

**ROCKY MOUNT TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 10, 2015**

The August 10, 2015 regular meeting of the Rocky Mount Town Council (hereafter referred to as "Council") was held in the Council Chambers of the Rocky Mount Municipal Building located at 345 Donald Avenue, Rocky Mount, Virginia, at 7:00 p.m. with Mayor Steven C. Angle presiding.

The following members of Council were present:

- Mayor Steven C. Angle
- Vice Mayor Gregory B. Walker
- Bobby M. Cundiff
- P. Ann Love
- Robert L. Moyer
- Jon W. Snead
- Billie W. Stockton

The following staff members were present:

- John T. Boitnott, Town Attorney
- Ken Criner, Chief of Police
- Bob Deitrich, Water Treatment Plant Superintendent
- C. James Ervin, Town Manager
- Josh Gibson, Town Planner
- Mark Lovern, Lieutenant, Rocky Mount Police Department
- Cecil Mason, Public Works Director
- Jeff Rakes, Fire Chief
- Stacey Sink, Town Clerk
- Linda Woody, Finance Director

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Steven C. Angle.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Angle led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Additions or Corrections: Council Member Cundiff requested to amend the agenda to add a closed session under Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A)1 regarding personnel matters in the Town Manager's Office.

Motion: To approve the agenda as amended

Motion By: Council Member Love

Second: Council Member Moyer

Motion Discussion: None

Ayes: Cundiff, Love, Moyer, Snead, Stockton, Walker
Nays: None
Action: The amended agenda was approved by a unanimous vote

SPECIAL ITEMS

Let the record show there were no special items to discuss at this time.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearing No. 1: Review and consideration of approval of proposed amendments to Articles 4, 20, 24, and 29 of the Town of Rocky Mount Zoning & Development Ordinance regarding “bed and breakfast,” “bed and breakfast inn,” and “mixed-use inn”

After being duly advertised, the staff of the Community Development Department presented for public hearing its request to amend Articles 4, 20, 24, and 29 of Appendix A, also known as the Zoning and Development Ordinance, of the Code of the Town of Rocky Mount, Virginia, 2002 (as amended).

Mayor Angle recessed the meeting to go into public hearing.

Staff Report by Town Planner Gibson: In February and March meetings, staff and planning commissioners generally agreed that some of the lodging definitions in the Town’s Zoning and Development Ordinance needed clarification and adjustment. After continued research, a few changes are proposed, including an expansion to the definition of *bed and breakfast establishments*, plus an additional category for a small hotel recommended as either a by-right or special exception use for parcels zoned Central Business District (CBD). Rather than a wholesale update to all lodging types, this proposal includes the updates most critical for bringing existing and planned businesses into compliance. It also addresses a need for more lodging options in the CBD regulations, without permitting those uses with a greater potential to unfavorably affect the character of the district, such as conventional hotels and motels. Since there appeared to be little interest from Planning Commission in immediately pursuing downtown design guidelines in concert with lodging updates, staff is making no recommendation to implement any design guidelines at this time.

Staff recommendations to amend the Town of Rocky Mount Zoning and Development Ordinance include:

1. Definition Updates:
 - a. ARTICLE 4 (Definitions) of the Town of Rocky Mount Zoning and Development Ordinance will be updated to **strike** the following definitions from 4-3:
 - BED AND BREAKFAST ESTABLISHMENT: A home occupation involving the rental of up to four rooms to overnight guests and offering breakfast meals only to said guests.
 - b. ARTICLE 4 (Definitions) of the Town of Rocky Mount Zoning and Development Ordinance will be updated to **add** the following definitions to 4-3:
 - BED AND BREAKFAST: A home occupation wherein the owner of the premises resides at the establishment, and which (1) may contain up to five (5) guestrooms for temporary/overnight guests, (2) shall not contain

restaurant facilities but may provide food service for temporary/overnight guests and (3) may host indoor/outdoor events such as weddings, receptions, and similar activities on site subject to other applicable restrictions.

- BED AND BREAKFAST INN: A dwelling and its associated building(s) used for temporary/overnight guests wherein the owner or manager provides full-time management of the establishment at all times when the facility is occupied by one or more guests, and which (1) may contain up to ten (10) guestrooms for temporary/overnight guests, (2) shall not contain restaurant facilities but may provide food service for temporary/overnight guests, and (3) may host indoor/outdoor events such as weddings, receptions, and similar activities on site subject to other applicable restrictions.
- MIXED-USE INN: A building designed or occupied as an abiding place featuring no less than 8 rooms and no more than 20 rooms available for temporary/overnight guests who are, for compensation, lodged with or without meals, and in which provision is not generally made for cooking in individual rooms or suites. In addition to the 8-20 rooms/suites, a mixed-use inn may or may not also include on-premises restaurants, banquet halls, meeting rooms, retail uses and similar facilities as approved by the zoning administrator. The intent of this lodging category is to encourage compatible mixed uses as an enhancement and compliment to the primary use, lodging.

2. Other Ordinance Updates:

- a. RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT R1 (ARTICLE 20)
 - Under Article 20, 20-2-1 should be updated as follows: strike “Bed and breakfast establishments” and add “*Bed and Breakfast and Bed and Breakfast Inn*”
- b. RESIDENTIAL BUSINESS DISTRICT RB (ARTICLE 24)
 - Under Article 24, 24-1-15 should be updated as follows: strike “Bed and breakfast establishments” and add “*Bed and Breakfast and Bed and Breakfast Inn*”
- c. CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT CBD (ARTICLE 29)
 - Under Article 29, 29-1-2 should be updated as follows: strike “Bed and breakfast establishments” and add “*Bed and Breakfast and Bed and Breakfast Inn*”
 - Under Article 29-2 “Uses by special exception” an additional definition should be added as follows: “29-2-8. Mixed-Use Inn”

Comments from Council:

- Love: Questioned if there are currently in lodging establishments in the Central Business District which have 8-20 rooms, with the town planner advising maybe the Early Inn, but he is not sure.
- Cundiff: Noted that the *mixed use inn* allows for retail sales and this might be helpful to bed & breakfast establishments. The town planner noted that one main concern with allowing retail sales for bed & breakfast establishments is that so many of them are located in residential neighborhoods.

- Love: Having researched the Early Inn on her phone, noted that it has five rooms in the main house plus one additional, for a total of six rooms; therefore it is not considered a *mixed use inn*.
- Mayor Angle opened the floor to any member of the public wishing to speak regarding the proposed zoning amendments.

Public Hearing: Let the record show that no member of the public came forward to speak.

Mayor Angle called the meeting back into regular session.

Discussion By Council:

- Moyer: Questioned if a decision on this matter could wait until the next Council meeting, to allow more time to review the documents in the packet.
- Town Planner Gibson: Confirmed that the Early Inn would be considered a *bed & breakfast inn* under the new regulations with up to ten rooms, and noting that nothing is a *mixed use inn* in Town at this time. Anyone wanted to open a *mixed use inn* would have to present a concept plan, and would have to go through the special use process to be granted permission for a *mixed use inn*.
- Town Manager Ervin: Advised that the item can be tabled until the next meeting, as there is not a pending applicant. This is a long term Community Development project and there is no rush.

Motion: To table this item for one month

Motion By: Council Member Moyer

Second: Vice Mayor Walker

Motion Discussion: None

Ayes: Cundiff, Love, Moyer, Snead, Stockton, Walker

Nays: None

Action: The item was tabled for one month by a unanimous vote

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Let the record show there were no draft minutes presented for review and approval at this time.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

This month's consent agenda consists of the following items:

(1) **Miscellaneous Action**, including:

- Review and consideration of allowing consumption-only billing for eligible non-profit water customers.

(2) **Miscellaneous Resolutions/Proclamations**, including:

- *Resolution by the Rocky Mount Town Council for the Acceptance of Allman Road*
- *Resolution by the Rocky Mount Town Council for the Acceptance of Lawndale Street*

(3) **Department Monthly Reports**, including:

- Community Development Department

- Finance Department
- Fire Department
- Police Department
- Public Works Department
- Waste Water Department
- Water Department

Discussion: None

Motion: To approve the consent agenda as presented

Motion By: Council Member Stockton

Second: Council Member Snead

Motion Discussion: None

Ayes: Cundiff, Love, Moyer, Snead, Stockton, Walker

Nays: None

Action: The presented consent agenda was approved by a unanimous vote

HEARING OF CITIZENS

Let the record show that prior to the meeting no citizen contacted the Town asking to address Council. Mayor Angle opened the floor to any citizen wishing to speak.

Let the record show that no citizens came forward to speak.

OLD BUSINESS

Old Business Item No. 1: Update on Roanoke Gas's application to take a portion of Franklin County into its service area

Staff Report by Town Manager Ervin: On March 25, 2015 Roanoke Gas Company filed an application requesting approval of a certificate of public convenience and necessity to take in a portion of Franklin County into its service area. Given that the Town had been in its service area for over 50 years and had not been served and that this application came during the discussion of the route of the Mountain Valley Pipeline, the Town filed a request for a hearing with the State Corporation Commission.

The Town stated that it has serious questions regarding the timing of the application, that it appeared only related to the proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline and that if approved, the Town and the County would be precluded from negotiating with other natural gas distributors to access and make available natural gas from the pipeline. Upon discussions with Roanoke Gas it was deduced that they in no way intended to invest any resources into a tap for the pipeline and that the Town, County or customers would be forced to pay the entire cost of the initial tap construction (estimated at \$2.5 million).

The SCC took the Town's position seriously and asked a series of pointed questions to Roanoke Gas trying to determine if there was a serious plan to serve this area or if this was territory squatting due to the proposed pipeline. Roanoke Gas's response was first to file a motion with the SCC asking for denial of our request for a hearing to which the Town filed a

suitable reply. The second approach by Roanoke Gas was to negotiate with the Town to have it withdraw the hearing request. An agreement could not be reached, as the Town's core position was the resolution of the following questions:

- Will Roanoke Gas service this area regardless of the outcome of the pending case before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the Mountain Valley Pipeline?
- If the application of Roanoke Gas is approved by the SCC and the application of Mountain Valley Pipeline is approved by FERC, will Roanoke Gas have any financial involvement in building the tap and decompression station needed to activate the negotiated access point on the pipeline?

The Town sought a public discussion of these questions so its citizens could be openly informed of the plans associated with the pipeline and the ultimate availability of natural gas. The Town was not supporting or objecting to the application but requesting a hearing to clarify the relationship between this application, the pipeline and future funding obligations of the local taxpayers.

Roanoke Gas was very specific that it would not invest in the access point and that the costs of construction would have to be borne by the Town and the County or the customers. The Town's position remained: In the event that the Mountain Valley Pipeline is approved, the Town and the County would like the ability to negotiate with potential gas distributors for a comprehensive solution that resulted in a solution that was not principally tax payer funded.

Rather than go forward with a hearing, Roanoke Gas requested that the SCC stay the application (pause consideration of it until such time as the applicant may wish to continue). This request was granted on July 31, 2015. This issue is therefore resolved for the time being and the Town will be notified if Roanoke Gas resumes the request. The Town's request for a hearing stands as part of the active case and will be active in the event that the request is renewed.

The Town benefited from the services of Williams Mullen, a regulatory action legal firm in Richmond, who typically represents the Town to the SCC on electric rate filings by AEP. Throughout this process, the Town was the only participant, as the application by Roanoke Gas appears to have been unnoticed by other interested parties.

General Discussion: None

This item was presented for informational purposes only. No action was taken.

NEW BUSINESS

New Business Item No. 1: Review and consideration of request of Waste Water Department to reallocate funding from pH equipment replacement to push camera replacement

Staff Report by Town Manager Ervin: The small push camera that the Waste Water Department uses to video small lines and laterals has completely quit working and needs to be replaced. The cost of a new system is projected to be somewhere between \$8,000 and \$12,000. There is \$12,000 in the capital improvement plan to replace pH equipment at the Waste Water Plant this

year. The staff at the Waste Water Plant believes the camera is more of a priority and would like to reallocate the \$12,000 for pH equipment to purchase a new push camera system.

General Discussion: None

Motion: To approve the request of the Waste Water Department as presented

Motion By: Council Member Snead

Second: Council Member Cundiff

Motion Discussion: None

Ayes: Cundiff, Love, Moyer, Snead, Stockton, Walker

Nays: None

Action: The request was approved as presented by a unanimous vote

New Business Item No. 2: Review and consideration of request of Water Department for funding of mixing and aeration equipment installation in water tank on southern end of system (with approval of necessary supplemental appropriation resolution)

Staff Report by Town Manager Ervin: Included in this month's council business is a request for an appropriation of funds for mixing and aeration equipment to be installed in the one million gallon water tank located at the southern end of the Town's water distribution system. The equipment will better preserve the quality of the water in the tank as well as provide removal of disinfection byproducts. The equipment, which has been proven effective by other regional utilities, comes with a money back performance guarantee.

Detailed information regarding the quality issues was provided in the July Council packet and a brief discussion was had during the regular council meeting. Council deferred the issue to the Public Utilities Committee for further consideration of the issue before any formal action was taken. Information about the equipment and the ways in which it will improve water quality and ensure regulatory compliance was provided at the subsequent Committee meeting in July. The Committee was in favor of the proposal.

Once funds are appropriated, the equipment will be ordered. The project will take approximately 90 days to complete after signing the contract.

General Discussion: None

Motion: To approve the request of the Water Department as presented

Motion By: Council Member Love

Second: Council Member Cundiff

Motion Discussion: None

Ayes: Cundiff, Love, Moyer, Snead, Stockton, Walker

Nays: None

Action: The request was approved as presented by a unanimous vote

New Business Item No. 3: Overview of House Bill 2 (HB2) and Commonwealth of Virginia transportation project funding

Staff Report by Town Planner Gibson: House Bill 2 (HB2) implements a ranking tool to help the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) determine which transportation projects will be

funded throughout the Commonwealth. Concurrently, VTrans 2040—Virginia's long-range multimodal transportation plan—is also in the process of being developed and updated. VTrans 2040 will help form the basis for House Bill 2, and a new construction project can only be submitted through the House Bill 2 process if it addresses a need identified in VTrans 2040.

Transportation projects may be submitted for HB2 funding consideration via four categories: (1) **Urban Development Areas** (UDAs), (2) **Corridors of Statewide Significance**, (3) **Regional Networks**, and (4) **Safety**. Many Town projects will already qualify under #2 above as the state long-range plan currently designates the North Carolina to West Virginia Corridor (US 220) a Corridor of Statewide Significance. Town staff is exploring UDAs, per Council's direction, in order to increase project competitiveness.

Also, staff is currently beginning the first ever funding cycle for HB2. Based on past direction from Council, staff anticipates submitting an application for the previous Six-Year Improvement Plan project addressing alignment concerns at the Pell Avenue Main Street/Franklin Street intersection. Staff is working with VDOT officials to develop and complete an application for project funding. The solicitation period is August 1 through September 30, after which project screening and evaluation will begin.

General Discussion: None

This item was presented for informational purposes only. No action was taken.

New Business Item No. 4: Review and consideration of request of Warren Street Festival for parking space reservations for car show during annual event

Staff Report by Town Manager Ervin: The Warren Street Festival is scheduled for the third weekend in August and as part of the event, Saturday's (August 15) festivities will include an antique car show. Event organizer, Darlene Swain, is requesting permission to reserve parking spaces along West Church Street (beside Stellar One Bank), turning left on Randolph Street, and in the Town-owned parking lot beside the bank drive-thru. Ms. Swain is not asking for any street closures. Spaces will need to be reserved from 7 a.m. until 1 p.m.

The town manager has asked the police department to review Ms. Swain's parking reservation request and to work out the details with her prior to Monday's meeting.

General Discussion:

- Mayor Angle: Asked Ms. Swain to clarify the reservation time to be from 7:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m.
- Ms. Swain: Identified herself as Chairperson for the Warren Street Society, and advised that the parade starts after people get off work at noon on Saturday, usually around 1:00 p.m. A lot of cars will leave after the parade. There is also a bus coming from New Orleans and West Virginia and she needs some of the space in the back. There will also be games for children. She is trying to keep everything in the perimeter of the Market, and trying to get a fence up between the Market and Cox's Fashions. She will work with the Police Department. Car show in the morning, then a parade, then game shows against the brick building at the Farmers' Market. Friday night is a back-to-school party for kids, and her son and his crew walk around and keep eyes on things and make sure that folks do not get into trouble. She wants the police available.

Motion: To approve the request for reserved parking as presented
Motion By: Council Member Stockton
Second: Council Member Love
Motion Discussion: None
Ayes: Cundiff, Love, Moyer, Snead, Stockton, Walker,
Nays: None
Action: The request was approved as presented by a unanimous vote

Ms. Swain confirmed to the Council that this is the sixteenth year of her event.

New Business Item No. 5: Review and consideration of award of FY2016 Paving Contract to Patterson Brothers Paving

Staff Report by Town Manager Ervin: The Town has bid out its paving work for the current fiscal year. The currently proposed street list includes:

- Patterson Avenue
- Oak Street
- Willow Avenue
- Cromwell Drive
- Oxford Circle
- South Main Street
- Grassy Hill Road
- Floyd Avenue
- Franklin Street
- Old Fort Road

The responsive bids include:

- (1) Patterson Brothers Paving: \$402,290.25 with South Main Parking Lot at \$14,224.00 and \$120.00 per ton
- (2) JC Joyce Trucking & Paving Co.: \$456,735.00 with South Main Parking Lot at \$16,900.00 and \$135.00 per ton

Staff recommends awarding the current year paving contract to Patterson Brothers Paving and asks Council's approval to issue a notice of award to them so that the required bonding can be put into place.

The Town has an excellent history with this paving contractor and will work closely with them to ensure another year of quality paving.

General Discussion: Public Works Director Mason verified to the Council that Patterson Brothers Paving has had contracts with the Town in the past, and they do great work.

Motion: To approve awarding the current year paving contract to Patterson Brothers Paving as presented
Motion By: Council Member Love
Second: Council Member Snead
Motion Discussion: None
Ayes: Cundiff, Love, Moyer, Snead, Stockton, Walker

Nays: None

Action: The awarding of the current year paving contract to Patterson Brothers Paving was approved as presented by a unanimous vote

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Committee Report No. 1: Public Utilities Committee Report for July 22, 2015

Report by Town Manager Ervin: The Public Utilities Committee met on July 22, 2015 to consider the request of Water Treatment Plant Superintendent Deitrich for access to the Utility Capital fund to address the proposed aeration and mixing system for the South 220 tank and to review the recent changes to the Town's refuse collection operation.

Superintendent Deitrich's request has been raised under New Business.

The Committee directed staff to tweak the refuse collection process such that:

- Lids are not required
- Warnings only will be given out until such time as the process is fully developed and communicated

Complaints that are being received at this point only relate to the following:

- Citizens that wish to use 96 gallon cans
- Citizens that wish to use 50 gallon cans as they are the size commonly available
- Citizens that wish to use no can due to terrain issues

Staff believes that a 50 gallon can may be used. A 96 gallon can would require the use of a device called a "flipper." This device would need to be installed on the refuse collection truck at a cost of \$6,000, but this would be a dramatically slow collection process. The committee was reluctant to give out terrain specific exemptions for the use of a can due to the fact that one neighbor would see another not using a can and believe that it was no longer required.

The current plan is to fold in any changes and adjustments offered by Council and continue the warning process until such time as Council feels the issues have been addressed and that it is appropriate to issue fines.

An earlier memo on refuse collection is included in the meeting documents, indicating that larger cans could be used if the citizens would accept an additional \$1.50 a month on the refuse collection bill to pay the debt service on a truck and a can for each household.

General Discussion:

- Cundiff: Noted that in doing away with lids, the condition is that garbage still needs to be in a garbage bag that is closed and confined, and trash should not be allowed to blow around. The main objective is to make sure that trash is in a secure area and the town looks good.
- Public Works Director Mason: Noted that things are calming down a lot. He sees a lot more applications for handicap service, and he is not sure how it will work out quite yet. He believes things will continue to calm down.

This report was for informational purposes only. No action was taken.

Committee Report No. 2: Public Facilities and Special Events Committee Report for August 5, 2015

Report by Town Manager Ervin: The Public Facilities and Special Events Committee met on August 5th to consider the staff's request to initiate a shop in Rocky Mount event involving a special booking at the Harvester whereby tickets could only be obtained by shopping at the Town's local retailers.

Mr. Moyer, Chairperson, was opposed to the concept and suggested that the Town not undertake this but instead waive the Town's meals tax for the month of December. Staff and the other committee members were not supportive of this, as it would cost the Town an estimated \$125,000 and not be a direct incentive to those outside the Town to come and shop in Rocky Mount. An alternate suggestion from Mr. Moyer was to re-use the "5 on Us" campaign that was used in the past. This campaign allowed Town residents to pick up a \$5.00 gift certificate in public places that local retailers accepted as cash and then turned in to the Town for payment. Staff suggested that if this approach was followed that the gift certificates should be only available to non-town residents as our goal this year was to bring new shoppers into Town.

Staff reported that a number of businesses and citizens had responded positively to the proposed Harvester event that would encourage local shopping. Mr. Moyer indicated that the principle reason he opposed the concept is that it involved using Town funds to orchestrate the event and that he viewed this as a subsidy to the Harvester and that he believed the increase in meals tax and BPOL revenue seen by the Town since the opening of the Harvester was not due to the economic impact of the Harvester but was a natural growth of Town revenue.

Other committee members indicated that the event as proposed was a good idea but they wanted some tweaks to avoid abuse. Specifically:

- Tickets should be available to business throughout Town, not just in the Uptown/Downtown area;
- Though the Town supports its food service businesses, the investment in the Harvester itself is enough of a stimulus for them and that this event should focus on retail establishments over food service establishments;
- All retailers should have the same criteria for giving out the tickets (sales over \$100 for example) and that they should be required to report the name of the shopper who won the ticket in order to discourage simply using the tickets for other purposes.

These suggestions can be rolled into the proposal.

The proposed plan is as follows:

- The Town underwrites the booking and advertising of a significant show to be named later. The event would feature an artist whom is likely to be a significant regional draw.
- Local retail non-food related businesses with gross sales over \$50,000 a year would be asked to participate in the program (with those under the \$50,000 threshold being allowed on a case-by-case basis if they are a new business or can demonstrate that they have a viable storefront operation in Town).
- 450 tickets would be distributed to those vendors who participate in a ratio fashioned based on total sales.

- Once the event kicks off, after due advertising for the “Shop in Rocky Mount for Christmas” event, the retailers participating would give the first shoppers in their establishment that spent over \$100 a pair of tickets to the event.
- Staff would maintain a list of participants and the number of tickets still available on the Town’s website as well as the Harvester’s website so interested parties could know where to shop in order to come to the event.
- Un-awarded tickets would be returned to the Town by a certain date to allow for direct purchase or re-assignment to retailers that had a need for additional tickets.
- Retailers would have to report to the Town the name, address and purchase total for the individual that won the tickets, to avoid simply giving the tickets away outside of the event rules.

The core portion of the plan is that there will be a significant musical event in Rocky Mount near Christmas, this event will be sought after by those throughout the region, and the only way to get access to the event is to shop in Rocky Mount.

Facts to consider regarding this are:

There are 141 retail businesses in Rocky Mount.

29 of these are food service.

23 of these are under \$50,000 annually in gross sales.

General Discussion:

Moyer: Advised that he wanted to clear up something that was said, being that the Harvester had nothing to do with the increase in the meals tax. He did not make any such statement. The statement he made was that the Town was already, for a year or so, gaining in meals tax each month. Assistant Town Manager Hankins was trying to take credit for all of the increase, which he cannot do. He reiterated that he did not make the statement that was written in the Council documents. He knows that the Harvester is bringing meals tax to the Town but it has not brought it all.

Town Manager Ervin: Noted that if the phrasing is inappropriate he apologizes. He tried to write it up as a fair recollection. It will stand corrected in the permanent record.

Love: Questioned if there was a decision about food?

Ervin: Noted that the general consensus was that the food providers have enough of a stimulus with the Harvester alone, and this project should be targeted at retail providers.

Moyer: Noted that this is one of the points he is trying to make in that it is not fair to everybody.

Walker: Questioned if food service was included with the ‘5 on Us’ project?

Ervin: Confirmed that it was and Ippy’s was a big consumer of that project. Also noted that he likes the idea of doing something, but if Council thinks it needs a more mature, thought out approach, then there is nothing wrong with laying the groundwork for next year.

Mayor Angle: Likes the idea to encourage people to shop locally.

Love: The idea for this project is to bring people in from other areas to shop in Rocky Mount.

Ervin: '5 on Us' was to get Rocky Mount people to shop in Rocky Mount. The idea behind this is to bring people in from outside to shop in Rocky Mount.

Snead: Suggested that this project be kicked back until there was a clear and concise plan for the Committee or Council to review.

Mayor Angle: Questioned how much lag time is needed for something like this. Would kicking it back mean next season instead of this season?

Ervin: Suggested a work session meeting within the next two weeks to go through it start to finish to develop a definitive plan.

It was the consensus of Council to delay this discussion until a later date. No action was taken.

OTHER MATTERS & CONCERNS

Referrals from other Town of Rocky Mount Boards, Authorities & Commissions:

Let the record show there were no referrals discussed at this time.

Rise and Shine Franklin County Appearances:

Town Manager Ervin appeared on *Rise and Shine Franklin County* with Host Dick Shoemaker this morning.

Council Concerns:

Angle: None.

Cundiff: None.

Love: Asked for an update on the 40 East sidewalk/crosswalk project. Town Manager Ervin noted that the Sheetz easement has been received, but still waiting on the Holiday Inn Express easement.

Moyer: None.

Snead: None.

Stockton: Received a citizen complaint about tractor trailers on Sycamore Street, getting stuck, GPS sending them down Sycamore Street to get to Dudley's Truck Stop. Town Manager Ervin noted that the Town has some signage that it can put up (NO TRUCKS, DO NOT USE GPS, etc.) This can also be reported to Google Maps so that it is updated on GPS.

Walker: Noted that a letter came to the Town addressed to him and was asked to read it for the record. It is about the trash policies and reads as follows:

Town Council

Town of Rocky Mount, Virginia 24151

July 20, 2015

Dear sirs:

Please consider the burden you are placing on the town's senior citizens with the recently enacted requirement that all trash must be in bags and those bags must be in 48 gallon cans for pick up. Aside from the subsequent fine for not complying with this, trash cans are often too heavy for seniors to lift. Carrying one bag at a time to the curb, or putting several bags, one at a time, into the car and taking them to the street is something seniors can do. Lifting heavy, full trash cans is often not something your elderly citizens can do. I know I can't. People on fixed incomes don't need another drain on their small pensions of fines, purchasing cans or having to pay somebody to take the cans to the curb.

There are other issues with trash cans, like empty cans rolling around the street, lids not put back by the collectors and misplaced, dented cans, cracked plastic cans, wind blowing cans and lids away. Would it be better to require heavy gage trash bags that will leave the street clean when the collectors pick them up, than unsightly empty cans left smelly on the curb side until people get home from work – or get their cane or walker out to go and retrieve the cans?

A Rocky Mount Citizen

Noted that he thinks many of this citizen's concerns have been addressed and also added that the Town offers a service to elderly or disabled persons who are not able to get garbage to the curb.

CLOSED MEETING & ACTION

Entering Closed Meeting:

Motion: To go into closed session under the Virginia Code Section cited below
Time: 7:58 p.m.
Virginia Code Sections: Section 2.2-3711(A).1 – Discussion, consideration or interviews of prospective candidates for employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining or resignation of specific public officers, appointees or employees of any public body (Town Manager's Office)
Motion By: Council Member Snead
Second: Council Member Moyer
Motion Discussion: None
Ayes: Cundiff, Love, Moyer, Snead, Stockton, Walker
Nays: None
Action: Meeting convened into a closed session by a unanimous vote

Exiting Closed Meeting:

Motion: To reconvene back into regular session
Time: 8:46 p.m.

Motion By: Council Member Love
Second: Council Member Snead
Motion Discussion: None
Ayes: Cundiff, Love, Moyer, Snead, Stockton, Walker
Nays: None
Action: The meeting was reconvened into regular session by a unanimous vote

Declaration of Closed Meeting Discussion:

Motion: To certify that nothing was discussed in the closed meeting other than what was stated in the motion to enter the closed meeting
Motion By: Council Member Cundiff
Second: Council Member Moyer
Motion Discussion: None
Ayes: Cundiff, Love, Moyer, Snead, Stockton, Walker
Nays: None
Action: The Mayor swore to adopt the motion on the floor by Council Member Cundiff and reported that no action was taken during the closed meeting.

Certificate of Closed Meeting:

Whereas, the Rocky Mount Town Council has convened a closed meeting on Wednesday, August 10, 2015 pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

Whereas, Section 2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, requires certification by this Council that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Rocky Mount Town Council hereby certifies that, to the best of each members' knowledge: (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under this chapter; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed, or considered in the meeting by the public body.

Steven C. Angle, Mayor

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Mayor Angle entertained a motion to adjourn:

Motion to Adjourn By: Vice Mayor Walker
Second: Council Member Stockton
Motion Discussion: None
Ayes: Cundiff, Love, Moyer, Snead, Stockton, Walker
Nays: None
Action: The meeting adjourned by a unanimous vote
Time of Adjournment: 8: 49.p.m.

Steven C. Angle, Mayor

ATTEST:

Stacey B. Sink, Town Clerk

SBS/

DRAFT