

Regular Meeting, Wednesday, February 8, 2012, 7:00 p.m. Government Center, Verona, VA.

PRESENT: Tracy C. Pyles, Jr., Chairman  
Jeffrey A. Moore, Vice-Chairman  
David A. Karaffa  
Marshall W. Pattie  
Michael L. Shull  
Larry J. Wills  
Timmy Fitzgerald, Director of Community Development  
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

ABSENT: David R. Beyeler

VIRGINIA: At a regular meeting of the Augusta County Board of Supervisors held on Wednesday, February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m., at the Government Center, Verona, Virginia, and in the 236<sup>th</sup> year of the Commonwealth....

\* \* \* \* \*

Chairman Pyles welcomed the citizens present.

\* \* \* \* \*

The following students at Shenandoah Valley Governor's School, led us with the Pledge of Allegiance:

Ashley Gartin, a Senior at Riverheads High School, plans on attending Duke University. Allie Casto, a Senior at Riverheads High School, plans on attending James Madison University. Noah Rodammer, a Senior at Waynesboro High School, plans on attending University of Virginia. John Miller, a Senior at Waynesboro High School, hopes to attend University of Virginia. Jarrett Donkle, a Junior at Riverheads High School, plans on attending University of Virginia in two years.

\* \* \* \* \*

David A. Karaffa, Supervisor for the Beverley Manor District, delivered invocation.

\* \* \* \* \*

Chairman Pyles recognized the Boy Scouts of America Troup #8, from Churchville. Woody Secrist, Leader, announced that the Boy Scouts were present tonight to earn their Citizenship Community Merit Badge. The following Boy Scouts were present: Dillon Sheffer, Evan Clough, Devon Miller, Chase Secrist, Kyle Lincoln, Jesse Wilmer, Blake Knight, Nick Weller, Connor Hensley, Weston Mandeville, Dillon Rusmisl, Jacob Gray, Hunter Hilbert, Josh Young. Leaders present: Woody Secrist, Gerry White, Roy Gray, Jimmy Sheffer, Wayne Young, Dale Rusmisl, and Connor White. Mr. Secrist stated that Connor White is the latest Eagle in the Troop.

Chairman Pyles welcomed the troop and especially appreciated the Troop Leaders. "They are the foundation to keeping this going and help you to come along and be the top-notch citizens that you are going to be. "

\* \* \* \* \*

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC

AUGUSTA COUNTY SCHOOL BUDGET CUTS

Several people spoke in support of the Shenandoah Valley Governor's School and Craigsville Elementary School and asked that the Board of Supervisors not eliminate these programs. Governor's School Director Lee Ann Whitesell emphasized the unique, advanced educational opportunities available at the regional Governor's

---

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

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

AUGUSTA COUNTY SCHOOL BUDGET CUTS (cont'd)

School. "SVGS is more than a place for students to take advanced courses. It is a community of learners who inspire each other to strive for academic excellence." Ms. Whitesell commented that the county schools budget has been cut drastically in the past four years and said, "if the trend continues, our schools will not be able to meet the needs of our students." The students felt that the Governor's School taught more than what was offered in their "home" high school. Alan White, former Augusta County School Board, said he was sure that the Board of Supervisors was aware of the Governor's School's value to the community. He knew that adequate money is not coming from the state government and said it might be time to consider a property tax increase to fund school needs. He felt that it would be easier to accept raising taxes if funding went directly to the County's needs, rather than going to Richmond or Washington. Ms. Rexrode distributed bracelets to the Board with the letters "BADD" meaning "Believe, Adjust, Dream, and Do". Ms. McCray, a fourth grade teacher at Craigsville Elementary School, was greatly concerned of that school being closed because of it being in a needy population.

The following speakers were: Lisa Donkle, Jarrett Donkle, Ashley Gartin, Allie Casto, Lee Ann Whitesell, Jennifer Rexrode, John Miller, Noah Rodammer, Alan White, Kathy Garber, Amanda McCray, Toni Sheets

Chairman Pyles made the following comments:

We appreciate your comments. As Dr. White said, you're preaching to the choir to a degree. This is a process that has just recently begun. I, personally, am a little bit upset with the School Board for trying to put things out there and cause us angst to the public until we know what's what. It was just, I think, last Friday in January I met with the Chairman of the School Board, the Superintendent, Vice-Chairman of the School Board, and we said what do you need. At that meeting, what they asked for was a growth money which was \$500,000 and to cover the drop in the composite index – \$1.1 in change million. We offered some other things. They said, no, this is good, let's wait and see what comes out because there's a lot to it. We are not in this by ourselves. As the first person said, what can we do; what can you do to help this? Some of our budget problems are because we've lost so much enrollment. We've gone from five years ago 10,900 to 10,300 projected next year. When you lose 600 students, that's more than a school's worth of children. So there has to be some adjustments made for that. On top of all that this year, the State, in its infinite wisdom, decided to catch up on VRS and Dr. Pattie a little bit later will give you a couple of slides that shows was it really necessary. This is the thing that is hurting us the most. This is some \$3.1 million additional money to catch up shortcomings that the State had and then they're putting it on us locally. Without that, things sail along. We, as a Board, are going to Richmond tomorrow to meet with our delegates and our senators to plead with them to mitigate this—to drop it. It is not necessary. We didn't get into a funding hole all at once; we shouldn't try to get out of it all at once. We're going there to meet with them. We met with these legislators just a few weeks ago and it seemed like you must feel like—you're talking to a wall. They didn't listen. They were recently quoted in the paper. And the comments were indifference to our needs. If you want to do something, let the delegates know that they need to represent you because what they're doing now is representing Richmond to us instead of us to Richmond. When people just take a party line instead of looking out for their constituents, it's just so much words. Now, we're concerned about all the things that you're talking about. Craigsville School was on the chopping block last year. It greaves me that they put it up again, even though I'm hearing that they have no real intention of closing it, but it's there because it gets a lot of people – a whole community looks to that school as their core, their center, the most important thing they have. While the young lady talked about the number of kids that are on free and reduced lunches and it is the largest in the County, they are also one of the highest achieving schools in the County. That should count as something. But where we have Craigsville School spoken up, and the Governor's School kids, you knew that they were going to come here. You've got your best and your brightest and they certainly are articulate; they can speak for themselves, and you know we don't want to lose that school. I worry about the program that Ms. Rexrode talked about because those kids won't speak for themselves; their parents won't show up here; they are not of the same portion. So we have to look at all the programs

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC (cont'd)  
AUGUSTA COUNTY SCHOOL BUDGET CUTS (cont'd)

for all the kids. Yes, when employers come here, they ask about the Governor's School, but they also ask about Valley Vo-Tech. They want to know that kids are being trained up that way. There are a lot of programs to be protected. I do want to say one thing to you bright kids at Shenandoah. Go ahead and say what's good about it, but don't knock the regular high schools. You know Buffalo Gap does a heck of a job. The young lady who was in monocular studies--my son is going to graduate in three years of Virginia Tech. He just went to poor old Buffalo Gap. He did his work there, got straight A's; he was accepted both at UVA and Virginia Tech, and now, he is going to graduate in three years because of the AP classes he took there. Just as well, there are a couple of other friends of ours that one of them is now at Yale doing research, working on his PhD. He goes all over the world talking about the research he is doing at Yale. He just went to Buffalo Gap High School and then he went to Tech and then he went to Yale. So you guys have a great program; there is a lot of add-ons to it, but we can still get an education just in the buildings that we have if we have good teachers and dedicated students. What we've tried to do with the School Board is go through a process. Can we change what the State is going to do? We don't know. We'll find out soon enough. Those numbers will come back. Second, we said we will do more from our funds both things that don't have to be paid back and there are some things that we could possibly borrow from our rainy day fund. What we have is not a "rainy day fund", it's a capital account with dedicated things, but we're willing to put it up and put it out until things get better so we thought we would advance some money. We have asked them to look at some things to change and take costs out of the system that doesn't affect education. We have a big area in Augusta County. We have 150 buses. We have 150 bus drivers. For each of them, they make \$13,000. It is not a lot. They get \$5,000 in benefits, but they only work two or three hours a day. What if we had them all day long? We spent \$800,000 a year for substitutes. Do they bring value to our system? Suppose those bus drivers were the substitutes and save that \$800,000. We have 21 buses that each day drive 20 or more miles from the time they drop off kids until they go home, they come back and pick up the kids. We've got some that are going as far as 40. It's just \$1 a mile and it's \$20 a day times 180 - \$3,600. So we've asked to look at things like that. How can we take costs out of the system? And it's not comfortable. I look at the list of the bus drivers. I look at the list of the teachers. I look at the list of all the people that somebody is probably going to get hurt. Many of those folks I've know for 50 years or more and they're out there; their hurt that is going to be done. Even if we were to try and fund this whole thing, you know, I can't stop them from cutting individual programs. We look at this--the budget, the Tier 1 and Tier 2 total \$2.7 million; you only need \$3.4 to balance the budget. Yet, they have \$2.9 million worth of cuts in Tier 3. Over \$2 million of things that they don't need. So they put in the Governor's School; they put in Craigsville because they are things that we're deeply attached to and folks are going to come out. I don't think they'll be closed. We're putting \$13 million to build and enlarge Wilson Elementary so the kids from Ladd can come over and then close Ladd. We have suggested to the School Board that they can't get the savings from closing Ladd this coming year, but they can the year after, what if we give you that money for next year so you will already have that savings--that \$600,000 that would save Craigsville? We only have \$200,000 difference. What I'm trying to tell you is that this is a process to find out what the State has. This Board wants to help. We have asked our Director of Finance to bring to us every tax that we are allowed to impose in Augusta County; where are we on the scale; how far can we go up; and see if there is something else that we might attach some funds to. But we get hit with things all the time from the State. Just today the legislature, one of the houses, passed that we couldn't increase our BPOL tax. We thought that was an appropriate place to add a few cents to get a little bit more; the State says no. They tie us up to where we can't do the things that we would like to do. We are being squeezed by the State. Our cuts are huge. We have other things to do. But as far as the key things that you are asking about here, tonight, I believe they'll be funded. I think this Board will work to see that they get funded. We are all in this. Ms. Rexrode said that the second letter on BADD was "adjust". We ought to learn to adjust a little bit. While we have all the folks that are here that are saying we need to spend more, there are a few folks out there for whom it would be a burden because you talk, well, it's just a couple of cents. To meet \$5.4, we would have to add something like 8¢ to our tax rate. Then next year we're going to do a reassessment. We think the values will come down. So we're liable to have to add another 15% to the tax rate and pretty soon it's a problem. The Board will do everything to keep school system where it needs to be, but we have to ask the School Board to work with us. We have to ask the legislature to work with us. It

---

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC (cont'd)  
AUGUSTA COUNTY SCHOOL BUDGET CUTS (cont'd)

shouldn't just come down to this Board raising property taxes. There are other things to do.

Mr. Wills made the following comments:

As a preface to what I'm about to say, I want to note for you all, for the press, and understand that any of the comments that we make here tonight, any of the comments that have been made in the past, whether it's Mr. Beyeler's suggestion of a tax increase, or Mr. Pyles' suggestion of a restructuring in the County school system in some manner, these are personal comments. They are not actions of this Board until we officially take action. My comments are my personal comments and please take them accordingly.

Since the combined meeting of the Board of Supervisors and the School Board (February 1) and the meeting of the School Board (February 2), I have received numerous emails and telephone calls regarding potential cuts in the School Board's Budget and the raising of the tax rate. Like most of those who contacted me, I have also read the articles and editorials in the local newspapers. I appreciate our citizens' concerns for these items and I am glad to see that they are willing to be actively involved in the decision making process. However, I feel that I must address a couple of areas of concern.

First: Remember that we are early in the budget processes at the State, local and School Board levels. The numbers that we are seeing today are not necessarily the numbers that we will see when all of the numbers are finalized. At this stage of the process, each body must look at worst case scenarios and work from there. While all of the cuts mentioned are on the table, it does not mean that all will have to be made. It leaves the responsible Boards and Legislative bodies with options on how to balance their budgets.

Second: Let us not make this a School Board versus Board of Supervisors issue. This Board does support a good educational system in this county. The offer is on the table to fully fund the losses in state revenue as a result of the change in composite index. In addition one half of the projected growth revenue will be given to the schools. This is approximately 1.6 million dollars of new county money for the schools with only \$900,000 in new revenue coming into the county. We will have to find the difference in other parts of the budget. As a member of the Board of Supervisors, I stand ready to work with the School Board in any reasonable way to meet our educational needs. With these revenues, the School System will be one of only two county budget areas that will be receiving more local county dollars than before the start of the recession. The cuts you're talking about are State cuts, people. This Board, this County, has funded your schools.

Third: The cause of the shortfall for this year's budget lies directly on the back of the state government. The Governor has proposed a 49% overall increase in the Virginia Retirement System (VRS) funding (11.93% to 17.77%). If you look only at the employer share, it amounts to an 84% increase (from 6.33% to 11.66). I will note, that according to state statutes, even though there are separate rates for employee and employer, for individuals hired prior to 2010, the locality is required to pay both. The State will tell you that they are paying their share (SOQ portion). In reality, the amount of increase (\$1.1 million) in the budget line for State VRS share has been offset by reducing amounts in other budget lines. The largest of these cuts come in loss of Lottery support for School Construction and Operating costs (\$890,000), vocational education (\$400,000) and special education (\$930,000).

They give us \$1.1 million; they take away \$2.2 million. In addition, they leave us with an increase in VRS and life insurance increases of \$3.121 million. The ironic twist to all of this is that it comes at a time when the legislators say that they want more money to go to the classrooms. To stress the importance of education in you and your children's lives, you need to convince your State Legislators, not those of us who are sitting at this panel.

Fourth: Tax rate. I have read articles that indicate that a group may come to this Board to request up to a 10 cent increase on the tax rate. First of all, to fund the initial school projections to the current level, it would require only a 7 cent increase. However, with these economic times, this is still unreasonable to place this kind of burden on our taxpayers. That would mean almost a 15% increase on the homeowners in Augusta County. Just as I see the State increase on VRS as unreasonable and a major burden on

---

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

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

AUGUSTA COUNTY SCHOOL BUDGET CUTS (cont'd)

localities, I would view such a tax increase as an unreasonable burden on our taxpayers at this time. We still have homeowners hanging on by a thread. Do we want to push them off the cliff just as the economic conditions offer a glimmer of hope for the future?

Supporting Education and tax rates go hand in hand. This is true at both the state and local levels. Yet every survey I see indicates that the majority of the responders want no tax increases. What the general public needs to do to help us with this situation is to contact your state legislators and ask them to do one of two things immediately: Reduce the VRS rate and/or reprioritize the spending at the state level to reflect their support for public education in K-12.

Mr. Shull made the following comments:

I think Mr. Wills has said, basically, what I think all of us are thinking. As a person that came through our schools here, I know and I appreciate our school system, our teachers, and our leaders; and I encourage you to do the same thing. Talk to your legislators; call them; send them e-mails, whatever it takes. They need to hear from you. If they don't hear from you, they don't know what is going on. Tell them that you vote and you want to know what is going on in the future. I encourage you to do that.

Mr. Moore made the following comments:

As most of you know, I was on the School Board for eight years. I know the members of that Board well. I worked with them closely, some for a shorter time than others, but what Mr. Pyles said is exactly right. This is a process. I think the feeling of this Board is that we are going to do everything we can to take care of our school system so that we continue to have a school system that we can be proud of. The expenses that are being pushed down from Richmond are really where we're having the problems. Hopefully, they will see what they're doing to us and before the final budget comes out of the House and the Senate and cross over, that it is something that is considerably more reasonable. Again, it is a process, so I ask that you all . . . I really like the fact that everybody is here tonight. It shows that you truly are supportive of education and here to let us hear what you have to say. Give us some time to work through the process and I would hope that you are pleased with what we end up with.

Mr. Karaffa made the following comments:

I really am encouraged to see so many people to come out to a Board meeting. I know it is difficult on a week night. For some of you, this is a church night and I also respect that you may be making that sacrifice to be with us this evening. It really says something when we see this room full. It's when we only see one or two of you in the audience that we feel that nobody truly understands. First of all, the Governor's School, just from hearing from you guys tonight, are an impressive group. We've had quite a few people come before this Board and speak and you guys have done it very eloquently. I had two cousins that went to the Governor's School and when they heard about this, they were quick to call me and offer to answer any questions that I might have about the Governor's School. I would like to echo what a lot of the other Board members have said here tonight. I am brand new on the Board of Supervisors. I did not serve on the School Board prior to this. I'm a nurse by trade. And if there's one thing that I've learned through this part of the process is that this County really does put its efforts in supporting County schools. The problems we're dealing with right now come from the State level. If it wasn't for what the State was doing right now, we would not have a budget shortfall in the schools, which we have already talked to the School Board about covering. We are willing to step up and we are willing to give the schools the support they need to continue the programs that you all are concerned about. The biggest thing that we can do right now is speak with one voice and say to the State Legislatures 'you have to come up with a solution that relieves this burden on our back'. We, as a Board, are going to Richmond to do it in person because when you're standing in front of them, and you're making the case, it's hard for them to blow you off. That's what we're going to do. You guys can help us. You can call. You can send letters. You can send letters as a group; you can send them individually; you can send pictures. We are going to plead. We are asking that you also

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

## MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC (cont'd)

### AUGUSTA COUNTY SCHOOL BUDGET CUTS (cont'd)

plead for yourselves. Go plead for your programs. We understand their importance and you need to show them their importance as well. There was a comment made tonight by a lady that we need to meet our students where they are. I agree to that 100%. We meet our kids on a lot of different levels and our gifted and talented ones we need to make sure we are doing the same thing as well. I look forward to the rest of this process.

It's a learning experience for me this time around. My opposite on the School Board, it's also her first time around. I think we talk almost every other day, now, as we've kind of gone into this process together. She keeps me abreast of what is going on over there; I keep her abreast of what is going on over here. We have a good relationship that is going with these two boards. Our problems are coming at the State level. I ask you; I plead to you, please make your voices heard. Tell your neighbors.

Marshall Pattie made the following comments:

To echo the comments, I love that you guys are here. I got involved in government because I thought it was important. I went out and I volunteered and I thought 'this would be great and I can really influence' and I knew this was coming. For the year I ran, I saw a shortfall coming and so I've been preparing for the worst case scenario. I just wanted to show you briefly sort of the shell games that our State Legislators are playing right now.

Mr. Pattie presented two slides:

#### **State Policy in 2011**

- Borrow \$620,000,000 from pensions
- Claim a surplus of \$545,000,000
- Require state employees pay 5%
  - but also give a 5% pay raise

#### **State Policy in 2012**

- Now have obligation for pensions
- Require localities to pay \$1,000,000,000 2012/2013
- Teachers pay 11.66% of pension
  - No pay raise like state employees
- Augusta "fair share" \$3,100,000.

Mr. Pattie's further comments:

What I've been telling people is 'I agree with you. I'm an educator; I'm in the same boat as you guys.' We need to fight this at the State level and make sure that this doesn't hit us. Now, if you remember State employees had to pay 5% but they also got a 5% raise. Basically, what they're asking is to increase it to 11.66% for our teachers and for our school employees, but there is no raise associated with that to help compensate for that difference. Our fair share to pay into this \$1,000,000,000 to refund VRS (and it's \$18 billion short) is \$3.1 million this year and next year increase. This is my problem. They're just playing shell games. They borrow from the account and now they're forcing us to pay back into it. I begged the media multiple times. I gave a long interview to 29—a 10-minute interview. This wasn't brought up. We need to start asking our legislators, 'where do you actually stand on this?' Last year, it wasn't an obligation; this year, it is an obligation. So that's what I'm going to push you guys to do, now. We need to, I don't know it'll take a month or so for the budget to go through, and if we all stand together and we all fight this, let's prevent this \$3.1 million from coming down here. Like we said, we're actually giving more money to our school system this year than last year unlike many of the other school systems. So we're in better shape if we can prevent this from happening. After the budget cycle, come here and yell at us and I am more than willing—I knew that this is part of the job. I know that, any decision I make, I will make half of the people happy and half of the people mad at me but I have thick skin; I can take it. In the end, I'm going to try to do what is right for the whole community. Please help us fight against the State that can borrow any time it wants from our VRS fund and then mandate that we pay into it.



February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

MILLS CREEK DAM

The Board considered funding for the rehabilitation of South River Watershed Site 10A, Mills Creek Dam.

Patrick J. Coffield, County Administrator, advised that over the last several years, it has been our approach to have partners with the federal government funding (65%) and the State (24-27%). Previously, there has been bond money available; there is no more bond money available. This project is rated the top project in the State of Virginia for funding. We have received a total of \$1.8 in federal financial assistance funds for this project. The Dam Rehabilitation Program requires a 35% non-federal match which can be provided through cash or in-kind services. The maximum that NRCS can pay for this project is 65% of the total project cost. What is being requested of the Board is to commit funds for the entire 35%, knowing that there is a pending request before the Commonwealth of Virginia (25%) for assistance. A written response is required by February 15<sup>th</sup>. If we do not respond, it may need to be fully funded at a later time. He noted that there is sufficient funding to cover the 35%.

Mr. Wills stated that with 1) getting 65% of funding from the federal government, and 2) the dam has been identified of having problems, and 3) the County could be forced in the future to be responsible for the entire funding, he supported the proposal.

Mr. Wills moved, seconded by Mr. Pattie, that the Board approve funding.

Funding Sources:	Flood Control Dams	#80000-8151	\$100,000
	Stormwater Management	#80000-8164	<u>472,000</u>
			\$572,000

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

Motion carried.

\* \* \* \* \*

REVENUE RECOVERY BRIEFING

The Board received a presentation by staff on the Revenue Recovery Program and revenue generation history.

Lt. Minday Craun, Volunteer Coordinator, Augusta County Fire and Rescue, gave the following overview:

Background:

- October 2008, the County received a request from one of the agencies to implement Revenue Recovery. Staunton Augusta and Waynesboro had started Revenue Recovery a few years prior to that.
- November 12, 2008, County staff then began analyzing the impact of Revenue Recovery on the County's Fire-Rescue System with the Board of Supervisors approval.
- February 2008, Augusta County, Rockingham and Harrisonburg put together a Joint Request for Proposal for Billing Services.
- March 11, 2008, Board of Supervisors approved to move forward with a draft ordinance and public hearing.
- April 8, 2009, Public Hearing was held.
- May 13, 2009, Board of Supervisors approved Ordinance.
- May 19, 2009, Volunteer Distribution Team was formed to look at distribution ideas.
- August 24, 2009, Signed a contract with current billing company EMS Management and Consultants.



February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

REVENUE RECOVERY BRIEFING (cont'd)

- February 10, 2010, Board of Supervisors approved the following policies:
  - Compassionate Billing Policy
    - Insurance company will be billed. Out-of-pocket expenses will be written off. Staunton/Augusta and Waynesboro will do the same.
    - Out-of-County residents – insurance company is billed; a series of three bills will be mailed out for out-of-pocket expenses; will be written off after third billing.
  - Mutual Aid Policy
    - Whichever transport agency who provides the service, will be the one who bills.
  - Non-Emergency Transport Policy
    - If agency transports patients to doctor appointments, dialysis, cancer treatments, etc., this is non-billable.
  - DOA Policy
    - If patient has passed when rescue crew arrives, this a non-billable call.
    - If services are provided and person is transported to the hospital before passing, it is a billable call.
- February 24, 2010/Revised May 11, 2011 – Board of Supervisors approved the Distribution Plan.
  - Agreement with volunteer agencies -
    - Outlines departments included and says that Augusta County will be handling the revenues. There are some administrative expenses – 6.25% paid to billing company. Money will be disbursed back out to the agencies based on career people funded by the County. Example: Mount Solon does not have career people, 100% of what comes in, after 6.25% to the billing company, goes back out to Mount Solon. Less than 5 career people in an agency, Augusta County keeps 25%, 75% goes out to agency. Five and over career people in an agency, Augusta County keeps 65%, 35% goes out to agency.
    - Responsible for all their data collection.
    - Provide to the County yearly information about their organization.
  - Estimates for Revenue projected each year. It is the responsibility of Augusta County:
    - To assure that disbursement is correct and that records are complete.
    - To provide benchmarks to the agency – 1<sup>st</sup> due areas, toning procedures, etc.
- General Fund Money that is saved goes to:
  - Contingency Fund: Lt. Craun added that if Revenue Recovery does not cover what was originally given in the annual contribution, that difference would be made up.
  - Fire-Rescue Grant Fund
  - Capital Replacement
    - Toughbooks

Lt. Craun distributed information regarding projected incomes and noted that less than 50% from most of the agencies, of their total calls, are actually billable. The agency can only bill for “actual” transports. Out of that 50% that is billable, there is another 50-60% that is written off for contractual allowances (no insurance in County resident out-of-pocket expense or above the insurance allowable expense).

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

### REVENUE RECOVERY BRIEFING (cont'd)

Melissa Meyerhoeffer, Assistant Finance Director, provided a PowerPoint presentation with the following high-lights:

#### **Billing Consultant**

- Regional RFP performed between the Counties of Augusta and Rockingham and the City of Harrisonburg
- EMS Management and Consultants was the selected billing consultant
- Currently under contract through December 2012

#### **Billing & Payment Process**

- Emergency Ambulance Transport
- Patient's Insurance Billing Information is received
  - Downloaded through EMS Management and Consultants
  - Uploaded data from Augusta Health
  - Send request to patient for insurance information
- Insurance billed
- Payments received in lockbox
  - Checked daily by First Bank & Trust
- Deposits posted daily by Treasurer to General Ledger
- Billing Company posts payments daily to Patient Accounts
- Daily/Monthly Reporting received from Billing Company
- Quarterly Disbursements to Agencies

#### **Fee Schedule**

Ms. Meyerhoeffer noted that these rates are set at 125% above the Medicare allowable rate for Advanced Life Support and Basic Life Support. The rates are set to be competitive with private insurance.

Call Type	2012 Rate	2011 Rate
ALS Emergency	\$516.00	\$503.00
BLS Emergency	\$435.00	\$423.00
Mileage	\$13.00	\$13.00

#### **Contractual Allowance**

- Contractual allowance is the amount billed less the amount an insurance company will allow for a transport service
- Example: Citizen is transported for BLS Emergency. The insurance company is billed for \$435. The insurance company only allows \$350 for this service; therefore \$85 is adjusted as a contractual allowance.
- Contractual allowance includes area resident adjustments

#### **Monthly Reporting/Service Fee**

- Reports are received for each Agency from EMS Management
- Reports are based on Net Collections
- 6.25% monthly service fee on Net Collections

---

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

## REVENUE RECOVERY BRIEFING (cont'd)

### **Quarterly Report**

This report had been enclosed with Agenda package. It will be received each quarter when disbursements are made to the agencies. Quarterly payments for Fiscal Year 2012 are based on the cash basis. The first quarterly payment made in July is for the previous quarter of April through June. The County General Fund Transfer reflects that the County, to date, has gotten approximately \$94,000 and it has been budgeted \$120,000, which will help offset the cost of career personnel.

### **Contingency Reserve**

The Contingency Reserve is a \$160,000 transfer that has been transferred from the General Fund into the Revenue Recovery Fund for the past two years.

- Contingency Uses:
  - To make up the difference between actual revenue recovery receipts received by an agency and what the County contribution would have been for the fiscal year
  - SARS/WFAC contribution of patient write offs
  - Reserve for future contribution shortfalls
- Calculated in April of each year
- The FY11 Year End Contingency Balance is approximately \$37,000 (It is estimated that the FY12 yearend contingency balance will be \$78,000.)

Mr. Wills questioned Grottoes and Bridgewater transports of Augusta County citizens. Lt. Craun explained that whoever is the actual transport agency is the one who bills. This goes through Rockingham County if it is transported by Bridgewater agency. There is an agreement if there is an out-of-pocket expense, it will be written off for Augusta County citizens.

Mr. Karaffa asked for clarification of the quarterly basis of 25% or 65% going back into a separate account. Ms. Meyerhoeffer said the 25% goes back to the General Fund to offset Fire/Rescue personnel costs. The \$160,000 (Contingency) is transferred from the General Fund to the Revenue Recovery Fund. Mr. Karaffa asked, when there is more than 5 career people, if it was just in the Rescue division or Fire-Rescue combined. Lt. Craun said that it would be combined (such as Churchville).

Chairman Pyles noticed that Deerfield had a higher revenue than Churchville and questioned why. He asked if it had anything to do with the paperwork turned in for billing. Ms. Meyerhoeffer said there have been more calls in Deerfield recently. She added that it was also based on the timing of paperwork received.

Chairman Pyles asked what triggered the billing agency to know that there was a transport. Lt. Craun said that when the agency returns from the transport, a report is to be done within 2 days. The billing company scans daily of all of the reports. Once the report is correctly received, it is marked for the billing company. There have been a few problems with agencies providing the reports in a timely manner. Some reports may be returned to Lt. Craun for additional information.

Chairman Pyles asked how many places transports are taken. Lt. Craun stated Augusta Health and Rockingham Memorial. Chairman Pyles asked if the hospitals could monitor the number of transports. Lt. Craun said that the ECC reports would reflect transports.

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

REVENUE RECOVERY BRIEFING (cont'd)

Mr. Shull asked if ECC could provide the calls per agency. Lt. Craun said she receives all that information. Chairman Pyles agreed that there should be a routine check to determine what reports are missing.

Mr. Wills asked if the ECC could provide a daily transport report. Lt. Craun said that probably could be done.

Mr. Moore asked if SARS and Waynesboro adhere to the same policy for Augusta County residents. Lt. Craun said they do.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHESAPEAKE BAY TMDL

The Board considered County response regarding concerns about proposals.

Timmy Fitzgerald, Director of Community Development, reported that a copy of the response letter sent to the Department of Conservation and Recreation had been distributed to the Board. Some of the key points in the letter were: 1) the questioning of the model data for the agricultural BMPs; 2) BMP goals are unrealistic and should be more attainable; 3) did not have a good handle on what the agricultural community has been doing voluntarily to help with the TMDL issue (such as fencing cattle out of streams) that did not utilize state or federal funding; 4) land covering data provided did not have a scientific background as to where the numbers were derived; and 5) the Service Authority was able to capture their numbers and were in agreement to follow the mandates on the waste water treatment plants.

Mr. Fitzgerald noted that the news articles reflected that all the localities within the region were in similar agreement. He added that they now have an inventory of urban BMPs within the County.

Mr. Karaffa asked about the non-point sources of pollution and inquired about any sort of direct testing of the water? He asked what process was in place to calculate. Mr. Fitzgerald questioned where the scientific data was coming from that created the model. The major concern is the validation of the data.

Mr. Pattie noted that at the last work session, he had suggested hiring a consultant to look at the numbers and determine more accurate data. He had also suggested teaming with different agencies to get a more accurate measure of what is coming in to Augusta County from the National Forest and what is leaving Augusta County to determine how much harm is actually being caused. He asked if the total cost of the TMDLs had been reviewed. Mr. Fitzgerald said they have not. He would like to see how much that would actually cost the residents to meet the 90% and to be in compliance by 2025.

Mr. Wills said that Headwaters and other agencies could give some baseline samples on streams to determine what was needed. Mr. Pattie said there were a number of people who are measuring the water samples now; the problem is the federal government will not accept their data because they are not doing the full spectrum. Mr. Shull said that each stream should be looked at to determine which is worse. Mr. Pattie said, if the Board desired, he could look into the matter a little more thoroughly and provide information. Mr. Wills said, "We can overreact but we can't stay still on this." He reported that he had been contacted by a resident who says that there are people in the County who would be happy to provide some of this service at no charge. Chairman Pyles expected a detailed response from DCR stating if it were acceptable or not and then a group can be created to determine what needs to be done to become proactive. He suggested that the Service Authority be involved with this group.

\* \* \* \* \*

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

WEYERS CAVE DRAINAGE PROJECT

The Board considered construction funding for drainage project (Middle River District).

Funding Source: Middle River Infrastructure Account #80000-8012-63 \$118,530

Mr. Coffield advised that there was a sewer project going forward adjacent to a known drainage problem. The purpose was to have the Service Authority and County Staff work together to address both issues at the same time. The previous Board had authorized \$21,000 funding and an additional funding of \$118,530 is required.

Mr. Wills stated that this was a project that he had supported 20 years ago and is now partially coming to fruition.

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

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

Nays: None

Absent: Beyeler

Motion carried.

\* \* \* \* \*

WAIVERS/VARIANCES

The Board had received copies of minutes explaining the process for waivers.

Chairman Pyles invited Ken Fanfoni, Executive Director of Augusta County Service Authority, to clarify a fire flow issue.

Mr. Fanfoni understood that the fire flow waiver for a proposed Dollar General Store in Crimora was approved on January 25<sup>th</sup>. He felt that there had been a lot of misunderstanding of what had happened. A clarification memo was attached to tonight's agenda. He explained to the Board how the fire protection issue is determined. The Service Authority (ACSA) has a lot of fire protection information, but it is very general. When a project comes in, the fire flow is unknown at that particular property. The applicant hires an engineer to do an analysis to determine that factor. When the applicant has a project, they contact ACSA and says a hydrant flow test is needed. ACSA does the test with the applicant's engineer present. The test runs for approximately 5 minutes determining the amount of water coming out of the hydrant. It is not fire protection or fire flow; it is the amount of water in a five-minute period. When the test is done, the pressure is also monitored at what is at a location referred to as the "critical hydrant". Critical hydrant means that the highest house in the service area is tested to insure that it has 20 pounds of pressure. The flow test is a starting point; the Augusta County Fire Ordinance requires a two-hour fire flow. A five-minute test is run and the engineer is to calculate what that flow would be after two hours. It would be less than what you would get for five minutes. When the Dollar General waiver request was submitted, there was no analysis. When the Fire Chief's office writes its comments, they have to look at the required fire flow which is referenced to the information that the applicant's engineer provided (which was not the available fire flow). Mr. Fanfoni said there was a lot of confusion in the way the information was submitted to the County. He emphasized that ACSA has information that would be helpful to the applicant's engineer. If the engineer brought in the fire flow analysis, it could be reviewed by ACSA and be determined if there would be a problem. He felt that the confusion began when the engineer took the incorrect information (incomplete application) to the Fire Department. Mr. Fanfoni added that a complete letter of

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

WAIVERS/VARIANCES (cont'd)

Dollar General – Crimora (cont'd)

comments that addressed the fire flow deficiency was faxed to the applicant's engineer two weeks before the Board meeting. He noted that another file was pulled indicating a different applicant, a different project, same location (around Route 340 and Doods), same engineer, same fire flow issues dated 2007 and 2009. He pointed out that this information was well-documented and well-known to the engineer two years before this occurrence. Mr. Fanfoni apologized to the Board for the position it had been put in and offered assistance to anyone who had a question with these types of projects.

Mr. Karaffa thanked Mr. Fanfoni for his explanation.

Chairman Pyles hoped that the Board would be more lenient in the future, when the request is presented the day of a meeting, to table the item until more information can be given. The Board should know all the facts and be more considerate of another Board member's concerns before making a decision.

\* \* \* \* \*

CONSENT AGENDA

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

MINUTES

Approved minutes of the following meetings:

- Staff Briefing Meeting, Monday, January 23, 2012
- Budget Work Session, January 25, 2012
- Regular Meeting, Wednesday, January 25, 2012

CLAIMS

Approved claims paid since January 11, 2012.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Beyeler

Motion carried.

\* \* \* \* \*

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE BOARD

The Board discussed the following issues:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY - REAPPOINTMENT

Mr. Wills moved, seconded by Mr. Shull, that the Board reappoint B. Randolph Roller to serve another 4-year term on the Economic Development Authority, effective March 26, 2012, to expire March 25, 2016.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Beyeler

Motion carried.

\* \* \* \* \*

---

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

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

Mr. Pattie: Attended the Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission meeting – Budget was presented – very enthusiastic about their Fields of Gold program.

Mr. Karaffa:

1. Attended Valley Program for Aging Services – Strategic Plan has been developed.

\* \* \*

2. Reassessment Committee Meeting, made the following comments:

At our last Board meeting, we had made a motion to put out an RFP for some estimates from private contractors, looking for some assessment prices. We talked about having an assessment in place by January 2013 and having an assessment in place on January 2014. I can report to you that Mr. Wills and I have visited Rockingham County and spent a number of hours sitting with their Chief Assessor who is also their statistician and also wears many other hats in that arena including mapping. He and their Commissioner of Revenue looked at the cost of how they run their in-house reassessment department. We talked to them about what we would be looking for and generated some numbers based on their experience and what they thought conducting the reassessment in-house would cost us to do the job. It was very informative and we really do appreciate them taking the time. Mr. Wills and I have had a number of meetings and discussions and in order to get a quality product for a reassessment, we feel it would not be possible either going in-house or out-to-bid and get a quality product by January 2013. I would like to clarify the motion by putting out an RFP to be effective in January 2014 for a reassessment to be completed. The in-house assessment aspect is still something that Mr. Wills and I are looking at very seriously in considering and we will be making a recommendation about that at a later date. At this point, we do need to move forward to release the RFP. I can say that, if we were to move forward right now, and try to get an in-house assessment done, even by the January 2014 date, it would be very fast and not enough time to select a chief assessor, having him get established in the Government Center, familiarizing himself with the County, hiring the appropriate staff to do a job that we would expect, and then being able to deliver. I think we would be setting up, and I believe Mr. Wills and I are in agreement, that we would be setting up a department to fail if we were to rush into it at this point. We've been advised that going out to bid for a contract privately for an assessment to be turned in and ready to go in January 2013 probably wouldn't get any bidders due to the fact that they would only have six months which to actually complete the assessment after the bidding process was complete. Again, we have put out an RFP which you have in front of you. Please feel free to peruse this as a draft of a Request For Proposal for 2014.

Chairman Pyles made the following comments:

Let me just say that doing it for 2014 is kind of in never-never-land as far as composite index. They will be using 2013 for two years. In essence, we could wait until 2015 to do the reassessment without impacting—you know, if we're not done in January, we're stuck for two years. If there was interest to wait until 2015, and it was our desire to have in-house, we have the time to do it before we really need to have a next assessment. Is that of any value?

Mr. Karaffa's response:

It presents a good point. Actually we hadn't discussed putting it off another year. My thoughts and Mr. Wills' is waiting at this point would not give us the opportunity of locking in at what I think would be lower assessment values to affect that composite. Now, do I think the economy is going to completely rebound in a year? No. But I think we have been with the assessment numbers for quite a long time. It is time to get a good process in place. Another advantage would be that, if were to go ahead and hire a Chief Assessor and have him or her in place to see the process for the last six months, it would be a good way to begin breaking in that Assessor if the in-house option is what we want to consider. It would provide a hands-on educational opportunity and we could go ahead and do a private bid.

---

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

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

Mr. Wills made the following comments:

I would concur with everything that Mr. Karaffa said there. The gentleman in Harrisonburg that we talked to, and who leads their in-house team, also has worked in the private industry. He, along with a couple of other people that we have talked to, have been very emphatic about the idea of not trying to get a quick assessment done. They were just very emphatic. They also were very emphatic that to try within a short period of time to hire your assessor and get him on board for our next needed reassessment that it would probably be setting them up for a very difficult situation. At this point, I think we need to see the bids come in. According with what we're seeing at this point, it looks like that this is a good market for getting reassessments done by people. Hopefully, from what Ms. Whetzel has told us and also what Ms. Shrewsbury has told us, we have several companies that are very interested in replying. I think that, if what comes in from the contract does not look reasonable, I think we have that option of one more year obviously given to us by the State. But I think, for our citizens, the quicker we can get another reassessment done, I think the better off we are in their light that their property value is reasonable. I would think that we would at least need to get the RFPs and see where they come in and then, at that point, the Committee will make a recommendation back to you.

Mr. Karaffa moved, seconded by Mr. Wills, that the Board authorize staff to put out an RFP for reassessment to be effective in January 2014.

Mr. Moore made the following comments:

The statement that you made that we wouldn't get any response from someone for 2013, I would like to put it out there and see that be the fact.

Mr. Wills' response:

I'm afraid of the quality of it, Jeff. I really am. I just don't think we can handle the quality that we would get there. The last one was so bad in terms of public relations and in terms of general feelings from the public. I think we have got to make sure that we are getting a quality product. Like I said, I have been told . . . the gentleman in Harrisonburg told me that he wouldn't . . . either way, whether it was in-house, or whether he had been with a private firm, he wouldn't want it.

Mr. Moore's response:

The only comment I make to that, I don't know, the knowledge as you call it, it would be useful. The more boots you have on the ground . . . the more people you have on the ground . . .

Mr. Wills' response:

The key to it is not only the boots on the ground, the key to it is that analyzing everything and making sure you are using the data properly. If we bring a new company in, they have to start all over. They have their information but they, basically, have to start all over on their sales assessments and all of this.

Mr. Karaffa's response:

Actually, from what we learned in our meetings is that we have a yearly data base that we keep up, but we do not have a reassessment data base. That data base is held by the company that we contracted with. We have the data sheets on each independent piece of property that we put in our yearly record. To do a quality job in the time frame we're talking about; we were going to go to 2013, would require so much resources that either a company wouldn't bid or the cost to do it would be outrageous.

Chairman Pyles' response:

But couldn't they tell us that? Why would we assume what may not be true? I mean, you could ask for it because timing doesn't mean anything. The last guy had 18 months and then he got a 3-months extension. So he worked 21 months to get us what we got. We



---

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

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

don't have as many sales to look at as it has been in the past. It used to be 1,800 a year; now it's 400 so the workload is down. All that Mr. Moore is asking, and I concur with him, is that we put a caveat in there, could you do it for 2013?

Mr. Moore's response:

I think it could be the same RFP. I think you just need an Option A and an Option B. Option A being having it done by 2013 and Option B being having it done by 2014. Everybody coming back saying 'we're not going to bid on Option A, but on Option B, then we can say that there were no bidders and we know that for a fact. If we get one bidder that comes back and bids on Option A, and through discussion, we're not comfortable with that, we're not bound to use Option A. I mean you're still getting the exact same thing you're asking for, but we may find that there is someone out there who would be prepared to provide the resources.

Mr. Wills' response:

Let's remember, the State equalizes the composite index. The reassessment has a bearing on it, but the State comes back and equalizes that anyway, so it does not have that major a bearing on your final numbers.

Chairman Pyles' response:

Mr. Wills, I would disagree with you.

Mr. Wills' response:

Look at the formula, Mr. Pyles.

Chairman Pyles' response:

I've looked at the formula. There are a lot of things that come into play. There's only so many sales and the sales are in one key area. We were going with the one before, we were going in the right direction, the same there. I'm asking what would it hurt to include this other factor?

Mr. Wills' response:

My major problem is that I don't think we can get a valid job that we can give that I would have confidence in giving to our public.

Chairman Pyles' response:

Could we not ask?

Mr. Moore's response:

My point is that we're not bound to do it, but it would at least give us the option. If it comes back and we say we have seven people that want to do Option B the 2014 timeline and no one feels they can meet the 2013 timeline, then the decision is theirs. But if you have two people come back and say 'with boots on the ground, we can get something done by then, then the option would be there to evaluate. I'm with you, I want a good assessment, but I don't know enough and the people that are in that industry that it can't be done. Now, if they tell us it can't be done, then it can't be done. To put it out in the exact same RFP and you have an A and a B where one is a 2013 deadline and one is a 2014 deadline.

Mr. Karaffa asked Ms. Whetzel if it was possible to combine the options in one RFP. Ms. Whetzel the two options could be included in the same RFP. It would be addressed in the narrative that you could bid on both.

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

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

Mr. Karaffa made the following comments:

As much as I would love to see the 2009 reassessment go away, my feeling is toward quality. My question, if we were to put it into an RFP that we do the January 2013, or we can ask the question, what assurances do we have on quality? We were talking, that last company had that long to do it, and we saw what we got back.

Chairman Pyles' response:

Quality is based on the company, not on the timeframe.

Mr. Wills' response:

When you rush a good company, you still get a bad product.

Mr. Pattie made the following comments:

I tend to agree with Mr. Wills. I think it will take a longer time to get a better quality. But I really see no harm. If the advice you receive is that nobody is going to bid on it, I think, as a Board, we can agree we will evaluate any options that we get and if we don't think they can really do it in six months, or they charge a premium for doing it in six months, then I think our decision is easy. I move that the Board move forward with an Option A and Option B.

Mr. Karaffa moved, seconded by Mr. Wills, that the Board authorize staff to include a choice in an RFP of Option A, completion in 2013, and Option B, completion in 2014.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Beyeler

Motion carried.

Mr. Moore made the following comment:

As a follow-up comment, I want a good product. If we're not comfortable with an Option A that comes back, then we don't go that way, but it just gives us information.

Mr. Wills' response:

I would like Option A to be 2014 and Option B to be 2013. In other words, let them bid on the product that they would normally give us and give us as an option the shortened timeframe.

Mr. Karaffa's response:

This assessment is going to be touchy no matter what we get out of it in the end. I think people are going to have their questions. They are going to question quality; they are going question time put into it. I think we're having a good discussion and continue to move forward.

\* \* \* \* \*

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF

Staff discussed the following:

1. Board of Elections – Question asked if there were any suggestions from the Board on changes to be made regarding redistricting or re-precincting?

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF (cont'd)

- 2. Forest Service Plan – Briefing in Rockbridge County indicated some changes were going to be made – Changes will be discussed at a meeting with Forest Service next Wednesday, at 10:00 a.m.
- 3. General Assembly – VRS letter has been jointly signed with School Board and will be hand-delivered to Richmond tomorrow.
- 4. VDOT –
  - a. Information distributed to Board (Six-Year Plan Priority Projects list)  
Mr. Moore suggested that Route 636 be made into a primary road. Mr. Coffield stated that there is a criteria that has to be met: 1) connecting two primary roads (Routes 250 and 358); 2) Commonwealth Transportation Board will have to review.  
  
Mr. Fitzgerald said that this project has been discussed with VDOT. He noted that this project is funded on the Preliminary Engineering side. VDOT's recommendation is to push forward with the Preliminary Engineering to get the bridge and road designs. It has been indicated that, when it comes to this point, secondary funding has been given from the State level to a secondary route.  
  
Mr. Wills mentioned Route 616 and getting environmental studies and right-of-way completed.
  - b. Staffing contacts: Matthew Shiley – Area Land Use Engineer; and Michael Fulcher, Secondary Six-Year and Other Funding Programs. Both will be working closely with Don Komara, Residency Engineer.
- 5. Virginia Department of Emergency Management Grant – ECC received an additional \$150,000 grant for radios with no match.

\* \* \*

- 6. FIRE AND RESCUE SAFER GRANT  
Fire Chief Holloway advised that this grant has been applied with the Department of Homeland Security for the last two years. It is a 100% grant. Available funding is \$380 million with 400 awards beginning May 1, 2012 to September 30, 2012. There are no annual salary limits on the awards. There are no commitments after two years. Fire Chief Holloway asked for Board approval of 21 positions as it falls within the scope of needs in the five-year plan.

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

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

Nays: None

Absent: Beyeler

Motion carried.

\* \* \* \* \*

- 7. Contractors' Meeting – February 23<sup>rd</sup> at 6:00 p.m.
  - a. Organizational change
  - b. BOCA updates, effective March 1<sup>st</sup>.
- 8. School Bonds refunded – Credit of \$103,323 to go back into school construction. (Previously been placed into the School Capital Account to assist with other capital needs.)

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF (cont'd)

- 9. Continued Education – Timmy Fitzgerald has been accepted to the July 15-27, 2012 Senior Executive Institute (SEI) Program. Suggested nominating Jennifer Whetzel in future years
- 10. Jennifer M. Whetzel, Director of Finance mentioned the following:
  - a. RFP – do not focus on the format; just focus on the text of it. A timeline will be included for the 2013 and 2014.
  - b. Budget Survey is available on the internet

\* \* \* \* \*

CLOSED SESSION

On motion of Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. Karaffa, 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 real property exemption under Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A)(3)**  
[discussion of the acquisition for a public purpose, or disposition, of real property]:  
  
A) Acquisition for a public purpose
- (3) the legal counsel exemption under Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A)(7)**  
[consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members or consultants pertaining to actual or probable litigation, and consultation with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel, as permitted under subsection (A) (7)]:  
  
A) Litigation
- (4) 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

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

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

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

February 8, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION (cont'd)

- 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 and Pyles  
 NAY: None  
 ABSENT: Beyeler

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

\* \* \* \* \*

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

Motion carried.

\* \* \* \* \*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
County Administrator