

Regular Meeting, Wednesday, September 12, 2012, 7:00 p.m. Government Center, Verona, VA.

PRESENT: Tracy C. Pyles, Jr., Chairman
Jeffrey A. Moore, Vice-Chairman
David R. Beyeler
David A. Karaffa
Marshall W. Pattie
Michael L. Shull
Larry J. Wills
Timmy Fitzgerald, Director of Community Development
Jennifer M. Whetzel, Director of Finance
Patrick J. Morgan, County Attorney
Patrick J. Coffield, County Administrator
Rita R. Austin, CMC, Executive Secretary

VIRGINIA: At a regular meeting of the Augusta County Board of Supervisors held on Wednesday, September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m., at the Government Center, Verona, Virginia, and in the 237th year of the Commonwealth....

* * * * *

Chairman Pyles welcomed the citizens present.

* * * * *

The following seniors at Buffalo Gap High School, led us with the Pledge of Allegiance:

Hayley Fix, Vice President of the Buffalo Gap High School FCCLA (Family, Career & Community Leaders of America), plans on attending Blue Ridge Community College and pursue a career in the medical field. Amy Rhodes, also a member of the Buffalo Gap High School FCCLA, plans on attending Blue Ridge Community College and then transfer into a University. She hopes to go into the legal or nursing field. LeAnne Simmons, also a member of the Buffalo Gap High School FCCLA, plans on attending Bridgewater College and become a Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher.

* * * * *

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

* * * * *

AGRICULTURE EXTENSION AGENT – INTRODUCTION

Mr. Wills introduced Matt Booher, the new Agriculture Extension Agent. He is an Agronomy Specialist who replaced Jason Carter as Unit Director. They are hoping to get another livestock agent to replace Jason. He noted that Mr. Booher went through an extensive interview process with Virginia Tech and at the County level. He asked Mr. Booher to introduce himself to the Board. Mr. Booher said that he is the new Crop and Soils Extension Agent and is from Pennsylvania. He has worked in the Shenandoah Valley for about six years in private industry. He is looking forward to working with the County. "I can already tell there is a lot of support for agriculture in the County and for Extension. I am thankful for that."

The Board welcomed Mr. Booher and said they looked forward to working with him.

* * * * *

EMPLOYEE BONUS – ORDINANCE

This being the day and time advertised to consider an ordinance to provide for the payment of lump sum bonus to employees of the County of Augusta.

Patrick J. Coffield, County Administrator, advised that this had been discussed at the last meeting where the quarterly report had been discussed. In that report, it had been noted that the County was fortunate to have a fund balance. He added that on the expenditure side, "the agencies did a yeoman's job of keeping things within budget and,

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

EMPLOYEE BONUS – ORDINANCE (cont'd)

actually, under-budget.” Mr. Coffield had suggested to the Board that, since during the budget process it had been determined that the County did not have sufficient funds for a pay raise that the Board consider a one-time bonus from that fund balance. Two scenarios had been presented; the Board authorized that, in accordance with State law, that it be advertised and placed on tonight’s agenda for public hearing.

The Chairman declared the public hearing open.

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

Mr. Wills moved, seconded by Mr. Karaffa, that the Board adopt the following ordinance:

**EMPLOYEE BONUS ORDINANCE
COUNTY OF AUGUSTA, VIRGINIA**

WHEREAS, *Virginia Code § 15.2-1508* sets forth the procedure, including the adoption of an ordinance, by which a Board of Supervisors may provide for payment of monetary bonuses to county employees; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors believes these one-time bonuses for County Employees is the most cost-effective way to give something to employees that have not received any increase in salary since the FY09 Budget; and

WHEREAS, one-time bonuses are payments made to Employees rather than COLA and Merit increases which affect further budgets; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors, after due notice, has determined that the desire of the Board of Supervisors to provide the County of Augusta, Virginia employees a monetary bonus shall be granted;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of Augusta County, Virginia, that:

1. A “bonus” shall be defined as a lump-sum payment to an employee that is not part of the base salary.
2. The Board of Supervisors shall appropriate and pay a bonus of \$1,000.00 for all full-time employees.
3. The Board of Supervisors shall appropriate and pay a bonus of \$500.00 for all part-time employees with benefits.
4. This ordinance shall become effective immediately.
5. This ordinance shall terminate on January 1, 2013.

Mr. Beyeler stated that he opposed this ordinance, “not that the employees aren’t doing a good job, and not that they don’t deserve it. This County and this Country is not out of the woods, yet. All indications I’m hearing is it could get worst next year. Just because we have money, doesn’t mean we have to spend it.”

Mr. Shull agreed with Mr. Beyeler. He felt that this money should be held back and if the economy improves at the beginning of the year, give a 1% pay increase to the employees. He stated that this would help build up their retirement.

Mr. Moore added that he changed his opinion on this matter noting that it is excess revenue from last year and felt that the employees deserved the bonus. He asked that the bonus be given in November so that it could be used for the holiday season.

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

EMPLOYEE BONUS – ORDINANCE (cont'd)

Mr. Karaffa understood the point of view of some of the Board members, he emphasized that the “entire” fund balance is not being used for bonuses; only one-third is being used. “Our folks have worked hard. We have good people here. We all know the type of situation we’re in. We know what it costs to fill up a car at the gas pump. While I would love for it to be a pay raise, if all we can do right now is a bonus, I will support that to actually keep our folks and don’t lose them to other jurisdictions who might be willing to pay more.”

Chairman Pyles noted the difference between a bonus and a raise. “The raise would be our starting point next year. The bonus just stands alone. It is given and we’re still where we are as far as pay scale.”

Mr. Coffield added that employees on the August payroll would be eligible to receive the bonus.

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

Nays: Beyeler and Shull

Motion carried.

* * * * *

GOLF CART SIGNAGE - ORDINANCE

This being the day and time advertised to consider an ordinance to amend the Code of Augusta County, Virginia section 14-63 of the Motor Vehicle and Traffic Ordinance.

Timmy Fitzgerald, Director of Community Development, advised that this ordinance is to amend section 14-63 of the Code as it pertains to traffic. A previous Board had put into place an ordinance that would allow golf carts within subdivisions in the County and set forth a process to follow. The latest request is from the Hamptons @ Kennedy’s Creek, which is located in the South River District. Required petitions have been obtained. Comments from the Sheriff’s Office and VDOT have indicated no objection to the request. Before the Board tonight is to consider allowing golf carts on Hampton Drive, Canada Court, Emperor Court, Queens Court, Prince Court, Jester Court and Kennedy Ridge Court. A map was displayed showing the streets (indicated in red). Three signs are required, two on the curves and one at the entrance of the subdivision.

Dr. David D. Smith, applicant, added that there were 50 homes in the subdivision with one entrance in-one entrance out and felt that it was a limited access and that the residents were of like mind for golf cart accessibility.

The Chairman declared the public meeting open.

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

Mr. Beyeler moved, seconded by Mr. Karaffa, that the Board adopt the following ordinance and allow the cost for signage to come out of the South River Infrastructure Account (Funding Source: #80000-8016-67 – 3 @ \$250 each = \$750):

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND
SECTION 14-63
OF THE AUGUSTA COUNTY CODE**

WHEREAS, the Augusta County Board of Supervisors has received a request to designate additional streets to those upon which golf carts and utility vehicles may be operated;

NOW THEREFORE be it resolved by the Board of Supervisors for Augusta County that Section 14-63 of the Augusta County Coded is amended to add subparagraph 2 to paragraph A of the ordinance to read as follows:

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

GOLF CART SIGNAGE – ORDINANCE (cont'd)

§ 14-63. County public highways designated for golf cart and utility vehicle operations.

A. The Board of Supervisors hereby designates the following public highways within the County upon which golf carts and utility vehicles may be operated in accordance with the provisions of this Article:

1. Gloucester Road (Route 1512), Dundee Court (Route 1516), Lynn Circle (Route 1591), Windermere Road (Route 1514), Brighton Court (Route 1515), Eavers Circle (Route 1513), Yarmouth Road (Route 1500), Sylvan Drive (Route 1507), East High Street (Route 1509), Skyline Avenue (Route 1508), Kay Street (Route 1518), Crestview Drive (Route 1505), Wilson’s Drive (Route 1550), West High Street (Route 1509), York Avenue (Route 1503), Virginia Avenue (Route 1501), Cambridge Drive (Route 1502), Stuart Avenue (Route 1510), Forrer Road (Route 1506), Parker Road (Route 1504), Rose Avenue (Route 1501).

2. Hampton Drive (Route 1150), Canada Court (Route 1151), Emperor Court (Route 1154), Queens Court (Route 1153), Prince Court (Route 1155), Jester Court (Route 1152), Kennedy Ridge Court (Route 1154).

B. With regard to each of the public highways listed in subsection (A) above, the Board of Supervisors has considered the factors set forth in section 14-62(B) above, as required by Virginia Code § 46.2-916.2.

This Ordinance is effective immediately.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

CAP-SAW

The Board considered supplemental funding request for CAP-SAW.

Funding Source: #92040-9999 \$39,200

Mr. Coffield stated that history of CAP-SAW was included in the advanced Agenda Package. He stated that in May 2009, the then-seated Board of Supervisors was presented a proposal for the creation of CAP-SAW (Community Action Partnership of Staunton, Augusta and Waynesboro). Federal and State funding was available at the time to be leveraged by local dollars for non-profit organizations to serve the citizens of the three communities; therefore, this agency was created. Local donations to area non-profit agencies in the past have been leveraged 3 to 1 with Federal and State funds. Since that time, Federal and State funds have been reduced. The request tonight is to make the agencies whole from what the original budgeted allocations were anticipated to be with the caveat if additional State or Federal funds are received, they would be released and “additional” go to the agencies as originally proposed. If this occurs, the money would be placed in an escrow account for next year.

Carol Blair, Director for Youth Commission, and Anna Leavitt, CAP-SAW Coordinator, presented CAP-SAW’s request. Ms. Blair said that the same request will be made to the Cities of Staunton and Waynesboro. Hopefully, this extra funding will be carried forward to be applied to Augusta County’s match for next year. The budget created for CAP-SAW was based on advice by the Federal government which was to plan on level funding. As of right now, they are faced with an \$80,000 shortfall. She noted that last

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

CAP-SAW (cont'd)

year agencies were notified of “pending cuts” but in the end the funds were restored. This year, it was the will of the Board that the localities be asked to “front” the additional money in order to help keep the agencies in whole. She feels sure that they will receive some additional money, but is unsure of the amount or time it will be received. Ms. Blair added that all three localities needed to agree with this request.

Mr. Pattie asked how the \$39,000 was determined. Ms. Leavitt said that, once the shortfall was determined, the same percentage base was used as in previous years. The percentages were based on population and poverty. Mr. Pattie asked what happened to the County's money if the other two localities do not agree. Ms. Leavitt said that it was a three-way agreement. “If all do not play, then no one plays.”

Mr. Karaffa, as a member of CAP-SAW, added that he attends their meetings. He felt that this process will work much better and enable plan this year. He stated that this is a one-time instance. He felt that this was a good plan.

Chairman Pyles added that if this is not done, this agency will operate six months at a reduced level. The last six months would require a lot more money. “This is not the way to run a business. People get hungry every day. It doesn't help you to get through the shortfall and bad times. If the Federal government does not come through, then there is no need to have the CAP-SAW Board. I suspect that this whole mechanism will be continued and we will not need an allotment next year for CAP-SAW. This allows us to have level support throughout the year for these agencies with the hope that the Federal government will come through.”

Mr. Karaffa moved, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the Board approve the request contingent upon the other two localities entering into this agreement and, if additional Federal funding becomes available, that the funding be carried forward for next year.

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

Nays: Wills

Motion carried.

* * * * *

ROUTE 636 PPTA

The Board received Staff update on status of PPTA.

Mr. Fitzgerald reported that this Board has been involved with Route 636 relocated, which runs by Augusta Health and past the new Mary Baldwin College campus (Murphy Deming) to Route 250 at Woodrow Wilson. He gave a PowerPoint presentation with the following high-lights:

Ten-Year History

2002 – VDOT held public meetings; options were introduced.
2003 - Timmons Study looked at corridor and alternatives.

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

ROUTE 636 PPTA (cont'd)

- 2004 – Adopted by Board of Supervisors in the Six-Year Plan in two different pieces: bridge project and a road project, based on the alignment selected.
- 2008 – Myers Corner development – As a result of rezoning, a TIF (Tax Increment Finance) agreement with Myers Corner and Crescent Development was created to build a piece of the road through the TIF agreement.
- 2009 – 2011 – Additional allocations placed on the Six-Year Plan for the road and the bridge to build funding to build the road.
- 2012 – Right-of-ways for project has been secured.

The County has received an unsolicited PPTA (Public Private Partnership Act) proposal from Branch Highways to build this road. That proposal includes five different phases. (Map was displayed.) Phase 1 (purple) starts at the new Mary Baldwin College campus to allow the college an entrance on the new location; Phase 1A (red) is where a box culvert is needed to be placed. Phase 2 (orange) is the Myers Corner property, which runs down to Route 250. Phase 3 (yellow) is all roadway built across two different properties (Hoy and Skyline/Critzer); Phase 4 (green) is a two-lane bridge across the railroad. Phase 5 (blue) is the Route 250 turn lanes and signal light at the intersection and associated work.

The question is – **Why Now?**

Emerging Corridor Investments:

Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center -	\$73 million
Myers Corner/Maple Ridge Complex -	\$ 4 million
Murphy Deming (Mary Baldwin site) -	\$25 million
Augusta Health (new cardiac center) -	\$22 million +
University of Virginia -	\$12 million
Exit 91 -	\$42 million

Supporting:

Comprehensive Plan
Economic Development Strategic Plan for Job Creation and Infrastructure
Regional Health Care
2014 Health Care Mandates

Mr. Moore added that, under the Economic Development, Health Care is the second largest employer in the County.

Existing Funding

On the Six-Year Plan, Dedicated Secondary Road System:	\$2.6 million (roadway and bridge)
Tax Increment Financing:	<u>\$3.6</u> million (Crescent) TIF
Total:	\$6.2 million

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that the PPTA working group has reviewed the unsolicited proposal and has requested Branch Highways to proceed to a detailed phased proposal. In this proposal, Branch Highways will answer questions that the working group had on their initial proposal. As part of the process, a public hearing is required on the detailed phased proposal. They would like to have this public hearing on September 26th.

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

ROUTE 636 PPTA (cont'd)

Mr. Moore moved, seconded by Mr. Karaffa, that the Board accept the detailed proposal from Branch Highways and authorize staff to advertise for a public hearing on September 26th.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

HEALTH DEPARTMENT – PUMP & HAUL AGREEMENT

The Board considered request to extend approved locations.

Mr. Fitzgerald reported that tonight’s request is consideration to an amendment to the County’s Pump and Haul Agreement with the Health Department. The original agreement was created as a result of several businesses in the Greenville area needing to “pump and haul” their sewage while building the wastewater treatment plant in Greenville. Through that process, they were able to get a general permit through the Department of Health that would allow for additional locations within the County to pump and haul when circumstances required. At that time, criteria was set further:

- A) Existing business
- B) Permanent solution would be identified
- C) Six-month local permit
- D) Monthly report required
- E) Backup provisions in place
- F) Bonding

Realty Income Raphine, LLC, at their Lofton site, is in the process of installing a new drainfield to accommodate employees in the warehouse. As a convenience, they are also providing portable toilets to the truck drivers that come to the distribution center. They would like to continue to use the portable toilets for the drivers as they do not allow drivers inside the facility. In order to continue to provide the portable toilets on a continuous basis, their site would need to be listed on the County’s general permit for pump and haul. He added that this is a different situation from Greenville because the portable toilets will be permanent. The contractor maintaining the toilets will be coming in weekly and a monthly report will be given to the Health Department. The Health Department has indicated that this can be done if the Board approves.

Mr. Shull expressed a conflict of interest and would abstain tonight.

Mr. Beyeler moved, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the Board allow Realty Income Raphine, LLC be allowed to be added to the County’s General Permit for Permanent Pump and Haul Agreement.

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

Nays: None

Abstain: Shull

Motion carried.

* * * * *

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

SECONDARY ROAD PLAN FUNDING ALLOCATION

The Board considered Magisterial District funding allocation formula.

Mr. Coffield advised that since Fiscal Year 1996-97, the Board's philosophy has been to allocate available Secondary Road funds equally by Magisterial District. After VDOT started reducing Secondary Road funding (from \$5 million a year in 2002 to \$250,000 a year), it was difficult to reduce projects proportionately leaving Magisterial Districts funding unequal. Current funding totals are:

	<u>1997 – 2018</u>
Beverley Manor	\$ 6,874,897
Middle River	6,975,057
North River	9,271,437
Pastures	10,775,452
Riverheads	10,865,372
South River	7,080,818
Wayne	<u>7,017,737</u>
	\$58,860,770 ÷ 7 = \$8,408,681.40

He noted that staff has undertaken a review of current projects to determine if any projects could be eliminated or re-scoped to come within anticipated revenues. From this review (in consultation with VDOT staff), the following projects have been identified:

	<u>Estimated Cost</u>	<u>Available</u>	<u>Needed</u>
Route 626, Limestone Road	\$2,584,598	\$ 737,277	\$1,847,321
Route 685, Lehigh Road	1,237,105	390,838	846,267
Route 616, Dam Town Road	5,126,601	1,934,559	3,192,042
Route 610, Howardsville Tpke.	2,248,628	1,221,032	1,209,596

Route 626 – Staff and North River Magisterial District Supervisor recommendation to re-scope within available funding to improve intersections . . . sight distances.

Route 685 – VDOT has indicated that they have identified Federal funding to cover funding shortfall.

Route 616 – Staff and Middle River Magisterial District Supervisor recommendation to re-scope within available funding and construct project in phases as funding becomes available.

Route 610 – Staff and South River Magisterial District Supervisor recommendation to re-scope within available funding and construct project in phases as funding becomes available.

Mr. Coffield added that when the Secondary Roads Six-Year Plan received \$5 million a year and \$30 million over the Six-Year Planning period, it was necessary to have contingency accounts for various purposes, i.e., engineering/surveying services, piping of entrances, shoulder/ditch/slope fertilization and seeding, traffic signals, rights-of-way, traffic calming and matching funds for eligible safety grants. It is Staff's recommendation to reduce funding to those accounts by \$900,000.

VDOT Staff has conducted an audit of "closed out" projects and calculated totals for each Magisterial District. Historically, the Board has authorized Staff and VDOT to work with individual Supervisors to "reallocate" available funding within their own Magisterial Districts. The Board has three options to consider:

Option 1: Status Quo – Continue practice of allowing Board members to reallocate within their own Magisterial Districts.

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

SECONDARY ROAD PLAN FUNDING ALLOCATION (cont'd)

Option 2: Reallocate – Pool available funding and redistribute/reallocate to more closely equalize funding between Magisterial Districts.

Option 3: Prioritizing Projects – Pool available funding and identify projects of countywide significance such as Route 636 project.

Mr. Coffield went over the Secondary Road Plan formula that had been given to the Board with their advanced agenda package. He said that, as the Board starts its Six-Year planning process, it should look at its projects in their respective Magisterial Districts as well as countywide projects such as Route 636. This can be discussed at the next Staff Briefing (September 24th) if the Board desires.

Chairman Pyles emphasized that there is not enough money. “When you go from getting \$5 million a year to \$250,000 for a county of our size, that makes for a couple of driveways. That really doesn’t do much for us. We are still living on the residuals when we had appropriate funding. We are going to have to take a hard look at where we go from here.” Chairman Pyles added that when there are limited funds, the County tries doing the “big” project – “try and get the most bang for our buck, because if we divvy up with so little money, we’re going to have a lot of years nothing gets done because we’re building account balances . . . not projects.” Chairman Pyles suggested that the Board take no action tonight but review it later on in a fuller context when something is needed to be done.

* * * * *

REGIONAL EMERGENCY OPERATION PLAN

The Board received a presentation by staff regarding the Regional Emergency Operation Plan.

Donna Good, Emergency Communications Center Director, gave a PowerPoint presentation with the following highlights:

The Plan helps to prepare for, respond to and recover from the threats and emergencies that face Augusta County:

Tornados; Earthquakes; Hurricanes; Floods; Blackouts; Chemical Emergencies; Drought; Heat-related Emergencies; Lightning; Thunderstorms; Radiological Events; Terrorism; Winter Weather; Hazmat incidents; Landslides and sinkholes; and Wildfires.

The Code of Virginia, 44-146.19, requires that each local jurisdiction and inter-jurisdiction agencies prepare and keep a current Local Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). The County has plans dated back to 1984.

Our EOP was to be reviewed in January 2012, the County was granted an extension till September to complete the Regional EOP Plan.

Every four years, each local agency will conduct a comprehensive review and revision of it’s EOP to ensure the plan remains current and updated.

The revised plan shall be formally adopted by the locality's governing body. As in the case with this plan, an inter-jurisdictional plan, the EOP must be adopted by each of the governing bodies of the jurisdictions included in the plan. This plan for Augusta County, and the Cities of Staunton and Waynesboro is designed to meet this responsibility and to include these jurisdictions in the mutually- supported statewide emergency management system.

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

REGIONAL EMERGENCY OPERATION PLAN (cont'd)

Staunton, Augusta and Waynesboro EOP Basic Plan was developed by the coordinators of Emergency Management of the three jurisdictions.

Waynesboro secured a regional grant from Dept of Emergency Management. This is a federal grant for local emergency planning. These funds were used to draft the regional plan that is formatted using the new State's template.

Assistance and input was also provided by local organizations that play key roles during emergencies and disaster situations, the Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission and other applicable regional agencies, and the Virginia Department of Emergency Management.

The Staunton-Augusta-Waynesboro Emergency Operations Plan (SAW EOP) consists of a Basic Plan and Functional, Support, and Hazard Specific Annexes.

- The Basic Plan describes the general concepts of emergency operations and assigns duties and responsibilities to agency heads or organizations which are either part of, or serve in support of, local government in time of emergency. The broad responsibilities include all four areas of emergency management including disaster mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery.
- The Functional Annexes highlight the Emergency Support Functions which are an element of National Incident Management System (NIMS). The Support Annexes and Hazard-Specific Annexes enhance the plan with more detailed information for specific emergency management topics.

The purpose of the S-A-W EOP Basic Plan and Functional Annexes is to set forth concepts and procedures whereby the Cities of Waynesboro and Staunton, and Augusta County can effectively apply available resources to ensure that casualties and property damage will be minimized and the essential services will be restored as soon as possible.

Ms. Good added that a resolution for the Board of Supervisors acceptance and adoption of the revised Emergency Operation Plan had been enclosed in the Board's Advanced Agenda package for consideration tonight. This resolution is required before submitting the Plan to the State for review. Furthermore, the Director of Emergency Management is tasked and authorized to maintain and revise as necessary the EOP during the next four (4) year period. Staff members will meet quarterly to review and update the plan as needed. Ms. Good added that, once the Plan is sent to the State, they review and evaluate it to make sure that it meets the new State template. The Plan will be sent back with revisions to be made to ensure that it meets the State guidelines. Once finalized, a copy will be provided to the Board for its review. Ms. Good was asked to read the resolution to the Board.

Mr. Wills asked if there were any major differences to this Plan. Ms. Good said that it was more detailed. Earthquakes, updated mitigation, hazmat (Title 3) have been added. Mr. Coffield noted that a lot of things have changed. He noted that when Katrina occurred, the City of New Orleans had problems in communication. In comparison, with the Pentagon situation, Northern Virginia had something in place; the Northern Virginia Operation Plan was held as a model nationally. The Federal government felt it important to look at the Northern Virginia model. Augusta County was already somewhat in that coordinated fashion. Ms. Good added that it was nice to share resources so that they are not duplicating efforts. Chairman Pyles added that

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

REGIONAL EMERGENCY OPERATION PLAN (cont'd)

since the derecho, problems that were observed have been corrected. He added that an inventory of emergency generators was available to the Board. He felt that this Plan was improved from last year's. Messrs. Pattie and Karaffa asked that a copy of the inventory be placed in their mail slots.

Mr. Moore moved, seconded by Mr. Wills, that the Board adopt the Resolution for the Staunton-Augusta-Waynesboro Emergency Operations Plan.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

FIRE AND RESCUE

The Board continued discussion regarding carryover topics from Board's August 29th Special Meeting:

- A. SAFER Deployment proposal
- B. Rescue Squad Assistance Fund Grant
- C. Career Chief (Title 27)
- D. PLY Agreement

Steve Morris expressed concerns he had in the western area. 1) Churchville Volunteer Fire Department - short on members. Asked how a floater would work. 2) Western area is very rural – few hydrants and limited water supply. 3) EMS calls – need quicker response. 4) No to two platform trucks – too costly. 5) Consider combining Preston Yancey and Company 10 – one station. 6) Move Craigsville First Aid to Craigsville Fire – one building will cut down on expenses. 7) Verona Fire Station – place an ambulance. Mr. Morris suggested having a district tax and cut Board members down to five (versus 7).

Doug Morris, of Deerfield Fire and Rescue, thanked the Board for the 24-hour person, 7 days a week. The new plan suggests removing this position. He hoped to keep this 24-hour person.

Wayne Martin, Craigsville Fire Chief and Vice-Chairman of the Officers Association, referring to making the Fire Chief Holloway in charge of all Fire and Rescue departments in Augusta County, expressed concerns of this change. He felt that the current system has worked well and that the change would be devastating to the volunteers. "This could be resolved by meeting with each company in the County. If some companies felt the need, than apply it to those particular companies that want it." He also stated that two men per station would not be able to handle the calls without help from the volunteers.

Bobby Snyder, Fire Chief of Stuarts Draft Rescue Squad, opposed having the Fire Chief Holloway in charge of all Fire and Rescue departments. In referring to the Special Meeting on August 29th, if the Fire Chief is in charge, he was concerned of having a checks and balance system. It had been proposed that there would be only two representatives from each of the districts (six people's input) and the other chiefs would be put into committee assignments. "You're killing the Chiefs' Association, which will silence a lot of your volunteers having input to make sure that Fire and Rescue does go forward with other information put into it other than just what Chief Holloway would get from the six people." In regards to the 21 people provided from the SAFER

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)

grant, it was proposed that 6 people to Weyers Cave to staff an ambulance, 6 people to Riverheads to staff an ambulance, 6 people to Preston L. Yancey to staff an ambulance, and 3 more to Craigsville to staff an ambulance. He did not see this as fire suppression and questioned the need of ambulances at other locations when a call was received. In regards to first right of refusal for the County, he understands that if he had equipment that he wants to give to Deerfield Rescue Squad, he cannot do it. He did not have a problem with keeping equipment in the County that has been purchased by local taxpayers and communities, but when he cannot give something to his local fire department or his fire department can't give something to him, "we're fighting against our own community. We aren't allowing our own community to keep what they purchased." In reference to the 21 career staff, he questioned having 12 of those personnel that are already being staffed by Staunton Augusta and Waynesboro. "It's like adding more employees in where you've already have coverage." He felt that the proposal places a lot of emphasis on ambulance staff, which would not help fire protection. He felt that new career staff is detrimental to the volunteers.

Craig Williams, Churchville Assistant Fire Chief, was pleased with the plan but expressed concerns of Title 27: 1) Questioned why the first document was one page and the final document was six pages and had not been seen. He felt that if the second document had been presented to the Officers Association, there would have been a different vote. They supported the idea of having one chief of the County; however, having independent departments – managing their own departments, managing their own personnel files, etc., was preferred. He felt that, currently, Fire Chief Holloway did not have full control for the SOGs. He referred to Paragraph C.1 needing new language. "At the end of the day, we think it is leaving us wide open for the next Chief that would turn the cart upside down in the County." He felt that wording should include the Officers Association as the governing body that holds the Fire Chief accountable to his position, but still allow him to be the ultimate person to make decisions based on the SOGs. 2) As far as the 21 personnel, call volume is increasing and Churchville supports. 3) Floaters – they oppose.

Mike Fisher, Dooms Fire Department Chief, said that he did not feel that the floater system is a good idea. He said that Dooms had two recent calls for which not one volunteer could respond. He said pulling paid staff from his department to fill in elsewhere for absences would compromise coverage.

Fire Chief Carson Holloway made the following comments (in reference to the August 29th meeting):

I will cover some of what we talked about earlier on the SAFER deployment proposal. Maybe, I need to clarify a little bit on that. As you know, the plan does call for six at Weyers Cave. They would be in EMS/ALS; they would also be firefighters. Fire based EMS is pretty common across the U.S. As far as SAFER goes, every ambulance or wherever we staff staff at, they would have the ability to fight fire, also. The ambulances that we have would have airpicks and personnel are trained to do both jobs. While it could be an issue, it is not an issue with SAFER from what I have looked at. The SAFER grant does allow for that. In Mount Solon, we did pay for three out there for part-time—utilized SAFER funds for that full-time. Craigsville, we did because of the call volume out there. The one person has been a concern for all of us. Craigsville Fire has stepped up and did a good job. I commend them, as I have all volunteer agencies in the County. As I stated the other day, it simply is not enough of volunteers anymore. It simply is not enough. We've heard chiefs come up and speak and each of the allude to the same thing that the lack of staff and the need to interact and work together. That's where the proposal is at Craigsville – three additional out there to take some of the load off of the Fire Department and because of the call volume out there also. We did, in the proposal, suggest to downsize Augusta County. Part of the plan calls for pulling three out of there, not SAFER positions, but removing three from that station and transferring them to Fishersville to work with the ambulance as well as the ladder truck. We plan on re-deploying the ladder truck there because of the hospital, mileage factors, and the infrastructure that we have talked about earlier. We've talked about the growth of the hospital and that area up there.

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)

I can't dispute the cost of equipment is high. Two ladder trucks would cost additional money, but with the growth here in the County, I think we've provided maps that outlines the need for additional ladder trucks not only for ISO, but for public safety. The Stuarts Draft area is heavily populated and has a lot of industry there so that's a justification for moving truck from Augusta County Co. 10 to Preston L. Yancey out of Augusta County. Preston L. Yancey, again, would need the ladder truck, too. Also, part of the plan, we would look at re-deploying staff from Grottoes, which station is up in volunteer staffing numbers. This would not be SAFER positions, but, simply, reallocate resources from Grottoes to the New Hope area to a station that is having problems getting out 24-7. We did put in our plan three to Churchville. This would put two each shift 24-7 because of the call volume; also, because of some of the requests from Churchville and from agencies. The Grottoes Rescue, we did talk to their agencies; they have been able to rebuild their volunteer system quite adequately, from what I've been told. They've been very adamant that they feel like they can get by, at least from a standpoint, that they can cover nights and weekends very well. The day we were there talking to them, the career staff was actually running 2nd calls. We looked at that and made a decision. We did look at the Riverheads area. We talked about the possible need for a ladder truck in Stuarts Draft. The reason we looked at the future of a possible ladder truck, or one of the reasons we talk about a ladder truck, possibly going to Riverheads and Verona, is already set up for it. When we built that station in Riverheads, it was designed to house a ladder truck. There would be some infrastructure needs at Stuarts Draft. Also, along those lines, upon talking to Stuarts Draft Fire Department, they were not receptive to a ladder truck. They feel like they could do a good job getting out, but taking on a ladder company operations—truck company operations, requires a lot of additional training and they didn't feel like, at this time, they were able to man a truck company. They felt they could do a good job as far as engine company operations, general firefighting, things like that and industrial firefighting, but they weren't inclined to go with a ladder truck.

It was twenty-one positions. All twenty-one were SAFER. There were some reallocations. As far as the floaters, we did look, again. We utilized that and we talked to different stations. It is tough decisions. I was requested to put together a plan and we did and we went out and put it together. We brought back the idea that some of the slower stations, because of the needs and things, not saying there is not value in every community. It certainly is. But we looked at data, run numbers. We compared 1,500 calls a year to 160. We did a lot of other things. We looked at infrastructure, populations, ability to get out, and could we centrally locate. Augusta County, as we all know, especially, it is a large county with a very large population and is wide spread throughout. We have a lot of different areas anywhere from well-developed in the Stuarts Draft area, remote areas out near the Highland County borders. But the Middlebrook area was suggested as a floater because of reduced call volume; Dooms area, even though it is a populated area, New Hope is proximal to it; Waynesboro City, we have mutual aid and automatic aid which is proximal to it; and also, the Preston L. Yancey Fire Department was pretty well proximal to it; so, while it is not good, and I don't dictate where to pull people out of it, but that was a location we could and still provide coverage if needed. In Middlebrook is the low call volume, and then, Deerfield, the one person out there is a concern since we've deployed one person with Chief Morris, and, again, it has worked very well and they've been very receptive and worked hard for it. However, the problem with having one person, career volunteer, we've had two injuries out there. We've had a firefighter fall off of a fire truck. No one was around, and, again, we were very fortunate to have career volunteer with the situation of someone being alone, we were very fortunate that the injuries were light, but it could have been worse. We also had an allergic reaction to one staff member that was out there. We've also had a couple of incidents involving equipment backing and things like that. This is a safety risk and the elements that we have faced when we have only one person deployed and working goes up. I understand there are certain risks with each job, but that is one of the concerns. The other concerns is career volunteers responding alone from the liability, litigation the ability to perform. A lot of places it works, and it can work, but the idea of having a first responder get there and getting someone else there very quickly sometimes it is just not easy to do when you're seventeen miles away and on some tough roads.

All of it is not directed to take anything away, but it is intended to add value and it is tough decisions. Certainly, it is your decision, but these were the recommendations and justifications as to why we looked at them the way we did.

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)

Chairman Pyles noted that Chief Holloway did not change the plan. Chief Holloway made the following comments:

Deputy Chief Armstrong has provided to the Board different options. Regarding the floaters, Option 1. "Use floaters to back-fill vacancies." Again, that was pretty much our plan. The plan was not to pull them completely from each station every time. What we are going to do is try to utilize our budget, maximize it, but, also, look at when it became an issue such as the six o'clock in the morning, the four o'clock in the morning, we would look at stations that were less busy and would hopefully get volunteer rosters ahead of time. The volunteers we would know, for example, if Chief Fisher could give me a monthly roster, and say, 'well, this week, we will have people available in Dooms. First week in September, Chief, we will have one volunteer that is available in Dooms.' Well, if I had that roster and it was effective across the County, we could look at that roster and say, 'Okay, today, Dooms does have a career person that we could pull out and move to another station if there is a volunteer that could cover.' And that was the thought behind the floaters. Maybe, I didn't explain it quite right the other day and get that across. We would try to communicate and make sure there was backup and that would be the way we would do everywhere -- Middlebrook, as well as Deerfield. We did suggest that Deerfield go from a 24-hour shift to daylight. The reason behind that was the one person there by himself. That was a recommendation. Again, there are other options out there and we will explore those. Option 2. "Increase line-item funding for over-time and part-time coverage." Again, we don't like money, cost increases, and things like that, and I'm a taxpayer, also, but that's another option for you to consider. Option 3. "Do not back-fill daily staffing vacancies with career personnel." When we have daily vacancies, we just simply take that station out of service, or simply run from a different area. We automatically dispatch to the next closest station. Again, this would reduce costs. It is not the ideal answer, but it's an option that's out there. Option 4. "Staff fewer stations with career personnel." We did consider, but tried to stay away from this option. Those were the four options that we sort of looked at. While we didn't change our recommendations, we did provide some options that are viable. We provided some options. There are a lot of different ways to do business. We understand this is pretty complex and we wanted to provide those options.

Chairman Pyles made the following comments:

If I can interject. . . I thought the Board was pretty firm in what they wanted. They didn't want the floaters pulled from those agencies. I would have wished that you would have brought another allocation of those people so that there were three floaters, or whatever number you needed, to do that. You put me in a bad spot, Chief. When we started looking at these SAFER grants, I had to convince this Board to go forward with it. It was something that I took to them was a way we could fund all of this. (Changed tapes, not sure what was mentioned.) That doesn't follow. We were the ones that asked for them to do the one person out in Deerfield so they could have full protection all the time. People work by themselves all the time in this world. I wish our firemen wouldn't fall off trucks. I think people need to be cautious in how they do things. But you haven't given us something for us to pick from. I asked you to go and ask the volunteers what they would be willing to do. We're giving them more; so they might be able to do more. We should be able to go each department and say, 'What can you do to help us? Can you cover during training time? Can you do something else?' Let's use them. The volunteers want to do more. Instead of saying, 'We're going to pull your people at our discretion.' There might be something we can do with the folks to, you know, work with them and let them use their volunteer skills. Maybe, we need to change when we have our training for our people so it's when the volunteers are available. I don't think we have a choice, here, and we've got to come up with a plan that we can afford in two years.

Mr. Karaffa made the following comments:

Mr. Chairman, I actually brought something this evening that reflects very much your concerns.

Mr. Moore suggested that the Chief continue with his proposal before the Board has its discussion.

Chairman Pyles asked to go forward with his comments. He said each item would be discussed individually. He made the following comments:

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)

This is a big part of what we do. Everything else falls in place. If we're not going to have these paid people that need ambulances, we don't need to buy an ambulance.

Mr. Karaffa made the following comments:

I share the same concern about floaters. I took a look at it and spoke to some folks. One of the things that I was thinking at that meeting was to dedicate a pool of floaters. I would like to see the three at Deerfield remain. I would like to see the three at Middlebrook remain and not go to a floater system. I would like to see the three addition, that we were talking about putting at New Hope, put into the floater pool. I also said that the three that we were putting toward Churchville for 24-7 be put into a floater pool that they had volunteers. That way you would have six floaters. I said we could have them report to Company 10 in the morning. That's where our Captains are currently at. If we move the Captains over to Preston Yancey, we could do that differently. But, basically, the floaters would report in the morning; they would get their assignments there, and they would move out. My hope is that this would dramatically cut down on the amount of part-time and over-time they are currently budgeted \$40,000 and \$122,000 respectively. There is another thing about the aerial and moving that. You can read that paragraph. The breakdown that I have there for you is what we have currently, what the Chief's proposal was that we all saw, and then what this modification is that I've put in front of you this evening showing the three stations not having floaters, the six floaters, for purposes of allocations somewhere on this piece of paper, being put at Company 10 and then, also, where the ambulances would be. I would like to say, first, for the Chief that the task that he was given was a monumental one and I commend him and his staff on the work that they have put in thus far. I respectfully add this part mostly because this Board has made commitments in the past to Middlebrook and Deerfield that we would have staffing in those stations. I think to renege on that is not something that would be advised.

Chairman Pyles' comments:

What I would like to propose if there would be someone who would work with Mr. Karaffa, to get input from whomever and then come up with some proposals for us to consider. I would like them to come with a single proposal, but if they can't, bring their two. I don't think we have time to go through and pick these out at this time.

Mr. Beyeler made the following comments:

You know what bothers me about this plan, and Chief, you had a hard job. Areas that had service, and I know Dooms better than any of them, there are a lot of people down at Dooms, Crimora area—a lot of people. If you run from New Hope to Crimora, it's a long crooked road. The thing that bothers me is, Mr. Chair, I'm agreeing with what you're saying that we probably need to look at this further, but we're taking away from areas – Deerfield, Middlebrook, and Dooms. We need those floaters. We need floaters, too, but we're adding people on other projects, or programs, that we already have covered. I'm particularly talking about Riverheads and Fishersville with Rescue. We're taking people and putting them in there and taking them away from these others. That, to me, isn't good.

Mr. Moore said that he did not support the floaters, either.

Mr. Shull made the following comments:

I would like to thank all you volunteers for coming out and showing your concerns. Volunteers organization is not dead. I know we're going through economic hard times right now and everybody has to look out for their jobs and it will heal itself. If the economy turns around, I think volunteers will pick up. We have a lot of ideas here and I don't think we have concluded what we need, yet. I'm not in agreement with taking the floaters out of these companies. I have talked to all three of them. I think they need their people there. I think this is a plan in working and that we need to continue to look at some options here and I think we need a little more time here to look at this.

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)

Mr. Shull moved, seconded by Mr. Beyeler, that the Board table this item until the September 24th Staff Briefing.

Chairman Pyles asked what Mr. Shull's plans were between now and time for discussion.

Mr. Shull's comments:

With all the ideas that we've heard tonight, I think there are a lot of concerns here from every department that is in this County. I think their concerns need to be expressed in this plan. We've heard from Title 27; their concerns. We've heard from floaters. We've heard the ladder truck being placed at 11. I think there are a lot of things that we need to look at that we don't have answers for, yet. I think that we need to discuss this probably in our staff briefing and, maybe, you can have some more ideas by that time. Maybe, by our next meeting, we can take a look at this, again. If the Board members here have any ideas, let them get back with the Chief. In light of everything that has come up this week, we haven't gotten answers from some departments back. It's like Deerfield, you know, if there are concerns there, maybe, we can talk to the volunteers. If they can help out and get somebody there with the career man, that's fine. We need to talk a little more and see what we can do. That's my concerns on it. I think we need to take a little more time to look at it before we go passing something.

Chairman Pyles noted that Title 27 had also been mentioned and asked if both the SAFER deployment proposal and the Career Chief should be tabled. It was the consensus of the Board to table one item at a time.

Mr. Karaffa asked if this tabling would affect the grants timetable. Fire Chief Holloway said that they have agreed to accept the grant, which will be about a three-week training period, beginning September 17th (2-week orientation). He had suggested that deployment not begin until middle of October to give them time to look at the plan. Mr. Karaffa offered to sit down with another member of the Board to discuss with Chief Holloway how to move this process along. He feared that they did not have enough of time to resolve the problems. Chairman Pyles understood from Mr. Shull that he wanted Chief Holloway to be the conduit of the work. Mr. Shull agreed.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

RESCUE SQUAD ASSISTANCE FUND GRANT

Fire Chief Holloway referred to his memorandum, dated August 16th regarding the Rescue Squad Assistance Fund Grant (RSAFG), which is due September 17th. He would like to submit an application for a 50/50 grant requesting for one ambulance and a monitor/defibrillator for the ambulance. Grant funding: Ambulance - Augusta County - \$92,500 (total of \$185,000); Monitor/Defibrillator – Augusta County - \$14,000 (total of \$28,000). Total of the grant request would be \$106,500; local matching funds, county other equipment, would be \$166,500 for a total of \$273,000. He added, at the August 16th meeting, he talked about ambulances with a fourth ambulance being a backup. He had stated that they would apply for one new ambulance, meaning that they would have two ambulances, currently, and one in reserve at this time. He said that he would not know anything until December if approved.

Mr. Wills asked if applied, and received, does the County have to accept it at that point if it is determined that the ambulance is not needed. Fire Chief Holloway said it did not

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)

RESCUE SQUAD ASSISTANCE FUND GRANT (cont'd)

have to be accepted, but it was not a good procedure to follow. "Once you turn it down, it makes it really tough to get it, again." Chairman Pyles added that, if it is the desire of the Board, after further discussion if it is determined that it is not needed, that they could be informed earlier that the grant is not needed at this time.

Mr. Moore moved, seconded by Mr. Wills, that the Board authorize staff to apply for the grant.

Mr. Karaffa felt that looking at Revenue Recovery monies, that used ambulances could be used as well as a new ambulance at a lower cost.

Mr. Beyeler did not feel that we needed this ambulance right now. Mr. Moore pointed out that a commitment is not being made right now. The Board is only authorizing Fire Chief Holloway to submit application for the grant. Mr. Beyeler said it would be more difficult to get another grant if this one is refused.

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

Nays: Karaffa and Beyeler

Motion carried.

* * *

CAREER STAFF (TITLE 27)

Fire Chief Holloway advised that he has spoken with the County Attorney about the revisions. It has been reviewed by several people. He noted that, under Section C.1., suggested alternate language has been included in the document for consideration noting that the "Chief of Fire and Rescue shall have the authority granted him under the provisions of Title 27 of the Code of Virginia. He shall act as coordinator of all Fire and Rescue services throughout the County." He also noted under Section 6, language had been changed to "Under the direction of the Board of Supervisors," the Chief of Fire and Rescue shall have the authority to take any actions necessary to obtain funding and assistance from other localities and from state or federal agencies for those purposes. He also noted changes in fire companies or departments or rescue squads recognized under the Virginia Line of Duty Act, noting the deletion of Goshen First Aid Crew and Fairfield Volunteer Rescue Squad and adding Walker's Creek Fire Department and Cloverhill.

Mr. Karaffa felt that Title 27 will help the County with ISO ratings. Fire Chief Holloway said that ISO has told him that it would help with the County being one umbrella in regards to territories and first due responses. He explained that all of the companies could be counted as one towards the minimum requirement of four in case of a structural fire, where if Stuarts Draft responded alone as first due, four trained people would have to be responding to meet the ISO requirement.

Mr. Karaffa made the following comments:

Currently, we do not have Title 27. I look back at what happened to the people in Fishersville with their station. Now, to preface my remarks, I have all the respect in the world for volunteers, especially, since the hazards that they put themselves into. My concern is that we are not hearing about problems in terms of training paperwork, or training itself, as it pertains to when a company is going to be examined by ISO until that actually happens because they don't have to, necessarily, open that information to you.

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)
CAREER STAFF (TITLE 27) (cont'd)

Fire Chief Holloway's response:

That is correct. We recently had an issue brought up in the latest ISO audit where there are some questions around paperwork and we're now working through the process. We were unaware of it.

Mr. Karaffa's response:

This time when they come back, it's going to be with a fine-tooth comb.

Fire Chief Holloway's response:

That's my understanding; yes. I wasn't there for the audit and I don't want to speak for the Deputy Chief. He was there. Yes, they will be coming back looking for some pretty strong paperwork.

Mr. Karaffa's response:

I have some great concern for the folks that live in my district. Stations that serve my district are Riverheads, Preston L. Yancey, Company 10, Verona and Stuarts Draft. My concern is that if there isn't a good flowing line of communication, that my constituents would see a dramatic increase in their home insurance premiums. That is something that nobody can afford in this economy. My concern is that if we do not have some sort of a clear line of communication in place, that something like Fishersville could happen again and we are leaving ourselves open for it.

Mr. Shull made the following comments:

I think some of those concerns will be addressed. It's here with the Captains and things that they will go day-to-operations on some of these and help them fill out paperwork.

Fire Chief Holloway's response:

To the best of our ability; that's correct. It depends on which plan is chosen. We try to do the best that we can.

Mr. Shull's response:

So as time goes on and this gets implemented, things should improve.

Fire Chief Holloway's response:

I can't answer that. That's the idea.

Mr. Moore's response:

You're thinking on the battalion chiefs?

Fire Chief Holloway's response:

They certainly would be out there to mentor, to help, and to do checks and balances. Maybe not directly train, but to identify needs and then we could get the proper person out there to assist.

Mr. Moore's response:

But paperwork, as an example, they could do as part of their responsibility to make sure there aren't questions on paperwork.

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)
CAREER STAFF (TITLE 27) (cont'd)

Fire Chief Holloway's response:

Yes, they can answer, provide training, mentorship on how to do some paperwork if we have positions and the time to do it.

Mr. Beyeler pointed out a correction to be made on the document. Under Paragraph F, "subparagraph C" should be "E". He also had a problem with the wording in Paragraph D. 2.C., and stated the following:

We ought to all be advocating for volunteers. I'm not sure it is proper to put in here that the volunteers ought to be advocating for volunteers. They are already doing their volunteering. My concern on all of this, when you go through this, you have certain volunteers saying, 'Hey, it isn't worth it anymore.' I've seen us lose volunteers every time we go through this kind of process because the volunteers get the idea that we're not with them. Then when I saw this, that the volunteers got to advocate for volunteers. That's a problem. If we all start advocating for volunteers, and not just the volunteers advocating for volunteers, it would be a whole lot better off.

Fire Chief Holloway's response:

Everybody sees things in a different way. I look at it, certainly, as all of us advocating and working as a team doing this. It just reinforces them. If it is the verbiage or communications issue there, I will certainly address it.

Mr. Beyeler's response:

We do have a committee, now, that meets once a month. When we got in trouble with Preston Yancey, we didn't do that. The whole Board was blindsided on that deal. One reason, and I happened to be on the Board when we decided to have monthly meetings is, if there is a problem with any company, this Board needs to know it before it hits the press. That was something that was brewing for a long time and we were left in the dark and blindsided. With the Committee, hopefully, the Chief, Assistant Chief, or whoever is coming to those meetings, are informing the Board of the problems. Now, we have problems, and they rotate. By the time we get one company up and going like we want it, another one takes its place.

Mr. Karaffa made the following comments:

My concern is that we get a lot of criticism on this Board in terms of Fire and Rescue that we put band-aids on situations, putting out fires, where to gain a whackamo (?) What I would like to see is communication in place that helps to dispel some of that. Let me ask you, Chief, have you encountered resistance from volunteer agencies, or any of our agencies, in terms of their ISO review and having somebody out there to help do, say, a mock survey, or to get their stuff pulled together?

Fire Chief Holloway's response:

We've made those offers and we've had feedback from only one or two agencies on it, but we made the offer countywide.

Mr. Karaffa's response:

Basically, all you're going to get in that monthly meeting from the Chief is, 'We've made an offer; they haven't taken us up on it'. I believe the next question that comes in that meeting is 'So what's your feeling on how they're doing?' And his answer is, 'Not quite sure.' And then before we know it, we're blindsided.

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)
CAREER STAFF (TITLE 27) (cont'd)

Mr. Beyeler's response:

Once we got into the Preston Yancey event, we got monthly updates and the Chief furnished monthly updates and we had who showed up and who didn't show up and we did everything in our power to try to keep them going if they would continue. It didn't improve and we didn't have any choice. If a company, just having a small problem, sometimes, if two Board members that's on that committee can solve that problem without it becoming a major issue, that's the way we need to do it. We don't want to embarrass anybody; we just want good Fire and Rescue services for the people of the County.

Patrick J. Morgan, County Attorney, made the following comment:

I did want to point out in this draft is Paragraph G, parts 1 and 2. One, the companies have volunteers and others have to comply with it. If the Chief becomes aware that there is a problem, then he sets up a team to go and look at the companies to observe and to assist and to make recommendations to change to bring them back up to minimum standards. If that fails, then he would bring it to the Board of Supervisors making recommendations, hopefully, to improve the company. If dissolution is the only solution, than he would make that recommendation, also. I think that gives you two swipes at the apple as to, if there is a problem, we're going to try proactively to deal with it rather than see it in the newspaper first.

Mr. Karaffa said that we currently did not have that option. Mr. Beyeler said we did. "Once that happens, yes we do."

Mr. Wills felt that the verbiage in the first part of Paragraph G. was too harsh.

Chairman Pyles made the following comments:

It seems like there is still some work to be done with this document. Something that I would like to bring up, I don't know if this is appropriate or not. What we continually heard, I've heard, from this Board and from the speakers is that we trust Carson; we don't know about the next guy. What I've told people is the Chief works for the Board and the Board is the ones that calls the shots. They're saying, 'well, maybe something will happen that before the Board can intercede, the problem has already festered, and people have left'. I'm wondering if we should consider any sort of thing that says, 'People can bring grievances to the Board or the Officers Association can bring challenges to the Board for the Board to vote on them'. While that may seem to undermine the Chief, I think it shows whose pulling the levers. If we want to do some consolidation of some sort, the Chief will take the hit for it, when, in fact is what we're driving. I don't know if that is something that will help make the volunteers feel better about things or not. We are the ones that are ultimately responsible, so, maybe, we need to have a more direct involvement.

Mr. Karaffa's response:

I think every person working in Fire and Rescue will agree that the Board of Supervisors in Augusta County has spent a significantly more amount of time proportionately on Fire and Rescue than it has for a long time. Sometimes that amount of attention is a good thing and sometimes it is a bad thing. I know that the attention has been good in the fact that many of the firefighters, both volunteer and career, feel that they can call me. They either live or work in my district. I appreciate those calls when they come in. They speak very well for themselves. I like how that works. I am able to take those concerns and go to Carson or I can go to Deputy Chief and look into those. My concern is bringing it out to the Association might magnify the problem.

Mr. Shull felt that this needed to be discussed further.

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)
CAREER STAFF (TITLE 27) (cont'd)

Mr. Shull moved, seconded by Mr. Beyeler, that the Board table this item until the September 24th Staff Briefing.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

Mr. Moore asked if anyone has concerns about Title 27 to get with their representative.

* * *

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)
PRESTON L. YANCEY AGREEMENT

Mr. Morgan reported that the attorney for Preston Yancey Fire Station and he have been through intense negotiation. He noted that a great concern was renting out the Social Hall, kitchen, and other places. The sub-company (the Augusta Fire and Rescue Company) would remain at Preston Yancey and be able to charge the rents. The language has been agreed upon.

Mr. Moore added that he has spoken with Mr. Swisher, who is the President, who has reviewed the document with his attorney, and they are comfortable with the language. Mr. Swisher asked that after the transfer, there be an inventory done of all the equipment, etc., by a representative of the County (possibly Minday Craun).

Mr. Moore moved, seconded by Mr. Shull, that the Board approve the agreement as presented.

Mr. Beyeler suggested that there be some money left for operation. Mr. Morgan said that was designated in the agreement.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

Mr. Morgan mentioned that the Board received an attachment with their agenda a document regarding "Issues for Firefighters". He explained that this information had been pulled off of the Internal Revenue Services' website, noting that "Expenses and Reimbursements" indicates how to reimburse volunteers. It states that if it is an "accountable plan," that it would not be counted as income, but if it is a "lump sum payment," than it would be counted as income. An "accountable plan" is where they incur expenses and can adequately account for them and then they are paid for those expenses.

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC - NONE

* * * * *

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

* * *

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

- 2. Panhandling – complaints continue. Mr. Beyeler said that the Ordinance Committee met today and discussed panhandling along with other items and will be submitting several items in either November or December to the Board. Mr. Moore added that one of the rules that would govern panhandling also would limit volunteer organizations in terms of fundraising. Mr. Morgan is doing some research on how other jurisdictions are handling panhandling.
- 3. Abandoned water tanks – asked for status of painting or to be taken down? Chairman Pyles said the tanks have been kept for a while to determine if needed. It is costly to repaint and will be torn down soon.
- 4. Staunton Senior Dance – let him know if tickets are needed.
- 5. News Leader article – thank you for Hometown Heroes article.
- 6. Recycling Beverley Manor member has resigned; will be looking for another member for replacement.

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF

Staff discussed the following:

- 1. Staff’s vehicles – Sheriff’s Department policy distributed to the Board. Solicited Board’s input.
- 2. Mandates Task Force – Information distributed to the Board. Asked for Board’s input.
- 3. AIB signage – A previous Board member had suggested signage to recognize County’s support of agriculture and to identify the Ag Forestal districts. Asked if the current Board is interested. Will be placed on the pending file for another month.
- 4. Forest Service Funding - Jennifer M. Whetzel, Director of Finance, said that the County receives annually what is known as Secure and Rural School Funding. This funding came about in the early 1900’s where they had established a National Forest System and had taken any revenues generated from the uses on the National Forest and gave the money to the counties. Over the last 10 years, this money has been dwindling due to low revenues and some of the larger states that have a lot of national forests, have lobbied to continue the funding. In 2008, they restored it to the full funding and, since 2008, the schools have received approximately \$1 million, roughly \$200,000 annually, and then a portion of that goes to Fire and Rescue. Previously, it could be spent on equipment; now, it is based on search and rescues on federal land or on the wildfire community programs, which the PDC is currently working on for us. The Fire and Rescue portion has been narrowed to the point that it is difficult to spend the funds received. Annually, certification is needed to receive the funds; 85% goes to the School Board. This year, the County had the option to forgo the 15% that was Fire and Rescue. This should increase payment in lieu of tax payment that is also received from the Federal government, which is based on the acreage of forestland. The annual certification has been filed. Chairman Pyles asked if this has been included in the School Board budget. Ms. Whetzel said it had.
- 5. SAW Consortium Health Insurance Renewal – information distributed to the Board. Will be discussed in October.
- 6. Virginia Wind Power Coalition Letter – Virginia Wind Power Coalition letter drafted for the County Attorney’s signature. Previously, Mr. Morgan VACo had expressed the interest of drafting a model ordinance for Wind Energy Systems. The County had just gone through that process, so he volunteered to assist VACo. This draft was sent to DEQ; DEQ wanted to make some revisions; therefore, Mr. Morgan volunteered to assist DEQ with that process. Virginia Wind Power Coalition asked Mr. Morgan to submit a letter to Senators Warner

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF (cont'd)

and Webb. He asked for the Board's approval. He added that the letter supports the Wind Energy System and the tax credits available.

Mr. Karaffa moved, seconded by Mr. Shull, that the Board authorize the County Attorney to submit the letter to Senators Warner and Webb.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

7. VACo Credentials Form for annual meeting.

Mr. Beyeler moved, seconded by Mr. Shull, that the Board authorize voting certification for the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

- 8. VDOT Commonwealth Transportation Board appointment – F. Dixon Whitworth, Jr., of Winchester, Virginia (retired Bank Executive at BB&T). Mr. Moore asked that it be put on record that Augusta County is looking forward to working with the new CTB member.
- 9. VDOT CTB meeting – September 18th in Winchester – Mr. Coffield will be attending.
- 10. CSA (Comprehensive Services Act) briefed Mr. Karaffa today and followed it up with a tour of the Juvenile Detention Center. Tour was offered to any Board member who wished to go.

* * * * *

CLOSED SESSION

On motion of Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. Pattie, 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 concerning the disposition of real property where discussion in open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body]:

A) Regional Jail

September 12, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION (cont'd)

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

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

 Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

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

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

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

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

Roll Call Vote was as follows:

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

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

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business to come before the Board, Mr. Moore 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

County Administrator