
Regular Meeting, Wednesday, January 25, 2012, at 7:00 p.m. Government Center, Verona, VA.

PRESENT: Tracy C. Pyles, Jr., Chairman
Jeffrey A. Moore, Vice-Chairman
David R. Beyeler
David A. Karaffa
Marshall W. Pattie
Michael L. Shull
Larry J. Wills
Timmy Fitzgerald, Director of Community Development
Becky Earhart, Senior Planner
Jennifer M. Whetzel, Director of Finance
Patrick J. Morgan, County Attorney
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, January 25, 2012, at 7:00 p.m., at the Government Center, Verona, Virginia, and in the 236th year of the Commonwealth....

* * * * *

Chairman Pyles welcomed the citizens present.

* * * * *

The following students of Wilson Middle School, led the Pledge of Allegiance: Morgan DeLange and Billy Coombe – 8th graders; Lucy Weidner and Bo Branham – 7th graders; and Jay Blackstone and Kyle Coombe – 6th graders. Billy enjoys basketball and football. Morgan plays softball and enjoys algebra. Lucy plays basketball, volleyball and enjoys algebra. Bo enjoys football. Kyle hopes to become a Marine Biologist. Jay loves Science.

* * * * *

Larry J. Wills, Middle River District, delivered invocation.

* * * * *

WILLIAM “BILL” EDWARDS – APPRECIATION

Patrick J. Coffield, County Administrator, asked that Jim Belshee, Vice President and Assistant Secretary, of William Edwards, Inc., and Bill Edwards, President, to come to the podium. Mr. Coffield reflected that 22 years ago, this facility (formerly Smith Transfer) was opened. After it was opened, the County wanted a connection to “our roots”. One of the first visitors was Mr. Edwards, with his annual calendar, who asked if he could provide one of his William Edwards trucks to add to an existing collection of Smith’s trucks. One time while visiting with Mr. Edwards at his business, Mr. Coffield had commented on Mr. Edwards’ cabinet display of trucks, stating that he would be proud to find a home for his collection at the Government Center. Mr. Edwards called a few months ago asking if the offer was still good. Mr. Coffield reported that “We are now the proud custodians of a Mr. Edwards’ collection!” The Board had requested that Mr. Edwards be invited tonight so that he would be publicly thanked. The cabinet has been refinished and is located in the Smith West Room.

Mr. Edwards stated that he had been in Verona 58 years. He started with Smith Transfer and has enjoyed living and working in Augusta County. He has always had a close relationship with the Board of Supervisors. He felt privileged in being able to set up a business in Augusta County for 40 years. He reminded the Board of two existing trucking companies: Houff and Wilson, which have been in existence longer than William Edwards, Inc. “I think the whole County should be very pleased that it works so well here. Thank you for a good home for the trucks.”

* * * * *

January 25, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

DEANNE P. JOHNSON, TIMOTHY C. ZIRKLE, RUTHERFORD CONSTRUCTION, INC., AND LOFTON LEASING, LLC – AMEND AND RESTATE PROFFERS

This being the day and time advertised to consider a request to amend and restate the proffers on 10.2 acres zoned Duplex Residential and owned by Deanne P. Johnson, Timothy C. Zirkle, Rutherford Construction, Inc., and Lofton Leasing, LLC, located on the west side of Colters Place just north of the intersection of Colters Place and Stuarts Draft Highway (Route 340) in Stuarts Draft (Beverley Manor District). The Planning Commission recommends approval of the deletion of the age restriction proffers and the restatement of the remaining proffers.

Becky Earhart, Senior Planner, displayed property outlined in pink. The applicant currently has a proffer on the property that restricts the occupancy of the unit to "housing for older persons", meaning that at least one of the residents has to be at least 55 years or older. The applicant is asking that this proffer be deleted. The other proffers of 1) no more than 36 duplexes will be constructed on the 10.26 acres, and 2) an access to the residential subdivision will be provided via a public street, will remain on this property. The property is in an Urban Service Area, slated for Medium Density Residential and Neighborhood Mixed Use development. Water and sewer are available.

Deanne Johnson, Applicant, asked that the age restriction be deleted. When the duplexes were originally designed in 2004, there had not been a lot of residential development in Stuarts Draft. The proffer was to eliminate any burden on the schools. There are currently no existing facilities which would entice someone of that age group – no walking trails, club houses, etc., nor are any proposed. With the change in the real estate market, it is more difficult to market property. To be in a more competitive position, she asked that the age proffer be eliminated.

The Chairman declared the public hearing open.

There being no speakers, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Karaffa noted that all residents are in agreement with this amendment.

Mr. Karaffa moved, seconded by Mr. Beyeler, that the Board approve the following ordinance, with the deletion of the age restriction and the reinstatement of the remaining proffers:

A request to amend and restate the proffers on 10.2 acres zoned Duplex Residential and owned by Deanne P. Johnson, Timothy C. Zirkle, Rutherford Construction, Inc., and Lofton Leasing, LLC, located on the west side of Colters Place just north of the intersection of Colters Place and Stuarts Draft Highway (Route 340) in Stuarts Draft in the Beverley Manor District.

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,

January 25, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

DEANNE P. JOHNSON, TIMOTHY C. ZIRKLE, RUTHERFORD CONSTRUCTION, INC., AND LOFTON LEASING, LLC – AMEND AND RESTATE PROFFERS (cont'd)

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 1-34 on tax map number 75G(5) containing a total of approximately 10.2 acres. The proffers are amended and restated as follows:

1. Access to the residential subdivision will be provided via a public street which will be built to state standards at no cost to the County and dedicated for public use from Route 340 to the northern property boundary with Tax Map 75-52D owned by the Stuarts Draft Baptist Church.
2. No more than 36 duplexes will be constructed on the 10.26 acres zoned Duplex Residential.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Karaffa, Shull, Wills, Moore, Beyeler and Pyles

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF VIRGINIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES – REZONING

This being the day and time advertised to consider a request to rezone from Single Family Residential to Attached Residential with proffers 0.759 acres owned by Department of Virginia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States located on the east side of Montgomery Road (Route 1401) approximately 0.2 of a mile south of the intersection of Montgomery Road (Route 1401) and First Street (Route 1402) (Beverly Manor District). The Planning Commission recommends approval with proffers.

Ms. Earhart displayed property outlined in blue. The applicant has submitted the following proffers:

1. No more than 4 residential dwelling units will be constructed on the 0.759 acre parcel.
2. There will be no more than 2 duplex buildings and each will have brick exteriors or vinyl siding.
3. Construction of the two duplex residential buildings will be in general conformity with Rezoning Exhibit A Showing Proposed Improvements on Tax Map #65A-1-B-12 dated 12-13-2011.

January 25, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF VIRGINIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES – REZONING (cont'd)

4. Construction of the two duplex residential buildings will be in general conformity with Rezoning Exhibit B.

The property has been zoned Single Family Residential since October 1947. It is in an Urban Service Area, designated for Medium Density Residential development. Public water and sewer are available.

Jerome Lane, Applicant, on behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, who are requesting the rezoning to assist veterans with housing and with heating, food, electric, etc. costs. They hope to build units to generate income to help fund as many veterans needing help and keep one unit available for veterans returning from war who do not have a home. Previously, they have been sent to the Mission. Mr. Lane feels this to be unacceptable.

The Chairman declared the public hearing open.

There being no speakers, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Karaffa moved, seconded by Mr. Wills, that the Board approve the following ordinance with proffers:

A request to rezone from Single Family Residential to Attached Residential with proffers 0.759 acres owned by Department of Virginia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States located on the east side of Montgomery Road (Route 1401) approximately 0.2 of a mile south of the intersection of Montgomery Road (Route 1401) and First Street (Route 1402) in the Beverley Manor District.

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:

January 25, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF VIRGINIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES – REZONING (cont'd)

Parcel number **12** on tax map number **65A(1) Block B** containing a total of approximately 0.759 acres is changed from Single Family Residential to Attached Residential with the following proffers:

1. No more than 4 residential dwelling units will be constructed on the 0.759 acre parcel.
2. There will be no more than 2 duplex buildings and each will have brick exteriors or vinyl siding.
3. Construction of the two duplex residential buildings will be in general conformity with Rezoning Exhibit A Showing Proposed Improvements on Tax Map #65A-1-B-12 dated 12-13-2011.
4. Construction of the two duplex residential buildings will be in general conformity with Rezoning Exhibit B.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Karaffa, Shull, Wills, Moore, Beyeler and Pyles

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC

Nicole Henrickson, as an educator, parent, and on behalf of the children of Augusta County, asked that the Board consider increasing support and revenues from the County for public education.

Chairman Pyles mentioned that the Board met earlier today to discuss priorities and noted that Education was a top priority.

* * * * *

PLANNING COMMISSION

Presentation by staff on Annual Report.

Ms. Earhart presented the Planning Commission Annual Report.

* * * * *

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS COMMISSION – ANNUAL REPORT

Presentation by staff on Annual Report.

John Wilkinson, Zoning Administrator, presented the Board of Zoning Appeals Commission Annual Report.

The Board recognized the contribution of a past member – J. Waller Callison, Jr., who demonstrated exemplary qualifications and capabilities in the performance of his duties on the Board of Zoning Appeals for 23 years. He served as Chairman for four years and as Vice-Chairman for six years. Mr. Callison also served on the Planning Commission for five years. Mr. Callison is commended for his past service, which he so aptly fulfilled with logic, diligence, and dedication. He distinguished himself with his fellow Board members, the staff and the citizens of Augusta County and was known for his fairness and equality of his decisions.

January 25, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

* * * * *

NEW HOPE COMMUNITY CENTER

The Board considered contribution for roof repairs and authorization to solicit bids for new roof (Middle River District).

Funding source: Middle River Infrastructure Account #80000-8012-70 \$1,400

John C. McGehee, Assistant County Administrator, advised that this had been discussed at Monday's Staff Briefing. What is before the Board tonight is to seek approval for \$1,400 to repair the existing roof and permission to solicit bids for the new roof for the flat section of the old New Hope School. This property is leased from the County to the Ruritan Club who subleases to the New Hope Fire and Rescue.

Mr. Wills added that the Ruritan Club and Augusta County have put a considerable amount of money in improvements of the Community Center. In order to preserve what has been done, the repairs are necessary.

Mr. Wills moved, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the Board approve the request.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Karaffa, Shull, Wills, Moore, Beyeler and Pyles

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

VERONA PARK

The Board considered status of park and funding appropriated to date.

Mr. Coffield advised that Ron Sites, Director for Parks and Recreation, provided a report on Monday on the origination and allocation of funding for Verona Park. The Chairman opened for further discussion.

Mr. Karaffa reported that he has researched this project for the last two months. He noted that the site in question is the Old Verona Wastewater Treatment Plant. It backs up to an industrial complex and is in a flood plain. He did not believe this is the place or time for such a recreation park but did feel there was a need for a recreation park in Verona in the future.

Mr. Karaffa suggested that the money that has been set aside for this project be placed back in the proper accounts.

Mr. Pattie asked about kayaking and canoeing privileges without making it an official park. Mr. Coffield said that they could look into "limited access" of the property and asked for Board direction.

Larry Curry, member of the Parks and Recreation Commission, and President of VCA (involved with VCA for 26 years), quoted figures appropriated for other parks in the County and asked for this item to be tabled for two months for further research before rescinding funding. He noted that most of the park areas had had problematic issues that were overcome.

Paul Bugas, of Game & Inland Fisheries, noted that Middle River is the largest watershed in Augusta County and has zero public access. He felt this to be the best opportunity to have kayaking, canoeing and fishing access. He asked that the Board not abandon this project and go forth with the recreation aspect. "Just because it lies in a floodplain, there are a lot of other uses besides ballfields."

January 25, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

VERONA PARK (cont'd)

Darrell Schwalm, a member of the Friends of Middle River, whose purpose is to promote stewardship of Middle River through education and outreach, noted that by not having access to the river, it is difficult to organize community or educational events and cleanups.

Chris Keagy, owner of property directly in front of the site (Riverside Heights Subdivision), expressed opposition of the use of Locust Street as the main entrance to the park. He provided a petition of opposition of this entrance with 75 signatures. He stated that he was not against having the park.

Mr. Karaffa stated that he was aware of the petitions and noted that the revised drawings eliminated the Locust Street entrance. It was going to use an entrance behind ASR; however, we have not been able to get the right-of-way from ASR that would allow for the new entrance. The allocated funding did not include the purchase of right-of-way. He reiterated that this site was not an ideal place for a park.

Mr. Pattie asked for clarification of what would happen to the funding. Chairman Pyles explained that the funding would go back to the original infrastructure and recreation accounts; mainly, Pastures, Middle River, and Beverley Manor. Mr. Pattie asked if the funds should be placed in a separate account.

Mr. Karaffa advised that there is no money from the State for Roads.

Mr. Wills, in looking at the funding, stated approximately \$130,000 will go back into matching grants for Parks and Recreation: North River, \$97,000; Middle River, \$30,000. This money could be reallocated for another project. He agreed with Mr. Karaffa of his concerns about the location; however, he understood the need for a park in Verona. Having read the plan, it calls for a large developed-type park with significant structures in the Verona area. That site is not adequate. He suggested that Parks and Recreation Department do some research regarding limited access to the river.

Mr. Karaffa advised that there is enough money set aside in the Recreation Account to assist in getting a landing for access to the river.

Mr. Beyeler stated that he was on the Board when it was turned back to the County and they were assured that there was nothing hazardous on the site. He asked about the railroad spur which would allow for a bicycle/walk trail. He felt that they still had time to make a decision.

Mr. Beyeler moved, no second, that the Board table this item for two months.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Shull, Beyeler

Nays: Karaffa, Wills, Pyles and Moore

Motion denied.

* * *

Mr. Moore added that he had been assigned as Liaison to the Parks and Recreation Commission. They have discussed strategic planning and he noted that this has been ongoing since 2002. The Locust Street entrance is not ideal and they have been unable to get the ASR right-of-way. He emphasized that the property is owned by the County. Parks and Recreation has requested direction from the Board. "It may not be the ideal place for a major park, but it may be a good place for access to the river."

January 25, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

VERONA PARK (cont'd)

Mr. Karaffa moved, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the Board rescind the funding and have it allocated in the correct Magisterial District Infrastructure and Recreation accounts.

Funding Sources:	Beverley Manor Infrastructure Account	#80000-8011-31	\$268,686.37
	North River Recreation Account	#80000-8023-26	96,699.78
	Pastures Infrastructure Account	#80000-8014-48	4,981.16
	Wayne Infrastructure Account	#80000-8017-51	14,943.80
	Middle River Infrastructure Account	#80000-8012-50	66,838.44
	Middle River Recreation Account	#80000-8022-35	<u>29,898.61</u>
			\$482,048.16

Chairman Pyles appreciated the comments made tonight and added that Mr. Curry's comments are well taken. He understood the needs of the Verona area and hoped for a passive recreation-type for launching at this site and a park located somewhere else.

Mr. Shull felt that this was not the time for the park because of other needs.

Mr. Beyeler strongly felt that a decision needed to be made.

Mr. Karaffa said that he was available to speak with those who had expressed concerns.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Karaffa, Wills, Moore and Pyles

Nays: Shull and Beyeler

Motion carried.

* * * * *

IT SUPPRESSION SYSTEM

The Board considered proposal to replace suppression system. **This item was tabled at the Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting on December 14, 2011.**

Funding source: CIP #80000-8147 \$351,325.70

Mr. Beyeler moved, seconded by Mr. Wills, that the Board remove item from the table.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Karaffa, Shull, Wills, Moore, Beyeler and Pyles

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

Mr. Coffield reported that a follow-up presentation and tour was given at the Staff Briefing on Monday.

Chairman Pyles added that during the tour, the Board recognized the needs and noted that the money is in the budget.

Mr. Beyeler moved, seconded by Mr. Karaffa, that the Board approve the proposal to purchase and install a new suppression system.

Mr. Pattie mentioned that a question had been asked about consolidating County, Service Authority and School IT Departments.

January 25, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

IT SUPPRESSION SYSTEM (cont'd)

Jackie Zetwick, IT Director, reported that there is a distance issue of only running Ethernet 300 feet and then you lose data. You would have to run fiber and then connect switches. That is why there are so many locations; the building is too big.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Karaffa, Shull, Wills, Moore, Beyeler and Pyles

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

SURPLUS VEHICLE

The Board considered request by Riverheads Fire Department for transfer of surplus pickup truck from Company 10 (Riverheads District).

Mr. Coffield advised that this had been discussed at Monday's Staff Briefing. He noted that Riverheads Fire Department will provide fuel and maintenance from their donation/annual contribution account.

Mr. Shull moved, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the Board approve the request with the understanding that Riverheads Fire Department will provide fuel and maintenance from their donation/annual contribution account.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Karaffa, Shull, Wills, Moore, Beyeler and Pyles

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

WAIVERS/VARIANCES

Timmy Fitzgerald, Director of Community Development, advised that Dollar General in Crimora has requested a waiver. A required fire flow of 1,250 gpm cannot be met. During a fire flow test conducted by ACSA, a fire flow of 860 gpm was observed; however, when the ACSA ran an additional long-term fire flow, it came below 250 gpm based on their water system model. Although the water system as a whole is out of their control, they will be taking the following measures to improve the level of fire protection:

1. Install an automatic fire alarm system in the building to notify authorities in case of emergency during off hours.
2. Revise the site entrance to allow for easier access of emergency vehicles to lay fire lines from the existing fire hydrant to the building.
3. Install a 2-hour fire wall in the building that will reduce the required fire flow to 1,000 gpm.

To move forward, a waiver is required.

Mr. Wills said that he has been working with this gentleman since January 2nd. The 860 was provided to him. He had followed instructions to meet all requirements. He learned this morning that he did not have enough gpm. This waiver is similar to the waiver that had been approved in the Dooms area. He apologized to the Board of the short notice.

Mr. Wills moved, seconded by Mr. Beyeler, that the Board approve the request.

January 25, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

WAIVERS/VARIANCES (cont'd)

Mr. Moore questioned who provided the fire flow test of 860. Mr. Wills said that it was provided by the County on the original site plan. Mr. Fitzgerald said that the Service Authority (ACSA) provided the report.

Mr. Coffield explained that many areas of the County do not meet fire flow requirements. There is a presumption when there is public water available, there is sufficient fire flow. From a staff level and previous Boards, they do not want the public to assume fire flow is available when it is not. It is brought to the attention of the property owner and it is the responsibility of the owner to provide a letter to be on record requesting a waiver stating that he was aware of insufficient fire flow.

Chairman Pyles added that the ACSA, when the wells and lines were originally installed, their mission was to supply domestic water. It was never their intention to provide higher level of pressure. "We have caused many dollars of increase to the ACSA and to builders to ensure fire protection that goes beyond this. The ACSA has had to put in new tanks, higher tanks, etc. It has not been a matter of just letting people know. It was the intention of the Board to ensure that there was a greater fire protection for people throughout the County and try to draw a line on that. I do worry that our ordinance becomes less valuable if we're going to do more and more waivers." Chairman Pyles said that he would support the motion, but felt that the Board should have had more information before making this decision. He suggested that the ordinance may need to be revisited.

Mr. Karaffa said that he would abstain from voting because of the short notice.

Mr. Beyeler pointed out that about 50% of the County does not have adequate fire flow. He suggested that Mr. Karaffa speak with ACSA to determine where fire flow is adequate. He said that waivers were needed to allow development.

Mr. Moore agreed with Chairman Pyles that the ordinance may need to be changed.

Mr. Wills also felt that correct information should be sent out on the site plan. "The applicant needs to know what is needed."

Mr. Wills moved, seconded by Mr. Beyeler, that the Board approve the request.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Shull, Wills, Moore, Beyeler and Pyles

Nays: None

Abstained: Karaffa

Motion carried.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Pattie moved, seconded by Mr. Wills, that the Board approve the consent agenda as follows:

MINUTES

Approved the following minutes:

- Organizational Meeting, Wednesday, January 4, 2012
- Regular Meeting, Wednesday, January 11, 2012

January 25, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA (cont'd)

ROAD NAMING POLICY

Considered request to change name of road from Boyington Blvd. to Pratts Run (Wayne District).

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Karaffa, Shull, Wills, Moore, Beyeler and Pyles

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

(END OF CONSENT AGENDA)

* * * * *

A five-minute recess was called at 8:25 p.m.

* * * * *

REASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

Chairman Pyles made the following comment:

Before we get started, the last Board had postponed the reassessment from what would have been done this year and to be put in place January of next year to the year after. One of the problems with that is that it extends our time on the existing Composite Index not just one year, but two years. Some of us, in running for office, said we needed to look at that and the public would like to see us change the reassessment. Tonight, we're going to start looking at the options available to us if we get started right away.

Jennifer M. Whetzel, Director of Finance, mentioned that the Code section dealing with Reassessment is 58.1-32.01 and that it is the requirement of the State that counties do a reassessment every four years. We had an option put in the Legislative Priorities to do it either Year 4, 5, or 6. Ms. Whetzel gave a PowerPoint presentation on Reassessment high-lighting the following:

Timeline:

- Procurement of Contractor or Dept. set up
 - January to June 2012
- Assessment Work (fieldwork & hearings)
 - June 2012 to December 2013
- Tax Bills
 - Processed and mailed-April 2014-May 2014
 - Deadline for payment June 5, 2014

Contracting:

- Number of vendors in Virginia
- Estimated cost per parcel is reasonable with prior reassessment costs
- Cost of 2009 reassessment \$633,000

Locality Survey:

- Each locality is set up differently
- Staffing varies among localities
- Workload varies among localities
- Software is key component

January 25, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

REASSESSMENT OVERVIEW (cont'd)

In-house Budget:

- Includes Chief Assessor, Statistician, Assessors and Clerical
- Special skill set needed
- Department expenditures include office expenditures, transportation and software maintenance
- Total \$550,000 estimated (preliminary)
- Capital needs largely depend on current system

Ms. Whetzel asked for Board direction. Does the Board:

1. Need additional information?
2. Want a presentation from the State?

Mr. Pattie asked for clarification of \$550,000, if it were annually? Ms. Whetzel said it would be annually if you had an office running full-time. Mr. Pattie, as far as clerical help, asked if personnel within the Government Center would be moved to different areas. Mr. Coffield said some personnel could be moved. Ms. Whetzel said that data entry is currently being done by the Commissioner of Revenue. The County has all records that are needed. The software does not do the sales study.

Mr. Moore made the following comment:

When I ran, this is something that it seems that nobody is happy with; right, wrong, whatever. How I'm looking at this job is that we are a multi-million dollar business; our taxpayers are our customers. Right now, we have a lot of customers who are unhappy with the system that is in place now. I support coming in-house. I don't know if we would save a whole lot of money, or any money. Too many advantages, I think we can get a lot better product. I think we can get where our taxpayers feel like they have a good system. That would be my goal where they feel we would have accurate numbers. Also, I like the fact that, having it in-house, we could do it every two years because there are market fluctuations. The market cycle is up and down. There could be times where, over four years, hopefully, the economy will come back strongly. A two-year cycle, I think, gives you a smaller window and you can take into account variations in the market more accurately. I would support it in-house and I would like for us to pursue it further.

Mr. Wills made the following comment:

I understand the concern over the last reassessment. However, when I look at in-house costs of \$550,000 a year versus a cost of doing a four-year reassessment being, even if you took the \$660,000 and increased it by 50%, you're still less than a million dollars over a four-year period. Given the climate of the economic situation today, I cannot support adding staff and a new department to this County when we're telling other departments that they have to cut staff; when we're having to make sacrifices in our schools, it just doesn't make sense to me at this point. I feel like we can control the process. If you think there is a problem with the last reassessment when the people weren't satisfied, wait until you do it in-house and the people aren't satisfied and they feel like the Board manipulated the numbers because we have control of it. When it is out-of-house, in a contractor's hands, the Board has a hands-off policy. We get blamed for some things we can't control, but at least, you know, one thing they can't say is we manipulated them. If it is in-house, we're subject to that type of accusation - right or wrong. I'm not saying we would, but I'm saying, right or wrong. The main thing I have a problem with it at this point is the increase. When we have private industry that can do it cheaper than we can do it, with government employees, I cannot support doing it with government employees.

January 25, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

REASSESSMENT OVERVIEW (cont'd)

Mr. Beyeler made the following comment:

I'm not going to say the last assessment was all right. If we go down the road you're suggesting, it is going to cost us twice as much for assessment to get the same product. Now, the key to all of this that has been in the past . . . and I served on the Assessment Board. Wingate is on this list. And Wingate was on when I was on the Board. The key is the people you put on that Board, they are the ones who set the price. The assessors can come in and give you a price, but it is up to that Board to set that price. If there was a weakness in the past, it's because we did not put the people on there that set what those rates were going to be in the beginning. Now, the other thing they used is sales. I would prefer we wait another year. That may not set for some people, but it would be cheaper for everybody if we did. We can take the \$550,000 or \$633,000 and divide by six for what it cost us per year, which is \$156,000. If we do it, as you suggest, we've got the start-up fee, plus \$550,000 the first year and the second year, and it will take two years to do it in Augusta County. We can go to a two-year assessment. I can make the argument either way on a two or a four-year. What's going to pay the bill in the end? Taxes are going to pay the bill in the end and the method that you are suggesting . . . I'll go along with it if the majority wants it, but I'm telling you right now it's going cost the taxpayers twice of what it cost us the last time and we still may not have a good assessment. The other thing is, we can reduce all the assessments by 10%. I heard this Board, this afternoon, talk about schools. If we reduce the assessment by 10%, then we're taking in less money to pay what you and others are saying we need to do next year. The only way to make up the difference is increase the rate. There is no free ride. I asked Mr. Coffield, at dinner, what our ratio was on sales. He said it was 96%. I know that is a little higher than I would like it to be. You are supposed to end up with 100%. I never did like the 100% because most of the time, when you sold property, it would cost you 10% to sell and I hated to pay taxes on something that you really don't get. I'm here to tell you that if we go in-house, you won't get any better assessment; plus, it's going to cost you twice the amount of money. The only way to pay for that is to increase the taxes to pay it. When you talk about the initial year cost of \$550,000, you're talking about roughly 1¢. Only you increase the tax rate 1¢ doing your method every year. If you want to do it over a two-year period, you're talking about \$1.1 million. Plus, where are we going to put the staff? I'm not saying you can't transfer staff in the building. In my experience, I've served on the Assessment Board, I know how it works. I didn't agree with everything they did last time, but the key is who you put on that Board. When I served there, we set the value. Now, an appraiser can come in and say what they think it ought to be, but it is that 7-member Board that sets those values and there isn't anyone to blame but that 7-member Board.

Mr. Karaffa made the following comment:

I have a couple of concerns in principle. Number 1, there was a case in Gloucester County where they were going through their assessment. It was outside. They actually cancelled their assessment because they didn't like the product that they were getting. They ran into all kinds of trouble. The problem I see, with us continuing to go outside, is what is our ability if we see a bad product coming to stop it and get out of that contract. Another problem that I have is that right now people feel that they are not being taxed fairly. I think one of our responsibilities on this Board is to make sure that there is integrity of the system. I respect Mr. Beyeler's concern in terms of cost, but I think we have higher responsibilities to make sure there is an integrity of the system in place. I think we can more closely monitor the integrity in-house. I would only be willing to consider bringing it in-house if we were able to increase the frequency in which we would do the assessment every two years. My reason for that is because to do an assessment every four years, especially, in the real estate climate that we have right now ebbs and waves are too great. I think there is a census among many counties and cities throughout the Commonwealth that doing it every four years produces a very big wave. Doing it more often actually increases the integrity of the taxes and that people are paying their fair share. I have a concern about going every six years. Whereas, if you have somebody who comes in and build the house half-way through, they pay three years at an old rate before the market adjustment is done again through the new assessment. That isn't fair. I think if we were to go six years, it would even be worse.

January 25, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

REASSESSMENT OVERVIEW (cont'd)

Mr. Pattie made the following comment:

First, I would like to point out that we've only spent eight hours together. We should do this more often. Let's fix the problem. I thought the problem was they took a smooth average. They assigned pretty much every lot to be the same regardless of where you were. If you were on a cliff, if you're in pastures, if you're in a busy street, it was the same lot price. Let's deal with the problem. I think the problem was that people didn't think it was accurate. On average, it is 96% accurate. That's good. In North River District, if you think of Springhill Village, and you think of that road Springhill to Shutterlee Mill and you think of where I live, that's all within a mile or so. Those are three completely different areas. Regardless of the path we go, we need to find a way to represent the great variability in this huge county. I think it was 75% of lots were \$50,000? There is something fundamentally wrong about that. We need a normal distribution there. Maybe, we should task that with finding the problems of the last assessment and recommending a way to deal with that regardless of what path we go down.

Mr. Beyeler added:

The majority of lots were one price. The highest one was \$110,000. They weren't all the same.

Mr. Pattie added:

If you look at the distribution, you have this one line.

Mr. Moore added:

One of the things I heard was that the last reassessment it was considered acreage. With this new reassessment, it became a building lot. There were no improvements made to it. There was no water, no sewer. Now, if water and sewer, or water or septic, or well and septic, were put on the property, then, yes, those are improvements and it does become a building lot. Without those things happening, I'm not sure how something that is acreage becomes a building lot when you don't have any well or septic tank. That is an example and I've heard that from several people. That's what I'm talking about a better product. We don't know that if the people who are doing the work are just flatly assigning.

Mr. Karaffa added:

I think you are going to find that the cost of our assessment goes up dramatically if you got that kind of detail.

Mr. Shull asked if it were possible to get an estimate from an agency for a comparison with in-house service. Ms. Whetzel said she would be happy to do that. She said that she had called a couple of places that had recently had reassessments. Those prices were in the ballpark of what the County had paid. It was not a significant difference.

Mr. Beyeler said that every time the County had gone out to bid, Blue Ridge was always able to give a better price because of the data they had already accumulated.

Chairman Pyles made the following comment:

I did meet with the City of Staunton's office and spent a couple of hours with them. First of all, I don't mean to doubt you, Ms. Whetzel, but \$550,000 is a questionable number for the work that is being done. Nine people key-punching . . . they're not going to be doing it all the time. The big thing of the in-house work is that you have a file that is continuously updated. After you have done your work once, there is a lot less to do. You keep up with the Building Department. You know if somebody added onto their house. You're getting the information from the Clerk of Court. You're getting MLS listing. You're doing a lot of things to keep up with it. The product becomes much better because if you are in Churchville, you go to Westridge, you find houses there on five acres and worth a ton of money. When you just go down the hill a little bit, you're at Crawford Manor—

January 25, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

REASSESSMENT OVERVIEW (cont'd)

totally different thing. We had lots out there that were saying that weren't that much difference. As a department has it, and keeps up with it, and people become very attuned to it, they know that this will sell better. This one won't sell. This is that. You will get a better price. We did say that it is important that if you want to have your better product, you need to do it more often. The two-year timeframe will allow you to keep current with the things that are going on. What they have there, it is not going to be \$550,000. And the other thing is, it is not all new money. There are positions within the Commissioner of Revenue's office that will become part of this department. They have a lot of real estate assessors and people doing that work that we may be able to man three positions that comes from there. I think it is short-sighted to stop an idea that may be good because we did some very rough tuned looks at things from a variety of people. We have a couple of things to decide. One is whether or not to do it in-house or out; whether we want to try to get it done by January of next year, or not, because it does have impact on our Composite Index. When you have your sales ratio, your third year going to 96%, that is the opposite of what is normally expected is that they start at 96% and as houses go up, the value comes down. By the fact that they start out lower than that, 92% and moving up to 96%, means that houses are going down. We would like to lock in at lower prices before they go up. I think we need some hard numbers to go by. I don't know whether we would like to go on two different tracks and put out a bid to do contracting and find out if people can do it by January 1 and put out an employee request for someone to set up the department and see what they can do. From that, be able to make a decision of which way to go and when to get it done. It may be that we come up with something where we put forward a contract, get it done this year and get that taken care of, but hire somebody to start getting involved so we can follow it up in the future and do that. That's all out there. The simplest thing to do is to go out and do another contract, but I don't think that that is going to provide us with the best long-term answer. I don't think that it is necessarily going to be more expensive to do it in-house. Augusta County never has the same number of employees for a job as other people. I'm sure that we would do it for less than that. That is my thinking.

Mr. Beyeler questioned the timeframe. "January 1, 2014, not 2013. There is no way you can do it."

Chairman Pyles stated:

Right now, we're in January. The last reassessment, we got a three-month extension. That is pretty routine. The thing in getting our facts done is being able to put out our tax bills. Normally, you have to do all the rest. I think we have right now over a year to get it done. Probably, something like 14 months; the question is to go to the people and say can you do it? You know when you talk about the qualified assessors, those folks that Blue Ridge hired, they were just folks that they brought in off the street. They are not assessors, they are information gatherers. They are taking pictures. They are recording dimensions on places. The bring that back, then, and somebody is looking at in relationship to sales in that area. Some of that is more of a function in how many people you put in a field at a given time rather than the time you have to do it. If you have ten people, you take x time. If you get twenty people, you have half as long.

Mr. Beyeler stated:

I'm not trying to argue with you. What I'm saying is, if we did it now . . . We're not into the fifth year. It would take the fifth year before we could get it.

Chairman Pyles stated:

It didn't finish last time on December 31st.

Ms. Whetzel clarified that the land book was effective January 1. "Even though there was an extension, that three months played into making the decision of what the January 1 value would be. We still had enough of time to set the rate for the budget.

January 25, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

REASSESSMENT OVERVIEW (cont'd)

Chairman Pyles stated:

They showed that but they weren't done then. The only time they show being used is when we send out our tax bill. We didn't finish our work until after January 1. We had a three month extension.

Mr. Wills stated that was after a two-year work period. Chairman Pyles said that was after eighteen months.

Mr. Beyeler asked the County Attorney if the Board could be appointed before July 1st. Mr. Coffield responded no, but said the Board of Assessors was optional.

Mr. Wills asked about sending out an RFP and ask for a price for both a short period of time or the normal two-year time frame. He expressed concern of getting a product too quick and "not being reviewed properly". "We have the problem of the quality of the product."

Chairman Pyles stated that a lot of that work did not happen until the very end. "It's the work of the people doing it. Much of the work is computerized. It's not the numbers coming out. It's the evaluation."

Mr. Beyeler recalled that an extension was requested because of the fluctuation of the economy. An adjustment was made after the extension.

Chairman Pyles stated that the minutes reflect that the delay was requested because of the election coming up.

Mr. Moore asked Ms. Whetzel if there were any locality near Augusta County that is doing assessments in-house who could come and speak about their process. Ms. Whetzel said that Rockingham and Albemarle are doing it in-house. He asked if someone could be invited to a meeting and give the Board a better perspective on whether or not it is feasible.

Mr. Karaffa moved, seconded by Mr. Pattie, that the Board direct Ms. Whetzel to submit an RFQ for alternate (short and long-term) timeframes and to invite a representative from the State Department of Taxation to the next Staff Briefing on February 21st to educate the Board to allow for a better understanding of the assessment process.

It was the consensus of the Board to have the Reassessment Committee, consisting of Larry Wills and David Karaffa, to meet with Rockingham County to discuss their in-house operation. Mr. Wills asked if the RFQ was needed to be brought before the Board to be approved before sending out or authorize the Chairman to send it out. Patrick J. Morgan, County Attorney, said that the motion authorizes for it to be sent out. Mr. Wills understood that, as part of this motion, the Board is going to begin the reassessment process now in some manner whether it is a one-year or two-year process.

Mr. Pattie liked the idea of updating the database. He asked if staff can be directed to begin that process. "Regardless of whether we do it, or hand it off to someone else, there is a more accurate database that we are thinking about."

Mr. Wills felt that the State needed to explain the basis on how values are determined.

Ms. Whetzel asked for clarification: 1) Draft RFP need to go through the Reassessment Committee before going out? **Yes** 2) State come to February Staff Briefing (February 21st)? **Yes** 3) Field trip to Rockingham or for them to come here? **Reassessment Committee to go to Rockingham County.**

January 25, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

REASSESSMENT OVERVIEW (cont'd)

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Karaffa, Shull, Wills, Moore, Beyeler and Pyles

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE BOARD

The Board discussed the following issues:

Mr. Pattie:

- 1. Clean Water – investigating in the near future.
- 2. Campaign – Have become friends with Mr. Roller. “In an environment where people were not getting along, I’m happy to say my opponent and I are getting along just fine.”

Mr. Karaffa:

Attended the following events:

- 1. Verona Fire Department Banquet
- 2. SARS Banquet
- 3. Company 10 Banquet

“Nice to go to these functions and meet these people and get a real clear understanding of the time and effort a lot of folks are putting in.”

Mr. Wills:

- 1. Attended Company 10 Banquet. “Congratulations on their 70 years!”
- 2. AIB – All 7 magisterial districts represented. Encouraged AIB to meet with their counter-parts. Charged AIB that Board of Supervisors is looking to them for ideas in terms of agriculture and the Chesapeake Bay Act and what is needed to meet the guidelines.

Chairman Pyles:

- 1. Attended CAP-SAW meeting – asked that when the Board attends a committee meeting to keep the Board informed of what is happening (as Mr. Wills did tonight).

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF

Staff discussed the following issues:

- 1. General Assembly update - John C. McGehee, Assistant County Administrator, distributed House/Senate bills.
 - a. Mandates
 - b. Aid to localities
 - c. VACo website provides updates
- 2. Courthouse tour –It was suggested that the new Board visit the courthouse to better understand what improvements are being discussed. Staff to work with Architect to develop scope of work.
- 3. Mills Creek letter distributed to Board – Federal Government: 65%; State: 25%; Locality: 10% - Will be discussed February 8th .
- 4. ECC application for a regional VDEM grant – \$72,000 - requires 20% of \$12,000 soft match.
- 5. TMDLs – distributed letter from United States Environmental Protection Agency to the Board - Timmy Fitzgerald shared with the Board:
 - a. Question and Answer

January 25, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF (cont'd)

- b. Letter received November 14th from DCR asking Community Development 1) to look at the BMP current inventory; 2) do land use verifications; 3) look at future BMP scenarios; 4) look at implementation strategies and any resource needs they may have. The date for this information is February 1st.

Mr. Fitzgerald has learned that through-out the region, most counties are keeping this at a high level and are not doing extra work for strategies. They are basically responding to the letter stating what is available, answering questions, but not implementing any Board policy or stating what the Board will do. He said it is difficult to provide the information. An inventory of all the County's BMPs on the urban side will be available by February 1; they do not have information for Agriculture. Mr. Fitzgerald asked for Board direction. He added that it takes a substantial amount of time to give a good solid product.

Chairman Pyles said this was very important. "We have a business that we weren't able to compete for because of the pre-processing that had to go on in order to help meet the Chesapeake Bay Act. We have the doubling of requirements that has happened within the last six months that have to be met. And I don't know if sticking our head in the sand is the right answer. I know that from Mr. Fanfoni's experience, is that he finds working with them helps him get stuff. If our strategy is to stick our head in the sand, I think we ought to come to that by conclusion if that is the best way to go rather than "that's what they're doing'. As I said at the last meeting, this is the kudzu of legislation. It's going everywhere and I don't how for us to get our hands around, but I would like you to find out who are all the main shareholders in that. You have Mr. Fanfoni, Agriculture, Natural Resources, etc. Until we get together, meeting of the minds, and somehow say 'let's get ahead of this, what do we need to do?' One of the things that is costing us is the computer modeling that they do. It may be to our advantage to start having information gathered ourselves and running the numbers. There are a lot of different approaches that we might take to get out under such a mandate if we can. If we can reduce what they expect of us, that's going to help us a lot. Start doing your groundwork of who we should get together." Mr. Fitzgerald said they have had several meetings with the Service Authority, Community Development, Planning District Commission and Extension. Chairman Pyles stated that he would like some feedback as to what is expected – if it is to be a regional thing with the Planning District Commission and if funding will be required.

Mr. Wills suggested that the Board "allow staff to handle this and kind of stay as much out of it as a Board right now as we can from the standpoint of not making 'what they see as commitments'. What we commit to do to the State, we have to be very limited on it."

Mr. Pattie stated that we need to take a pro-active stance and challenge some of the assumptions made.

It was the consensus of the Board to discuss at the February 8th meeting.

6. NACo Prescription Discount Card letter suggesting "to keep the present program in its current form or may choose to receive \$1 per prescription filled when the NACo Prescription Discount Card gives the best price vs. the pharmacy's price." Staff is not recommending this.
7. George Washington National Forest Stakeholders Group Meeting – Thursday, February 2nd, 2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., Lexington. Information distributed to Board.

* * * * *

January 25, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION

On motion of Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. Beyeler, the Board went into closed session pursuant to:

(1) the personnel exemption under Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A)(1)

[discussion, consideration or interviews of (a) prospective candidates for employment, or (b) assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining or resignation of specific employees]:

A) Boards and Commissions

(2) the economic development exemption under Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A)(5)

[discussion concerning a prospective business or industry or the expansion of an existing business or industry where no previous announcement has been made of its interest in locating or expanding its facilities in the county]:

A) Pending industrial prospect(s)

On motion of Mr. Karaffa, seconded by Mr. Beyeler, the Board came out of closed Session.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Karaffa, Shull, Wills, Moore, Beyeler
 and Pyles
 Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

The Chairman advised that each member is required to certify that to the best of their knowledge during the closed session only the following was discussed:

- 1. Public business matters lawfully exempted from statutory open meeting requirements, and
- 2. Only such public business matters identified in the motion to convene the executive session.

The Chairman asked if there is any Board member who cannot so certify.

Hearing none, the Chairman called upon the County Administrator/ Clerk of the Board to call the roll noting members of the Board who approve the certification shall answer AYE and those who cannot shall answer NAY.

Roll Call Vote was as follows:

 AYE: Pattie, Karaffa, Shull, Wills, Moore, Beyeler and Pyles
 NAY: None

The Chairman authorized the County Administrator/Clerk of the Board to record this certification in the minutes.

* * * * *

