

The regular meeting of the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors was held on Tuesday, November 26, 2013, in Rooms 226 – 228 of the Greenfield Education and Training Center in Daleville, Virginia, beginning at 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Members: Mr. Stephen P. Clinton, Chairman  
Mr. Terry L. Austin, Vice-Chairman  
Mr. Billy W. Martin, Sr.  
Mr. L. W. Leffel, Jr.

ABSENT: Members: Dr. Donald M. Scothorn

Others present at the meeting:

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

Mr. Clinton called the meeting to order at 2:05 P. M. and welcomed those present.

Mr. Paul Peery, Utilities Manager, then introduced Mr. Jeff Nelms to the Board. He noted that Mr. Nelms was recently hired as a Utility Line Crew Leader in the Utilities Department. Mr. Peery noted that Mr. Nelms has over 20 years of experience in water and sewer installation and repair and he believes that Mr. Nelms will be an asset to the department's operations.

Mr. Clinton welcomed Mr. Nelms to employment with Botetourt County.

Mrs. Guzi then noted that Ms. Wendy Farkas, the County's Management Analyst, has decided to leave the County at the end of November after 10 years of service. She asked that Ms. Farkas come forward to receive a certificate of recognition for her years of service and a gift certificate from the County.

Mr. Clinton noted that Ms. Farkas has provided the County and the Board with wonderful reports and analyses and provided thorough research details on numerous projects during her employment with the County. He noted that she also served as the County's webmaster by keeping the County website updated and its contents easily understood and locatable by County residents and visitors.

Mrs. Guzi stated that during her 1½ years as County Administrator she has requested different reports from many staff members containing five year trends and Ms. Farkas has been very helpful in preparing these reports in a concise and readable format.

Mr. Clinton again thanked Ms. Farkas for her service to the County.

Mr. Austin then asked for a moment of silence in memory of Mr. Bobby Layman who passed away last week. He noted that Mr. Layman served as the Amsterdam District representative on the Board of Supervisors for 10 years from 1988 - 1997.

There being no discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, and carried by the following recorded vote, the minutes of the regular meeting held on October 22, 2013, and the minutes of the special meeting held on November 8, 2013, were approved as submitted. (Resolution Number 13-11-05)

AYES: Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Mr. Austin, Mr. Clinton

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: None

Mr. Clinton then noted that, as there were only four Board members present at today's meeting, any motion on which there is a 2 – 2 tie vote would be considered denied.

Consideration was then held on approval of the additional appropriations. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, stated that there were 7 pass through appropriations for the Board's consideration this month. He noted that these requests included receipt of donations, cost reimbursements, State grant funds, tourism-related activity, and funds from the Town of Buchanan for debt service payments on the Buchanan fire truck previously transferred to the County's ownership.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mrs. Guzi noted that the refinancing of the fire truck's loan has been completed and this debt service appropriation is based on the refinanced figure. After further questioning by Mr. Austin, Mrs. Guzi noted that the refinancing did result in a lower interest rate on this loan.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following additional appropriations. (Resolution Number 13-11-06)

AYES: Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Mr. Austin, Mr. Clinton

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: None

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$675 to Library – Books and Subscriptions, 100-4073100-6012. These are donated funds from the Blue Ridge Chapter of the Friends of the Library.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$290.92 to Emergency Services – Other Operating Supplies, 100-4035500-6014. These are funds received from FedEx Ground as a result of the County's response to a hazardous material incident.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$14,087.80 to Sheriff's Department – RAID Patrol, 100-4031200-5830. This is a six-month reimbursement of RAID program expenses for the Botetourt County Sheriff's Office Alternative Program.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$2,958.65 to Sheriff's Department – DMV Salaries, 100-4031200-1800. This appropriation is for receipt of two State grants for reimbursement of overtime costs.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$1,500 to Tourism – Marketing, 100-4081600-5840. These are grant partner funds of \$500 each received from three County vineyards.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$33,605 to Debt Service – Buchanan Fire Truck, 400-4095112-9100. These are funds received from the Town of Buchanan to be applied to debt payments for a fire truck which had ownership previously transferred to the County.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$777 to Maintenance – Maintenance Service Contracts – ETC, 100-4043000-3321. These are funds received from Virginia Western Community College for quarterly reimbursement of County custodial salaries for classroom set-up at Greenfield ETC.

Consideration was then held on approval of the accounts payable and ratification of the Short Accounts Payable List. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, noted that this month's accounts payable totaled \$1,156,699.03; \$905,316.69 in General Fund expenditures; and \$251,382.34 in Utility Fund invoices. He also noted that this month's Short Accounts Payable totaled \$216,779.81; \$205,733.99 in General Fund expenditures; \$3,055 in Debt Service Fund invoices; and \$7,990.82 in Utility Fund expenditures.

Mr. Zerrilla further noted that a check was written on November 8 in the amount of \$39,372.32 payable to Optum/Unimerica Insurance Company. He noted that this was a binder premium for stop loss insurance for the County's new 2013-2014 employee health insurance policy.

Mr. Zerrilla stated that this month's large expenditures included \$126,689 payable to Sheehy Auto Stores for five new Sheriff's Department vehicles (paid on the Short Accounts Payable), \$24,100 to Sheehy Auto Stores for a 2013 Ford F-150 pickup for use by Animal Control, \$82,313 as the quarterly budget payment to the Botetourt County Health Department, \$38,743 as a FY 14 budget payment to Blue Ridge Behavioral Healthcare; and \$161,227 to English Construction for work on the Tinker Creek Interceptor project. Mr. Zerrilla noted that \$123,822 of this amount will be reimbursed to the County through the VRA loan on this project.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Zerrilla stated that the County still has approximately \$50,000 in retainage payments on the Tinker Creek Inceptor project.

After further questioning by Mr. Austin, Mrs. Guzi noted that construction is complete on the Tinker Creek Interceptor.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the accounts payable and ratified the Short Accounts Payable List as submitted. (Resolution Number 13-11-07)

AYES: Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Mr. Austin, Mr. Clinton

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: None

Consideration was then held on preliminary site grading bids for the Greenfield ball field development project. Mr. Pete Peters, Director of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism, stated that the FY 14 budget and Capital Improvements Plan included funds (\$160,000) for the design and preliminary grading work for two additional ball fields to be located southwest of the Botetourt Sports Complex.

He noted that Mr. Hunter Young of Civil Consulting Group designed the ball field site plan. Mr. Peters stated that the preliminary grading project was advertised for bids and, on October 21, 10 bids were received. He noted that the low bid of \$157,950 was received from Earth Movers, Inc.

Mr. Peters stated that, due to previous experience on other Greenfield grading projects, it is anticipated that rock will be found during the grading work on this project; however, the quantity or quality of the rock remains unknown at this time. He noted that this project will include preliminary grading work, including the removal of any rock encountered, seeding, and installation of other erosion and sediment control measures. Mr. Peters stated that future phases of the project are proposed for outlying years of the County's CIP and include finish grading, seeding, irrigation, dugouts, fencing, infield installation, and additional parking.

Mr. Peters estimated that 50,000 cubic yards (cy) of soil will be moved on this site and it is proposed that future budgets include funding for additional rock removal. Mr. Peters then reviewed aerial photographs of the Sports Complex property and the location of the two new ball fields. He noted that the new fields will be at the approximate same elevation as the existing Sports Complex ball fields.

Mr. Peters then requested that the Board accept the low bid from Earth Movers, Inc., for the preliminary grading of two new ball fields and authorize the County Administrator to execute a contract upon review and approval by the County Attorney.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Peters stated that the engineer's estimate was \$3.50 per cy for this work, while the low bidder's price was \$2.84 per cy. After further questioning, Mr. Peters stated that the project includes the removal of soil from this site while leaving any rock outcroppings visible.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Peters stated that Mr. Hunter Young did recommend acceptance of this bid. Mr. Clinton noted that this bid pricing appears to be good, relative to the other nine bids received for this work.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board accepted the low bid in the amount of \$157,950 from Earth Movers, Inc., for preliminary site grading of two new ball fields at the Botetourt Sports Complex and authorized the County Administrator to execute a contract upon review and approval by the County Attorney. (Resolution Number 13-11-08)

AYES: Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Mr. Austin, Mr. Clinton

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: None

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Peters stated that the aerial photos of the Sports Complex were taken by Mr. Allen Barkett of Fincastle. He noted that Mr. Barkett is a financial planner but takes these photographs as a side business and hobby.

Mr. Austin then stated that additional long range parking options for the Complex will be needed.

Mr. Peters stated that he is planning for future budgeting of funds to increase the parking area at the Sports Complex. Mr. Peters noted that excess fill material from the Etzler Road reconstruction and the Catawba Road/Etzler Road intersection projects has been placed on the site between the proposed ball field location and Etzler Road for this purpose. Mr. Peters noted that he plans to "carry the existing paved parking lot around" to the new ball field area.

After further questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Peters stated that some additional fill material will be needed at the end of the current paved parking area in order to extend this parking toward the new ball fields.

After further questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Peters stated that this project will have a balanced amount of cut and fill material.

Consideration was then held on approval of local response interval standards as required by the Virginia Office of Emergency Medical Services. Mr. Jason Ferguson, Division Chief of Emergency Services, stated that every two years, each of the County's EMS agencies is required to go through an inspection process to ensure that they are meeting the Department of Health's benchmarks.

He noted that each EMS agency has to establish a response interval standard from the time the 911 call is placed to when the emergency services unit arrives on the scene. Mr. Ferguson noted that this standard has to be reviewed and agreed to by the agencies, the Operational Medical Director, and the local governing body. Mr. Ferguson stated that the response times in the southern and northern portions of the County have been reviewed and, due to the County's diverse geography, two separate response interval goals have been established: South County—12 minutes; North County—18 minutes.

Mr. Ferguson stated that the emergency response agencies are required to review these response intervals annually to see how often these goals are achieved and to consider ways to improve response times. Mr. Ferguson then stated that this information was presented to the

volunteer fire chiefs and rescue captains at their October meeting with the County Administrator and the County has received only positive responses from them regarding these local response standards.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Ferguson stated that this information has been vetted through the volunteer fire and rescue agencies to ensure that there was nothing that the County overlooked in developing these standards. Mr. Ferguson stated that these response times “seem to be a standard that is achievable, but there is room for improvement.”

After discussion, Mr. Ferguson stated that there are three segments contained in the response interval: the time from when the call is placed until a unit is dispatched from the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP); the reaction time from when the call is dispatched until a unit is in route; and the response time from when the unit is in route until it arrives on the scene. He noted that another aspect of this includes the time from when a volunteer responding to a call leaves their home until they “get the unit out the door” of the rescue squad building.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Ferguson stated that these 12 and 18 minute response intervals are determined based on first unit response times. Mr. Ferguson noted that the County will not be able to meet these benchmarks when it is necessary to dispatch a second unit due to the unavailability of the first unit. Mr. Austin noted that the County continues to have issues with the first call response units being unavailable to respond to emergency services calls.

After further questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Ferguson stated that he does not have the statistics available on how often it is necessary for the dispatch staff to place a second unit response request but it is on a regular basis. Mr. Ferguson further noted that, whenever one ambulance is assigned to a call, it impacts the remainder of the call response process.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Ferguson stated that the County does not have the staffing capacity to have a second unit from another location standing by at the first call responder’s facility in the event another call is received by that unit.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Ferguson stated that, by setting these response intervals, the County is not declaring that, in the best case scenario, a southern County unit will respond to a call within twelve minutes of 911 being dialed. He noted that the County is stating that this response benchmark should be met 90% of the time. He further noted that the 90% figure is required in the Health Department’s Office of EMS Regulations Manual.

After further questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Ferguson noted that when a call exceeds this benchmark figure, the County will have to document the reason why, e.g., the call took longer because a call had to be placed to a second response agency. After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Ferguson stated that these local response intervals are to be reviewed annually and altered as appropriate.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Austin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board adopted the local EMS Response Interval Standards to serve as benchmarks for Botetourt County as required by the Virginia Department of Health administrative code specific to Designated Emergency Response Agencies as follows: **South County**--The response interval shall be 12 minutes. This benchmark will be the goal for EMS response. An effort will be made to meet this benchmark at least 90% of the time; **North County**--The response interval shall be 18 minutes. This benchmark will be the goal for EMS response. An effort will be made to meet this benchmark at least 90% of the time. (Resolution Number 13-11-09)

AYES: Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Mr. Austin, Mr. Clinton

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: None

Mr. Kevin Hamm, VDoT's Maintenance Operations Manager, was present to speak to the Board. He then reviewed VDoT's monthly report. Mr. Hamm stated that the I-81 Exit 150 intersection improvements are still scheduled to be advertised for bids in December 2014, as VDoT staff continues to work on the project's right-of-way issues. He noted that work to replace a culvert on Route 1533 (Cedarbrook Lane) in Stratford Place Subdivision should be completed shortly. Mr. Hamm noted that the pipe replacement on Route 11 north of Buchanan has been completed.

Regarding Route 634 (Cedar Lane), Mr. Hamm stated that this project includes the installation of 72" pipe with headwalls as well as widening the roadway in this curve. He noted that VDoT will build up the road to keep the adjacent stream from washing out the road during heavy rains. Mr. Hamm noted that the reinstallation of a low water bridge on Route 819 (Barger Drive) has been completed and the drainage issues on Stoneledge Drive have been resolved. He noted that asphaltting Stoneledge Drive will have to be delayed until spring.

Mr. Hamm then noted that VDoT issued five utility, private entrance, road construction, and special use permits from mid-October to mid-November.

Regarding the traffic engineering study on Valley Road, Mr. Hamm stated that their staff continues to work on this report and plan to obtain information from the Sheriff's Department on the number of instances of tractor trailer-involved accidents that occur on this road.

Regarding the issue of no "U" turns on Route 220 between Lumos and Daleville Town Center, Mr. Hamm stated that they will study this section of roadway further to determine if additional signage is needed.

After questioning by Mr. John Graham of Daleville, Mr. Hamm stated that their study will include whether "U" turns should be permitted at the Daleville Town Center intersection.

Mr. Austin noted that photographs of the crossovers along Route 220 from the Lumos building to Daleville Town Center were provided by County staff to VDoT. He stated that additional signage should be placed on the crossover in front of Lumos, which does not allow "U" turns, that "U" turns are allowed XX feet north on Route 220. Mr. Austin further proposed that VDoT allow "U" turns in one lane of Route 220 north at the Daleville Town Center intersection as is currently allowed at the stoplight in front of Botetourt Commons/Kroger.

Mrs. Guzi noted that Mr. Hamm was only notified of the details of the Route 220 "U" turn issue earlier today as her previous conversations on this matter were with VDoT's Residency Administrator Dan Collins. Mrs. Guzi noted that Mr. Collins informed her that he would discuss this situation with VDoT's traffic engineering staff.

Mr. Austin noted that there have been several accidents at the crossover in front of the Lumos building and signage informing drivers that "U" turns are allowed further north on Route 220 would help to improve traffic safety in this area.

Mr. Hamm also noted that he will discuss this matter with their traffic engineers either later today or tomorrow morning.

Mr. Martin then noted that he had received a call from Lethia Hammond who works in the Commonwealth Attorney's Office regarding vehicles passing school buses that are loading/unloading children along Route 460. Mr. Martin noted that he talked to both Mr. Collins and Mr.

Hamm about this issue and Dr. Tony Brads, Superintendent of Schools, has requested that VDoT install flashing warning lights along Route 460 near Mountain Pass Road.

Mr. Hamm stated that there are short turning lanes along Route 460 in this area. He noted that VDoT can implement a reduced speed limit in a school zone; however, Colonial Elementary School is some distance off of Route 460 on a secondary road. Mr. Hamm further noted that VDoT would be willing to install the signage if the County/Schools would purchase the electronics/flashing lights and obtain the necessary permits.

Mr. Martin noted that there are frequent occurrences of drivers passing stopped school buses along Route 460 which could result in accidents and injuries.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Dr. Brads stated that drivers passing stopped school buses "is not a new issue." Dr. Brads stated that the school administration has made repeated requests to VDoT for flashing warning lights to be installed at the 460/Webster Road intersection but have been denied year after year. Dr. Brads noted that VDoT increased the speed limit on Route 460 several years ago which has further added to the traffic hazards that buses deal with along this roadway.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Morris Gill, the school system's Supervisor of Transportation, stated that they have developed their school bus routes "as best they can" in this area so the bus drivers have as safe routes as possible and do not have to make "U" turns. He then thanked VDoT for doing what they can at this time to help resolve this school bus/traffic safety problem.

After further questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Gill stated that the school system has also expressed their concerns about the 60 mph speed limit on Route 460 with VDoT many times.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Hamm stated that flashing lights are proposed to be installed on Route 460 as follows: eastbound—0.11 mile west of the eastern intersection of Route 738 (Webster Road); westbound—0.11 mile east of the eastern intersection of Route 738, in order to reduce the speed limit to 35 mph during the mornings and afternoons when school buses are going to and coming from Colonial Elementary School.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mrs. Guzi stated that the school system has agreed to pay to have these signs and flashing lights installed and obtain the necessary VDoT permits for this project.

Mr. Austin then noted that there are drainage pipes along Salt Peter Cave Road near the Route 43 intersection that need to be cleaned out. He noted that debris is partially blocking the pipes which cause flooding problems during heavy rains.

Mr. Hamm stated that VDoT is waiting to receive environmental clearance before proceeding with this project.

Mr. Austin noted that this pipe is in a dry creek bed and asked that Mr. Hamm see what can be done to expedite this project.

Mr. Hamm noted that VDoT approved several environmental permits earlier today; however, he does not know if the permit for this particular project was included.

Regarding the drainage issue on Lake Catherine Drive, Mr. Hamm stated that VDoT's hydraulics engineer is still looking at this matter.

Mrs. Guzi then noted that a speed study request on Routes 779 (Catawba Road) and 600 (Little Catawba Creek Road) has been submitted by Mr. Collins for VDoT review.

Mr. Harold Wingate then stated that he requested this speed study as neither of these roads in the western portion of the County have a posted speed limit. Mr. Wingate stated that he would imagine that it is difficult to drive 40 mph along either of these roads due to their

narrow and curving condition. He also requested that edge of pavement striping be installed along the roads as a safety improvement during dark and rainy weather.

Mrs. Guzi then asked that Mr. Hamm forward the edge of pavement striping request to Mr. Collins for review.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Hamm left the meeting at this time.

The Chairman then called for a 10 minute break.

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 3:05 P. M.

A public hearing was then held on a request from the Eagle Rock Baptist Church Trustees to vacate a portion of a 16½' undeveloped alley and create a new lot line to the center of the alley located 165' northeast of the Branch Road (Route 742)/Second Street (Route 43) intersection and identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 27A (3), Parcels 10 – 11, 11A, 12, and 19A – 21A.

Mr. Clinton again noted that, as there were only four Supervisors present at today's meeting, a tie vote, if it occurs on this matter, would result in the denial of the request.

It was noted that the Planning Commission had unanimously recommended denial of this request.

Mr. Wade Burkholder, Planning Manager, stated that the Eagle Rock Baptist Church Trustees is requesting to vacate a 16½' X 130' section of an undeveloped or "paper" alley located behind the church in Eagle Rock. He noted that this area was platted in 1903 as the Finney Addition but the alleyway was never developed. Mr. Burkholder stated that this alleyway currently consists of grass and gravel and has a rolling topography.

Mr. Burkholder stated that the church constructed a parking lot on a portion of the alleyway requested to be vacated in the 1960s without obtaining approval from the County. He noted that the church is now requesting that a 16½' X 130' section of the alley be vacated and the land would be split and conveyed to the church as they are the property owners on either side of the vacated alleyway.

Mr. Burkholder noted that plat vacation procedures of this type are regulated by Sections 15.2-2272 and 2274 of the Code of Virginia. He noted that, if the alley is vacated, utility companies would still have authority to service any lines or equipment located within or adjacent to the alley. He stated that the Planning Commission unanimously recommended denial of this request because of the loss of access to lot 13, which is owned by Pineapple Properties, LLC, as well as the loss of driveway access to lots 14 and 15, and suggested that representatives of the church and Pineapple Properties meet to discuss a parking or access agreement.

Mr. Burkholder stated that Ms. Theresa Fontana, representing Guynn, Memmer & Dillon, County Attorney, stated that there has to be demonstrated proof that there is no property owner that would be irreparably damaged if this alleyway is vacated and the Planning Commission believed that the loss of access to lot 13 would cause damage to the owners of that lot. Mr. Burkholder further noted that the church has allowed the residents of lot 13 to use the church's parking lot in the past.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Burkholder reviewed the topography of this area and stated that, due to the hill and embankment located in the alleyway, the alley is not passable by vehicles at the present time. Mr. Burkholder also noted that the land slopes down toward the front of the church and Route 43 (Second Street).

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Burkholder stated that the topography on the eastern portion of the alleyway at its intersection with Church Street is more flat and more passable by vehicles than from the Branch Road (Route 742) end.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Burkholder stated that the residents of lot 13 have always had an agreement to use the church's parking lot to park their vehicles and utility trucks have used this parking lot as well to gain access to lot 13.

Mr. Clinton noted that the Board had received an updated plat from Mr. Chris McMurry which indicated the location of the "edge of pavement" of the church's rear parking lot in relation to the adjacent properties and the alley.

Mr. Burkholder then displayed several photographs of this site.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Burkholder stated that the chain link fence shown in the photographs and Mr. McMurry's plat is not located on lot 13's property line. After further questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. McMurry noted that the steps shown in the photograph of the church's front parking area are located on lot 13 and are not in VDoT's 50' right-of-way (Route 43/Second Street).

Mr. Burkholder noted that, at the Planning Commission meeting, six citizens spoke in favor of this alley's vacation and two spoke in opposition to this request.

Mr. Leffel noted that the slope in the rear parking lot is substantial.

Mr. Bobby Simpson, Trustee of Eagle Rock Baptist Church, then stated that there was some confusion at the Planning Commission meeting regarding this request. He noted that the church is requesting to close the paper alley located on the church's property and they do not plan to impact the access from Route 43 to the other two property owners located adjacent to the alley. Mr. Simpson stated that this alley has never been improved and there has been no indication of anyone using the grass portion of the alley for travel by vehicles.

Mr. Simpson noted that Pineapple Properties purchased lot 13 two years ago and deliveries to the property were made through the church's property. Mr. Simpson stated that the church has always worked with the residents of lot 13 and had an informal agreement allowing the property owners to park on the church's paved parking area.

Mr. Simpson stated that page 1 of the Planning Commission's extract says that this vacation request would deny access to lots 13, 14, and 15. Mr. Simpson stated that the church's request would not involve closing access to lots 14 and 15. He noted that approving this request would still allow for deliveries to be made to these lots from the Route 43 (eastern) end of the alley and address the concerns of the lot 14 and 15 property owners.

He further noted that the letter from VDoT included in the information for this request mentions no concerns about this vacation. Mr. Simpson further noted that there are a set of steps leading from the church's eastern parking area to lot 13. He stated that these steps would give the property owners a shorter distance to access to their back porch versus parking in the alleyway.

Mr. Simpson noted that he has contacted the Pineapple Properties' attorney regarding a formal written parking agreement; however, the attorney said that they were "not willing to go this route at this point."

After questioning by Mr. Simpson, Mr. Clinton noted that the Board did receive a copy of the letter from Mr. Linnie Gregory in their information packets.

Mr. Simpson then asked that this vacation request be approved and noted that, if anyone has any potential for damage, to open the alleyway for traffic to the church itself and to

other down-stream properties. He noted that there is a considerable slope across the rear parking lot. Mr. Simpson stated that the church also has concerns about vehicles and all terrain vehicles using the alley if it is open which could interrupt church activities and they also have concerns about erosion if the alleyway is frequently used by vehicles.

Mr. Simpson noted that there are no rear entrances to subdivisions currently located in the County so they question why rear access to these lots is needed. He further noted that the church previously owned the house and land on lot 13. Mr. Simpson then questioned if the 15 years of adverse possession that the church has had on the rear paved parking area have any "play" with regard to this alley.

Mr. Chris McMurry, Certified Land Surveyor, noted that he had earlier today presented the Board with a more detailed drawing of the church property, the alley, paved parking areas, and the location of various fences. He noted that there is a 7' elevation difference and a 5' horizontal distance from the edge of the pavement at the church's rear parking lot to the top of the embankment. He noted that this is a 14.4% grade.

Mr. McMurry further noted that the area between the chain link fence to the east (approximately 108') has a 17.5% grade.

After questioning by Mr. Leffel, Mr. McMurry noted that the 130' length of the alley that is requested to be vacated extends from the church's rear property line at Branch Road to the corner of lot 13.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. McMurry stated that the church's property line stops at the rear corner of lot 13. He noted that the church also owns lots 19A – 21A located directly across the alleyway from the church's building.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. McMurry stated that the outbuilding shown on the County's GIS maps as being located within the alleyway is actually not located within the alley's boundaries. Mr. McMurry further stated that the only encroachment into the alleyway is a small portion of the chain link fence located on lots 14 and 15.

Mr. Wayne Adkins of Main Street in Buchanan noted that he is the owner of Pineapple Properties and owns lot 13. Mr. Adkins stated that there have been some misrepresentations on the property lines and "what his desires are." Mr. Adkins noted that the Finney property was divided among family members in the early 1900s and there are two alleys in this area.

Mr. Adkins noted that he has used the alley over the past two years since he purchased this property and there have been instances when delivery trucks have used the alleyway. He stated that, if one end of the alley is closed, then a large truck would not be able to turn around in this 16½' wide area. Mr. Adkins stated that, based on a 1995 survey of this property, he talked to the County Planning Office and was told that he could use the alley for access. Mr. Adkins noted that he has a letter from a realtor stating that the home's real estate value would be harmed if a portion of the alley is closed.

After discussion, Mr. Adkins then presented the Board with photographs of the alley and noted that these photos show a discrepancy in the grade figures mentioned earlier by Mr. McMurry. Mr. Adkins noted that there is an incline near the chain link fence on lot 13; however, this incline is not located within the alleyway's boundaries. He also noted that there are no obstructions located in the alleyway as is currently shown on the County's GIS map.

Mr. Adkins then questioned how the propane tank on the rear of lot 13 was placed on the property if the alley was not used by a delivery truck. Mr. Adkins stated that the Planning Commission did an excellent job of reviewing this situation and they determined that other property owners would be harmed if this portion of the alley was closed.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Adkins stated that he has accessed the alley from both ends as recently as 2012 to reach the rear of his property.

After questioning by Mr. Leffel, Mr. Adkins again stated that within the past year he has used both the Route 43 and Branch Road alley entrances to access the rear of lot 13.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Adkins noted that most of the large vehicles that he would need to access the rear of his lot would have difficulty backing into the alley as it is only 16½' wide, which doesn't give much clearance on either side of the vehicle.

Regarding previous comments regarding traffic and flooding/run-off issues, Mr. Adkins stated that he cannot imagine that citizens "would start running up and down this alley" if it is realized that it is an open access. He also noted that the County has ordinances in place to keep citizens from causing erosion/run-off issues from their use this road. Mr. Adkins noted that the church paved a portion of this alley many years ago without permission from the County and they could be required to tear up the parking lot area located within the public alleyway's boundaries.

After questioning by Mr. Leffel, Mr. Adkins stated that the County would not allow any erosion problems to occur from the use of this alley by vehicular traffic.

Mr. Leffel noted that he has reviewed the steep slope of this alley and believes that Mr. Adkins would have to improve the slope in order for vehicles to use the alley.

Mr. Adkins stated that the alley is not located in the area of the steep slope—it is located on a gradual grade which makes it very accessible by traffic.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Adkins stated that he has no intention of making any improvements to the grassy alleyway at this point and noted that the County would have to authorize any improvements to the alley.

Mr. Leffel stated that, after two or three days of rain as this area experienced earlier this spring, he does not think that a large propane truck could drive across this alleyway to make a delivery to the rear of lot 13.

Mr. Adkins noted that, if a truck such as the delivery mentioned by Mr. Leffel damaged the alleyway, then the company would be responsible for any needed repairs.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Adkins stated that the alley could be used by vehicles making deliveries or for other purposes. Mr. Adkins noted that this is a property rights issue in his opinion.

Mr. Austin noted that he does not know if irreparable harm would be caused if one end of the alley is closed as there is access to the rear of these lots from the east (Route 43). Mr. Austin noted that he walked the alley yesterday.

Mr. Adkins stated that the church's "parking lot has taken away [this public access] from the citizens of Botetourt County."

Mr. Austin noted that he does not think that this has occurred at all—this is a change of circumstances.

Mrs. Debbie Adkins of Main Street Buchanan stated that she is also an owner in Pineapple Properties. Mrs. Adkins noted that when this matter was brought up at the Planning Commission meeting "they were wanting to close the entire alley" and she questioned if the church does want to close the entire alley or just the portion located on the church's property.

Mr. Austin stated that the request before the Supervisors is to vacate only a 16½' X 130' portion of the alley located adjacent to the church's property.

Mrs. Adkins requested that no portion of the alley be closed as it does allow access to the rear of each of the adjacent lots. Mrs. Adkins noted that this is not a steep alley and she has driven vehicles across the alley.

Mr. Doug Wilson of Garst Mill Road in Roanoke stated that he is the attorney for Pineapple Properties. Mr. Wilson stated that governments “should do no harm.” He noted that Pineapple Properties are not asking for anything in this matter. Mr. Wilson noted that the Adkins’ have had the right to use this alley since they purchased lot 13. He stated that nothing had changed until the church came in and said that they wanted to take away the access to the rear of the parcel.

Mr. Wilson stated that this issue “is not about erosion” as the alley has a gentle slope from both directions. He noted that access via the alleyway does not occur every day and traffic will not increase if the alley remains open. Mr. Wilson stated that the church wants the traffic to stop which will take away the remaining property owners’ rights. He noted that “there is no good reason why the Adkins’ rights should be taken away.” He noted that the alley is not the church’s property; the church has taken the County’s property and done what they want with it.

Mr. Wilson noted that the County staff wanted to close the right-of-way, not the Planning Commission. He stated that any alley that is not improved by VDoT or the County is a paper alley. He noted that the Board should not be taking away the rights of other parties without compensation or a just reason to do so. Mr. Wilson stated that “your rights to do anything cannot be at the expense of other property owners.”

Mr. Wilson noted that the Adkins’ received a proposal from the church at 4PM yesterday to resolve this issue. Mr. Wilson stated that requests of this type should follow the “clean hands theory”—he who comes in with such a request should have clean hands.

Mr. Leffel noted that concerns regarding erosion have been mentioned at today’s meeting. He stated that there have not been any instances of erosion previously because the alley has not been disturbed. Mr. Leffel stated that he does not believe that Mr. Adkins could have used this alley this past summer because over 25” of rain fell in the Eagle Rock area this spring. Mr. Leffel questioned how Mr. Adkins plans to improve the alley so there are no downstream erosion problems.

Mr. Wilson noted that there is no obligation for Mr. Adkins to improve anything regarding this alley. He noted that Mr. Adkins has been using this alleyway for two years and there have not been any run-off issues. Mr. Wilson further stated that County staff informed Mr. Adkins that he would have to obtain approval from the County to improve the alleyway. Mr. Wilson stated that his client is only demanding the right to continue to use what they have had available for the last two years—the alleyway. Mr. Wilson stated that, if the Board approves this request, they are taking away a right by statute based on publicly recorded documents.

Mr. Leffel stated that he takes Mr. Wilson’s comments as a threat that, if Pineapple Properties “does not get what they want, then they will be back.”

Mr. Austin noted that the County has been asked by the church, which is the property owner adjacent to this portion of the alley, to vacate that portion only.

Mr. Wilson stated that this “request is taking something away from the other property owners” located adjacent to the alley.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Bob Fridley of Eagle Rock then chose not to speak.

Mr. Jason Adkins of Buchanan then stated that the Adkins’ are his parents. Mr. Adkins stated that he also previously served on the Buchanan Planning Commission and had to deal with similar requests. He noted that in Buchanan during the 1970s/1980s there were several

alleys that were closed in a similar situation. Mr. Adkins stated that “once they are closed you can never get them back open.” He stated that “there are many places that would have benefited from having rear access.”

Mr. Adkins asked that the Board not be too “short-sighted” in closing these alleys. He noted that the County’s Traditional Neighborhood District zoning designation and the Daleville Town Center project have rear alleyways in their designs to keep cars off the street and to allow for deliveries. Mr. Adkins asked the Board to not close these types of rights-of-ways/ alleys “without significant reason.”

Mr. Austin noted that the church has used a portion of the alley for many years for a parking lot. He noted that the church’s concerns include the condition of the existing grass right-of-way. Mr. Austin questioned if the alley could be improved so as to not cause erosion.

Mr. Adkins stated that, if the Board believes that there is a way that this issue could be worked out, then it would be within the Board’s right to deny this vacation request.

Mr. Adkins noted that his father asked to meet with the church’s representatives early in this process to discuss this issue but did not receive a response.

Mr. Leffel then questioned what would happen if the next owner of lot 13 is not as good a neighbor.

Mr. Adkins noted that they are asking that “something not be taken away.” He asked that the Board deny this request in order to allow all affected parties the opportunity to work out this issue. Mr. Adkins noted that Pineapple Properties has spent many thousands of dollars to improve this property and the residence which had become derelict. He noted that the company has also improved several townhomes located along Lowe Street in Buchanan. Mr. Adkins stated that they are “good stewards that want to make the County better.” He further stated that it is “unfortunate that this has gotten to this point.”

Mr. Billy Ronk, Pastor of the Eagle Rock Baptist Church, noted that there is a handicapped ramp located from the rear paved lot into the church building and children use the parking lot for games and events. Mr. Ronk noted that there are many places in the County where “getting things in and out is difficult.”

After discussion, Mr. Ronk stated that no one person in the church can make a decision; the church’s trustees are responsible for making decisions affecting the church. Mr. Ronk then noted that the church owns property on both sides of the alley.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Ronk stated that the church has not had any previous problems with vehicles using the alley. After further discussion, Mr. Ronk noted that he is aware that the owners of lot 13 may want to have parking available at the rear of their lot.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Ronk stated that the church has no plans to make any changes to the alley if this vacation request is approved. After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Ronk stated that, if the alley is vacated, the church would still allow the owners of lot 13 to continue to use the area for trucks to make deliveries to the rear of the parcel.

After further questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Ronk stated that he does believe that the alley’s grade/elevation would cause issues during wet weather. After further questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Ronk stated that, as in the past, the church would continue to allow deliveries to the rear of these lots if this vacation request is approved.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, it was noted that there was no one else present to speak regarding this matter. The public hearing was then closed.

Mr. Clinton stated that he “gets the picture in terms of the controversy” surrounding this request. He noted that this is an “example of how governments become activists.” Mr. Clinton noted that the least that government can do in this situation is the best solution.

Mr. Leffel stated that he agreed with Mr. Clinton’s comments about “the least government, being better.” Mr. Leffel noted that this is a common sense issue; however, some of the comments that he had heard today do not tie together. He noted that the church has had the area at the rear of their building used as a parking lot since 1968.

After discussion, Mr. Leffel stated that we are not denying the owners of lot 13 access to their property as they can use the alley’s entrance from its intersection with Route 43. Mr. Leffel further stated that the “alley comes through where the church’s handicapped parking is located.” Mr. Leffel stated that he would not want to vacate the entire alley and noted that “no access is being taken away from Mr. Adkins.”

Mr. Leffel stated that he is in favor of approving this request. He stated that “it is not fair” to make the church change what they have been doing since 1968. Mr. Leffel further questioned why this issue is coming up two years after the property was purchased.

Mr. Martin stated that he would rather see both property owners work this out among themselves. Mr. Martin noted that he does not see a problem with the request. Mr. Martin stated that the church’s pastor has said that the landowners would still be allowed to have access through the church’s parking lot if the vacation request is approved.

Mr. Austin stated that he is concerned about the lack of ability to turn a large vehicle around in the narrow alley if the Branch Road end is closed. Mr. Austin noted that this is the only reason he would consider the possibility of not vacating this alley. Mr. Austin stated that personally he would like to see the ingress improved up to the church’s property line.

After discussion, Mr. Austin then suggested that the matter be tabled to see if the landowners can come to some decision. He noted that there is access from Route 43 and there is the potential for Mr. Adkins to install a driveway from the east. He further noted that “we are not talking about a high volume of traffic use on this alley” and there should be consideration given to an alternate method.

Mr. Clinton stated that a mediator could be engaged to meet with both parties to discuss this matter.

Mr. Wayne Adkins stated that it is always a desire to find the best way and he would be more than willing to meet with the church’s representatives. Mr. Adkins noted that he attempted to approach the church several times regarding discussions on “fixing the berm” at the rear of the church but never received a response.

Mr. Simpson noted that this issue was addressed at the Planning Commission meeting. He noted that Mr. Adkins said that he would “strip the soil and put down gravel.” Mr. Simpson stated that the church is against this request due to concerns about erosion on this slope.

After questioning, Mr. Simpson stated that the church would prefer pavement and engineered ditching along this alleyway.

Mr. Clinton stated that he is troubled by Mr. Adkins being told that he could or could not do something and believes that Mr. Adkins was victimized in this matter.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Adkins stated that he is willing to consider paving the alley from the paved parking lot to his property line but he does not know how much this would cost.

After further discussion, Mr. Adkins stated that, if this issue is tabled, he would like input from the County.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mrs. Dillon, County Attorney, stated that the County would have to agree to any changes to a public right-of-way.

Mr. Adkins stated that he “wants to be a good neighbor” and will investigate paving a portion of the alley to help the person who may purchase lot 13 in the future.

Mr. Austin stated that he believes that the church “has a legitimate concern” and he would ask that the two parties be given an opportunity to try to resolve this issue.

Mr. Clinton noted that pavement costs may be a “significant commitment” from Mr. Atkins.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Austin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board tabled the request in the Fincastle Magisterial District from the Eagle Rock Baptist Church Trustees to vacate a portion of a 16½’ undeveloped alley and create a new lot line to the center of the alley located 165’ northeast of the Branch Road (Route 742)/Second Street (Route 43) intersection and identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 27A (3), Parcels 10 – 11, 11A, 12, and 19A – 21A, for up to 60 days to allow representatives of the church and Pineapple Properties, LLC, to try to reach a mutual agreement on access to lot 13. (Resolution Number 13-11-10)

AYES: Mr. Martin, Mr. Austin, Mr. Clinton

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: Mr. Leffel

The Chairman then called for a 10 minute break.

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 4:56 P. M.

Consideration was then held on advertisement of a public hearing on water/sewer rate adjustments. Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator, stated that as shown in the report included in the Board’s agenda packets prepared by Paul Peery, Utilities Manager; Wendy Farkas, Management Analyst; Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance; himself; and Kathleen Guzi, County Administrator, staff has developed five-year forecasts of utility revenues and expenditures.

He noted that, based on these forecasts, additional revenues in the amount of \$400,000 are needed per year to support County utility operations and development in the future. Mr. Moorman stated that during the FY 13-14 budget committee meetings, held in March 2013, staff reviewed the County’s water and sewer rates and informed the committee that these rates should be reviewed again later in the year. Mr. Moorman noted that detailed information on these rates and the proposed increases was included in the Board’s packets and previously staff members briefed each Board member.

Mr. Moorman noted that the forecasts anticipate that operating expenses will increase an average of 3% per year, but will decrease at the end of the period by the County eliminating its purchase of water from the Western Virginia Water Authority. He further noted that debt service is projected to increase as much as 21% before falling 2% below current levels due to the retirement of older debt and noted that capital improvements are projected to fall from a current year level of \$1,422,500 to \$454,500 in fiscal year 2019.

Mr. Moorman stated that operating costs increases are expected to be driven primarily by inflation with the notable exception of employee health insurance costs and, due to uncertainty associated with continuing federal healthcare reforms, staff forecasts annual insurance cost increases of 12%. He further stated that utility debt service increases are the result of the

County's assumption of debt funding the soon-to-be-completed upsizing of the Tinker Creek sewer interceptor to accommodate continued development in the Daleville and Exit 150 areas. Mr. Moorman further noted that improvements to the Roanoke Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, in which Botetourt County is a partner, will add just under \$70,000 in new debt service, and financing for well development and water storage near Bonsack is estimated to add approximately \$100,000 in debt service.

Mr. Moorman stated that, among the capital improvements projected over the next five years are \$900,000 for the development of new wells to replace the existing Greenfield wells because of non-safety related water quality issues, \$1.2 million for additional well development to support growth, \$300,000 for a utility equipment storage and a maintenance building, and \$600,000 for general water and sewer system improvements.

Mr. Moorman stated that the proposed rates, if adopted, would impact the average residential County water customers' monthly water bills by an increase of between \$2.00 and \$5.44; however, over eight percent of residential water customers could expect to see their monthly bills decrease by as much as \$14.50 per month. He stated that residential sewer bills would increase an average of \$3.00 per month for those customers who are also County water customers and private water system customers could expect their sewer bills to increase an average of \$5.00 per month. He further stated that commercial water customers' water bills would increase an average of \$61.05 a month and their sewer bills would increase an average of \$38.29 per month.

After discussion, Mr. Moorman noted that the staff is also proposing a new 10% consumption fee for residential water customers using more than 5,000 gallons of water per month. He noted that this fee is proposed to encourage water conservation without adding costs to the average water customer. He further noted that the average residential customer uses 4,252 gallons of water a month and would not be affected by the fee.

Mr. Moorman noted that the staff is also proposing a new unmetered fire service fee that would apply to commercial customers where fire protection to buildings is provided separately from the building's domestic water supply. He noted that the Western Virginia Water Authority has such a fee and the proposed County fee is slightly less than what is charged by the Authority. Mr. Moorman stated that the County's implementation of this fee would close a loophole whereby some businesses currently receive water for fire protection at no cost.

Mr. Moorman then requested the Board to authorize staff to advertise these rates for a public hearing at their December 19, 2013, regular meeting.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Moorman noted that the unmetered fire service fee is proposed to be a flat fee based on the water line's size. After further questioning by Mr. Austin, Mr. Moorman noted that the County has approximately 9 businesses at the present time that would be required to pay this unmetered fire service fee.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Moorman noted that the current projections show that the County would need to implement another 5% rate increase in FY 16 to meet the Utility Fund's five year revenue and expense forecasts. After further questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Moorman noted that the County last implemented a utility rate adjustment effective January 2012. Mr. Moorman noted that this proposed increase allows the County to continue its policy of smaller, incremental rate increases.

Mr. Zerrilla noted that the unanticipated Greenfield water source issue is driving this need for an increase in rates. He noted that the Greenfield water issues were unknown at the

time the last rate increase was implemented and, therefore, were not included in the Capital Improvements Plan for future funding.

Mr. Moorman noted that the County will continue to review the utility rates on an on-going basis. He noted that, if these rates are adopted by the Board in December, they should be sufficient for the County's revenue/expense needs until FY 16 unless actual conditions substantially differ from anticipated conditions.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton regarding an opinion from the County's financial advisor on these proposed rate increases, Mr. Zerrilla stated that he thinks that the financial advisor would suggest that the County utilize reserve funds in the short term. He noted that next year, the staff can ensure that the level of rates and utility reserves are sound.

Mr. Clinton then questioned if the financial advisor would be concerned with the fact that the County needs to make these rate adjustments only two years after the last adjustment. Mr. Zerrilla stated that the County will make sure that our operating fund balance has adequate liquidity to make any Virginia Resources Authority or other required debt service payments. Mr. Zerrilla stated that he believes that the County's financial advisor would agree with the staff's proposed course of action in increasing rates.

Mrs. Guzi stated that this rate increase will assist the County in planning for the future. She noted that it is prudent in the short term to use reserve funds but, for the long-term, additional revenues are needed to meet expenses.

After questioning by Mr. Austin, Mrs. Guzi noted that the County has identified the need for a more potable water source for the Greenfield system. She noted that the test wells dug several months ago did not result in a feasible water supply and the County continues to look at options.

After further questioning by Mr. Austin, Mrs. Guzi noted that the staff does not know what the costs would be of alternatives to a new Greenfield water source. She noted that "it will require a different type of capital investment." After further questioning, Mrs. Guzi stated that the Board could adjust these rates again after deciding "where we want to be five years in the future."

Mr. Moorman noted that action on this proposed rate increase does not mandate the Board to complete any particular CIP projects. He noted that these rates are the basis for financing of the system.

Mr. Clinton suggested that staff provide additional graphics at next month's public hearing on these proposed rate increases to "make it clear to the public as to what we are doing and why."

Mr. Moorman noted that a copy of the draft public hearing advertisement was included in the Board's information packets. He also noted that the staff can make informational charts available at the public hearing.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board authorized the advertisement of a public hearing at the December 19 regular meeting on proposed utility rate adjustments. (Resolution Number 13-11-11)

AYES: Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Mr. Austin, Mr. Clinton

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: None

Mrs. Guzi then reported on Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) legislative items. She noted that based on a request from Botetourt County, VACo agreed to support expanding

eligibility statewide for the Port of Virginia Economic and Infrastructure Development Zone grant program. She also noted that VACo is supporting Botetourt County's, and other local governments', request that the General Assembly study the State's dam/impoundment safety standards and the significant financial impact on localities and/or property owners to bring these structures into compliance with new Department of Conservation and Recreation standards.

Mrs. Guzi stated that VACo's Finance Committee also discussed the State's unfunded teacher pension liability which could impact the County's financial statements. Mrs. Guzi stated that the County does not have the full responsibility to fund teacher pension liability costs; however, these costs have to be included in the County's annual financial statements as a liability. Mrs. Guzi noted that VACo and the County are working with the State to find a compromise position on this issue.

Mr. Austin stated that this is a complicated issue "that does not appear to be shaking out in the County's favor." He noted that the State could place this large expense on the County's financial sheets.

Mrs. Guzi noted that it is a Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) requirement that County and School employee pension liabilities be included in the County's financial statements.

After discussion by Mr. Clinton, Mrs. Guzi noted that Virginia has underfunded the teachers' pension plan for many years. She further noted that some states do not have a pension liability—it is the locality's responsibility.

Mr. Austin stated that he does not like the position that the State has put the County in in this situation. He noted that, if this requirement impacts the County's bond rating, it could impact the County's future economic development opportunities as well.

Discussion was then held on various appointments.

On motion by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board reappointed Mr. John Griffin as the Fincastle District representative on the Planning Commission for a four year term to expire on January 1, 2018. (Resolution Number 13-11-12)

AYES: Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Mr. Austin, Mr. Clinton

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: None

After discussion, on motion by Mr. Austin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board reappointed Mr. Steve Kidd as the Buchanan District representative on the Planning Commission for a four year term to expire on January 1, 2018. (Resolution Number 13-11-13)

AYES: Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Mr. Austin, Mr. Clinton

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: None

Consideration was then held on a request to participate in the Bank On Roanoke Valley program. Mrs. Guzi noted that the Bank On Roanoke Valley program is a new initiative from the United Way of the Roanoke Valley which is designed to connect unbanked and underbanked citizens with local banks for financial services such as low-cost checking accounts, savings accounts, and financial education opportunities.

Mrs. Guzi noted that she has talked to representatives of the Bank of Fincastle, the Bank of Botetourt, and Freedom First Credit Union who are participating in this program. She noted

that the program is a tool to help citizens improve their economic state. She noted that information on this program will also be provided to the Department of Social Services to give to their clients.

Mrs. Guzi noted that the United Way is requesting \$2,500 in funding for the next two years to help with the program's marketing campaign. She noted that the County could evaluate the program after the first year to ascertain its success and viability and, if the program is not working, the County can decide to not provide funding in the second year.

Mr. Martin stated that he has reviewed the information supplied on this program and he is opposed to the County's participation at this time. Mr. Martin noted that the Board removed approximately 20 community organizations from the FY 13 budget due to financial constraints and the County is now being asked to include funding for a new program. Mr. Martin noted that this does not appear to be appropriate and he does not feel that he can support this request.

Mr. Clinton stated that Mr. Martin has a good point. He noted that this request should be considered during the County's budget development process in early 2014.

Mrs. Guzi noted that requests of this type would normally be handled during the County's budget development cycle.

Mr. Leffel stated that he would be opposed to the Board approving funding for this program at this time. He noted that the Board members and County staff have no idea what issues will have to be addressed during the FY 14-15 budget development process. He noted that this request would be a "dilution" of the funds allocated to the County's citizens. Mr. Leffel stated that he also would prefer that the Board consider this funding request during the upcoming budget process.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board denied the request to participate in the Bank On Roanoke Valley program at this time with the issue to be reconsidered during the development of the FY 14-15 County budget. (Resolution Number 13-11-14)

AYES: Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Mr. Austin, Mr. Clinton

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: None

The Board was reminded that the December regular meeting will be on Thursday, December 19, 2013.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 5:27 P. M.