

June 26, 2014

Virginia:

AT A CONTINUED MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 4:00 p.m. in the General District Courtroom located on the third floor of the Nelson County Courthouse, Lovingston, Virginia.

Present: Allen M. Hale, East District Supervisor
Constance Brennan, Central District Supervisor – Chair
Thomas H. Bruguiera, Jr. West District Supervisor
Larry D. Saunders, South District Supervisor – Vice Chair
Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor
Stephen A. Carter, County Administrator
Susan Rorrer, Director of Information Systems
Stormy Hopkins, Planning and Zoning Secretary

Absent: Candice W. McGarry, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk

I. Call to Order

Ms. Brennan called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm, with all Supervisors present to establish a quorum.

II. Public Comments

Ms. Brennan opened the floor for public comments on any topic other than the pipeline; which she noted would be heard later in the meeting, and the following persons were recognized:

1. Donna Small, Nellysford

Ms. Small spoke in support of both Linda Russell and Philippa Proulx being reappointed to the Planning Commission.

2. Mark Rosenthal, 140 Magnolia Acres Lane

Mr. Rosenthal noted that he thought the Planning Commission as it was now was very functional and he spoke in support of leaving it intact.

3. David Jergens, 215 Rosewood Drive

Mr. Jergens noted that the Planning Commission has experienced service in Linda Russell who has been a dedicated servant for the past twelve years. He added that Ms. Brennan, the Central District Supervisor, recommended Ms. Russell, the incumbent. He noted she was a willing participant and should be reappointed for another four (4) year term.

III. Presentation – Blue Ridge Railway Trail (E. Harper)

Ms. Harper began by noting that the three (3) phases of the trail were now complete and consisted of 7 miles of trail that currently had no exit at the end of it.

Ms. Harper then presented a PowerPoint presentation photographically depicting the improvements that have been made during the three phases of construction on the trail from 1996-2014. She noted that the funding of the improvements were made through the combined efforts of Nelson and Amherst Counties that consisted of the following:

PHASE I

Architectural Services: Land Planning & Design Associates, Inc. –Bill Mechnick
Contractor: Keith Barber Construction Inc. Project Manager: Fred Boger
Completed: Piney River to Rose Mill
Funding: Enhancement Grant (VDOT)

PHASE II

Architectural Services: Land Planning & Design Associates, Inc. –Bill Mechnick
Contractor: Keith Barber Construction Inc. Project Manager: Fred Boger
Completed: 4 bridges -Enhancement Grant (VDOT)
Trail -Recreational Trail Fund (DCR)
Congressional Grant –Goodlatte

PHASE III

Architectural Services: Architectural Partners –Mark Smith
Land Planning & Design Associates, Inc. –Julie Basic
Contractor: Keith Barber Construction, Inc. Project Manager: Fred Boger & Emily Harper
Completed: Depot Restoration, Covered Naked Creek Bridge, Restored the Scales, Tip Car, & Push Car
Funding: Enhancement Grant (VDOT)

Ms. Harper noted that the 2013 Rockfish River Elementary School Destination Imagination Team donated a wooden bench along the trail that some additional “Kids in Parks” benches were donated by Boxley, and some were to be donated as Eagle Scout projects.

Following the presentation, Ms. Harper noted that each of the Counties maintained their own sections of the trail; however they were working on generating funds for upkeep on the bridges etc. She noted that the County’s property ran out to the Norfolk-Southern rail line.

Mr. Carter then noted his appreciation of the Board’s concurrence with the project over the past twelve (12) years. He added that Nelson County staff had administered all of the grants and that 98% of the project was constructed with State and Federal grant funding. He added that the federal and state regulations were not easy to keep up with.

IV. Board/Commission Appointments

June 26, 2014

The following list of appointments was presented for the Board’s consideration and Ms. Brennan noted that traditionally, Supervisors have nominated candidates from their districts; however it was the full Board’s decision in the end.

(1) New Vacancies/Expiring Seats & New Applicants :					
Board/Commission	Term Expiring	Term & Limit Y/N	Incumbent	Re-appointment	Applicant (Order of Pref.)
Nelson County Service Authority	6/30/2014	4Years/No Limit	Allen Hale - East	N	Robert McSwain
			Russell Otis - Central	Y	
			Tommy Harvey - North	Y-Verbal	
Local Board of Building Code Appeals	6/30/2014	4Years/No Limit	Robert L. Yoder	Y	
			Robin Meyer	Y	
Economic Development Authority (EDA)	6/30/2014	4Years/No Limit	Natt A. Hall, Jr.	Y	
			J. Alphonso Taylor	Y	
Library Advisory Committee	6/30/2014	4Years/No Limit	Ellen Bouton - North	Y	
			Nancy K. Kritzer - East	N	
Planning Commission	6/30/2014	4Years/No Limit	Phillipa Proulx - North	Y	
			Emily Hunt - East		
			Linda Russell - Central	Y	
Department of Social Services Board	6/30/2014	4Years/2 Term Limit	Joan Giles - West	Y	
			Pauline Page - East	Y	
	6/30/2017		Donald Gray - North	N	
TJ Area Community Criminal Justice Board	6/30/2014	3Years/2 Term Limit*	Jim Hall	Y	
<i>* term limit does not apply if noone else is qualified</i>					
(2) Existing Vacancies:					
Board/Commission	Terms Expired	Term & Limit Y/N	Number of Vacancies		
JABA Advisory Council	12/31/2013	2 Year/No Limit	Deborah Harvey	N	No Applications Received

The Board then considered the appointments as follows:

1. Nelson County Service Authority:

Mr. Hale moved to nominate Mr. Robert McSwain as the East District representative on the Service Authority Board and to re-appoint Mr. Russell Otis representing the Central District on the Service Authority Board. Mr. Bruguire seconded the motion and Mr. Hale noted he was gratified to see the public attending their meetings. He added that Mr. McSwain has been a regular attendee at NCSA meetings and would do an excellent job. He added that Mr. Otis has also served the Board well and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted

June 26, 2014

unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion. It was noted that appointment of the North District seat would be deferred.

2. Local Board of Building Code Appeals:

Mr. Harvey moved to re-appoint Robert Yoder and Robin Meyer to the Local Board of Building Code Appeals and Mr. Bruguere seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

3. Economic Development Authority (EDA):

Mr. Hale moved to re-appoint Natt A. Hall, Jr. and J. Alphonso Taylor to the Economic Development Authority (EDA) and Mr. Harvey seconded the motion. Mr. Hale noted having served with both of them on the EDA and that they were very conscientious. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

4. Library Advisory Committee:

Mr. Harvey moved to reappoint Ellen Bouton as the North District representative to the Library Advisory Committee and Mr. Hale seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

5. Planning Commission:

Mr. Harvey noted he would like to defer these appointments as he was not quite ready to vote on these. Mr. Hale noted that he was still looking for an East District candidate. Mr. Bruguere and Mr. Saunders agreed with Mr. Harvey that these appointments be deferred.

Mr. Hale then noted that he had attended the Planning Commission's meeting the previous night where there were two public hearings and even though they did not always agree with the Board he found Linda Russell and Philippa Proulx to be very conscientious members. He added that he told them they did not necessarily want to find someone who would always agree with them and that the Board valued all opinions. Ms. Brennan noted she agreed and added that Ms. Russell had been her appointee for most, if not all, of her term and that even if she also did not agree with everything she said, she was very diligent in understanding the ordinance and going out to talk to people on every application.

Following brief discussion, Supervisors agreed by consensus that they were not prepared to consider these appointments and these were tabled until the next meeting.

6. Department of Social Services Board:

Ms. Brennan noted that sadly, the Board had lost Mr. Gray from the North District. She noted she served on the Board and all three of the incumbents had done an excellent job. Mr.

June 26, 2014

Harvey then indicated that he was working on finding a replacement candidate for the North District.

Mr. Bruguiere moved to reappoint Ms. Joan Giles representing the West District and Ms. Pauline Page representing the East District to the Social Services Board and Mr. Hale seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

7. Thomas Jefferson Community Criminal Justice Board:

Ms. Brennan noted she served on this Board with Mr. Jim Hall who does a great job. Mr. Saunders noted that he agreed and moved to reappoint Mr. Jim Hall to the Thomas Jefferson Community Criminal Justice Board and Mr. Hale seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

Ms. Brennan then noted the vacancy on the Jefferson Area Board for Aging Advisory Council that met every other month. She noted this was a countywide position and applications for all Boards was on the county website. She added one could always put an application in for any Board at any time.

V. Other Business

A. Resolution Authorizing Sole Source Procurement for a Maintenance Agreement with Alcatel-Lucent (R2014-45)

Mr. Carter noted that this was concerning an agreement with the County's communications systems vendor. The County had upgraded the public safety radio communications, which was also used by the County and the Schools and was done to comply with the Federal narrow banding mandate. He noted that Alcatel Lucent had provided the technology to update the County's simulcast radio system and staff was recommending to the Board to enter into a three year maintenance agreement with them. He added that because of the County's Board approved purchasing policy, this was a sole source decision where Alcatel-Lucent was the sole source available to provide maintenance on the system. He then recommended approval of the proposed resolution.

Mr. Harvey asked if it was set up for emergency response if something went down and Ms. Rorrer noted that it would be monitored 24/7 with a 4 hour guaranteed response time.

Mr. Hale questioned the need for this on a brand new system and Ms. Rorrer noted that the system was not covered under a full time maintenance agreement and if the simulcast radio network went down, the radios would go down. He then questioned why the price of this could not be based on the actual demand for services as opposed to a lump sum.

Mr. Harvey noted that it was not able to work that way and it was a key component to the radio system. Ms. Rorrer added that that the new system would be cut over in August or early September and that the manufacturer's warranty had passed. Mr. Carter added that the

June 26, 2014

simulcast part of the radio project dealing with Alcatel Lucent had completed two years ago and it had moved forward with Motorola on the radio equipment. Mr. Carter added that staff was concerned about the cost as well; however it was somewhat unavoidable.

Ms. Rorrer then noted that preventative maintenance would be done to make sure the system was at 100%. Mr. Harvey noted that if one radio transmission site was down, the signal would go to the other sites simultaneously (simulcast) and Ms. Brennan noted that this helped with the inter-jurisdictional communications for emergency services. Mr. Carter reiterated this and added that the County had been working on this for 3-4 years now and it was a \$3 million to \$4 million dollar project.

Mr. Carter moved to approve resolution **R2014-45** Procurement Exception Alcatel-Lucent Microwave Maintenance Agreement and Mr. Saunders seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2014-45
PROCUREMENT EXCEPTION
ALCATEL-LUCENT MICROWAVE MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT**

WHEREAS, the Nelson County Purchasing Manual amended November 10, 2011 prescribes procedures for Sole Source purchasing such that the purchase of non-professional services greater than \$100,000 requires a resolution approved by the Board of Supervisors reflecting the written sole source determination; and

WHEREAS, Title 2.2-4303 of the Code of Virginia requires the local governing body to make written determination and documentation that competitive sealed bidding or competitive negotiation is either not practicable or not fiscally advantageous; and

WHEREAS, the County currently utilizes Alcatel-Lucent microwave technology in the delivery of its public safety communications and desires to enter into a 3-year maintenance agreement with Alcatel-Lucent for a total of \$133,071 versus a year to year agreement that would cost the County approximately \$6,243 more over the same three year period;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that the formal bidding process is not practicable or fiscally advantageous because the microwave network system was manufactured by Alcatel-Lucent and is the equipment that the County wishes to cover under the maintenance agreement. Alcatel-Lucent is the only source available for manufacturer provided technical support, is the only source available to obtain software patches and maintenance releases from, and is the only source available to provide for the manufacturer's return for repair services;

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that a procurement exception is allowed such that the County is authorized to enter into a 3-year maintenance agreement with Alcatel-Lucent in the amount of \$133,071.

June 26, 2014

B. FY14 Budget Amendment (R2014-46)

Mr. Carter noted that the budget amendment consisted of a request by the Commonwealth Attorney for asset forfeiture funds in the amount of \$3,252 for the purchase of office equipment and a transfer of funds for fire and rescue fuel expenses in the amount of \$4,000. It was noted it was for the remainder of the fiscal year and fuel was purchased through the County's Tiger Fuel account.

Mr. Hale then moved to approve resolution **R2014-46** Amendment of Fiscal Year 2013-2014 budget and Mr. Brugiure seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2014-46
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AMENDMENT OF FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014 BUDGET
NELSON COUNTY, VA
June 26, 2014**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Nelson County that the Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Budget be hereby amended as follows:

I. Appropriation of Funds (General Fund)

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Revenue Account (-)</u>	<u>Expenditure Account (+)</u>
\$ 3,252.00	3-100-009999-0001	4-100-022010-5419

II. Transfer of Funds (General Fund)

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Credit Account (-)</u>	<u>Debit Account (+)</u>
\$ 4,000.00	4-100-999000-9901	4-100-032020-5415

Introduced: Sheriff's Department Vehicles and Ammunition:

Mr. Harvey then inquired about the Sheriff's Department's request for the purchase of two cars for deputies that did not have them and ammunition. Mr. Carter noted that this was originally removed from the budget and the department agreed to use asset forfeiture funds for the purchase of three vehicles once the anticipated asset forfeiture funds were available. He added that he had reminded Captain Robertson of this and he had not heard back. Mr. Harvey asked whether or not the vehicles could be purchased now and the asset forfeiture funds applied to these when the funds became available. Mr. Carter noted he would have to check on that and Mr. Harvey noted he wanted to stay on schedule with vehicle purchases. Mr. Carter reiterated that the Board had previously agreed to purchase vehicle equipment when needed in exchange for the Sheriff using asset forfeiture funds to purchase the three

June 26, 2014

new vehicles. Mr. Harvey noted he was suggesting the same, however he preferred not to wait when the cars were presently needed.

Mr. Harvey then noted that ammunition was a big issue as there were training exercises coming up and Mr. Carter noted that he would check on this with the Sheriff's Office; however during the budget cycle; staff was told that they were going to store the ammunition; which was a concern to staff and it was taken out. Mr. Harvey noted that he had been told that the ammunition was hard to get and it took a while to be received. Mr. Carter noted that his understanding was that the ammunition they wanted was premium ammo and a large quantity was to be purchased per Captain Robertson. Mr. Harvey noted that there may be a difference in training results between using cheaper ammunition versus the premium rounds. He added that after staff had questioned the need for this, they had not yet come back to ask for this again. Mr. Saunders indicated that if it were a concern for them, they would be present at the meeting to ask for it. Mr. Hale agreed and noted that this would require a change to the budget that has been adopted and is effective July 1st and they would certainly entertain a change in the budget based upon their presentation to the whole Board rather than going on hearsay related to this.

Mr. Hale and Mr. Bruguiere noted that they did not want them to buy the ammunition retail and Ms. Brennan noted that at this point the funding would require a FY15 budget amendment. Mr. Carter reiterated that the request was part of the original budget discussions and concerns were reported back to them; however the budget could be easily amended. Mr. Carter advised that the concern of staff was not so much the type of ammunition to be purchased, but rather the stockpiling of so much ammunition.

Supervisors then agreed by consensus to add this subject to the next meeting's agenda for discussion.

Introduced: State Budget

Mr. Bruguiere then inquired whether or not the State Budget had been ratified and Mr. Carter noted that it had and the summary budget had been distributed to the Board. He noted that the Revenue assumptions used would have to be updated, the State was facing a shortfall of about \$1.2 Billion; however there was no significant impact on the Schools.

Introduced: Public Comments on Pipeline:

Ms. Brennan then thanked the public for their attendance, noted that comments should be kept to under 3 minutes and that the Board would not be responding to comments; however the Board was very interested in what the public had to say. She added that the Board was waiting to hear from Dominion as to when they would come to the County to explain what they were doing. She added that this information would be made available to the public. She noted that Dominion had not yet visited any Counties in Virginia impacted by the proposed pipeline thus far. She then advised speakers to address the Board using the podium and it was also noted that there was no sign up sheet for speakers.

June 26, 2014

She then opened the floor for public comments regarding the proposed Dominion Transmission Pipeline and the following persons were recognized:

1. Beth Golden, Shipman

Ms. Golden spoke in opposition to the pipeline and noted she had lived in the County for 20 years and loved it. She noted the beautiful character of the County and that the pipeline did not belong in it. She added that the RFP for the project called for future low cost expansions; which included fracking. She also supposed the route through Nelson County was chosen as it was the path of least resistance; having the fewest number of landowners to oppose it and the fewest documented natural and historic resources. She then cited several recent instances in the country where natural gas lines had exploded and noted the various reasons Dominion would provide to support the pipeline. She then advised that Dominion had been approved by the Federal Government to export natural gas to foreign countries from its Maryland plant. She then asked the Board of Supervisors to be unified in telling Dominion that the pipeline was not wanted and she encouraged landowners to contact Friends of Nelson to get information concerning their rights. She then referred to a 2006 Attorney General's Opinion that would eventually allow Dominion onto property but noted that this could be revisited by the current administration at the request of an elected official at any level of government. She concluded by noting that Nelson was known for its hospitality, however in this instance, Nelson County should be less hospitable.

2. Andre Derdeyn, Lovingston

Mr. Derdeyn spoke in opposition to the pipeline. He noted that he participated in the Davis Creek Conservancy and was concerned about the potential wilderness destruction in National Forests and the apparent lack of regard for the destruction of pristine forests. He then stated he hoped the Board would pass a resolution opposing the pipeline project.

3. Robert Gubisch, Afton

Mr. Gubisch spoke in opposition to the pipeline and noted that if the Board and Sheriff stood against the pipeline with the group present, there would be no doubt that the pipeline could be defeated. He noted that he was confident that there would be no pipeline especially if the County Sheriff stood with them.

4. Matt Dwyer, Howardsville

Mr. Dwyer spoke in opposition of the pipeline and noted that the James River was in peril with it crossing the river. He cited several instances where the James River had been negatively impacted through oil and sewage spills. He then read a quote from Dickie Bell from the Lynchburg paper that indicated that citizens should avoid over-reacting and that it was unknown if the environmental impacts would be negative. He noted that Representative Bell had indicated he had spoken with Dominion who said they understood the concerns and would be above board with any environmental codes and that the company was usually very responsible. He concluded that was not acceptable and there would not be a pipeline.

5. Jane Taylor, Afton

Ms. Taylor spoke in opposition to the pipeline and noted that neighbors had received letters from a subsidiary of the pipeline company that would be transporting gas that had come from fracking. She noted that the fracked gas would come from many wells and that they had applied for fracking in the George Washington National Forest. She then recommended the movies Gasland 1 & 2. She added that Cove Point had been designated as the recipient of the gas from this pipeline, which would be liquefied and would be sold to the highest bidder on the world market. She added that she thought this would negatively affect gas pricing here and this should be considered.

6. Ernie Reid, Nelson County Property Owner

Mr. Reid spoke in opposition to the pipeline. He noted that after a previous Board meeting it was realized that the County did not have the information from Dominion that was needed. He added Friends of Nelson created a petition and read it aloud noting that "We the undersigned residents and/or property owners of/in Nelson County request that Nelson County Board of Supervisors convene a special public hearing on the Southeast Reliability Project and request that Dominion Transmission, Inc. make a presentation of their pipeline project and its impact on the county. The meeting must allow questions from the public. Dominion shall provide answers immediately or within two weeks of the meeting in a written response to the Board of Supervisors, who then shall disseminate to the public." Mr. Reid noted that the petition had 280 signatures from residents or property owners, relatives of property owners, former property owners, and concerned citizens from surrounding counties. He noted that Dominion had cancelled its meetings with the County and other impacted counties that have requested meetings. He then reported that the Acorn Inn owners had an agent of Dominion show up on their property to speak about the pipeline and supposed that if they could send these people out now, then they could send someone to a Board of Supervisors meeting. He concluded that he did not believe they intended to impart any information ahead of time. He asked for the Board's support in opposing the pipeline and noted that Friends of Nelson County would continue to work against it. He then provided the petition to the Board.

7. Charlie Weinberg, Afton

Mr. Weinberg spoke in opposition to the pipeline. He noted details reported in the New York Times pertaining to a pipeline in Kansas that had ruptured on June 23, 2014 during routine maintenance. He added that three Board members had not yet gone on record opposing the pipeline and he wondered about their position.

8. Digna Gantt, Wingina

Ms. Gantt spoke in opposition to the pipeline. She noted they had written two letters to Dominion denying them access to their property. She added they were concerned about the pipeline and compressor station that would affect theirs and their neighbor's property. She

June 26, 2014

noted reading that compressor stations generated a lot of noise. She added that more information was needed from Dominion quickly.

9. James Ford, Lovington

Mr. Ford spoke in opposition to the pipeline. He then reminded the Board and public of the formerly proposed nuclear power plant in the County that was nixed. He added that he did not trust Dominion to do the right thing and he hoped the Board would stand up to the State and Dominion to protect their lives in the County.

10. Sarah Thomas, Shipman

Ms. Thomas spoke in opposition to the pipeline. She noted that she had spoken to Mr. Hale regarding the subject of the petition and then noted that if the citizens of the county allowed the pipeline, they would be promoting fracking. She added that fracking wells were leaking methane and this could promote erosion of the ozone layer. She urged the remaining Board of Supervisors members to go on record opposing the pipeline in order to let the citizens know the right folks were elected.

11. Frank David Holub, Nellysford

Mr. Holub spoke in opposition to the pipeline and noted he was reluctant to speak; however he had worked his entire career on all types of pipelines and power plants. He noted that the amount of destruction and damage done to the environment involved in the pipeline construction process was a lot more than met the eye. He added that he would do his part to prevent this.

12. George Staton, Afton

Mr. Staton spoke in opposition to the pipeline. He noted that tourism in the County would be greatly hurt by this. He noted that he had not seen an issue where all types of people agreed and did not want to see the pipeline happen. He added that he hoped the Board would see how detrimental it would be and urged them to help it be stopped.

13. Rob-Ann Griffin, Faber

Ms. Griffin spoke in opposition to the pipeline. She noted that she had heard about the dangers of the pipeline and that construction would cause environmental damage. She noted her main concern was that even though Dominion claimed there would be no fracking in Nelson, she knew it to be very dangerous and destructive. She added that to deny the pipeline in Nelson County would make a statement that the County was against fracking.

14. Charles Flickinger, Nellysford

Mr. Flickinger spoke in opposition to the pipeline noting his agreement with the previous speakers. He added that there was no neutrality on the issue and he felt as though it was an assault on the County and something should be done about it.

15. Gale Troy, Shipman

Ms. Troy spoke in opposition to the pipeline. She noted that earthquakes did occur occasionally in the County and that pipelines did not fare well with them. She noted the County should be kept as the beautiful County it was. She advised that citizens conserve energy so that it could be said the natural gas was not needed. She added that the pipeline gas was geared towards export and the County would not benefit from it. She added that the Board could do something positive to help the opposition.

16. Ann Catherine Briddell, Afton

Ms. Briddell spoke in opposition to the pipeline. She reported that on May 1st, Dominion formed an MLP, or Master Limited Partnership which meant they would not have to pay taxes and she questioned who paid for this.

17. Donna Truslow, Crozet

Ms. Truslow spoke in opposition to the pipeline noting that there were major faults in Nelson County listed on the US Geological website. She cited Lebabon Church Fault listed in Virginia which was on Route 250 as you went from Crozet towards the bottom of Afton Mountain and near Greenwood Road. She added that the fault was named after the church it sat upon. She added the process of fracking and blasting could ripple out and affect people where there were known and unknown faults. She noted a Senator who supported fracking until it was to be done in his backyard and noted if it was not good enough for him, it should not be for the County either.

18. Vian Evans, Lovingston

Ms. Evans spoke in opposition to the pipeline. She noted she had a small farm and has been proud of farming in Nelson County. She added that small sustainable agricultural businesses would be truly affected by the construction of the pipeline.

19. Flo Hollis, Faber

Ms. Hollis spoke in opposition to the pipeline. She noted her understanding was that the gas was not going to be used in this county or Country, with the profits going to a faceless entity. She added that fracking was a bad technology. She noted there would be some jobs created; however she suggested that jobs be created through the implementation of alternative energy means. She added she loved Nelson County and would hate to see the pipeline happen.

20. Hilary Day, Nellysford

Ms. Day spoke in opposition to the pipeline. She noted fracking operations were shrouded in secrecy and were highly toxic. She noted her properties depended on local wells and she was concerned about water safety if the pipeline were constructed. She noted this would be the beginning of fracking in Virginia where there was a large shale deposit. She added it would be a matter of time before the water became poisoned. She described contaminated spring water at a relative's place in Pennsylvania where fracking occurred. She added that she would fight to keep the pipeline out of the county and she hoped the Board of Supervisors would too.

21. Eleanor Amidon, Afton

Ms. Amidon spoke in opposition to the pipeline. She noted that she saw the movie Gasland 2, in which a Cornell University Professor said that the cement casing of pipes in 5% of the cases failed immediately upon installation and roughly half of the casings failed in about 50 years. She then recommended that the Board see the movies Gasland 1 and 2 due to the wealth of information they provided. She added that it was all horrifying and she hoped the Board would do all it could to keep Nelson County as beautiful as it was.

22. Previous Male Speaker (name not provided)

This speaker noted that the spray that went on top of the stripped out areas was not good and that the right of ways would be sprayed forever and it was not good for the environment. He added that they may also use drones to check the lines.

23. Charlotte Rea, Afton

Ms. Rea spoke in opposition to the pipeline. She noted that an area not addressed had been the immediacy of Dominion's actions. She noted that citizens were now going out to find lawyers to protect their rights and not everyone could afford to do this. She added most retired people put their money into their land and she noted her land was her long term care insurance should she need to be in a nursing home and she felt that she stood to lose that. She added that the pipeline coming was something to be concerned with now and that citizens were being stressed by this issue and it was happening now.

Ms. Brennan then thanked all of the public for their attendance and comments.

Mr. Hale noted that he would like to state that his interest was in knowing the more precise location of the proposed pipeline as the information received so far was inadequate. He noted that he had requested that County staff ask Dominion for this so that they were able to see the proposed route on a topographic map. He added that staff had tried taking the crude rough line and placing it on a more legible map and this had made it easier to see. He noted that he thought one of the things to be looked at most carefully was the terrain of the planned pipeline and he thought a less favorable route had been chosen based on the proximity to conservation areas, wilderness areas, and natural forests etc. which were more

June 26, 2014

reasons than not to oppose the pipeline as opposed to tackling the overall question of how energy was produced and used. He added that this would be the basis of his analysis. He noted that he realized that the Board had very limited power; however they would try to exercise whatever power they could. He concluded that they needed to have very solid reasons for the position the Board takes.

Mr. Harvey then stated that he could not think of any reason anyone would want the pipeline. Mr. Hale noted that he did not want the pipeline and the real question for him was how they could effectively oppose it. Mr. Harvey then added that it did not make sense that landowners' rights were being threatened and it was scary.

Ms. Brennan then noted that Mr. Hale had made some good points and they would have to look at this issue as a Board as to how best to fight this politically and any other way. She noted that they were looking at what other Boards were doing in other areas. She noted that the Board was concerned about all of the issues presented and she hoped that the public would not castigate the Board until they had actually come together to figure out their plan of action. She concluded by noting that they cared deeply about everyone who lived or would live in the county.

VI. Adjournment

At 5:51 PM, Mr. Harvey moved to adjourn until the next scheduled meeting and Mr. Hale seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously by voice vote to approve the motion and the meeting adjourned.