

Regular Meeting, Wednesday, September 23, 2009, 7:00 p.m. Government Center, Verona, VA.

PRESENT: Larry C. Howdyshell, Chairman
Gerald W. Garber, Vice-Chairman
David R. Beyeler
Wendell L. Coleman
Tracy C. Pyles, Jr.
Jeremy L. Shifflett
Nancy Taylor Sorrells
Patrick J. Morgan, County Attorney
Melissa Meyerhoeffer, Assistant Director of Finance
John C. McGehee, Assistant County Administrator
Patrick J. Coffield, County Administrator
Rita R. Austin, CMC, Executive Secretary

VIRGINIA: At a regular meeting of the Augusta County Board of Supervisors held on Wednesday, September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m., at the Government Center, Verona, Virginia, and in the 234th year of the Commonwealth....

* * * * *

Chairman Howdyshell welcomed the citizens present and reminded them to remove their hats and turn off their cell phones.

* * * * *

David Tanner, Operations Manager for Vector Industries, led the Pledge of Allegiance. He informed the Board that Vector Industries is a self-worth workshop for the disabled.

* * * * *

Gerald W. Garber, Supervisor for the Middle River District, delivered invocation.

* * * * *

VECTOR INDUSTRIES – RESOLUTION

Mr. Coleman moved, seconded by Mr. Beyeler, that the Board adopt the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, since 1969 Vector Industries, a non-profit organization that serves Waynesboro, Staunton and Augusta County, has given people with diverse disabilities the opportunity to earn a living, gain dignity and develop self-worth, skills and pride; and

WHEREAS, Vector Industries currently provides training and employment related services for over 100 special people, which enables them to reach their potential as productive citizens; and

WHEREAS, this mission is enacted in a manner that promotes safety, quality, customer service, productivity and cost effectiveness while increasing their sense of dignity, pride and self-worth; and

WHEREAS, Vector Industries has built a customer base to include companies such as Reynolds, Parker Bows, Bloomaker, HDT and Hollister, therein creating cost efficiencies for such customers with quality products and services; and

WHEREAS, Vector Industries' employees provide services such as shredding, engraving, quality inspection, assembly and packaging and products such as survey, construction and tomato stakes, related survey and construction material, distributes ClearPak one piece deli containers and assembles and distributes disposable utensil packets; and

WHEREAS, Vector Industries has established their services as a reliable member of the business community that enhances the long-term sustainability of the region while adding to the well-being of its citizenry.

NOW, THEREFORE, WE, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Augusta, Virginia, and on behalf of the citizens of this community, applaud and salute Vector Industries for their forty years of dedication and service and commend all citizens and businesses that support this worthy organization.

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

VECTOR INDUSTRIES – RESOLUTION (cont'd)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Augusta County Board of Supervisors and a copy be presented to the Vector Industries

Kent Iberg, of Vector Industries, mentioned to the Board that he was the most fortunate person to work with the “greatest workforce” in Augusta County. “Our people love coming to work everyday. They love every job they do. They are excited about what they do. There are people that have never had a bad day. They are so positive and so optimistic.” Mr. Iberg invited the Board to attend the 40th Anniversary Celebration on Thursday, October 8, at 11:00 a.m.

Ms. Sorrells added that she had the privilege last year to judge a fundraiser at their womanless beauty pageant.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdysshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler, Shifflett, Pyles and Coleman

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

THE BENNETT REALTY, LLC – REZONING

This being the day and time advertised to consider a request to rezone from General Agriculture and General Business to General Business with proffers approximately 4.8 acres owned by The Bennett Realty, LLC, located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Lee Highway (Route 11) and Weyers Cave Road (Route 256) in Weyers Cave (North River District).

The Chairman declared the public hearing open.

Dale Cobb, Director of Community Development, displayed property which fronted on Route 256 that is already zoned General Business. The applicant has submitted the following proffers:

1. No traffic signal will be allowed to the entrance to the site.
2. The development will be limited to ensure there will be less than sixty (60) vehicles per hour making right turns into the site.
3. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) will need to be completed to show the volume of traffic the site will generate. This TIA will be required as part of the site plan approvals for uses on this site.
4. Fifteen (15') foot right-of-way be dedicated to the Virginia Department of Transportation along Route 11 for the entire length of their property.

The property is Urban Service Area and slated Business. There is an existing 8” sanitary sewer line that runs through the property. Staff is working with the Service Authority to upgrade three different phases to increase fire flow. Presently, the sewer has a limited number of connections available (estimated 400 equivalent residential connections).

Richard Johnson, of Blackwell Engineering in Harrisonburg, representative for The Bennett Realty, LLC, stated that the ultimate use of the property has not been determined but will be investigated after the Board’s action tonight. He was available to answer any questions.

There being no one present to speak for or against, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

THE BENNETT REALTY, LLC – REZONING (cont'd)

Mr. Garber moved, seconded by Ms. Sorrells, that the Board adopt the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE to amend Chapter 25 "Zoning" of the Code of Augusta County, Virginia.

WHEREAS, application has been made to the Board of Supervisors to amend the Augusta County Zoning Maps,

WHEREAS, the Augusta County Planning Commission, after a public hearing, has made their recommendation to the Board of Supervisors,

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has conducted a public hearing,

WHEREAS, both the Commission and Board public hearings have been properly advertised and all public notice as required by the Zoning Ordinance and the Code of Virginia properly completed,

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has considered the application, the Planning Commission recommendation and the comments presented at the public hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, by the Board of Supervisors that the Augusta County Zoning Maps be amended as follows:

Parcel numbers 145, 146 and 146A on tax map number 19 containing approximately 4.8 acres are changed from General Agriculture and General Business to General Business with the following proffers:

1. No traffic signal will be allowed to the entrance to the site.
2. The development will be limited to ensure there will be less than sixty (60) vehicles per hour making right turns into the site.
3. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) will need to be completed to show the volume of traffic the site will generate. This TIA will be required as part of the site plan approvals for uses on this site.
4. Fifteen (15') foot right-of-way be dedicated to the Virginia Department of Transportation along Route 11 for the entire length of their property.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdysshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler, Shifflett, Pyles and Coleman

Nays: None

Motion carried.

Mr. Coleman explained to the public that this issue had been discussed at the Staff Briefing on Monday and the property has been previously viewed.

* * * * *

ANIMAL CONTROL – ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

This being the day and time advertised to consider an ordinance to amend the Code of Augusta County, Virginia, to increase the license tax for dogs and to provide for three-year tags, pursuant to its authority under Virginia Code § 3.2-6528.

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

ANIMAL CONTROL – ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (cont'd)

Patrick J. Morgan, County Attorney, reported that the Treasurer had requested an ordinance amendment to increase the license tax for dogs and to provide for three-year tags that would run concurrently with the dog rabies vaccination period. It also adds a \$20 fee to be charged when a dog is recovered from being impounded and to recover the expenses of the cost for certified mailing for notification of unpaid dog licensing tags.

After advertisement for public hearing, it had been brought to Mr. Morgan's attention by the Animal Control Department of § 5-54, **Conditions precedent to issuance of summons for violation of chapter; notice**, that they had no problem with the Treasurer recovering the amount of the certified mailing, but felt that this particular section was cumbersome when they caught a dog without a license and had to prepare a certified mailing notice before any violation was cited. They recommended that this section be repealed.

Mr. Coleman moved, seconded by Ms. Sorrells, that the Board adopt the following ordinance, as amended:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CODE OF AUGUSTA COUNTY, VIRGINIA, TO ADJUST THE LICENSE TAX FOR DOGS

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 3.2-6528 the Board of Supervisors of Augusta County, Virginia, adopted an ordinance setting a license tax on the ownership of dogs in Augusta County; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors deems it advisable to amend the said ordinance;

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Board of Supervisors of Augusta County that Sections 5-14 and 5-25 are amended to read as follows:

§ 5-14. Amount of license tax.

A. There is hereby imposed a license tax on the ownership of dogs within the county, unless otherwise exempted by law.

B. The annual license tax on a fertile dog not in a licensed kennel shall be Ten Dollars (\$10.00). A multi-year license tax that runs concurrently with the dog's rabies vaccination effective period shall be Twenty-five Dollars (\$25.00).

C. The annual license tax on a neutered or infertile dog shall be Six Dollars (\$6.00). A multi-year license tax that runs concurrently with the dog's rabies vaccination effective period shall be Fifteen Dollars (\$15.00). Any person who applies for a license tag for a neutered or infertile dog shall present at the time of application certification from a licensed veterinarian attesting the neutering or infertility of the dog. If such certification is not so presented, the dog shall be taxed the fee levied on fertile dogs.

D. The tax for each kennel shall be calculated at the rate of Fifty Dollars (\$50.00) for each block of up to ten dogs.

E. For purposes of this chapter, "kennel" means an enclosure with five or more dogs.

§ 5-25. Impoundment.

A. The board of supervisors shall maintain or cause to be maintained a pound or enclosure in accordance with state law and shall cause dogs running at large in violation of article III of this chapter to be confined therein.

B. Any animal which has been so confined must be kept for a period of not less than five days, such period to commence on the day immediately following the day the animal is initially confined to the facility, unless sooner claimed by the owner thereof.

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

ANIMAL CONTROL – ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (cont'd)

C. In the event that any animal confined in such facility is claimed by its rightful owner, the owner shall only be charged with the actual expenses incurred in keeping the animal impounded. Additionally, the owner shall be charged a fee of Twenty Dollars (\$20.00).

D. Unclaimed dogs shall be disposed of in accordance with applicable state laws.

E. The pound shall be accessible to the public at reasonable hours during the week by appointment.

§ 5-54. Violation of chapter; notice.

The treasurer may, on a form to be provided by the county, notify a dog owner by certified mail at his last known address, that the dog owner may pay the dog license fee within the time specified by the notice together with the added cost of the certified mailing and, if such fee is not paid within the time so prescribed, the treasurer will notify the animal warden or other authorized authority that the dog owner has failed to pay such fee within the time so prescribed and a summons will be issued to appear before the general district court.

This ordinance shall be effective immediately.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdyshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler, Shifflett, Pyles and Coleman

Nays: Shifflett

Motion carried.

Mr. Shifflett expressed that he did not agree with the fee increases.

* * * * *
(END OF PUBLIC HEARINGS)
* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC

Frank Bridgeforth, a lifetime member of Stuarts Draft Rescue Squad, offered assistance to the Board’s Emergency Services Committee in considering options for the proposed Fire and Rescue Station in Riverheads.

* * * * *

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN

The Board received recommendations from the Emergency Services Committee regarding:

- 1. Company 10 relocation;
- 2. Riverheads District Fire and Rescue Station

1. COMPANY 10 RELOCATION

Mr. Garber made the following statement:

There has been a lot of discussion about whether or not to move Company 10 and this has caused a lot of uneasiness within the County. The City of Staunton, with whom we share fire and rescue services, also gets uneasy when they hear discussion about us moving out of Staunton. Because we have, in the past, talked about moving the station, we probably have not kept up with the maintenance the way we would have if we had been firmly committed to remaining in the City. At some point, you have to decide that

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

1. COMPANY 10 RELOCATION (cont'd)

you are either going to stay put and get everything back in order or move and make plans for a new station. We are at the point where we need to make the decision because we are letting some of the maintenance issues slide. It is, therefore, the recommendation of the Emergency Services Committee that we leave Company 10 where it is and that we immediately start an assessment of the maintenance and improvement needs to put it back in order at its present site.

Mr. Garber moved, seconded by Mr. Shifflett, that the Board approve that Company 10 remain at its present location with an assessment of needs to be presented to the Board.

Mr. Pyles made the following comment:

I see that the Committee made a recommendation. It would be well if we could look at all the facts and figures that went into that consideration. I think that we're owed, at least, that much to know what you looked at and what you didn't look at. When we looked at Staunton . . . you know when I looked at it, I was surprised at how many calls we do for Staunton versus how many they do for us. We are charged by Rockingham County for services they provide to us up at Weyers Cave. Why aren't we getting money for what we're doing for Staunton? We are giving away about \$200,000 of services to Staunton over and above of what we're getting. Now, we can still supply help to them by doing elsewhere, but if we looked at what we're doing for Staunton and then we remove the call volume that would be going to Greenville, we are going to be having over \$1,000 a call for responses in Staunton. Do you have that number, Mr. Garber? Do you know how much it costs us per call? If you do, will you tell me?

Mr. Garber's response:

I have not worked it out on a per call basis.

Mr. Pyles' response:

Well, I think that a business person ought to look at what it costs us to do so. If we're going to give away that many resources, what are we getting for it? Staunton isn't even willing to help us with the Fire Training Center that they originally were going to do. These are tough times. Staunton is not giving us anything and we should not be hard, but let's be fair. Let's see how much it's costing us per call for the Fire Company in Augusta County, not volunteers, is \$2.5. They don't make that many calls. They have been making 350 calls for Staunton. Let's find out what it has cost us; then, let's look at . . . What have you done as far as build-out to see what it's going to do as far as congestion and what we're going to have to go through? Mr. Shifflett brought up, when we were talking about the corridor on Richmond Road how many 100's of 1,000's people are going to start going to Frontier Culture Museum? They are going to re-do Western State into a commercial area with high traffic. That all is going to be build-out and here we've got our fire station sitting in that congestion which is mainly going to be for Staunton. It is inconceivable of me that we would think long-term that the best place to have the Augusta County career station is in Staunton. Mr. Garber, I would like to see what you were looking at to see if we could concur with that. If the public can take a look at what you're looking at, not just 'Here is my opinion,' but what is it based on? I think we owe it to our taxpayers to do that.

Mr. Pyles moved, no second, that the Board table the Company 10 relocation recommendation until the facts are looked at and evaluated, as a Board, not just as a committee.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pyles

Nays: Howdysshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler,
Shifflett and Coleman

Motion failed.

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

* * *

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

1. COMPANY 10 RELOCATION (cont'd)

Mr. Beyeler made the following comment:

We're sitting right at the edge of Staunton. Up until the last two years, I was in favor of moving it, too. With what we have going down here on Route 262, what is being proposed on Route 250, interstate and . . . all of us, I think, except Mr. Pyles attended the meeting on Richmond Road and they showed us the plan that they had there. The other thing is that most of the calls in the City of Staunton that were answered are within a mile of the Fire Station. That isn't true on the western side of the County. We need to compare apples with apples. We can't separate it.

Mr. Beyeler called for the question.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdyshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler,
Shifflett, Pyles and Coleman

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

Vote for the original motion:

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdyshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler,
Shifflett and Coleman

Nays: Pyles

Motion carried.

* * *

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

2. RIVERHEADS DISTRICT FIRE AND RESCUE STATION

Mr. Garber asked Mr. Morgan if this item had been tabled at the previous meeting. Patrick J. Coffield, County Administrator, read from the August 26, 2009 minutes:

Mr. Garber moved, seconded by Mr. Pyles, that the Board table this item and authorize Emergency Services Committee to meet and answer questions that have been submitted and provide recommendations at the next Staff Briefing (September 21st).

Mr. Morgan stated that it should have been removed from the table on the 21st. Mr. Beyeler stated that it had not been removed on the 21st because actions are not usually made at Staff Briefings.

Mr. Garber moved, seconded by Ms. Sorrells, that the Riverheads District Fire and Rescue Station item be removed from the table.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdyshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler,
Shifflett, Pyles and Coleman

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

2. RIVERHEADS DISTRICT FIRE AND RESCUE STATION (cont'd)

Mr. Garber felt that there were a number of issues to be considered and the Committee did not feel comfortable in addressing those issues at the present time.

Mr. Garber moved, seconded by Mr. Pyles, that the Board table this item until October 14th.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdysshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler,
Shifflett, Pyles and Coleman

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

Mr. Beyeler added that a report prepared by Ms. Sorrells and he was distributed to all Board members and asked that it be made as a part of the minutes. Ms. Sorrells reminded the Board that the Board had requested that a report on a proposal for a potential fire and rescue station, looking at all the pros and cons, be prepared.

Ms. Sorrells moved, seconded by Mr. Beyeler, that the following report be made as a part of the minutes so that it would become a public document:

**Summary Report
Investigations into a fire & rescue station in the
Riverheads District (in close proximity to the school
campus and the interstate)**

THE NEED - There has been a long-standing realization that a fire & rescue company is needed for the Riverheads community in the vicinity of Greenville. The situation is now at a point where the lives and safety of citizens in the southeastern part of the county are being compromised. For the following reasons, it makes sense to move ahead with a fire and rescue station along the Rt. 11/I-81 corridor near Greenville as soon as possible.

1. In January, the Stuarts Draft Volunteer Fire Department formally requested coverage help in the area. Currently SDVFD covers all the way to Rt. 11 at the schools and south on Rt. 608 to Stoney Creek. This creates a large coverage area for a company located in what is one of the areas targeted for the county's highest growth in the Comprehensive Plan. Stuarts Draft feels like it either needs to have its resources increased or its coverage area reduced.
2. Coverage along the Rockbridge line from Raphine FD and Fairfield RS has not been up to par for quite some time now. Add to that the fact that Rockbridge's response time for first due is twice as long as Augusta's (10 minutes vs. 5 minutes). While Rockbridge does respond in 5 minutes if the caller is from a landline in Augusta, cell phone callers who do not identify themselves specifically as Augusta County receive treatment as if they were Rockbridge callers. Add to that the fact that the "no responses" coming from these two departments are often higher than average and the result is reduced service for those Augusta County citizens along the Rockbridge line. Both Middlebrook VFD and Stuarts Draft RS have increased their coverage in an attempt to cover these deficits. This situation could compromise emergency service response to the citizens in their first due areas. **In a June 8, 2009, preliminary meeting of officers from all companies potentially affected by a new Riverheads station (Co. 10, Stuarts Draft RS, Stuarts Draft VFD, Fairfield RS, Raphine VFD, Middlebrook VFD, and SARS), Fairfield expressed relief that something was being done because of their inability to respond effectively. Of note, also is the fact that Rockbridge County has no paid fire and rescue personnel and two of the seven emergency response companies serving the Riverheads District are

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

2. RIVERHEADS DISTRICT FIRE AND RESCUE STATION (cont'd)

coming from Rockbridge. There is currently only one emergency services company located within the boundaries of Riverheads and that is the Middlebrook Volunteer Fire Department.

3. The need to respond to interstate calls from the three exits, Mint Spring, Greenville, and Raphine, has increased dramatically over the years and is putting an increased strain on the resources of all the fire and rescue units along the I-81 corridor from Staunton south to Fairfield.
4. For a variety of reasons including the increased commercial and truck traffic as a result of the Pilot truck stop, the interstate exchange area is averaging almost a 911 call a day. Many of these calls must be handled by the Middlebrook Volunteer Fire Department. That small department is already stretched thin due to its extended coverage of the Raphine Fire Department. Within the last two years, 3 career daylight positions have been added at Middlebrook in an attempt to provide increased manpower there.
5. With access to water and sewer, the new comp plan has added an urban service area south on Rt. 11 from the two schools to within a quarter mile of the village. Approved plans are already in place for at least 250 houses and town homes around the high school. The commercial development that includes Pilot contains several hundred business zoned acres awaiting development. There are also several tracts of business land across Rt. 11 from that large commercial area as well as on both sides of Rt. 11 from the traffic light to the schools. Once the residential areas begin being built and the commercial development begins, the current demands for fire and rescue will increase dramatically.
6. The current master plan recognizes the need for expanding fire and rescue services into the area near Greenville. Our budget notebook this year included a page reiterating that point.

- As a result of long-standing needs in the Riverheads District and potential impacts in the South River District to its first responders that provide coverage in the Riverheads District, Mr. Beyeler and Mrs. Sorrells have been responding to requests from both constituents and fire and rescue units to address these potentially life-threatening problems. This summer, the county's emergency services representatives, Larry Howdyshell and Gerald Garber, instructed Beyeler and Sorrells to bring back to the board a detailed plan. To that end we have been moving forward with due diligence in conjunction with the county's fire chief and the assistant county administrator who oversees fire and rescue.
- In putting together this plan, we are looking at the long-term needs of this area of the county in conjunction with the overall picture of fire and rescue in Augusta County. The plan must work not only now, but 20 or 30 years from now. It is important to keep this in context of the economic realities of the present while finding the best way to partner with community resources and create something that will be strong enough to serve a growing community long after those of us planning this are out of the picture. In other words: efficiency and effectiveness of community services now and in the long range future, lowest expenditure possible of taxpayer dollars, and community buy-in.
- **A band-aid approach now will result in higher costs both now and in the future and also result in lower quality services. Further, this must be a long-range plan that carries us decades into the future. Allowing ourselves to waylay the right plan because of personality issues and inconsequential control issues now will not be in the best interests of the citizens immediately or in the future. Personality issues can be controlled in the short run and will disappear in the long run. Further, a little less government control and a little more community buy-in will make this a station that belongs to the county AND the Riverheads Community and will be a station that everyone will be proud of.

CALL VOLUME - Last year there were 532 fire calls and 669 EMS calls in the projected service area. Chief Carson projects about a 1,000 combined fire and rescue calls initially for a new Riverheads station. This number would certainly increase once the approved subdivisions are built and the commercial areas begin to be built out. If the new station is providing coverage into the current Fairfield RS and Raphine VFD areas then the call volume could also increase.

THE LOCATION & BUILDING - Close proximity to the high school and to the interstate exits (213A & B) are important considerations when determining a location. After carefully studying all of these options and issues and looking

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

2. RIVERHEADS DISTRICT FIRE AND RESCUE STATION (cont'd)

at a number of pieces of property both north and south of Greenville, a piece of real estate that best meets the fire and rescue needs in the southern portion of the county has been located. The location of a station here, either through retrofitting the current building or building a new structure at this location not only addresses current issues and concerns but will also meet future needs for the community and the larger county fire and rescue plan.

This location has numerous access points to main arteries such as Rt. 11, 340, two interstate access points, Old Greenville Rd., Middlebrook, etc. This will give the flexibility for back-up access should an incident occur on the interstate that clogs the intersection. (See attachment of times from station to various points)

The Campbell property is a 3-acre parcel located on Swortzel Shop Rd. just off of Rt. 11 (next to Pebbles to Boulders). Six of the seven supervisors have visited the site. The property is a half-mile north of the schools and one mile north of the interstate interchange. The location on Swortzel Shop gives a future fire company insulation from any bottlenecks created south of the school due to a situation on the interstate. In an event of severe congestion around the interchange, the company could still respond to Stuarts Draft and Rt. 608 calls by going east on Swortzel and taking Rt. 340. They could respond to points west (Middlebrook) by taking Chestnut Ridge to Middlebrook Rd., and to points north by taking Chestnut Ridge to Old Greenville (response to Spring Lakes community for instance).

The cost of the real estate and the building as a turn-key job is as follows (with a +/-5% margin of error based on the fact that the 3 items with asterisks would require another meeting with Chief Holloway for finalization of numbers):

\$490,045	Land & Building per plans designed after discussion with Chief Holloway and Mr. McGehee
\$65,296	Paving as stipulated by Chief Holloway to insure adequate support of heavy equipment
\$55,000	Per specs from Chief Holloway*
\$25,000	Per discussions with Chief Holloway and based on what is in several current Augusta County stations*
\$72,610	Waterline extension with fire hydrant (from Rt. 11)
\$45,000	Three phase power*
\$5,000	Soil engineering
<hr/>	
\$757,951	turnkey package

This includes a total retrofit of the building, inside and out. The only thing that would be retained from the current building is the roughed in plumbing and utilities in the living space area and the cement pad in that area.

--Should the committee wish to add post support, 100 pressure treated lumber posts could be added for less than \$3,000.

--Should the committee want to reduce this final figure, the three phase power could be eliminated as well as the fire hydrant

--Should the committee wish to tear down the current structure and start from scratch on a building, \$94,000 should be added to the turnkey package figure for a total of \$851,951.

Where would the money come from?

There are several scenarios for financing this station. These are three scenarios; there could certainly be others. It should be emphasized that the need for a Riverheads station is real and increases daily. It should not be tied to the future of Co. 10's relocation. The project needs to be considered whether or not Co. 10 relocates and funding scenarios would certainly be adjusted accordingly. Further, if Co. 10 moves to a location just south of Staunton, this does little to meet the current or future needs in the Riverheads District

1. There is currently about \$1.2 million in the Co. 10 fund for potential relocation. If it is decided that the future of Co. 10 is in its current location, then the money could come from there. This leaves enough for retrofitting Co. 10. Other start up costs for a new Riverheads station would come from the infrastructure accounts of Riverheads and South River as well as fundraising efforts within the community. It is anticipated that fundraising efforts would be successful as a number of people have already offered donations.
2. Money from Co. 10 could be less than the amount discussed above and then could be offset by a larger infrastructure amount.
3. If the decision is made not to use Co. 10 money, then the land could be purchased (\$225,000) out of infrastructure money and the current building could be used while another one is built on site. The two potential groups

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

2. RIVERHEADS DISTRICT FIRE AND RESCUE STATION (cont'd)

that would like to come into the building (a group of fire volunteers who want to form a new company & SARS) have verbally committed to entering into a fundraising capital campaign to make this station a reality should this option be chosen.

**If a new building is constructed on the site, the existing building could be used as is for county storage of county equipment such trailers, haz mat equipment, etc. that is currently stored in the open and at scattered locations throughout the county.

Estimated Annual Operating Expenses for a new fire station at Riverheads
(Expenses such as utilities, occupancy, etc. would be for both fire and rescue because they will share the building, however actual fire equipment expenses are for the fire side only. If SARS handles the rescue side then there will be no equipment and gear expenses on the emergency side.)

ANNUAL

Accounting fees: \$3,400
Supplies (office, miscellaneous fire and EMS equipment) \$15,000
Telephone & internet \$1,000
Equipment and vehicle maintenance and vehicle fuel \$22,000
Occupancy [Utilities (electricity, water, LP)] \$15,000
Turnout gear, radios, pagers
--Annual maintenance, replacement, etc.\$5,000
--[Initial startup for EMS for fire engine is \$10,000 see below] (after that miscellaneous replacement costs are covered under the miscellaneous supplies)
Training & materials \$10,000
Buildings and ground maintenance and snow removal: \$2,500

FIRE EQUIPMENT START-UP

Turnout gear, radios, pagers --initial start up \$50,000
Airpacks, fans, hose start-up costs \$70,000
--Initial startup for EMS for fire engine is \$10,000

Chief Holloway has discussed moving Engine 102 and Tanker 109 to the new station (If this is the case, then there would be no need for the \$70,000 fire equipment figure seen above)

If a commercial fire engine (not customized) is purchased then the cost is at least \$200,000; but probably \$300,000 because of the need for lighting and generator and front intake pump for rural areas. This equipment could be secured through the revolving loan fund, grant writing, and fundraising.

STAFFING THE NEW STATION (Different scenarios)

SARS & VOLUNTEER FIRE - To best meet the needs of this portion of the county, this station should be a combined fire and rescue station. Staunton Augusta Rescue Squad would provide the top-level 24/7 EMS services at no cost to the county. This is in their current first due area and they would continue to collect the revenue recovery that they now collect. Although SARS has paid personnel, they also have more than 40 volunteers. They are also committed to running community first aid classes and other training classes at the schools as a community service.

There are currently 13 fire volunteers (most but not all from the current Co. 10 volunteer corps) as well as a group of other trained fire fighters and some new community volunteers who have already started to talk about forming a new company if allowed by the county. They are willing to commit in writing to 24/7 fire coverage without county paid personnel for at least the first year and potentially well into the future. The first six months of any new fire company's existence entails double coverage of calls anyway so we know that someone will get out on every call. If after a year, it becomes apparent that the company would need to be supplemented with daylight career staff, then what has been lost? You still will have a new company in place and better coverage than ever before will have been provided for the area. It is a win-win situation for the citizens and the county's emergency services team.

COMMUNITY BUY IN - It is our belief, particularly in these tough economic times, that the best way to staff the fire side of this station is with this newly formed volunteer company. The current group of volunteers will work with the community to expand their ranks (there are already a number of people who have expressed an interest). Training could be provided within the community (the schools are willing to provide space) so that people would not have to

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

2. RIVERHEADS DISTRICT FIRE AND RESCUE STATION (cont'd)

drive to Verona to get training. Fundraisers can be held at the new station site as well as at the schools. It is our opinion that making this a career station would be a wrong decision not only because of the excessive and unnecessary expense, but also because of the appearance of government being shoved down the throats of the community. There is no community buy-in from a career station and the community people are excluded from their own place.

**One sidenote is that there are more than 3,400 households within a five-mile radius of the proposed new station site. A local insurance agent ran the numbers to find out what kind of building insurance savings would result for those located within that circle. Each household could expect savings of between \$100-200 per year on its insurance.

CAREER FIRE - If the county makes this station totally career on both the fire and rescue side, then the costs will be as follows: At least 5 people 24/7 are needed so that is 15 new or shifted positions. With benefits and salaries that is nearly **\$840,000 annually** (salary is \$42,000 and with benefits \$56,000)

What other different scenarios are there instead of building a new station at Swortzel Shop Rd.?

ON THE RESCUE SIDE:

Middlebrook: Middlebrook has requested that the county give them an ambulance and the staff necessary to run the ambulance 24/7. It should be noted that the Riverheads supervisor has offered to buy Middlebrook an ambulance for the last five years but they have declined because they never had the volunteers to run the vehicle. Further, the idea of wanting an ambulance is apparently a new one as the department purchased a new Suburban recently. Also, two years ago, Middlebrook requested and received three career firefighters. The county currently has 3 career people there daylight Monday-Friday.

--Should we respond positively to Middlebrook's request then there would be the initial cost of the vehicle as well as an annual additional salary expense of \$168,000 per year because of the necessity of adding three more positions to cover 2 per shift 24/7. **Additional expense of about \$168,000 per year.**

Pros & Cons of the Middlebrook request: We would have an ambulance to cover a remote part of the county (currently this is first due for SARS, but MVFD responds and provides fast ALS coverage during the day when there is career staffing until SARS arrives. The ONLY increase in service to the citizenry is the potential of faster transport. There will be NO increase in medical service for an increase of \$168,000 annually. However if the cross-trained personnel are out on a fire call and an ambulance call comes in then there will be no trained personnel to respond unless you increase the career staff to 15 total which would increase the expense of salaries to \$840,000. Additionally Middlebrook currently has no facilities to house personnel 24/7. Further, this will not provide optimum coverage to address the current concerns of Fairfield's lack of response on the east side of Rt. 11, and the increased needs envisioned for the interstate interchange area and the expanded residential, school, and commercial growth areas there. Placing an ambulance at Swortzel Shop Rd. would be just as effective to help the remote county needs south and west of Middlebrook because of faster response time and would also address the current needs south and east of Rt. 11.

Camp 10 options - There has been some very new discussion about placing a fire and/or rescue vehicle at the state correctional facility south of Greenville. Placing an ambulance at Camp 10 or in another area south of Greenville would require 6 positions, which is **\$336,000 a year in salaries alone**. Pros & Cons: This option would help provide the coverage in the southeastern portion that is currently not being handled by Fairfield. However, in addition to the salaries, there will be building maintenance and cost. If you also put an ambulance in Middlebrook then you have annual operating expenses at two locations (buildings, utilities, etc.) in addition to an increase of salaries of between \$504,000 and \$1.2 million to address rescue issues ALONE.

Stuarts Draft Rescue option - The option of asking SDRS to respond to an RFP to run rescue at a new Riverheads station has been discussed. The squad currently has 3 career people. To make this work, the county will need to increase the number of county career staff currently with SDRS. While the potential of receiving all of the revenue recovery money in a new Riverheads station's first due area is alluring, would SDRS or any other current company be willing to give up all its county career personnel, all of its annual stipend, and all the other purchases made for it by the county?

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

2. RIVERHEADS DISTRICT FIRE AND RESCUE STATION (cont'd)

SARS - SARS has proposed placing an ambulance and medic crew in a new station in the Riverheads area on a 24/7 basis at no cost to the county. Pros & Cons: Expansion of quality of service in what is already almost entirely SARS' first due area and in the Fairfield first due area for which Fairfield has requested help. No cost in salaries or equipment. The ability to quickly shift a second rescue vehicle into action should there be multiple calls. The promise of community training classes at the schools and in the community. Relieves call volumes from Fairfield and Stuarts Draft (which is currently covering for Fairfield all the way into Rockbridge thus making them unable to adequately cover calls within the South River District). Also, SARS currently receives no annual stipends from the county, uses no county personnel, and needs no other equipment such as Toughbooks. The only Con to this option is a perceived lack of control by the county. This is easily addressed through any contract between SARS and the county.

POLICY ISSUE: The county currently does not allow career people to go 24/7 at volunteer stations. The policy would have to be changed at Middlebrook and Stuarts Draft to make the above options possible.

--Should the county elect to go with placing an ambulance in Middlebrook and south of Greenville, they will need to purchase a minimum of three vehicles so that two are active while vehicles are out of action for regular maintenance as well as repairs.

FIRE OPTIONS AT A NEW RIVERHEADS STATION

The study of expanding fire and rescue services in the southern part of the county along either side of the interstate began with a letter in January from the SDVF requesting that they be relieved of the pressures from their increasing call volume in that area. Additionally, the county has been providing double coverage for Raphine (by Middlebrook) for a long time now.

There are two options to help relieve Stuarts Draft:

Option One: Put career staff at SDVF during daylight hours, 3 people would be \$168,000 a year. **Pros & Cons:** It would get people out DURING the daylight hours, however it would not do anything to decrease the call volume. Response time to remote portions of the county would not improve.

Option Two: The SDVF option does not solve the problem with the coverage provided by Raphine so simultaneously you would have to add 3 people at Raphine which is problematic because it is in Rockbridge. Do we ask Rockbridge, which has NO career staff, to pay for part of the \$180,000 in salaries?

Option Three: Put an engine south of Greenville. **Pros & Cons:** This would require the cost of the engine, minimum of \$400,000 and of a building, and the need for 9 career people to provide 24/7 coverage which would cost \$504,000 annually in salaries. You would not need the Raphine personnel, however you might still need to add the SDVF personnel. This would address some of the problems areas south of Greenville that are not being met by Raphine.

**Locating a fire and rescue station south of Greenville might not give the best access to other areas: Stuarts Draft, Jollivue, Middlebrook, or even the city of Staunton. It is a long way between the two interstate exits (Raphine and Greenville) and so it has poor access to the interstate. The county will also be running a larger number of calls into Rockbridge. Further, if the location is at Camp 10, there is no secondary access should Rt. 11 be clogged because of an incident on the interstate (a frequent occurrence). If you put a fire station south of Greenville there will be no relief to Co. 10 on their call volume south of Staunton.

IN CONCLUSION - After carefully studying all of these options and issues and looking at a number of pieces of property both north and south of Greenville, the South River and Riverheads supervisors feel like the Campbell property located on Swortzel Shop Rd. best meets the fire and rescue needs in the southern portion of the county. The location of a station here, either through retrofitting the current building or building a new structure at this location, not only addresses current issues and concerns but will meet future needs for the community as well as the larger county fire and rescue plan.

It is our recommendation that, to best meet the emergency service needs of this portion of the county, this station should be combined fire and rescue. In order to provide the BEST service at the MOST ECONOMICAL COST, SARS would provide the EMS side coverage at no cost to the county. This is in their

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

2. RIVERHEADS DISTRICT FIRE AND RESCUE STATION (cont'd)

current first due area and they would continue to collect the revenue recovery that they now collect. The fire side would consist of a newly formed volunteer company with no career people for AT LEAST the first year and perhaps for much longer.

TIMELINE

1. January 2009 Stuarts Draft Volunteer Fire Department requests help in either reducing their coverage area or adding more personnel.
2. March 2009 AC budget contains planning information from the Fire Chief and County Administrator for long range emergency services needs in the county. Among the recommendations is a station in the Greenville area.
3. May 1, 2009 Memo from Chief Holloway to Asst. Co. Administrator John McGehee notes: "I certainly concur with Ms. Sorrells and Mr. Beyeler. The area is presently served by four fire agencies and three rescue squads, two of which are out of county agencies. These agencies provide an invaluable service to the area; however, at times it taxes their available resources by having to travel long distances to respond to the area. An agency located in this area that could serve both needs would certainly enhance service delivery not only by providing a timely response but could also serve as a support to agencies currently providing the service in a more cost effective and efficient way. It would be a one station, all service approach."
4. June 8, 2009 Sorrells, Beyeler, Holloway, and McGehee meet at Riverheads HS with the officers from the first due agencies coming into Riverheads: Stuarts Draft RS, Fairfield RS, Staunton Augusta RS, Middlebrook FD, Augusta Co. FD, Raphine RD, and Stuarts Draft FD.
5. June 25, 2009 Sorrells, Beyeler, Holloway, McGehee, and Minday Craun host a community meeting at Riverheads HS to let the community know of the planning process and to judge community interest.
6. July 22, 2009 Consensus of the BOS that Sorrells and Beyeler bring a concrete proposal for a fire and rescue station to the board.
7. August 17, 2009 Middlebrook VFD Chief Tommy Hughes sends a letter to the county requesting that the county provide an ambulance and staffing at the Middlebrook station.
8. August 20, 2009 SARS Executive Director Kim Craig sends a letter to the county committing to providing staff and ambulance 24/7 at a new Riverheads station at no cost to the county.
9. August 24, 2009 Proposal presented to the board
10. August 26, 2009 Motion passed to study the proposal for 30 days by a committee consisting of Larry Howdysshell, Gerald Garber, Holloway, and McGehee. Chairman Howdysshell noted that no further action would take place until Sorrells and Beyeler met with the committee and brought them up to speed on everything.

Mileage/times from a new Riverheads station at the proposed site

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	1.1 miles
Travel - Swortzel Shop Rd.	1.5 mins.
To - Swortzel Shop Rd. and Stuart's Draft Hwy intersection	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	1.2 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy	1.5 mins.
To - Riverheads School(s)	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	2 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy	2.5 mins.
To - Pilot Truck Stop	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	3.4 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy.	4.37 mins.
To - Greenville (center of)	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	6.4 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy.	7.5 mins.
To - Lofton Rd. (Rt. 666)	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	9.6 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy	11 mins.
To - Rockbridge County line	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	11.6 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy and Raphine Rd.	14.5 mins.
To - Raphine Fire Dept.	

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

2. RIVERHEADS DISTRICT FIRE AND RESCUE STATION (cont'd)

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	2 miles
Travel - Lee Jackson Hwy. and Howardsville Rd.	3.3 mins.
To - Old Greenville Rd.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	3.3 miles
Travel - Lee Jackson Hwy. and Howardsville Rd.	4.4 mins.
To - Bethel Green Rd.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	5.3 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy. and Howardsville Rd.	6.4 mins.
To - Middlebrook Rd.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	6.7 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy., Howardsville Rd, and Middlebrook Rd.	8.5 mins.
To - Middlebrook Fire Dept.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	1.5 miles
Travel - Chestnut Ridge Rd.	2 mins.
To - Old Greenville Rd.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	2.3 miles
Travel Chestnut Ridge Rd.	3.1 mins.
To - Bethel Green Rd.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	5.4 miles
Travel - Chestnut Ridge Ln. then Old Greenville Rd.	7.5 mins.
To - Mill Creek Ln. and Old Greenville Rd. intersection	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	1.3 miles
Travel - Lee Jackson Hwy	1.4 mins.
To - Walnut Hill Rd.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	2.8 miles
Travel - Lee Jackson Hwy	3 mins.
To - White Hill Rd.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	4 miles
Travel - Lee Jackson Hwy	3.3 mins.
To - Cochran's Mill Rd.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	4.7 miles
Travel - Lee Jackson Hwy	5.1 mins
To - Brookwood subdivision	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	5 miles
Travel - Lee Jackson Hwy	5.3 mins.
To - Landfill Rd.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	6.5
miles	
Travel - Lee Jackson Hwy	7.3 mins.
To - Frontier Dr.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	7.6 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy. and Frontier Dr.	11.4
mins.	
To - Augusta County Fire Dept.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	7.1 miles
Travel - Lee Jackson Hwy., White Hill Rd. and I-81 North	10.3
mins.	
To - I-81 North Exit 222	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	8.6 miles
Travel - Lee Jackson Hwy., White Hill Rd. and I-81 North	10
mins.	
To - Augusta County Fire Dept.	
From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection	5 miles
Travel - Lee Jackson Hwy. and Greenville School Rd.	6.8 mins.

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

2. RIVERHEADS DISTRICT FIRE AND RESCUE STATION (cont'd)

To - Cold Spring Rd.

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 5.5 miles
Travel - Lee Jackson Hwy., Greenville School Rd. and Cold Springs Rd. 7.9 mins.

To - North, Stoney Creek entrance

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 3.9 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy., Peyton Hill Rd. and Indian Ridge Rd. 5.5 mins.

To - Avis Rd.

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 5.3 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy., Peyton Hill Rd., Indian Ridge Rd. 7.8 mins.

and Avis Rd

To - Cold Springs Rd.

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 5 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy and White Hill Rd. 5.3 mins.

To - Old White Hill Rd.

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 6.5 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy and White Hill Rd. 7 mins.

To - Twin Hills Rd.

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 7.6 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy and White Hill Rd. 8.1 mins.

To - Stuart's Draft Hwy

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 8.6 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy, White Hill Rd., and Stuart's Draft Hwy 10.1 mins.

To - Stuart's Draft Fire Dept

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 2.9 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy. and Walnut Hill Rd. 3.6 mins.

To - Stuart's Draft Hwy

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 1.6 miles
Travel - Swortzel Shop Rd. and Stuart's Draft Hwy. 2.2 mins.

To - Walnut Hill Rd.

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 4.6 miles
Travel - Swortzel Shop Rd. and Stuart's Draft Hwy. 5.5 mins.

To - Guthrie Rd.

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 8.6 miles
Travel - Swortzel Shop Rd. and Stuart's Draft Hwy. 8.8 mins

mins

To - White Hill Rd.

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 4.8 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy. and Cochran's Mill Rd. 4.9 mins.

mins.

To - Old Greenville Rd.

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 7.4 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy., Cochran's Mill Rd. 8.4 mins.

and Old Greenville Rd.

To - Spring Lakes

From - Swortzel Shop Rd. at Lee-Jackson Hwy. intersection 8 miles
Travel - Lee-Jackson Hwy., Rt. 262 and Old Greenville Rd. 9.3 mins

To - Spring Lakes

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdysshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler,
Shifflett, Pyles and Coleman

Nays: None

Motion carried.

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

* * *

FIRE AND RESCUE MASTER PLAN (cont'd)

2. RIVERHEADS DISTRICT FIRE AND RESCUE STATION (cont'd)

Mr. Beyeler suggested that the Board view Company 10 at the Board's next Staff Briefing on October 26 and ask staff to provide an assessment of remodeling the station. At that time, it can be decided when to proceed – immediately, or at budget time. It was the consensus of the Board to view Company 10 on October 26th.

Mr. Shifflett stated, "With it being right in the middle of the growth corridor for Staunton, and since we're keeping it in Staunton, I think that in the near future, once we decide what we are going to do with Greenville, that we should at least extend the 'olive branch' to Staunton to see if we can have some discussion on operating Company 10 regionally there. There may be a call savings for Staunton and Augusta County. We won't know unless we, at least, have that discussion." Chairman Howdysshell suggested that this be discussed at the next Governance (Mayors/Chairman) meeting.

* * * * *

BULK WATER SYSTEM – RIVERHEADS

The Board considered initiation of process to identify site for locating of a bulk water system for sale of ACSA water to individuals and vendors.

Funding Source: Riverheads Infrastructure Account #80000-8015-54 \$5,000

Mr. Coffield advised that the Board received a briefing at Monday's Staff Briefing. He noted that there is a need of a number of residents on Coal Road to get access to public water in the Riverheads District. The Service Authority has prepared a report identifying locations; the next step is to look at a potential sites to either purchase, lease, or to modify an existing site that is owned by Augusta County or the Service Authority to locate this facility. Mr. Coffield emphasized that this request is NOT to purchase the system, but to do a preliminary investigation.

Ms. Sorrells moved, seconded by Mr. Shifflett, that the Board approve the request.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdysshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler, Shifflett, Pyles and Coleman

Nays: None

Motion carried.

Chairman Howdysshell added that this was similar to a gas station – you have a card or a key number for people who need water and then they are billed for what they use.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Beyeler moved, seconded by Ms. Sorrells, that the Board approve the consent agenda as follows:

MINUTES

Approved minutes of the following meetings:

- Regular Meeting, Wednesday, September 9, 2009

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

* * *

CONSENT AGENDA (cont'd)

VDOT – ROAD ABANDONMENT (PORTIONS OF ROUTE 635 AND ROUTE 632)

Adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Transportation has provided this Board with a sketch and letter dated September 2, 2009 depicting the abandonment's required in the secondary system of state highways as a result of Project 340-007-V06, C-504, which sketch is hereby incorporated herein by reference,

WHEREAS, the new road serves the same citizens as those portions of old road identified to be abandoned and those segments have been incorporated into the additional lanes of Route 340, and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, this Board abandons as part of the secondary system of state highways those portions of road identified by the sketch as Sections 1 & 2 to be abandoned, pursuant to §33.1-155, Code of Virginia:

Route 635-From: 80-feet south of centerline Route 340 Southbound lanes
To: Centerline Route 340 Southbound Lanes
Length: 0.02 mile [measured along Section 1 center line], and

Route 632-From: 83-feet south of centerline Route 340 Southbound lanes
To: Centerline Route 340 Southbound Lanes
Length: 0.02 mile [measured along Section 2 center line], and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

* * *

STREET ADDITION

Adopted resolution for acceptance of the following streets into the secondary road system in accordance with VDOT request (Beverly Manor District):

SPRING LAKES @ WOODLANDS, PHASES 1B, 2A AND 3A - STREET ADDITIONS

WHEREAS, that the County and the Virginia Department of Transportation have entered into an agreement on August 26, 1996, for comprehensive stormwater detention which applies to this request for addition.

WHEREAS, VDOT Form AM-4.3 is hereby attached and incorporated as part of the governing body's resolution for changes in the secondary system of state highways.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Virginia Department of Transportation is hereby requested to add the following streets in **SPRING LAKES @ WOODLANDS, PHASES 1B, 2A AND 3A**, into the secondary road system of Augusta County pursuant to Section 33.1-229 of the Code of Virginia (1950) as amended:

Fairfield Drive (Route 1460), Phase 1B
From: 0.16 miles east of Route 1450
To: 0.25 miles east of Route 1450
Length: 0.09 miles

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA (cont'd)
STREET ADDITION (cont'd)

AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board does guarantee the Commonwealth of Virginia an unrestricted right-of-way of 50 feet with necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drainage as recorded in Plat Book 1, Pages 4392-4398, recorded June 7, 2000.

Whispering Oaks Drive (Route 1463), Phase 2A
From: 0.02 miles from Route 1448
To: 0.16 miles from Route 1448
Length:0.14 miles

Fairfield Drive (Route 1460), Phase 3A
From: 0.25 miles east of Route 1450
To: Dead End
Length:0.24 miles

AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board does guarantee the Commonwealth of Virginia an unrestricted right-of-way of 50 feet with necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drainage as recorded in Plat Book 1, Pages 6424-6426, recorded December 7, 2005.

AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED, that the Virginia Department of Transportation will only maintain those facilities located within the dedicated right-of-way. All other facilities outside of the right-of-way will be the responsibility of others.

* * *

FIRE FLOW WAIVER

Approved Barren Ridge Church of the Brethren request for fire flow waiver as per section 24-2(E) of the County Code (Middle River District).

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdysshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler, Shifflett, Pyles and Coleman
Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *
(END OF CONSENT AGENDA)
* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE BOARD

The Board discussed the following issues:

Mr. Pyles:

1. Fire and Rescue Master Plan/Company 10 – Requested any notes from Committee’s meeting and any information provided for their decision on Company 10 and any e-mails or phone calls from the City of Staunton. Mr. Coffield advised that all information was placed in the Board’s mail slots; no notes were taken and he had no knowledge of any e-mails from Staunton. He stated that there were no notes, no staff reports, no minutes, nor handouts.
2. Recorded meetings – Asked staff to research how to place recorded meetings on the web. Ms. Sorrells added that this would make it more accessible to the public. She stated that she would look into it with the vendors at the VACo meeting in November. She hoped that there would be a live cam on the internet.

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE BOARD (cont'd)

Ms. Sorrells:

- 1. Household Hazardous Waste Day – September 26th, 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., at the Government Center.

Mr. Beyeler: Library Breakfast at Tinkling Springs Presbyterian Church, Friday, September 25th, at 8:30 a.m.

Mr. Shifflett: Library ground-breaking – October 7th at 4:30 p.m.

Chm. Howdyshell:

- 1. Ordinance Reviews – Joint meeting with Planning Commission, September 28th at 4:30.
- 2. Emergency Services Meeting – Weyers Cave ALS proposal letter will be forthcoming.
- 3. Water Resource Protection – Joint Meeting with Planning Commission and Service Authority sometime in January.

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF

Staff discussed the following:

- 1. Census Report (projections) distributed to Board. Mr. Pyles reminded the Board that the School Board is obliged to provide its census count to the Department of Education by September 30th and he requested that a copy be distributed to Board members.
- 2. Route 250 Corridor Study Joint Meeting with Staunton – October 15th at 7:00 p.m. at the Government Center.
- 3. Health Fair – October 28 and October 29, regular flu shots available.

* * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF (cont'd)

- 4. Greenville Sewer Study

Mr. Coffield reminded the Board that this item had been brought before them in March. The Board approved \$34,600 to look at various alternative systems in the Greenville community. The consultant has provided seven options. The cost for a consultant to facilitate plans to develop, install, and operate a waste water treatment facility is \$8,500.

Ms. Sorrells added that the research is to look at the different ways that sewage can be brought to the Greenville Village, the cost of the construction of the project, annual maintenance such as the hookups, etc. The next stage would be to do some exploration with the Village to determine community interest. Mr. Pyles suggested talking with the people and informing them the cost to hook up. Ms. Sorrells agreed that this was very important and that it was the purpose of SR Consulting to educate and discuss the various options with the people.

Ms. Sorrells moved, seconded by Mr. Coleman, that the Board award SR Consulting to assist with community education engagement and funding research.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdyshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler, Shifflett, Pyles and Coleman

Nays: None

Motion carried.

September 23, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF (cont'd)

4. Greenville Sewer Study (cont'd)

Mr. Beyeler felt that the Service Authority should have been able to do the service versus "another consultant".

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE BOARD (cont'd)

YOUTH COMMISSION – APPOINTMENT

Mr. Beyeler moved, seconded by Mr. Coleman, that the Board make the following appointments:

1. Appoint Erin Stabel to serve an unexpired three-year term, effective immediately, to expire June 30, 2010.
2. Appoint Kendrick A. Kier to serve a three-year term, effective immediately, to expire June 30, 2012.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdysshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler, Shifflett, Pyles and Coleman

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

Mr. Garber suggested that those present who are involved with the Farm Bureau should attend the Ordinance Review meeting.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business to come before the Board, Mr. Beyeler moved, seconded by Ms. Sorrells, the Board adjourned subject to call of the Chairman.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Howdysshell, Sorrells, Garber, Beyeler, Shifflett, Pyles and Coleman

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

Chairman
H:9-23min.09

County Administrator