

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 13, 2006**

At the regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Floyd County, Virginia, held on Tuesday, June 13, 2006, at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Room of the County Administration Building, thereof;

PRESENT: David W. Ingram, Chairman; J. Fred Gerald, Vice Chairman; Diane B. Belcher, Jerry W. Boothe, Kerry W. Whitlock, Board Members; George W. Nester, County Administrator; Terri W. Morris, Assistant County Administrator.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. with the reading of the handicapping statement.

The Opening Prayer was led by Vice Chairman Gerald.

Supervisor Belcher led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. Deronda Thomas, Treasurer, appeared before the Board. She presented the invested cash and cash in office report as of June 13, 2006. She reported that the June 5 tax deadline was very busy but proceeded well. Will provide a collection summary for the Board later in the day.

Mrs. Morris presented the Balance Sheet and Revenue/Expenditure Summary as of May 31, 2006. She reported that, at 92% through the year, that General Fund revenues are at 86% and General Fund expenses at 93% of budget. One department is already over budget, but the CSA budget is \$175,000 under budget at this time.

The minutes of May 9, May 24, and June 6, 2006 were presented to the Board for review and approval.

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, seconded by Supervisor Whitlock, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to approve the minutes of May 24, 2006 and June 6, 2006 as presented.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

On a motion of Supervisor Gerald, seconded by Supervisor Belcher, and carried, it was resolved to approve the minutes of May 9, 2006 as presented.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - abstain - not present for entire meeting
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

The monthly disbursements were presented to the Board for review and approval. A list of additional disbursements was also presented for the Board's consideration. Questions and discussion followed.

On a motion of Supervisor Belcher, seconded by Supervisor Boothe, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to approve the monthly disbursements, plus additions, as presented.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

At 9:00 a.m., the Chairman called for the Public Comment Period. After no comments from the audience, the Chairman declared the Public Comment Period closed.

Agenda Item 8a - Subdivision plats as approved by Agent for May 2006. Mr. Nester reported that the number of lots created has declined from the same time last year. Forty-seven new lots have been created this year to-date, 13 in the month of May. Of the 13 May creations, 6 were agricultural lots, 7 were standard lots. Five modifications of existing lots of record and 18 lot line revisions were approved by the Agent. \$1245 in permit fees were collected.

Agenda Item 8b - Appointment to Floyd County Social Services Board, Locust Grove District, four year term.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Boothe, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to appoint Mr. James Richards to the Floyd County Social Services Board, representing the Locust Grove District, for a four year term from July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2010.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Agenda Item 8c - Appointment to Local Advisory Board of New River Community Action, three year term, July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2009.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Belcher, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to reappoint Ms. Susan Icove to the New River Community Action Local

Advisory Board for a three year term beginning July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2009, contingent upon her acceptance of same.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Agenda Item 8d - Report - Outstanding bonded project balance with VDoT - Industrial Access Road. Mr. Nester reported that in earlier conversations with VDoT, that they had indicated that they would refrain from requiring the County to repay for the Industrial Access Road portion of the loan until April 2007. Somewhere along the line, someone higher in VDoT looked into that and decided that this was not the way. We have been notified that we are expected to make the payment on our portion of the Industrial Access loan in the amount of \$199,860.46. We do have the money set aside and identified for that use.

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, seconded by Supervisor Belcher, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to approve a one-time disbursement of \$199,860.46 to VDoT from funds set aside for the project, based upon review/clearance of legal counsel.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Agenda Item 8e - Proposed Resolution - Industrial Revenue Bonds - Mountain Empire Services of the Southwest, Inc., trading as New River Valley Community Services Board. Mr. Nester reported that they are requesting authority to use a portion of the IDA's tax exempt financing to fund renovation of their offices in Blacksburg. Each jurisdiction in Virginia is allocated \$10 m per year to be used for private, non-profit groups to finance a facility. There are special benefits to the banks that buy those bonds. The way the program is set up, the IDA would issue the bonds, a bank would buy the bonds, there is no financial responsibility assumed by either the County government or the IDA for issuing the bonds. It's a stand-alone transaction but again, so there is some way of managing the number of tax exempt bonds issued in Virginia during the year, it was decided that the safest way was to divide the bonds up and give everyone a \$10 m allocation. To-date, we have used \$3.5 m of our allocation. This agency is requesting up to \$5 m, which would still leave a ceiling of \$1.5 m that would be available for some type of tax exempt projects. This is an industrial development revenue bond, will it have any impact on any type of private business that might want to locate? It would not, those funds are accounted for separately, this is just to allow public, non-profit community service organizations to gain a little additional tax benefit from the sale of the bonds. The next step is, if the Board endorses the resolution, the matter will go back to the Floyd County Industrial Development Authority, and they will be required to hold a public hearing and have the formal application reviewed and approved, and they will also adopt a resolution. With your adoption, its non-binding, the

application amount cannot be increased, only lowered. The IDA can also receive a small handling charge up to 1/8 of 1% of the outstanding balance per year.

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, seconded by Supervisor Whitlock, and carried, it was resolved to adopt the resolution as presented for approval of issuance of Industrial Revenue Bonds to Mountain Empire Services of the Southwest, Inc. (Document File Number _____).

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - nay
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - nay
Supervisor Ingram - aye

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, seconded by Supervisor Whitlock, it was resolved to authorize staff to write a letter of recommendation to the Industrial Development Authority to consider a lower administration fee for the Mountain Empire Services of the Southwest, Inc. Industrial Revenue Bonds since they are an organization that provides services to the County's citizens.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - nay
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - nay
Supervisor Ingram - nay

Motion failed.

Agenda Item 8f - Proposed Resolution - Signing of County warrants.

On a motion of Supervisor Belcher, seconded by Supervisor Whitlock, and carried, it was resolved to approve the resolution as presented, for signing of County warrants (Document File Number _____).

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - abstain
Supervisor Ingram - abstain

Agenda Item 8g - Request - Abandonment Process, off of State Secondary Route 810. Mr. Nester reported that besides the request from Mr. Lawson to begin the abandonment process, several requests from adjacent landowners have been received against the process. The citizens are concerned about the impact that this closing would have on their property. After review of the property maps and discussion of concern from adjacent landowners, consensus of the Board was to take no action on the matter.

Mr. Carl Ayers, Social Services Director, next appeared before the Board. He thanked

the Board for their input into the agency's contingency plan that was discussed last month. What the State did was an emergency appropriation for the month of June, which basically puts us in the same fiscal year now as the other State agencies. So they handled a big item that was a concern for our department outside of the State budget process. Nobody has addressed it again, but at least they did something for June. The Governor was able to do this through a debt authorization so we can continue to provide our services. Hopefully we will see something from the State budget soon. We are still continuing to operate all services as we have been and appreciate your support.

The cooling program begins June 15 and continues through August 15. If for any reason you might be contacted by citizens from your district for assistance for any type of cooling needs, please have them apply with us. The sooner they apply, the better, once all the funds are used, there are no more coming and they will not receive assistance. It is funding limited. Air conditioners can be purchased and the installation can be paid for also. If someone has not received an air conditioner in the past, they can have one installed in their home. We partner with Community Housing Partnership who come in and do the installation. People can go to Lowe's or somewhere and purchase one, pick it up themselves, have it installed, or we can manage that for them, there are a variety of options. Once one air conditioner is received, that's all they are eligible for. You can receive assistance later with the electrical bills to run the air conditioner.

Agenda Item 8h - Report - Transition to New River Resource Authority landfill - July 1, 2006. Mr. Nester reported that we are set up and ready to go with the transfer beginning July 1. On June 30, three new trailers will be delivered to our transfer station. The operators have been trained on the walking floor trailers that will be used. Some of the employees who have been with us for a long time had used this type of trailer when we first began the operation.

Agenda Item 8i - Report - Audit Proposals for three year term beginning July 1, 2006. Mr. Nester reported that three proposals were received for the management document that is under the Board's purview. The Board deferred the matter for discussion later in the day.

Agenda Item 8j - Appointment of Acting County Administrator.

On a motion of Supervisor Belcher, seconded by Supervisor Gerald, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to appoint Terri Morris as Acting County Administrator effective June 14, 2006 at 5:00 p.m. until such time as a new County Administrator is hired.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Mr. Nester presented a report from Mr. Calvin Reed, Sanitation Superintendent, concerning repair/replacement of a backhoe at the transfer station. He reported that this 1993 Ford backhoe with an extend-a-boom is used to compact the trash. This is an extended reach

boom so the operators can reach over the walls of the trailers to compact materials. Over the years of use, the boom had metal fatigue, and one day the boom just broke loose from the backhoe, didn't come unpinned, it broke and fell into the container and created a little bit of excitement. The dilemma that Mr. Reed has encountered is that the parts to repair that backhoe would run approximately \$9700-10,000 plus the cost to install would make the total cost from \$12,000-15,000 to get it back in operation. Meadows of Dan Ford/New Holland has a 1993 655 diesel backhoe, same make and model, but with 5200 hours, he is willing to trade for \$22,500. Solid Waste does not have the money in their budget to do either one of those. The options are that we can get by for the time being using the one backhoe that we have. The Department has always tried to keep one good piece of equipment in reserve for that proverbial rainy day, and that day came a couple of weeks ago. I think we probably need to be thinking about 1) can we get by without replacing that backhoe; 2) if we do decide to replace it, what would be the best option to replace it, repair the equipment or look at buying another used piece of equipment? After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board for staff to investigate other options and report back to the Board.

Mr. Mike Lawless, Draper-Aden Associates, next appeared before the Board. He reported on the corrective action plan for the landfill. He reported that he is not the bearer of good or bad news, things are just status quo, which can be a good thing. We did install three new wells in April, MW19, MW18, and MW17. 17 and 19 are deep wells, about 120', and 18 is a shallow well. We sampled those in May when we did the semi-annual event and have not gotten those results back yet. The corrective action program does require quarterly sampling initially so we did the first quarterly event in February. The quarterly events are looking at 7 wells and surface water location and we only have to do that for the first year and then drop back to semi-annual sampling. In that first quarterly event, MW2 and MW10, MW8 was not. MW8 is typically the one where we see the most number of organics. MW2 and MW10 we just generally see one or two organics and they are generally around groundwater protection standards, and we saw that again in this quarterly event. MW2 over the years, has gone up and then back down. MW10 has slowly increased from 1 to 5-6 parts per billion, so its not a significant increase, although in this last event it did exceed the groundwater protection standards for the first time. But still the highest levels we were seeing in MW2 were up around 80 parts per billion, and we're seeing here up around 6. So it does appear that things are migrating but it also appears that the levels are degrading as they continue to move. That's one of the things that we'll be evaluating in the corrective action program is to make sure that we continue to see that degradation as things move. If we don't see that and see that those constituents are moving without degrading, then we'll need to look at a new remediation for that area, which would probably be injecting some sort of nutrients or oxidation chemicals into the aquifer to speed up the natural reaction. These are very minor increases. We've sampled these for five years, and there is a very minor increase.

Supervisor Boothe - do you monitor the water volume in these wells also?

Mr. Lawless - yes we do.

Supervisor Boothe - have you seen any reduction in MW2 that would lead you to believe that you have a shift underground?

Mr. Lawless - we did have a significant decrease in the level in around 2002, but since then its come back. But its still not where we consider normal.

Supervisor Boothe - during drought conditions, the water may have found a different route.

Mr. Lawless - that's a possibility, but the drop in the water level is dropping everywhere, so generally the flow pattern is staying the same. What it does is it, as they drop, the gradient drops out a little bit, so your flow rate actually slows down, but we're not seeing the situation where MW10 stays up here and MW2 drops. It stays in the same general area. As a general trend across the site, some levels are decreasing, some are staying the same, and some like MW10 are slightly increasing. There are not any significant increases and we are continuing to see indications that these constituents are breaking down naturally like we want to see them. We are not seeing anything new. Some of the parameters we've seen in the past we're not seeing now. The big variable that's out there is still the surface water, the spring discharge, which DEQ is considering at this point is surface water. We've met with the Water Division in Roanoke about the permit program and submitted all our data to them, and the stream assessment, and we're waiting for them to review that. In the meantime, last month DEQ came out with some guidance as to how they're going to handle surface water discharges at landfills. We're in the process of reviewing that guidance. On a quick read-through, it didn't appear that it would provide much helpful guidance, its more of a restating of the regulations and which program is going to handle which releases. It still indicates that the water division would handle the surface water release and the waste division would handle the rest of the program. It still appears to allow the permit option. At the site that we're working on in Roanoke, where we're a little further in the program, not to the permit stage, but we have gotten feedback from the Water Division where they've reviewed all the data and they've said that they can issue a permit, but all levels of constituents in the water are below surface water quality standards, so you won't have discharge limits or monitoring requirements, just have the permit. The Waste Division doesn't like that, so they're looking for something different. The concentrations that we're seeing here are similar to what we're seeing in Roanoke so if the Water Division was to issue a permit right now, you'd be below all your limits, there would be minimal monitoring requirements and there would be no treatment requirements. So, its caught in this regulatory limbo right now where the Water Division says fine, we'll issue you a permit and you don't need to do anything, and the Waste Division says well, we don't like that answer but we really don't know how to handle it. The guidance tries to address that but doesn't do it clearly. I need to read the guidance more and see exactly what it does say. We will be submitting comments to DEQ on the guides and try to make sure that it's a balanced program. But this is still a variable at this time. The bottom line is that the spring discharge flows into a natural wetland and we're detecting very low levels of DOC's in there. Once that water gets into the wetland, the wetland is doing its natural thing and cooling off the water, so by the time the water flows out of the wetland and off the property, there's nothing detected. So the wetland is doing its job. Those levels coming out of that spring

have been remarkably steady over the years, we've seen no increases or decreases.

Supervisor Belcher - is that monitoring well off our property?

Mr. Lawless - yes it is. When we put that well in, the property owner was notified that there was a potential that contaminants were off-site and once we detected those, we notified him of that also, since the regulations require notice to adjacent property owners. He has been great to work with and we've had no problems. From a financial standpoint, once the facility entered the corrective action program, the regulations require that the County establish financial assurance for \$1 m/year for corrective action. That's generally an accounting exercise where you demonstrate that you have enough money flowing into your system vs. what's flowing out that you can demonstrate financial solvency and pay for corrective action if needed. The good news is that once the corrective action program was approved, we then do a specific cost estimate for annual corrective action costs and project that over the life of the corrective action program to see where that falls out. That comes out to about \$50,000/year, we estimate ten years, that \$500,000. So now you only have to demonstrate financial assurance for \$500,000 rather than the \$1 m. Again, its an accounting exercise but it does show the liabilities that are potentially out there. Now that you have a formal corrective action program in place, its significantly less than it was a couple of years ago.

Supervisor Whitlock - so it still seems that DEQ can't decide on what they want to do. One wants to clean up the world as it is, and Mother Nature is not going to allow you to do that. The water board wants to do something else. One wants to fight Mother Nature and one wants to live with it.

Mr. Lawless - with this new guidance that's out there, we may get an answer this year or it may just continue to be in limbo. The bottom line is that you don't have contamination leaving your site in surface water. The groundwater levels are generally decreasing as they migrate off site, although we have seen slight increases, its still not at the level that would cause significant concern, and certainly not to the level that would require immediate remediation.

Supervisor Whitlock - at what level would we have to do that?

Mr. Lawless - I would expect that it would be levels on the order of 50-100 parts per million which are the high levels that would indicate that what is here is moving without degrading. As long as we're seeing those levels to remain what the levels were, and we're still seeing the proper indicators, then we can make the case that things are degrading before they get off-site and the procedures are working.

Supervisor Belcher - when do you expect to get the results back?

Mr. Lawless - they were collected at the end of May so it will probably be the end of June before we get those back. One other thing in the permit, is a deadline of May 31 to submit the surface water mitigation plan, how we're going to clean up that spring. Obviously that's

caught in limbo between the water and waste division so we submitted a letter to the waste division requesting an extension to that May 31 deadline, and tied the extension to the date of the approval of the water division. So we said within 90 days of the water division telling us how they want us to handle this, we'll submit a plan.

Supervisor Belcher - have you heard back from them as to whether this is suitable?

Mr. Lawless - no, in verbal discussions, they said it was ok. But that is one other plan that is out there to be done.

In reference to further discussion concerning the audit proposals, staff was instructed to obtain an hourly rate from the firms for the meeting later in June. Interviews with the firms may be scheduled for the July regular meeting.

Mr. Gene Dalton, EMS Operations Manager, next appeared before the Board. He presented the age breakdown report on calls and commented that figures still continue to show more calls for the elderly age group. The report for agency #1219 shows 56 total calls for the month. At the bottom it shows the breakdown, if the Fire Department goes out, we go out with them, anything industrial. Out of 56, we transported 34 patients to the hospital, so we're looking at 22 calls where we didn't transport anyone. Patient refusals were 13, so we could have gone to the Roanoke or Carroll County lines, and the patient changed their mind. We had five cancelled calls, we started out and then we were cancelled. Carilion New River Valley continues to be the most used hospital, which is good.

Mrs. Myra Grim, EMS Operations Clerk, next appeared before the Board. She presented the financial statement for May 2006 and reported that collections continue to hold steady. One new thing I started doing this month is sending out a card explaining the program to individuals who use the service. I have received several calls back, but most of them were assuring that we had received their insurance information. I am sending this out to all people who use our services. One call today was from someone who was having some financial difficulty, so I was able to inform them as to what to do. So it has been a positive thing with people thanking us for outlining the options.

Mr. Steve Love, Floyd Rescue Captain, next appeared before the Board. He reported 17 auto accidents for the past month. We are seeing a steady increase in them. Average calls are up even though the monthly count is lower. The Parkway travel increases the volume during the summer. Transportation was provided for 61 out of the 70 patients to the hospital. We will have a formal presentation of the 6-wheeler that we just received sometime in early July, we'll let the Board know of the date.

Mr. Ford Wirt, Emergency Services Coordinator, next appeared before the Board. He reported that bids have been received for the four brush trucks for the Fire Department. He presented a synopsis of the bids in memo form, outlining the process and the bids received. You also have a letter from the Fire Department stating that they have reviewed the bids and they do

meet the specifications. You also have a list of the individual bids that were received from the different manufacturers. The bidders that bid on these did base their bid on four units. If you do not buy four units, then there will be an adjustment upward by individual. By doing four, we get a great discount. If you just opt to buy one, two or three, the figures will jump up. Their rationale is that they buy the materials to do all four in bulk, and they can discount by doing that when they set up the jigs and so forth, they can cut four instead of one and can save time and money by doing that. These are 2007 models. If the orders are placed, we won't get into the additional cost of emissions that's coming up on the 2008 models. They are cutting off orders on the 2007 models sometime around July 15 - August 1. Anything after that, will be 2008 models with the increased cost based on the emissions. The increased cost was somewhere between \$5,000 - 10,000 minimum. The lowest bid was \$249,520 for the complete unit, the next is broken down between chassis unit and slide-in modifications. If you go with those two bids, it would be a savings of \$28,442. If you go with that option, and those chassis are received, that would be somewhere in the 8-10 week range, then it would be the obligation of the County to pay for those chassis at that time. They would go to the manufacturer, and somewhere in the 90-120 day range after receipt of the chassis at the manufacturer's facility, the full unit would be ready and the balance due at that time. These units have a 15-20 year life and would be set up on a yearly basis rather than four at one time. It is the request of the fire service that the purchase of these four units be done. Based on cost factors and rationale of the increased cost that you're going to face if we don't do all four at this time, as Emergency Services Coordinator, it's my recommendation also that we move forward with the purchase of these four units from Duncan Ford and Vests Sales and Service. Vest Sales and Service, for those of you that don't know it, is located here in Floyd County and this puts dollars back into our community and I think that says a lot as well as having the lowest bid.

Supervisor Whitlock - the new emissions controls, they've already told us, is at least \$15,000 per vehicle.

Mr. Wirt - it could be anywhere from \$12,000-15,000. Multiply that by four, you're talking about \$60,000.

Supervisor Boothe - we can get around that as long as they don't change their mind and go back to discussions of retrofitting.

Mr. Wirt - and again if they do that, Mr. Boothe, you not only have these trucks here but you'd have to go back and retrofit everything that you have in your fleet. It would be a costly situation. We hope they don't do that at this point, and you know how that goes. Along with the cost of the chassis going up, each year the manufacturer of ambulance and fire equipment usually have a 5-8% increase over and above the chassis increase. It's an ongoing procession that keeps eating up the dollars.

Supervisor Whitlock - what is the process of disposal of the old equipment?

Mr. Wirt - I think at this point, it was my understanding that they would remain in the

County to be used possibly for the transfer station, recycling, or if rescue needed something. They just got the 6-wheeler and if they needed a 4-wheel drive truck, these are just examples of where they might be used within the County. If that is not the pleasure of the Board, then they would be disposed of.

Supervisor Boothe - what about the actual fire apparatus itself? It would be taken off wouldn't it?

Mr. Wirt - it could probably be salvaged through another fire service for parts and that type of thing. I don't know whether the transfer station or recycling would need anything that sprays water, years ago we used a fire truck there to water down things. That's a question that would be up to the Board with several options. There would be three brush trucks and a utility truck out of Station #3.

Supervisor Boothe - would it be to the County's best interest to continue the speed limit restriction on these vehicles considering the history?

Mr. Wirt - that probably wouldn't be a bad idea. That would be something I would have to do some research on and report back to you.

Dr. Terry Arbogast, School Superintendent, next appeared before the Board. He reported on the following:

- Presented copy of May 8, 2006 School Board meeting highlights;
- School Board approved the new teacher evaluation form which is results based;
- Presented copy of June 12, 2006 School Board meeting highlights;
- Presented copy of PALS scores for K-3 reading assessment remediation through Title I funds, goal is to be below 10% of total school population;
- Working on draft student conduct handbook and draft Consolidated Plan for Federal Funds.

The Board recessed for lunch.

Mr. Bob Beasley, Residency Administrator and Mr. Jeremy Hendricks, VDoT, next appeared before the Board. Mr. Beasley presented the revised 6-year secondary construction plan which incorporates the 40% State cuts. We will be able to do two projects this year only and then we'll be down to one major project a year. Routes 648 and 735 will be done this year. \$2.75m has been cut from the total plan. Of the remaining funds, \$1.5 m has to go for Federal projects. Total reduction of funds that have been applied to unpaved roads is \$4,299,282.00 over the 6-year schedule. The six year plan is now really a 40 year plan of all projects we had scheduled.

Supervisor Whitlock - Route 681 bridge - is this scheduled for upgrading anytime soon?

Mr. Beasley - can be repaired with maintenance funds which we are planning to do, but any renovations will be a long time coming.

Supervisor Gerald - nothing for today.

Supervisor Whitlock - trimming was started but has been stopped.

Mr. Beasley - the contractor was sent home and State crews were doing work but stopped to work on patching and machining. Hope to work on it more in late summer or early fall.

Supervisor Boothe - appreciate work you are doing, nothing else to report.

Supervisor Belcher - I called on Routes 602, 603, 799 already. Route 727 has very uneven patching. Routes 604 and 727 also have very rough places. Route 799 in the curves past Route 775, the road is very rough and drop-off to side is bad. Will call you with other routes.

Supervisor Ingram - nothing specific. Whatever that can be done for mowing on secondary roads is a bigger safety concern than Routes 8 or 221.

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, seconded by Supervisor Whitlock, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to amend the agenda to include Mr. Roger Hollandsworth and Mr. Kelcie Bower as representatives from the Floyd County Lifesaving and First Aid Squad, Inc.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

Mr. Hollandsworth - We are in the process of building a building in the Indian Valley section of the County for the Rescue Squad. It would be Floyd County Rescue Squad Station #4. Basically we have growing pains with the Fire Department/Rescue Squad joint building right now. We've outgrown that building due to the situation with being landlocked and other situations. So we're looking to build a building about 8/10ths of a mile up the road, at the intersection of Indian Valley Post Office Road and Macks Mountain Road. What Kelcie is giving you are two different sets of paperwork. As we look at the one dealing with Indian Valley, what we're looking to do there is build a building that has three bays on the front of the building, the back side would be basically housing as far as kitchen, meeting rooms, bunk rooms, showers. The under-portion of the back side would have a basement area that we hope to be able to utilize also as a community room. Up in that immediate area there's not really a good spot for a community room so we're hoping to be able to utilize it in that capacity. We're looking to do this project with as much of the funding from the Squad as we possibly can. Also, we have talked with Supervisor Gerald and Supervisor Whitlock about these two building projects and got their input. Of course, to come along with any building project you're going to have to have

funding. We as Squad, can put a chunk of money into it but its still going to take a larger chunk to finish the project there and also look at the situation at the Station #1 area. What we're looking to do at Station #1 is put an addition onto the building as it sits. The drawing there has a wall that we're going to expand in the same direction the property lays in now. With that, we will have a basement that will have an open area that will have three different bay areas where we will be able to house more equipment. We're looking not at something that will just last to get us through 2-3 years, what we're basically looking at is something to get us through another 15 years down the road. As time goes on, we'll be looking at more and more need due to the volume of calls. So we feel we're going to have some more room for additional equipment as time goes by. Above that, would be basically showers, bunk rooms, office spaces, a great room for different things such as a meeting room or conference room. We've talked with some people about pricing. What we're basically looking at is a total project cost in the neighborhood of \$850,000 - 900,000 for both facilities. We have also talked with some financial institutions also to see what they would require if we got to the point that we had to borrow money directly ourselves. Of course we're looking for a blessing from the County and the Board to go towards these two projects, or the possibility of the Squad doing the full funding of Station #4 and looking to Station #1 for the County to help us with that situation. We're pretty much ready to go quickly with Station #4 because we've been in the planning stages for it for a long time. Station #1 we're hoping to be able to do at the same time as Station #4 providing we can get the financial numbers to work out and go forward from that aspect. The two facilities will be pretty much the same dollar amount. We think the numbers are pretty close to what we'll need for the complete turn-key facilities.

Mr. Bower - the one set of drawings for Station #1 we just received this morning. They are just something to work from, a rough draft. The fellow drawing them had a family emergency so it was rushed.

Mr. Hollandsworth - we've been trying for the past 30 days to get these drawings, and its been difficult because he knew we were coming to meet with you today.

Supervisor Boothe - has the membership as a whole approved these?

Mr. Hollandsworth - they have not. Its hard to approve a concept without numbers to go with it. As far as commitment from the Squad side, the County side, and what we have to do from outside sources. Squad approval for Station #4 has gone before the membership but #1 has not. We have approval to go forward with Station #4. We are trying to coordinate the two projects together with the same company, therefore, it would be cheaper. That's what our hopes and dreams are about. As you should know, the contract that we negotiated back when the County decided to hire your own personnel, we would house them, they would use our equipment and other resources. These people that are having to spend the night are having to sleep in the basement, in a bunk bed that's about half the size of the table here, no air conditioning, no shower facilities. We have an organization that's going 24 hours, 7 days a week, its hard to get a nap or sleep if you've been out 6 solid hours on a call. Its hard to have privacy. There are also some things that will be done to the existing building such as a

decontamination area, also the bathrooms will be handicapped accessible, minor things that won't run into a lot of money.

Supervisor Gerald - what kind of time frame are you looking at to get things started? I believe Station #4 is the priority.

Mr. Hollandsworth - Yes, Station #4 is the priority, because we're further along in our planning there. When you go home today, you'll see a difference today. We have dirt that's being moved today. The deed is in the attorney's office for editing, and we should have that by this afternoon. Then we'll be ready to dig the well. The two gentlemen that are donating the property that Station #4 is on, they have a stipulation in the deed that if nothing is built within two years, that the property will revert back to them. But that's not going to happen.

Supervisor Whitlock - on Station #4, is there going to be any access in the bottom area into the existing basement.

Mr. Hollandsworth - yes, there will be. As it sits right now, if you stand at the front doors looking at it, on the side there is a garage door where we will have access or any other areas that we need to facilitate. The property at Station #1 we can expand out, because we already had the property and there is no need to purchase any more property. We have the proper amount needed for the expansion.

Mr. Nester - there are two things that I think are important. If the Board and Rescue Squad decide to move forward, and you need to do any financing, you still have \$1.5 m cap left under the IDA bond program for public projects. Second, the PSA still owes the County eight public water/sewer connections. The Station #1 facility could be served particularly by the sanitary sewer connection. We have run the elevations, and found that the Station #1 could use the connection. Right now they operate off of a septic tank and drain field.

Mr. Hollandsworth - that is one thing that we would definitely try to do. We are already on the PSA water. We have met with your committee on a couple of occasions looking at these projects.

Chairman Ingram - these plans look similar to the Station #3 layout.

Mr. Bower - the gentlemen that drew the plan started from the same plan, but when he looked at the lay of the land, we could save money by changing it slightly by using the land wisely. It is very similar.

Mr. Hollandsworth - it saves time and money. We're here today for the Board's blessing in support of this project by financial means. We want to advance on this quickly. The paid people came in a year and a half ago, so we're basically behind what really should have been done before. I know it's a bad scenario, but I invite any of you to come down and spend the night with us one night and you'll appreciate the lack of facilities that we do have now. Like I

said, we're not looking for something that's going to only get us 2-3 years down the road, we're looking for 15 years down the road with the additional equipment space, meeting rooms, showers and bunk rooms.

Supervisor Whitlock - will this give you more area for training?

Mr. Hollandsworth - it would have to. With moving sleeping areas from the basement in the existing area to the other building in the back, that frees up some room in the basement and also that will free up some room with the addition. We have the conference room on there. That would be additional space for training also. Kelcie talked about getting this set of drawings back today, this is actually the third set. We have been in communication with them, we had a general idea and then we've gone back and fine-tuned them. This is more what we had envisioned that would be the best set-up for what we need.

Chairman Ingram - I'm only speaking for me, but I need a little time to think about this. I know you want to move, I know that you have things going on. We need just a little bit of time to think about it individually and discuss it among ourselves and we may have some questions after we have time to think and talk about it. We'll either get in contact with you or have Terri contact you.

Mr. Hollandsworth - what we wanted to do was get as much done while Mr. Nester was here since he's been involved from the start and we don't want to train someone else as far as our needs are concerned. That's one reason we're trying to go forth. He's been great to work with us, we've talked with him many times, and he's given us some suggestions and ideas.

Supervisor Gerald - as far as these rescue stations are concerned, one thing we failed to mention is the safety and welfare of the people. I think these renovations and improvements will satisfy that need. And you have my support to move forward.

Mr. Hollandsworth - we appreciate that. We think this will benefit the entire County. Like today, Station #1 is being used as voting precinct. So we get more use out of the building from the paid staff being there plus the other activities that go on also.

Supervisor Gerald - let me say, so there's so misunderstanding, even if this was in somebody else's district besides my district, I would still support it.

Mr. Hollandsworth - we serve the whole County, not just one district. We are all one County organization and hope to proceed forward with the plans.

Chairman Ingram - I just don't want you to think that you're going to get what you want right here, right now. The wheels just don't turn that fast. We'll be here a long time yet today and will discuss it later.

Mr. Hollandsworth - we have talked with the Bank of Floyd, Blue Ridge Bank and First

National Bank. Today they are surveying, we're trying to touch a lot of bases. We got a list of what the banks needed if we did have to go that route, so we wouldn't slow anything down.

Mr. James Cornwell, County Attorney, next appeared before the Board.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Belcher, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to go into closed session under Section 2.2-3711, Paragraph A.1, discussion of specific personnel; Paragraph A.5, discussion concerning a prospective business or industry where no previous announcement has been made of the business' or industry's interest in locating in the community; Paragraph A.7, consultation with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters requiring the provisions of legal advice by such counsel.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Gerald, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to come out of closed session.

Supervisor Boothe - aye
Supervisor Belcher - aye
Supervisor Whitlock - aye
Supervisor Gerald - aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, seconded by Supervisor Whitlock, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adopt the following certification resolution:

CERTIFICATION RESOLUTION CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, this Board convened in a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote on the motion to close the meeting to discuss personnel, prospective business or industry, legal matters in accordance with Section 2.2-3711, Paragraph A.1, A.5 and A.7 of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act;

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Board that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge (1) 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 meeting to which this certification applies; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the meeting to which this certification applies.

Before a vote is taken on this resolution, is there any member who believes that there was

a departure from the requirements of number (1) or number (2)? If so, identify yourself and state the substance of the matter and why in your judgement it was a departure.

Hearing no statement, I call the question.

Supervisor Boothe - aye

Supervisor Belcher - aye

Supervisor Whitlock - aye

Supervisor Gerald - aye

Supervisor Ingram - aye

This Certification Resolution was adopted.

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, it was resolved to authorize the purchase of two brush trucks for the Floyd County Volunteer Fire Department; one for Station #4 and one for Station #3.

Motion died due to lack of second.

On a motion of Supervisor Gerald, seconded by Supervisor Whitlock, it was resolved to authorize the purchase of four brush trucks for the Floyd County Volunteer Fire Department, as per the recommendation of the Fire Department officials.

After discussion, the motion and second was withdrawn for receipt of information on financing options for the four units.

On a motion of Supervisor Boothe, it was resolved to continue the policy of a 45 mph speed limit for fire units.

After discussion, the motion was withdrawn for more information.

On a motion of Supervisor Whitlock, seconded by Supervisor Gerald, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adjourn to June 28, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. for a fiscal year end meeting.

Supervisor Boothe - aye

Supervisor Belcher - aye

Supervisor Whitlock - aye

Supervisor Gerald - aye

Supervisor Ingram - aye