

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
REGULAR MEETING
NOVEMBER 9, 2010**

At the regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Floyd County, Virginia, held on Tuesday, November 9, 2010, 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; Virgel H. Allen, Case C. Clinger, William R. Gardner, Jr., Board Members; Daniel J. Campbell, 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 Chairman Ingram.

Chairman Ingram led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. Mary Turman, Treasurer, appeared before the Board. She presented a list of uncollectible delinquent taxes for the Board's review. She commented: I am requesting that the write-off of these delinquent taxes be approved and that I receive a response in writing to have for the auditors. These taxes, we have searched, some businesses are gone, some people are deceased, they are dead taxes. That Code section gives us the right to remove them with the Board's approval.

On a motion of Supervisor Clinger, seconded by Supervisor Gardner, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to authorize the Treasurer to write off uncollectible delinquent taxes, as presented, per Code of Virginia, 1950 As Amended, Section 58.1-3921.

Supervisor Clinger – aye
Supervisor Gardner – aye
Supervisor Allen – aye
Supervisor Gerald – aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

The minutes of October 12, 2010 were presented to the Board for review and approval.

On a motion of Supervisor Allen, seconded by Supervisor Gerald, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to approve the minutes of October 12, 2010 as presented.

Supervisor Clinger – aye
Supervisor Gardner – aye
Supervisor Allen – aye
Supervisor Gerald – aye
Supervisor Ingram - aye

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

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

Supervisor Clinger – aye
Supervisor Gardner – aye
Supervisor Allen – aye
Supervisor Gerald – aye
Supervisor Ingram – aye

Agenda Item 7a – Subdivision plats as approved by Agent for October 2010. Ms. Lydeana Martin, Subdivision Agent, commented that the trend for creation of fewer lots continues, although there are as many plats, the lots are larger than last month, which is odd in this economy.

Comprehensive Plan – the Planning District Commission is drafting the pieces of the plan together. When the draft is received, it will be taken to the local Planning Commission first to work with and then brought to the Board. We hope to have the draft next month, with a copy to the Board in January.

Tourism Plan – the Board saw this draft plan a few months ago. It has been presented to the Town Council for their review with the thought to get everyone's input before endorsements are sought, to cut down on revisions. As soon as we hear back from them, we will bring it back to the Board.

Economic Development – we had a social media class week which outlined the whole Facebook, Twitter, You Tube, to use that to grow our businesses and expand opportunities. We had very good participation, had two different classes, with over 20 people participating from about 15 different businesses. Very encouraging.

The EDA and Chamber are both looking to the future for more training workshops for small business owners, managers and front line staff. Among the things that we're considering are customer service training as well as a human resource type class. We continue to look at work forces that have multiple generations, really young people that technology is everything to them, and then the older people who have a different work ethic. Sometimes there are tensions among different age groups. We hope this training session would provide tools to work with that.

Five and Ten Program – The EDA has made four low-interest loans out of the program to small businesses for creating or retaining jobs. There is still money in that program, probably \$60-70,000 left. The company has to have nine or fewer employees to qualify. If you know of anyone interested in borrowing money to help their business grow, or are encountering problems with cash flow, and just need a small loan, let us know. \$5000 if you are creating or saving one job, \$10,000 if you are creating or saving two jobs. If they borrow for a five year period, the

interest is 2% annually. If they borrow for a ten year term, it is 4% annually. So it is very reasonable. Please help us get the word out for that. They do have to share limited financial information, but we try not to make it onerous for them.

Agenda Item 7b – Floyd County Volunteer Fire Department, Station #3 – flood insurance – Mr. Campbell provided further information from the insurance company as to this type of coverage. The County’s insurance carrier does not recommend the purchase of this type of coverage because of the cost and the limited items it covers. The County’s general insurance covers some of this type of damage. After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to not obtain this coverage because of the improvements made to the building since the previous damage and the high premium cost.

Agenda Item 7c – Maintenance on discontinued roads. Mr. Campbell presented a draft policy he prepared, and reviewed by the County Attorney for the Board’s consideration. Mr. Cornwell revised the policy to show the County’s involvement only as administrative review; language taken out that the County will approve/veto any action taken. The property owner will be required to notify other property owners along the road of work to be done. His changes were done to protect the County from any liability. Consensus of the Board was to defer for discussion with the County Attorney later in the day.

Agenda Item 7d – DCR request for committee to look at land issues. Mr. Campbell reported that Mr. Gall had a family emergency/illness and will be unable to attend the meeting today. Will reschedule him for the December meeting.

Agenda Item 7e – Legislative recommendations – Mr. Campbell provided a draft list for the Board’s consideration. Board will discuss further later in the day.

At 9:00 a.m., the Chairman called for the Public Comment Period.

Mr. Jesse Lawrence, Bent Mountain Bed and Breakfast – First of all, I brought Mr. Allen a brochure, still inviting you to come see us when you get a chance, it has been five months since we asked you. The other thing, just following up on Lydeana’s comments on the tourism plan, I commented about that the last time I was here, to encourage you, to try to be involved, and to give us some feedback. One of the things that is really important, in this brochure of Floyd County, there are 24 ads in here for lodging in the County. That is pretty significant. Probably there are more than 30, because everybody is not in here. Only one is in the Town of Floyd. The rest of them are in the County, I find that very interesting. I don’t know if you realize that or not. So this business, we met with Mr. Campbell a couple of weeks ago; we discussed some things and got his advice on how to move this thing along. At that point, it came up, that you all have kicked it over to the Town of Floyd, where it still is. I would contend with you that this is pretty important to the County itself because as this information shows you, we would like you to take the lead or push this thing along, so we can get something moving. It is not necessarily approval that we’re asking for; all we’re asking for is comments. We would really like to encourage you to do that. Of course, you’ll get further comments from the next speaker. I thought you might find that interesting.

Mr. Shep Nancy, Woodberry Inn – My wife and I are the new owners of the Woodberry Inn, in the Burks Fork District. I am here representing the Floyd Lodging Association. First, I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak to you concerning the adoption of the Floyd Tourism Plan as well as the Transient Occupancy tax usage. The Floyd Lodging Association is asking the Floyd County Board of Supervisors to take an immediate position on the Plan once it is received from the Floyd Town Council. Either yea or nay. The Floyd Lodging Association fully supports the Floyd Tourism Plan as many members were involved in the development of this plan. Please note that we believe the Tourism Plan benefits the Town of Floyd and Floyd County, as well as tourists visiting Floyd and Floyd County. Floyd County has so much to offer and the Tourism Plan would provide the means to make tourists and visitors aware of these assets. With respect to the Transient Occupancy tax usage, the Floyd Lodging Association would like to have the opportunity at your next budget cycle meeting to provide the Board of Supervisors with a proposal for use of the taxes we collect. Tourism accounts for a large amount of revenue brought into Floyd County and we would appreciate the chance to share some of our ideas for getting the most benefit from these dollars.

Ms. Diana Sutphin, President of the Floyd County Education Association. I am here today to make a plea to this board to support the school children of Floyd County by increasing funding to our schools. Because of our excellent program and our high test scores, all schools in the county are accredited by the State of Virginia and The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The teachers of Floyd County are clearly giving our school children the skills and knowledge they need to meet Virginia's high standards. Yet the County is not paying teachers a salary that matches the value of this service. Floyd County School Board employees have had their salaries frozen for the last two years. Yet health insurance costs have increased. These two things combined result in an actual pay cut. I always thought that if you did a good job you would be rewarded for your effort. But this isn't how the education professionals of Floyd are treated. The School Board was forced to cut over \$1 million from the school budget last year alone. The positions of teachers who retire are often not being filled. Class sizes are slowly increasing each year. The number of teacher assistants who are available to assist with instruction decrease each year. At the same time, more and more duty assignments are being added to the average teacher's list of responsibilities. If these trends continue, they will inevitably affect the quality of education Floyd County children receive. To attract good quality educators to Floyd we need to pay a salary equal to the responsibilities of the profession. The wonderful teachers we currently have may begin to look for jobs in other locations where the value of teachers and the work they do is recognized in their paychecks. In my personal household, our purse strings have had to be tightened just to make it in these hard economic times. Needless to say, the running of a school is the same. But, you can only cut back so much until something has to be eliminated. The school system has already started cutting teacher assistant and teaching positions to accommodate the lack of funding. The schools are already beginning to feel the serious negative impact of purse strings tightening. The Education of Floyd County children will begin to suffer if this is not resolved. I would like to invite the Board to come and visit our schools to observe our students and Floyd's highly effective educators at work. When you come you will see, first hand, the many reasons why we need more financial help from you so that, in turn, we can help our students to become the successful and productive citizens we all want them to be.

Mr. Fred Jones – as a freshman in college, I had a roommate that was not a normal person. He always took early morning classes, and before he went to bed at night he would set his alarm. He knew that alarm would not wake him up because when this guy slept he was with the living dead. Fire alarms, parties, knocks on the door, nothing woke him up. But he set his alarm anyway because he knew it would wake me up and I would get him up. He would thank me and I would thank him for shutting off the alarm and we got along just fine. The point is, there are some noises that normal people are not supposed to sleep through. Fire alarms, police sirens, train whistles, crying babies and barking dogs. And barking dogs is why I'm here; I've been following the Floyd Press issue regarding barking dogs. Some people have this idealist view of country life as a place where neighbors just work out their problems. I had a guy move in next to me who loved dogs. One wasn't enough, two wasn't enough, three, four, five, six, he had twenty-seven dogs. He shared his love by putting his dog kennel right on the property line with me. The first time I went over to his house at 3:00 in the morning after listening to five consecutive hours of dogs barking, he met me at the door with a sawed off shotgun. So that's the reality of country life. The next time we met was in the Courthouse here in Floyd. Because we had a noise ordinance on the books, Judge Turner was able to tell the Sheriff that any time I called with a problem regarding barking dogs that he would have to send a deputy out to verify it. That Judge worked more magic than a Louisiana voodoo queen because the incessant barking stopped cold. Not only that, within a month, this guy packed up his family and the cannon he used to shoot off every Sunday afternoon, and he moved out of the county because he knew he couldn't behave badly in Floyd County. The attorney for you guys does a good job of protecting you, tells you what you can't do. I think you should charge him with telling you what can be done because there are localities in Virginia that have laws on the books that protect people from irresponsible citizens who behave badly. Sleep deprivation is a serious matter. I'm glad you don't have to deal with it personally. Terrorists use sleep deprivation as a torture technique. I'm not having any problems with dogs right now but I'll never forget when I did. It is really ugly. I would love to live in a world where we didn't have to have laws but that is a mythical place. There are folks out there who are looking for counties like Floyd who don't have laws on the books where they can come and misbehave with impunity. I don't have any problems now but I hope you will take this seriously. Barking dogs are the tip of the iceberg regarding animal control issues. I've experienced many other problems with dogs. Dogs aren't the problem, they do what they do anywhere. The problem is the people; people need to take responsibility for their animals.

After no further comments from the audience, the Chairman declared the Public Comment Period closed.

Ms. Dawn Barnes, Extension Unit Coordinator and Mr. Andy Overbay, Acting District Director, next appeared before the Board. Ms. Barnes reported that they were here today to explain what they know about the restructuring that has been set forth across the State for Cooperative Extension. Basically, the restructuring is an outline process of specifics that will be put into place. Three implementation teams will be formed, which are the Local Presence Implementation Team, Programming Implementation Team, and Organizational Structure Implementation Team. They will be formed with the community, employees and personnel at Tech to make those. Those decisions that they will be making, we've been told that the teams will be put into place around the middle of this month and then they will begin to fine-tune the

outline that is in front of you. Part of what will be taken into those teams making the decisions is information from meetings like this and feedback, thoughts and concerns that are out there in the counties. The outline that you have shows dividing the counties into groups. At the moment, the plan has 28 groups. They refer to them as hubs. Each of the counties in that group, say a group of five, each county would have one co-funded agent, referred to as educators. Which is how we are now. We're co-funded with county, state and federal money to pay me and Jon. As to whether it is a FCS agent, an agriculture agent, or 4-H agent, that would be determined primarily by the needs and the desires of the counties, plus some interjection from the State. That interjection comes into play if, for example, all five counties said they wanted a FCS agent or a 4-H agent, those agents are going to be given some leadership for programming in all of the counties together. If we only have one 4-H agent in all the five counties, then the youth would be the only ones being addressed. The farmers won't be, the landowners won't be, the families who have issues with their food safety or any of the other issues we address with nutrition or financial management won't be addressed. So, the hope is that we would have a variety of agents in each hub. In addition to those, there will be a hub. The hub in the diagram is shown as being one center; it is more of a virtual hub. Everyone may not be housed in one area; there may be other people in other areas. In that hub, virtual or real, there will be one State-funded FCS agent, one State-funded agriculture agent, one State-funded 4-H agent, a Unit Coordinator, and one business manager or support staff. Each of those educators will have responsibilities, whether co-funded or State, in the overall Counties areas. While you may have one co-funded in your county, you have the opportunity to receive resources, strength and knowledge from all the others in the hub group. One of the questions is how is that going to affect the local budget. Locally, we have two locally-funded staff members; they are not affected by this in any way. Counties have the option of having one co-funded agent. Once you have that one co-funded agent and you have some dollars that are going to local staff, then there is still going to be a pot of money that could go to a second agent or third agent that is traditionally in that county. That County money that you have is not being asked to go anywhere else but you would have the opportunity to use that County money, combine it with another county's money that is not being used, could fund another co-funded agent position. They could be housed in either county, or split between the counties. Right now, they are only asking for level funding for the next fiscal year. Not until 2013 will the funding plan need this particular restructuring plan. There is a time line, although there are still many steps in the process that have not been finalized. This is a work in process. The time line in the back of the document shows meetings like this between October of this year and January. November – March will be the State alignment of the educators along the strategic plan, this is one of the keys. They want to make sure that the work that is being done is meeting the strategic plan and the needs that the communities have. February – May, existing faculty/staff roles will be identified, to specifically outline what we will be doing. The plan is then, by July 2011, all the new roles will be implemented. A lot of things have not been clarified yet but we will try to answer questions.

Supervisor Gerald – I'm worried about the money, what will this cost the County? Can you go over this one more time?

Ms. Barnes – at this time, the next fiscal year would have no change in what you're providing for Cooperative Extension.

Mr. Overbay – also from the Director of Finance from the College of Agriculture said, our goal is to not ask for any more dollars from counties than what we’re now receiving. Now, what time line he puts on that, I can only assume that goes into perpetuity, he did not give a date. To use the State dollars for future use. In the New River Valley, we already use a regional model. Jon and Dawn are both good examples, they cover Montgomery County as well as Floyd. Montgomery County funds some of their salaries. That is already in place. One of the things that we’re faced with; we’re asking fewer and fewer people to do more and more. That can’t continue. We have to draw a line somewhere and have a plan, with your help. That is the big piece, we really need the local people to say, we need this, we need this, and we need this, so we can make plans. Say, ok these things are important, they cannot be dropped. We have to provide 4-H, provide financial education, provide services to our farmers, we look to you all and the public in general as to what you need.

Supervisor Gerald – so you’re just getting started on this, all the ducks aren’t in a row?

Ms. Barnes – right, we only heard about this the first part of October.

Mr. Overbay – we have very few ducks to get in a row. Dawn’s tenure with Extension goes back further with mine. How many agents did we have when you started?

Ms. Barnes – at least 500.

Mr. Overbay – at our high water mark, we had 600 agents. When I started with Extension, there were around 400. Now, we’re under 190. We still have 107 offices to keep open, there’s not too many ways to work the math, we are spread out. In some areas, we’ll actually hire people under the restructuring plan. We have to grow.

Supervisor Gardner – who are the Unit Coordinators? This says they will be drastically reduced.

Ms. Barnes – each County has a Unit Coordinator. I’m the Coordinator for Floyd County.

Supervisor Gardner – this says it will be reduced to 22. Will there be other roles?

Ms. Barnes – right now I’m the Unit Coordinator but also an educator. If I’m not selected as the Unit Coordinator for our group, that means I will be an extension educator and won’t have to assume any of the unit coordinator duties. The unit coordinator will be the person who would be in charge of administration, working with the Boards, working with the Extension Leadership Councils, for that whole group. May do some programming also. So instead of 107 positions, it would go down to that 28 number. Each hub would have its own coordinator.

Mr. Overbay – one of the things that is misleading about the hubs is people think, oh, we’ll have a business hub where everybody is going to be. What that means, the proposal shows that Floyd County will be part of a five county hub, probably the planning commission. If we put one business hub in one county, like Floyd County, you’d think you hit the jackpot because

they'd have all the agents there and everybody else would be losing. That just can't be. My job, in shaping this plan, is to say, guys, the public doesn't care how we do our business as long as we do our business. They care about if the people in their county, the children, farmers, and others that we serve, that's what they care about and where our focus should be. Honestly, you can do business on the moon if you want to.

Mr. Campbell – will you all initiate any meetings or presentations for the Counties that may be necessary?

Mr. Overbay – that has been discussed. Maybe the whole group gets together from all the counties to take a team approach. To see where we're strong and where we're weak. Luckily they did increase the hubs from 22 to 28, because the areas were so big and couldn't be handled. We will keep you informed as best we can. Also commend Floyd County for having one of the few Senior Agents, in Dawn. There are only six senior agents State-wide and Dawn is one of them. Jon will be up for Senior Agent next year.

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

- Food Stamp distribution for October 2010 – to 2019 people, up from 2079 the previous month. \$251,135 was paid out in October.
- The unemployment rate was 7.1% for October, which was the lowest since April at 6.9%. Before the economic downturn, the rate was 3.9%, highest ever was 9.5%.
- Energy Assistance Program – received 512 applications so far, 598 total last year. Applications end next month. The crises applications will be taken through March. The amount of benefit will depend on the Federal funding received, divided by the number of applications. \$100 was the average benefit last year. The benefit amount will probably be less than last year because of the number of people in the pool.
- Substance Abuse Town Hall meeting – we were so pleased with the turnout; we had over 120 people attend. The information was very beneficial and we hope to continue these types of sessions.
- Silver Bells Program – this program is for adults over 65. The bells are on a tree at Floyd Pharmacy for the needy adults; over 40 were served last year. This is 100% community donations.
- Family Engagement Facilitator – new person will begin November 15. Remember that this position is required by the State and will be paid from CSA funds. This is a home based position. Payment is 11.67% match rate from the County and shared with the City of Radford.
- Appreciate the opportunity to review the legislative recommendations that you will be considering later in the day. Did include some items directly related to our agency.

Ms. Karen Maute and Ms. Deborah Lovelace next appeared before the Board concerning uranium mining and milling.

Ms. Maute – I live in Pittsylvania County, but own property in Floyd also. Ms. Lovelace lives in Gretna, Virginia. Ms. Ann Rogers is also with us and lives in Patrick County. It was a real challenge to get the information together to send to you because there is so much

information out there. It was hard to skinny it down. I want you all to be informed as to what I'm asking and why. Most of the focus on uranium mining has been on Coles Hill in Pittsylvania County. Although uranium is throughout Virginia as evidenced in the PowerPoint presentation that you have, on page 11. On that map, it shows areas that may have radioactivity in some way, shape or form. I can't tell you the extent of it because I haven't explored it. Will they become an object of exploration, I don't know. In conversation with Conrad Spangler with the Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy several months ago, I asked if there were any other permits besides Coles Hill that had been granted by the State for exploration. He said no, but if the ban is lifted, he imagined that there will be many permits sought for exploration in Virginia and North Carolina. North Carolina does not have a ban on uranium mining now; they are watching to see what happens here. Prior to the ban on mining, an article ran which I sent you as well, in 1978, in the Chatham Star Tribune, the last paragraph in this article says that Chevron Resources Subsidiary is Standard Oil Company of California is another company exploring in Virginia and is seeking to obtain mineral rights in Floyd and Patrick Counties. Does that mean you'll get mined if the ban is lifted? I don't know. But apparently, back in the late 70's, prior to the ban being put on, it was looked at. You have to prepare here in Floyd County, just like every County in Virginia should be preparing. What do your citizens want, what do you want, and how do we go about doing that? There are four studies underway, and these are also in the PowerPoint, when you look at the four studies, the question I would ask is, were you aware of this before you saw this? Had anybody consulted you? If the ban was lifted, and you weren't even asked about it, what does that mean? I have a real problem with the way this has been gone about in Virginia, focusing on the one place that was almost mined in the 80's, it is very politically connected. A lot of leg work has gone into this project. If the ban is lifted, it is lifted for the whole State, which includes Floyd County. You're not going to get any special consideration if this ban is lifted. I hope that you'll become proactive. I have property in Floyd County, I love Floyd County, my grandchildren are in Floyd County, I wouldn't mind spending more time here after retirement. The thing that I ask you to consider, and it has to come from you, is to pass a resolution in opposition to lifting the ban, if for no other reason than, when these studies come back, to contact legislators, let them know you're looking at this and are concerned. The ones in the General Assembly are the ones that have the power to lift this moratorium and most importantly I would ask you to appoint a citizens committee to gather research on the effects of uranium mining on localities, health-wise, agriculture-wise. In your packet you have a handout concerning keeping agriculture alive in the shadow of uranium mining. I encourage you to look at this. It targets Pittsylvania County but that's all we've heard about. There is a list of links that gives you a starting point. The information is overwhelming. We have looked for information that was positive about uranium mining because we wanted to see where it was. The two things that you'll hear and I wouldn't be surprised if the industry didn't contact you after they find out that we've been here and talked with you, but the industry will say that this is being done in France. Further research by the Piedmont Environmental Council shows the actual truth about France. Uranium is no longer mined in France. Areva has taken over their mines and may do some mining here. France mines in other countries. Do your own research. They will also tell you that there is enough uranium at Coles Hill to fuel Virginia for 65 years. In actuality, any uranium that is mined will be sold on the open market, they are investors. The fact that the mine will run for 35 years doesn't mean they don't already have contracts. Dig a little deeper. Another thing is that when you get ready to have the citizen committee, hopefully, that you'll draw on your local population, your farmers, your organic farmers, dairy farmers, real estate

agents, water resource people, all water springs from Floyd County, wonderful resource to protect. Put a grandmother on the committee, they will look out for the future. I also caution to not put a state agency on the committee, nor institutions, such as Virginia Tech. A big study with the National Academy of Sciences, Virginia Tech is realizing \$300,000 just to pay NAS with Virginia Uranium Inc.'s money. It smells to me, I have to say it, be cautious, and do your own research. Also provided copies of a Virginia Coal Commission Study and draft regulations from the 80's.

Ms. Lovelace - originally from Franklin County, close by from Ferrum, live in Pittsylvania County now. This issue today has been brought up for three years. I've been concerned and surprised that the general public is unaware of the issue and that it does not get out in the media. Yesterday, at our County offices, the people there had not heard a thing about uranium mining and milling. Back in March, five experts were brought into Richmond to heighten the awareness. What I have brought is a DVD which is the highlights of these experts speaking. They have studied uranium mining and milling for years. We appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today and we offer our services in any way that we can help you.

Said video was presented for the Board's review. She also presented a copy of the DVD to each member for their use.

Ms. Lovelace also commented that a meeting will be held in December in Danville on the issues. Will get that information to the Board if anyone is interested in attending. Fully expect that a vote will be taken in the General Assembly before the end of 2011.

Supervisor Gerald commented that there are always two sides to every issue. Where would the Board find information on the positives of mining?

Ms. Maute - I feel sure they will be contacting you soon, once they realize we've been here.

Ms. Regina Elsner, New River Valley Planning District Commission and Ms. Tammy Stephenson, Department of Environmental Quality, next appeared before the Board to present/report on the Regional Water Plan.

Ms. Stephenson - I'm just going to touch on DEQ's goals and regulations. DEQ's goals for the water supply plan regulation are to provide adequate, reliable, safe water to all the citizens of the state; while also balancing the need to protect our environment and allow for future growth. It is a continuous planning process, it is not a study that we're going to complete and put up on the shelf, it is similar to your comprehensive plan. We also want to create a water planning partnership among state, local and regional interests and to increase public involvement. The regulation does require one public hearing, but most localities are having more than one. We want to see what our local water needs are for at least the next thirty-fifty years and improve our understanding of your water resources and how it can be sustained. The localities are expected to take the lead role, which is one of the things that I really like about this regulation, it is not the State coming to you and telling you what your plan is. This is your plan that you develop with the planning district commission. All Counties, Cities and Towns have to

do this, it is a mandate. It does not change existing water rights. As I mentioned, it is a continual planning process that you'll use. All the plans, starting in 2008 with the larger localities, did individual plans; the median 15,000-30,000 population was due in 2009; the small localities below 15,000 population were due November 2, 2010. The regional groups have until 2011 to complete their water supply plan. We'll review all the local and regional plans to determine compliance and then when we get all the plans, we'll develop the State Water Resources Plan. You are expected to review your plan at least every five years and resubmit every ten years any significant changes. For instance, if you have an economic development prospect that comes in with high water usage, then you allow for that, and see if your plan needs to be updated. To touch on the elements that are required in the regulations are your existing water sources, where your water is coming; your existing water usage, who is using and how much they're using; your projected water demands, we look at your population growth, land use, economic development and use what your future need is. Then we look at alternatives, if there is a deficit in your water supply plan or projected plan. We look at existing water resource conditions, which is your wetlands, threatened and endangered species, impaired waters, that type of thing, any water management actions such as on-going water conservation measures. We'll work with you to make sure we have all your ordinances and resolutions and will assist in your local public hearing if you so desire. Any written comments submitted, we'll help you respond to them.

Ms. Regina Elsner, New River Valley Planning District Commission – the PDC has been working on this since 2006, together with the NRV Water Plan Participation Committee. It is basically made up of public works directors, planning staff members, PSAs, to get into the heart of the systems. We began meeting in March 2006, very shortly after the regulations were completed. This plan actually covers all the localities in the New River Valley except the Towns of Blacksburg and Christiansburg, those chose to do their own plans. This plan covers the Counties of Floyd, Montgomery, Giles, Pulaski, City of Radford, and Towns of Floyd, Dublin, Glen Lyn, Narrows, Pearisburg, Pembroke, Pulaski and Rich Creek. Regionally, there are fifty-five community water systems which are regulated systems by DEQ and the Health Department. Thirty-nine of those systems use groundwater sources, which are wells; fifteen use surface water sources which are either stream or lake intakes, or spring water. Regionally, approximately 21% of all residences utilize private wells which are not regulated. Floyd, specifically, your primary water source is wells. There is one other community water system that is regulated by DEQ. You have one “large” system, the Great Oaks Country Club, which means they have their own water source and use more than 300,000 gallons each month. Approximately 83% of the population in Floyd County is on private wells. The PSA is very limited in their coverage area. There are seven NTNC's systems, which are non transient non community water systems such as schools, where the population uses the water for short periods of time. Water Use Information – this is how the water is being used. Regionally, there are 24,102 connections; Floyd County has 427 connections with only 27,000 gallons per day usage. Approximately 150,000 gallons/day is the peak day usage, which occurs usually in May. There is one large agricultural user, Riverbend Nursery, which uses a large irrigation system. Resource Information – Regionally, there are 40 Federal endangered threatened species of concern, 4 in Floyd County. There are nine significant habitats as listed by the Department of Conservation Resources. The Little River is classified as a Qualified Scenic River. When we originally started this plan in 2006, we worked with Virginia Tech using one of their computer programs to determine water capacity.

In 2010, it projected 41% water capacity used; projection of 55% by 2050. You will still be way under EPA's recommendations to begin looking at alternate water sources. Drought response management is the main impetus of the regulations. Drought indicators for the County have been developed with assistance of the PSA. Needs – the PSA has a new well ready for operation; they are looking for sites for additional wells.

Ms. Elsner presented copies of the plan to the Board and commented that all localities need to pass a resolution adopting the plan. A public hearing will be required locally. She and Ms. Stephenson would both be willing to attend the public hearing if the Board so desires, to assist with information and questions.

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

- Presented copy of school board meeting highlights from October 2010 meeting;
- Presented copy of school membership as of September 30, 2010 indicating 2068 students;
- On-time graduation rate report shows a rate of 91.37% for Floyd County, State average 85%. This does not include those that may obtain a GED after their graduation time, this only shows those students who graduate within the four year time frame;
- Will be meeting with legislators this week to discuss our concerns about State funding and other issues;
- Presented copy of school board meeting highlights from November 2010 meeting;
- Presented copy of school membership as of October 31, 2010 indicating 2052 students, budget was based on 2070 students. We do not know why there was a loss of 16 students in one month. We've never had a loss that high within one month; it seems to be families who have moved to other places. This will be a big budget issue for us that we'll have to take a hard look at. We've already made some reductions in things we're doing because we will have to anticipate a reduction in State Aid

Supervisor Gerald commented that he had a copy of the Floyd County Cost of Community Services Study. It asked you about the capacity of the schools. The report says that we have a capacity of an additional 300 students. Could you speak to this?

Dr. Arbogast – yes, I remember doing that. When you look at capacity, you look at a number of things. You project what number of students you would like in each classroom. Capacity is based on what you think the class sizes should be, 25:1, which raises your capacity, 24:1, 23:1, 22:1, it is whatever you decide it will be. When we looked at that study, we looked at the number of teachers in the classroom and grade level at every building. I used 25:1 in the grades 4-7 and 22:1 in K-3. When you have less students than that, you multiply by the number of students you think you can handle. The high school enrollment, you calculate usually 24:1 or 25:1. So you take a look at exactly how many more students you could accommodate before you believe your schools are totally maximizing all the space and you have the maximum number of students that you feel you could accommodate. Is there always room for more capacity? I guess there could be if you eliminated programs that take up classroom space. For example, if there is a workroom at a school and you wanted to change it into a classroom, that could be done. It all depends on how you look at it. I just looked at it strictly from the number of students and

teachers we have and we could handle about 300 more, and all classes at all schools would be at maximum.

- PALS scores – spring pass rate goal was 90%; overall district rate was 95%. We did see an increase from the fall to spring scores.
- School Board reappointed me as Superintendent for a two year term.

Supervisor Clinger – Diana Sutphin spoke to us during public comment time this morning, she mentioned that the schools are beginning to feel serious negative impacts from the purse strings tightening. Do you know the negative impact she might have alluded to?

Dr. Arbogast – I think it is personal stress among everybody right now. I would probably say that this is the most stress related environment with staff that I've ever dealt with due to the economic times. They are all concerned about their jobs, their households. These are the most difficult economic times I've dealt with since being in public education, this is my 43rd year, and I have never seen such a stress related time. We had a tough economic time back in the late 80's and that was not State government, that was local government when property values devalued significantly. We were doing reductions in staff back in the early 90's and late 80's. I was in charge of a school system with 450 employees and we had to do a reduction in force because the local property values declined so much, it was a local revenue issue, not State revenue. That was tough but this seems to be an issue of both, State and local revenue issues. I think what is happening is that people are really finding out all the additional duties, mandates for testing, accountability that have to be done. The State is requiring that all our schools submit, by teacher, their evaluations, by category. We have seven categories on our teacher evaluation system. Under each category, there are four options, exemplary, proficient, satisfactory and unsatisfactory. We are now being asked to rank under each one of the seven standards, and the four areas that we can rank them, the individual ranking for every classroom teacher. The State is going to take that number of how many exemplaries we have, how many proficient we have, satisfactory and unsatisfactory, by teacher and schools, and do an analysis by SOL scores, and they're going to publish, which is essentially going to show, do you have a relationship between your teacher evaluations and the SOL scores. You talk about an additional pressure on classroom teachers, schools, and school divisions. It is another data collection system that we have had to start doing because the Federal government requires it when we accepted the Stimulus money. So all of this is coming down, more and more and more, with no support at a critical time when insurance rates are going up, families are having difficulty economically. It is the most stress I've experienced ever. I've talked to so many people who are just trying to keep things together, it is tough, it is tough everywhere, your businesses and everywhere. Our teachers are really feeling it, with just the things they deal with normally that's just adds to what we're doing. It just seems that everything has become a bigger issue than it has ever been before. It is tough, there is a lot of stress.

Supervisor Allen – if they don't perform to the evaluation, is that a reason to let them loose?

Dr. Arbogast – sure, it could be something simple. We do not have a performance based evaluation system meaning your job is not based on your evaluation. That is what the Federal

government wants us to do. They want your job to be based on the amount of money you make, and your job based on your evaluation which shows the test scores and evaluation are the same. If the test scores are down, it means your evaluation should be down and you should not be employed. They're trying to get to a performance based, merit based system and hardly any school systems do that. It can be done but it is extremely difficult because it has to be very objective in how it is done, not subjective at all. It is a tough system to have.

Supervisor Allen – does it have a good point?

Dr. Arbogast – over time, yes, but I think every group of students are different. What is going to happen is that the number that comes out is going to show how your students in your classroom perform not based on your own individual growth. What it will show is how Johnny and Mary perform based upon all other students in that same class. If you score in the 34th percentile, of a score in the SOL that means that you performed better than 34% of all the students that took the test in your age range and 66% did better than you did. What we're trying to say as educators is, you should reflect on your own growth, individual growth, not ranking you against a whole body of people because it is not right. If you increase your academic level to 95% this year, you still might only be in the 25th percent improvement based upon the whole body of people that took the test. You might have grown 95% based upon your own ability, but that won't show, it will only show based comparing you to a whole body of people. We're trying to say as educators, that we want students to be prepared to how they grow individually, how did you do. If you didn't grow, then maybe we have an individual teacher problem. If you grew 65% or 75% of your academic ability from where you started, that's improvement, individually improved, that's what we want to see. Not comparing you to the growth of everybody else.

Supervisor Allen – do you think it will come to pass?

Dr. Arbogast – the thing will be the Elementary Secondary Education Act, a Federal Act as part of the No Child Left Behind Act. It is in the process of being re-authorized; the question will be whether it is in 2011 or 2012 at the Federal level. The word is, it will not pass under its current format. If you don't have 100% of your students passing the SOL information, your school will be deficient. We know that we can never get 100% of the students in each subgroup passing. If they don't change something, every school system in the country will be in the same boat. There is a belief that they will change to some other type of measurement of individual performance instead of group performance. We don't know how it will come out, but we believe it won't be re-authorized in the current format. We won't know for another couple of years. That's why we've asked the State to keep the scores that they rate us on to stay the same for the next two years, 82% Math, and 82% Reading and the third year go to 100%. That's a 20% jump in one year. We're banking that it won't be there in three years anyway and we won't have to deal with it. By December 2011, you're going to see a percentile ranking of every teacher in every school all over the country, every classroom, on the evaluations that we perform. We're looking hard at having our principals have a direct correlation on every evaluation. The problem is that the evaluations occur in mid-May and the SOL test scores don't come back until the end of May, so the time line doesn't even meet. The whole thing is based on a number and not on individual growth of the children. That's what we're opposed to. They have us because one of

the conditions in taking the Stimulus money to start with, was we had to do this. So, we'll give them the numbers and see how it all turns out. We're seeing success, we're meeting AYP, but do the numbers meet the requirements, that's what we're up against.

Supervisor Clinger – within your evaluation matrix, is there a category for student growth? Can the numbers be easily quantified?

Dr. Arbogast – yes, that is included. I'll bring one to show you. If you have a teacher whose student scores are low, they shouldn't be receiving exemplary. We're telling our staff that, this is not a feel good kind of thing, it is an honest evaluation of how your students are performing. There needs to be some correlation. Each child grows at a different pace, their home environment affects them greatly, what the parents do with them, some students just do better. They are trying to go to a national and state evaluation system, that everybody will use the same thing. If you want a pay increase, your students have to perform at a certain level, if it is over a certain period of time, you lose your job. We want each child to improve, each and every day. Those things that you asked about are what we're dealing with.

Supervisor Clinger – we have teachers coming in here asking if they're going to get a raise, that's up to you and your board.

Dr. Arbogast – it is based on the money that we get.

Supervisor Clinger – we have another budget cycle coming up soon, are you all planning to add raises in?

Dr. Arbogast – we haven't looked at that yet. With the budget situation, I'd rather not even comment on it at this time, because there are so many pieces. In order to do anything, it will require increased revenue from some revenue source. We recognize that we have three revenue sources, the Federal government, the State government and the local government. The Federal government doesn't have any extra money. We've already been told by the State of Virginia to not expect any additional revenue. It is the other revenue source that we're talking about and I'm sure we'll be talking again before long.

Supervisor Allen – do you feel that as many people are out of jobs that the teachers should feel some satisfaction knowing that they have a job?

Dr. Arbogast – yes they do but there is still the uncertainty as to whether they can keep the job.

Supervisor Allen – why are they griping about the pay then?

Dr. Arbogast – I guess because everything is going up, insurance went up, everything going up around them and for three years not getting any increase at all. It is one of those things that happen, they look for an increase. We have not paid our stipends or increases for degrees as well, or for longevity stipends as well. Other school systems have done that. Carroll County

gave a step on their pay scale for the last several years; we've not given a step, nor longevity, nor degrees that they've earned for the last few years. We'll have to see what we can do.

The Board recessed for lunch.

Mr. Dan Huff, Virginia Department of Transportation, next appeared before the Board. He reported the following maintenance activities performed in the last 30 days:

- Skin patching on Routes 758, 764, 602 and a section of 787;
- Cleaned out ditches on Route 758 and several other routes;
- Crush run on various routes;
- Machining on various routes;
- Brush cut on Routes 750 and 737;
- Hand cleaned several pipes;
- Potholes have been the focus in the Check headquarters;
- Four new hires at the Check headquarters, with two more to start soon;
- Have performed a dry run on snow preparation.

Supervisor Clinger – nothing specific to report.

Supervisor Gardner – I do have some constituents here who would like to talk to you privately. There was another person who was supposed to be here concerning Emanuel Road. With the rain last week it was almost impassable with lateral gullies. It needs machining and potholes repaired.

Supervisor Allen – had a person call VDoT to see about reducing the speed limit on Route 615 on Poff hill. They referred him back to me. He said his wife has a disability and can't get across the road quick enough to get the mail, and there are a lot of kids around. What is the procedure for that?

Mr. Huff – it is up to the Board if they want to do a speed study. We have a budget set aside for County engineering which this would come out of; it is part of the 6-year plan budget.

Supervisor Allen – I feel it should be done. Also, on Franklin Pike past the nursing home, a tractor trailer ran into the ditch and messed it up; the water is standing in the ditch. On Thompson Road, someone got stuck in a ditch and dug it up trying to get out; the water is running down the road instead of the ditch.

Supervisor Gerald – appreciate patching of potholes on Indian Valley Road. The lines had been painted on the road, when the patching was done, the lines were covered up.

Mr. Huff – the District does the line painting, we do the patching, so things sometimes get off schedule. They will come back and re-paint them.

Supervisor Gerald – why is mowing being done now?

Mr. Huff – I am not in the maintenance section so I don't know, but I will try to find out.

Supervisor Gerald – we do appreciate all you do. Would you like to comment on the new call center in Salem?

Mr. Huff – the center has been open since spring but computers have been revamped and personnel better trained, so we hope it will be better now. It is staffed 24/7 so we hope things will be better.

Supervisor Gerald – so if we call, we'll be able to talk to a real person?

Mr. Huff – that's correct.

Supervisor Allen – does the system know if it is a call from Floyd County, where the problem actually is?

Mr. Huff – if it is a call about maintenance, it gets put on a different system than other items such as needing a sign, those come to my section. Maintenance calls go to a different system that automatically pops up at the Check or Willis headquarters, and they have a certain amount of time to reply back to that to get the concern fixed or if it is something major, like guardrail, those will be replied to directly.

Supervisor Ingram – we have been shorthanded on my end of the County but hopefully things will improve with the new hires. Lots of roads need machining when possible.

Mr. Huff – have you had a chance to think about changing the Route 860 project to another one?

Supervisor Allen – I have not decided yet as to what I want to do.

Supervisor Gerald – Floyd County is part of the New River Valley and we are just as important. We want a level playing field with everyone else and not be put at the bottom of the list.

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

Agenda Item 6k(i) – Mutual Aid Agreement with Franklin County – Franklin County has not responded to our revisions.

Agenda Item 6k(ii) – Contract – Floyd County Volunteer Fire Department/Floyd County. We have taken the draft that they sent us and made some revisions to it. I think you have a letter from Steve Durbin in my office which states that it is appropriate for your consideration. The purpose of this contract is to enable the fire department to ensure that it has sovereign immunity against claims as provided by statute. As you see, it provides that the fire department will provide volunteer fire fighting and emergency medical services in the County as they are able. You will provide financial or other assistance to them as you may deem appropriate with no

requirement of any contribution or amount of contribution. No third parties are a beneficiary to this and that the contract can be terminated by either party with thirty day notice. It is basically a fairly simple contract that they will provide the services as they are able and you will provide financial support as you desire.

On a motion of Supervisor Gardner, seconded by Supervisor Gerald, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to approve the contract between the Floyd County Volunteer Fire Department, Inc. and Floyd County with the inclusion that approval of the contract does not constitute recognition by the County that members of the Floyd County Volunteer Fire Department are employees of the County for purposes of workers compensation purposes.

Supervisor Clinger – aye

Supervisor Gardner – aye

Supervisor Allen – aye

Supervisor Gerald – aye

Supervisor Ingram – aye

Agenda Item 6i(iii) – Draft Policy regarding maintenance upon public roads that have never been abandoned but are no longer publically maintained. As you know, we have previously adopted resolutions who wanted to ask for roads to be abandoned but this is a little different. There are roads in Floyd County that the highway department has discontinued for maintenance but which people still use. There is a statute, Section 55-50.3 of the Code of Virginia, which provides the process that allows a person who might be using a discontinued public road, to be able to keep it maintained where they can actually use it. Before, there has always been the issue as to who owns it, who can work on it, do I have to get the consent of everybody that has property on it to work on it, and so forth. This statute seems to resolve that question, at least, in that there is a procedure for the property owner to apply to the County for administrative review of the work. Upon administrative review, the person doing the work doesn't have to get the permission of the other people on the road. What Dan has drafted and I revised, is a policy for doing that administrative review. The policy basically requires a written request filed with the County to perform the maintenance on the road that is discontinued. At the same time, the request has to set forth what work will be done. At the same time the request is made to the County, the property owner who wants to do the work, sends to the other property owners on the road, a copy of his application to the County, and state their ability to make comments to the County. Following receipt, the County Administrator and Board Member for the district, will conduct a site visit and request the property owner who wants to do the work, to accompany them. The County will then comment back to the applicant concerning the work. The administrative review is done pursuant to the statute and the comments do not constitute approval or denial of the work and the County has no liability for the maintenance, repair or improvement of the road, thereof. While they are doing the work, they cannot interfere with other property owners' use of the road. It is a fine line that you're trying to walk here. The statute states that if you ask the County for administrative review, you don't have to get permission from other property owners to do the work, which is a good thing. Cuts down on fights between property owners. The bad thing is, I don't want to put the County into a position of approving the work. If somebody puts in a culvert, doesn't do it right, the culvert washes out, somebody drives along and knocks the front end of their truck out, and before you know it, somebody sues the County because the County approved the work. All I'm trying to do is follow

the statute for the administrative review and comments to the person doing the work, about the work. This is not an approval or denial by the County of the work. If the adjacent property owners don't like the work they're intending to do, they can tell the County that. It puts the County in the middle, but that's why you all get the big bucks. I don't want us to approve, nor deny it, but the statute gives no guidance, of course, except to say that it is an administrative review. That's how I drafted it.

Supervisor Gerald – the first section says that we “encourage” use of the form, wouldn't it be better to require use of the form?

Mr. Cornwell – you can do that. The first sentence says a written request to perform maintenance will be filed so the request has to be in writing. But we can make the form mandatory, that is not a problem.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to change the first paragraph from “encourage” use of form to “require” use of form; strike the third paragraph totally; add to second paragraph “after review of project”; paragraph four, strike “and Board member”; paragraph four strike “within 5 days of site visit”; add to notice to other property owners “County does not have the authority to approve/disapprove any projects”.

On a motion of Supervisor Gerald, seconded by Supervisor Clinger, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adopt the Policy Regarding Maintenance Upon Public Roads That Have Never Been Abandoned But Are No Longer Publically Maintained as amended (as per above comments) (Document File Number _____).

Supervisor Clinger – aye
Supervisor Gardner – aye
Supervisor Allen – aye
Supervisor Gerald – aye
Supervisor Ingram – aye

Agenda Item 7f – Appointments (2) to Economic Development Authority of Floyd County, Virginia, 4 year terms. Mr. Campbell presented letters from the incumbents expressing their interest in being reappointed.

On a motion of Supervisor Allen, seconded by Supervisor Gardner, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to reappoint Mr. Jack Russell and Mr. Laurence Wood to the Economic Development Authority of Floyd County, Virginia for four year terms, terms December 11, 2010 – December 10, 2014.

Supervisor Clinger – aye
Supervisor Gardner – aye
Supervisor Allen – aye
Supervisor Gerald – aye
Supervisor Ingram – aye

Agenda Item 7g – Appointments (2) to Floyd – Floyd County Parks & Recreation Authority, 4 year terms, Little River and Locust Grove Districts. Mr. Campbell presented letters from the incumbents expressing their interest in being reappointed.

On a motion of Supervisor Gardner, seconded by Supervisor Allen, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to reappoint Mr. Steve Graham as Little River District representative and Mr. Clay Link as Locust Grove District representative to the Floyd – Floyd County Parks & Recreation Authority, for four year terms.

Supervisor Clinger – aye
Supervisor Gardner – aye
Supervisor Allen – aye
Supervisor Gerald – aye
Supervisor Ingram – aye

Agenda Item 7h – FY11 amendment to Local Government Agreement between the Virginia Department of Health and Floyd County. Mr. Campbell presented a copy of the standard agreement that is approved each year by the Board. The dollar figure listed is as the Board approved in the FY11 budget.

On a motion of Supervisor Gerald, seconded by Supervisor Gardner, and carried, it was resolved to approve the FY11 amendment to the Local Government Agreement between the Virginia Department of Health and Floyd County, as presented.

Supervisor Clinger – nay
Supervisor Gardner – aye
Supervisor Allen – aye
Supervisor Gerald – aye
Supervisor Ingram – aye

Agenda Item 7i – Floyd County Volunteer Fire Department, Station #1, heating system. We have received a request to replace part of the heating system and improve the heating system at Station #1. There was some annual maintenance done by Blue Ridge Heating. During their inspection and annual maintenance, they made the statement that the gas valve spring is weak and very rusted. They recommend replacing the furnace before failure. It has been maintained and is working. The cost is \$2892. They also talk about spending some more funds wanting to install a heat pump system to enhance the system in the office and break room area. The cost would be \$6123 total to replace the existing furnace and new heat pump system.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board for staff to obtain additional bids on both items and address the issue during the next budget cycle since there is not a failure at this time.

Agenda Item 7j – Titling of new EMS response vehicle. Mr. Campbell commented that grant funds were used to purchase a new first response vehicle, used 99% of the time by the paid staff. We also budgeted a smaller amount of local money to upfit the vehicle. The Rescue Squad requested that we keep the old vehicle as a backup. Historically, we've had some trouble when the first response vehicle was out for service or deer damage, we've been in a bind. We

targeted keeping it around for a while if needed. The question today from the Rescue Squad that the new vehicle be titled entirely to the Board of Supervisors. There is an agreement between the Rescue Squad and Floyd County EMS and Board of Supervisors, with one of the inclusions being that equipment will be titled jointly. So this is deviating from that agreement but that is the request from the Rescue Squad governing body. We do not have line items in our budget for fuel and repairs. If you do this, at the end of the year we'd have to make an adjustment for these items. Historically, the Rescue Squad has paid for these items out of their budget according to the agreement. They feel this is different since it is used entirely by the paid staff. They feel the agreement only applies to full-blown ambulances.

On a motion of Supervisor Clinger, seconded by Supervisor Gardner, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to deny the request from the Floyd County Lifesaving and First Aid Squad for County titling only of the new response vehicle, since the Agreement calls for joint titling of all equipment.

Supervisor Clinger – aye
Supervisor Gardner – aye
Supervisor Allen – aye
Supervisor Gerald – aye
Supervisor Ingram – aye

Consensus of the Board, after discussion, was to keep the current response vehicle in the County fleet, parked at the Administration building, under control of the County Administrator.

Agenda Item 7k – E&S Control Fees/Building Permit fee modifications. Mr. Campbell presented a request from the Building Official to discuss E&S fees with Skyline Soil Conservation to see if they are current and cover costs. He has also requested that the building permit fees be reviewed also, especially in the area of residential accessory buildings. He has had difficulties with citizens obtaining permits for accessory buildings such as workshops, and turning them into garages, which are rated at a higher fee.

Agenda Item 7l – GIS data fees. Mr. Campbell presented the same type of request as Item 7k, from the Emergency Services Coordinator, that fees for GIS services be reviewed. They frequently receive requests for different maps/data from our system. We have not charged a fee in the past, most other localities charge for these types of services.

Consensus of the Board was for staff to review all the fees for E&S, Building and GIS and make a recommendation to the Board next month as to changes.

Agenda Item 7e – Legislative recommendations. Mr. Campbell commented that he drafted the 2010 requests using some from the 2009 list and some from VACo's requests. Mr. Ayers, Social Services Director, added some human services items.

After extensive discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to approve the legislative recommendation with the following amendments: strike item j, taxing authority of School Boards; make language stronger on VDOT issues; add similar request as VACo's for a minimum of ten officers per County in the Sheriff's Office, funding now is 1:1500 population; add

authority to assess a meals tax in the County; try special legislation for meals tax if not approved this way (County along Blue Ridge Parkway, as per other special legislation).

On a motion of Supervisor Gerald, seconded by Supervisor Allen, and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adjourn.

Supervisor Clinger – aye
Supervisor Gardner – aye
Supervisor Allen – aye
Supervisor Gerald – aye
Supervisor Ingram – aye

Daniel J. Campbell
County Administrator

David W. Ingram, Chairman
Board of Supervisors