

The regular meeting of the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors was held on Tuesday, May 26, 2015, in Rooms 226-228 of the Greenfield Education and Training Center in Daleville, Virginia, beginning at 2:00 P. M.

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

ABSENT: Members: None

Others present at the meeting:
Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator
Mrs. Kathleen D. Guzi, County Administrator
Mr. Mike Lockaby, County Attorney

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 2:01 P. M.

Mr. Dodson then thanked everyone for attending today's Board meeting. Mr. Dodson stated that yesterday was Memorial Day and while doing chores at home he took time to reflect on what Memorial Day means to him. He noted that Memorial Day was first celebrated 140 years ago to honor Civil War veterans and the holiday now honors the memory of all veterans.

Mr. Dodson stated that some of those who sacrificed their lives were his friends and colleagues. He noted that Memorial Day is more than a day for cookouts; it is a day to honor those individuals who have served their country since the Revolutionary War and for those who stand up when needed to serve their country.

Mr. Dodson then asked those present to observe a moment of silence or prayer for the Country, the State, the County, and for our veterans who gave their all in their sacrifices for freedom in today's world.

Mr. Dodson then asked that all veterans present at today's meeting come forward to lead the group in reciting the pledge of allegiance.

After the pledge of allegiance, Mr. Leffel stated that he is honored and proud to sit next to Mr. Dodson and he appreciates all of the veterans for their service.

Dr. Scothorn then stated that the County would like to recognize Gala Industries for allowing its employees who serve in the County's volunteer fire and rescue organizations to leave their jobs in order to respond to emergency calls. He noted that Gala Industries also allows the Eagle Rock Volunteer Fire Department to house a fire truck at their business in order to reduce the call response time. Dr. Scothorn stated that Gala Industries has served their community in this manner for 30 years.

Dr. Scothorn then asked that representatives from Gala Industries come forward along with their employees who volunteer for the County's fire and rescue units.

Chief Jeff Beckner stated that the County cannot put numbers or a price on what Gala Industries allows these volunteers to do to serve their community during company working hours.

Mrs. Guzi stated that actions such as this make Botetourt the wonderful community that we are.

Mr. David Bryan, President of Gala Industries, stated that Botetourt County is the company's home and many of his staff went to school and grew up together. Mr. Bryan noted that

this recognition is gratefully accepted and the company appreciates the volunteers' dedication to serving the County and their community.

Dr. Scothorn then presented Mr. Bryan with a plaque expressing the County's appreciation for Gala Industries providing this service to the County, its citizens, and the area's volunteer fire and rescue units.

Mr. Jay Brenchick, Economic Development Manager, stated that the first business expansion to the new world happened on May 14, 1607, at Jamestown and is considered the first business venture in Virginia. Mr. Brenchick noted, therefore, that it is appropriate that May be declared Business Appreciation Month by the Governor.

Mr. Brenchick stated that there are over 1,700 businesses in Botetourt County which support the economy and help to make the community prosperous. He noted that a letter of appreciation has been sent to all of these businesses.

Mrs. Guzi then read the following proclamation which was also read at the Botetourt County Chamber of Commerce's recent annual dinner meeting:

WHEREAS, the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors is committed to ensuring the long-term economic stability of the County and creating a business-friendly environment that benefits all who live, work, and travel in the County; and,

WHEREAS, Botetourt County's businesses, whether they be small or large, play a pivotal role in strengthening our County and the Roanoke region by embracing job creation, innovative technologies, and employing a diverse workforce to preserve the economic well-being of all our citizens; and,

WHEREAS, Botetourt County currently has more than 1,700 businesses that provide thousands of jobs to our citizens, the Roanoke region and beyond, and offer a variety of services and products worldwide; and,

WHEREAS, Botetourt's businesses operate in diverse industries, including advanced and traditional manufacturing, transportation, tourism, agribusiness, professional services, and information technology; and,

WHEREAS, the Board recognizes the new and continued accomplishments and expansions of our existing businesses, and celebrates and emboldens the entrepreneurial spirit that thrives in Botetourt County, opening the floodgates for a future wave of pioneering commerce and industry; and,

WHEREAS, the Board acknowledges the many charitable, civic, and philanthropic contributions made by businesses and encourages the highest level of corporate citizenship and community involvement; and,

WHEREAS, the Board also thanks its partnering organizations for the collaborative effort required to promote, retain, and grow a vibrant and varied business community;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors does hereby recognize May 2015 as **Business Appreciation Month** in Botetourt County in order to give the citizens a distinct opportunity to recognize Botetourt businesses for the essential role they play in the community as well as driving and strengthening the County's economy.

Consideration was then held on approval of the minutes of the FY 16 School budget public hearing held on April 22, 2015, and the minutes of the regular meeting held on April 28, 2015.

There being no discussion, on motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the minutes of the FY 16 School budget public hearing

held on April 22, 2015, and the minutes of the regular meeting held on April 28, 2015, were approved as submitted. (Resolution Number 15-05-01)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Consideration was then held on approval of additional appropriations. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, stated that there were six pass through appropriations for the Board's consideration this month. He noted that these were for receipt of sponsorship funds, restitution, grants monies, and cost reimbursements.

There being no discussion, on motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following additional appropriations: (Resolution Number 15-05-02)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$2,500 to Sports Complex – Marketing, 100-4071300-5840. These are sponsorship funds for costs associated with the NCCAA Softball National Championship banquet.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$160 to Parks and Recreation – Vehicle & Power Equipment – Fuels, 100-4071000-6008. These are restitution funds received for fuel theft.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$28,319.22 to Fire & EMS – Capital Outlay – Machinery & Equipment, 100-4035500-8001. These are RSAF (Rescue Squad Assistance Fund) grant monies. This appropriation will cover qualified purchases made with these funds.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$885.60 to Electoral Board/ Registrar – Other Operating Supplies, 100-4013300-6014. These are reimbursement funds received from the Department of Elections.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$1,937.93 to the following Sheriff's Department accounts: \$1,800.21 to Wages – Overtime, 100-4031200-1200; and \$137.72 to FICA, 1004031200-2100. These are funds received from AEP for providing traffic control at their Cloverdale construction site entrance.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$2,409.14 to Sheriff – Subsistence & Lodging, 100-4031200-5530. These are funds received from the Commonwealth of Virginia for reimbursement of extradition costs.

Consideration was then held on approval of the accounts payable and ratification of the Short Accounts Payable List. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, stated that this month's accounts payable totaled \$642,122.96; \$524,473.02 in General Fund invoices; \$13,156.66 in Debt Service Fund expenditures; and \$104,493.28 in Utility Fund invoices. He noted that this month's Short Accounts Payable totaled \$137,364.30; \$126,457.36 in General Fund expenditures; \$3,055 in Debt Service Fund invoices; and \$7,851.94 in Utility Fund expenditures.

Mr. Zerrilla stated that this month's large expenditure was an invoice in the amount of \$40,035 to Wampler-Eanes Appraisal Service for work to date on the County's real estate reassessment.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Zerrilla stated that this project is billed based on the percentage of completion and the County holds a 15% retainage of the bill amount.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the accounts payable list and ratified the Short Accounts Payable List as submitted. (Resolution Number 15-05-03)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Consideration was then held on authorizing the sole source procurement for remounting of an ambulance chassis. Deputy Chief David Firestone stated that today's ambulance bodies are built in such a way that they can outlast the vehicle's chassis which results in remounting an ambulance body on a new chassis as a viable option.

Chief Firestone stated that the County has a 2009 ambulance with over 120,000 miles on the odometer that suffered a major mechanical failure of the transfer case three months ago. He noted that this ambulance has been out of service since that time and, in reviewing all options, staff has determined that the most viable way to return this unit to service is to have the original manufacturer (Horton Emergency Vehicles/FESCO Emergency Sales) remount the ambulance body onto a new chassis. Chief Firestone stated that this action will allow the existing warranties on the vehicle to remain in effect.

After discussion, Chief Firestone stated that, if any other firm remounts the ambulance onto a new chassis the warranty will be voided. He noted that the module and mounting were originally warranted for 15 years and, if Horton/FESCO remounts the unit onto a new chassis, the original warranty would be retained and the company would also provide the County with an additional five year warranty. Chief Firestone stated that the company would warranty the remount for one year on the workmanship from the date of the remount or 24,000 miles, whichever occurs first. He noted that funding for the remount is being requested in the upcoming FY 16 budget.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Chief Firestone stated that the County currently owns 6 or 7 ambulances that were built by Horton Emergency Vehicles. After further questioning, Chief Firestone noted that this is the first remount that the County has considered in approximately 10 years. He stated that the staff talked to other emergency services units that had ambulances remounted by Horton and the company provides reasonable pricing for this service.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Chief Firestone stated that any body shop can detach and remount an ambulance body onto a new chassis but they would not offer a warranty comparable to the one offered by Horton/FESCO.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution authorizing the sole source procurement of ambulance remounting service with Horton Emergency Vehicles/FESCO Emergency Sales.

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Resolution Number 15-05-04

WHEREAS, Botetourt County is interested in remounting an ambulance chassis; and,

WHEREAS, these services are non-professional services; and,

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-4303 of the Code of Virginia provides that sole source purchasing may be used in procurement of non-professional services when only one source is practicably available for the service to be procured; and,

WHEREAS, the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors finds that only one source, Horton Emergency Vehicles and FESCO Emergency Sales, is practicably able to provide the required services because service from any other source would void the warranty on the module; and,

WHEREAS, in consideration of the above conditions, the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors finds that competitive bidding is not practicable;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors authorizes sole source procurement of ambulance remounting services from Horton Emergency Vehicles and FESCO Emergency Sales for up to two procurements, such awards to be made no later than June 1, 2016, dependent on availability of funding.

Consideration was then held on a request for an additional appropriation from the Botetourt County Schools regarding dual enrollment reimbursement. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, stated that, in affiliation with Virginia Western Community College (VWCC), the School system participates in a dual enrollment program for high school students. He noted that VWCC reimburses participating localities for 100% of their program expenditures for the current school year. Mr. Zerrilla stated that the schools are invoiced by VWCC for student tuition costs and then are reimbursed for those costs.

Mr. Zerrilla stated that the current school year saw a higher than anticipated student participation in the program which resulted in costs exceeding budgeted amounts. He noted that the school system is requesting an appropriation in the amount of \$210,227.42 to their FY 15 operating budget to fully fund this program and County staff is recommending approval of this request.

Dr. Tony Brads, Superintendent of Schools, stated that that the school system had an unanticipated number of students enrolled in the dual enrollment program this year. He noted that the school system only "pays what we owe" to Dabney S. Lancaster Community College for this program; however, VWCC reimburses the school system for these costs. Dr. Brads stated that this allocation will be accounted for in FY 16 spending.

After discussion, Dr. Brads noted that dual enrollment is one of their signature programs as it offsets costs for continuing a student's education. He noted that 5,692 college credit hours were accumulated by the school system's FY 14-15 graduates through this program. Dr. Brads then thanked the Board for their consideration of this request and their support for the School Board's budget over the years.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Dr. Brads stated that he would guess that there had been an increase from FY 13-14 to FY 14-15 in the number of college credit hours accumulated by Botetourt County students. After further questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Dr. Brads stated that of this year's 152 graduates from James River High School, nearly one-half will be going to a four-year institution, one-third to a two-year institution, the military, or into the work force. He stated that of the 231 graduates from Lord Botetourt High School, 111 will attend a four-year institution, over 60 will attend a two-year institution, 11 will go to a trade school, 7 will enter the military, and approximately 30 will go directly into the work force. Dr. Brads stated that many of those graduates who are going into the work force are doing so because in high school they received State licensure in their trade of choice.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved an appropriation of funds in the amount of \$210,227.42 to the School's FY 15 operating budget regarding dual enrollment program reimbursements. (Resolution Number 15-05-05)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Mr. Kevin Hamm, Maintenance Operations Manager with the Virginia Department of Transportation, was then present to speak to the Board.

After discussion by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Hamm stated that Farmer's Road, Brugh's Mill Road, and Blue Ridge Turnpike are scheduled for asphalt patching work this spring/summer.

Mr. Hamm then reviewed VDoT's monthly report. He noted that the Exit 150 project is continuing and noted that there is a public meeting scheduled for Thursday, May 28 at Lord Botetourt High School to allow citizens and affected property owners an opportunity to talk to the project's contractor and VDoT personnel. Mr. Hamm further noted that there are "No Trespassing" signs posted on the former truck stop property and these signs will be enforced by the Sheriff's Department.

Mr. Hamm noted that the request discussed last month to have the Route 11 north through lanes shifted to the left to allow tractor trailers to have additional shoulder area to park while waiting to access the Pilot station property will not be possible. He noted that the far left lane will be used when traffic is shifted during the Exit 150 construction project.

Mr. Hamm stated that there were two land development projects, two private entrance permits, and three utility permits reviewed and/or issued in the past month. He further noted that VDoT's area headquarters are also patching asphalt, sweeping roads, and installing pipe in various locations.

After questioning, Mr. Hamm stated that the Route 460/Mountain Pass Road deceleration lane extension project will be completed this summer. He further noted that VDoT has access to a sweeper for the next month and will use this equipment where they can during this time. Mr. Hamm also stated that VDoT has contracted with a tree trimming company to trim trees and brush from rights-of-way in Troutville, Buchanan, and Eagle Rock. He noted that the company will spend four weeks in each area.

Mr. Hamm then stated that VDoT's traffic engineering staff have completed the study of Route 43 (Parkway Drive) near the Pico Road intersection after receiving citizen requests for a School Bus Ahead sign and to reduce the speed limit in this area. He stated that the study indicated that there was adequate sight distance at the school bus stops in this area; therefore, no signs will be installed. Mr. Hamm stated that this section of roadway is posted for 55 mph, has a traffic count of 434 vehicles per day, and only one accident, which involved a deer, occurred between 2012 and 2014. He stated that VDoT staff is not recommending a change in the speed limit at this time but many of the signs along this section of road are in poor/fair condition and new replacement signs have been ordered.

Mr. Williamson stated that the citizens who contacted him regarding this matter are scared to come out of their driveways onto Route 43.

Mr. Hamm noted that the through truck restriction on Valley Road (Route 779) has been delayed and is now expected to be completed next month. He stated that a request for a 3-way

Stop sign and speed limit reduction at the Parsons Road (Route 676)/Trinity Road (Route 670) intersection was reviewed by their traffic engineering staff. He noted that the speed reduction and posting are not warranted; however, VDoT installed some intersection warning signs, winding road signs, and advisory speed plaques in this area two weeks ago.

Mr. Martin then stated that he had previously discussed with Mr. Hamm a citizen's concerns regarding large trucks using Mountain Pass Road as a short cut between Routes 460 and 11.

Mr. Hamm stated that VDoT has heard from their staff and some citizens about trucks using Mountain Pass Road and they are conducting a review of this roadway. He noted that a full through-truck restriction may be an option for this road due to its many sharp curves and hills.

Mr. Dodson then questioned if the Exit 150 construction project could cause trucks to use Mountain Pass Road to avoid the construction zone. Mr. Hamm stated that he would not think that this would be the case; however, VDoT is considering installing signs on Mountain Pass Road notifying truck drivers to not follow GPS directions to use the roadway. He noted that these types of notice signs can be installed without VDoT having to go through a full through truck restriction implementation process; however, VDoT will need to obtain additional information before making a decision.

Mr. Martin noted that VDoT has installed a sign on Route 460 as discussed last month warning truck drivers to not use Webster Heights Road.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Hamm stated that he will check to see if a sign can be posted on the I-81 bridge across the James River near Buchanan identifying the river as part of the Upper James River Water Trail. Mr. Dodson also suggested that a sign be placed on I-81 near Troutville notifying drivers of the Appalachian Trail's location. Mr. Hamm stated that he would check on this request as well.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson regarding the Catawba/Etzler Road intersection project, Mr. Hamm stated that as far as he is aware this project is still on schedule for completion this fall. After further questioning, Mr. Hamm stated that he has seen the contractor working on this project when he drives through this area.

Mr. Leffel then stated that there is a deep pothole on Route 43 near Oxbow Farm. Mr. Hamm stated that Route 43 is scheduled for asphalt paving work this summer but he will see if this pothole can be patched prior to the paving work being done.

Dr. Scothorn then thanked Mr. Hamm for his fast responses to his e-mail inquiries regarding Apple Tree West Subdivision and pothole patching in front of a business located on Alternate 220. Mr. Hamm stated that the issue of slurry stone size in Apple Tree West has been taken care of and VDoT will repair the pavement damage near the Cavalier Automotive entrance off of Alternate 220 as it is located on VDoT's right-of-way.

Mr. Kevin Shearer, General Services Manager, and Mr. Brian Blevins, VDoT's Area Land Use Engineer, then conducted a work session on the proposed FY 2016-2021 Secondary System Six Year Plan.

Mr. Shearer stated that there are not many changes to the Plan from last year's document. He noted that last year the Board adopted resolutions declaring Deerfield Road and Buhrman Road as Rural Rustic Road projects and they are included as Priorities 4 and 5 in the

FY 16-21 Plan. He noted that McFalls Road is a 0.60 mile gravel road and is listed as Priority #6.

Mr. Shearer stated that Deerfield Road will receive funding after July 1, 2015, and is anticipated to be fully funded and advertised for bids in October 2017.

After discussion, Mr. Blevins stated that excess funds from a previous project were moved to the Deerfield Road project which has allowed it to proceed earlier than expected. Mr. Blevins stated that the County will have more money in the Six Year Plan for unpaved roads than paved roads over the next six years.

Mr. Blevins stated that McFalls Road should begin to receive funding in FY 17 with the project advertised for bids in FY 19 or FY 20. He noted that VDoT has already replaced the culvert pipes and done other repair work on Deerfield Road so, if the actual construction work costs less than anticipated, the excess funds will be moved to the Buhrman Road and McFalls Road projects, if possible.

After questioning by Mr. Martin as to why McFalls Road was designated as Priority #6, Mr. Blevins stated that Deerfield and Buhrman Roads were set as higher priorities as some maintenance work has already been completed on these two roads which will allow those projects to be completed sooner.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board authorized staff to advertise the FY 16-21 Secondary System Six Year Plan and the FY 15-16 Secondary System budget for public hearing at the June 23 regular meeting. (Resolution Number 15-05-06)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Shearer stated that the road project in Marion Oaks Subdivision is complete and the County is waiting on the paving company to pave the road.

Consideration was then held on an amendment to the cell tower and ground space lease agreement with nTelos. Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator, stated that the County leases space on its Fincastle emergency communications tower and site to nTelos for the placement and operation of telecommunications equipment. He noted that the company's current lease was approved in 1998 for space to co-locate six antennas on the tower. Mr. Moorman noted that nTelos pays an annual rent of approximately \$17,000.

Mr. Moorman noted that nTelos would like to add additional telecommunications equipment to the tower and a corresponding increase in their rental fees has been negotiated as follows: upon execution of the amendments, annual rent increases to \$20,000; on the first year anniversary of the amendment, annual rent increases to \$27,000; on the second year anniversary of the amendment, annual rent increases to \$35,000; on the third year anniversary of the amendment and every year thereafter, rent increases four percent (4%).

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Moorman stated that the County entered into an agreement with the Town of Fincastle that the revenues from nTelos would be remitted to the Town. He noted that the revenue from the remaining co-locators is paid to the former owner of the property as per a previously approved agreement.

Mr. Moorman noted that the lease increases more closely reflect current market rates. He further noted that the County Attorney has reviewed and approved the lease amendments.

After discussion, Mrs. Guzi stated that she has discussed this cell tower lease amendment with the Town of Fincastle and they appreciate the County negotiating this agreement on the Town's behalf.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved an agreement in substantial conformance with the proposed "First Amendment to Tower and Ground Space Sublease" between Botetourt County and Virginia PCS Alliance, LC (NTELOS) for the Fincastle tower site, subject to the review and approval of the County Attorney, and authorized County staff to execute the same on the Board's behalf. (Resolution number 15-05-07)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Consideration was then held on approval of a lease agreement for a public access boat ramp on the James River in Glen Wilton. Mr. Guzi stated that the development of additional boat access sites on the James River is part of Phase 2 of the development of the Upper James River Water Trail. She noted that the Water Trail Committee identified the Glen Wilton area as a key location for a public access site and this specific site has been traditionally used by boaters and fisherman to access the James River.

Mrs. Guzi stated that Pete Peters, Director of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism has worked hard to find a landowner willing to lease their riverfront property for this purpose. She stated that Mr. and Mrs. Robert Gadpaille have agreed to a ten year lease with two five-year renewals for a one acre site adjacent to Bridge Street in Glen Wilton. Mrs. Guzi noted that the negotiated lease amount is \$250 per year and the County will be responsible for site improvements and signage for this location similar to those implemented at other James River public boating access ramps.

Mrs. Guzi stated that several stakeholder groups have committed time and donations to assist with immediate site improvements and additional grant sources have been identified for funding of longer term improvements to this site. She further noted that the County Attorney has reviewed and approved this lease agreement.

Mr. Leffel stated that it is a good idea to have a boat access at this location. He noted that this site offers safe and easy access to the river.

On motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approve the agreement between the County and Mr. and Mrs. Robert Gadpaille to lease a one acre tract of land for the development of a public access point on the James River in Glen Wilton and authorized the County Administrator to sign the document on the County's behalf. (Resolution Number 15-05-08)

AYES: Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Mr. Williamson, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Consideration was then held on a request to advertise for a public hearing on the disposition of public property associated with the County's water and sewer systems to the Western

Virginia Water Authority. Mrs. Guzi stated that, as part of the County becoming a member of the Western Virginia Water Authority, certain properties, including water tanks, pump stations, sewage treatment plants, and other appurtenances/infrastructure, will need to be transferred to the Authority's ownership. She noted that this disposition of public property requires that a public hearing be held.

Mrs. Guzi noted that a listing of these properties was included in the Board's information packets. She noted that, if a utility-related infrastructure is not currently active in the County's system, it is not proposed to be transferred to the Authority. Mrs. Guzi further noted that the Hollins/Strawberry Hill water tank and cell tower site is included on this listing; however, it has been determined that the cell tower site will need to be subdivided from the water tank property in order to be retained in the County's ownership. She also stated that the Greenfield water tank site will be subdivided from the larger Greenfield tract and transferred to the Authority's ownership.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mrs. Guzi stated that this public hearing request was not considered at the Board's April meeting because the Authority's participating localities had not yet held their public hearings on the County becoming a member of the Authority. She stated that Roanoke City, Franklin County, Roanoke County, and the Water Authority have now held their public hearings. She stated that no one spoke at these hearings and those localities have endorsed the County joining the Authority. She noted that Roanoke County will take final action on this request later today.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Dodson, seconded by Mr. Williamson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board authorized the advertisement of a public hearing at their June 23 regular meeting on the disposition of public property associated with the County's water and sewer systems to the ownership of the Western Virginia Water Authority. (Resolution Number 15-05-09)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Consideration was then held on a request to authorize for a public hearing on amendments to Chapter 25. Zoning of the Botetourt County Code regarding a proposed Utility-Scale Wind Ordinance. Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Planning Manager, stated that the Community Development staff and Planning Commission members have been working to draft a Utility-Scale Wind ordinance for several months. She noted that this process has included two joint Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors work sessions, a trip to a wind farm in West Virginia, a public forum held on April 21, and a citizen survey accessible through the County's website.

She noted that the Planning Commission held a work session at their May 11 meeting and voted unanimously to advertise the draft ordinance for public hearing at their June 8 meeting.

Mrs. Pendleton then conducted a PowerPoint presentation on the survey's results. She noted that 32 survey responses were received.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mrs. Pendleton noted that no official communications have been received from the Sierra Club about this proposed ordinance.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that 80% of the survey's responses were in support of the proposed ordinance.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mrs. Pendleton stated that approximately 2/3 of the respondents indicated that they had attended at least one of the public forums.

She noted that almost 80% of the respondents indicated that this ordinance will promote wind energy development in the County; 70% indicated that the ordinance's provisions will protect public safety; 60% indicated that the ordinance will protect the environment; 65% of the respondents indicated that the provisions will protect wildlife; almost 70% indicated that the provisions will protect scenic resources; and almost 80% indicated that they generally support the ordinance as proposed.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that 55% of the respondents indicated that they did not believe that no resources would be harmed if this ordinance was adopted; 25% indicated that the ecosystem would be harmed; and 20% indicated that native and/or endangered plant species would be harmed. She noted that almost 50% indicated that they did not believe wildlife would be harmed; and 35% indicated that birds, bats and other flying or avian wildlife would be harmed.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that 80% of the respondents believed that these types of utility-scale wind farms should be placed in forest districts; 75% believed that the facilities should be placed in agricultural districts; 60% believed that they should be allowed in industrial districts; and almost 30% of respondents believed that the facilities should be allowed in commercial districts. She then reviewed various comments both positive and negative submitted by the survey's respondents.

Mr. Martin requested that he receive a copy of Mrs. Pendleton's PowerPoint presentation.

After discussion, Mr. Moorman noted that there is a link on the County's website to the presentations that were given at the various work sessions and public forums on this proposed ordinance.

Mr. Williamson stated that the Board needs to further consider the issue of whether separate Special Exceptions Permits (SEP) are necessary for both a MET (temporary meteorological tower) and the wind farm itself. Mr. Williamson stated that he believes that MET towers should be considered through an administrative approval process.

Mr. Williamson also stated that SEPs are required in Agricultural A-1 Use Districts for "nursery, production" and "home business, rural" uses and he does not see that a SEP is necessary for these types of activities. He requested that the Planning Department review these requirements during the next Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan updates.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board authorized the advertisement of a public hearing at the June 23 regular meeting on proposed amendments to Chapter 25. Zoning of the Botetourt County Code regarding a proposed Utility-Scale Wind Ordinance. (Resolution Number 15-05-10)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Mrs. Guzi then updated the Board on various strategic planning-related projects. She noted that staff and the Steering Committee have been working diligently with the consultant on the Exit 150/Gateway Crossing Study. She noted that the County is at a point in this process whereby we need to solicit input on what the public would and would not like to see in this corri-

dor. She noted that a public meeting to obtain this input is scheduled for the evening of Thursday June 4 and the Steering Committee will hold their work session earlier that day. Mrs. Guzi also noted that meetings have been held with the Appalachian Trail Conservancy to identify areas for cooperation and partnership which will open up additional opportunities for not only Exit 150 but for the County's tourism program. She stated that, as the Board is aware, this study is a major initiative of the strategic plan and staff is excited about partnering with the Appalachian Trail regarding promotion and packaging of the trail to hikers and tourists.

Regarding the Daleville greenway, Mrs. Guzi stated that the County has received preliminary approval for full funding for this project from the Metropolitan Planning Organization's Transportation Technical Committee, pending final approval by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. She stated that approval from the CTB should be obtained in June and the County should receive these funds this fall.

Dr. Scothorn stated that a thank you letter should be sent to William Fralin and Court Rosen for their work in having this funding application approved.

Mrs. Guzi noted that this letter will be drafted and forwarded to these individuals upon final approval of the project's funding.

Mrs. Guzi then updated the Board on the Western Virginia Water Authority transition. She noted that staff orientations will be held this week with Authority representatives. She noted that there are many operational matters that need to be considered as part of the transition and this is requiring additional work of all staff members, especially the Utilities staff. She then thanked the Utility Department employees for their cooperation, hard work, and positive demeanor in making this transition as smooth as possible.

Regarding the Community Development Department, Mrs. Guzi stated that building permit requests are increasing and the staff continues to work on the draft Wind Ordinance, the Exit 150 study, and their day-to-day work items. She noted that implementation of the new storm water management regulations regarding the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permits is more involved than in the past and is taking up a lot of the staff's time. Mrs. Guzi stated that there is more monitoring and follow-up paperwork than originally anticipated which is very time consuming. She stated that the Board will continue to be updated as the County transitions to full compliance with the new regulations.

Mrs. Guzi stated that the County hosted the National Christian College Athletic Association tournament two weeks ago. She noted that ten ladies softball teams from as far away as California participated in this tournament and also worked on various community service projects in the County and the Roanoke Valley while they were here. Mrs. Guzi stated that the tournament was a huge success which reflects well for the entire County.

Mrs. Guzi noted that as discussed earlier May is Business Appreciation Month. She noted that letters of appreciation were sent to every business in the County. She noted that the staff appreciates the assistance of the Chamber of Commerce and Commissioner of the Revenue Rodney Spickard with this project.

Mrs. Guzi stated that, as previously reported, there was a need for additional broadband service for the businesses located in EastPark Commerce Center. She noted that Economic Development and Administrative staff facilitated a meeting of the interested businesses' Information Technology (IT) staff to discuss the situation. She stated that information was shared which proved useful to many of the participants including the identification of a third-party vendor who provided an acceptable solution to the companies' broadband issues.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mrs. Guzi stated that the third provider can offer a better level of service through a wireless feed to provide a redundant broadband service that can supplement their current fiber service.

After discussion, Mrs. Guzi stated that she is working with the Roanoke Valley/Alleghany Regional Commission on a grant to study providing broadband services in the rural, northern end of Botetourt County. She noted that this study will be no cost to the County initially as the Alleghany Foundation is providing the matching grant amount.

Mrs. Guzi stated that she has begun holding meetings with representatives of the three towns. She noted that the towns recently conducted a combined workshop for their planning commission members and elected officials on planning and zoning issues. She noted that Dr. Mike Chandler from Virginia Tech spoke at this meeting.

Mrs. Guzi noted that the County will begin work this fall to update the Comprehensive Plan and this will include input from the towns on their strengths, challenges, needs, and opportunities.

She then noted that the Bank of Fincastle is sponsoring a legislative wrap-up meeting on June 4 at 8:30 AM at Bellacino's restaurant in Daleville with Delegate Terry Austin and Senator Steve Newman. Mrs. Guzi stated that the County needs to begin planning its list of 2016 legislative initiatives to be discussed with our General Assembly representatives.

Regarding technology updates, Mrs. Guzi stated that the contract for the telephone system update is in the process of being signed and the new enterprisewide software contract is being implemented. She noted that representatives from Harris Computers were in the County for a week to meet with various departmental staff on the upcoming software updates. She noted that this is a great opportunity for the staff to review our processes and procedures to see how we can continue to revise them to be more business friendly.

Mr. Martin then stated that he had received a letter from the Botetourt Farm Bureau in opposition to a proposal from the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF) to prohibit harvesting of elk during deer season in all counties west of the Blue Ridge. He noted that the Farm Bureau is opposed to this proposal because elk have a significant impact on farming operations and also carry diseases such as tuberculosis and brucellosis which can infect livestock. Mr. Martin stated that the Bureau is asking that the County "stand with them" in opposing this proposal.

Mr. Martin then made a motion that staff be directed to draft a letter to DGIF opposing this proposal to prohibit harvesting of elk during deer season. (Resolution Number 15-05-11)

Mr. Leffel stated that he does not think that the Board's action on this request would "make a difference one way or another." He noted that elk also carry Chronic Wasting Disease which can be transmitted to deer and other animals.

Mr. Leffel stated that elk were reintroduced into Kentucky several years ago and into three southwest Virginia counties more recently and these animals can roam over large territories. He noted that an elk can weigh between 800 – 1,000 pounds and can damage crops and fences. Mr. Leffel stated that he believes that it would be a long time, if ever, before elk would be an issue in this part of the State but he has no opposition to Mr. Martin's proposal.

Mr. Martin stated that he believes that the Board should support the Farm Bureau in this matter.

After further discussion, Mr. Dodson then seconded Mr. Martin's motion and it was then voted on as follows:

AYES: Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: Mr. Williamson

Consideration was then held on approval of an amendment to the Chief Local Elected Officials (CLEO) charter agreement. Mrs. Guzi stated that the County Attorney has determined that a public hearing is required on this proposed CLEO charter amendment and, if the Board agrees with this amendment, she asks that staff be directed to advertise this public hearing for the June regular meeting.

Mrs. Guzi stated that Mr. Jake Gilmer, Acting Director of the Western Virginia Workforce Development Board, was present to discuss the proposed charter amendments and to answer any questions the Board may have.

Mr. Gilmer stated that the Workforce Area #3 Chief Local Elected Officials (CLEO) Consortium was formed via a Charter Agreement in 2003 by the cities and counties in the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany region under the provisions of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). He noted that the Consortium agreed to cooperatively guide local workforce development efforts and the agreement identified CLEO's role in this process, e.g., appointing members of the Western Virginia Workforce Development Board (WDB), and designating a Grant Recipient and Fiscal Agent for WIA funds.

Mr. Gilmer stated that the local government administrators (City Managers and County Administrators) represent their jurisdictions at these meetings. He stated that in July 2014 Congress enacted the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) which repealed and replaced WIA. He noted that, in light of this change, a proposed partnership between the WDB and the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission (RVARC) was discussed. He stated that CLEO voted to amend its Charter Agreement (Amendment No. 1) to be consistent with the provisions of WIOA, re-designated the City of Roanoke as the Consortium Grant Recipient, and designated the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission as Fiscal Agent.

Mr. Gilmer noted that this will also allow the 3 – 5 staff members of the Workforce Development Board to be brought into RVARC's oversight. He noted that this consolidation will provide for greater organizational and fiscal capacity to support the mission of the WDB, result in better coordination of economic and workforce development efforts, and create a stronger focus on serving the needs of key industry sectors.

After discussion, Mr. Gilmer stated that the amendment also confirms that the Charter Agreement is an exercise of joint powers as permitted by Section 15.2-1300 of the Code of Virginia, which provides the member jurisdictions more options to cooperatively address workforce development in the future.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Gilmer stated that Mrs. Joyce Kessinger's term as CLEO's Chairman expires next month. After further questioning, Mr. Gilmer stated that RVARC will receive an allocation of funds for their oversight of CLEO.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Williamson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board authorized staff to advertise for a public hearing at the June regular meeting on a proposed amendment to the Chief Local Elected Officials (CLEO) charter agreement. (Resolution Number 15-05-12)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Mrs. Guzi then reminded the Board that the Virginia Secretary of Commerce and Trade will be attending the dedication ceremony for the welding lab at the Botetourt Technical Education Center at 5:00 P. M. today. She noted that it is planned that the Board members will attend this event and asked that they return to the Education and Training Center by 7:00 P. M. for the scheduled public hearings on two Special Exceptions Permit requests.

The Chairman then called for a 10 minute break.

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 4:05 P. M. to continue the Board's work session on the draft FY 16 County budget.

Mrs. Guzi stated that the County does anticipate receiving increased revenues in the current fiscal year (FY 15). She noted that the Board has been reviewing potential expenditures over the next two fiscal years and the anticipated real estate reassessment's revenues are "the big unknown" in FY 17. She noted that the reassessment valuations will become effective as of January 1, 2016 and these tax revenues will be collected in December 2016.

Mrs. Guzi stated that the County's portion of the debt service payment on the YMCA facility is expected to double in FY 17 and the County will be required to allocate performance grant monies to a couple of industries over the next two fiscal years. She noted that AEP's Cloverdale Substation expansion project will be completed by early 2017 which is anticipated to bring in additional tax revenue; however, the impact on meals, hotel/motel, and sales taxes from the Exit 150 construction project is unknown at this time.

Mrs. Guzi suggested that the Board could defer a couple of the big ticket items but "we are deferring way too many projects as it is." She noted that there is currently a \$1.5 million gap between revenues and expenditures in the FY 16 budget. She stated that the Board had previously said that they would like the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) monies (\$150,000) to be included in anticipated revenues, even though this enabling legislation has not been approved by Congress, which would decrease the budget's deficit to \$1.35 million. Mrs. Guzi then questioned whether the Board would rather increase revenues or use the Undesignated Fund Balance to close this gap. She noted that, if the County issues bonds in the next few years, we will have to explain our budget decision in this situation to the bond rating agencies.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mrs. Guzi stated that, if certain criteria are met, the County waives utility connection fees for new business prospects; however, under the provisions of the Virginia Resources Authority and the Western Virginia Water Authority agreements we can no longer provide these fee waivers. Mrs. Guzi stated that she would propose that a majority of the \$2 million in the Utility Capacity and Utility Operating Funds be set aside for potential future waiver of utility connection fees.

Dr. Scothorn stated that he believes that the County should provide funding to proceed with some of the school system's capital projects—buses and a roof at Lord Botetourt High School. He noted that \$1 million of these Utility Fund monies could be set aside for future connection fee waivers and \$1 million could be used for CIP items.

Mr. Martin then questioned why these monies couldn't be used to close the budget shortfall.

Mrs. Guzi stated that the Utility Fund monies are one-time funds and they should be used for one-time expenditures.

Mr. Martin stated that, as the Board cannot direct the Schools to use their local revenue allocation on certain, specific projects, what is to say that they do not use the funds proposed for the LBHS roof for some other purpose.

Mr. Williamson stated that the Board of Supervisors could allocate these funds through a special appropriation which specified the item/project that the funds would be used for. He noted that the County could also change the manner in which it appropriates funds to the schools from a lump sum amount to a categorical appropriation.

Mrs. Guzi stated that outside of the regular budget process, the Supervisors could make a special allocation for a specific, designated capital improvement project.

Mr. Leffel stated that most of this year's budgetary-related issues between the County and the School system could have been avoided if the Supervisors had been able to sit down with the School Board in a joint meeting earlier this year. He noted that both boards should work together and compromise on budget matters. Mr. Leffel further stated that the Board would be "going down a slippery slope" if they tell the schools where they can and cannot spend their budget monies. He noted that there was cooperation and understanding between the two boards during the James River High School renovation project.

Mrs. Guzi suggested that a joint committee could be created between the two boards to consider proposed capital improvement projects.

Mr. Dodson agreed that the Board would be on a slippery slope if they told the School Board what items they could spend their operational budget on. Mr. Dodson stated that, in his mind, buses and roof replacements are safety issues.

Mr. Williamson stated that the excess monies in the Utility Fund were received from County projects and County citizens paid for these projects. Mr. Williamson stated that in October 2014, the General Fund Balance was \$11.3 million and it is projected to be \$9.4 million in October 2015. Mr. Williamson noted that if the Board uses Undesignated Fund Balance monies to balance the FY 16 budget, then the General Fund Balance will be reduced to 7.2 million in October 2016.

He noted that, if the Board decides to use Undesignated Fund Balance monies to balance the FY 16 budget, this will have been done for three years in a row. Mr. Williamson stated that he does not believe that the Board should close the budget gap with Fund Balance monies and he will not support such a proposal. He further stated that the County will have a \$5 million liability to close the landfill at some point in the future and this could reduce the General Fund Balance to \$2 million. Mr. Williamson stated that the Board should set a tax rate that justifies this budget and suggested that a 4¢ or 5¢ increase in the real estate tax rate be advertised for FY 16.

Mr. Martin stated that he believes that the staff and Board need to look at where the money is being spent and he cannot support Mr. Williamson's proposed tax increase. He suggested that the staff and Board again review the budget to see where additional reductions can be made. He noted that the County approved a 7¢ real estate tax increase a few years ago (2012).

Mr. Williamson stated that he and Dr. Scothorn have spent a lot of time over the past few months reviewing the proposed budget. Mr. Williamson stated that he is not saying that the budget cannot be further reduced by \$1.5 million but "there will be a lot of agony" in doing so.

He noted that employee health care, Virginia Retirement System, public safety, and education are large parts of the budget.

After questioning by Mr. Martin regarding health care expenses, Dr. Scothorn stated that the County's health insurance companies provide the rates to the County.

Mr. Moorman noted that the County's health insurance contract has a term of December 1 through November 30. He noted that health insurance-related budget costs are based on the County's current health insurance contract and on historical trends and information received from our health insurance advisors as to what they estimate the costs will be in the next year based on their experience.

Dr. Scothorn stated that these expenditures also depend on the health of the individual and whether their spouse has coverage with the County or through the spouse's place of employment. Dr. Scothorn stated that he does not believe that we have seen the end of health insurance cost increases.

Mrs. Guzi stated that staff projects a 10% increase in health insurance rates next year.

Mr. Dodson stated that the County should consider whether to combine its health insurance plans with the schools' plans to see if any savings could occur.

After questioning by Mr. Martin regarding departmental maintenance budgets, Mr. Moorman stated that there has been some consolidation of maintenance service contracts. Mr. Zerrilla stated that equipment maintenance service contracts increase approximately 5% each year and they are considered a type of insurance.

Dr. Scothorn then questioned what the Board would do if the reassessment property valuations have decreased from the 2010 levels.

Mr. Martin stated that he would love to see more economic development activity in the County to bring in additional revenue. He asked that the Board and staff look to see if there can be any additional reductions made to the proposed budget without having to raise taxes.

Mr. Dodson stated that he is opposed to a tax increase in two consecutive fiscal years. He stated that, if the County knows that the reassessment rates are going to be lower than in 2010, it should be determined how to provide adequate revenues through only one tax increase. Mr. Dodson noted that a 5¢ tax increase would provide adequate revenues to fund the FY 16 and a part of the FY 17 budget. He further noted; however, that if it is anticipated that the reassessment figures will be 7% - 8% lower than in 2010, then the Board will have to consider a 10¢ tax increase in order to fund the budget.

Mr. Martin stated that he is concerned that, if the revenues are available, they will be spent.

Mr. Dodson stated that the Board has 30 days to come up with a budget before the end of the current fiscal year. He stated that the Board needs to ask more questions about the proposed new emergency operations center, the purchase of two ambulances, etc. Mr. Dodson noted that the Board is aware that they will have a "hole" in the FY 17 budget.

Mr. Williamson then reviewed the County's real estate tax rates over the past 30+ years. He noted that in 1982 the rate was 65¢, from 1983 – 1999 it was 75¢, from 1999 – 2007 it was 70¢, in 2007 it was decreased to 65¢, and in 2013 it was increased to 72¢.

He noted that the tax rate decreased in 1999 because of the housing boom and the growing economy. Mr. Williamson stated that "we need to get back to where we were" in the tax rate as the current economy is not as robust as it was in the late 1980s early 1990s. He noted that, if the reassessment valuations decrease, it will exacerbate the County's revenue situation.

Mr. Williamson then questioned if the Board should wait two years to see what revenue impacts the AEP Cloverdale substation project will have on the County.

Mr. Leffel noted that at one time the County's real estate rate was 90¢. He stated that in 1964 the Board of Supervisors agreed to increase the real estate tax rate to 90¢ for one year in order to construct a new jail facility. Mr. Leffel agreed that it is important for the County to have a reserve fund. Regarding the \$2 million in Utility Fund monies, Mr. Leffel stated that he believes that the County may have a more dire need now for this money to balance the budget than to save it or use it for one-time expenditures.

Mr. Leffel stated that the Board is going to have to raise taxes at some point but he would prefer that this only occur once and not for two consecutive years. Mr. Leffel stated that he would be reluctant to present this two year tax increase proposal to the taxpayers. Mr. Leffel stated that he "would like to get through this year's budget and see where we are next year."

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Leffel stated that the Board should wait until the reassessment figures are available before determining if and how much of a tax increase is necessary.

After questioning by Mr. Leffel regarding using the \$2 million in Utility Fund monies to balance the FY 16 budget, Mr. Williamson stated that he would prefer that the County save \$1 million of these funds in the event it is needed for unanticipated expenses.

Mr. Dodson stated that a determination needs to be made on whether the County really needs two ambulances at this time and questioned if only necessary equipment options on the new fire truck are being considered in the bid proposal.

Mrs. Guzi stated that all of the fire trucks that have over 100,000 miles are out of warranty and any repairs to those vehicles are costly. Mrs. Guzi stated that she would be concerned about not getting two new ambulances in FY 16 based on the age and condition of the current vehicle fleet. She noted that the County expects to receive approximately \$237,000 in grant funds for these vehicle purchases. After discussion, she stated that the County could delay funding for the new EOC.

Dr. Scothorn questioned whether not purchasing two ambulances in FY 16 would be a risk to the public.

Mrs. Guzi stated that the County has one ambulance that has been out of service for months. She noted that this unit is the vehicle that the Board approved its remounting onto a new chassis earlier today. Mrs. Guzi stated that she is willing to go back and review the departmental justification for purchasing two ambulances in FY 16 but this would be an area where the County would be challenged to make budget cuts.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mrs. Guzi stated that the proposal to purchase two pneumatic lifts for County ambulances (\$60,000) could be delayed for one year.

Mr. Williamson stated that, if the County takes \$1.5 million from the Undesignated Fund Balance to balance the FY 16 budget and the reassessment results in an 8% reduction in real estate valuations, then he estimates that there would be a \$3 million "hole" in the FY 17 budget.

Dr. Scothorn stated that if the Board takes away more and more from the budget the functionality of our government will change.

Mr. Martin stated that the Board does not yet know the reassessment's results. He noted that the County keeps adding and adding to the budget each year and he encouraged the staff and the Budget Subcommittee to go back and review what the funds are being spent on and make some adjustments.

Mrs. Guzi stated that since the staff began development of the FY 16 budget, \$2 million in reductions have been made. She noted that the State has not been providing as much funding to localities as in previous years and the growth of the economy after the recession has been slow.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Zerrilla stated that the Jail's food bill for FY 16 is based on the inmate population which is estimated to be higher than the current fiscal year. He noted that the Sheriff is very efficient in saving monies wherever possible.

After discussion, Mr. Zerrilla stated that for FY 16 the County has cut \$1 million from the departmental operations budgets, \$1 million from the CIP, and \$775,000 from the school budget.

Mr. Martin noted that Roanoke City conducts their real estate reassessment every year.

After discussion, Mr. Moorman stated that the County's services and scale of services has changed significantly since the early 1980's. He noted that at that time, the County did not have paid fire and rescue staff, no parks and recreation staff, there was a smaller Sheriff's Department staff, and no regional jail facility.

After questioning, it was noted that Roanoke City's real estate tax rate is \$1.21 and Roanoke County's is \$1.09.

Mr. Dodson stated that the County could increase the real estate tax rate this year and, if the reassessment figures are higher than expected, the Board could lower the rate next year.

Dr. Scothorn stated that the Board could also wait to see what the reassessment increase/decrease will be before making a decision on tax rates.

Mr. Williamson suggested that the Board consider increasing the real estate tax rate by 5¢ this year and then reevaluate the issue during the FY 17 budget development.

Mr. Dodson stated that, if the Board plans to raise taxes, "then do it and be done with it."

Dr. Scothorn stated that, if monies are used from the Undesignated Fund Balance to balance the FY 16 budget, the Board will have to increase taxes next year. He noted that the Board can direct staff to advertise a 5¢ tax increase this year and then the Board can consider reducing this rate when the budget is adopted.

Mr. Leffel stated that if a 5¢ tax increase is advertised "this will be where we will end up."

Mr. Dodson suggested that a 10¢ tax increase be advertised. He noted that this figure will give the Board "some room to work with the budget."

Mr. Leffel stated that he agrees with Mr. Martin that we should not increase taxes this year but the County will have to raise taxes in the near future. He noted that the Board does not yet know what will happen with the reassessment rates.

Dr. Scothorn stated that he would prefer to see a tax increase next year. He further noted that, if a 10¢ tax increase is advertised, it does not mean that the full 10¢ amount will be approved.

Mr. Dodson stated that he believes that a tax increase is justified based on the need for a new roof at Lord Botetourt, seven new school buses, and the \$1.5 million shortfall in the proposed County budget.

Mr. Leffel stated that he feels that he could make "a sales pitch" next year to his constituents for a double-digit tax increase versus doing so this year.

After questioning by Mr. Zerrilla, the Board agreed to include the anticipated Payment-in-Lieu-of-Taxes revenues (approximately \$150,000) in the budget revenue figures. Mr. Zerrilla

noted that if these monies are included in the anticipated revenues then the budget deficit would be reduced from \$1.5 million to \$1.35 million.

Mr. Leffel stated that he would like to see the purchase of one ambulance removed from the proposed budget and use the Utility Fund monies to balance the budget and make one-time expenditures.

Mr. Dodson stated that he would prefer to advertise for a 10¢ tax rate increase as he does not want to vote on increasing taxes for two consecutive years.

Mr. Williamson stated that, rather than having no tax increase this year, he would suggest that a 10¢ tax increase be approved which would allow the Lord Botetourt roof project to be completed, seven new school buses to be purchased, restore the General Fund balance, and allow deferred maintenance items to be completed.

After further discussion, Mr. Dodson then made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Williamson, to advertise for a 10¢ real estate tax increase. (Resolution Number 15-05-13)

This motion failed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson

NAYS: Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Mr. Williamson then made a motion to advertise for a 5¢ real estate tax increase. (Resolution Number 15-05-14)

There was no second to this motion; therefore, the motion failed.

On motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board directed staff to advertise the FY 15-16 County budget with no real estate tax increase and indicated that, in order to balance the budget, \$1,350,000 is proposed to be transferred from the Undesignated Fund Balance. (Resolution Number 15-05-15)

AYES: Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 P. M. to allow the Board members to attend a dedication ceremony for the new welding lab at the Botetourt Technical Education Center.

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 7:05 P. M.

A public hearing was then held on a request in the Buchanan District from Dennis W. Painter for a Special Exception Permit, with possible conditions, for a private dog kennel for up to twelve (12) dogs in an Agricultural (A-1) Use District on a 1.413-acre lot at 2515 Frontage Road, Buchanan, approximately 0.07 miles northeast of the intersection of Frontage Road (Route F054) and Indian Rock Road (Route 608), identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 53, Parcel 7C.

It was noted that the Planning Commission had recommended conditional approval of this request.

Mr. Jeff Busby, County Planner, stated that the Planning Commission's recommended conditions for this request are as follows: Maximum number of dogs shall not exceed ten (10) at any given time; the property owner shall provide adequate sanitary disposal for the amount of dogs.

Mr. Busby noted that there were several comments made by the Planning Commission members regarding this request including a request that the number of dogs permitted on the property be reduced from 12 to 10. He stated that Mr. Painter has now installed a sanitary waste disposal system for this kennel.

Mr. Busby stated that Mr. Painter has lived on this property since 1993 and there have been no complaints reported to the County's Animal Control Department regarding the number of dogs on this property. Mr. Busby noted that Mr. Painter has had more than four dogs at a time on this property since 1993 but was not aware that he needed a SEP until he purchased dog tags from the Treasurer's Office this year. He stated that the Treasurer's Office referred Mr. Painter to the Community Development Office and a determination was made that Mr. Painter would have to apply for a SEP as he has more than four dogs on his property.

Mr. Busby stated that Mr. Painter has been very cooperative throughout the permit process and noted that the applicant is present at this meeting to answer any questions.

After discussion, Mr. Busby noted that this 1.4 acre lot is zoned for Agricultural A-1 use and Mr. Painter is aware that the Board of Supervisors could impose additional conditions on this request. Mr. Busby stated that Mr. Painter's property has one 10' X 12' fenced in area for use by the dogs as well as individual dog houses for use as shelter by the animals.

Mr. Painter stated that he believed that Mr. Busby reviewed everything regarding his request. Mr. Painter stated that he has dog tag receipts from the Treasurer's Office from 2007 through 2014 and was not informed until January 2015 that he would need a SEP in order to have more than four dogs on his property.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Painter stated that he owns all of these dogs.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Painter stated that these dogs are used to chase bears. After further questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Painter stated that he has been living on this property since 1993 and has always had between 6 and 10 dogs on the property at any one time.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson as to whether this was a grandfathered use, Mr. Lockaby, County Attorney stated that there are County Code provisions for setbacks and dimensions of structures that are considered to be grandfathered uses but not for this situation. He noted that, as the use was never legally established, it never became a vested use.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Busby stated that having more than four dogs on a property also required a SEP in 1993.

After discussion by Mr. Leffel, Mr. Painter stated that he "was not hiding" his dogs as he obtained licenses for them each year through the Treasurer's Office.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Painter stated that the dogs are chained and have individual dog houses that they can get into out of the weather.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Busby stated that the County does not have standards for kennels of this type. Mr. Busby stated that the County relies on the Animal Control Department to review these types of dog kennel facilities.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Busby stated that the County does not have a kennel inspection program and a determination on humane treatment of dogs is made by the Animal Control Officers.

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

Dr. Scothorn stated that he appreciates the efforts by Mr. Painter to limit the impact that this kennel would have on his neighbor by placing the facility on the north side of his property adjacent to an open field versus along the southern property line close to his neighbor's home. Dr. Scothorn then noted that the Community Development staff had compiled a listing of the kennels approved via SEP between 2002 and 2014. He stated that there have been a lot of kennels approved by the County over this period.

After discussion by Dr. Scothorn, Mrs. Pendleton stated that there are no County ordinance requirements, e.g., kennel size, sheltered area requirements, etc., for private kennels. Mrs. Pendleton stated that she discussed this matter with Chief Animal Control Officer Sergeant Kevin Crowder and these types of private kennel facilities are only required to meet certain aspects of the State Code, which includes providing regular food and water for the dogs; a sheltered area large enough for the animal to walk into, turn around, and rest comfortably; and, if the dogs are chained, there is a requirement for a certain length of chain based on the dog's size.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mrs. Pendleton stated that she obtained information from a couple of localities who regulate private kennels. She noted that Roanoke County refers to these types of kennel permits as multiple dog permits and their ordinance only includes standards for lot sizes and setbacks. She further noted that for lots less than one acre, these types of multiple dog permits are not allowed in Roanoke County; for lots greater than one acre, a SEP is required; and for lots larger than 5 acres in size, multiple dog permits are allowed by right. She noted that Roanoke City only allows private kennels in their agricultural district by SEP; however, most localities do not regulate these types of private kennels.

Dr. Scothorn stated that the County has had a lot of SEP requests for kennels over the years and there will be more in the future. Dr. Scothorn stated that he would like to see some requirements considered by the County for these types of private kennels to include standard of care, size, etc.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Busby stated that, according to the Animal Control Department, there have been no complaints against Mr. Painter regarding his dogs.

After discussion by Mr. Williamson, Mrs. Guzi stated that these types of private kennels for the homeowner's hunting dogs are usually found in rural counties.

Dr. Scothorn stated that the County should have some standards for these types of kennels and suggested that the Board table consideration of Mr. Painter's request to allow staff to obtain information from other localities on their standards for this type of use.

Mr. Williamson stated that he has no objections to the staff conducting some research on how this type of use is regulated in other localities. He stated, however, that Mr. Painter has been living on this property for 22 years with no complaints regarding the care of his animals and the Board should approve this SEP request at tonight's meeting.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Painter stated that he constructed the dog houses himself and located the entrance off to the side so the wind does not enter the sleeping area. Mr. Painter also stated that he places straw and cedar shavings in the dog houses during the cold weather months to help the dogs keep warm. Mr. Painter said that he has not had any problems with his dogs suffering from cold even during this past winter's weather.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Painter stated that the kennel area has good drainage.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved a request in the Buchanan District from Dennis W. Painter for a Special Exception Permit for a private dog kennel for up to twelve (12) dogs in an Agricultural (A-1) Use District on a 1.413-acre lot at 2515 Frontage Road, Buchanan, approximately 0.07 miles northeast of the intersection of Frontage Road (Route F054) and Indian Rock Road (Route 608), identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 53, Parcel 7C, with the following conditions: (Resolution Number 15-05-16)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

1. Maximum number of dogs shall not exceed ten (10) at any given time.
2. The property owner shall provide adequate sanitary disposal for the amount of dogs.

A public hearing was then held on a request in the Amsterdam District from Chad E. and Mary S. Paderick for a Special Exception Permit, with possible conditions, for a storage yard in an Agricultural (A-1) Use District on 25.32 acres located off of a 50' private right-of-way at the end of Twin Oak Drive, Troutville, approximately 1.0 mile southeast of the intersection of Twin Oak Drive (Route F050) and Sunset Avenue (Route 651), identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 101, Parcel 118.

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

Mr. Jeff Busby, County Planner, stated that the staff received comments from two adjacent property owners in opposition to this request and five individuals spoke at the Planning Commission meeting in opposition to this SEP.

Mr. Busby stated that Mr. Paderick's property has been used to place fill dirt from the Troutville water line project and is currently being used by Appalachian Power Company for the construction of its Cloverdale to Lexington power line upgrade project.

He noted that the Planning Commission members discussed several issues of concern regarding this project including commercial traffic in a resident area, past history of the property, and whether this agriculturally-zoned site was suitable for a storage yard. He further noted that there is a large, high-voltage power line which runs the length of this 25 acre parcel which makes it less suitable for any type of development.

Mr. Busby then read the Zoning Ordinance's definition of "storage yard," as follows, "A yard area in which materials, equipment and/or vehicles used for construction, excavating or similar activities are stored, kept and/or maintained. Storage yards may be partially covered, enclosed or screened."

Mr. Busby stated that Mr. Paderick previously obtained a building permit to construct a 30' X 37' pole barn on this property for storage of recreational vehicles and has recently applied for an electrical permit for this building. He noted that, among other equipment, Mr. Paderick is currently storing a snow plow, skid steer, mini-excavator, and a flat-bed trailer on this property. Mr. Busby stated that Mr. Paderick has indicated that he eventually plans to use the property for agricultural/farming purposes. Mr. Busby stated that Sunset Drive currently has a count of 140 vehicles per day and Twin Oaks Drive has an average daily traffic count of 80 vehicles.

He stated that this is a SEP request and the Board can add conditions to this request. He noted that the Community Development Department received six complaints regarding this site during construction of the access road and pole barn. Mr. Busby stated that, even if Mr. Paderick is storing his own private equipment on this property, he would have to obtain a SEP to do so, unless the equipment was for an active agricultural use on the property. Mr. Busby noted that Mr. Paderick is present at this meeting.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson regarding any other options for this use, Mr. Busby stated that the County Code allows for the storage of this type of equipment if the owner is operating a rural home business; however, there has to be a single family dwelling located on the property. Mr. Busby stated that the County Code has the same definition for all three types of storage yards (business storage yard, contractor's storage yard, and storage yard). He stated that the County's ordinances do not distinguish between business and personal storage yards.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Busby stated that the driveway off of Twin Oak Drive is the only access to this property as far as he is aware.

Mr. Paderick then stated that there is only one entrance to this property.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Paderick stated that this property, including a 50' undeveloped right-of-way, was under an auction sale when he purchased it.

Mr. Paderick then clarified an issue contained in some of the comments and letters opposing this request. Mr. Paderick stated that he removes snow with ¾ ton pickup trucks with plows on them; he does not use his 3500 dump truck for snow removal. Mr. Paderick stated that the right-of-way is steep so he relocates the snow removal equipment off of the property from the beginning of snow season until spring.

Mr. Paderick stated that he met with the County to discuss the complaints received regarding his use of this property to store this equipment. Mr. Paderick stated that he would like to have a place to keep the equipment that he has worked hard to obtain. Mr. Paderick stated that he plans to develop this 25 acre parcel for his home and a farm.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Paderick stated that he would like to have a cattle farm on this property. Mr. Paderick noted that he remembers his grandfather having cattle and would like to use this property to have some cattle of his own.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Paderick stated that he is a 50% owner in The Landscape Store located on Alternate Route 220. Mr. Paderick stated that, if he does store his equipment at the Alternate 220 business, he would be hauling it in and out when he wanted to work on the equipment in his pole barn. Mr. Paderick also stated that there is some large timber on his property and he would like to remove the logs at some point.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Paderick stated that he owns a mini-excavator, not a bulldozer.

After further discussion, Mr. Paderick stated that the fill work involved in the AEP power line project on his property has reduced his need for fill dirt in half.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Paderick stated that there is a gate across the access road to his property; however, he has to leave the gate open so that AEP's contractor can access the property. After further questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Paderick stated that after the AEP project is completed only his family will have access to this property.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Paderick stated that the fill material from the Troutville water line project which was placed on this property has given him some flat ground.

Mr. Martin stated that he visited Mr. Paderick's property and thought it was well-kept. Mr. Martin then reviewed the list of citizens' complaints with Mr. Paderick. Regarding burning large brush piles, Mr. Paderick stated that when the derecho occurred in June 2012 brush and debris from his cousin's property was taken to this property and eventually burned. He noted that the material was still green and burned for several days.

Regarding vehicle traffic on the road, Mr. Paderick stated that he travels for his job three days a week and is rarely on the property. Mr. Paderick stated that he is in and out of the property a couple of days a week checking on his equipment and making equipment repairs in the pole barn and he also hunts on the property.

After questioning by Mr. Martin regarding reports of an assault-type weapon being used on the property, Mr. Paderick stated that he is not aware of any weapon of this type being used on his property. Mr. Paderick stated that he does shoot skeet on the property as well.

After questioning by Mr. Martin regarding a dirt bike race track, Mr. Paderick stated that he did have a trail on the property and he and his family have ridden motorbikes on the property. After questioning regarding using the cul-de-sac as a parking area, Mr. Paderick stated that he may have parked some construction equipment in the cul-de-sac when he was building the access road. Mr. Paderick stated that he has told the neighbors to call him if they had any problems.

Mr. Martin stated that the neighbors have also said that, while in their vehicles, they have been run off Twin Oak Drive by commercial trucks accessing Mr. Paderick's property that take up a large portion of the roadway.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Paderick stated that Central Contracting is building the power line road but he has not seen any of their equipment coming and going during nighttime hours.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Paderick stated that the AEP construction project could take up to a year. After questioning regarding pollution of groundwater, Mr. Paderick stated that this complaint has no merit. After further questioning, Mr. Paderick stated that he does not run a commercial enterprise from this site. Mr. Paderick stated that he has three business licenses from the County—The Landscape Store, F&P Services, and Triple P Services.

After questioning by Mr. Martin regarding room for compromise in this matter, Mr. Paderick stated that he is willing to compromise in this situation and to work with his neighbors. After further questioning, Mr. Paderick stated that he has talked to Mr. Palmer, Mrs. French, Mr. Jenks, and Ms. Tunnell about his plans for this property. Mr. Martin stated that he would like to see Mr. Paderick and his neighbors work something out in this situation.

Mr. Duane Palmer of Twin Oak Drive stated that he did talk to Mr. Paderick when he originally purchased this property and was told about Mr. Paderick's plans to eventually build a home on this lot. Mr. Palmer noted that Mr. Paderick mentioned the equipment he would need to build the road and that he would be using motorcycles on the property as well. Mr. Palmer stated that he has not had any issues regarding noise from the property.

Mr. Palmer stated that he is concerned about the approval of a SEP as he does not want a contractor's equipment storage yard located on this property in the event that Mr. Paderick sells the land in the future. Mr. Palmer stated that he is concerned that "this would open the door and allow something larger" to be placed in this quiet neighborhood.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Busby stated that, if Mr. Paderick had a bona fide agricultural activity on this property, he would not be in violation of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr.

Busby stated that, if the storage of this equipment is not directly related to an agricultural activity, it is considered a zoning violation.

Mr. Dean Paderick of Leatherneck Road in Troutville stated that he is present to speak on behalf of the Town of Troutville regarding this request. Mr. Paderick stated that 1½ years ago he asked Chad Paderick if he would consider allowing the Town to store fill material from their water line project on this property. Mr. Paderick stated that Chad Paderick agreed to this proposal and he (Dean Paderick) feels that he created the onset of the problems that Chad Paderick is having today. Mr. Paderick stated that there were 10 – 20 dump trucks per day hauling material to this property for 8 months from the water line project. Mr. Paderick stated that he should have discussed this situation with the property's neighbors but he did not.

Mr. Paderick noted that Chad Paderick has been a victim just like the other neighbors in this area. He stated that when Mr. Cutright built his house in this same neighborhood it also required dump trucks to bring fill material to that property and now AEP is "doing the same thing." He noted that the neighborhood has been under a barrage of construction for some time and the AEP project will be ongoing for the next 1 – 1½ years.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Paderick stated that only fill dirt was placed by the Town's water line contractor on Chad Paderick's property. He noted that the material did not contain any trash and could not have impacted the area's groundwater.

Mrs. Rose Jenks of Twin Oak Drive stated that she has lived in this area for 25 years in peace and harmony. Mrs. Jenks stated that Twin Oak Drive is a narrow road and it has been a "nightmare" for the last four years to travel along this roadway. She noted that there has been noise, traffic, and large dump trucks coming and going from the property for 12 – 14 hours each day. Mrs. Jenks stated that this has been "a commercial property" since Mr. Paderick purchased the land.

Mrs. Jenks stated that she is concerned about noise, air pollution, and safety. She noted that Mr. Paderick did not mention anything to her about heavy equipment moving in and out of this property early in the morning. She noted that there are children who play along Twin Oaks Drive and there is a school bus that uses this road to pick up these children.

Mrs. Jenks stated that she is sure that Mr. Paderick is a nice man but "he has been rewarded for whatever he has done for the Town of Troutville." Mrs. Jenks stated that she has called and written letters in opposition to this request. Mrs. Jenks stated that this proposed use is not appropriate for this neighborhood, it is not good planning, and does not bode well for the future.

Mrs. Jenks stated that the neighbors' properties have been devaluated because of this use. She also noted that Adams Construction Company's vehicles have been coming and going along this road as well. She further noted that Mr. Paderick has been cleaning up the property over the past few weeks.

After discussion, Mrs. Jenks asked that Board for their consideration in this matter and do what is best for the entire neighborhood. She stated that Mr. Paderick has other businesses on which he could locate this equipment. She then thanked the Board for their time, for listening when she called, and reading her letters.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mrs. Jenks stated that Mr. Paderick has been working very hard for the past several weeks to clean up the property. After further questioning, Mrs. Jenks stated that she does not believe that she can compromise in this situation because the equipment is still coming in and out of this property.

Ms. Sandra Tunnell of Twin Oak Drive then stated that she opposes this request. She noted that four property owners spoke in opposition to this request at the Planning Commission meeting. She stated that the nature of this subdivision does not warrant the location of a storage yard at the end of the cul-de-sac. Ms. Tunnell stated that there are currently no other storage yards adjacent to subdivisions in the County and, if this request is approved, it would set a precedent.

Ms. Tunnell stated that she and her neighbors do not want their property values to decrease because of this use. She further stated that this type of heavy traffic will cause more damage to Twin Oak Drive. She noted that AEP just began their construction work a few months ago and they have been very considerate of the neighbors. Ms. Tunnell stated that their truck drivers drive slow and clean up the gravel and mud that their vehicle tires carry onto the roadway.

She noted that it was stated at the Planning Commission meeting that the commercial equipment had been stored on the property for some time. She questioned, if this request is approved, what guarantee would the neighbors have that the conditions would be followed.

Ms. Tunnell stated that they have nothing against the Padericks but they do not want a commercial storage yard next to their residential neighborhood. She noted that, if the property is sold in the future, the SEP's provisions will go with the sale to a new owner.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, it was noted that there was no one else present to speak regarding this request. The public hearing was then closed.

Mr. Martin stated that he can understand the neighbors' feelings on this proposed SEP but he does not like to see Mr. Paderick invest money in this property and not be able to use it for his equipment.

Mr. Dodson stated that he thinks that "several things are going on here." He stated that the property is currently zoned A-1 and questioned if the County is "opening the door" to similar requests if this SEP is approved. Mr. Dodson stated that this is a commercial storage yard and it is the commercial aspect of this request that concerns him.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Busby stated that the snowplow trucks would have to be removed from the property if this request is denied. Mr. Busby stated that Mr. Paderick could retain any equipment that is used to maintain the property, e.g., tractors, brush hogs, etc. He further noted that the pole barn is used for agricultural purposes and could remain on the property.

Mr. Leffel stated that AEP and its contractors will be using this property for the next year and the heavy construction traffic along Twin Oak Drive associated with this power line upgrade project "has not started yet."

Ms. Tunnell stated that she was told that AEP would bring in very large construction equipment, including cranes, to this property between January and June 2016. She noted that the necessary construction work would be completed with this heavy equipment and it would then be removed from the property.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Dodson, seconded by Mr. Williamson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board denied the request in the Amsterdam District from Chad E. and Mary S. Paderick for a Special Exception Permit for a storage yard in an Agricultural (A-1) Use District on 25.32 acres located off of a 50' private right-of-way at the end of Twin Oak Drive, Troutville, approximately 1.0 mile southeast of the intersection of Twin Oak Drive (Route F050) and Sunset Avenue (Route 651), identified on the Real Property Identi-

fication Maps of Botetourt County as Section 101, Parcel 118, due to citizen opposition, incompatibility with the surrounding land use, transportation impacts, and the public health, safety, general welfare, and good zoning practice. (Resolution Number 15-05-17)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: Mr. Martin

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 P. M. (Resolution Number 15-05-18)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None