

The regular meeting of the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors was held on Tuesday, July 22, 2014, in Rooms 226-228 of the Greenfield Education and Training Center in Daleville, Virginia, beginning at 2:00 P. M.

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

ABSENT: Members: Mr. John B. Williamson, III

Others present at the meeting:

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

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 2:00 P. M.

He then asked for a moment of silence and asked those present to remember the victims and families of the recent airplane crash in Ukraine and also to encourage the local government officials to make the right decisions.

Mr. Martin then led the group in reciting the pledge of allegiance.

Dr. Scothorn noted that Mr. Williamson is unwell and will not be able to attend today's Supervisors meeting.

Dr. Scothorn also noted that Mr. Bob Bagnoli of Daleville had passed away yesterday. He noted that Mr. Bagnoli has routinely attended the Board meetings for many years and most recently encouraged the Board and VDoT to reconstruct a portion of Glebe Road.

Mr. Jason Ferguson, Emergency Services Division Chief for Operations and Training, then introduced Mr. Ian Wiles and Mr. Thomas Andrews to the Board. He noted that Mr. Wiles has been employed by the County for six years and recently achieved the National Registered Paramedic certification. He noted that Mr. Wiles completed this certification process in eleven months.

Mr. Ferguson noted that Mr. Andrews has been employed by the County for almost a year. He noted that Mr. Andrews attended Dabney S. Lancaster Community College and has completed, tested, and passed his National Registered Paramedic Intermediate certification.

He stated that both certifications require 500 hours of didactic and practical, hands-on, skills.

The Board congratulated Mr. Wiles and Mr. Andrews for their achievement in obtaining these certifications.

After discussion, on motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the minutes of the regular meeting held on June 24, 2014, as submitted. (Resolution Number 14-07-01)

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None

Consideration was then held on approval of transfers and additional appropriations. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, noted that there were three transfers, 10 pass through appropriations, and one regular appropriation for the Board's consideration this month.

He stated that the transfers are for recurring quarterly and annual allocation requests and the appropriations are for revenue collections, insurance payments, receipt of recreation funds, receipt of federal funds and State grant monies, and annual appropriations. Mr. Zerrilla stated that the Sheriff's Department Property Seizure Proceeds Fund appropriations are divided into two separate categories for receipt of federal and State monies.

There being no discussion, on motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following transfers and additional appropriations. (Resolution Number 14-07-02)

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None

Transfer \$14,867.25 from the E911 Fund to the County General Fund. This is to recapture E911 operating expenses.

Transfer \$609.89 to Sheriff's Department - Vehicle & Power Equipment Supplies, 100-4031200-6009, from the following departments for vehicle repairs at the County Garage:

- \$ 31.36 Dep. Co. Admin- Repair & Maint. - Vehicles, 100-4012121-3312
- \$ 25.22 General Svces. - Repair & Maint. - Vehicles, 100-4040000-3312
- \$ 52.07 Devel. Svces -Repair & Maint. - Vehicles, 100-4034000-3312
- \$130.93 Animal Control-Veh. & Power Equip. Suppl., 100-4035100-6009
- \$ 20.63 Maintenance - Repair & Maint. - Vehicles, 100-4043000-3312
- \$ 64.76 Fire & EMS - Repair & Maint. - Vehicles, 100-4035500-3312
- \$ 41.96 Parks & Rec. - Veh. & Power Equip. Suppl., 100-4071000-6009
- \$ 96.33 Van Program - Repair & Maint. - Vehicles, 100-4071500-3312
- \$ 77.68 Library - Repair & Maint. - Vehicles, 100-4073100-3312
- \$ 20.63 Sports Complex - Repair & Maint. - Veh., 100-4071300-3312
- \$ 48.32 Utilities - Repair & Maint. - Vehicles, 502-4041500-3312

Transfer an amount not to exceed \$560,608 from Utility Operating Fund, 502, to General Fund - General Services, 100-4040000. This is a payroll transfer for FY15. Cash transfers will occur monthly; however, this transaction will provide advance authority.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$8,702.39 to Sheriff's Department - Special Law Enforcement, 100-4031200-5880. This is the portion of the FY14 traffic fine proceeds payable to the Town of Buchanan per the County's contract for law enforcement services. This payment is included in this month's Accounts Payable.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$2,945.85 to Sheriff's Department - Repair & Maintenance - Equipment, 100-4031200-3311. These are insurance funds received for repairs to two damaged vehicles.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$398.30 to Library - Books & Subscriptions, 100-4073100-6012. These are funds received from Verizon as a result of the Library's participation in the E-rate federal program which provides assistance to schools and libraries.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$36,024.56 to Volunteer Fire & Rescue - County Volunteer Rescue Squads, 100-4032200-5651. These are Four-for-Life funds received from the State.

Additional appropriation in an amount up to \$140,000 to the Property Seizure Proceeds Fund - Sheriff's Office - Federal. This provides the authorization to expend these funds based upon predetermined expenditure guidelines.

Additional appropriation an amount up to \$18,000 to the Property Seizure Proceeds Funds - Sheriff's Office - State. This provides the authorization to expend these funds based upon predetermined expenditure guidelines.

Additional appropriation in an amount up to \$10,000 to the Asset Forfeiture Fund – Commonwealth’s Attorney – Federal. This provides the authorization to expend these funds based upon predetermined expenditure guidelines.

Additional appropriation in an amount up to \$4,000 to the Asset Forfeiture Fund – Commonwealth’s Attorney – State. This provides the authorization to expend these funds based upon predetermined expenditure guidelines.

Additional appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$7,000 to Correction & Detention – Inmate Phone Commissions, 100-4033100-5820. This is an advance pass-thru for funds received for debit card phone commissions received by the County.

Additional appropriation in an amount up to \$746,419.27 to Utility Fund CIP – Roanoke WPCP Flow Upgrade, 502-4094412. This is an advance pass-thru of loan proceeds to be received from DEQ during FY15.

Additional appropriation in an amount up to \$10,000 to Unemployment Claims, 100-4091502, to provide for coverage of potential unemployment insurance claims.

Consideration was then held on approval of the Accounts Payable and ratification of the Short Accounts Payable List. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, stated that this month’s accounts payable totaled \$1,027,156.62; \$898,742.93 in General Fund invoices; \$550 in Debt Service Fund expenditures; and \$127,863.69 in Utility Fund invoices. He stated that the Short Accounts Payable totaled \$474,009.76; \$461,256.73 in General Fund expenditures; \$3,055 in Debt Service Fund invoices; and \$9,698.03 in Utility Fund expenditures. He also noted that the Short Accounts Payable included \$266,716 in FY 15 semi-annual budget payments to the volunteer fire and rescue agencies

Mr. Zerrilla then stated that this month’s large expenditures included \$26,634 to the Roanoke Valley/Alleghany Regional Commission for their FY 15 budget allocation, and \$34,459 to the Roanoke Regional Partnership for one-half of their FY 15 budget allocation.

There being no discussion, on motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the Accounts Payable list and ratified the Short Accounts Payable List as submitted. (Resolution Number 14-07-03)

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None

Consideration was then held on the proposed budget reappropriation resolution for FY 15. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, stated that this resolution is to allow for the funding of programs, capital, and equipment-related projects that were begun but not completed in FY 14 to continue in FY 15. He noted that these requests total \$723,074.

Mr. Zerrilla stated that his year-end review shows that \$3.3 million less was spent in the amended FY 14 budget (County, Schools, Debt Service, Utility Fund, and Social Services) than the total budget allocation. He noted that, of this amount, \$1.3 million was unspent in the Utility Fund CIP. He further noted that of the \$1.5 million unspent in the General Fund Operational budgets, \$577,000 is being requested, mostly by the public safety, fire, and rescue departments, to be reappropriated into FY 15, which leaves \$954,000 in unspent funds as of June 30, 2014.

Mr. Zerrilla stated that the General Fund CIP had a year-end balance of \$234,000 and approximately one-half of this amount is being requested to be reappropriated into FY 15. He

further noted that Social Services underspent their FY 14 budget by approximately \$178,000 and the Schools had approximately \$31,000 remaining at June 30, 2014.

After discussion, Mr. Zerrilla stated that 78% of the unspent fund balances are not being requested for reappropriation into the FY 15 budget. He noted that of the \$577,000 being reappropriated into the General Fund Operational budgets, \$357,000 is for public safety purposes--\$225,000 for new ambulance and approximately \$100,000 for the Sheriff's Department. Mr. Zerrilla stated that \$100,000 in contingency funds is also being requested for reappropriation in order to cover unanticipated costs in the FY 15 budget. He further stated that \$91,000 is being requested for reappropriation into the FY 15 budget to complete the Route 606/11 intersection project.

Mr. Zerrilla stated that the Board is also being requested to reappropriate the Schools' Nutrition, Textbook, and Capital Project Reserve Fund amounts into the FY 15 budget so appropriations are not necessary during the fiscal year.

Mrs. Guzi then stated that the Sheriff has requested that two additional fund amounts be reappropriated into the FY 15 budget--\$2,000 for repairs to the Jail's generator and approximately \$18,000 for guns and ammunition.

Mr. Zerrilla noted that, with these two additions, the new reappropriation total is \$743,539.

There being no discussion, on motion by Mr. Dodson, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following revised budget reappropriation resolution for Fiscal Year 2015.

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None

Resolution Number 14-07-04

WHEREAS, appropriations for several County projects terminated on June 20, 2014, but completion of these projects will carry-over into Fiscal Year 2014-15; and,

WHEREAS, appropriations for several grant programs terminated on June 30, 2014, but these programs will continue into Fiscal Year 2014-15;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the following appropriations for Fiscal Year 2014-15 are made to allow carry-over of approved funding begun in Fiscal Year 2013-2014:

GENERAL FUND OPERATIONS:

<u>Destination Acct. #</u>	<u>Account Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
100-4012121-3100	Dep. Co. Adm. – Prof. Svces.	\$ 30,000	For economic development website enhancements.
100-4012510-3100	Mgmt. Systems – Prof. Serv.	\$ 9,957	For cont. project - Fiber cabling.
100-4012510-8007	Mgmt. Systems – Cap. Outlay-EDP Equip.	\$ 7,400	For cont. project - UPS battery backups.
100-4021600-5510	Clerk of Circuit Court - Mileage	\$ 1,300	To provide for oversight during budget process.
100-4031200-5830	Sheriff - Raid Patrol	\$ 63,968	RAID Funds - For Sheriff's Department use.
100-4031200-6010	Sheriff - Police Supplies	\$ 13,352	Purchase of guns and ammunition.
100-4031200-6015	Sheriff - Firing Range Expenses	\$ 3,728	Firing range funds.
100-4031200-8012	Sheriff – Cap. Outlay - Other Cap.	\$ 30,910	Firing range improvements.
100-4031700-3311	Dispatch - Repair & Maint.-Equip.	\$ 1,000	Repairs to aging equipment.
100-4032200-3180	Vol. Fire & Resc. - Instr. & Train.	\$ 5,000	For recruitment & retention efforts.
100-4032200-5651	Vol. Fire & Resc.-Co. Vol. Res. Sq.	\$ 7,500	For system-wide oxygen cylinders.
100-4032200-8005	Vol. Fire & Rescue – Cap. Outlay - Mtr. Veh./Equip.	\$ 225,000	For ambulance on order for career staff.
100-4032200-8005	Vol. Fire & Rescue – Cap. Outlay - Mtr. Veh./Equip.	\$ 2,500	For storage cabinets & command board for vehicle.
100-4032200-8005	Vol. Fire & Rescue – Cap. Outlay - Mtr. Veh./Equip.	\$ 6,500	Equipment for Buchanan brush truck.

100-4033100-3311	Corr. & Det.-Repair & Maint. Equip.	\$ 2,084	Jail generator repairs.
100-4033100-5820	Corr. & Det.-Inmate Phone Comm.	\$ 11,099	For subsidizing inmate expenditure use.
100-4033100-6010	Corr. & Det.- Police Supplies	\$ 5,029	Purchase of guns and ammunition.
100-4042400-3311	Div. of Waste Mgmt. - Repairs & Maint. – Equip.	\$ 17,300	For repairs to compactor.
100-4043000-8012	Maint. – Cap. Outlay - Other Cap.	\$ 3,000	For maintenance/upkeep to equipment/buildings.
100-4071000-8012	Parks & Rec. – Cap. Outlay - Other Capital	\$ 19,000	For utility pole move & Daleville Greenway expend.
100-4071300-8012	Sports Complex - Capital Outlay - Other Capital	\$ 3,500	For two used infield tarps.
100-4071500-8001	Van Program - Capital Outlay - Machinery & Equip.	\$ 2,000	For funding towards new van.
100-4081600-5840	Tourism - Marketing	\$ 12,000	For grant funding match & Google Adwords campaign.
100-4091503-2300	Wellness Program - Hospital & Medical Costs	\$ 15,125	For planned portion of FY15 budget funding.
100-4093000	Contingency	\$ <u>100,000</u>	To supplement FY15 budget to cover unanticipated costs.
TOTAL	General Fund Operations	\$ 577,787	

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS:

100-4094101	Enterprise-Wide Software	\$ 22,722	For continuation of project.
100-4094723	Community Rec. Incentive Prog.	\$ 2,328	To complete current Recreation Incentive projects.
100-4094732	Greenfield Recreation Park	\$ 4,237	To complete grading project for new ball diamonds.
100-4094809	VDOT Revenue Sharing Match	\$ <u>91,000</u>	For the Route 606/11 intersection improvement project.
TOTAL	General Fund Capital Projects	\$ 120,287	

UTILITY FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS:

502-4094433	Water & Sewer Improvements	\$ <u>25,000</u>	For completion of Dal-Nita Hills well project.
TOTAL	Utility Fund Capital Projects	\$ 25,000	

GRAND TOTAL \$ 743,539

Fund	Botetourt Co. Schools - School Nutrition Fund	\$1,824,950	For FY15 activity in this fund
Fund	Botetourt Co. Schools - Textbook Fund	\$ 825,000	For FY15 activity in this fund
Fund	Botetourt Co. Schools – Cap. Project Res. Fund	\$1,160,059	For FY15 activity in this fund

A report was then given regarding the Glen Wilton leash law petition. Mrs. Guzi stated that the County Code allows a petition process for a leash law designation. She noted that a portion of the Glen Wilton community submitted a petition which was brought before the Board in May. Mrs. Guzi noted that the Board directed staff at that time to conduct a poll of the property owners to determine their wishes on whether the leash law should be enacted.

Mrs. Guzi stated that ballots were mailed to the 64 separate property owners in early June. She stated that the County received responses from 36 property owners within the 30 day time limit—24 responded that they wanted a leash law and 12 did not want a leash law. Mrs. Guzi stated that the County Code states that “at least fifty-one (51) percent of the property owners in question must have mailed back an affirmative response” for the Board to enact the leash law designation; however, this did not occur in this matter.

Mrs. Guzi noted that County staff has discussed this matter with Sheriff Sprinkle and the Chief Animal Control Officer. She noted that they agree that there is a problem with dogs running at large in the Glen Wilton area but they are not sure that it “rises to the level of having a leash law” enacted. Mrs. Guzi noted that the staff’s recommendation is to work closely with the Sheriff and Animal Control staff to increase patrols in this area. She noted that Animal Control has issued warnings to two property owners whose dogs were caught running at large.

After discussion, Mrs. Guzi stated that she believes that increasing patrols in this area should bring this problem under control. She noted that an Animal Control Officer will patrol the area once a week at a minimum; however, if there are calls received from residents during this time, they would be investigated as soon as possible. Mrs. Guzi stated that a regular presence of Animal Control Officers in this area should begin to curtail the problem.

Dr. Scothorn stated that this agenda item is not an open, public discussion but he has received some request to speak forms and he would allow these individuals to speak for three minutes each.

Mr. Frank Thurston of Fieldale Road stated that he is not sure how much the Board members have heard about this issue. He noted that there have been calves, dogs, chickens, and cats killed by dogs in the Glen Wilton area, including a recent incident of a young child's cat being killed. He noted that there are also issues with dogs barking during church events including a funeral that was held yesterday.

Mr. Thurston noted that the property owners adjacent to the post office have two pit bulls. Mr. Thurston stated that he is representing a large percentage of the people in Glen Wilton who want this leash law enacted. He noted that some residents did not have an opportunity to vote as they were not within the proposed leash law boundary area.

Mr. Thurston noted that the dogs have damaged his garden and spread trash in the area. He noted that this is a sad situation and some people have no intention of changing what they have been doing for years—allowing their dogs to run throughout the community. Mr. Thurston stated that he tries to get along with people but suggested that anyone try to come up with a good reason not to have a leash law.

Ms. Debbie Thurston of Firehouse Lane stated that the ballots returned to the County show that twice as many property owners want the leash law enacted as those who do not. Ms. Thurston noted that she has a cat and the property owners behind her home own dogs. She noted that these dogs “sneak up” on her and her cat when they are in their own yard. Ms. Thurston stated that she is concerned about keeping her animal safe because these dogs run loose all day after their owners leave for work.

Ms. Thurston then stated that she owned dogs prior to moving back to Glen Wilton several years ago. She noted that she previously lived on a large farm and her dogs were caught by Animal Control $\frac{3}{4}$ mile from home for killing chickens. Ms. Thurston stated that she had to keep the dogs leashed for a year.

Ms. Thurston stated that she hopes that one of the dogs roaming loose in the community does not maim a child. She asked that the Board be preventative, not reactive, to this situation as it is a safety issue. Ms. Thurston then questioned if the Board would feel comfortable if it were their children involved in a situation with these dogs running at large. She noted that, if people know there is going to be punishment, then they might keep their dogs penned up. She asked that the Board help the Glen Wilton residents with this safety issue.

Mr. Murray Frank (Buddy) Buchanan of Main Street in Glen Wilton stated that he is opposed to this leash law. He then questioned why the proposed boundary area was drawn as it was. He noted that the boundary map shows that there are neighbors on one side of the street who are located within the leash law area and residents on the opposite side of the street are not. Mr. Buchanan also questioned why the landowner, not the resident, was polled and noted that there were people with Fincastle and Alleghany County addresses who received

ballots. He noted that they may own property in Glen Wilton but they do not live there. Mr. Buchanan questioned how many of the ballots were from people who did not live in Glen Wilton.

Mr. Buchanan noted that he has lived in Glen Wilton for years and was not aware of any issues with dogs prior to the leash law petition being taken around the community. Mr. Buchanan stated that, if he has a problem with a neighbor, he would first call them to discuss the situation.

Mr. Buchanan then questioned that, if this leash law is enacted, how will it impact groups such as bear hunters which have a bear chase season which begins on August 1. He noted that Glen Wilton is surrounded by national forest which is frequently used by hunters with dogs.

Mr. Buchanan then thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak his mind.

Mr. Steven Windsor of Forrest Hill Drive stated that he also opposes enacting this leash law. Mr. Windsor noted that he recently moved to Glen Wilton and his former residence was in a jurisdiction that had a leash law. Mr. Windsor stated that he has a dog and it stays on his property. Mr. Windsor stated that he has not seen any problems with dogs in the eight months that he has lived in Glen Wilton.

Mr. Windsor noted that the cat mentioned by Mr. Thurston which was recently killed was his daughter's cat and she voted against the leash law. Mr. Windsor then thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Thurston then noted that the dog mentioned by Mr. Windsor that stays on his property was in his (Mr. Thurston's) yard yesterday.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mrs. Guzi stated that the current County ordinance directs citizens who have problems with dogs running at large to contact Animal Control. She noted that Animal Control visits the site and if they find the dog or the dog's owner they can issue a warning that the dog cannot run at large for a period of one year. She stated that, if the dog is caught again running at large during that one year period, Animal Control can issue a summons to the dog's owner.

Mrs. Guzi encouraged citizens who have a problem with dogs trespassing on their property to contact Animal Control to investigate the matter.

After discussion by Mr. Dodson, Mrs. Guzi stated that the first step for Animal Control once a complaint is received is to issue a warning to the dog's owner; however, if a complaint is received within a designated leash law area, then Animal Control can issue a summons immediately.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson regarding the historical call rate for the Glen Wilton area, Mrs. Guzi noted that during the last calendar year there were 21 calls from citizens in this area; however, 5 – 6 of these calls were regarding horses, cows, etc. She noted that Animal Control averages approximately one call per month regarding dogs in this area.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mrs. Guzi stated that she does not have any details on calls received regarding an animal being killed by dogs.

After discussion by Mr. Martin, Mr. David Horton, retired County Animal Control Officer, stated that dogs running at large is considered a class 1 misdemeanor. He noted that the Animal Control Officer has to see the offense happen in his presence.

Mr. Leffel then thanked the Thurstons for their efforts throughout this leash law process and thanked them for allowing him into their home to discuss this matter. Mr. Leffel stated that he is a dog owner but has also owned cattle so he understands both sides of this issue.

Mr. Leffel noted that this area is very rural; however, there is a concentrated residential area as well. Mr. Leffel stated that he believes that the reported incidents of dogs running at large, damaging gardens, etc., has happened. He stated that this area is surrounded by national forest and when bear chase season comes in it will be difficult to patrol this area. Mr. Leffel stated that he thinks that this is a very unfortunate circumstance which puts neighbor against neighbor; however, he does not see how a leash law will immediately help this situation.

Mr. Leffel stated that he is not against the eventuality of a leash law in this area but there are laws in place now which may solve the problems that are occurring. He suggested that the residents "see how it works" with the existing ordinances before considering a leash law. Mr. Leffel noted that Animal Control will "tighten up" on their patrols in this area and that may help to resolve the problem.

Dr. Scothorn stated that he would like to see additional information on the Animal Control call history from this area and try to find out why there is currently a problem with dogs running at large.

Mr. Thurston stated that one of the things that has changed is a new neighbor who has two dogs who join with a couple of other dogs and run throughout the community. He noted that the County requires a person who has four adult dogs to obtain a kennel license.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mrs. Guzi stated that Animal Control will patrol the Glen Wilton area at least once a week.

Mr. Leffel stated that he "wants this problem solved" as this is a situation that the County needs to pursue and, if the current County regulations do not solve the problem, then the matter needs to be addressed by other means.

Mrs. Guzi noted that, once a leash law petition comes before the Board but is not approved, then the situation is monitored for a year.

Dr. Scothorn noted that he would like the animal-related call history for this area to be reviewed.

Mr. Buchanan stated that he hopes that he is still friends with Mr. Thurston after they leave today's Board meeting, even though they are on opposite sides of this issue. Mr. Buchanan noted that there are several people who will abuse the system and, if Animal Control enforces the existing laws on the two or three dog owners who are causing the problem, then this matter should be resolved.

Dr. Scothorn stated that the Board believes that, with Animal Control patrolling Glen Wilton more frequently, this problem will be resolved.

Mr. Martin stated that he hopes that the neighbors will still call each other if there is an issue with individual dogs and that they can discuss the problems without getting upset.

Mr. Leffel noted that the residents are trusting Animal Control to do their job.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board denied the request for a running at large (leash law) designation in a portion of the community of Glen Wilton. (Resolution Number 14-07-05)

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None

Mr. Kevin Hamm, VDoT's Maintenance Operations Manager, was then present to speak to the Board. Mr. Hamm reviewed the monthly report. He noted that Etzler Road has been reopened to through traffic; however, the intersection improvement project continues. Mr. Hamm noted that the three bridge replacement projects on Jennings Creek Road have been completed with the remaining site work to be finished by September.

Mr. Hamm noted that VDoT issued seven new permits between June 17 and July 12 as follows: 2 utility entrance permits, 2 private entrance permits, 2 special sign permits, and 1 low volume commercial entrance permit. He stated that VDoT staff is also working on mowing and road patching projects with the street paving work in Rainbow Forest Subdivision being completed yesterday.

Mr. Leffel then stated that he has received two calls regarding a fatality yesterday on Route 220 south of Fincastle.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Jason Ferguson, Emergency Services Division Chief for Operations and Training, stated that this accident was on Route 220 southbound near the Shane Lane intersection. Mr. Ferguson noted that the vehicle drifted off of the side of the roadway and wrecked.

After questioning by Mr. Leffel, Mr. Hamm stated that he will ask their traffic engineering staff to review the history/accident data in this area to see if any safety improvements are needed.

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

Consideration was then held on amendments to a Memorandum of Understanding with the Fincastle Resolutions Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution. Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator, stated that in May 2012 the Board adopted a Memorandum of Understanding with the SAR which outlined the respective roles and responsibilities of the parties relative to the siting, construction, and maintenance of a memorial to Colonel William Preston on the Greenfield property. He noted that the Board's agenda item on this request contains copies of the original MoU, the 2012 conceptual rendering, the 2013 revised design, and a draft amended MoU.

Mr. Moorman stated that in October 2013, the Board by consensus agreed that the memorial could be relocated from the Greenfield historic preservation area to the Education and Training Center site.

Mr. Moorman then noted that earlier this month, Dr. Rupert Cutler, representing SAR, requested that the County adopt an amended MoU so as to establish the County as an "official" partner in this project to help SAR in its fundraising activities. He noted that the amended MoU states that SAR shall provide construction drawings and a materials list with a cost estimate for County review and approval, reimburse the County for construction expenses for the monument within 30 days of completion, and demonstrate before the start of construction that it has adequate funding for completion of the monument. He further noted that the MoU states that the County shall establish a construction timetable, select and hire a construction contractor and inspect all construction activity, hire the design engineer to advise and assist with any field issues during construction, pay for agreed-to site improvements such as lighting, landscaping, and signage, and will own and maintain the site and memorial upon completion. He further noted that the parties, jointly, shall determine construction costs prior to the development of

construction drawings and, upon receipt and acceptance of a construction bid, specify costs to be reimbursed by SAR.

Dr. Cutler then stated that the idea for this project was raised almost 20 years ago in a letter to the editor at The Roanoke Times by a Preston family relative. Dr. Cutler stated that SAR currently has \$70,000 in funding available for this project and have paid Hill Studios approximately \$8,000 to date for design work.

Dr. Cutler stated that the SAR would like to have a signed MoU with the County to assist in their fundraising activities. He suggested that a signing ceremony with the Supervisors Chairman and SAR representatives be held as soon as possible after the MoU is approved. Dr. Cutler noted that the Preston family has offered to help raise funds and donations have been received from many individuals including \$500 from the Botetourt County Historical Society.

After discussion, Dr. Cutler stated that the MoU states that the facility will be the County's property upon completion. He noted that the design's vertical panels will be provided by SAR and the five in-ground stonework pieces will each point in a different direction of importance in Colonel Preston's life and contain engravings of his accomplishments based on various books of his life.

Dr. Cutler stated that SAR is anxious to move ahead with this project and he understands that the County Administrator has mentioned appointing a citizen committee to provide input to the Board on the memorial. Dr. Cutler then requested that the Board approve the MoU. He noted that SAR recognizes the County's budget constraints which may impact funding of this project.

Dr. Cutler stated that the Virginia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution will hold their annual meeting in Roanoke in 2015 and he would like to be able to bring this group to the Greenfield memorial site. After discussion, Dr. Cutler thanked the Board for their partnership in this project.

Mrs. Peggy Davis of Fincastle then asked that the Board please vote "aye" for this request.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Dodson stated that he fully supports this request. He noted that this memorial will help citizens and visitors understand Botetourt County's history. Mr. Dodson noted that the County does not have enough historical markers explaining its history. Mr. Dodson stated that budget constraints are a fact of life now but he thinks this will be a good project as the County has a rich and deep history.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Dodson, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board adopted the revised Memorandum of Understanding with the Fincastle Resolutions Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution as presented. (Resolution Number 14-07-06)

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None

Discussion was then held on various committee reports.

Mr. Dodson noted that he attended the July Parks and Recreation Commission meeting and would like to pat the Recreation Department's staff on the back for their work. He noted that the baseball and softball seasons recently ended and positive comments were received

from the participants on how well the County's ballfields were maintained. Mr. Dodson thanked Mr. Peters and his staff for their hard work.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Peters stated that beginning early next week the Sports Complex will be hosting, along with Roanoke City, Roanoke County, and Salem, 140 girls softball teams from 32 states for the ASA/USA Under 16 Girl's Class A Fast-Pitch National Championship.

Mr. Dodson noted that he recently attended the Bot-e-type Tourism marketing campaign event in Buchanan and noted that there were approximately 1,200 participants at the recent Buchanan Fishing Carnival. He also noted that the County has obtained sponsorships from various local corporations including Boxley and the Bank of Fincastle for ballfields and these donations will be recognized at the Board's August regular meeting.

Dr. Scothorn noted that he recognized the efforts of the County's Parks and Recreation Department staff at the June regular meeting.

Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator, then updated the Board on the work of the Strategic Pre-Planning Committee. He noted that County staff has been working under the direction of Mr. Williamson and Mr. Martin, who serve on this committee, to make preparations for the Board's strategic planning sessions scheduled for later this year. He noted that proposals from facilitators to oversee this process are due to be submitted today for review by staff and the committee.

Mr. Moorman stated that the staff is compiling reports on general statistical data for the County as well as future projections and will draft a "white paper" on local government in Virginia. He noted that Virginia is a Dillon Rule state which means that localities are only allowed to do what the General Assembly permits them to do. Mr. Moorman further noted that the staff is also conducting an internal SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis for the committee's review and consideration.

Mr. Moorman stated that staff will provide the Supervisors members with various reports for their review through the Dropbox account in the next few days. He noted that some of these reports are quite lengthy.

After discussion, Mr. Moorman noted that the staff has been working to identify some potential benchmarks in the strategic planning process but it is a little difficult as staff "does not know where the Board wants to go."

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Moorman noted that the committee members will review the facilitator proposals and schedule meetings with the proposers within the next month or two.

Discussion was then held on various appointments.

Dr. Scothorn noted that Mr. Williamson had contacted him prior to today's meeting and asked that Mr. Harry Falls be appointed as the Buchanan District representative on the Transportation Safety Commission.

On motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board appointed Mr. Harry Falls of 1316 Narrow Passage Road, Buchanan as the Buchanan District representative on the Transportation Safety Commission and directed staff to send a letter to Mr. Ray Sloan thanking him for his previous six years of service on the Commission. (Resolution Number 14-07-07)

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None

On motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board appointed Mr. William O. Burluson of 2184 Old Rail Road, Eagle Rock, as the Fincastle District representative on the Board of Social Services for a four year term to expire on July 1, 2018, and directed staff to send a letter to Mr. Colby Trammel thanking him for his previous service on the Social Services Board. (Resolution Number 14-07-08)

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None

After discussion, on motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following representative/alternative appointments to the Community Policy and Management Team for two year terms to expire on September 1, 2016: (Resolution Number 14-07-09)

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None

Mr. Jeff Stritesky
Sheriff Ronnie Sprinkle (alternate)

Sheriff's Department

Mrs. Penny Hall
Ms. Leigh Martin (alternate)

Department of Social Services

Ms. Julie Baker
Mr. Sam Foster (alternate)

Botetourt County Schools

Dr. Stephanie Harper
Ms. Suzanne Renegar (alternate)

Botetourt County Health Dept.

Ms. Donna Dent
Ms. Gina Wilburn (alternate)

Blue Ridge Behavioral Healthcare

Ms. Samantha Higgins
Mr. Gary Conway (alternate)

Juvenile Probation/Court Services Office

Ms. Ashley Wittl
Ms. Tanisha Nash (alternate)

Minnick Education Centers

County staff then conducted a zoning work session for the Board's information. Mrs. Elizabeth Dillon, County Attorney, stated that according to the Supreme Court of Virginia, zoning is intended to "strike a deliberate balance between private property rights and public interests." She noted that Virginia is a Dillon Rule state and localities can only do what the General Assembly permits them to do; however, zoning decisions are legislative, so broad discretion is granted.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mrs. Dillon stated that the Board can only do what the General Assembly tells them that they can or have only those powers that are inferred by the General Assembly.

She noted that the Board's legislative action is presumed valid as long as it is not unreasonable and arbitrary. She noted that the Virginia Supreme Court says that the Board must

strictly comply with all procedural/technical requirements of zoning. Mrs. Dillon noted, for example, that failure to advertise a hearing in a timely manner or failure to notify adjoining property owners of a zoning application and hearing would void the Board's action. Mrs. Dillon stated that the County is required to advertise a zoning-related public hearing notice once a week for two consecutive weeks with the hearing to be held no less than six days nor more than 21 days after the second advertisement is published.

Mrs. Dillon then gave an example of a variance request for a small convenience store; however, notice of the application/hearing was not provided to an adjacent property owner. She noted that in this instance the court said that the variance was void due to the lack of notification to the adjoining property owner.

Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Planning Manager, then noted that Mr. John Griffin and Mr. Hiawatha Nicely, Planning Commission members, and Mr. Scott Caldwell, Board of Zoning Appeals member, were also present at today's meeting.

Mrs. Pendleton noted that "zoning is not an attractive topic" of discussion and can be compared to "eating sand." She stated that localities in Virginia must have a comprehensive plan in order to adopt a zoning ordinance. She noted that comp plans are an important land use control device and should contain the following components—present and future land use; existing and planned public utilities and facilities; transportation infrastructure; general programs for the County's physical development. Mrs. Pendleton further noted that comp plans control the general or approximate location, character, and extent of each public facility or utility feature shown; and unless already shown on the plan, no street, park or other public area, public building or public structure, public utility facility or public service corporation facility shall be constructed, established or authorized, unless and until the general location or approximate location, character, and extent thereof has been submitted to and approved by the commission as being substantially in accord with the adopted comp plan.

Mrs. Pendleton noted that comp plans must be reviewed every five years by the Planning Commission who then makes a recommendation on the plan to the Board of Supervisors. She noted that the Board most recently adopted the comp plan in 2011.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that the purposes of zoning is to strike a balance between property rights and public interests by improving public health and safety; plan for future development of communities, adequate transportation, utilities, health, education, recreation activities; recognize the need for agriculture, industry, and business, as well as residential areas with healthy surroundings; preserve land for agriculture and forests; and allow growth with efficient and economical use of public funds.

After questioning by Mr. Martin regarding "residential areas with healthy surroundings," Mrs. Pendleton noted that in the past tenement housing was constructed near pollution sources.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that zoning ordinances are designed to give consideration to the provision of adequate light, air, access, safety; reduce congestion on public streets; provide for a convenient, attractive, harmonious community; provide adequate police and fire protection, water, sewer, transportation, schools, parks, forests, recreation, etc.; protect historic areas; protect against overcrowding of land with regard to public facilities; encourage economic development; preserve agricultural/forestral land; promote affordable housing; and protect groundwater and surface water.

Mrs. Pendleton noted that the Zoning Ordinance is contained in Chapter 25 of the County Code. She noted that there are three main types of land use cases heard by the

County—rezonings, special exception permits, and variances. She stated that information considered during rezoning requests includes conformance with the comp plan, traffic, noise, availability of public utilities, and character of surrounding properties.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that the County may accept voluntary “proffered” conditions on rezoning requests but they must be in writing and submitted to the Development Services staff prior to the Board of Supervisors’ public hearing. She noted that once accepted, the conditions become part of the zoning of the property and are binding until a future zoning change is approved, but can be amended in the same manner as a rezoning request. Mrs. Pendleton stated that a violation of a proffered condition is the same as a violation of the zoning ordinance and the Zoning Administrator can bring legal action against the landowner if the property is not in compliance with its proffered conditions. She noted that the County does not accept cash proffers.

After discussion, Mrs. Pendleton stated that upzoning is an increase in the intensity of development permitted on a parcel of land and downzoning is a reduction in the formerly permitted land use intensity or any action that reduces the permitted intensity of development by right. She further stated that spot zoning is considered valid if it serves an identifiable public interest.

Regarding special exception permits, she noted that the proposed use or structure must be listed as allowed with a SEP within a zoning district and the County can impose reasonable conditions to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on community or neighboring properties. Mrs. Pendleton noted that there are 37 different considerations in making decisions on special exception requests including consistency with the comp plan; fire hazards, noise, light, landscaping; preservation of natural, scenic, historic areas; timing and phasing, storage, open space; traffic; effects on water, availability of public facilities, utilities, and services; compatibility with adjacent properties, etc.

Mrs. Pendleton noted that variance requests are heard by the Board of Zoning Appeals. She noted that variances are reasonable deviations from provisions that regulate size or area of a lot or size, area, bulk or location of a building or structure when strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would result in unnecessary or unreasonable hardship to the owner, the need is not shared generally by other properties, and the matter cannot be remedied by rezoning or conditional zoning.

Mrs. Pendleton then reviewed the rezoning/SEP submittal process. She noted that a property owner completes the application, submits it to staff for review and report, and a public hearing notice containing a descriptive summary of the proposal, its location, date/time/location of the hearing, and the location where information can be reviewed by the public is then drafted and advertised for once a week for two successive weeks. She noted that the Code of Virginia is very detailed about what information is required to be included in the public hearing notice.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that staff then notifies the adjacent landowners of the proposed hearing, its purpose, and the date/time/location of the hearing. She stated that a public hearing is then held by the Planning Commission and a recommendation is made to the Board of Supervisors which has final approval of the request. She further stated that an applicant can appeal the Supervisors’ decision to the Circuit Court. Mrs. Pendleton stated that the Development Services website contains a significant amount of information on zoning and the application process.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mrs. Pendleton stated that on average it takes approximately two months from the time the staff receives a rezoning/SEP application and declares it complete before the Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors public hearings are held.

Mrs. Pendleton noted that the Planning Commission also conducts hearings on proposed text amendments to the Zoning and Subdivision ordinances. She noted that amendments to these ordinances may be initiated by the Board, by resolution, or by the Planning Commission by motion whenever public necessity, convenience, general welfare, or good zoning practice requires.

Regarding enforcement of zoning violations, Mrs. Pendleton stated that she, as Zoning Administrator, has 90 days to investigate and make a determination on a citizen's zoning-related complaint. She further stated that, if a property owner fails to comply with proffered conditions attached to their rezoning request, it may result in denial of their building permit or certificate of occupancy.

She noted that types of zoning violations include inoperable vehicles, trash, illegal home occupations, animals (dogs, chickens or livestock), building without a permit or in the floodplain/floodway, signs, parking tractor-trailers in residential areas, etc. Mrs. Pendleton stated that notifications to property owners regarding zoning violations require 30 days for the matter to be appealed to the BZA and, if the illegal use is not ceased within the time stated in the notice, she can institute further action such as an injunction, mandamus, abatement, or other legal action including a court summons. She noted that zoning violations are considered misdemeanors and the owner can be fined up to \$1,000 by the court.

After questioning by Mr. Leffel as to what a citizen can do if their neighbor has trash/junk on their property, Mrs. Pendleton stated that she will cover that situation shortly.

Mrs. Pendleton noted that items not considered zoning violations include civil matters, e.g., covenants and restrictions, trees on adjoining properties, fence placement; VDoT issues, erosion and sediment control issues (clearing and grading); and stormwater complaints. She further noted that the staff does talk to property owners if they have problems to try to alleviate the issue/concern as not everything can be regulated by the Zoning Ordinance. She then reviewed a flow chart of the enforcement process.

After discussion, Mrs. Pendleton stated that the Development Services Office has a database of citizen calls/complaints received and the staff works with the Sheriff's Department on complaints received. She stated that, if a citizen contacts a Board member with a complaint about a trash pile on their neighbor's property, the Board member is requested to forward the citizen's contact information to the Development Services Office or ask the citizen to call the office directly. Mrs. Pendleton noted that the staff will process the complaint, conduct a site visit, and, if necessary, send a courtesy notice to the landowner regarding the complaint filed and directing the owner to clean up/bring the property into compliance within 30 days. She stated that staff will conduct a follow-up site visit after the 30 day period and, if necessary, send a notice of zoning violation.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that the office receives an average of six complaints per month; however, the actual violations are usually less than this number. She noted that the number of violations is cyclical. Mrs. Pendleton further noted that the staff has to provide that a violation exists (law of evidence) in the event that the matter is taken to court and, with the appeal and court process, the timeline for these violations to be resolved can be years.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that the Planning/Zoning staff have other duties including review and approval of building permits, subdivision plats, boundary line adjustments, street/right-of-way vacations, site plans, business licenses and home occupations, sign permits, FEMA letters of map amendment, Commission Permits, zoning determinations and verifications, text amendment research, floodplain inquiries, VDoT street acceptance/review, letters of credit/bonds, etc. She further noted that new site plans have to be completed by property owners whenever there is a change of use on a parcel of land.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mrs. Dillon noted that mandamus is “the court’s power to tell you what to do—to make you do something.”

Mrs. Pendleton thanked the Board for allowing her to make this presentation.

Mrs. Guzi noted that if the Board has any questions regarding this presentation to contact the Planning/Zoning staff or herself.

Dr. Scothorn thanked Mrs. Dillon and Mrs. Pendleton for their work on this presentation.

On motion by Mr. Dodson, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board went into closed session at 3:45 P. M. to discuss or consider the disposition of publicly held real property, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body; discuss a prospective business or industry not previously announced; consideration of the investment of public funds where competition or bargaining is involved, where, if made public initially, the financial interest of the governmental unit would be adversely affected; and discussion or consideration of the investment of public funds for potential extension of fiber optic lines, where competition or bargaining is involved, where, if made public initially, the financial interest of the governmental unit would be adversely affected as per Section 2.2-3711A (3), (5), and (6) of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended. (Resolution Number 14-07-10)

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 6:01 P. M.

On motion by Mr. Dodson, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board returned to regular session from closed session and adopted the following resolution by roll call vote: (Resolution Number 14-07-11)

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None

BE IT RESOLVED, that to the best of the Board members’ knowledge only public business matters lawfully exempt from open meeting requirements and only such matters as were identified in the motion to go into Closed Session were heard, discussed or considered during the Closed Session.

A public hearing was then held on a request in the Amsterdam Magisterial District from Loretta R. Ikenberry and Ikenberry Family, LLC, for an amendment of the proffered conditions in the Business B-2 Use District to remove proffer #4 related to substantial conformity to a concept plan dated December 16, 1998, in order to relocate a 50-foot wide, non-exclusive right-of-way, and to remove the requirements to build a home and farm retail store as shown on the concept plan on property located at 2257 Roanoke Road, Daleville, approximately 0.2 miles north of the

Roanoke Road (U. S. Route 220)/ Glebe Road (State Route 675) intersection, identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 88, Parcels 25 and 25B.

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

Mr. Jeff Busby, County Planner, stated that Mrs. Loretta Ikenberry and Ms. Gwen Ikenberry were present regarding this request. He noted that the applicants are requesting to remove the following proffered condition from their January 1999 rezoning request—"Project will be developed in substantial conformity with the concept plan dated December 16, 1998." Mr. Busby noted that this 1999 request was to rezone a total of 2.85 acres from Agricultural A-1 to Business B-2 for retail sales in a section of the existing packing house on the Ikenberry Orchard's property north of Daleville.

Mr. Busby noted that the concept plan for the rezoning included a 50' non-exclusive right-of-way south of the existing packing house which was proposed to be used as an emergency access off of Route 220 to The Glebe retirement facility located behind the Ikenberry property. He noted that in 2002 The Glebe obtained approval from the Board to relocate the access road to its current location north of the Ikenberry Orchards store. Mr. Busby further stated that the 1999 concept plan also included a proposed home and farm retail store and the Ikenberrys would like to remove this requirement as well.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, the applicants stated that they had no additional information to add to Mr. Busby's presentation.

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

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Dodson, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the request in the Amsterdam Magisterial District from Loretta R. Ikenberry and Ikenberry Family, LLC, for an amendment of the proffered conditions in the Business B-2 Use District to remove proffer #4 related to substantial conformity to a concept plan dated December 16, 1998, in order to relocate a 50-foot wide, non-exclusive right-of-way, and to remove the requirements to build a home and farm retail store as shown on the concept plan on property located at 2257 Roanoke Road, Daleville, approximately 0.2 miles north of the Roanoke Road (U. S. Route 220)/Glebe Road (State Route 675) intersection, identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 88, Parcels 25 and 25B. (Resolution Number 14-07-12)

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the meeting was adjourned at 6:08 P. M. (Resolution Number 14-07-13)

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Williamson

ABSTAINING: None