
Special Meeting, Wednesday, August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.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
Patrick J. Morgan, County Attorney
Patrick J. Coffield, County Administrator
Rita R. Austin, CMC, Executive Secretary

VIRGINIA: At a Special Meeting of the Augusta County Board of Supervisors held on Wednesday, August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m., at the Government Center, Verona, Virginia, and in the 237th year of the Commonwealth....

* * * * *

FIRE AND RESCUE

The Board received a presentation of Staff on recommended Fire and Rescue "SAFER" deployments and budgetary impacts:

1. SAFER Plan
2. SAFER Budget Revisions
3. Revenue Recovery Projections and Current Distribution Plan
4. 2012 Agency Cost per Call
5. 2013 Estimated Cost per Call
6. Agency Financial Stability
7. S.W.O.T. Analyses

Chairman Pyles made the following comment:

I would like to call this Special Meeting of the Augusta County Board of Supervisors. Just to put a little context to it, after Schools, the number one thing this Board finds is Public Safety. The amount of money that we provide for that has been rising continually as its needs have been. We approached \$8 million now and after we get done with the Fire grants, \$9-10 million a year, will go to Fire and Rescue and Emergency Communications Center (911 Center). We have had a series of Fire Plans over the years going back to 2000 and 2005. They have not been ignored, but they haven't been things that suddenly we did. It's been an evolution from 14 people to up to (Chief will tell us today) 75-80 career people. Over that time, Revenue Recovery has been put in place. We've seen the impact of not providing services to folks impacting their insurance costs. So there's a great deal of funding that comes from taxes, from insurance companies, and paying bills that go to combine as a costs for these services. These services are the most important thing, I think, this Board does and we have the sole responsibility for it. The School Board directs where they send the money, we send them. Most of other things are smaller and we do it, but this impacts lives and properties and we have to do a good job on this. Over the years, it's been here we have a plan, we need people. Today, we have a different opportunity; now, we have people, we need a plan. Mr. Wills had called for a couple of times that we needed to get together as a group and try to figure out where we were going and what direction we already had. We started in responding to that with the Chief's Five-Year Plan. The Five-Year Plan was something that received a lot of sticker shock from members of this Board. Maybe, we should call it an "Alternate Build-out Plan" that will come about as it needs to come about. So, now, with the arrival of the SAFER grants, we have an ability to fill in that Five-Year Plan, or build-out plan a little more and see how best to utilize our services. We plotted out this time and we only have a beginning time on this; we don't have an ending time that has to do

August 29, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

with whatever we need to do, we ought to do here, today, and get this job started. But we shouldn't have expectations at the end of this meeting, or anytime soon, we will have a definite—this is the only way we're going to go; this is locked in stone, because this is an ongoing process where we'll take what the Chief has to say, decide what we can, today; but, we need to work as closely as we can with the Volunteer agencies, with everyone else who will provide these services. The greatest value we have is our Volunteers, apart from our taxpayers. That is the kind of context the Board wants to know more, bring it all together; we have five new members of the Board in trying to direct this County, Fire and Rescue services, from this point on. That's our goal.

Chief Carson Holloway introduced staff:

Deputy Chief Mike Armstrong; Lt. Minday Craun, who is Finance and Volunteer Co-coordinator; Captain Chris Shaver, Fire Training Division and EMS; Captain Bunny Hearn, who provides insight and has been very helpful with EMS in Augusta County both Career and Volunteer; and Melissa Meyerhoeffer and Jennifer Whetzal, Central Finance; and Human Resources also assisted.

He noted that it has involved a lot of people to ensure correct factual data has been provided for the Board's consideration.

Chief Holloway gave a PowerPoint presentation with the following high-lights:

Augusta County

Staffing for Adequate Fire & Emergency Response (SAFER) Deployment Presentation:

Fire and Rescue

- Current Status Overview
- Agency Financial Stability
- Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT) Analysis

This has been done with every Volunteer agency in the County. Have personally met with representatives from each agency. Have also asked that they provide information to the Board.

- SAFER Plan
- Budget Revision Recommendations
- 2012 Agency Cost per Call
- 2013 Estimate Agency Cost per Call
- Revenue Recovery Projections & Current Distribution
- Restructure & Grant Deployment Recommendations

Chief Holloway came to the Board several months ago asking if they could stay within their budgetary limitations and possibly restructure the management of his organization. That permission was given to him and they have move forward. They have recently completed the Captain's process.

* * *

August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

Fire and Rescue

Discussion Points:

A) Five Year Plan (as presented 2/21/2012)

Modifications have been made. Fire Services are evolving not only in the County but nationwide. The economy, ability to get volunteers, ability to maintain staff is a big challenge. Fire and Rescue is an intense business; it takes time to train people and to get people to a certain level.

B) ISO Status (Countywide)

Will be revisiting in September.

C) SARS (Financial Briefing)

D) Miscellaneous

- a. Title 27 Code of Virginia
Chief of Fire and Rescue being the oversight for County Fire and Rescue
- b. First Right of Refusal Policy
- c. Rescue Squad Assistance Fund (RSAF) Grant
Another grant coming up in September.
- d. Volunteer Agencies Incentive Funding Formula
County Attorney will be addressing concerns.
- e. Fire Revolving Loan Program
Board of Supervisors' input had been discussed at the Officers Association meeting.
The Association did approve, as revised.
- f. Preston L. Yancey Update
- g. Mutual Aid Agreements
Will talk about partnerships with other agencies in the County, both internal and external partners.
- h. Career/Agency Agreements
Some changes could be costly. Pending legislation on the Governor's desk; may need to make some changes and adjustments, ie. 12 VAC-5-31-610 (Virginia Code).

* * *

Fire and Rescue

SAFER Grant Status:

- Hiring process is complete offers have been made (21 offers have been made – received 17 responses)

Logistics and Planning:

- Start Date 9/17/2012 Orientation/Training
- Station Assignments – October 2012
- Deployment of Personnel – October/November 2012

* * *

August 29, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

Present Status Fire and Rescue

Present Status : Fire

19 Fire Department First Due Areas Serving Augusta County

(A map was displayed)

First Due Areas are assigned to a certain fire company that has primary responsibility. Because of partnerships and working together, multiple companies are utilized. Fire and Rescue has gone from being individualism to partnership for service delivery.

* * *

Present Status: Rescue

13 Rescue Squad First Due Areas Serving Augusta County

(A map was displayed)

* * *

A chart was shown designating the Present Staffing Status and Locations (as of July 1, 2012), "2011 Data" of the East, Central and West.

West: 9 Career; 3 part-time filled Mt. Solon (12)

Central: 18 Career

East: 24 Career

Total Calls 2011: 17,926

53 Full-time Operational; 6 Administration; and 3 part-time at Mount Solon, 62 total career staff combined; total Volunteer: 923.

* * *

Agencies within Augusta County & Organizational Status

15 Fire Departments:

**	Company 2	Deerfield Fire Department	May 1964
**	Company 3	Middlebrook Fire Department	1948
**	Company 4	Churchville Fire Department	August 1959
*	Company 5	Weyers Cave Fire Department	1923
**	Company 6	Verona Fire Department	Fall 1958
*	Company 7	Stuarts Draft Fire Department	1950
*	Company 8	Craigsville Fire Department	November 1960
**	Company 9	Dooms Fire Department	April 1962
**	Company 10	Augusta County Fire Department	August 1941
**	Company 11	Preston L. Yancey Fire Department	1977
*	Company 14	Swoope Fire Department	1979
**	Company 18	New Hope Fire Department	1991
*	Company 19	Wilson Fire Department	1986
**	Company 21	Mt. Solon Fire Department	1989
*	Company 25	Riverheads Vol. Fire Department	March 2011

10 Rescue Squads:

***	Rescue 1	Waynesboro First Aid Crew	1951
**	Rescue 2	Deerfield Rescue Squad	1964
**	Rescue 4	Churchville Rescue Squad	August 1959
***	Rescue 5	Staunton-Augusta Rescue Squad	1938
**	Rescue 6	Stuarts Draft Rescue	1970
***	Rescue 11	WFAC / SARS @ Preston L. Yancey	2011

August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

**	Rescue 16	Craigsville-Augusta Springs Rescue	1971
**	Rescue 18	New Hope	2002
**	Rescue 21	Mt. Solon Rescue Squad	1989/1995
***	Rescue 25	SARS @ Riverheads	March 2011

*** - Agencies all Volunteer**

**** - Agencies Currently Have Career Staffing by County**

***** - Agencies Have Career Staffing by SARS or WFAC**

Fire Chief Holloway noted that "All agencies are Volunteer, but supplemented by Career staff. Agencies who do not have Career are 6 Fire Stations and all Rescue Squads have Career staff either by Augusta County or from WFAC or SARS.

* * *

All Emergency Service Agencies assisting Augusta County

- Within Augusta County – 25 Agencies on previous slide
 - ***SARS provides EMS staff to two (2) Stations: Staunton and Riverheads
 - ***WFAC and SARS share EMS staff at Fishersville
- Outside Augusta County – 9 Agencies
 - **Company 20, Grottoes Fire - Rescue 20, Grottoes Rescue
 - **Company 15, Bridgewater Fire - Rescue 15, Bridgewater Rescue
 - **Wintergreen Fire - Wintergreen Rescue
 - *Company 17, Clover Hill Fire - Company 12, Raphine Fire
 - *Company 80, Walkers Creek Fire
- Career – 4 Agencies
 - **Augusta County Fire-Rescue
 - **Staunton Station 1 or Staunton Station 2, Staunton Fire & Rescue
 - **Company 1, Waynesboro Fire Department
 - **Company 22, Shenandoah Valley Regional Airport

*** - Agencies all Volunteer**

**** - Agencies Currently Have Career Staffing by County or other Governing Jurisdiction**

***** - Agencies Have Career Staffing by SARS or WFAC**

* * *

SWOT Analyses Agency Financial Stability

Melissa Meyerhoeffer, Assistant Finance Director, reported that the Board had received Financial information in their package. The first two pages were a summary, with the details attached. In order for Volunteer agencies to receive a contribution from the County, an audit is needed every fiscal year. The County hired Didawick and Company to provide these audits. This financial information is based on December 31, 2011 financials. Stuarts Draft Rescue is a March 31, 2012 fiscal year end. Presented in the spreadsheets included assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses. She noted that everything presented was non-inclusive of everything that was in the financial statements. The financial statements take accrual entries into account; therefore, accounts receivable and accounts payable were not included in the analysis. With assets, cash investments (most liquid assets the agencies would have) were included; investments were noted separately because they may have timeline restrictions as far as when those monies can be drawn out of those investments. The 4-for-life Escrow are funds that the County receives from the Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles to support local Rescue Squads. The funds are designated for Augusta County and are allocated among the six Volunteer Rescue Agencies. Those monies are held by the Central Shenandoah Emergency Medical Services Council. Funds

August 29, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

can be used by those Rescue Agencies at any time; as long as they meet the stipulations of State Code to be used for training equipment and certain supplies. Any cash restricted in their balance sheet was high-lighted; the corresponding note payable was also high-lighted. The Restricted Cash is a reserve of a year worth of payments to go towards that note payable. If there was any other cash restricted, that was also noted. Liabilities were listed separately. The note-payables to the County are for specific pieces of apparatus. These loan balances do not include the payment that was made in FY2012. The other note-payables are for apparatus and other buildings that the agencies may have.

Audited Financial Statement Information
 Volunteer Fire/Rescue Agencies
 Year Ending December 31, 2011

	Assets							Liabilities (long-term)					NOTES
	Cash	Investments	Total Cash & Investments	4-For-Life Escrow*	Cash Restricted	Net Property/Equip	TOTAL ASSETS	Capital Lease	Note Payable (County)*	Note Payable	Loan Bldg	TOTAL	
Augusta Co. Volunteers	94,130		94,130			99,400	193,530					-	
Churchville Fire & Rescue	304,256		304,256	22,416		979,121	1,305,792		53,125	340,000		393,125	NP-purchase property
Craigsville Fire	69,320		69,320			477,378	547,198					-	
Craigsville Rescue	165,470		165,470	69,886		160,361	405,217					-	
Deerfield Fire & Rescue	217,601	6,798	224,399	30,352		265,158	520,909					-	
Dooms Fire	84,185		84,185		31,352	684,388	800,423		165,002	202,784		367,786	NP-KME Predator Custom Pumper
Middlebrook Fire	833,912		833,912			133,118	967,030		29,928			29,928	
Mt. Solon Fire & Rescue	205,808		205,808	12,623		784,384	1,003,315					9,222	
New Hope Fire & Rescue	276,950	54,889	331,839	45,498		720,358	1,097,688		165,000			165,000	
Preston L. Yancey	59,619		59,619	107,381		765,748	932,748	35,418	120,000		105,655	260,873	
Riverheads Fire	125,933		125,933			120,306	246,439					-	
Stuarts Draft Fire	958,925		958,925			477,438	1,438,363		123,514			123,514	
Stuarts Draft Rescue (3/31/12 YE)	270,385	622,207	892,593	69,783		334,463	1,295,839					-	brd designated unrestricted net assets
Swoope	298,837		298,837			403,385	703,272					-	
Verona	48,019	124,769	172,788	55,255	1,535,361	1,765,444		160,000	100,000	269,722	529,722		NP-2011 Brush Truck
Weyers Cave	268,224		268,224			464,359	752,583		140,000			140,000	
Wilson Fire	239,151		239,151		9,404	731,794	980,349		68,682			68,682	restricted cash-County Infra donation

*Funds are generated by the Virginia Dept of Motor Vehicles and are used to support local rescue squad equip purchases. The funds designated for Augusta County are allocated among the County's volunteer rescue agencies and held in escrow and administered by the Central Shenandoah Emergency Medical Services Council. Withdrawals may be made at any time as long as the expenses meet the stipulations as set forth by State code for training, equipment, and supplies.

*Revolving Loan Apparatus does not include FY12 pymt

NOTE:
 Information is taken from Audited Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 2011 (except Stuarts Draft Rescue, YE 3/31/12)
 This information is not all inclusive of all data presented in the financial statements. Financial statements and notes are available upon request

For the Revenues and Expenses chart, the Augusta County column under "Revenues" includes all funds received from Augusta County (contributions, grant approvals, and any infrastructure approvals). That number can fluctuate; for example, Churchville Fire and Rescue, received a large infrastructure donation. Economic Dependency is based on what is received from the County, as a percentage of total revenues, which takes into consideration all funding received from the County. Ms. Meyerhoeffer noted that the purpose of these charts were to give the Board an idea of how much the agencies depend on County funds in order to operate. Under Expenses, there is both Program and Administrative expenses. The Program expenses are expenses directly related to the actual operation of the agency, which could include utilities, equipment maintenance, training, supplies, fuel, and pass-through payments given to agencies for Volunteer reimbursements.

Mr. Wills asked what Administrative Expenses would include. Ms. Meyerhoeffer said that would be directly related to the agency Fire Chief as far as administrative, not related to the operations of the agencies, such as printer paper, office supplies, etc.

August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

Audited Financial Statement Information
Volunteer Fire/Rescue Agencies
Year Ending December 31, 2011

	Revenues							Expenses			
	Augusta County*	Rev. Recovery	Fundraising	Donations	Other Revenue	TOTAL	Economic Dependency on Augusta County	Program Expenses	Admin Expenses	Fundraising	TOTAL
Augusta Co. Volunteers	17,294		2,583	570	2,313	22,760	75.98%	7,858	10,336	1,743	19,937
Churchville Fire & Rescue	242,652	73,916	67,439	16,630	150,224	550,661	44.05%	163,307	16,420	69,344	249,071
Craigsville Fire	95,223		8,717	2,959	20,410	127,309	74.80%	55,587	5,117	7,095	67,799
Craigsville Rescue	91,844	88,220	2,543	136	16,003	198,746	46.21%	56,677	9,046	2,378	68,101
Deerfield Fire & Rescue	55,168	63,931	17,832	4,997	13,036	154,964	35.60%	73,971	5,326	12,728	92,025
Doorns Fire	133,641		28,427	15,959	3,862	181,889	73.47%	88,718	5,538	12,699	106,955
Middlebrook Fire	62,818		14,905	16,962	29,532	124,217	50.57%	31,743	3,897	5,239	40,879
Mt. Solon Fire & Rescue	90,975	29,535	3,269	8,374	10,590	142,763	63.72%	79,664	3,202	2,256	85,122
New Hope Fire & Rescue	99,753	23,214	903	9,922	12,493	146,285	68.19%	74,844	14,949	200	89,993
Preston L. Yancey	94,114		4,976	8,030	7,799	114,919	81.90%	78,702	6,950	2,137	87,789
Riverheads Fire	102,732			7,005	2,806	112,543	91.28%	28,282	3,924		32,206
Stuarts Draft Fire	103,186		44,516	11,766	27,472	186,940	55.20%	63,784	9,040	22,801	95,625
Stuarts Draft Rescue (3/31/12 YE)	6,569	148,050		59,574	34,310	248,503	2.84%	111,227	16,559	1,866	129,652
Swoope	74,562		13,710	16,165	9,529	113,966	65.42%	76,317	10,511	8,926	95,754
Verona	109,808		25,936	22,078	39,342	197,164	55.69%	126,124	4,200	20,179	150,503
Weyers Cave	96,446		68,224	22,297	45,804	232,771	41.43%	83,748	16,378	57,701	157,827
Wilson Fire	66,153		18,363	2,137	5,519	92,172	71.77%	62,755	4,613	6,259	73,627

*Revenues received from Augusta County include yearly contributions and any approved Infrastructure, County grant funds, and/or funding from the Fire Revolving Loan Fund.

* * *

SWOT Analyses Agency Meetings

All information regarding the SWOT analyses was provided by Volunteer Chiefs and/or Officers and Members of each agency: 15 Fire Department and 10 Rescue.

Augusta County (SWOT) Overview

Strengths:

- Most of agencies are financially stable with some cash reserves or investments - low debt loads
- Most agency buildings are paid off
- Apparatus condition is in good to excellent condition overall
- Emergency personnel are dedicated and committed to serving the citizens
- Some agencies have standards for officers above minimums as well as mentorship programs and succession planning in place for personnel

August 29, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

Weaknesses:

- A few agencies are financially challenged and have limited ability to raise funds
- Multiple County agencies' infrastructures are in need of remodeling or upgrades to accommodate future growth and/or expansions regarding additional apparatus or personnel
- Some stations are not located to effectively serve current and future service delivery needs and some apparatus are not strategically placed (i.e. ladder trucks – Waynesboro, Staunton and Augusta County)
- Records management is overwhelming volunteer staff
- Volunteerism locally as well as nationally is on decline due to current economic condition, training requirements and call volume

Opportunities:

- SAFER grant provides immediate manpower assistance to help offset current economical impact regarding volunteer staffing shortages
- Window of opportunity to restructure and pursue volunteer recruitment and retention as well as provide training needed in all aspects of Fire/Rescue including management
- Increase staffing to reduce safety concerns and liabilities regarding volunteers and/or career responding or manning stations alone
- Win-win regarding personnel trained and manning multiple stations to meet all hazards approach to public safety, reducing response times and assuring adequate number of responders are on scene meeting minimum required number of staff to operate

Threats:

- Increasing demand for services increased call volume
- Not providing training and succession planning for agencies
- Increasing training requirements and mandates
- Increasing safety concerns and liability associated with public and personnel responding without adequate staffing levels

* * *

August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

SAFER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

SAFER Deployment and Restructure Proposal:

	Present	Explanation Restructure	Staffing Change (SAFER)
Weyers Cave:	0	2 per shift; 24/7 Ambulance	+6
Mt. Solon:	0	2 M-F; full-time	+3
Craigsville	3	2 per Shift – 24/7	+3
Augusta County	12	3 to PLY – Oct. Captains	- 3
Preston L. Yancey	12	15, 24/7 with Ambulance & T106	+3
Captains (Duty Officers)	2	Re-deploy Battalion Admin.	N/A
Fire Rescue Administration	6	Restructure jobs	N/A
New Hope	3	Redeploy from GRS 2013	+3
Middlebrook	3	Floater Central	Floater
Stuarts Draft Rescue	3	No change	N/A
Verona	3	No change	N/A
Dooms	3	Floater East	Floater
Churchville	3		+3
Deerfield	3	Shift Change Floater West	Floater
Grottoes	3	Re-deploy to New Hope	- 3
Riverheads	0	2 per shift; 24/7 Ambulance	+6
Total Operations/Admin:	59		21
Final Staffing: 80			

Chief Holloway noted that this Plan has a “domino” affect. When you move one piece here, it affects other pieces throughout the County. There will be some timelines and a lot of things we will have to work out ahead of time and implement this Plan in pieces. He added that Floaters would be used to cover vacations, illnesses and deploy from slower (“Floater”) stations when coverage is needed.

Chief Holloway added that ISO audits are coming up for Stuarts Draft and Riverheads September 6th. He reiterated the SAFER positions would be Weyers Cave, Mt. Solon, Craigsville, Churchville, and Riverheads, with re-deployment of the current staff for Grottoes and Augusta County Company 10 and then the utilization of one company in each battalion to a Floater position. A map was displayed designating these positions: 18 Staff in West Division; 27 Staff Central Division; 27 Staff East Division with Admin OPS, totaling 80 Fire & Rescue positions. He noted that the ladder truck would be moved to Fishersville from Company 10.

Mr. Moore asked about floaters being pulled. Chief Holloway said that there would be two from Monday to Friday – 6/6. He recommended that 2 be pulled at a time. If Volunteers can be contacted for staffing, then that particular station would remain in service. We would not pull both career personnel if a volunteer was available to fill the second position for the day.

* * *

A map was displayed indicating Fire and Magisterial Districts featuring deployments. He noted that there will be some challenges:

West Division - 18 Career

Mt. Solon Volunteer Fire Co & Rescue Squad (Co 21/Rescue 21)
Daylight 6 A.M.- 6 P.M. Mon-Fri Two (2) on duty
Timeline Immediate

Churchville Volunteer Fire Dept & First Aid Crew (Co 4/Rescue 4)
(Will require possible infrastructure work before deployment)
24/7, 365 Days Two (2) on duty each shift
Timeline December 2012 – January 2013

August 29, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

Deerfield Valley Volunteer Fire Department (Co 2/Rescue 2)
Daylight Floater Station 6 A.M.-6 P.M. Mon-Fri
Two (2) on duty each shift
Timeline December 2012

Craigsville and Augusta Springs First Aid Crew (Rescue 16)
(Recently put an addition; sleeping quarters good)
24/7, 365 Days Two (2) on duty each shift
Timeline October 2012 or ASAP

Central Division - 27 Career

Weyers Cave Volunteer Fire Department (Co 5)
(Moderate modifications required; infrastructure needs – bunk rooms, kitchen, washer and dryer)
24 / 7, 365 Days Two (2) on duty each shift
Timeline November 2012

Verona Volunteer Fire Company (Co 6)
Daylight 6 A.M.- 6 P.M. Mon-Fri Two (2) on duty each shift

Augusta County Fire Department Volunteers (Co 10)
(Possible training issues or re-deployment of staff to operate ladder truck and specialized equipment)
24/7, 365 Days Three (3) on duty each shift
Timeline October 2012

Riverheads Volunteer Fire Department (Co 25)
(SARS has 90-day grace period)
24/7, 365 Days Two (2) on duty each shift
Timeline January 2013

Middlebrook Volunteer Fire Department (Co 3)
Daylight Floater Station 6 A.M. - 6 P.M. Mon-Fri
Two (2) on duty each shift
Timeline October 2012

East Division - 27 Career

New Hope Volunteer Fire Department (Co 18/Rescue 18)
(Few modifications. Will allow Rockingham for their budgetary needs)
24/7, 365 Days Two (2) on duty each shift
Timeline January 2013

Dooms Fire Company (Co 9)
Daylight Floater Station 6 A.M.-6 P.M. Mon-Fri
Two (2) on duty each shift
Timeline October 2012

Preston L. Yancey Volunteer Fire Company (Co 11)
(Infrastructure needs; waiting for final turnover to the County before implementation – no additional costs; training for ladder truck; SARS and WFAC have a 30-day grace period)
24/7, 365 Days Five (5) on duty each shift
Timeline October 2012

August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

Stuarts Draft Rescue (Rescue 6)

Daylight 6 A.M.-6 P.M. Mon-Fri Two (2) on duty each shift

* * * * *

A 10-minute break was taken at 10:00 a.m.

* * * * *

Budget Revisions and Agency Cost per Call

Lt. Minday Craun displayed a summary page stating that every possible scenario was considered and included in the infrastructure money; it was not taking into consideration used vehicles or grants. Salaries and part-time training was included because, along with the restructure, comes additional funds. Salaries are offset by the grant (\$1.1 million a year) part-time and overtime is shown because of vacation and sick time and that position would need to be filled. She informed the Board that she has a spreadsheet showing calculations for part-time available for their review.

AUGUSTA COUNTY FIRE-RESCUE - SAFER REVISED

2013 - REVISED FOR SAFER ONLY

DESCRIPTION	FY 2013	FY 2013 Revised	
1100 - Salaries and Wages (Includes 32030/Training Salaries)	\$ 2,677,150.00	\$ 3,476,955.44	23.0%
1200 - Over-time Wages (Includes 32030/Training Benefits)	\$ 40,000	\$ 44,000	9.1%
1300 - Salaries & Wages Part Time	\$ 128,270	\$ 192,270	33.3%
2100 - 2700 Employers Share for Benefits	\$ 1,000,285	\$ 1,302,392	23.2%
3110 - Physicals	\$ 11,400	\$ 27,150	58.0%
3120 - Professional Services - OMD	\$ 12,000	\$ 13,000	7.7%
3130 - Rockingham County - Contractual	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	0.0%
3310 - Repairs and Maintenance - Contractual	\$ 21,900	\$ 21,900	0.0%
3320 - Maintenance Service Contracts	\$ 25,500	\$ 28,500	10.5%
3700 - Laundry Services	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	0.0%
5201 - Postal Services	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	0.0%
5203 - Telephone Service	\$ 13,500	\$ 16,336	17.4%
5305 - Motor Vehicle Insurance	\$ 24,645	\$ 27,645	10.9%
5501 - Travel Expenses/Professional Development	\$ 25,000	\$ 30,750	18.7%
5651 - Contribution - L.E.P.C.	\$ 800	\$ 800	0.0%
5801 - Dues and Subscription	\$ 1,400	\$ 1,400	0.0%
6001 - Office Supplies	\$ 11,450	\$ 13,450	14.9%
6006 - Linen Supplies	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	0.0%
6007 - Repairs and Maintenance Supplies/Buildings	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	0.0%
6008 - Vehicle and Power Equipment/Fuel	\$ 76,000	\$ 94,000	19.1%
6009 - Emergency Apparatus Maintenance	\$ 75,000	\$ 80,000	6.3%
6010 - Administrative Vehicle Maintenance	\$ 6,500	\$ 6,500	0.0%
6011 - Wearing Apparel	\$ 28,525	\$ 53,195	46.4%
6012- EMS Supplies	\$ 21,000	\$ 30,600	31.4%
6014 - Fire Fighting Supplies	\$ 59,165	\$ 124,165	52.3%
6015 - Emergency Search/Rescue Supplies	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	0.0%
8001 - Equipment	\$ 35,000	\$ 56,000	37.5%
8002 - Furniture and Fixtures	\$ 1,500	\$ 10,000	85.0%
<i>Total</i>	\$ 4,348,490	\$ 5,693,508	23.6%
CAPITAL BUDGET ITEMS	\$ -	\$ 580,550	100.0%
<i>Grant Total</i>	\$ 4,348,490	\$ 6,285,558	30.8%

Budget Revision Highlights (21 new positions – FY basis)

- Salaries & Benefits - \$1.1 Million
- Part Time/Over Time - \$68,000
- New Hire Physicals - \$15,750
- Uniforms & Gear - \$95,000
- Equipment (pagers) - \$21,000
- Ambulance (supplies/insurance) - \$30,600
- Restructure Expenses - \$13,000
- New Location Expenses - \$17,000
- Developmental Expenses - \$6,800
- Apparatus (new ambulances & equipment) - \$575,000

August 29, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Moore asked what the cost was for a base-line ambulance. Lt. Craun said that the ambulance is about \$185,000; equipment/defibrillator would be another \$80,000; computer and accessories would be another \$6,000. One new ambulance would cost approximately \$283,000. Mr. Moore asked what the life of an ambulance would be. Lt. Craun said it should be five years depending on the mileage and number of calls.

Lt. Craun stated that she provides a report annually on how much the County gives the agencies. This is not only monetary, but support, Career staff, insurance, etc. She worked with Finance to determine the call volume. She displayed "2012 Agency Cost Per Call, which is a call volume chart on the budget year – July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012. This chart was all inclusive of everything that the County gives in Career staff, maintenance for their buildings, pump testing, internet services, plus donations, infrastructure money, grant money, etc. Under Revenue Recovery, what the County gets back was included (25% if under 5 employees) which would offset the cost per call. A "2013 Estimated Cost Per Call" report was also displayed; she did not include any additional revenue that may be generated in this report. With some agencies, the policies may have to be reviewed. If all County staff is going to be running those calls, the policies may needed to be tweaked.

Revenue Recovery Projections

REVENUE RECOVERY PROJECTED INCOMES

Assumption									
	\$ 435.00	- BLS -	90%						
	\$ 516.00	- ALS -	10%						
								\$ 13.00 dollars per mile	
								4.17% Uncollectable	
								6.25% Administration Cost	
2011/2012	Calls	% Billable	Average Mileage	ALS \$	BLS \$	Mileage	Total Gross Billed Revenue	Less Uncollectable	Less Admin
11 - PLYVFC	1313	57.50%	755	\$22,440.71	\$170,262.36	\$ 39,575.67	\$ 232,278.75	\$ 222,592.72	\$ 208,075.30
25 - Riverheads	843	57.50%	485	\$14,407.86	\$109,315.44	\$ 54,448.30	\$ 178,171.60	\$ 170,741.85	\$ 159,606.12
5 - Weyers Cave	468	67.79%	317	\$9,430.05	\$71,547.79	\$ 95,031.55	\$ 176,009.39	\$ 168,669.80	\$ 157,669.21
								Sub-Total of County EMS	\$ 525,351

Mr. Karaffa asked Lt. Craun to explain the chart. The first column is the call volume; the second is percentage billable calls (more than 1/2 because of no responses, DOA, incidents with no transport). Mr. Karaffa understood this to mean only transports were considered under this column. Lt. Craun said that Contractual Allowances were 42% this is write-off money because of County citizens who do not have insurance or their insurance does not cover all the expenses. Mr. Karaffa asked where she got the 42% and Lt. Craun said, from the last two years of billing, Stuarts Draft statistics were used as a baseline. BLS calls vs. ALS calls determine the dollar amounts charged. Mileage is estimated from the area to Augusta Health.

"FY2013 Projections Revenue Recovery and Annual Contributions SAFER – With Percentage Changes " was displayed. Percentages will change from the current policy

August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

when an agency has six or more career people (from 5 or less). Indicated on that report was "Contingency without SARS and WFAC"; \$152,561 would have to be paid to those agencies to make up the difference. Mr. Karaffa questioned the Net Projected Revenue of \$591,123. Lt. Craun said that this amount should not change; what would change would be the amount the County would keep versus the amount that the agency would receive because of policy changes. It was noted that Stuarts Draft brings in \$183,884.83 and the projected 2012 Annual Contribution was \$83,040 (\$100,000 above) meaning that Stuarts Draft Rescue's revenue recovery more than covers their contribution estimate.

Chairman Pyles asked if the bottom line for the changes in restructuring is positive or negative for the County. Lt. Craun said it would be close to a wash. "The County is going to be collecting more, but they're going to be giving the agencies a little more."

* * *

Fire and Rescue Restructure Proposal

Chief Holloway displayed the Proposed Fire-Rescue Organizational Structure (Battalions) chart. He reiterated that the Fire Board studies and the Officers Association have echoed the need to restructure how the Association does business. While the Association is the representation of all of the Volunteer agencies in the County, at times it can be confusing. The recommendation is that the Officers Association remains as it is currently but be broken down into "Advisory Groups" which would work on different projects and would put together Standard Operating Guidelines (SOG) and make recommendations. They would report to the Emergency Advisory Board, which would be broken down from each division of the County – East, Central and West (approximately 2 from each division). They would work with staff in making recommendations. This would be the group to set policies and make recommendations to the Board regarding Fire and Rescue countywide. He said with this being a smaller group, it would allow participative management from each agency in the County through the Officers Association to run it through the chain of command. It would then be moved up to the Emergency Services Committee, the Board of Supervisors and the County of Administrator and the Citizens. He noted that this was discussed last year along with the financial support and hoped to move forward as quickly as possible. In restructuring, he noted the purposes of Battalion Chiefs were to work day-to-day operations while being administrative (60% administrative; 40% operational). They would be managing one-half in the three divisions (6-to-6 shift; 7 days a week). At nights, Captains from Preston L. Yancey would cover duty officer calls. Battalion would be more administrative; Captains would handle the operational part. Some minimal costs would be involved as to promotions and responsibilities.

A Fire-Rescue Organizational Chart was displayed. He noted that projected future growth will cause the need for additional support positions:

- Deputy Chief – growth will cause the need to two: Administrative Deputy Chief and Operational Deputy Chief
- Administrative Assistant – growth will cause the need for a second Administrative Assistant
- Branch/Division Leadership will need to change to titles to Battalions
- Additional Field Captains will be needed

A Proposed Career Staffing Utilizing Safer Grant and Shift Changes was displayed.

* * *

August 29, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

Fire and Rescue Goals and Objectives

Maximize the Opportunity within the Scope of the Grant to:

- Enhance Public Safety (Positive Impact)
- Augment & Support Combination System (address manpower shortages)
- Utilization of Funds (Support local needs identified but unfunded due to local economy)
- Resource Deployment (add depth and flexibility to current system)

Chief Holloway noted that the Virginia Department of Health, Office of Emergency Medical Services is looking at regulations changes which may require by October agencies in jurisdictions to have duty crews available to respond 90% of the time 24/7.

* * *

Draft Staffing Proposal Span of Control was displayed. This is to initiate 2 Battalions 7 days per week.

Mr. Karaffa asked about having a Battalion Chief at the Central Division. Chief Holloway said they would split the interstate and actually have two Battalions. Everything west of the interstate would be under the responsibility of one Battalion; everything east would be the responsibility of another Battalion, but you would still have three divisions for the Captains and Duty Officers to maintain the span of control. This would be based on location.

Chief Holloway mentioned that in regards to ambulances and trucks, a second ladder truck is needed in the County. As far as Rescue, there are grant options (not free – RSAFG – 50/50 match); he recommended a total of 4 ambulances for the Plan – one at Weyers Cave, one at Riverheads, and one at Preston L. Yancey, and a reserve will be needed. Currently, there are two ambulances. Chief Holloway recommended purchasing and equipping two used ambulances. He suggested applying for the Rescue Squad Assistance Fund Grant for the ambulance first of next year. He was concerned of buying all used because of the time cycle – used: 2.5 years; new: 5 years. Mr. Karaffa asked what the life span was for the currently owned ambulances. Chief Holloway said one was a 1990's model with low mileage and was still viable. He reiterated his recommendation to move forward with purchasing two additional used ambulances and apply for RSAF Grant. We would like to have a direction and decision no later than September 12.

Chief Holloway added that another ladder truck needed to be considered in the future and that this would affect the ISO rating. It was noted that \$900,000 in the CIP account has been set aside for partial funding. Mr. Moore asked where a second ladder truck would be deployed. Chief Holloway said it could possibly be placed in Stuarts Draft, Fishersville or Verona. He noted that Stuarts Draft Volunteer Fire Company is not receptive because of additional training being required.

Mr. Beyeler asked for justification of moving the ladder truck to Fishersville. Chief Holloway said that currently the ladder truck is in the middle of Staunton. It allows easy access to the Interstate. However, the hospital is a primary concern. Mr. Beyeler asked about the difference in the location of Preston Yancey and Company 10 to Augusta Health. Chief Holloway said it was approximately 2.5 miles difference. Mr. Beyeler noted that it was placed at Company 10 because of the Staunton Mall and the interchange at Route 250 and was centrally located for the County. He felt that it would not be any better to be placed at Stuarts Draft because of the road system. He felt that Staunton would be more exposed if the ladder truck were to be moved. Chief Holloway said that Staunton would be assigned to use their ladder truck and it would be the priority of the County to provide the engines. He added that if needed, the ladder truck

August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

for Weyers Cave would be coming from Bridgewater. Waynesboro goes to the Lyndhurst area and Route 340 towards Grottoes. Mr. Beyeler said that Stuarts Draft, at one time, had a ladder truck but got rid of it because of additional training and liability. Company 10 has the HazMat equipment.

Chief Holloway stated that they continue monitoring critical factors in the County. "There are going to be future infrastructure needs. As the County grows, the possibility of station locations may need to be revisited, equipment and apparatus relocated, and smaller agencies may be needed."

* * * * *

FIRE AND RESCUE

Discussion of Board on "pending" Fire and Rescue issues:

- A) Five-Year Plan (as presented on February 21, 2012)
- B) ISO (PLY and other County agencies)
- C) SARS (financial briefing)
- D) Miscellaneous:
 - a. Career Chief as Chief of Volunteers (Title 27)
 - b. First Right of Refusal
 - c. Rescue Squad Assistance Fund Grant
 - d. Volunteer Incentive Funding Formula
 - e. Fire Revolving Loan Fund Program
 - f. Preston L. Yancey Update
 - g. Mutual Aid Agreements
 - h. Career/Agency Agreements

* * *

A) Five-Year Plan

Chief Holloway asked for Board direction. Chairman Pyles said that this would not be done today. "The Board needs to revisit and tweak it."

* * *

B) ISO

Chief Holloway reiterated that Deputy Chief Armstrong will be working with ISO on September 6 to review Riverheads and Stuarts Draft Volunteer Fire Company. He is unsure when they will be coming back countywide. Two years ago, we were told a countywide visit would occur.

Chairman Pyles asked if direct requests could be given to the Board. Chief Holloway said that he needed assurance that he is getting four personnel per structure fire call for ISO purposes. He noted that fell in line with Title 27 Code of Virginia. ISO had stated that if the County was under the one-agency umbrella, they would be able to count those three departments responding as manpower to meet the minimum requirements. Title 27 will have an impact on ISO because they are looking for a one-management structure countywide. He stated that this needed to be addressed as soon as possible.

* * *

C) SARS Financial Briefing

Chief Holloway said, from an operational standpoint, SARS would like to continue; but from a financial standpoint, there were some concerns.

* * *

August 29, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

D) a. Title 27 Code of Virginia

Chief Holloway mentioned earlier.

b. First Right of Refusal Policy

Chief Holloway advised that this had been discussed at the Officers Association meeting last night. Time limit concerns were mentioned. It was also questioned if there would be a conflict if it was put out to a private vendor to sell. It was given back to the SOG Committee to make some recommendations.

c. Rescue Squad Assistance Fund (RSAF) Grant

Chief Holloway asked for Board direction; deadline is September 17th.

d. Volunteer Agencies Incentive Funding Formula

Patrick J. Morgan, County Attorney, advised that he had looked over the material that was presented to the Board by Chief Holloway and noted that there were some provisions based on Rockbridge County proposal for a flat fee to be paid to the Volunteers. Mr. Morgan expressed concern about this provision and tried contacting the Rockbridge Attorney to see if she had researched the legality of such a provision. The attorney had no knowledge of the proposal. Mr. Morgan researched the issue and found an Attorney General's Opinion which discussed pay for Volunteers. According to the Attorney General, if they accept pay, they do not qualify to be Volunteers anymore. They would lose that statutory definition. If there is a set fee, he was unsure it would not be considered pay unless it can be determined as actual expenses by the Volunteers. The Opinion of the Attorney General further stated that if compensation, or reimbursement, to the Volunteers would not count as pay. He cautioned whatever reimbursements would have to be closely tied to actual expenses. Chairman Pyles asked how that compared to what is currently being done for Personal Property Tax reimbursements. Mr. Morgan said they were clearly statutorily provided for and would not affect. He also highlighted the Attorney General's Opinion, "receipt of mileage and clothing reimbursement would not, in my opinion, constitute pay. Within the meaning of Section 27-42 of the Code of Virginia, provided that the level of reimbursement is reasonably related to the actual expenses incurred by members of the Department for mileage and clothing." Chairman Pyles advised that the Board anticipates sending the money to the Volunteer agency for their disbursement. "We could rightly say that because it is based on calls, it would not cover expenses for that sort of thing." He asked Mr. Morgan if that would be correct. Mr. Morgan stated that the County needed to be cautious. "Sending the money to the Rescue Squads for them to disburse; that would actually become their problem. I think it would be up to them to make sure that they can reasonably associate what they are paying to the Volunteers for reimbursement for expenses." Lt. Craun said that discussion occurred at the Officers Association meeting about making sure that it is worded in the proposal of reimbursable expenses for their mileage, wear and tear of vehicles, clothing, food, etc., when they run the call. Rockbridge, originally, did it this way—as a reimbursement, not as a pay per call. Discussion included to specify it as reimbursement for their expenses to legally have it correct. Mr. Karaffa asked what Rockbridge is currently doing. Lt. Craun said they were not doing anything now because they have had some trials in their area. Some of their agencies are having some trouble. They are looking at the Plan, again, but have not done anything. He asked if there were any agencies doing this; Lt. Craun said there were not. Mr. Shull added that Rockbridge is running in the same problems as Preston L. Yancey. They do not have any infrastructure as far as a Chief or Volunteer Coordinator. He was told that Rockbridge checked with IRS, through their attorney, and learned that they could be paid up to \$600. If it went over \$600, a 1099 was required. They could go above \$600 if it was reimbursement designated for gas, food and training.

August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

Chairman Pyles suggested that Mr. Morgan provide guidelines to be submitted to each agency to provide a formula. Lt. Craun said that each agency would have suggestions by the Officers Association September 25th meeting.

Mr. Karaffa moved, seconded by Mr. Pattie, that the Board authorize the County Attorney to provide guidelines as to how reimbursements can be done legally by the Volunteer agencies.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

Mr. Beyeler understood that there were states who did this and had to follow the IRS requirements. Lt. Craun said that there were some agencies who are doing a pay per call (Chesterfield) and some agencies who did a fuel card for their members. Mr. Beyeler asked if what the County did now violated what Federal or State allowed. Mr. Morgan said it does not.

* * *

Chairman Pyles asked if it was the desire of the Board to allow the Chief to apply for the RSAFG. Mr. Beyeler asked that this be discussed later. It was the consensus of the Board to be placed on the September 12, 2012 agenda for the Regular Board of Supervisors' meeting.

* * *

e. Fire Revolving Loan Program

Chief Holloway advised that the Officers Association approved the recommendation "up to \$300,000 loan, agencies would be responsible for 20% down".

Mr. Beyeler moved, seconded by Mr. Karaffa, that the Board approve the Revolving Loan Program, as recommended.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

f. Preston L. Yancey Update

Chief Holloway asked for Board direction. He advised that this needed to be brought to closure because of some infrastructure issues needing to be addressed.

Mr. Moore asked if the usage of the kitchen facilities and management been decided. Who is allowed to use it? Usage fee? Standard fee? Mr. Karaffa asked about the liability lease fee?

Mr. Morgan reported that insurance would cover the liability. Mr. Morgan suggested, before the Board making an ultimate decision, that he would bring back to the Board some guidelines. Chairman Pyles mentioned that the Government Center had a "general open policy" for rooms and asked if we had a choice on who was allowed usage. He did not see this is a fundraising mechanism, but allowing such groups as the Ruritans usage. Mr. Morgan said that he had done something for a "multi-generational center" that was built in

August 29, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

Louisa County a few years ago and would use that as a model.

Mr. Beyeler asked how close Mr. Morgan was in completing the PLY Agreement. Mr. Morgan said, "We have had some correspondence and are still trying to hammer out some very small details. We are close. I think with this suggestion that will close the deal." Chief Holloway reminded the Board that they had a 501(C)(3) and that was adequate to manage their kitchen and for their support of a volunteer agency. Mr. Wills asked if agreements with the Fire Departments needed to be changed that specify property under the 501(C)(3). Mr. Morgan said that in the agreements of those organizations that are 501(C)(3) if they are required by their by-laws to distribute their assets to a similar 501(C)(3), that would be the mechanism to use.

Mr. Karaffa asked what the designation was for his magisterial infrastructure funds. Chief Holloway stated that there was approximately \$80,000 remaining for the PLYMO system (exhaust removal system); electrical upgrades in the bays; and a generator for backup power. Mr. Moore suggested that this be put on hold until a formal agreement is made.

Chairman Pyles asked if the PLY Agreement could be discussed on September 12th.

* * *

g. Mutual Aid Agreements

Chief Holloway reported that he has spoken with Waynesboro, Staunton, and Rockingham and noted that a lot of the planning comes in these partnerships. He noted that they are "solid" with Waynesboro, "We've made some adjustments; we continue to review that. They were coming into the County more than we were going into the City. I don't think there will be an issue. The biggest impact would be if we relocate floaters (Career staff) out of Doods to cover for vacations." As far as Staunton, "We've been talking for a while about the truck displacement or the reallocation to Preston L. Yancey. The numbers I've run from ECC, it looks like we can deploy the truck to Fishersville. The amount of calls Staunton Fire runs in the County would bring us closer to parity with the numbers we run into the City (Staunton Fire). I see a sharing of resources and seeing balance. We need to continue to monitor it." As far as Rockingham, "I've been in contact with the Chief there. He is aware of us removing our career staff from Grottoes. It's a positive. Grottoes Rescue has rebuilt its Volunteer agency. If we can re-deploy resources that are not needed in Grottoes it is a win-win. We need to do some more talking." Mr. Coffield said that the Rockingham County Administrator wants more direct discussion.

Chief Holloway said that there are some agreements regarding EMS standards that may be changing. Chief referred to 12 VAC-5-31-610.

* * *

h. Career/Agency Agreements

Chief Holloway said that these should be revisited. He stated that there are different Revenue Recovery scenarios with a Rescue Squad going to an agency that is furnishing infrastructure. He asked "Do we stay with the current policy in how we supplement them? Right now it is 65; 35 if they have the infrastructure, but most of those agencies furnish the Rescue Squad; we simply furnish the manpower." He asked for the Board's guidance as to how they wished him to pursue.

Chairman Pyles said that there were other things that come into play based upon how to do the "big picture". This Board had directed Chief Holloway to do this without influence from the Board. He felt that the Board got what was requested. "A professional opinion of how to deploy the people that we have to meet the needs that we have. I think this was a wonderful presentation. It gave us a lot of background. I think new members of the Board

August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

have appreciation more for our costs and what people are providing. We have to take a vote at some time today to implement the Plan or not.”

Mr. Moore referred to Chief Holloway meeting with WFAC and SARS as part of his presentation and noted that SARS had said, financially, they needed more money; Waynesboro said, they could not operate Fishersville, alone, but they are committed to Fishersville, Preston Yancey. He expressed concern of those two agencies, and a lot of the County, are second call on Rescue. He referred to SARS commenting that the County is trying to run them out of Fishersville and Riverheads. Mr. Moore asked what kind of relation would the County have with SARS and WFAC if we proceed with Chief Holloway's recommendations. Chief Holloway said it is about the service to the citizens. He asked if they would pull out of the County if this was done. They said they would not. It was asked if there would be any change in the \$200,000 being paid to SARS. Chief Holloway said there was no indication of a change. That was a budget projection. Mr. Shull asked if SARS would pull out of Riverheads, could they absorb the costs and carry Fishersville. Chief Holloway would have to look at the records to determine that. Mr. Moore referred to Riverheads losing \$55,000 and Fishersville was losing \$6,500 and asked why \$200,000 was requested. Chief Holloway said that there was \$180,000 under Riverheads and \$66,500 under Fishersville. Projected total loss was \$196,478 countywide. These are projected losses of 2012. Funding request was \$196,478. Chairman Pyles said that “for two years, the \$525,000 that would be gained on Revenue Recovery would not need to go towards Career salaries. After two years, that money would need to be used to offset the costs of 21 people. We would have about two years to accrue money that could be applied to the Capital funding, so you would have an additional \$1 million coming in for two years to support and provide the ambulances that are necessary to do this. On an ongoing basis, if we are unable to forego \$200,000 a year going to SARS, that should allow us to stay current and keep money coming in for our Capital fund.”

Mr. Karaffa asked if we needed to apply for a SAFER grant extension. Chief Holloway said the guidelines are revisited each year, but the current policy is that can be done now. He noted that Caroline County just got their approval for third year funding.

Mr. Beyeler wasn't sure of Chairman Pyles' figures because of spending money for ambulances the first two years. Chairman Pyles said, “We are going forward with a new one, already. Within the year, we will gain \$500,000 from Revenue Recovery. Ongoing, after two years, that money will be necessary to offset the 21 new positions, but we would have that to help do that. You would have two years, where the people are being paid for, and the revenue is just coming in without the normal expense of personnel. We would have two years to accrue \$1 million that would more than pay for our needs and ambulances.”

Mr. Beyeler made the following comments:

The way I look at this is we're looking at a 4 to 5¢ tax increase in two years. Now, this is happening right now. Again, I need and I think this Board needs to look at a 5 or 10-year plan, not we're going to do in the next two years. We all know that this money that we're getting that the Federal government didn't have to start with except to borrow money. Now, how long that can continue and we keep asking the government to go in the red when they don't have the money, I'm not willing to do that. This is political, but that's what this election year is about. We cannot continue to spend 40¢ more than we're taking in. These grants are coming out of that borrowed money. In the two years, I personally hope we get nothing because we can't afford it and nobody else gets anything because we can't afford it. The idea that this is free money—this is not free money. This is borrowed money that we're going to be operating on. I look at Waynesboro, Staunton, and Stuarts Draft and they answer two-thirds of the calls in Augusta County with very little bit of funds spent from this County. And if we're going to keep chipping away, the people of Augusta County are the ones that are going to be paying the bill. That's why I've always favored taxing people in a 1st due area at a cost to their operation because, after two or three years, these people are going to say, 'Hey, we may need it, but we can't afford it' if that scenario does happen. Yes, we've got this money. I'm not saying we didn't need some of it. Yes, we did need some of it, but we did not need 21 positions. That's

August 29, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

the bottom line. Mount Solon was asking for people; yes, we needed them.

There's a couple of other things I think we need to discuss. I don't like our North/South boundary lines because with the North/South boundary lines, if you turn to that, we've got Weyers Cave, Riverheads, or Raphine in the center. They have nothing in common. We need to be changing those lines. Stuarts Draft, Riverheads, Wilson, Middlebrook and, maybe, Dooms should be in one. Dooms is on the borderline, whether or not they ought to be in the North. I don't like the North/South; I would rather go more East/West or more as a group. You take Weyers Cave; Weyers Cave should be in the Mount Solon area. New Hope should be in the same area. A lot of these boxes that we have need to work together. When Stuarts Draft Fire Department has an event, Wilson shows up; Riverheads shows up some; and Dooms. We don't have anybody that shows up from Weyers Cave, and we don't expect them; or New Hope. We need to be working with those boundary lines a little bit different.

Chief Holloway's response:

Basically, we're using this as a management tool for us.

Mr. Beyeler's response:

I understand; but as a management tool, we don't have a community of interest with agencies. Wintergreen would be in there. You look at Mount Solon and Craigsville, I'm not sure they belong together. I don't like the North/South boundary line. I don't have any problem with drawing lines, but Stuarts Draft, Riverheads and Wilson – Riverheads is right at Stuarts Draft. In fact, they took a lot of Stuarts Draft territory when they became a fire station. I would like to see that part change.

Next item I would like to discuss is Deerfield proposal and what is being proposed at Middlebrook. Put up your map with the floaters. Put up your 1st due boxes. Your 1st due boxes, and I realize Deerfield does not have as many calls; and I realize Middlebrook doesn't have the calls, but you do away with those people who are already there, and for another area to cover a whole lot of that area, you're talking about an additional 10-15 minutes in there. The cost per call is way up there, but we're leaving a whole group of people sort of vulnerable about having good Fire services. Dooms, I don't understand your thinking on Dooms. Dooms is right there at Waynesboro; if you look at where Dooms runs, they've got a big area down there.

Chief Holloway's response:

In an ideal world, again, that falls back to the Five-Year Plan, we were looking at a combination of a centralized station. Again, I alluded to a little bit, but the need is we move forward in the future, Dooms is a prime example. Again, it is a very good station; yes, it does run a lot of calls; but its location is sitting right on top of the City of Waynesboro along with other stations. Would it be more effective to reallocate some of these stations to meet the needs of the County in the future? That is my perspective.

Mr. Beyeler's response:

The problem we have in the County, we have a couple of real good roads in the County, but you get out in the rural areas, there is no quick way to get there. You talking about moving New Hope, and Dooms over to Crimora, there really isn't any quick way to get to New Hope or Crimora. There is down Route 340 from Dooms. I see Dooms as a mutual aid with Waynesboro on the eastern side and I think they're doing it, now.

Chief Holloway's response:

That is correct. Again, that falls back to what we're giving these agencies with personnel. Again, I am looking at it at several different standpoints. You're correct. When Waynesboro sends an engine to the County, they send it with three people. When we send an engine to the City of Waynesboro, we're sending, usually, one from 11 with three people, and sometimes 4, and, if it is during the day, we're sending them two more from Dooms. While the parity of service is a concern, and it will never be 100% one way or the other; we're giving a lot more to them when they call for it, than they are to us; but they're giving more to us run-wise.

August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

They're running more calls in the County. City of Staunton is the same way. On a given day if we have a structure on fire in the City of Staunton, Augusta County goes automatically; and if they go to a full-fledge working incident, at the point, you would pull in Churchville, Verona, and Preston L. Yancey at one time. This leaves a tremendous hole in the County. We have contingency plans; and it doesn't happen every day; but when we send a Duty Officer to ECC, because we pull that many resources, we may have 10 or 12 Career staff into the cities. Again, that doesn't happen every day and that is part of the trade-off; it is part of what you give them; the expectation that they give you. It is somewhat of a shell-game; there are flaws in pulling things here and taking away (or re-deployment), but, again, that is trying to look at the overall good, the call volume, using the data that we have and trying to maintain calls to make sure the service is delivered. That's where we come up with our projection.

Mr. Beyeler's response:

Chief, you've done what the Board asked you to do. I commend you for that. I just don't agree with all of your decisions. I don't think you expected that I would.

Chairman Pyles made the following comments:

If you take these things myopically and just look at Deerfield by itself; or look at Middlebrook by itself, I think your points are on target. But, I think, when you look at the overall plan, what has evolved and changed, since we first put Career staff in Middlebrook, we've added Riverheads Station, and now we're going to add more personnel, there; so there's a lot more support for that area than there was before. With Deerfield, they were struggling with having just the one person. They didn't want two, but they wanted 2-24/7. This is going to be an issue for me with that company. To get the 2 and consider that Churchville will now have more Career staff so they will be there to support those calls there. I think, as I look at it, you have to look at it in totality. What have we done? What are we showing up? I would like Deerfield to have two people, if you get into your Fire Tax, I'm going to put Deerfield out of business. They are all going to leave there because they will have to pay too much to live out there. It is a way to support those folks with more services. We are going to put 3 more people at Churchville and just move them out some when they need to do it. As far as dividing the County up, you would almost to have to get a lot more ways to split it up. If you don't go North/South and you go East/West, you've got some issues there, too. When I see what the Central section is all around the Interstate. That is a unique problem that they have with the Interstate. How do they service that? They have issues with, I'm coming from this side, what's my exit; what's my return; and all that sort of thing. I think that Craigsville, Deerfield, and Mount Solon have a lot of similarities in that they supply a broad distance; they're having to go into the mountains together, so they have a good bit of commonality. Where I think that Dooms, and the area it serves, is not that different from Stuarts Draft and the area it serves. Weyers Cave is, also, that. What I'm saying is that we, each, can have a perspective on it, but I think there is a lot of thought that went into it by the Chief weighing the pros and cons and he has come up with a plan. When we get to the dollars and cents, the fact of it is we're going to have this grant for two years, unless we want to cancel it in total. So we have two years to experiment with what's the best way to allocate these people. What's the best way to find revenues to support them? So that at the end of two years, or after one year, we're going to have a heck of idea of which direction we go. If we turn down the Chief's plan, we've got to come up with an alternate plan; a plan devised by the seven of us up here who have a whole lot less knowledge than the Chief who has to deal with it. I think we have to be mindful of all the things that you're talking about, but we need to start someplace and then correct because anything we do up here is only in place until we change it. We can change it down the road. We have 21 people that the Chief has devised a way that he would like to deploy them and that will be it. This shouldn't be between Mr. Beyeler and myself but I would entertain thoughts from the rest of the Board.

Mr. Shull made the following comments:

I would like to address what we did. He went out and met with the Fire companies and then we did a follow-up. The public out here is looking at us. As Middlebrook told me, they are taxpayers, also. They should get the same amount of service that everybody else should. They reiterated that they wanted to keep their two Career staff up there. I know we put Riverheads in, but there has been a lot of increase of houses and things along Route 11, subdivisions and everything. They feel like on the west side of Middlebrook if you take the floaters and use them as floaters and they are not there, then those people that used to respond were farmers and people that weren't working during the day, but most of the people are working now, and they feel like they won't have the service over there. Even though Riverheads is close by; you have Summerdean and all, over in that area, they still are pretty

August 29, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

far away. They said they would like to have their service. As far as the East and West, North and South, from the members that I talked to, they would like to work within the fireboxes that they are in. If those companies work together, they said, when they had training and everything, they would like to work within that area, rather than go North to South. Most of them would like to work within that area. East or West, I feel like would probably be a better plan. Everybody looks at plans differently, but that is just my opinion and that is the opinion that was created by the volunteers that I talked to. I don't think we should forget these volunteers. We should try to work with them. You know we could come up with a plan and we can try to ram it down their throats, but you can also turn those volunteers off. I think we need to take their perspectives in mind when we do these plans.

Mr. Wills made the following comments:

The one comment that I would have looking at it and when you started talking about floaters, when we first started talking about the SAFER grant, I assumed that the floaters were not going to be assigned anywhere specifically, but they were going to be used to reduce over-time and part-time. Yet, the plan we get has a massive increase in over-time and part-time. As far as the Plan, and, again, I appreciate all of the efforts that staff went together to put into this Plan and provide us a professional plan, not a political plan, and commend the staff for that. In looking long-term, in trying to find a way to make sure our costs can be controlled. When you skip to a point when you have 80 personnel, you certainly are going to have a few off each day. To me, the floaters should be assigned accordingly so that we're not having to spend that much in over-time or part-time bringing extra people in. The idea, that you talked about, with Stuarts Draft Rescue being able to back up different agencies on weekends, or when they have training, or whatever, to me, that is legitimate use of part-time. Part-time people that are out here can be assigned to that station for that day makes sense. In terms of the overall operation, to me, with that many employees, fill-ins that are required should be within that number if you can possibly do it. I think that is the way we can control costs.

Mr. Pattie made the following comments:

First thing this Board did, and I think it was great, is that we have the Chief report directly to us. I think that has been a definite improvement. The second thing we asked him to do was to come up with a Plan. He has come up with a Plan. He wasn't influenced by us, as Mr. Wills said. Right now, I think it is an accountability issue. This is his plan. He's come up with it. He's put his name on it. We have two years to figure this out. Let's let him be 100% accountable for this Plan. In a year from now, let's look at it and see the good and the bad and see if there is a net difference to see if we can make improvements or whether overall it is pretty good. I think that we should go ahead and accept this Plan as is; review it at the end of next September, 2013; and then, make adjustments. Right now, we're talking about changes some major things and it is a domino affect. We change one small thing here and the whole plan is going to change and then we're going to have give more input. I think we have valid points by Mr. Beyeler and Mr. Wills and Mr. Shull, But I say, let's give this year; let's see what happens, and then let's make those adjustments then.

Mr. Karaffa made the following comments:

Chief, I also commend you on your efforts. I know it's not easy with seven of us trying to stay out of the political foray of where this would go. I do share a concern about the floaters in Deerfield, but I'll let Mr. Pyles speak to that. One of the things that this Board has talked about here in the last few minutes is questioning the need for 21 positions. When I came on this Board, one of the things you said to me is that the first time we get a call, the first call that comes in becomes an active working incident, we're good throughout this County. We can cover one call at a time. It's when we start getting in situations in certain areas where you have more than one call at the same time. That's where risks and problems crop up. That's where you talk about the depth and the flexibility of having these people in place. I think that's incredibly important. I disagree with the idea of a Fire Tax. The reason I disagree with that is because so often our personnel, both Volunteer and Career, are crossing all kinds of 1st due lines, or could supposedly be Fire Tax districts, to help save people. Let's take Fishersville, for instance; if you have a working incident in Fishersville, then you get another call and you are sending some of those people that are backup in Fishersville to another call and that first incident gets worse and they need more help, then the people in Fishersville say, 'Wait a minute, we paid the tax to have them, and they're out serving people in some other part of the County; where is their Fire Tax district?' I think, if we get into that, we further subdivide and

August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

keep apart our people. The only line that I see really dividing up the stations in terms of your plan is the two Battalion Chiefs because, basically, you will have divided the County in half-East and West. The companies will be working with that particular Battalion Chief, but beyond that I don't see why other companies wouldn't be able to work with each other; wouldn't be able to train with each other. I understand the administrative lines and I think some of those lines are to help evenly distributing personnel in the County as opposed to the number of calls and the miles between them. The only way to draw a line is one line. Do you draw it East and West; do you draw it North to South because you only have two Battalion Chiefs in there? You can draw it diagonal if you wanted to. Beyond that, I don't see any problem with your lines. If we start doing things like putting in permanent floaters and we start trying to find out where you are going to put some floaters together, you're pulling apart the ability to offer 24/7 support in an ambulance crew to parts of this County that we're depending on for Revenue Recovery to justify offsetting the costs in two years. That is a concern that I have just from the discussion that I've heard here that we're talking about. Well, we should have some permanent floaters. Maybe, we should keep the people over at Deerfield; we should keep the people at Middlebrook. Before you know it, you don't have enough people in the Riverheads Station, the Preston L. Yancey Station, or the Weyers Cave Station to man ambulances and your Revenue Recovery is impacted. There was a comment about ramming this down the Volunteers throats. I don't agree. I went to the stations that are inside of my district. I spoke to them. I took questions. They were very appreciative that you were going around and sitting down with each and everyone and discussing and getting input while you were putting this Plan together.

They were appreciative that we were staying out of it and the first input I got on the idea of where to put the 21 SAFER personnel were sitting in their station hearing from their volunteers. I heard from them before I heard from you, today. I think they have had ample time for input. I don't know, exactly, if we need to make a decision today on how we're going to disburse these folks. From what I understand, these new folks that we have now hired are all in training. We don't necessarily have to say this is how we're going to disburse these people, today. We can take this home. We can sit down and we can look at it. We can talk with the Chiefs about it and then we can come back. Again, this was an enormous task and I think we are seeing more and more of our volunteer stations come forward and say, 'We like to volunteer. We want to be here to volunteer.' But due to the economy, time constraints, and the increased amount of training that is necessary in order to volunteer, we're losing them. It is getting harder and harder to bring in new ones. I don't think that we are turning off volunteers, or telling them that we are showing them the door. I think they are saying to us, 'We want to stay around as long as possible'. But, at the same time, this reality is sitting in. It's not politics; it's a reality. It is happening across the country. I don't think the country is slamming its door on volunteers. I think it needs to be reiterated how much we appreciate the volunteers and how much this Plan is keeping them in mind and how much we're trying to keep them involved in the decision-making. Again, I do appreciate all of the effort that you put into this and your department. It is a very nice presentation.

Mr. Moore made the following comments:

I think you did exactly what we asked you to do. You gave us some unbiased opinion on the best way to distribute to the people. I think, from the divisions, I think it is more to show the different parts of the County are being staffed, from the Battalion side which is the operational. You got two guys and 81 certainly seems like an easy way to divide the County. It is centrally located. Again, I think it comes back to the Chief is our guy! He met with everyone of the departments. The part about the floater, I do have questions on that. My thought was that, when we put more people, say, at Churchville and the Preston Yancey, that, when we had people that were going to be off, or something, that we could pull from where we had more people to supplement to Dooms as an example. To say that the two people at Dooms, we might take off the grid if we had to pull those people out of there. I'm not sure I'm 100% with you on that. Other than that, I think you put a lot of work and commitment to the Fire and Rescue here, today. Thank you!

Chairman Pyles made the following comments:

Chief, I think good points have been brought up by everyone today. I commend the seriousness which this Board takes this activity. I was thinking that we ought to try and get a vote, but after hearing this, maybe not, today; let's vote on the 12th. Each of you would have the opportunity to meet with the Chief and others and give your input. We are a political process, whether we want to admit that. And ask you to come back Wednesday, September 12th, recommit to the Plan you presented or with a new Plan with some tweaking based upon what you have heard here recognizing that what we say here. The floaters seem to be a big issue. I think about folks saying we need to keep them there. It's a matter of costs. You've been trying to live within the 21 people. Some people think that's way too many. To service

August 29, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

everybody, it may be the right thing. I think we can wait for you to let this all settle in; let the Board members settle and give you their input, and then come back with something else and we can go on with that.

Mr. Beyeler moved, seconded by Mr. Shull, that the Board accept Chairman Pyles' recommendations and table further discussion on the Plan/Deployment until September 12th.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

Mr. Wills asked for the recommendation on purchasing new or used ambulances to be discussed on September 12th.

Mr. Beyeler asked if Title 27 was going to be addressed today.

Mr. Morgan said that what the Board had was a first draft; he would like to look at it more closely and bring back September 12th with the Board's suggested changes.

Mr. Wills asked if the concept could be approved today, with the understanding that revisions will be made. He clarified that the concept is that the Fire Chief will be over all Fire and Rescue in the County. Chief Holloway said that if ISO had some kind of idea that the Board supported that concept, ISO would be taking that into consideration during their evaluations currently underway.

Mr. Wills moved, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the Board support the concept for Title 27 with the exact language being drafted by the County Attorney and approved by the Board at a future date.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

Chairman Pyles asked that each Board member review Title 27 and provide input on September 12th before submitting information to the Officers Association for their review.

Chief Holloway reminded the Board that he would be out of town until September 9th; Deputy Armstrong will be available.

Chairman Pyles expressed appreciation to Chief Holloway for his presentation with a heavy heart.

* * * * *

August 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

Chairman
H:/8-29spmtgmin.12

County Administrator