

A special meeting of the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors was held on Tuesday, November 17, 2015, in the Circuit Courthouse's second floor conference room in Fincastle, Virginia, beginning at 10:00 A. M.

PRESENT: Members: Mr. L. W. Leffel, Jr., Vice-Chairman  
Mr. John B. Williamson, III  
Mr. Billy W. Martin, Sr.  
Mr. Todd L. Dodson

ABSENT: Members: Dr. Donald M. Scothorn, Chairman

Others present at the meeting:

Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator  
Mrs. Kathleen D. Guzi, County Administrator

The Vice-Chairman called the meeting to order at 10:00 A. M. and expressed his appreciation to those representatives of the Botetourt County Historical Society who were present at this meeting.

Mr. Leffel stated that the purpose of this meeting is to discuss the history of Greenfield, the proposed location of a shell building and the creation of a small business center, and the development of a partnership with the Society for the preservation of the historical structures on the property.

Mrs. Guzi stated that she appreciated everyone taking time from their busy schedules to attend this meeting. She noted that a lot of information was shared at the Society's public comment meeting held a couple of weeks ago on this issue. She noted that both the County and the Society want a lot of the same things, there are different ways to accomplish both sets of needs, and the County is interested in forming a partnership to proceed with this issue.

Mr. Moorman then gave an overview of the County's history regarding the Greenfield property. He noted that this process formally began with a voter referendum and the issuance of \$19.7 million in general obligation bonds in 1994. He noted that these bonds were used to make investments in the school system and the County including development of a new County business park on the 900+ acre Greenfield property.

Mr. Moorman noted that in July 1995 the County purchased the Greenfield property for a mixed use development. He noted that a master plan was unveiled and community meetings were held. He stated that a three-member citizen advisory committee was formed and in October 1995 this committee recommended hiring Preservation Technologies to do a thorough historical study of the property. Mr. Moorman stated that, at a joint Planning Commission/Supervisors meeting in November 1995, a public hearing was held to amend the Comprehensive Plan and land use maps to incorporate this proposed development. He noted that in May 1996 the property was rezoned; in January 1997, the citizens advisory committee endorsed the preservation plan for the site which included the relocation of the historical structures to a designated preservation site at the Route 220 entrance to the property; in March 1997, the committee recommended this plan to the Board of Supervisors which endorsed this proposal.

Mr. Moorman stated that in 2009 the preservation plan was reviewed and reaffirmed and the County applied for historical designation of this site/buildings and the historic structures were stabilized in 2009.

After questioning by Mrs. Ann Layman, Mr. Moorman stated that the citizen advisory committee included Ms. Gwen Ikenberry, Mrs. Donna Henderson, and Mr. Jim Moore. He noted that Mr. Moore passed away and then Mrs. Katherine Harris agreed to serve on the committee.

Mr. Moorman also noted that Mr. Michael Pulice with the Virginia Department of Historical Resources was involved in this group and was aware of their purpose in regards to the Greenfield property.

Mrs. Layman noted that none of the citizen committee members have ever been a member of the Botetourt County Historical Society.

Mrs. Kathy Austin then questioned whether after 1997 Board of Supervisors member Steve Clinton met with the committee and decided that the structures would not be moved.

Mr. Moorman stated that the Board of Supervisors did not endorse any official action contrary to the preservation plan which stated that the historical structures would be relocated to the preservation site.

Mrs. Guzi then discussed the siting of a shell building on the Greenfield property. She noted that it was determined that the County needed more economic development "product" as businesses today want sites that are shovel-ready. She noted that this is why the pad-ready site was developed.

Mrs. Guzi stated that over a year ago the Greater Roanoke Valley Development Foundation agreed to fund the construction of a shell building in the valley. She noted that area jurisdictions submitted site proposals and after deliberations Site C, which is located across the street from the pad-ready site in Greenfield, was chosen. She noted that there are two historical structures on/near this site (slave quarters and kitchen). Mrs. Guzi further noted that the proposed shell building was designed to be 100,000 square feet (sf) in size and be expandable up to 250,000 sf.

After discussion, Mrs. Guzi stated that Greenfield was developed for large-lot businesses but it should also have a place for smaller-lot businesses.

Mrs. Guzi stated that she reviewed the County's files on the Greenfield property and the Board of Supervisors has always said that these historical structures would be moved to the preservation area. Mrs. Guzi stated that she was impressed that the County designated a special preservation area for these structures which will "steer" citizens to this site without them having to navigate to different locations throughout the park or having to deal with tractor trailer traffic entering and leaving the various businesses.

Mrs. Guzi stated that, after the County was awarded the shell building location contract earlier this year, she talked to Mr. Pulice in April 2015, contacted the two remaining members of the citizens committee, and met them with in July 2015 to discuss the County's plans for the shell building on Site C. Mrs. Guzi stated that Mr. Pulice provided the County with names of qualified companies to move the two historical structures and County staff met with those companies on site with Mr. Pulice. She noted that the companies determined that the buildings can be moved to the preservation area without being dismantled and stored first.

After discussion Mrs. Guzi stated that Mr. Pulice also recommended that the County prepare the preservation area site prior to relocating the two structures. She noted that this site is more visible to the public and there is a parking area nearby. Mrs. Guzi stated that it was agreed that the buildings should be oriented on the new site so they maintain as much historical integrity as possible with their original locations, e.g., same distance apart, orientation, etc. She noted that they spent hours on the site looking at different building location options and the County is committed to doing this relocation correctly.

After questioning by Mr. John Rader, Mrs. Guzi stated that she contacted Mr. Weldon Martin with the Historical Society earlier this summer; however, he did have some health issues

that he was dealing with at that time. Mrs. Guzi stated that there was a previously-appointed citizens advisory committee and this was the avenue that the County continued to use in this situation.

Mr. John Alderson then questioned whether the Board of Supervisors had “made its mind up” that the buildings are going to be moved.

Mr. Williamson stated that relocating these structures has been the plan for the last 20 years.

Mr. Alderson then stated that, it appears that any discussion on preserving the site as-is, is to no avail.

Mr. Williamson stated that in his opinion the shell building project has been two years in development and it is the Supervisors’ duty is to preserve the buildings and maximize the return of the taxpayers’ investment in the Greenfield property.

Mr. Dodson stated that he believes that this concept is a win/win situation. He noted that the County had two companies which located in Greenfield (Altec and Koyo/JTEKT) and then the September 11, 2001, attacks and the recession occurred which impacted the global economy. Mr. Dodson stated that the County now has the option for a \$3 million shell building project to use in our efforts to attract additional industries. Mr. Dodson stated that the concept being discussed at this meeting gives the County an opportunity to build a showcase for our history that school children and visitors can learn from.

Mr. Dodson stated that the Virginia Department of Historic Resources has been involved in this issue from the beginning. He noted that the County is not trying to hide anything regarding its plans for the Greenfield property or the historical structures. Mr. Dodson stated that the County would like to create a partnership on this project with the Society as the County is not in the business of historical preservation and the current situation at Greenfield does not allow the County to celebrate its heritage.

Mr. Alderson stated that the County is building on a “flawed process” as the citizen committee had zero access to the preservation community. He stated that it may be possible that both groups can find a way forward to address the concerns of the County and the preservation community. He then questioned if the Society is going to be permitted time to review these issues. He noted that they have been waiting “11 hours and 59 minutes for this discussion” and are now being told that they are out of time.

Mr. Martin stated that he has served on the Board of Supervisors for eight years, has attended most of the Chamber of Commerce events, and has donated some items to the Society’s museum and talked to their members. He stated; however, that in those eight years he has not heard anyone say anything about these historic structures until the County indicated that they were going to move the buildings to meet our economic goals.

Mr. Martin stated that, at the Society’s public comment session a couple of weeks ago, he heard comments that this situation was the County’s, the Board’s, and the staff’s fault; however, the Society has not said anything for eight years about these buildings’ deterioration. Mr. Martin stated that people also said at this meeting that Greenfield is not being used for its intended purpose. Mr. Martin stated that he tried to work with the previous County Administrator to change the requirements for location of companies in Greenfield so small businesses could locate there; however, the Administrator only wanted large companies to locate on the property.

Mr. Martin stated that the Supervisors’ strategic planning sessions last year changed these parameters so that small businesses could locate in Greenfield and we have had interest

from people around the world in this property over the past few years. He noted that the Foundation and the Roanoke Regional Partnership are paying attention to the County and giving us a \$3 million shell building. Mr. Martin noted that the County also needs more options to attract businesses to Greenfield so that the \$450,000 in VDOT industrial access funds to extend International Parkway will not be forfeited to the State of Virginia.

Mr. Martin stated that the shell building's design will be appealing. He stated that no one has been concerned about these historical structures until it was announced that they would be moved and the County is not waiting until the eleventh hour to notify the public about their relocation. Mr. Martin suggested that signs could be placed on site indicating the buildings' original locations.

After discussion, Mr. Martin stated that with this plan the County can meet our goal and the historical committee's goal and it will be a win/win for both and questioned "why can't we meet the economic and historical goals at the same time." Mr. Martin stated that, if the buildings are left in their current locations, the County will lose a total of \$3.5 million in economic investment and would be "going backwards." He noted that an opportunity for a \$3 million shell building, with minimal cost to the County, does not occur very often and will help to alleviate some of the taxpayers' burden.

Mr. Martin stated that he wants to do what he thinks is the best for the County. He noted that we are finally turning things around and can have a real economic development success in Greenfield. Mr. Martin noted that he is in favor of moving the historical buildings intact and hopes that this can be done through a partnership so that we can proceed with business.

Mr. Alderson stated that they are not criticizing the Board and realizes that the County is desperate for economic development but asked the Board to name one other site in the County that has a history tied with pre-Revolutionary War heroes such as William Preston.

Mr. Dodson named Santillane south of Fincastle.

Mr. Alderson stated that he thinks that those at this meeting are not discounting the money for the shell building and the extension to International Parkway; however, they view the site differently than just as the location of a shell building. He noted that this property was built during the period that involved the creation of our nation and its value is what it represents to the nation's history. Mr. Alderson stated that he believes that the County and the Society can find a way to proceed in a reasonable, logical, and friendly manner to accomplish goals for this site and for other valuable historical buildings and sites as well.

Mr. Martin stated that he does not mean to lessen their concern about the timing of this issue but this has been in the County's plans for a long time and he believes that the buildings' values can be preserved by moving them to the preservation site.

Mr. Williamson stated that the Preston home site was associated with the Revolutionary War; however, it burned in the 1950s. He noted that these two remaining historical structures were built after the home and after the Lewis and Clark expedition. Mr. Williamson questioned if the Society's focus was on the buildings or trying to preserve the hilltop where the Preston home was located.

Mr. Rader stated that he visited Greenfield this past Sunday afternoon and explained the proposed use of the property to his mother. He noted that she could not understand how the shell building could be placed on this hill and not impact the viewshed.

Mr. Leffel stated that he had one plea and one request. He asked that the group "leave the recent past behind, forget yesterday" and do the best that can be done with what is coming.

Mr. Leffel stated that he is a County native and this issue has been a struggle for him. He noted that this is not about industrial sites—this is what the Greenfield property was purchased for.

Mr. Leffel then asked what would be the best thing to do to preserve the County's African American history—leave the structures in their current locations or move them to a site that is more easily accessible to the public that is 0.6 mile away from their current location. Mr. Leffel stated that he believes that having the buildings at one site in one location is the best solution to try to accomplish both issues. Mr. Leffel further stated that he does not believe that relocating these structures would affect the proposed Lewis and Clark Trail designation and he hopes that the County and the Society can come to a solution that all can work with.

Mrs. Layman stated that the Society has been working on obtaining the Lewis and Clark Trail designation for 10 years, have been trying to have a restroom constructed in the museum for 50 years, and they thought that the Greenfield structures were safe because they were put on the National Register of Historic Places. She noted that, since it was mentioned that these two structures were to be moved, fifteen organizations have offered to partner with the County to preserve these buildings but only if they are left in their existing locations.

Mrs. Layman stated that William Preston was also a surveyor and chose this hill for the location of his home. She noted that the County is now proposing to flatten the hill to construct a shell building. She further noted that Virginia Tech would like to help research the site and integrate the historical site into the industrial park and make it an educational resource. Mrs. Layman noted that no other historical site in Virginia has these types of slave buildings still standing. She asked that the site remain as is. Mrs. Layman stated that it has been estimated that it will cost \$250,000 to move the buildings but, according to Mr. Pulice, they can be restored on site for approximately \$200,000. After discussion, Mrs. Layman then questioned who is going to pay the loan on the \$3 million shell building.

Mrs. Guzi stated that these financial negotiations are still underway but it will not be the County.

Mr. Williamson further stated that the Foundation will provide \$1 - \$1.2 million to construct the shell building and when a business purchases the building the Foundation will use that money to pay the loan. He noted that there is no Botetourt County taxpayer liability on this project.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mrs. Layman stated that the organizations that have offered to partner with the County to preserve these buildings include the Society, the Mountain Valley Preservation Alliance, Smithfield Plantation, Daughters of the American Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, Hollins University, Virginia Tech, UVA, Countywide League, and the Roanoke Valley Preservation Society, among others.

Mr. Alderson then requested that the Supervisors give the Society time to sit down with them so they can agree on the steps forward and the goal to be achieved at the end of this process and beyond. He noted that there has never been a comprehensive archaeological evaluation of the site.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson and Mr. Martin, Mrs. Guzi stated that there was a phase 1 archaeological investigation conducted on the Greenfield property after it was purchased in the 1990s and a phase 2 investigation has been done on portions of the property.

After questioning by Mr. Leffel, Ms. Judy Barnett stated that she would prefer that the historical structures remain at their current locations. Ms. Barnett stated that she met the previous County Administrator and former Supervisor Don Meredith several years ago to discuss a

location to display the County's African American history. She noted that the proposed visitor's center on the Greenfield preservation site was discussed for this purpose.

Mrs. Austin stated that she does not want these two structures moved from their close proximity to the cemetery. She further noted that one-half of the citizen committee members have passed away so they could not have had any recent input on this proposal.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mrs. Guzi stated that Site C is the only location for the shell building because of the soils on the adjacent property and because it will qualify the roadway under the State's industrial access road funding guidelines whereby the County will not have to return \$450,000 to VDoT.

After discussion, Mr. Moorman noted that previously the Greenfield Master Plan indicated that this area of the property would be used as an office park and contain a loop road for access.

Mr. Rader stated that he can see the economic need for this shell building and realizes that the Foundation will construct the building so that a new company will locate there and pay County taxes.

Mr. Dodson stated that this shell building will help increase industry in the County but will not use County taxpayer dollars for its construction.

Mr. Rader stated that what is more important to him than the building is the site. He noted that the shell building can be placed elsewhere and the property can be made attractive; however, once the historical buildings are removed "we cannot get it back."

Mrs. Layman noted that this hill is an historical site and can be an asset. She suggested that the County construct two shell buildings elsewhere on the property and leave the hill undisturbed.

Mr. Williamson stated that the Foundation has worked on this shell building proposal for quite some time and to choose another site would cause the project to be pulled from the County. He noted that there is always a choice but saying no to a \$3 million investment and returning \$450,000 to the State is a hard choice for the Board and would have a negative impact on the taxpayers.

After questioning by Mr. Alderson, Mrs. Guzi stated that the County staff reviewed other locations for the shell building including shifting it 150 yards west of its proposed location to be further away from these two historical structures. She noted that there are wetlands adjacent to the shell building's location which could not be disturbed.

After further questioning by Mr. Alderson, Mrs. Guzi stated that the County has worked with Engineering Concepts, Inc. (ECI) to determine "buildable areas" for the location of this shell building. After further questioning by Mr. Alderson, Mrs. Guzi noted that there is a greenspace/buffer between the shell building's location and the wetlands. She noted that the staff spent hours with ECI reviewing potential sites for this building in different locations on the property to no avail.

After questioning by Mrs. Layman, Mr. Moorman reviewed the 1997 concept layout of the preservation area. He noted that this is an approximate 28 acre site which fronts on Route 220 and is accessed from International Parkway. Mr. Moorman noted that the site currently contains the Holloday House foundation and a kitchen structure and the concept plan shows the location of the summer kitchen and the slave quarters currently located on Site C.

After questioning by Mrs. Layman, Mrs. Guzi noted that the artefacts found during the phase 1 archaeological study have been in storage at DHR's Salem office for 18 years. She

noted that a safe and appropriate location to display these artefacts is needed to educate the next generation of County students.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Moorman stated that he does not know the total number of items in storage at DHR but they include colonial, Native American, and pre-historic artefacts.

Mr. Leffel then called for a short break.

The meeting was called back to order at 11:20 A. M.

Mrs. Austin then suggested that the shell building's parking lot and greenspace be moved and the aforesaid greenspace area, which includes the two historic structures, be retained as is.

Mr. Williamson stated that, if the historic structures remain in their current locations, they would be at the top of a steep cut, look down upon the shell building's loading docks and truck turnaround area, which would destroy the integrity of the historical site. He stated that there are also concerns about being able to sell the shell building if the historical structures remain in this location.

Mrs. Guzi stated that the County also worked with ECI and Mr. Pulice on layouts for the area if the historical structures remained in their original location. She noted that no other workable option could be found.

After questioning by Mr. Rader, Mrs. Guzi stated that the Foundation is not tax exempt so they would be responsible for paying taxes on the shell building.

Mrs. Guzi stated that Mr. Pulice recommended that a phase 2 archaeological study be conducted on the proposed new location and the current sites of these historic structures. She noted that this study would include digging up to 12 architectural units which are approximately 1 meter square and excavating the soil to see if any historic/pre-historic artefacts could be found. Mrs. Guzi stated that Mr. Pulice believes that this work could be done in a matter of weeks depending on the weather and should not exceed \$15,000 for this work. She noted that it was always the Board's intention to conduct a phase 2 archaeological study of this property and the Board would welcome a partnership with the Society on this project to oversee this archaeological investment.

After questioning by Ms. Barnett, Mrs. Guzi stated that the construction of the visitor's center on the preservation site is dependent on County budget funding and the timing of this facility's construction has not been determined.

Mr. Williamson stated that, in order for the shell building's construction to begin in the spring, relocation of the buildings will need to occur by the end of February 2016 by which time the archaeological work will need to have been completed.

Mrs. Guzi noted that the archaeological work can be done in phases. She noted that the first phase will be the site where these historical buildings are to be located and phase two will be done at the proposed shell building's location.

After questioning by Ms. Barnett, Mr. Williamson stated that conducting a complete restoration of the historical buildings will be an expensive budget item; however, the Board has a broad commitment to restoring these structures in the future.

Mr. Dodson stated that the Board has had preliminary discussions on a long-term funding strategy for the preservation area and a partnership with the Society will be helpful to see this project develop and grow.

Mr. Alderson stated that this is part of the Society's request for time in order to have an opportunity to agree on the structure of the partnership--an equal 50/50 authority for the Society, an agreement on what work Mr. Pulice will complete, review of the previous archaeological work done on cataloging the historical sites, determination of these sites, etc.

Mr. Williamson stated that this is an interesting and worthwhile project; however, it takes time.

Mr. Moorman noted that several years ago there was a countywide inventory of historical buildings over a certain age compiled.

Mr. Alderson stated that none of this is difficult work but it takes time to agree on how to proceed.

Mrs. Guzi stated that both groups have agreed that they need to be partners in the future.

Mr. Williamson stated that the time issue is in moving the historical buildings quickly so as to not jeopardize the shell building project.

Mrs. Guzi stated that the County has done a lot of preliminary work on this issue. She noted that the first step is to get both partners together and share the available information.

Mr. Alderson stated that he and the other Society members present today will need to see how their remaining members want to be involved in this project. Mr. Rader agreed that this issue will have to be taken to the Society's Board of Directors.

After discussion, Mr. Williamson noted that the preservation site's size will need to be formalized through a survey, confirm the property's zoning designation, and set the site's boundaries.

After further discussion, Mr. Moorman agreed to provide a copy of the preservation area's concept plan to the Board and Society for their review. He then discussed a potential timeline counting back from February 2016 for this work to be completed to give the Society an approximate timeframe in which to discuss this with their Board of Directors.

Mr. Williamson stated that the most critical decision is where these two buildings will be located on the preservation site so these locations can be excavated by Mr. Pulice prior to February 2016 and then the long-term planning for the preservation site can begin.

After questioning by Mrs. Layman, Mrs. Guzi stated that the shell building's design is still being drafted but if Mrs. Layman has a copy of the design she can provide it to the press.

Mr. Williamson noted that the final shell building agreement has not been signed but the agreement is based on the shell building's drawing.

After questioning by Mr. Alderson regarding the design concept placement of the buildings, Mr. Williamson stated that Mr. Pulice has identified several building arrangements for the preservation site.

After discussion, Mr. Leffel stated that input from the Society on the specific locations of these buildings is needed so a determination can be made on the location of the archaeological study sites. He asked that Mr. Pulice's proposed building siting arrangements be provided to the Society so that they can use them during their site visit with Mr. Pulice.

Mr. Alderson stated that they will try to ensure that this is not delayed.



Mr. Moorman stated that the timeline will need to include a couple of weeks for the archaeological evaluations to be completed, two weeks to move the two buildings, and a week or two to determine where the buildings will be located. He noted that this will mean that a joint committee will need to be formed and working by no later than December 1, 2015, to keep to the February 2016 completion schedule.

After discussion regarding the 1996 layout of the Greenfield property, Mr. Moorman stated that the lot sizes on the Greenfield property were flexible from the beginning to leave as many acreage options available as possible for potential industry locations.

Mr. Leffel stated that the Society's committee that will work with the County on this matter should be appointed as soon as possible. Mr. Leffel stated that he wants to make sure that this is a joint project in the future.

After discussion regarding a joint committee meeting by December 1, Mr. Rader stated that he thinks that the Society can have a committee appointed by the end of this week in order to have a site visit scheduled with Mr. Pulice early next week.

Mrs. Guzi stated that she will need to contact Mr. Pulice to ascertain his schedule for next week prior to confirming the site visit but will try to schedule this for Monday, November 23 at 3:00 PM.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 P. M.