

There were no questions and there was no discussion. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. There were two absences. Mr. Burrell abstained from the vote. The Motion carried.

And by **MOTION** duly made by Ms. Alksne and seconded by Mr. Burrell, Mr. Proffitt was **APPROVED** and elected Board Chairman by verbally responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Burrell Decker, Mitchell, Washington).

There were no questions and there was no discussion. There were no opposing votes. There were two absences. Mr. Proffitt abstained from the vote. The Motion carried.

Mr. Proffitt thanked the Board members for their confidence and faith.

3) **Motion to Approve Board Meeting Dates for 2010**

The proposed meeting dates for 2010 were included in the Board package. The meetings will continue to be held the 3rd Wednesday beginning with March. There will be no meeting until after the General Assembly has concluded its 2010 Session. Therefore, the Board meetings for 2010 are: ***March 17, May 19, July 21, September 15, October 20 and November 17.***

By **MOTION** duly made by Mr. Mitchell and seconded by Mr. Burrell, the 2010 Board meeting dates were **APPROVED** by verbally responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Burrell, Decker, Mitchell, Washington).

There were no questions and there was no discussion. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. There were two absences. The Motion carried.

II. Public/Other Comment (Mr. Proffitt)

Two members of the general public requested to address the Board. Mrs. Newbanks is Executive Director of FACES of Virginia Families: Foster, Adoption, and Kinship Association. She thanked the Board for the opportunity to present brief comments. Each Board member was provided a typed document which outlined her speech. That document is included in the Board file.

Once she had provided a brief overview of her organization's mission and entertained some general questions from the Board, the Director asked Mr. Leininger to contact her to further discuss her proposal.

The other speaker was Ms. Jay George (phonetically) with the Exodus Foundation. She had some general questions more appropriately addressed by Mr. Johnson. She inquired about the change to the new 7-digit inmate number. It was explained this change was necessary because the Department is going to a new Offender Management System. She noted that with the closing of facilities, inmates had been transferred to institutions with a higher security level and enquired if hardship transfers would be entertained in order to transfer affected inmates back. She was advised that these inmates are being tracked and as soon as bed space becomes available, they will be moved. She made some other general comments and then closed her remarks.

There were no questions or comments. The Chairman thanked the ladies for their comments. No action by the Board was required.

III. Liaison Committee (Mr. Burrell)

Mr. Burrell gave a brief overview of the Committee meeting. Mrs. deSocio's report was bleak as far as budget news was concerned, and she reported that more cuts are in the offing. Mrs. Lipp reported the Grayson County facility is scheduled for completion in July of 2010 and that inmate labor is currently being utilized in order to save costs wherever possible. Mr. Wilson indicated the current out-of-compliance number was 3,450. He also reported that Richmond City, the Meherrin River Regional and the Rappahannock, Shenandoah, Warren Regional Jails would be coming to the Board for approval of their construction projects. Mr. Bass reported that with the closing of Brunswick and Botetourt, inmates have been moved to other state facilities with the exception of the 120 placed in local jails.

After some general questions, Mr. Burrell's report was concluded. No Board action is required. Mr. Proffitt thanked Mr. Burrell for his report.

IV. Administration Committee (Mr. Decker)

Mr. Decker noted there will be a time change for the November meeting. The meeting will begin at 12:00.

Board Motion to Replace Language in Previously Approved Board Motion to Transfer Chatham Diversion Center to Pittsylvania County

Due to changes being requested by an attorney for the Department of General Services, the previously approved Board motion to transfer 13.56 acres, more or less, at the Chatham Diversion Center to Pittsylvania County has been revised.

Therefore, by *MOTION* duly made by Mr. Decker, seconded by Mr. Mitchell and duly *APPROVED* by responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Burrell, Decker, Paige, Washington):

“Pursuant to Sections 53.18 and 2.2-1150 of the Code of Virginia, Chapter 625 of the 2009 Virginia Acts of Assembly, “An Act to authorize the Department of Corrections to convey certain real property to the County of Pittsylvania,” and as requested by the Department of Corrections, the Board of Corrections approves the transfer of the following portions of the Chatham Diversion Center to the County of Pittsylvania:

- 1. A portion of the Camp 15 Work Camp facility consisting of 13.56 acres, more or less, to include the Diversion Center and outbuildings; and**
- 2. The structure and property referred to as the Warden’s Residence containing 1.50 acres, more or less.**

The property to be conveyed is more particularly described and shown on that certain plat of survey entitled, “Pittsylvania County Virginia, Situated in Chatham Magisterial District, Being Part GPIN: 2415-22-1875, Plat of Preliminary Survey For: Pittsylvania County Board of Supervisors,” prepared by Crane Surveying PLLC, dated January 14, 2009, as “1.50+/- ACRES” and “13.56+/- ACRES.”

The legal descriptions of the parcels may be modified to conform to accurate surveys or other more accurate information.

The terms and conditions of the transfer shall be as follows:

- A. The County shall pay all costs and expenses incurred by the Commonwealth in the transfer. There shall be no other consideration paid by the County for the transfer.**
- B. The requirements, terms and conditions typically imposed on purchasers or grantees of Commonwealth property conveyed to localities or other political subdivisions pursuant to Section 2.2-1150 (a)(1) of the Code of Virginia, as determined by the Department of General Services, shall be applicable to the transfer.”**

This transfer is being made as a part of the Governor’s FY 2009 Reduction Plan. The Director of the Department of Corrections is hereby authorized to prepare, execute and deliver such deed and other documents as may be necessary to accomplish the conveyance.

There were no questions and there was no discussion. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. There were two absences. The Motion carried.

There was no other discussion and no further Board action is required. Mr. Proffitt thanked Mr. Decker for his report.

V. Correctional Services Committee Report/Policy & Regulations (Mr. Washington)

With Board members Burrell, Paige, Washington and Proffitt and several guests present, the Committee met to discuss several items:

1) **Discussion on Piedmont House**

Piedmont House has been under review by the Board since September of last year when they underwent their Certification Audit during which several deficiencies were cited. Of particular concern was that an independent financial audit had not been conducted as required by the Standards. Also during this period, the facility experienced personnel turnovers which affected operations. As a result, the Board requested the Department's Compliance and Accreditation Unit to again review the operation and report back in July. The report was presented with several concerns still being noted. As a result, this item had been deferred from September in order to give the facility an opportunity to come into complete compliance. In order to do that, the financial audit must be completed. The audit is in process and should be completed in time for the next meeting of the Board.

Therefore, this item is deferred to the November Board meeting. No action by the Board is required.

2) **Appeal by Fairfax County Adult Detention Center to Finding of Non-Compliance with Standard 6VAC15-40-580 from Unannounced Inspection**

The Sheriff had a scheduling conflict and requested this item be deferred to the November meeting. The Board agreed; therefore, no action by the Board is required at this time.

3) **Board Motion to Approve Revised Community-Based Corrections Plan for the Meherrin River Regional Jail**

On July 16, 2009, the Board approved the community-based corrections plan (CBCP) for the Meherrin River Regional Jail. The original CBCP called for the construction of two facilities. The main facility that was to be located in Brunswick County and have a DOC operational rated capacity of 672 beds, and a satellite facility was to be located in Mecklenburg with a rated capacity of 126 for a total rated capacity of 798 beds. The combined average daily population (ADP) for all three counties in 2006 was 317 inmates per day.

One reason the Mecklenburg facility was included was because of the distance of over 50 miles between some areas of Mecklenburg County and the proposed jail site in Brunswick County. Some of the towns in Mecklenburg County have only one law enforcement officer on duty. Therefore, an officer making an arrest and having to transport a defendant may leave the town without law enforcement protection for two hours or more.

The other reason for having a satellite facility in Mecklenburg is that the Sheriff operates a work release program in the county to help inmates keep their employment or find work prior to being released back into society; also, some inmates are sentenced to report on weekends.

During the January 2009 session of the General Assembly, the legislature approved a single, 400-bed facility to be constructed. This is roughly half of the requested and previously approved beds. This facility will be located in Brunswick County, which still means transporting a great distance anyone arrested in Mecklenburg County.

The current Mecklenburg County Jail has a DOC operational capacity of 68 beds. The Meherrin River Regional Jail Authority is requesting to keep the Mecklenburg County Jail open but under the Authority's control in order to continue the work release program in Mecklenburg and to have the ability to house inmates awaiting transport to the Brunswick facility. Mecklenburg also has an average daily pretrial population of between 38 and 40 inmates per day.

Finally, the projected forecast for the Meherrin River Regional Jail is 466.4 inmates per day in 2011 when the new facility is scheduled to open. By allowing the Mecklenburg facility to remain open, the regional jail will be able to meet its need when the facility opens instead of being 66 beds behind the forecast.

Therefore, by *MOTION* duly made by Mr. Washington, seconded by Mr. Burrell and duly *APPROVED* by responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Burrell, Decker, Paige, Washington),

“The Board of Corrections approves the request by the Meherrin River Jail Authority to allow the Mecklenburg County Jail to remain open as a facility of the Meherrin River Regional Jail Authority.”

There were no questions and there was no discussion. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. There were two absences. The Motion carried.

4) **Board Motion to Approve Revised State Jail Funding for Construction Reimbursement for the Meherrin River Regional Jail**

This is a request from the Meherrin River Regional Jail Authority, comprised of the Counties of Brunswick, Dinwiddie and Mecklenburg, for funding for jail construction reimbursement for the construction of a new, 400-bed jail. The localities'

reimbursement request is being submitted in light of the project's exemption from the current funding moratorium under Chapter 781, Item #388.A.4.a of the 2009 Acts of Assembly.

The Planning Study, based on language in the 2009 Acts of Assembly, proposes construction of a new, 400-bed facility in Brunswick to house the inmate population of participating localities. The Planning Study for a larger facility was approved by the Board in November, 2008. The revised community-based corrections plan reducing the number of beds to 400 in a single facility and keeping the existing Mecklenburg County Jail open was presented to and approved by the Board during this meeting.

Therefore, by **MOTION** duly made by Mr. Washington, seconded by Mr. Mitchell and duly **APPROVED** by responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Burrell, Decker, Paige, Washington),

“The Board of Corrections approves the request from the Meherrin River Regional Jail Authority for State jail funding for construction reimbursement of a new, 400-bed regional jail, which is to be known as the Meherrin River Regional Jail. This approval recognizes a total eligible cost of \$64,378,938, of which up to 50% or \$32,189,469 would be the State reimbursement. Such reimbursement is subject to the availability of funds and compliance with Board Standards for Planning, Design, Construction and Reimbursement of Local Correctional Facilities (1994) and Sections 53.1-80 through 82 of the Code of Virginia.”

There were some general questions and comments. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. There were two absences. The Motion carried.

5) **Board Motion to Approve Community-Based Corrections Plan for the Rappahannock, Shenandoah and Warren (RSW) Regional Jail**

The Counties of Rappahannock, Shenandoah and Warren have established the RSW Regional Jail Authority and are seeking approval of their community-based corrections plan (CBCP) to justify the construction of a 375-bed facility. This submission is made in light the Authority's exemption from the current funding moratorium under Item #388.4.b.

Therefore, by **MOTION** duly made by Mr. Washington, seconded by Mr. Mitchell and duly **APPROVED** by responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Burrell, Decker, Paige, Washington):

“The Board of Corrections approves the request for approval of the Community-Based Corrections Plan for the RSW Regional Jail Board in support of their need to construct a new, 375-bed facility and to close the existing Rappahannock, Shenandoah and Warren County Jails.”

There were some general questions and comments. There were no opposing votes.

The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. There were two absences. The Motion carried.

6) **Board Motion to Approve State Jail Funding for Construction Reimbursement for the Richmond City Jail**

This is a request from the City of Richmond for funding reimbursement for a 572-bed expansion and renovation of the Richmond City Jail. This request is being submitted in light of the project's exemption from the current funding moratorium under Chapter 781, Item #388.A.4.g of the 2009 Acts of Assembly.

The Planning Study proposes the construction of a 572-bed expansion and major renovation of the Richmond City Jail to house the inmate population of the locality. The facility is proposed as a six-story facility with 16 pods to hold all custody levels. The project also includes extensive renovation and expansion for administrative, visitation, intake/release processing, special purpose, medical, kitchen, inmate programs and storage support areas and core sizing to accommodate the existing population and future needs. The community-based corrections plan supporting the need for the 572-bed expansion was approved by the Board at its September meeting.

The Planning Study also requests consideration of incorporation of sustainable initiatives in the project for an additional cost of \$2,131,700. This would not result in construction cost savings for the State or locality but would benefit the City in operational savings in water and energy, and the State would benefit by supporting a well-designed, efficient building that minimizes impact to the environment. Sustainable initiatives by the locality are consistent with those of the Commonwealth. Governor Kaine's Executive Order #48 requires agencies of the Commonwealth to utilize sustainable energy conservation practices. Since the Commonwealth, by Code, shall review, approve and provide partial funding for local jails, it is believed that the State shall also support sustainable practices at the local level.

Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) is a third-party certification program and the nationally accepted benchmark for the design, construction and operation of high-performance green buildings. Achieving LEED certification is the best way to demonstrate that a building project is truly "green." The LEED green building rating system -- developed and administered by the U.S. Green Building Council, a Washington D.C.-based, nonprofit coalition of building industry leaders -- is designed to promote design and construction practices that increase profitability while reducing the negative environmental impacts of buildings and improving occupant health and well-being. There are four certification levels for new construction that correspond to the number of credits accrued in five green design categories: sustainable sites, water efficiency, energy and atmosphere, materials and resources and indoor environmental quality. Those levels are: Certified, Silver, Gold and Platinum. When completed, the jail design team anticipates a LEED Silver certification or better.

In order to qualify for this certification, the Richmond City Jail project will follow LEED certification guidelines. These efforts were outlined and explained in the

Sustainable Initiatives construction cost premium and operational payback estimates provided to the Board. Sustainable Initiatives (LEED initiatives) for this facility include, but are not limited to: innovative wastewater/water use reductions; energy efficiency upgrades to the mechanical, lighting and building envelope systems; the use of environmentally friendly certified wood and low-emitting composite wood; and the use of non- or low-toxic treatment for pest control. By implementing these Sustainable Initiatives, it is estimated the facility will save approximately \$420,000 a year in energy costs.

Therefore, by **MOTION** duly made by Mr. Washington, seconded by Mr. Mitchell and duly **APPROVED** by responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Burrell, Decker, Paige, Washington):

“The Board of Corrections approves the request from the City of Richmond for State jail funding for construction reimbursement for a 572-bed jail expansion and renovation. This approval recognizes a total eligible cost of \$118,810.833, of which up to 25% of \$29,702,708 would be the State reimbursement. Such reimbursement is subject to the availability of funds and compliance with Board Standards for Planning, Design, Construction and Reimbursement of Local Correctional Facilities (1994) and Sections 53.1-80 through 82 of the Code of Virginia.”

There were several general questions and comments. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. There were two absences. The Motion carried.

7) **Board Motion to Approve State Jail Funding for Construction Reimbursement for the City of Newport News Public Safety Building**

This is a request from the City of Newport News for funding approval for the second phase of a life, health, safety renovation of the Public Safety Building (jail) for the City of Newport News. This request is being submitted in light of the project's exemption from the current funding moratorium under Chapter 781, Item #388.A.1 2009 Acts of Assembly.

The Planning Study provides details of life, safety upgrades to the Public Safety Building in Newport News. The building was built in 1975 under the 1969 edition of the Southern Standard Building Code and does not have the safety features required by more current codes. These upgrades are necessary to provide safety to the occupants of the facility and to be allowed to maintain the occupant load that is currently in the facility. These upgrades are in response to Building and Fire Code issues brought forward by the local Building and Fire Officials.

Therefore, by **MOTION** duly made by Mr. Washington, seconded by Mr. Mitchell and duly **APPROVED** by responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Burrell, Decker, Paige, Washington):

“The Board of Corrections approves the City of Newport News’ request for state jail funding for reimbursement of life, safety upgrades to the Public Safety Building. This approval recognizes a total eligible cost of \$3,501,175, of which up to 25% or \$875,294 would be eligible for state reimbursement. This represents a funding increase of \$1,841,800 of which 25% is \$447,169. Such reimbursement is subject to the availability of funds and compliance with Board Standards for Planning, Design, Construction and Reimbursement of Local Correctional Facilities (1994) and Sections 53.1-80 through 82 of the Code of Virginia.”

There were no questions. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. There were two absences. The Motion carried.

8) **Compliance and Accreditation
Certifications Section**

On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Washington presented the following certification recommendations for consideration by the Board:

Unconditional Certification as a result of 100% compliance for Blue Ridge Regional Jail (Halifax), Vinton Town Lockup to include male and female juveniles in accordance with Section 16.1-249.G of the Code of Virginia;

Unconditional Certification with ACA Re-Accreditation for Roanoke City Jail;

And Unconditional Certification for Probation & Parole District 11 (Winchester).

By **MOTION** duly made by Mr. Washington and seconded by Mr. Burrell, the Board **APPROVED** the above recommendations by verbally responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Burrell, Decker, Mitchell, Washington).

There were no questions, comments or discussion. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. There were two absences. The Motion carried.

9) **Policy & Regulations**

In accordance with the Administrative Process Act, 6VAC15-26 Regulations for Human Subject Research needs to be reviewed and revised. These regulations apply to any individual, group or agency conducting research using human participants within the Virginia Department of Corrections including any facility, program or organization owned, operated, funded or licensed by the Department. Given the need for possible amendments, the Board may initiate the Administrative Process Act (APA) to amend these regulations.

Therefore, by **MOTION** duly made by Mr. Washington, seconded by Mr. Mitchell and duly **APPROVED** by responding in the affirmative (Alksne, Blank, Burrell, Decker, Paige, Washington):

“The Board moves to initiate the regulatory process to review and revise as necessary 6VAC15-26 Regulations for Human Subject Research by submitting a Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) in accordance with the Virginia Administrative Process Act.”

There were no questions. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. There were two absences. The Motion carried.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Washington for his report.

VI. Presentations to Board (Ms. Scott)

Staff members from the Division of Administration provided information on how their activities/functions impact the Board. Of the Divisions 9 units, 5 presented overviews today. The five units who presented information were General Services, Policy and Initiatives, A&E Services, Financial Management & Reporting and Compliance & Accreditation. The four not represented were Professional Services, CTSU, VCE and Procurement Services.

Among other things, Mr. Thurston with General Services noted that all land transfers that come to the Board are handled by his office. The Board is custodian of all real property of the Department pursuant to Section 53.1-18 of the Code of Virginia. He regularly meets with the Administration Committee.

Ms. Dow with the Policy & Initiatives Unit spoke to the Board Policies (there are four), Board Standards and Regulations (there are 10) as well as the Regulatory Process in general. She explained what is meant when the Board sees, for example, 6VAC15-26. She regularly meets with the Correctional Services Committee.

Ms. Lipp with A&E Services noted she deals with the prison side of construction and presents the prison construction update to the Liaison Committee. She mentioned the Board is responsible for naming new prisons.

Ms. Ballard with A&E Services spoke to the fact that she deals with the jail side of construction and reviews planning studies, design and staffing analyses and construction costs submitted by localities when they are considering jail renovations or construction. She noted the Board Standards for Planning, Design, Construction and Reimbursement of Local Correctional Facilities guide this process. She regularly meets with the Correctional Services Committee.

Mr. Eacho with Financial Management & Reporting stated his unit is responsible for directing financial and budgetary operations of the Department to include general accounting and payroll, among other things. He meets regularly with the Administration Committee regarding the Department's overtime report as well as the correctional officer vacancy report.

Ms. Hill-Murray with Compliance & Accreditation stated her staff conducts all compliance audits (conducted every three years) and is responsible for the executive summary provided in each Board package. Audits are conducted on all jails, lockups, institutions, probation and parole, diversion and detention centers and community residential programs and all findings are presented to the Board for their review and action. She regularly meets with the Correctional Services Committee.

And Mr. Wilson with Compliance & Accreditation stated he handles unannounced inspections (conducted once every year) conducted on all jails and lockups and are focused specifically on Life, Health and Safety Standards. If a jail has 100% compliance on their three-year audit, he comes to the Board for a waiver of their unannounced inspection for that year. The *Standards for Jails and Lockups* guide this process. He also reviews community-based corrections plans submitted by local jails. He regularly meets with the Correctional Services Committee.

The Chairman thanked the staff for their time and effort. There were no questions or comments. No action by the Board was required.

VII. Closed Session

No Closed Session was held.

VIII. Other Business (Mr. Johnson)

The Director indicated that all inmates have been removed from Brunswick and Botetourt Correctional Centers. He stated that most of the affected staff has been placed.

IX. Board Member/Other Comment

The members were polled. Mrs. Alksne thanked everyone and stated she appreciates their efforts. Messrs. Decker, Mitchell, Burrell and Washington had no comments. Mr. Blank remarked he had attended a presentation regarding how the United States incarcerates. Mr. Proffitt reiterated that any Board member who received a per diem payment in July must reimburse the Commonwealth.

The Chairman concluded his remarks. No action by the Board was required.

X. Future Meeting Plans

The Chairman announced the November 18, 2009, meetings are scheduled as follows:

Liaison Committee – 9:30 a.m., Board Room, 6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia;

Correctional Services/Policy & Regulations Committee – 10:30 a.m., Board Room, 6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia;

Administration Committee – 12:00 p.m., Board Room, 6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia;

And Board Meeting – 1:00 p.m., Board Room, 6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia.

XI. Adjournment

There being nothing further, by **MOTION** duly made by Mr. Mitchell, seconded by Mrs. Alksne and unanimously **APPROVED** (Blank, Burrell, Decker, Mitchell, Washington), the meeting was adjourned. There was no discussion. The Chairman voted his approval of the move to adjourn. There were two absences. The Motion carried.

(Signature copy on file)

STERLING C. PROFFITT, CHAIRMAN

RAYMOND W. MITCHELL, SECRETARY