

AGENDA
BEDFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
FEBRUARY 28, 2005

Due to inclement weather, the regularly scheduled meeting of the Bedford County Board of Supervisors for Monday, February 28, 2005 at 5:00 p.m. has been postponed and has been rescheduled for Monday, March 7, 2005 at 5:00 p.m. per Section 15.2-1416 of the Code of Virginia.

5:00 P.M. BOARD WORK SESSION

- a. Call To Order
 (1) FY 2005-06 Draft Budget Presentation

7:00 P.M. Dinner

7:30 P.M. WELCOME

- a. Moment of Silence
 b. Pledge of Allegiance
 (1) APPROVAL OF AGENDA
 (2) APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
 (3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 14, 2005
 (4) FIFTEEN MINUTE CITIZEN COMMENT PERIOD
 (For Items On This Agenda That Have Not Been Addressed At A Public Hearing)
 (5) PUBLIC HEARINGS/PUBLIC APPEARANCES
 a. Public Hearing To Amend and Adopt Changes To The Zoning Ordinance
 b. Public Hearing For A Special Use Permit; Bedford County PSA; Moneta WWTP
 c. Public Hearing - Request to Authorize The Interim County Administrator To Execute The Agreement With The Bedford County Public Service Authority
 d. Public Appearance – Harry Lantz, Citizen, With Comments Regarding The County Attorney And The Administration Building, and The Director Of Fire And Rescue And Montvale Rescue
 e. ~~Public Appearance – Nanci Drake, Director Of Tourism, To Present The Board With The Repayment Of Monies For The Welcome Signs~~ *cancelled*
 (6) ACTION ITEMS
 a. ~~Presentation Of A Resolution In Honor Of The 250th Anniversary Committee~~
 • ~~Staff Presentation: Bill Hoy~~ *cancelled*
 b. Request To Authorize The Interim County Administrator To Execute An Annual Maintenance Contract With Trane For Up To \$70,674
 • *Staff Presentation: Kathleen D. Guzi*
 c. Request For The Board's Support Of An 'All-American Road' Resolution
 • *Staff Presentation: Kathleen D. Guzi*
 d. Resolution Of Support For A State Transportation Planning Grant For Region 2000
 • *Staff Presentation: Kathleen D. Guzi*
 e. Request For Proposal For Reassessment Services Jointly With The City Of Bedford.
 • *Staff Presentation: Kathleen D. Guzi*
 f. Request For Transfer From Contingency Fund To Purchase Mobile Office For Fire And Rescue
 • *Staff Presentation: Kathleen D. Guzi*
 g. Request From VDOT For The Bedford County Board Of Supervisors To Reaffirm Their Support Of The Reconstruction Of That Portion Of State Route 811, Thomas Jefferson Road Between 0.21 Mile North Of Route 661 Bateman Bridge Road And 0.15 Mile South Of Route 622 North Everett Road
 • *Staff Presentation: Kathleen D. Guzi*

- h. **Closed Session Pursuant To Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711 (A) (1) To Discuss Personnel Matters; Specifically, Hiring A County Administrator.**

(7) BOARD COMMENTS, COMMITTEE REPORTS, REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. **Bedford Public Library System Board Of Trustees Meeting Minutes - February 8, 2004**
- b. **Bedford Public Library System Board Of Directors Meeting Minutes – December 14, 2004 and January 11, 2005**
- c. **Bedford County Planning Commission Meeting Minutes – January 3, 2005 and January 18, 2005**
- d. **Bedford County Board Of Zoning Appeals Meeting Minutes – January 18, 2004**
- e. **Building And Grounds Committee – *Information to follow***

(8) APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

(9) COUNTY ATTORNEY REPORTS, REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(10) COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORTS, REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. **Information Item – Results Of The Speed Study On Route 122 and Route 735**
- b. **Information Item – Bedford County Solid Waste Management Facilities Compliance Inspections, Permits 560, PBR 031 And 030**
- c. **Information Item – Permits Issued In January**

(11) PENDING MATTERS

(12) UPCOMING MEETINGS

- **March 3, 2005 – 1st Quarterly Joint Meeting with School Board at BSTC (Thursday)**
- **March 7, 2005 – Budget Work Session (Dinner with Extension Office at 6:00 PM)**
- **March 14, 2005 – Regular Meeting (Budget Work Session 5:00 – 7:00 PM)**

*Items added at meeting

Board of Supervisors:

Dale Wheeler - Dist. 1, Charles Neudorfer - Dist. 2, Roger W. Cheek, Chairman – Dist. 3, Bobby G. Pollard – Dist. 6, and Gary M. Lowry, Vice-Chairman – Dist. 7

Absent:

Robert L. Bashore – Dist. 4 and Steve Arrington – Dist. 5

Staff Present:

Kathleen Guzi, Carl Boggess, Tommy Mason, Susan Crawford, Bob Gerndt and Brigitte Petersen

5:00 P.M. BOARD WORK SESSION

Chairman Cheek called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone.

(1) Kathleen D. Guzi, Interim County Administrator, opened with an explanation of how the books containing the FY 2005-06 Draft Budget Presentation were organized. Mrs. Guzi briefly reviewed the Fund Balance Policy, the Investment Policy (for the Treasurer's office), the Re-appropriating Policy, the Supplemental Appropriation Policy, and the General Fixed Assets/Capitalization Policy.

Mrs. Guzi then gave the Board an overview of where Bedford County is with regard to our budget in comparison to our neighboring counties; especially tax rates and fees, as this is something the Board has control over. This is usually done with a County average, a City average and an "overall" average. Currently, our real estate tax rate and our decal rate are below the surrounding averages; we are slightly higher than average on the E911 tax. Bedford County is below average on the "effective rate" for personal property tax, and generally higher on machinery tools and landfill tipping fees. Figures for expenditures per Capita for Judicial Administration, Public Safety, Public Works, Health and Welfare, Educations, Recreation, Libraries and Cultural, Community Development are also available if needed.

Mrs. Guzi proceeded to go over the General Funds Summary, reiterating that the budget before the Board tonight was truly a draft and that it is normal at this point in the budget process to have expenditures in excess of revenues. She commented that the school request has not yet been reviewed by staff. Mrs. Guzi also stated that, while the school's budget request seems to only ask for \$700,000, the local share transfer for school funds is over \$33,000,000 that represented an increase of well over \$700,000. The big difference between what the school's budget shows and what our budget shows is in how the County accounts for carryover funds. When there are carryover funds as of June 30, the school is allowed to come back to the Board (as long as they have gotten the right revenue from the Feds and the Commonwealth as budgeted to support it) to request the money be re-appropriated – but only for one-time items, so the school's one-time operating funds are not built into the County's transfer of local fund dollars. The school has lumped all the local fund dollars together and treated them equally, which is not allowed, as leftover funds for one year may very well not happen again next year and so may not be built into the yearly budget request.

Mrs. Guzi further stated there are several major funds the Board appropriate to (which are listed in the budget draft) including School Textbooks and School Maintenance Projects.

Mrs. Guzi then quickly reviewed the summary sheets, which outlined Personal Services, Employee Benefits, Purchase Services, Contributions and Public Assistance, Reoccurring Charges, Supplies and Materials, Equipment and Improvements, Salary and Benefits, Operating Expenditures, Purchases of Equipment, Local Funding and Full-Time Personnel.

There followed a brief discussion between Mrs. Guzi and the Board members regarding options on how to arrange the budget information for future presentation. Several suggestions were made and will be taken into account when the final budget is presented for approval.

6:00 P.M. EXTENSION OFFICE DINNER AND ANNUAL REPORT

The Board of Supervisors and staff remained in open session and moved into the Main Floor Training Room for dinner and the Extension Office's annual report.

Board of Supervisors:

Dale Wheeler - Dist. 1, Charles Neudorfer - Dist. 2, Roger W. Cheek, Chairman – Dist. 3, Bobby G. Pollard – Dist. 6, and Gary M. Lowry, Vice-Chairman – Dist. 7

Absent:

Robert L. Bashore – Dist. 4 and Steve Arrington – Dist. 5

Staff Present:

Kathleen D. Guzi, Carl Boggess, Tommy Mason, Sue Montgomery, Willie Jones, Brian Keyes, Johnnie Roark and Brigitte Petersen

7:30 P.M. Board Meeting

Chairman Cheek welcomed everyone to the meeting, a moment of silence was held and the Pledge of Allegiance was said.

Chairman Cheek noted the following additions to the agenda:

- Public Appearance Item 5e has been removed from the agenda.
- Action Item 6a has been removed from the agenda; it has been replaced with a Request to Authorize the Interim County Administrator to execute a contract with Verizon Virginia.
- Action Item 6i regarding FY2005-2006 Revenue Road Sharing Fund has been added to the agenda.
- "Litigation" has been added to Action Item 6h (Closed Session)
- "Rotation of Chairmanship" policy has been added to the County Attorney's Reports

(1) Supervisor Neudorfer made a motion to approve the agenda as amended.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry
 Voting no: None
 Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington
 Adopted Unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA
BEDFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
FEBRUARY 28, 2005

ITEM 1 RESOLUTIONS/MOTIONS

- a. Consideration Of A Request Authorizing The Sheriff To Submit A Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant In The Amount Of \$14,736.10 To The U.S. Department Of Justice For FY 2005-2006
- b. Consideration Of A Request To Advertise For A Public Hearing – Animal Ordinance “No Dogs Running At Large”
- c. Consideration Of A Request By VDOT To Add Streets To The Secondary System Of State Highways
- d. Consideration Of A Request To Advertise A Request For Proposal For Health Insurance Benefits For All Employees On The County’s Health Insurance Plan

ACTION: Approve resolutions/motions as presented.

- (2) Supervisor Pollard made a motion to approve the consent agenda as presented.**
 Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry
 Voting no: None
 Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington
 Adopted Unanimously.

(3) Corrections to the minutes for February 14, 2005, were as follows:

- In the minutes for February 14, 2005, the year was incorrect in the amendments (in the minutes for January 10th – this has been corrected to show the year as 2005). Also, the spelling of ‘Realty’ has been corrected, and in paragraph 7 of item 1 (in the work session) the second sentence should read “*Mrs. Guzi answered that the Board authorized up to \$2.6 million and another \$100,000 is needed to cover debt issuance costs*”.

Supervisor Pollard made a motion to approve the minutes for February 14, 2005 as corrected.

Voting yes: Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry
 Voting no: None
 Abstained: Mr. Lowry and Mr. Wheeler
 Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington
 Adopted.

(4) FIFTEEN MINUTE CITIZEN COMMENT PERIOD

- There were no citizens desiring to speak.

(5) PUBLIC HEARINGS/PUBLIC APPEARANCES

(5a) Johnnie Roark, Planner, appeared before the Board with recommended changes to the Zoning Ordinance. On January 18, 2005, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance. After the public hearing, the Planning Commission reviewed the public testimony and discussed each proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment. The Planning Commission recommended approval on ten of the eleven proposed amendments and postponed action on one of the amendments (Wheatland Road Area) until its February 7, 2005, meeting to review information provided

by the public at the public hearing and to give the joint industrial development authority time to review the proposed rezoning area. On February 7, 2005 the Planning Commission recommended to not move forward with the Wheatland Road Area rezoning based on the comments from the joint industrial development authority.

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND READOPT THE BEDFORD COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE BY CHANGING THE ZONING DISTRICT DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN AREAS ON THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP AND BY REVISING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AS DESCRIBED IN THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPHS

BE IT HEREBY ORDAINED, that the Bedford County Zoning Ordinance is hereby amended and readopted by changing the zoning district designation of certain areas on the Official Zoning Map and by revising certain provisions of the Zoning Ordinance text as described as follows:

Map Amendments

Bell Property

Parcel 86-5-1, a portion designated C-2, General Commercial District, located in Election District 6 on West Lynchburg Salem Highway near Montvale, shall be redesignated AV, Agricultural Village Center District, as shown on the proposed official Zoning Map.

Owens Market Area

Parcels 152-A-2A & 152-A-37 (north of Route 460) designated partially R-1, Low Density Residential District, located in Election District 3 north of Route 460 in the area generally known as Owens Market, shall be redesignated AV, Agricultural Village Center District, as shown on the proposed official Zoning Map.

Text Amendments

Section 30-94, Exterior Lighting, amend section to read as follows:

- A) The following exterior lighting standards shall apply to all uses and developments requiring a site development plan pursuant to Sec. 30-90 of this ordinance.
1. All exterior lighting fixtures shall be designed, located, and arranged so as not to direct glare on adjoining streets or residential properties. The intensity at adjoining streets or residential properties shall not exceed 0.5 foot candles.
 2. All lighting fixtures on canopy structures shall be recessed.
 3. Standard NEMA dusk-to-dawn lights shall be installed with a shield. Shields shall also be installed on street lights, lights in parking lots, and on any lighting in residential areas. Any other lighting type shall be approved by the zoning administrator.
 4. Parking lot light poles, canopy structures, and other similar structures in commercial and industrial areas shall not exceed 25' in height.
- (B) All exterior lighting fixtures within residential zoning districts shall be designed, located, and arranged so as not to direct glare on adjoining streets or residential properties. The lighting intensity at adjoining residential properties shall not exceed 0.5 foot candles.

Section 30-90-3 (E), Administrative Procedures and Requirements, amend section to read as follows:

- (E) Comments offered by the director of planning or his/her agent on a proposed site development plan shall remain effective for a period of six (6) months from the date of issuance. After this period, the comments and the site development plan shall become void unless substantial progress has been made by the developer to address the comments.

Section 30-82-5 (C), Manufactured Home, amend section to read as follows:

- (C) Additional standards in R-1 and R-2 districts:

Intent – The intent of this section is to allow manufactured homes in areas that were originally developed for manufactured housing but are now zoned R-1 or R-2. This section is not intended to allow for the expansion of these areas but to allow for infill development.

1. The zoning administrator may be authorized to allow manufactured homes in R-1 and R-2 districts if the following standards and guidelines are met:
 - a. Seventy percent (70%) of the homes in the surrounding area are manufactured homes or manufactured homes (Class A).
 - b. Fifty percent (50%) of the parcels in the surrounding area have functioning housing units on them.

- c. Surrounding areas for (a) and (b) above shall be defined as a platted subdivision containing 25 lots or more or an area encompassing 1,500 feet from each property line, as determined by the zoning administrator.
2. Prior to allowing a manufactured home, the zoning administrator shall give all property owners in the surrounding area written notice of the request, and an opportunity to respond to the request within 21 days of the date of notice. If any property owner in the surrounding area objects to said request in writing within the time specified above, the request shall be transferred to the board of zoning appeals for decision. The person filing the appeal shall be responsible for all required application and legal ad costs.
 3. The zoning administrator or board of zoning appeals shall be authorized to place conditions on the approval of the manufactured home. These conditions may include: building design considerations (pitch of roof, permanent foundation, etc.); and screening and landscaping requirements to reduce any impacts on adjacent properties.

Section 30-82-7 (C), Manufactured Home, Class A, amend section to read as follows:

(C) Additional standards in R-1 district:

Intent – The intent of this section is to allow manufactured homes (Class A) in areas that were originally developed for manufactured housing but are now zoned R-1. This section is not intended to allow for the expansion of these areas but to allow for infill development.

1. The zoning administrator may be authorized to allow manufactured homes (Class A) in an R-1 district if the following standards and guidelines are met:
 - a. Seventy percent (70%) of the homes in the surrounding area are manufactured homes or manufactured homes (Class A).
 - b. Fifty percent (50%) of the parcels in the surrounding area have functioning housing units on them.
 - c. Surrounding areas for (a) and (b) above shall be defined as a platted subdivision containing 25 lots or more or an area encompassing 1,500 feet from each property line, as determined by the zoning administrator.
2. Prior to allowing a manufactured home (Class A), the zoning administrator shall give all property owners in the surrounding area written notice of the request, and an opportunity to respond to the request within 21 days of the date of notice. If any property owner in the surrounding area objects to said request in writing within the time specified above, the request shall be transferred to the board of zoning appeals for decision. The person filing the appeal shall be responsible for all required application and legal ad costs.
3. The zoning administrator or board of zoning appeals shall be authorized to place conditions on the approval of the manufactured home (Class A). These conditions may include: building design considerations (pitch of roof, permanent foundation, etc.); and screening and landscaping requirements to reduce any impacts on adjacent properties.

Section 30-23-2 (H), Nonconforming Uses of Buildings, Structures or Land

(H) Notwithstanding (A) through (G) above, a nonconforming manufactured home existing on an individual lot of record that has served as an active dwelling for at least 6 months may be replaced with another manufactured home provided:

1. The replacement home is installed on the lot within two years of the removal of the home to be replaced;
2. The replacement home is installed in approximately the same location on the lot, or is installed to comply with the setback regulations for principal structures;
3. The installation of the replacement home complies with the Use and Design standards for manufactured homes contained in Article IV.

Section 30-83-12 (A), Utility Services, Major, amend section to read as follows:

A) General standards:

1. In considering an application for a special use permit, the planning commission and board of supervisors shall consider the justification for the location of the proposed utility service and any alternative locations which may be available.
2. The minimum lot size may be reduced as part of approval of the special use permit provided all setback and yard requirements are met and all other dimensional requirements are achieved.

3. The height limitation contained in each district may be increased as part of the approval of the special use permit, subject to any other height limitation contained in Article III.
4. No major utility service shall be located within 100 feet of an existing residence.
5. Except in the I-1 and I-2 districts, outdoor storage of materials and equipment, except during construction of the utility facility, shall be prohibited in association with a major utility service, unless specifically requested and approved as part of the special use permit. In the I-1 and I-2 districts outdoor storage areas shall comply with the screening provisions contained in Article V.
6. Buildings and facilities shall be designed and constructed to be compatible with the surrounding area, so that these facilities or structures will not adversely affect nearby properties.
7. Except in the I-1 and I-2 districts, Type E screening and buffering consistent with Article V of this Ordinance shall be required, unless specifically modified as a part of the approved special use permit.
8. All sewer and water utility services shall be publicly owned and operated by a government agency unless otherwise recommended by the Public Service Authority and approved by the board of supervisors.
9. Sewer and water utility services shall be designed with a service area and capacity consistent with the purposes of the respective zoning district and the recommendations of the comprehensive plan.

Section 30-79-2, Permitted Use Table, amend the Permitted Use Table to allow a laboratories as a use by right in the PID (Planned Industrial Development) zoning district.

Severability

Should any portion or provision of this ordinance be held by any court to be unconstitutional or invalid, that decision shall not affect the validity of the ordinance as a whole, or any part of the ordinance other than the part held to be unconstitutional or invalid.

Effective Date

This ordinance is effective upon adoption.

Supervisor Neudorfer pointed out that, with reference to the proposed text changes to Section 30-90-3(E) Administrative Procedures and Requirements, the State Code and County Code do not match; will this change correct this? Mr. Roark stated this change with still not match Bedford's code to the State's Code, but it will bring Bedford closer to approving plans that reflect the current line of thinking. Supervisor Neudorfer asked if it would be possible to change the text to bring it in line with the State Code. Mr. Roark replied we would need to go back to the Planning Commission and have them look at it, and perhaps have further changes in their next series of amendments to the text.

Mrs. Guzi interjected that when the Board first adopted the Zoning Ordinance, the sentiment was to have a fairly loose interpretation of the State requirements. We have seen over the years that this loose interpretation has caused some difficulties in administering the ordinance. The Planning Commission probably felt this would be a good step to really tighten our code up, but not go quite as far as to the full State Code. Mrs. Guzi stated the County Attorney has looked at the State Code with respect to how we interpret it, and this is the most restrictive we could implement.

Carl Boggess, County Attorney, added that this is more influenced by Supreme Court cases, etc. What can be done is to change the procedures, such as we are doing here, as to what makes something vested or not vested. For example, having something in the ordinance that says when something comes in it is not vested, but it is vested when it is approved. There a number of ways to do this and Attorney Boggess has already instructed some of the planners to review how other counties handle this in their ordinances. We could still pass this tonight with the intention of making additional changes to the text in the future.

Supervisor Lowry asked if, with regard to Section 30-30-100-16 Job Site Waste/Debris Container, would we require a container at every job site where any type of construction is taking place? Mr. Roark responded that this is exactly what the text of the ordinance says. Supervisor Lowry then asked if those

concerned would no longer be allowed to burn or bury the trash. Mr. Roark replied that under current air pollution regulations, burning at a job site is illegal. Attorney Boggess stated that if the waste is "clean material" (i.e. regular spruce wood) then it is permissible to burn it. However, if you have a mix of materials it cannot be burned, as certain materials such as pressure treated lumber, plastics, etc., are illegal to burn or bury.

Supervisor Wheeler asked how stumps are currently being disposed of. Mr. Roark replied they are not allowed to be buried. Supervisor Wheeler then asked if he were clearing a lot to build a home and the stumps go to the landfill, can he saw down the stumps can he keep the oak and other trees for firewood? Mr. Roark answered the ordinance did not apply to trees that would be used for firewood; rather, lumber used in the building of the home that may be treated, drywall, vinyl siding, etc., is what the ordinance would apply to.

The public hearing was opened; the following people were registered to speak: Helen Davis, in favor of Section 30-82-5 (C) Manufactured Homes of the ordinance; Linda Davis, in favor of Section 30-82-5 (C) Manufactured Homes of the ordinance; Erin Davis, in favor of Section 30-82-5 (C) Manufactured Homes of the ordinance; Mack Burgess, in favor of Section 30-82-5 (C) Manufactured Homes of the ordinance; Ken Tomlin, contractor, against Section 30-30-100-16 Job Site Waste/Debris Container of the ordinance; Daryl Gaylor, contractor, against Section 30-30-100-16 Job Site Waste/Debris Container of the ordinance. There being no one else desiring to speak, the public hearing was closed.

There followed a discussion among the Board members, with several members voicing their concern regarding Section 30-30-100-16 Job Site Waste/Debris Container of the ordinance. It was decided to pull this section out and send it back to the Planning Commission to rework the text changes.

After reviewing the public testimony, the public record, the Planning Commission's recommendation, and the goals and objectives of the County's Comprehensive Plan, Supervisor Pollard made a motion to remove text amendments for Section 30-30-100-16 regarding Job Site Waste/Debris Containers, and accept the remaining changes to the Zoning Ordinance, and to amend and readopt the Bedford County Zoning Ordinance by changing the zoning district designation of certain areas on the official Zoning Map and by revising certain provisions of the Zoning Ordinance text as described in the attached ordinance.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

Supervisor Wheeler made a motion to refer Section 30-30-100-16 Job Site Waste/Debris Container back to the Planning Commission for further deliberation.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

(5b) A public hearing was held on Special Use Permit #050007; Bedford County PSA; Moneta Waste Water Treatment Plant. Johnnie Roark, Planner, appeared before the Board, and reported that the Bedford County Public Service Authority is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow a wastewater treatment system (Utility Services, Major). The property owner is NBI Development, LLC, P.O. Box 138, Thaxton, VA 24174. The agent for the project is Bedford County Public Service Authority/Brian Key, 1723 Falling Creek Road, Bedford, VA 24523.

Mr. Roark reported that the request does not propose to change the existing zoning, but does request approval of a Special Use Permit to allow a wastewater treatment system. The existing land use is agricultural. The wastewater treatment facility is proposed to have an initial capacity of 500,000 GPD that can be readily expanded to 1,000,000 GPD. The Bedford County Public Service Authority will own the system. At a minimum a 200' buffer will be maintained between the facility and the property

boundaries upon final site development. The facility will consist of a lab building and all appurtenances necessary for treatment and will be enclosed within a chain link fenced area (400' X 400') that will be gated. The wastewater treatment facility will discharge into Hunting Creek, which is located along the southern boundary of the property. The creek will be approximately 500' from the wastewater treatment facility. The AV (Agricultural Village Center) District, R-1 (Low-Density Residential) and AR (Agricultural/Residential) site development regulations in Article III (Sections 30-36-3; 30-41-3 and 30-34-3) provide standards for all property zoned AV, R-1, and AR in Bedford County. Article IV, Use and Design Standards, Section 30-83-12 (Utility Services, Major), also applies.

Comprehensive Plan

The County's Comprehensive Plan (1988) contains several goals and objectives which are relative to this Special Use Permit. They include:

Land Use Goals:

- Develop orderly and harmonious growth and land use.
- Protect the individuals' right to use their property as they please as long as the use does not pose an environmental hazard and does not cause an undue burden on other property owners.

Land Use Objectives:

- Encourage orderly expansion in the high growth areas of Forest, Stewartsville and at Smith Mountain Lake.
- Direct growth to the rural service nodes and established communities in the county.
- Direct public services and facilities to area of desired growth and land use.

Environment Goal:

- Protect and preserve the environmental quality and natural resources of the county.

Environment Objectives:

- Prevent the degradation and enhance the water quality of rivers and streams.
- Guide development to areas that are topographically suitable and that are not subject to adverse soil conditions.
- Prevent visual eyesores and noise pollution which detract from the rural environment.

Economy Goal:

- Develop a diversified and environmentally compatible economy that will provide full, stable employment and increase the county tax base.

Economy Objectives:

- Attract industry to the county that will not substantially degrade the environment.
- Develop the economic base of the county to provide employment opportunities and expand the tax base of the county.

Community Facilities Goal:

- Develop adequate community facilities and services to meet existing and anticipated needs.

Community Facilities Objectives:

- Provide and expand water and sewer facilities in areas of high population density or to areas where well and septic tank use poses a health or environmental hazard to assure adequate and unpolluted surface and ground-water supplies for present and future generations.
- Plan ahead to install public water and sewer facilities in anticipation of and to direct development.

Mr. Roark briefly discussed environmental conditions, transportation, utilities, public facilities, and visual impacts.

Mr. Roark reported that the Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 18, 2005. The Planning Commission recommended approval (by a vote of 6-0) of the special use permit with the following conditions:

1. Sections 30-34, 30-36, 30-41 and 30-83-12 of the Bedford County Zoning Ordinance shall apply to the development of this project.

2. The site shall be developed in general conformance with the concept plan dated December 14, 2004, and prepared by Hurt and Proffitt, Inc.
3. A minimum 200' buffer will be maintained from the wastewater treatment facility to all property boundaries.
4. A vegetative buffer consisting of large evergreen trees shall be planted surrounding the perimeter of the wastewater treatment facility. Trees shall be planted 15' on center and be a minimum of five (5) feet at the time of planting.
5. The applicant shall comply with all local, state, and federal laws.

Brian Keys, from the Public Service Authority, then appeared before the Board with a PowerPoint presentation illustrating the needs for this treatment plant, as well as frequently asked questions that have either been phoned or emailed in, or were received at a public meeting the Public Service Authority held on February 3, 2005. Mr. Keys stated this project was for a new sewer system in the Moneta area, and is needed for immediate and anticipated future growth potential in that area. This project is intended to reduce the environmental impact and to encourage pump-out from both the service area and the entire Bedford County. It will also allow for septic to be treated locally instead of being sent to Lynchburg or Roanoke, and coincides with the current Comprehensive Plan outlines for major utility in this area. We will also be able to treat sewage from outside Bedford County for a premium rate.

The Public Service Authority will be both owner and operator of this project, and a proposal has been submitted by Moneta Resource Group to design and construct this plant.

Financing comes from both the Board-passed moral obligation support from the Capital Improvement Plan and from property developers in the area.

Questions that have been posed by the public to the Public Service Authority regarding this project are as follows:

Question: Why is this plant not being built at the Camp 24 site, which has already been identified as a feasible site?

Answer: While it is a feasible site, the site on Route 608 is being considered because the service area for this plant has been expanded, making Route 608 the better location. Using Camp 24 would cost an estimated \$6,000,000 more.

Question: Why is the PSA in such a hurry to complete this project?

Answer: This project has actually been discussed for a number of years, specifically with the Board of Supervisors since October of 2001. When we took on the VRA loan in 2002 we did not include this project because the Board of Supervisors simply did not have the ability to provide funding for every one of the projects the PSA would like to have done at that time. Since then, the development has really taken off in many areas of Bedford County, and the time is now right to take on the next round of projects – this is part of that next round.

Question: This is a great project – how quickly can we get it?

Answer: As soon as the regulatory agencies all approve the project, we will be able to move on the project and would like to finish by the end of 2006 or January of 2007.

Question: Why doesn't the PSA require developers to pay more or even all of the project costs?

Answer: This plant is not being constructed in favor of the developments; we are trying to stay ahead of the area growth and provide the service in advance. The Comprehensive Plan states "Water and sewer service should not be constantly playing catch-up to housing development, chasing the development, or being forced on the PSA in reaction to a water supply or ground water pollution problem. Utility service must perceive the development, directing it to particular areas in coordination with planned development patterns and other public services".

Question: Will the areas around the plant smell?

Answer: The PSA is working diligently to make sure the odor does stay on-site. Some of the things this process allows us to do is cover the basins.

Question: Will the plant be loud, and what about lights?

Answer: The PSA is spending a fair amount of time making sure the plant is as unobtrusive to the neighborhood as possible. Blowers used to be really loud, but there is a new design for a blower that is extremely quiet and this is the design we will use on the site. Lighting will be minimal, and kept at 25 feet or lower.

Question: What is going to happen with traffic in the area? Will it increase?

Answer: Per VDOT, with the exception of intersection work, there is not much in the way of any large-scale projects along the 122 Corridor being planned at this time. They will continue to evaluate traffic and if there is an increase from development, VDOT will react accordingly at that time.

Question: Where can I find more information about this project?

Answer: Our website at www.bcpsa.com contains all the information we have available about this project.

Mr. Keys stated this project will enhance the property values in the area and will help promote sustainable growth. This plant would protect the environment by having one plant instead of multiple sites discharging into creeks and streams nearby; there will be no discharge flowing into Smith Mountain Lake.

The public hearing was opened; there being no one desiring to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Supervisor Neudorfer commented that this would affect his district, District 2, most directly and he has sat in on the Planning Commission meetings, the public meetings and his own meeting, and he has heard quite a number of comments from people who have real questions and concerns about this project. He has referred a lot of the questions to the PSA, some of which were discussed here tonight. Mr. Neudorfer feels there is never going to be a unanimous agreement to put this project in place, and he believes there is also a considerable amount of opinion in favor of the project. He feels this is a valuable project for the area as well as the County.

After reviewing the public testimony, the public record, the Planning Commission's recommendation, the goals and objectives of the County's Comprehensive Plan, and Section 30-3 of the County's Zoning Ordinance, Supervisor Neudorfer made a motion to approve Special Use Permit Application SU050007, Bedford County PSA, Moneta Wastewater Treatment Plant, with the following conditions:

1. **Sections 30-34, 30-36 30-41, and 30-83-12 of the Bedford County Zoning Ordinance shall apply to the development of this project.**
2. **The site shall be developed in general conformance with the concept plan dated December 14, 2004, and prepared by Hurt and Proffitt, Inc.**
3. **A minimum 200' buffer will be maintained from the wastewater treatment facility to all property boundaries.**
4. **A vegetative buffer consisting of large evergreen trees shall be planted surrounding the perimeter of the wastewater treatment facility. Trees shall be planted 15' on center and be a minimum of five (5) feet at the time of planting.**
5. **The applicant shall comply with all local, state, and federal laws.**

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

(5c) Carl Boggess, County Attorney, appeared before the Board and stated that at the February 14th meeting, the Board authorized the advertisement for a public hearing to grant an easement to the Bedford County Public Service Authority; specifically, the Public Service Authority is requesting from the County of Bedford, an easement for a sewer line to traverse across the property of the County acquired from Northcote Farm Company; this land is adjacent to the New London Business & Technology Center. Maps showing the requested easements were given to the Board in their agenda packets.

There followed a brief discussion between the Board and Attorney Boggess.

The public hearing was opened; there being no one desiring to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Supervisor Lowry made a motion authorizing the Interim County Administrator to execute the agreement with the Bedford County Public Service Authority to grant an easement for sewer lines to traverse across the property of the County of Bedford, as described in the agreement and plats that are attached.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

(5d) Harry Lantz, citizen, appeared before the Board, to discuss public access to the County Administration Building.

(5e) ~~Public Appearance by Nanci Drake, Director of Tourism~~ **cancelled**

(6) ACTION ITEMS

(6a) ~~Presentation of a resolution by Bill Hoy, Public Information Officer~~ **Cancelled and replaced with a request to authorize the Interim County Administrator to execute a contract with Verizon Virginia.**

Carl Boggess, County Attorney, appeared before the Board and stated this item has been ongoing since 2003. The County of Bedford entered into a lease in 1994 with Bell Atlantic for the 9-1-1 enhanced telecommunications equipment. This lease has been amended several times through the years, the most recent being the lease entered into in February of 2001. In August of 2003, the Communications Center was struck by lightning, which disabled one of the Center's servers and some other related equipment. The County has settled with our insurance carrier; however, we have not been able to come to terms with Verizon. Verizon will not install any new equipment nor renew our maintenance agreement unless there is a complete audit of all of the communications equipment in the Center. Under their terms, the audit must be performed by the manufacturer of the equipment. The cost of the audit is \$24,650.00.

The cost of the new server, some cards and miscellaneous equipment is \$23,500.00. This price includes maintenance on the system for 12 months. When Mr. Boggess discussed the contract with our contract with our Verizon representative, Debbie Lilley, on Wednesday, she stated that Verizon would further have performed a separate audit of our facility as to grounding, etc., at no additional cost.

In Mr. Boggess' conversation with the Interim County Administrator, they felt very handicapped in the short-term realm as Verizon owns the equipment and the County is at their mercy to repair the equipment should it fail, since there is no maintenance contract in place and the Center needs the replacement server for proper operations. Attorney Boggess reluctantly recommended that the County accept Verizon's terms. He does not feel the County and the Dispatch Center Board needs to be immediately commenced, addressing our mid-range goals as to whether it is in our best interest to own the communications equipment, what is on the horizon as to new technology, do we need to hire a consultant to steer us through the process, and a myriad of other issues.

Attorney Boggess said this is a situation he is not pleased with what he has to report, but at the same time he is not sure he knows of any better solution, at least in the short-term.

Kathleen D. Guzi, Interim County Administrator, commented that this is an issue the Dispatch Board has grappled with for quite some time. They have tried to reach a different solution with no success. It is important to note the City of Bedford shares in this cost, as it is a joint 911 center.

There followed a brief discussion between the Board members, the County Attorney and the Interim County Administrator. The general consensus of the Board is that Verizon is taking advantage of our situation; the Board is hopeful we will be able to find a new source for service and equipment as soon

as possible, and have decided to table this item, to be revisited at the next Board meeting. The Board also requested a Verizon Representative appear at a regular meeting to clarify these issues for them. Attorney Boggess will, in the interim, meet with Verizon to share the Board's concerns and seek clarification on the terms of the contract.

(6b) Kathleen D. Guzi, Interim County Administrator, appeared before the Board to request authorization to award the HVAC contract to Trane. Staff has managed the compilation of a 20-year HVAC equipment replacement schedule showing that Bedford County now owns and operates greater than \$4.5 million dollars worth of heating and cooling equipment. The Board authorized the advertisement of a Request for Proposals for HVAC services at their meeting on October 25, 2004.

Submitted proposal information was reviewed by the Building & Grounds Committee on December 1, 2004 and staff was asked to get additional information. Complete cost information was reviewed by the Building & Grounds Committee on February 9, 2005, and based on that review, it's recommended that a contract be awarded to Trane. The contract has an initial term of 5 years with two (2) 2-year option periods. Annual inflationary adjustments are allowed in the proposed contract but other contract additions (i.e., Health Department, Garage, etc.) will be presented to the Board for future consideration.

Supervisor Neudorfer made a motion authorizing the Interim County Administrator to execute an annual maintenance contract with Trane for up to \$70,674 beginning March 1, 2005 subject to the approval of the contract language by the County Attorney.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

(6c) Kathleen D. Guzi, Interim County Administrator, appeared before the Board with a resolution for supporting an 'All American Road' designation. The Blue Ridge Parkway has been working with representatives of many government agencies and tourism organizations to earn All-American Road designation for the Blue Ridge Parkway. All-American Road is the highest designation of the National Scenic Byways program of the Federal Highway Administration. Besides the prestige that follows designation, the Blue Ridge Parkway would be featured on the National Scenic Byways Map should the designation be granted.

Supervisor Pollard moved to adopt the Resolution supporting the designation of the Blue Ridge Parkway as an All-American Road under the National Scenic Byways Program.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

(6d) Kathleen D. Guzi, Interim County Administrator, appeared before the Board with a request from Region 2000 for the Board of Supervisors support for a State Transportation Planning Grant. During the last General Assembly session, \$1.6 million dollars was allocated for intensive planning grants that are eligible for planning district commissions, in our case Region 2000, to apply for. It will involve no money on the County's part – the dues that Bedford pays into Region 2000 will cover any local match that is needed. Mrs. Guzi stated it really gives us more of a detailed implementation plan of future transportation needs, and everyone in the Region is supportive of this, as we really do not do enough transportation planning. When Dr. Bashore and Mrs. Guzi served with Region 2000, they learned there are some major transportation issues. The more planning we do now, the better set we will be in the future to deal with these issues.

Supervisor Pollard stated that while he does not mind supporting this as a grant, he wanted to emphasize the MPO Region Commission only represents a small area of Bedford County. Mr. Pollard

feels that since we are located between two regions we should form our own (region). Mrs. Guzi replied there has been talk about trying to get our own designation as an MPO because we are torn between Roanoke and Lynchburg, but at this point the funding will only come down to recognized PDC's. Mrs. Guzi offered to contact Roanoke to see if they would be applying for one and pass a similar resolution of support if the Board wanted.

Supervisor Wheeler agreed with Mr. Pollard.

Mr. Pollard stated the Roanoke MPO has no plans currently for Bedford County.

There followed a brief discussion between the Interim County Administrator and the Board members.

Supervisor Lowry made the motion to support this resolution for a State Transportation Planning Grant for Region 2000.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

After the vote was taken, Mr. Pollard requested that staff investigate the possibility of Bedford County becoming its own Region before Region 2000's first meeting in April.

(6e) Kathleen Guzi, Interim County Administrator, appeared before the Board to ask for their consideration for a Request for Proposal for reassessment services. This is a joint RFP with the City of Bedford as was done four ago. This reassessment will be effective January 2007. A review team consisting of the Commissioners of the Revenue from both localities, two governing body members from localities, the City Manager and the County Administrator will review all proposals, interview prospective firms, negotiate draft contracts and make a recommendation to each respective governing body. Proposals will be received until April 15, 2005. It is anticipated that a recommendation will be presented to the governing bodies in June of this year for consideration. The RFP has been reviewed by the Tax Study Committee.

There followed a brief discussion between the Board members, Attorney Boggess and Mrs. Guzi regarding whether the contract should include a penalty clause. Attorney suggested discussing this with the companies that are eventually interviewed for this project. Mrs. Guzi recommended requiring the company who get the reassessment contract to appear before the Board on a quarterly basis to update the Board on their progress.

Supervisor Wheeler made a motion authorizing the advertising of the RFP for reassessment services with the City of Bedford.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

(6f) Kathleen D. Guzi, Interim County Administrator, appeared before the Board with a request for a Transfer from Contingency Fund to Purchase Mobile Office for Fire and Rescue At its December 13, 2004 meeting the Board approved leasing a mobile office for Fire & Rescue and authorized a transfer from the Contingency Fund for the delivery and set-up of the mobile office. At the Buildings & Grounds Committee meeting on February 9, 2005, further purchase/lease options were discussed. It is the Committee's recommendation that the mobile be purchased. A transfer from the Contingency Fund in the amount of \$30,000 will be needed to fund the recommendation.

This is the same unit the Solid Waste department used during the construction of their new office. The unit is in very good condition, and would provide a good return on the County's investment.

Supervisor Pollard asked if Fire and Rescue was being moved into the mobile unit because the space is needed in the County Administration Building. Mrs. Guzi replied that the Board has authorized the start-up of a purchase order system and a procurement office, and since we are maxed out on space

these positions have not been implemented. Our goal is to move at least some of the Fire and Rescue offices currently housed in the County Administration Building moved as soon as possible so we may then get procurement and purchasing started, which will in the long run save both County dollars and staff time.

Mrs. Guzi further stated that if the County were to lease this unit for three years, the cost would be the same as buying it now. She anticipates needing the mobile unit more than three years, so purchasing it is the most economical option.

Supervisor Neudorfer made a motion to approve a TRANSFER from the Contingency Fund in the amount of \$30,000 to Department 4320, General Properties.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

(6g) Kathleen D. Guzi, Interim County Administrator, appeared before the Board with VDOT's request for the Board to reaffirm the Board of Supervisors support of the reconstruction of that portion of state Route 811, Thomas Jefferson Road between 0.21 mile north of Route 661 Bateman Bridge Road and 0.15 mile south of Route 622 north Everett Road. The design public hearing was held by VDOT in December 2004. Mrs. Guzi stated the Board was being asked to reaffirm their support because the first resolution included support of a bike path; VDOT's regulations have changed and they do not want the bike path in the same resolution as the road, making the first resolution null and void.

Supervisor Wheeler made a motion to reaffirm the Board of Supervisors support of the reconstruction of that portion of state Route 811, Thomas Jefferson Road Between 0.21 mile north of Route 661 Bateman Bridge Road and 0.15 mile south of Route 622 north Everett Road.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

Supervisor Pollard suggest the Board hear item 6i prior to the closed session. The Board concurred.

(6i) Kathleen D. Guzi, Interim County Administrator, appeared before the Board with a request from VDOT for our participation in the Revenue Sharing Program for Fiscal Year 2005-2006. Mrs. Guzi stated that in the past the Board has participated in the Revenue Sharing Road Fund Project up to the total amount that is allowed. This year that amount is \$500,000.00. The projects that we have identified are the New London Academy turn lane issues, and the Perryville Road turn lane issues. This also assists those citizens who would like to upgrade their roads with half their own money and half state funding.

There followed a brief discussion between Mrs. Guzi and the Board members.

Supervisor Neudorfer made a motion to participate in the FY2005-2006 Revenue Sharing Program offered by VDOT and authorizes the Interim County Administrator to forward the appropriate letter to VDOT indicating Bedford County's participation in the program.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

(6h) Closed Session Pursuant To Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711 (A) (1) To Discuss Personnel Matters; Specifically, Hiring A County Administrator.

Supervisor Lowry made a motion that the Board of Supervisors convene into Closed Session pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(1) and Section 2.2-3711 (A)(1) for consultation with Legal Counsel and briefings by staff members pertaining to actual or probable

litigation, where such consultation or briefings in open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the public body, and to discuss personnel matters; specifically, hiring a County Administrator.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

Supervisor Wheeler made a motion to go back into regular session.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

Supervisor Pollard made a motion that in accordance with Section 2.2-3712.D the Board certifies that to the best of each member's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under this chapter and only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed session was convened, were heard, discussed or considered in the closed session by the Board.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

(7) BOARD COMMENTS, COMMITTEE REPORTS, REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. The Board was given a copy of the meeting minutes for the Board of Directors of the Bedford Public Library System dated January 11, 2005.
- b. The Board was given a copy of the meeting minutes for the Board of Directors of the Bedford Public Library System dated December 14, 2004.
- c. The Board was given a copy of the meeting minutes for the Bedford County Planning Commission dated January 3, 2005.
- d. The Board was given a copy of the meeting minutes for the Bedford County Board of Zoning Appeals dated January 18, 2005.

(8) APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

- **Supervisor Wheeler made a motion to appoint Travis Williams to the Recreation Advisory Committee for District 1.**

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

(9) COUNTY ATTORNEY REPORTS, REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. Carl Boggess, County Attorney, presented a Rotation of the Chairmanship as requested earlier by the Board, for the Board's review. This new system would follow a rotation based on seniority of those who had not served as Chairman. Mr. Wheeler stated that he would like to leave the process the way it is. Mr. Pollard agreed with Mr. Lowry.

Mr. Lowry made a motion that this be tabled until all the Board members were present.

Voting yes: Mr. Cheek, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: Mr. Wheeler

Abstained: Mr. Pollard

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

(10) COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORTS, REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

a. Kathleen Guzi, Interim County Administrator, stated she had two items to briefly cover while Tommy Mason, Budget Analyst, handed out budget summary sheets to the Board. Mrs. Guzi comments that the Buildings and Grounds Committee was originally on the agenda, but when she spoke with the Committee (specifically regarding the cannery), they were still waiting on information from Mr. Bill Gillespie, Consultant, which will not be available until the next meeting.

Mr. Pollard made a motion to continue the meeting past 10:30 p.m.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

Mrs. Guzi continued that the first sheet of the budget summary show the dollar increases and the percentage increases. Overall, the budget is out of balance at this point by \$3.3 million dollars. The second budget sheet show fund transfers, which appears towards the end of the General Fund expenditures (the 9000 series). The increase in fund transfers is \$2.9 million dollars. School Operating is increasing by \$1.2 million, School Maintenance is increasing \$440,000, the Capital Improvement Plan is increasing by \$775,000, School Textbooks is increasing by \$470,000 and the Nursing Home is increasing by \$10,000. Prior to the next meeting on March 14th, Mrs. Guzi stated the Board will be given a summary of all the budget increases sort by dollar and percentage, as well as a budget funding comparison. Each of the increases will be categorized by what is mandated, what is an increase service, what is an actual purchase of equipment, what is additional personnel, etc.

Mrs. Guzi also briefly reviewed the Board's upcoming meeting.

There followed a brief discussion between Mrs. Guzi and the Board. Mr. Neudorfer asked that the Board be given specifics on what construction projects are on the horizon for Bedford County, and how much does the Board want to leave that is not borrowed for emergency situations.

b. The Board was given a copy of the results of VDOT's speed studies conducted on Route 122 and Route 735

c. The Board was given the results of the unannounced compliance inspections conducted at the Bedford County Solid Waste Management Facilities

d. The Board was given maps illustrating various permits issued in January 2005

(11) PENDING MATTERS

(12) UPCOMING MEETINGS

- March 3, 2005 – 1st Quarterly Joint Meeting with School Board at BSTC (Thursday)
- March 7, 2005 – Budget Work Session (Dinner with Extension Office at 6:00 PM)
- March 14, 2005 – Regular Meeting (Budget Work Session 5:00 – 7:00 PM)

Supervisor Neudorfer made the motion to adjourn the meeting.

Voting yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Cheek, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Neudorfer, and Mr. Lowry

Voting no: None

Absent: Dr. Bashore and Mr. Arrington

Adopted Unanimously.

Chairman Cheek adjourned the meeting at 10:36 p.m.

Chairman
