

April 14, 2014

The Carroll County Board of Supervisors held their regular monthly meeting on, April 14, 2014 in the Board Meeting Room of the Carroll County Governmental Center.

Present were:           David V. Hutchins  
                              W.S. "Sam" Dickson  
                              Dr. Tom Littrell  
                              Joshua A. Hendrick  
                              Phil D. McCraw  
                              Bob Martin  
                              Gary Larrowe, County Administrator  
                              Nikki Cannon, Assistant County Administrator  
                              Jim Cornwell, County Attorney

Mr. Hutchins called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**CLOSED SESSION – PURSUANT TO VIRGINIA CODE SECTION 2.2-3711(A1, A7)**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. Dickson, and passing, the Board convened a Closed Session for the discussion of personnel, legal matter, as authorized by Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A1).

Mr. Hutchins explained the purpose for entering Closed Session as listed below. Discussion, consideration, or interviews of prospective candidates for employment; assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining, or resignation of specific public officers, appointees, or employees of any public body; and evaluation of performance of departments or schools of public institutions of higher education where such evaluation will necessarily involve discussion of the performance of specific individuals. Any teacher shall be permitted to be present during a closed meeting in which there is a discussion or consideration of a disciplinary matter that involves the teacher and some student and the student involved in the matter is present, provided the teacher makes a written request to be present to the presiding officer of the appropriate board.

Consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members or consultants pertaining to actual or probable litigation, where such consultation or briefing in open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the public body; and consultation with legal counsel employed or retained by a public body regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel. For the purposes of this subdivision, "probable litigation" means litigation that has been specifically threatened or on which the public body or its legal counsel has a reasonable basis to believe will be commenced by or against a known party. Nothing in this subdivision shall be construed to permit the closure of a meeting merely because an attorney representing the public body is in attendance or is consulted on a matter.

April 14, 2014

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED SESSION**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. Martin, and passing, the Board adopted the following Resolution:

**WHEREAS**, the Carroll County Board of Supervisors convened a Closed Session this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and on the motion to close the meeting in accordance with the Virginia Freedom of Information Act;

**WHEREAS**, Section 2.2-3711(D) of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Board of Supervisors that such Closed Session was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Carroll County Board of Supervisors hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (I) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act were heard, discussed or considered in the Closed Session to which this certification applies, and (II) only such business matters as were identified in the motion by which this Closed Session was convened were heard, discussed, or considered in the meeting to which this certification applies.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

Mr. Hendrick led in invocation and pledge.

Mr. Hutchins thanked everyone for being here and told that we have a busy agenda.

April 14, 2014

(Order)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved the minutes of the meeting on February 25, 2014 and March 10, 2014 and March 24, 2014 as previously distributed to the members of this Board.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**APPROVAL OF PAYROLL**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw, and passed unanimously, the Board approved the payroll for April 2014 and did authorize the Chairman and Clerk, along with Bonita M. Williams, Treasurer, to sign checks for the May payment of salaries and wages for all County officials and employees as previously budgeted by the State Compensation Board and this Board of Supervisors.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved the Consent Agenda.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes

April 14, 2014

Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**RURAL RUSTIC RESOLUTION**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved the Rural Rustic Resolution below.

**WHEREAS**, Section 33.1-70.1 of the *Code of Virginia*, permits the improvement and hard surfacing of certain unpaved roads deemed to qualify for designation as a **Rural Rustic Road**; and

**WHEREAS**, any such road must be located in a low-density development area and have no more than 1500 vpd; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Supervisors of Carroll County, Virginia (“Board”) requests that Route 735 (Pridemore Road), From: Route 635 To: End of State Maintenance, be designated a Rural Rustic Road; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board is unaware of pending development that will significantly affect the existing traffic on this road; and

**WHEREAS**, this road is in the Board’s six-year plan for improvements to the secondary system of state highways; and

**WHEREAS**, the general public and particularly those citizens who own land abutting this road have been made aware that this road may be paved with minimal improvements as is consistent with the development of a rural rustic road project; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board believes that this road should be so designated due to its qualifying characteristics;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, the Board hereby designates this road a Rural Rustic Road, and requests that the Residency Administrator for the Virginia Department of Transportation concur in this designation.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, the Board requests that this road be hard surfaced and, to the fullest extent prudent, be improved within the existing right of way and ditch-lines to preserve as much as possible the adjacent trees, vegetation, side slopes, and rural rustic character along the road in their current state.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Residency Administrator for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes

April 14, 2014

Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**RURAL RUSTIC RESOLUTION**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved the Rural Rustic Resolution below.

**WHEREAS**, Section 33.1-70.1 of the *Code of Virginia*, permits the improvement and hard surfacing of certain unpaved roads deemed to qualify for designation as a **Rural Rustic Road**; and

**WHEREAS**, any such road must be located in a low-density development area and have no more than 1500 vpd; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Supervisors of Carroll County, Virginia (“Board”) requests that Route 799 (Crestwood Drive), From: Route 718 To: Grayson County Line, be designated a Rural Rustic Road; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board is unaware of pending development that will significantly affect the existing traffic on this road; and

**WHEREAS**, this road is in the Board’s six-year plan for improvements to the secondary system of state highways; and

**WHEREAS**, the general public and particularly those citizens who own land abutting this road have been made aware that this road may be paved with minimal improvements as is consistent with the development of a rural rustic road project; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board believes that this road should be so designated due to its qualifying characteristics;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, the Board hereby designates this road a Rural Rustic Road, and requests that the Residency Administrator for the Virginia Department of Transportation concur in this designation.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, the Board requests that this road be hard surfaced and, to the fullest extent prudent, be improved within the existing right of way and ditch-lines to preserve as much as possible the adjacent trees, vegetation, side slopes, and rural rustic character along the road in their current state.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Residency Administrator for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
--------------	-----

April 14, 2014

Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**PETSMART GRANT**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved being the fiscal agent for the Pet Smart Grant. The Twin County Humane Society will administer the grant and there are no matching dollars associated.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**BUDGET RESOLUTION**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved the Budget Resolution below.

Whereas, the Virginia General Assembly did not agree on the approval of a budget by the adjournment sine die date of March 8, 2014; and

Whereas, funds from the state received by Carroll County comprise a large portion of revenues necessary for Carroll County to deliver many of the public services mandated by the Commonwealth; and

Whereas, the delivery of mandated public services by Carroll County depends upon a stable and healthy partnership between state and local governments; and

Whereas, Virginia's local governments are subject strict, statutory deadlines for approving certain components of their respective budgets; and

Whereas, local governments under Sections 15.2-2500 and 15.2-2503 of the Code of Virginia are required to approve their respective budget and tax rates by July 1 of each year; and

Whereas, by May 1 of each year, or at least 30 days after receiving an estimate of state aid, whichever is later, local governments are required under Section 22.1-93 of the Code of Virginia to adopt an annual school budget; and

April 14, 2014

Whereas, not later than June 1 of each year, all school divisions under Section 22.1-304 of the Code of Virginia, must notify teachers of reductions in force due to decreased funding; and

Whereas, failure to approve a budget in a timely manner would disrupt the ability of Virginia's businesses and public agencies to operate effectively; and

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Carroll County Board of Supervisors that the Virginia General Assembly and the Governor of Virginia are urged to reconcile their differences and agree on a FY 2015-2016 budget;

And be it further resolved that the Carroll County Board of Supervisors shall transmit copies of this resolution to the Honorable Terry R. McAuliffe, Governor of Virginia, and to members of the Virginia General Assembly.

**VOTES**

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved an appropriation in the amount of \$388 from asset forfeiture monies.

**VOTES**

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**PHASE III CONSTRUCTION**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved an appropriation in the amount of \$65,690.55 for the Phase III Construction and Renovation project.

**VOTES**

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes

April 14, 2014

Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**BUDGET CALENDAR**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved Budget Calendar below.

**Carroll County, VA  
2014– 2015 Budget Calendar**

**July, 2013**

- \*8 Budget calendar adopted by BOS  
Appointment of Budget Committee in August by BOS

**August, 2013**

- \*12 Goals adopted by BOS\County Administration  
BOS appoint Budget Committee

**September, 2013**

- 27 Budget packets (goals, personnel, CIP, requests) distributed to departments

**October, 2013**

- 31 Budget packets (goals, personnel, CIP, requests) due from departments

**November, 2013**

- TBD Capital Improvements Program presented to Board as information
- 12-15 Budget review meetings with Department Heads  
Preliminary budget information assembled

**December, 2013**

- \*9 Capital Improvements Program adopted by Board  
Schedule Budget Committee meetings

**January, 2014**

April 14, 2014

**TBD** Budget Committee Meetings  
Budget information assembled

**February, 2014**

**10** Budget Committee report to BOS  
Final budget information assembled

**March, 2014**

**10** Budget Committee report to BOS  
**11** Superintendent presents proposed budget to School Board, public hearing on this budget is held by School Board  
**24** 7:00 a.m. School Board approves School Budget  
**24** 6:30 p.m School Budget presentation to BOS (authorize advertising of proposed School budget and April 14 Public Hearing)

**April, 2014**

**\*14** 5:30 p.m. FY2015 Public Hearing on proposed School budget,  
Presentation of County Budget (authorize advertising of proposed County Budget, and Tax Rates)

**May, 2014**

**5** 6:30 p.m. Budget work session – Public Hearing on County FY2015 Budget, Adopt School Budget

**\*12** Adopt Carroll County FY2015 Budget, tax rates

Prepare 2014-2015 final budget documents

**June, 2014**

Adopted Budget uploaded to website and distributed to departments and agencies

\* Indicates regularly scheduled BOS meeting date.  
Indicates public advertisement required.

**VOTES**

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

April 14, 2014

(Order)

**TOURISM ALLOCATION**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved an allocation in the amount of \$3,950 to Tourism.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**FEMA**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved an additional allocation in the amount of \$10,414.32 to repay to agencies the reimbursement from FEMA for work performed during an emergency. During the straight line winds in Carroll, significant damage occurred and caused agencies to operate shelters and repair damage.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**HEALTH DEPARTMENT ALLOCATION**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved an additional allocation for the Health Department in the amount of \$229,648.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes

April 14, 2014

Dr. Littrell            Yes  
Mr. Martin            Yes

(Order)

**GAS UTILITY FUND**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved an additional allocation in the amount of \$3,250.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick            Yes  
Mr. McCraw            Yes  
Mr. Hutchins            Yes  
Mr. Dickson            Yes  
Dr. Littrell            Yes  
Mr. Martin            Yes

(Order)

**AMBULANCE PURCHASES**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved for Wheeled Coach Ambulances for ambulances purchases for the next five years.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick            Yes  
Mr. McCraw            Yes  
Mr. Hutchins            Yes  
Mr. Dickson            Yes  
Dr. Littrell            Yes  
Mr. Martin            Yes

(Order)

**PIPERS GAP RESCUE**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved for Pipers Gap to use the grant received from RSAF/Virginia Office of Emergency Medical Services to purchase a Type 1 unity with no cost directly to the county to replace an older unit.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick            Yes  
Mr. McCraw            Yes

April 14, 2014

Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**EXTENSION RESOLUTION**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved the resolution below.

WHEREAS, Virginia Cooperative Extension of Carroll County is part of the nationwide Cooperative Extension System that is a partnership of federal, state and local governments and Virginia Tech and Virginia State University, the state's land-grant universities in Virginia; and WHEREAS, The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 established the Cooperative Extension Service, utilizing faculty serving as Extension Agents, who along with local staff and community-based resources, extend University research and knowledge to local communities; and WHEREAS, Virginia Cooperative Extension provides wide-ranging educational programs and information in the areas of agriculture, natural resources, family and consumer sciences, 4-H youth development, food, nutrition and health, along with related areas of economic and workforce development across Virginia; and WHEREAS, Virginia Cooperative Extension programs in Family and Consumer Sciences; Agriculture and Natural Resources; 4-H Youth Development, and Community Viability, benefit thousands of families, schools and businesses in Carroll County;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Supervisors of Carroll County that May 2014 be designated as National Cooperative Extension Centennial Celebration Month in Carroll County and that we encourage residents to take advantage of the programs and educational opportunities that Virginia Cooperative Extension offers to the community.

**VOTES**

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**COURT ROOM SECURITY**

April 14, 2014

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved an allocation and appropriation in the amount of \$127,383.25 for Courtroom Security. The increased expenses are associated with the additional security measures in the Court wing. The increase will be offset by savings from the Cost of Prisoners at the NRVJR.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**PHONE ALLOCATION**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved to appropriate an additional allocation for Telecommunications in the amount of \$35,662.95.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

**COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board approved an additional allocation from Highway Safety in the amount of \$142,103 for improvements to the communications equipment.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

April 14, 2014

(Order)

### **AWARDS PRESENTATION**

Mr. Hutchins told that it is a pleasure to recognize someone who has worked extremely diligently. He told that she had a mission and stuck to it and now it is close to fruition. He asked Ms. Gina Isom to come forward and presented her with an award. He told that she has worked hard to make Fancy Gap pottery a success and she still finds time to improve her community.

Ms. Isom told that she is proud of Fancy Gap and all she can say is God is good and he will always make a way. She told that like the boulder that they are blasting behind her building to get water, he will make a way.

(Order)

### **HERO DAY – MIKE MOCK**

Mr. Hutchins told that Mr. Mock has worked diligently on several different things and he appreciates it.

Mr. Mock told that he would like to start with thanking fire and rescue, Sheriff's Department, Parks & Rec, Tourism and Gary for supporting HERO day. He told that HERO Day is a chance for agencies from surrounding counties to come together and do some fun challenges. He told that they are having a 5K Challenge race where you will jump over fire, go through netting, down a slide and through paint. He told that it is open to the public and there are things for the kids to do. He told that they will also have a drug dog demonstration, the State police helicopter and the medical helicopter. He told that they will be using a challenge coin which was started in the military and it is a pride thing that spilled over into law enforcement and fire and rescue. He told that they hope to start a new tradition an instead of giving out ribbons they will give out coins. He told that the event is scheduled for May 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Mr. Hutchins told that Mr. Mock has been working on a replacement plan for fire apparatus and asked if he wanted to talk about that.

Mr. Mock told that the plan covers a lot of aspects with fire apparatus and you will see a review of the apparatus and what they look at. He told that it is suggested that they be replaced every 20 years but if they are in good shape it is not a problem but they don't like for you to go more than 25 years. He told that looking at the overall fleet some trucks are over 30 years old and one is 40 years old. He told that the insurance also goes by the national standards. He told that we do have some serious issues and he encourages everyone to read and see what they are. He told some trucks are already out of service. He told that a good example is Laurel Fork where they have one out of service and it is the only pumper that they have. He told that he tried to do a fair review and it is going to be difficult because they range from \$350,000 to \$700,000 each.

April 14, 2014

Mr. Hutchins told that it would appear that 2016 is the first year it is in the CIP and the amount is \$375,000. He told that starting in 2017 through 2024 we are looking at \$450,000 to \$550,000 per year investment. He told that when you look at that and that we have the QSCB payments, that is a \$2 million hit to the budget. He told that he knows that when Mr. Mock looked at this he put the minimum that we could do but we need to be thinking very carefully about spending money but we have to find ways to do these things.

Mr. Mock told that he did eliminate two trucks in this plan which can be incorporated into the other trucks as they are being purchased so it does help lower annual costs but not long term.

Mr. Hendrick asked on a structure fire how many gallons of water are you suppose to show up with.

Mr. Mock told that the standard is according to how much fire is in the building and there is a formula but you need to put on the scene immediately at least several thousand gallons of water and to give you an example if you have two hose lines off the truck you are automatically going to be flowing 500 gallons a minute so you have only got on your initial trucks with a tanker and a pumper about four minutes to fight the fire. He told that in that four minutes you are hoping and depending on tankers from somewhere else to get there if there aren't any hydrants and in Laurel Fork there are a lot of areas that don't have hydrants. He told that it can create a problem and it is like that in areas all over the county. He told that you can imagine arriving on scene and two hose lines is the bare minimum and 500 gallons a minute.

Mr. Hendrick told that if you show up without Laurel Forks primary truck you would have to have four trucks. He told that he wants people to know that a lot of these trucks are already in a position where they need to be replaced and it is a serious matter and he wants everyone to be aware of that.

Mr. McCraw told that this is a very serious matter he agrees with Josh 100%. He told that the tough part for us as a county is going to be coming up with a way to do these things with the QSCB hanging over our heads. He told for those of you out in the crowd that don't know what he is talking about it is the amount of money that we have to pay back over a course of 10 years, \$1.5 million a year plus probably some interest due to sequestration and it is really going to put our citizens in a bind as far as taxes he is afraid especially when we start trying to replace these rescue apparatus. He told that he is concerned because we need the rescue apparatus and he is not so sure that we didn't need that worse than we needed some of the things we are doing with QSCB. He told that having been working on the budget with Josh and Dr. Littrell he thinks they are all painfully aware and they have made cuts upon cuts and we still have more to go. He told that it is a tough situation.

(Order)

April 14, 2014

**PHASE III/HVAC UPDATE**

Mr. Cole told that they have progressed pretty far on the STEM Lab and they have walls up and they are finishing up some of the plumbing. He told that the county inspector has been out there and has given approval to move forward. He told that they are waiting on some case work to show up and having ceilings go up within 2 weeks. He told on the mechanical project they are working with the controls people to finalize it. He told that all of the chillers are operational and all of the controls are working. He told that they have completed about 1/3 of the roofing and weather is one of the things we have to look out for. He told that he doesn't see any major changes coming up.

Mr. Dickson told that on the expenditures there is Lee Hartman and Sons for close to \$58,000 and asked what that is for.

Mr. Cole told that is not in their contract and he thinks it is what the school is doing separately inside the gym area and auditorium area.

Mr. Dickson asked where that money is coming from.

Mr. Cole replied he does not know. He told that they are not doing it under their contract.

Mr. Dickson told that it says bond issue VPSA.

Mr. Larowe told that it was the end of the QSAB money that was left over. He told that we had gotten notice that those funds had to be spent by the end of this month. He told that it came through the School System as a request.

Mr. Dickson asked if it is a sound system.

Mr. Cole told that it is his understanding that they redone something with the sound but he has not been personally involved in that.

(Order)

**STORMWATER – TIM CARPENTER**

Mr. Tim Carpenter told that Carroll County is faced with the need to choose for the State to take over the Stormwater Program or for Carroll County to administer the program. Since the beginning of notification that all localities in the Commonwealth would be required to have a Stormwater Management Program this endeavor has been very challenging and confusing at times. There have been many changes as to what would be required of local governments. Mr. Carpenter reviewed the history as well as the pro's and cons of the program and they are listed below.

Stormwater History

- September 13, 2011 new legislation was passed by the State requiring all localities to adopt and administer a Stormwater Management Program which was to go into effect on July 1, 2014.
- February 11, 2013 the Carroll County Board of Supervisors adopted a draft Stormwater Management Ordinance in accordance with the new Stormwater Management Laws and Regulations.
- March 24, 2014 new legislation was passed by the State which now requires only those localities that are MS4's or which are in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed to adopt and manage a Stormwater Program. All other localities now have the option of adopting and managing their own Stormwater Program or allow the State to manage their Stormwater Program. The new legislation also brought the permit fees for the construction of a single family residence down from \$2,700.00 to between \$200.00 and \$300.00. It also requires the State to provide an Agreement in Lieu Of for the construction of a single family residence. (Which has not been developed as of yet)

Pro's and Con's of allowing the State to manage a Stormwater Program include:

- Pro The State assumes all responsibility of the program. (Plan review, permit issuance, enforcement, long term maintenance agreements).
- Pro The County can refer all complaints of the new program to the State.
- Pro No liability or expense on the County for training personnel or possibly bringing on more personnel to adequately run a new program.
- Pro The County would have the option of adopting and managing its own Stormwater Program at any point in the future if it determined it necessary.
- Con New laws prohibit Building permits or Land-disturbing permits to be issued until applicant shows proof of coverage under the General Permit for discharges during construction activities or that an Agreement In Lieu Of for the construction of a single family residence has been entered into between the applicant and the VSMP.

Pro's and Con's of the County adopting and managing its own Stormwater Program:

- Pro County would have more control of the program and could possibly help to expedite the plan approval and issuance of required permits.
- Con Parameters of the Agreement In Lieu Of for construction of a single family residence have not been set. Stormwater pollution prevention and technical criteria of flow rate and velocity would still need to be addressed under the agreement.
- Con County assumes all responsibility of the Stormwater Program. (Plan review, permit issuance, enforcement, long term maintenance agreements).
- Con Could possibly require more personnel being hired to adequately manage the new program, along with additional operational expenses.
- Con May be more difficult to turn the program responsibilities back over to the State if needed.

April 14, 2014

Mr. Carpenter told that at this time they respectfully recommend that the Carroll County Board of Supervisors allow the State to manage and assume all responsibilities of a Stormwater program for the County of Carroll.

Dr. Littrell asked if this is only for new construction.

Mr. Carpenter told that it is pretty much for new construction and they do have a clause for grandfathering.

Dr. Littrell asked about a place that already has a large parking lot that is already in existence.

Mr. Carpenter told that he is not sure if it would really affect that. He told that there is a number of things that they are unsure of and that is one of the main problems we have had from the beginning is that the State doesn't even know how it is going to play out.

Mr. Hendrick asked where the money from the permits goes.

Mr. Carpenter told that if the county agrees to adopt it would go to the county and it would be \$209.00.

Mr. Hendrick told that he wasn't sure if DEQ still got some of the fee or not. He asked if DEQ administers the program are they still going to have the same times.

Mr. Carpenter told that they still have the 65 days for plan reviews and so forth.

Mr. Hutchins told that Mr. Carpenter is correct and Carroll County is not in a unique position and if you look at most rural counties it could be huge for us because of our topography. He told that he doesn't see it getting any better and for those of us in rural Virginia it is going to become more of a challenge to comply with these. He told that if it is the Board's will he would like to take it under advisement until our next meeting and really look over it and see if anything has been missed.

Mr. McCraw asked if we could give ourselves a couple months.

Mr. Hutchins asked if we could do that and still meet the mandates.

Mr. Carpenter told that they want notification by April 30<sup>th</sup> but he thinks as long as we address that it shouldn't be a problem.

Mr. Cornwell told that if it becomes a problem he will let us know.

(Order)

## CITIZEN'S TIME

Ms. Janet Tate told that she is presenting statistics on these localities because it is wise to evaluate where you are and where you stand among similar regions before making decisions that will affect future land usage. She continued with the following.

As you can see from the information below Carroll County has a long history of allowing "substandard" roads in our developments, resulting in an excess of small residential lots. However, such continued allowances are not called for in future development projects, as highlighted on page 3 of the Comprehensive Plan, where it is states: "The County only needs 2,000 additional homes to accommodate projected growth over the next 20 years." Thus, the creation of more small lots only serves the interests of developers, not those of our citizenry, who have other, more pressing needs.

Our current SO allows two types of "private road" subdivisions: Family S (protected by the Code of Virginia) and Class B S. For clarity a "private road" is a non-state road defined as having at least two homes. We have more "private roads" in Carroll County than the total of all Interstate, Primary, and Secondary roads combined! (I did not take the time to contact the 911 Coordinator and VDOT on the current # of "private roads". However, in 2008 CC had 884 compared to 170 in FC, a 520% difference.) "Private roads" are distinct from private driveways, which are not regulated by a SO. For private drives the homeowner bears the entire cost of construction. There are VDOT entrance requirements for driveways to connect to a State Maintained Road (tax subsidized) but VA is a "shall issue" state so the bar is set low. The SO comes into play when land is divided. VDOT Entrance requirements change as the number of lots in a development increase, due to increased traffic pressures.

Our unique, mountainous topography has always presented a road/transportation challenge. During the Depression rural Virginians "had little money to pay the property taxes that had continued as the main source of income for the county roads." <sup>1</sup> Rural citizens relied on roads to haul their farm products to market. With the BYRD ROAD ACT of 1932, the State of VA recognized the financial burden of building and maintaining roads and bridges for localities. This Act permitted each county "to give its road responsibility" to the Highway Department, ultimately leading to the formation of VDOT. The 6 Year Plan was enacted as a continuing resolution, from the General Assembly through VDOT, to upgrade existing roads for county residents. <sup>2</sup>

Reassessments are required by the State of VA to insure that each property is valued fairly. The information also allows cross-regional comparisons of tax rates and land values. Thus, we can easily determine how tax rates from Floyd and Wythe counties stand against Carroll County's tax rate. Carroll County's tax rate is 155% of Wythe County's and 136% of Floyd County's tax rate.

There is a long standing myth, propagated by special interest groups, that ALL development is good; not coincidentally, such a philosophy has large financial benefits

April 14, 2014

for these groups. Credible Local and State governmental agencies will tell you that responsible development is the best course of action for our county moving forward. Carroll County clearly has a road problem. The solution to a problem is NOT to make it worse. I question the wisdom of the CC BOS if you vote to continue on this path.

Mr. Martin asked if Ms. Tate's bottom line is she is speaking opposed to.

Ms. Tate told that she is speaking to set up her opposition to Class C.

Mr. Chris Brown told that he is with United Way Virginia Highlands and in 2013 they merged the Twin County United Way with Virginia Highlands and they are looking to bring programs to the area about education, income and health. He told that they have determined that those three are the building blocks that everybody in this community needs to survive and make a decent living. He told that if you are missing one of those things it makes it tougher for you to survive in this community. He told that he wants to recognize a few people that are with him tonight, Mava Vass and Sarah Jo Jones and they are part of a cabinet that they work with. He told that they just finished up last year's campaign and they fell a little short but compared to what United Way has done in the past they are very pleased with the progress that they are making. He told that they are in the process of planning this campaign and they have three Board members from this area. He told that with the merger their overhead cost is very low and one of the big things they are planning right now is a summit on May 29<sup>th</sup>. He told that it is a Leadership Summit for all people in Southwest Virginia to work on ideas that the community needs and to get everyone talking and working together.

(Order)

### **PUBLIC HEARING – SCHOOL BUDGET**

Mr. Larrowe told that the proposed budget has a total operating summary of \$40,871,311 and that is up from last year's \$39,656,597. He told that the food service budget is \$2,868,958 up from last year's \$2,703,065 and the Textbook budget is \$409,900 up from last year's \$354,400.

Mr. Hutchins told that if he remembers correctly the presentation was for operational purposes it was a level funded budget as regards to the county contribution.

Mr. Larrowe told that is correct. He told that the county contribution is \$11,299,437.

Mr. Hutchins told that does not include the debt service, correct.

Mr. Larrowe replied correct. He told that there is approximately \$310,000 in this budget in addition to this.

Mr. Hutchins opened the Public Hearing 5:57 p.m.

April 14, 2014

With no one to speak, the Public Hearing was closed at 5:58 p.m.

(Order)

### **JOINT PUBLIC HEARING – SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE MODIFICATIONS**

The Carroll County Board of Supervisors and the Carroll County Planning Commission held a joint Public Hearing for the purpose of hearing public comment concerning proposed modifications to the Carroll County Subdivision Ordinance.

County Attorney Jim Cornwell reviewed the proposed changes and told the Board and Commission that there were three major changes before them. He told that there was a revision to Section 4 which would allow definitions for flag lots including flag poles and also a definition for a Class C Subdivision, revisions to Section 14 which would allow the Subdivision Agent to review and approve Class C subdivisions, and a revision to Section 27 which were the road requirements for the Class C subdivisions. He told that the Planning Commission had held a public hearing and brought the proposed changes to the Board and after review the Board had asked the Commission to do a little more work on these. He told that the Commission is now back before the Board for their consideration of these changes. He stated that he could go into detail on the changes if the Board so desired. He told that the Class C would basically be a subdivision to allow parcels of real estate in existence as of January 1, 2014 which lack road frontage and the street right-of-way has been reduced to 25 feet and there were provisions related to flag lots.

Mr. Larry Chambers called the Planning Commission to Order and Opened the Joint Public Hearing at 6:02 p.m.

Mr. Hutchins Opened the Joint Public Hearing for the Board of Supervisors at 6:02 p.m. and opened the floor for comments.

Mr. Dennis Ward told that he would like to address the flag lots and distributed copies of the auction brochure for the Forest Wilkinson Estate auction for the Board to review. He told that there was the option of building a commercial entrance. He told that the field on this property had been completely destroyed by having to have flag poles 100 feet wide.

Mr. Ray Melton told that he had one lot that needed the 20 foot flag pole to back to it to be able to divide it.

Ms. Janet Tate told that she loved the mountains and wanted to protect them. She told that she is for responsible development and that she was speaking against the Class C division and the 25 foot right-of-way. She told that previously the recreation subdivisions by policy had a 30 foot right-of-way and cemeteries were required to have a 30 foot right-of-way. She told that there was no rationale for the 25 foot right-of-way and stated that the roads for the Class C would never be taken into the VDOT system. She told that she would like to see Section 113-7C apply to the Class C divisions. She

April 14, 2014

told that she spoke with Will Dotson and people would have trouble meeting VDOT requirements with a 25 foot right-of-way. She told that the Board should listen to Mr. Hendrick as he was a former VDOT employee.

With no one else to speak, the Joint Public Hearing was Closed by Mr. Hutchins and Mr. Chambers at 6:11 p.m.

Mr. Hendrick stated that the Class C roads did not have geometric requirements for horizontal and vertical curve requirements which are as important as the grade. He told that he would not have a problem with the Class C with the right road structure. He told that the road could even be dropped to only 16 feet wide. He told that there needed to be maintenance easements for drainage and stated that the Class B roads need geometric standards as well to meet the safety and welfare of the public. He stated that insurance companies will start looking at this more stringently. He stated that flag lots can help clean up a development.

Mr. Martin stated that he had questions about the 1.5 acre lot size.

Mr. Hendrick asked Ronald Newman the minimum lot size.

Ronald Newman stated that the minimum lot size with well and septic is 0.75 acres for Class A and family divisions.

Dr. Littrell told that originally he had opposed the Class C division. He read the portion of Section 113-4 that caused the Class C to be an exception. He stated that the agent needs to consider road design when approving.

Mr. McCraw told that the Planning Commission had done a good job to help people out that don't have the needed road frontage.

(Order)

**APPROVE RECOMMENDATION OF SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE  
MODIFICATIONS TO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Upon motion by Mr. Joey Dickson, second by Mr. Namon Strickland, and passed unanimously, the Planning Commission approved recommending approval of the proposed modifications to the Carroll County Subdivision Ordinance by the Board of Supervisors.

**VOTING**

Ms. Margaret Leggett	Yes
Ms. Beverly Tipton	Yes
Mr. Joey Dickson	Yes
Mr. David Williams	Yes

April 14, 2014

Mr. Namon Strickland	Yes
Mr. Larry Chambers	Yes
Mr. Donnie Morgan	Absent
Mr. Rex Hill	Absent

Mr. Hutchins asked Mr. Cornwell to read the letter below from Mr. Tom Slusher, surveyor:

Gentlemen:

I cannot be a part of the public hearing this evening due to a conflict with another previously scheduled meeting. However, I would like to briefly share thoughts with you concerning the proposed amendments to the subdivision ordinance.

I agree with the proposed amendments to the ordinance and urge you to adopt them as recommended by the planning commission. I hope that the changes will be made effective upon adoption as some of my clients and others are awaiting your decision so that they may proceed with their plans.

We do need orderly direction in the subdivision of property in Carroll County. Both of these elements will allow that order as they are specific in their structure. Some have stated that the proposed class C subdivision would negate the need for flag lots, but it is my experience that both elements are needed for more flexibility in divisions. Sometimes a property only needs connectivity to an existing road to make it a legal division. This can be accomplished by a flag strip when there may not be a need for a road or driveway to be constructed.

I see these amendments as a positive for the citizens of Carroll County because it will help them to accomplish their desires concerning their property. Too many times I have seen good divisions that would benefit the property owner and the County, go by the wayside because of technical elements of the ordinance. These amendments are a step in the direction to help make the ordinance more user-friendly.

(Order)

#### APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE MODIFICATIONS

Upon motion by Mr. Sam Dickson, seconded by Mr. Phil McCraw, and passed, the Board of Supervisors approved the modifications to the Carroll County Subdivision Ordinance as presented by the Carroll County Planning Commission.

#### VOTING

Mr. David Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Phil McCraw	Yes
Mr. Joshua Hendrick	No
Mr. Sam Dickson	Yes

April 14, 2014

Dr. Thomas Littrell                      Yes  
Mr. Bob Martin                              Yes

Mr. Hendrick urged both Boards to take a look at the standards for roads and told that one possibility would be to specify a speed limit.

Mr. Cornwell told that he understood Mr. Hendrick's concern and that the roads for both the Class B and Class C may need to be looked at. He told that this is a living document.

Dr. Littrell asked if the Sheriff could enforce a speed limit on a private road.

Sheriff Gardner stated that he did not think the Judge would do anything since it was a private road.

Mr. Hendrick stated that the speed limit would be the design speed and not a radar speed. He stated that if the roadway is 16 feet wide people would have to go slower.

(Order)

**PUBLIC HEARING – SIX YEAR ROAD PLAN**

A Public Hearing on the 2014-2015 Secondary Construction Budget Priority List and Six-Year for fiscal years 2014-2015 to 2019-2020 for Carroll County was held at the Carroll County Governmental Building on April 14, 2014. The public hearing was opened at 6:48 pm.

Public Hearing was opened with Mr. Dan Huff serving as moderator, with the following opening remarks:

This hearing is being held today, April 14, 2013, at 6:48 P.M., in accordance with Housebill 1041 passed by the 1977 session of the General Assembly and in specific, Section 33.1-70.01 Code of Virginia, which requires the joint effort of the County Officials and the Department of Transportation personnel for the tentative commitment of estimated available secondary construction funds, beginning with Fiscal Year 2014-2015. A copy of the proposed Six-Year Plan and priorities for the proposed secondary construction budget for 2014-2015 have been available for public viewing at the county building; and a copy is on display here. After receiving your requests, the Board of Supervisors and the Virginia Department of Transportation Personnel will finalize the Six Year Plan. Currently the top four priorities are:

- The Route 620 – 4 lane project, near Exit 19. Construction has started and is scheduled to be completed this year.
- Route 735, Pridemore Road – Scheduled to be completed this year.
- Route 799, Crestwood Road – Scheduled to be completed this year.
- Route 793, Sherwood Road

April 14, 2014

Under the new funding format, available funds are to be used for paving projects, on unimproved roads with an average daily count of 50 or greater. With this in mind, we have reviewed the unimproved roads in Carroll that meet the traffic count criteria and could be paved using the Rural Rustic Program. Not all of the roads we reviewed made the list because they were too narrow in places, or had drainage issues or other issues; issues that would require more construction than just paving. We have identified the following 22 additional roads as potential projects. At that time, Ms. Lisa Hughes proceeded to read the list of proposed projects. Upon the completion of the opening remarks, the following comments were received:

Route 893, Round Hill Road – Citizen Mike Winegarden requested that improvements, in the form of hard surfacing, be performed on Route 893, Round Hill Road. Many concerns were presented to strengthen his position, more houses, more traffic, school bus traffic, poor road conditions, etc. Jerry and Archie Hall also filled out an attendance card in regards to Route 893, but did not wish to speak.

Route 608, Boundary Road and Groundhog Mountain Road – Citizen Jim White requested that improvements, in the form of hard surfacing, be performed on sections of Rt. 608. He mentioned that these roads see a lot of commercial traffic since commercial traffic cannot use the adjacent Blue Ridge Parkway. He also talked about the narrow width that made it difficult for two vehicles to pass.

(Note: after the meeting it was noted that these sections lie within the Blue Ridge Parkway Boundary, so VDOT would need the Park Service permission prior to performing any upgrades.)

Route 840, Mountain Valley Road – Citizen Connie Padgett requested that improvements, in the form of hard surfacing, be performed on Rt. 840. He mentioned that it was difficult for two school buses to pass. He also talked about “Wildlife Management” that dump materials on the road, and that motor grader work should be done on Rt. 840.

Route 908, Park Bridge Road – Citizen Bob Spenser requested that improvements, in the form of hard surfacing, be performed on Rt. 908. He thought it would be more economical to pave the road, than performing constant motor grader machining. (Currently the road does not meet the required ADT threshold for paving).

Other – Citizen Janet Tate commented that the proposed change to the subdivision ordinance would not be conducive to allow VDOT to bring any new private roads into the state system.

Also Citizen Tom Tabor fill out an attendance card, but did not speak. He attended on behalf of Bluestone Road, which is on the draft 6 year plan.

With no other citizen requested to speak, the floor was opened up to questions from the Supervisors.

April 14, 2014

Supervisor Hendricks asked if any funding would be available for other type of improvements, such as building up existing road embankments near creeks. VDOT responded that funding allocation policies may change in the future which would allow other types of improvements.

Supervisor Martin questioned the schedule of the projects. VDOT responded that based on projected revenues, the projects would all be funded by the year 2020.

Vice Chairman McCraw was concerned about removing the previous Rt. 690, Brushy Fork Road, from the priority list. VDOT responded that the property owners did not desire to donate the required Right-of-Way, and any future allocations could not go towards spot improvements projects.

Supervisor Dickson asked about putting Route 685, Winding Ridge Road, on the plan. VDOT responded that it did not have sufficient traffic.

Chairman Hutchins hear rumors that VDOT may be closing some of the I-77 ramps for construction projects. VDOT responded that they were not aware of any construction in which ramp closures would be necessary.

With no further questions, the public meeting was closed at 7:18 pm.

### **PRESENTATION OF COUNTY BUDGET**

Ms. Nikki Cannon told that she is very enthusiastic tonight to present the FY2015 proposed budget. She told that the budget book has a copy of the presentation so you can follow along and it also includes the CIP, not that was approved at the Board meeting but what is included in the proposed budget. She told that in the last tab you have the Gas Utility Fund budget which we will need to adopt along with the regular budget. She told that our budget challenges this year are we have no approved State budget, increased cost of personnel and operating expenses, increase in debt service for CCHS HVAC, the operating costs of Woodlawn School and capital needs. She told that on this tab alone our budget committee was tasked with finding an additional \$458,000 this year outside of our normal reoccurring operating costs. She told that as Chairman Hutchins was stealing part of her budget presentation earlier, 1 cent on the tax levy is about \$230,000 so these costs are roughly 2 cents. She told that our options are increased taxes or fees, reduce services provided to citizens or redistribute resources. She reviewed the revenue and the total that is budgeted is \$39,549,404. She told that \$21 million of that is in our general property taxes and if you go to the second largest funding source we have it is the Commonwealth and that is unknown but we are assuming that it will remain level. She told that the expenses are \$39,549,404 to give you a balanced budget. She told that non-departmental used to be large and she is focused on allocating costs to departments to have an understanding of what our services are costing us. She told that we had the School Budget Public Hearing tonight and the transfer was level at \$11 million but when we factor in the debt service associated with education it brings the total up to \$15,428,871 and that is really Carroll County's commitment to education is and she

April 14, 2014

wanted to make sure you understood that. She told that on expenses education is 39% of our overall budget and if you compare these to last year's you will see a shift. She told that some of the considerations are a VRS rate increase of 1.087% and continued implementation of employees paying of the employee share, VRS insurance rate increase of .13%, health insurance increase of 5.2% with it being absorbed by the employees, and a variety of funding decisions with vacant positions. She told that they also reduced the CIP and explained those changes. She told that are several personnel recommendations are reviewed each of those and their impact to the budget.

Mr. Hutchins told that the finance position is not an elimination it is just that we chose to not fill it or try to this year and it is not elimination.

Ms. Cannon told that what we have coming in 2016 is a \$1.5 million debt service payment and they will continue for the next 10 years. She told that this budget is based heavily on the collection of delinquent real estate and personal property taxes and if we are successful in that effort we will eventually remove that funding. She told that when you are looking at the increases that we have it is a lot that we are going to have to find.

Mr. Hendrick told that FY2017 is where it gets tough.

Ms. Cannon replied yes. She told that we have about done all the redistributing we can do internally. She told that trends may change and the State may come in with more funds. She told that it is not a need to be alarmed right now but a need to be frugal. She thanked the Budget Committee and told that it has been pleasant this year. She reminded everyone of the Public Hearing on the budget scheduled for May 12<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Hutchins asked if it requires 14 days.

Ms. Cannon told that it only requires 7 between public hearing and adoption.

Mr. Martin asked on the gas distribution line, we currently project a positive revenue situation.

Ms. Cannon replied, no sir we don't.

Mr. Martin asked if we would in the future.

Ms. Cannon told that we don't have a trend yet and we are adding on people but trying to project revenues and expenditures depend on how many people tap onto the line.

Mr. Larowe told that before you can end up growing you have to have resources to grow and those are not necessarily budgeted in here.

Mr. Martin told that he didn't envision breaking even anytime soon but he feels like on down the road.

April 14, 2014

Mr. Dickson asked if the total number of employees for the County since we transferred we only come up with ½ employee.

Ms. Cannon told that because we share a position with the Treasurer's Office.

Mr. Dickson asked if we have to pay for that.

Ms. Cannon told that we do not get any extra compensation from the State.

Mr. Dickson asked how long the freeze is going to last. He asked if there is any hope of us getting more money from the State.

Ms. Cannon told that she went with level funding from last year. She told that they are talking about a 2% increase for constitutionals as of December and she did not budget that in.

Mr. Hendrick told that he would like to thank Nikki and the budget committee. He told that he knows for a fact that Nikki has put in a lot of hours and the rest of the administration has to and he appreciates it.

Mr. McCraw told that he echo's what Josh said and Nikki has done a super job along with the rest of our staff and we appreciate it.

Dr. Littrell told that he thinks the budget that Nikki has put together is very realistic and he is very comfortable with the numbers that she has used and she can cut down from 20 hours a day to 16 or so.

### **SUPERVISOR'S TIME**

Mr. Martin told that he passed by the hallway and Josh and our County Attorney were hashing over something where they had done some refinancing and he would like to revisit that area to see if we could refinance anything at a cheaper interest rate. He told that in talking to Gary a long time ago the first Board that he served on they spent an hour fussing over \$100 typewriter and that is the truth and if the Board tried to go in that detail we would meet forever. He told Nikki that she did a great job.

Mr. Hendrick told that he appreciates the work the Planning Commission has put in on the Subdivision Ordinance and all the work Administration has done on the budget. He told that he would like to bring up what Bob was talking about and another locality had refinanced some previous loans that they had and cut the interest rates dramatically and left the terms the same. He told that he would like to put that on the floor for discussion. He asked Mr. Cornwell if he would give a quick rundown of what they were discussing.

Mr. Cornwell told that he thinks he has talked to most of the Board members. He told that several of his jurisdictions have obtained services of a financial consultant to review their debt and to determine if they can go out to refinance or not. He told that his

April 14, 2014

suggestion is for the Board to issue a RFP for a financial consultant to see what interest there is in assisting the county and if there is interest what they might recommend as far as lowering interest rates. He told that it is all in your hands, a financial consultant comes in and tells you what to refinance or what won't work then you make the decision of whether to do it or not, it is all in your hands. He told that it is a little bit of a process and procedure. He told that he is not ruling out or ruling in anybody but it may be something that VACO/VML could do but they could respond to the request just as well so it is his recommendation that it go out for proposal.

Mr. Hendrick told that if he understands it right the first RFP is kind of a no obligation deal where they come in and take a look and see if they can save money and if they can that is part of the payment.

Mr. Cornwell told that they will tell you what their fee structure is and you decide if you want to hire them or not and their fee structure may very well be that they don't charge anything unless you do refinance.

Mr. Hendrick told that is a possibility. He asked if Administration had any comments.

Mr. Larrowe told that one of the situations that we could end up doing prior to issuing an RFP would be to look at this internally and see what the interest rates are. He told that some of these are tied up whether it is USDA or QSCB or whatever as far as being able to refinance based upon the terms. He told that he is not saying anything in opposition to what Jim is saying except that maybe we could end up saving the cost of the RFP up front to go ahead and get a listing of what is out there and see what we could potentially look at and see if it is even able to go to the RFP. He told that they have looked at this previously in PSA and VML/VACO has looked at some of this as well so we just need to see if there is a way to do this.

Mr. Cornwell told that he is not a financial advisor so whatever the Board wants to do, he simply put it on the table. He told that he has had clients do this but it is what you want to do.

Mr. Hendrick told that anytime he has a discussion and someone tells him there is a potential for significant savings that is the reason he wanted to throw it on the floor.

Mr. McCraw told that he thinks saving money is what we need to be all about right now. He told that maybe it would be a good idea for staff to check it out first and see what the situation looks like then we can decide what we need to do.

Mr. Larrowe told that we can end up having an analysis next month that we could end up bringing back to you to see if you want to move forward.

Mr. McCraw told that to him that would be the best way to approach it.

April 14, 2014

Mr. Hendrick told that as long as we look at it.

Dr. Littrell told that he probably should have asked for this to be on the agenda but he and Mr. Dickson were tasked with the idea of looking at Woodlawn School as possibilities of what it could be used for and Nikki already mentioned how much it was going to cost for next year just to keep it there. He told that we have had public hearings where they talked to us about things they would like to see it used for. He told that Mr. Dickson and himself along with Gary had a chance to visit with Chris Newman who is project estimator for Community Housing Partners and they are headquartered out of Christiansburg. He told that they visited two rehabs, one which was a former school and they have 27 apartments and it is fully occupied and they were able to look at those apartments. He told that the school was built in 1938. He told that they also went to Lynchburg to visit a former school that is in the process of being rehabbed. He told that in both of these cases they were able to receive grants. He told that when he went to look he was somewhat skeptical but after having been on the ground and seeing them, he is not suggesting that we do this or not but he thinks we should at least look at it as a possibility. He told that otherwise it is going to be a constant financial drain on the county. He told that it is not a recommendation it is simply a report.

Mr. Hendrick asked who he was talking with at CHP.

Dr. Littrell replied Chris Newman was one and they talked to a couple others. He told that in both of those cases they had cut off the gym and some other parts of the building to be used for the community.

Mr. Dickson told that one thing he might add about Lynchburg is they sold the property to developers and the agreement was that money would be spent on the gym and the developers would lease the gym to the city for a number of years and it worked out real well. He told that the affordability was reasonable. He told that Lynchburg has a waiting list of over 200. He told that he is not saying that is what we need to do but it is a possibility.

Mr. Dickson told that someone told him that the convenience center in Cana is not handicap accessible for some. He told that he didn't understand what he was talking about and hasn't had a chance to go.

Mr. Larrowe told that we have it manned down there with someone to try to help with those issues. He told that he doesn't know if they are going at times when they aren't there.

Mr. McCraw told that he knows the guy that works there and he knows that he helps a lot of people.

Mr. Dickson told that he appreciates the Planning Commission for all their work and we got something passed.

April 14, 2014

Mr. McCraw told that he appreciates everyone attending and also thanks the Planning Commission for all their work. He gave kudos to staff and Nikki and told that she did a really great job on the budget. He told that out of the three budgets that he has worked on this has been the most challenging but most rewarding.

Mr. Hutchins thanked the staff for a lot of long hours and told that he appreciates it. He told that he realizes that the time may come when our revenues fall short of our expenditures and that is going to be a difficult time. He told that a lot of folks don't appreciate the financial condition that is prevalent in the County. He told that there is a lot of folks in our county that is hurting and he knows the food banks are constantly asking to be replenished. He told that they have worked since he came on the Board to not raise taxes and while we are higher than some you also need to look at the revenue streams that some of the other counties have to offset that. He told that we are in a position where our revenue source is predominately real estate and if you look at that and the expenditures most of the dollars go to support education. He told that he was fearful that you were going to come back and say we need a 2 to 3 cent increase and he is thankful for that.

(Order)

**RECESS**

Upon motion by Mr. Hendrick, seconded by Mr. McCraw and passing, the Board recessed until May 5, 2014 at 6:30 p.m.

VOTES

Mr. Hendrick	Yes
Mr. McCraw	Yes
Mr. Hutchins	Yes
Mr. Dickson	Yes
Dr. Littrell	Yes
Mr. Martin	Yes

(Order)

---

Chairman

---

Clerk

April 14, 2014