
Regular Meeting, Wednesday, July 24, 2013, at 7:00 p.m. Government Center, Verona, VA.

PRESENT: Jeffrey A. Moore, Chairman
Larry J. Wills, Vice-Chairman
David R. Beyeler
David A. Karaffa
Marshall W. Pattie
Tracy C. Pyles, Jr.
Michael L. Shull
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, July 24, 2013, at 7:00 p.m., at the Government Center, Verona, Virginia, and in the 238th year of the Commonwealth....

* * * * *

Chairman Moore welcomed the citizens present.

* * * * *

Betty Hawpe, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

* * * * *

Tracy C. Pyles, Jr., Pastures District, delivered invocation.

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC - NONE

* * * * *

VDOT SECONDARY SYSTEM FUNDING RE-ALLOCATION

The Board considered formula for equalizing funding.

Patrick J. Coffield, County Administrator, advised that this had been discussed at Monday's Staff Briefing.

Chairman Moore added there have been several meetings on this issue and noted infrastructure projects had been deleted from formula as requested by the Board.

Mr. Karaffa moved, seconded by Mr. Wills, that the Board approve the equalized option.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

HOLLISTER

The Board considered Hollister TIF resolution and agreements.

Dennis Burnett, Director of Economic Development, reported that this had been reviewed briefly at Monday's Staff Briefing and was consistent with the full presentation made to the Board in May, 2013. Before the Board tonight is a resolution which outlines the program criteria that includes the Tax Increment Financing (TIF), which is used as a match for the Virginia Investment Partnership. Also, before the Board are the actual TIF agreements: 1) Development Agreement, which outlines the program criteria; 2) Contribution Agreement, which is the County's contribution to EDA; and 3) the Grant Agreement is between EDA and the company in order to expedite the funds.

July 24, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.

HOLLISTER (cont'd)

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

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF AUGUSTA COUNTY, VIRGINIA**

WHEREAS, Hollister Incorporated, a Illinois corporation (the "Company") is the owner of an existing manufacturing facility in Augusta County, Virginia (the "Facility").

WHEREAS, the Company intends to expand production at its manufacturing Facility, the expansion will produce \$29.6 million in capital expenditures dedicated to machinery, tools and construction. Additionally, the 100 jobs to be retained are critical to the ongoing vitality of Augusta County; and specifically to make certain interior alterations and infrastructure improvements in connection with the expansion (the "Project").

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of Augusta County, Virginia (the "Board of Supervisors") has received and reviewed the proposal of the Company to undertake the Project.

WHEREAS, the Company, has applied for a grant from the Virginia Investment Partnership (VIP) through the Virginia Economic Development Partnership ("VEDP"), for the purpose of inducing the Company to undertake the Project.

WHEREAS, the Company has received approval of a grant from the VIP and expects to receive the amount of \$250,000.00 from the VIP (the "VIP Grant").

WHEREAS, under the terms of the VIP Grant, the County is to match the VIP Grant, in the amount of \$250,000.00 which is being satisfied through a tax increment financing grant payment in the amount of \$250,000.00 ("County Grant").

WHEREAS, the Company has also received funds from the Virginia Jobs Investment Program (VJIP) through the Virginia Department of Business Assistance (VDBA) in the amount of \$50,000.00.

WHEREAS, local employees are expected to be employed, and local suppliers, contractors and services are expected to be utilized, in connection with the development and operation of the Project.

WHEREAS, the Project is expected to generate increased real property, machinery and tools, personal property and business license tax revenues for the County, which can then be used for the further benefit of the residents of the County.

WHEREAS, the Project is in accordance with the desire of the County to attract commercial enterprises to the County to diversify and strengthen its economic base, provide jobs for its citizens and otherwise provide for controlled development of its land with minimal negative impact on its environment and resources.

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors desires to facilitate the Project by the provision of the GOF Grant and the County Grant to, or for the use of, the Company

WHEREAS, to that end there has been presented to this meeting a certain Performance Agreement by and among the County, the Economic Development Authority of Augusta County, Virginia, and the Company (the "Agreement"), a copy of which is filed with the records of the Board of Supervisors.

WHEREAS, also there have been presented to this meeting preliminary drafts of the following documents (collectively, the "Documents") copies of which shall be filed with the records of the Board of Supervisors:

(a) Development Agreement by and between the County and the Company (the "Development Agreement").

(b) Contribution Agreement by and between the County and the Industrial Development Authority of Augusta County, Virginia (the "Contribution Agreement").

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF AUGUSTA COUNTY, VIRGINIA:

1. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds and determines that the Project will provide substantial economic and other benefits to the County through the creation of jobs, increase of tax revenues, enhancement of the commercial and industrial base and utilization of local suppliers, contractors and services.

July 24, 2013, at 7:00 p.m.

HOLLISTER (cont'd)

2. The animating purpose for the County's undertakings under the Agreement is the public benefit derived from the Project.

3. The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, either of whom may act, are hereby authorized and directed to execute the Documents and to deliver the Documents to the other parties thereto.

4. The Documents shall be in substantially the form submitted to this meeting, which is hereby approved, with such completions, omissions, insertions and changes as may be subsequently approved by the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, which approval shall be evidenced conclusively by the execution and delivery of the Agreement by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

5. The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors is authorized to affix the seal of the County to the Documents and to attest such seal.

6. Each officer of the County is authorized to execute and deliver on behalf of the County such other instruments, documents or certificates and to do and perform such things and acts, as they shall deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the transactions authorized by this Resolution or contemplated by the Agreement.

7. All acts of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Board of Supervisors and other officers of the County, including without limitation, the County Administrator, the Director of Finance and the County Attorney, regardless of whether such acts occurred prior to or occur after the adoption of this Resolution, that are in conformity with the purposes and intent of this Resolution and in furtherance of the undertaking of the Project are hereby approved and ratified.

8. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

Mr. Beyeler moved, seconded by Mr. Karaffa, that the Board approve the Development Agreement; Contribution Agreement and the Grant Agreement.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

LIFECORE – ROUTE 636

The Board endorsement of resolution.

Chairman Moore mentioned that this had been discussed at the Staff Briefing on Monday and that Mr. Burnett was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Wills moved, seconded by Mr. Pattie, that the Board adopt the following resolution:

**Resolution of Support
for
LIFECORE: BLUE RIDGE HEALTH SCIENCE CORRIDOR**

WHEREAS, Augusta County, is committed to strategically growing its local economy and has committed to the construction and development of Route 636; and

July 24, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.

LIFECORE – ROUTE 636 (cont'd)

WHEREAS, development of the corridor supports the goals set forth in the Economic Development Strategic plan that call for the Support of Existing Business and Stimulation of New Business, and further supports the Comprehensive Plan, pertaining to Economic Development; and

WHEREAS, support of the growing medical corridor along Route 636 in Fishersville, strengthens the existing business cluster and optimizes its location strategy, further providing opportunities for future growth; and

WHEREAS, a stakeholder group was formed that represented a cross section of key private and public partners involved in the corridor’s development, thus creating a desire to achieve brand awareness and location competitiveness on state, regional, national and international levels; and

WHEREAS, stakeholder consensus was to brand the corridor as LIFECORE: BLUE RIDGE HEALTH SCIENCE CORRIDOR; thus creating an opportunity as one of Virginia’s fastest growing clusters of medical, rehabilitation, life-science, and wellness services; and

WHEREAS, Augusta County, as a key stakeholder through its investment and participation in development of Route 636 was presented a Place Branding Corridor Report of the region; and

WHEREAS, Augusta County acknowledges the dynamic medical corridor as an engine for economic growth, thus creating high-quality job opportunities and an increased tax base; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Augusta County Board of Supervisors, values the investment set forth by the stakeholders as key partners and supports their endeavor to brand their services provided along the emerging life sciences district along Route 636 in Fishersville known as LIFECORE: BLUE RIDGE HEALTH SCIENCE CORRIDOR.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

Chairman Moore made the following comment:

I would like to take a moment, Mr. Burnett, this is your last official public meeting with us and we, as a Board, wish you the best of luck in your future endeavors and we also hope you will take care of us in your future endeavors. We look forward to seeing you here and you are always welcome. Thank you for the leadership you have given us and the great success we’ve had and we wish you the very best of luck.

Mr. Burnett made the following comment:

It has been truly and honor to serve you. You have set a precedent out there, I think, a great example to follow. I think Mr. Shull said it best. He had high expectations of me before. Wait until he sees what I expect from me, now. I do look forward to being back before the Board and I do greatly appreciate the support you have given us. We’ve had an incredible record and it has been unanimous every time. Thank you very much for the support.

* * * * *

NEW HOPE/CHURCHVILLE FIRE AND RESCUE STAFFING

The Board considered recommendation of Emergency Service Committee for additional career part-time staffing at New Hope and Churchville agencies.

| | |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| New Hope Fire & Rescue | \$74,212 |
| Churchville Fire & Rescue | <u>56,168</u> |
| | \$130,380 |

Funding Options:

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Volunteer Fuel Account | #32020-5602 | \$ 35,000 |
| Volunteer TPP Account | #32020-6010 | 10,000 |
| Volunteer F&R Training Account | #32020-3205 | 50,000 |
| County CIP (F&R) Account | #80000-8152 | <u>35,380</u> |
| | | \$130,380 |

July 24, 2013, at 7:00 p.m.

NEW HOPE/CHURCHVILLE FIRE AND RESCUE STAFFING (cont'd)

Fire Chief Carson Holloway gave a PowerPoint presentation with the following highlights:

Response Challenges and Initiatives:

- ▶ Augusta County has an estimated 900 volunteers of which 490 meet the minimum requirements for fuel reimbursement and property tax incentives FY 2012
- ▶ County Career consist of 9 Administrative and 72 Operational staff
- ▶ 2012 overall call volume was 18,700 calls, turnover to next due was a combined 2.8% for all agencies/YTD 2013 it is 3.2%
- ▶ While many areas of the County have experienced growth others have remained rural with an aging population
- ▶ Several stations are experiencing issues with call volumes and sufficient personnel to provide consistent service delivery
- ▶ There are areas that have either significant turnover on first call or a high volume of calls where there are secondary calls not answered

Augusta County Primary Agencies 8 Fire / 4 Rescue / 7 Combinations

Fire Departments:

| | | |
|------------|---|------|
| Company 3 | Middlebrook Volunteer Fire Department | 1948 |
| Company 6 | Verona Volunteer Fire Company | 1958 |
| Company 7 | Stuarts Draft Volunteer Fire Company | 1950 |
| Company 8 | Craigsville Volunteer Fire Department | 1960 |
| Company 9 | Dooms Volunteer Fire Company | 1962 |
| Company 10 | Augusta County Fire Department Volunteers | 1941 |
| Company 14 | Swoope Volunteer Fire Department | 1979 |
| Company 19 | Wilson Volunteer Fire Company | 1986 |

Rescue Squads:

| | | |
|-----------|---------------------------------|------|
| Rescue 1* | Waynesboro First Aid Crew | 1951 |
| Rescue 5* | Staunton-Augusta Rescue Squad | 1938 |
| Rescue 6 | Stuarts Draft Rescue Squad | 1970 |
| Rescue 16 | Craigsville-Augusta Springs FAC | 1971 |

Combination Departments Fire & Rescue:

| | | |
|----------------------|---|-----------|
| Company 2 | Deerfield Valley Volunteer Fire Department | 1964 |
| Company 4 | Churchville Volunteer Fire Department & FAC | 1959 |
| Company 5 / R26 ** | Weyers Cave Volunteer Fire Department | 1923/2013 |
| Company 11 | Preston L. Yancey Station | 1977 |
| Company 18 | New Hope Volunteer Fire Department | 1991 |
| Company 21 *** | Mt. Solon Volunteer Fire Company & Rescue | 1989 |
| Company 25 / R 25 ** | Riverheads Volunteer Fire Department | 2011/2013 |

July 24, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.

NEW HOPE/CHURCHVILLE FIRE AND RESCUE STAFFING (cont'd)

* **SARS and WFAC provide own career staff**

** **Fire Department Volunteer with Rescue Operated by County**

Career Staff/Magisterial Districts

Career Staff coverage over multiple Magisterial Districts

Fire Chief Holloway noted there is career coverage in 13 stations, but there are 6 stations that actually boarder several Magisterial Districts and the career staff serve multiple districts; for example, Churchville is on the border of North River and Pastures. He also noted that, while some Magisterial Districts do have more career, there are a lot of sharing across their areas of resources.

No. of Staff / District:

| | |
|--------------|----------|
| Pastures | 15 |
| Wayne | 18 |
| Beverley | 15 |
| Middle River | 9 |
| North River | 3 |
| South River | 3 |
| Riverheads | <u>9</u> |
| Total | 72 |

Fire Chief Holloway displayed Present Staffing ACFR Career (72 Operational & 9 Administrative) at Mount Solon, Churchville, Deerfield and Craigsville and identified Monday through Friday daylight stations 6 to 6 and the ones that have 24 hour staffing. He noted that career staff are spread evenly across the County.

New Hope Fire Department Specific Challenges and Initiatives

- ▶ Lack of sufficient administrative and operational personnel to meet service delivery needs for both Fire and EMS 24/7
- ▶ Recruitment and Retention issues due in part to lower population and call volume
- ▶ Majority of membership does not live in community
- ▶ High turnover of EMS initial calls to 2nd due
- ▶ Concerns with meeting an acceptable ISO rating
- ▶ Concerns with meeting Virginia Office of EMS mandates on service delivery

Emergency Services Committee Recommendations

- ▶ Deploy floaters to provide 24/7 coverage to areas having ongoing manpower or coverage issues
- ▶ Backfill staff shortages from floater deployment with part time personnel
- ▶ Work with agencies with a Performance Improvement Plan for long term solutions
- ▶ Emergency Services Committee and Chief of Fire-Rescue continue working with agency administration in initiating plan on service improvements
- ▶ Emergency Services Committee and Chief of Fire-Rescue will work with agency to assure the best interest of Public Safety is met

Staffing Recommendations:

Would not increase any staffing; currently, there are 15 career staff, 5 per shift at Station 10 (one is the Captain Duty Officer). Suggested that they would redeploy one personnel from Station 10 to the New Hope area. This would drop staffing at Station 10 to 12, 4 per shift. The Duty Officer is not counted on ordinary responses. His job, after

July 24, 2013, at 7:00 p.m.

NEW HOPE/CHURCHVILLE FIRE AND RESCUE STAFFING (cont'd)

6:00 p.m., is to cover the entire County as a Duty Officer and support all companies. Staff has also enclosed an addendum to the original agreement along with a Performance Improvement Plan for the New Hope Fire Department that includes specific objectives and timelines to meet the plan. New Hope has agreed to the terms of the addendum and the Performance Improvement Plan.

Jennifer M. Whetzel, Director of Finance, displayed a spreadsheet and explained that the costs are associated with backfilling those full-time career floater positions with part-time. It is based on 24-hour shifts, the number of personnel needed at an hourly rate and FICA has been included. There is a small amount of money indicated for wearing apparel. FLSA and Holiday Pay is also included. Currently New Hope gets 75% of their Revenue Recovery. If they go to 5 or more people in the station, that split would be 35%/65%. They would be getting less Revenue Recovery at that point and the County would be getting more due to the career that is in the Station. She explained that there may be a contingency fund payment for New Hope to bring them back to their full funding. She noted that the Board has already budgeted for the contingency payments in the Revenue Recovery budget. The total cost for 11 months in FY14, minus the Revenue Recovery that would be coming back to the County and minus the \$15,000 that Middle River District has already put towards this funding, would be \$74,212. That would be the reallocation of an existing appropriation. Going into the 2015 Budget, to get it to a full year, the total cost would be approximately \$121,000.

Fire Chief Holloway added that this was part-time coverage to backfill a floater who was originally pulling coverage at other stations. He noted that the floaters are deployed often with aiding employees in vacationing and sick leave.

Fire Chief Holloway noted that the Board also had information included in their packages of Churchville. He said that they are addressing some concerns from Churchville. They had requested additional staffing. He has contacted the Chief on several occasions to schedule a meeting and was recently informed that he would be meeting with his membership tomorrow night. One concern was the amount of funding changes regarding how their Revenue Recovery would be affected. Currently, Revenue Recovery is a split 75/25 with 75% going to the agency and 25% going to the County with only three career personnel. When career personnel goes above five, the funding falls back to 65/35 with 65% going to the County and 35% going to the agency.

Mr. Pyles noted that at the last Staff Meeting, Mr. Wills had mentioned the need to look at how calls are funded. He felt that funding for calls and Revenue Recovery with staffing needs to have a fuller evaluation. He asked that the Emergency Services Committee look at this issue and provide a proposal to the Board. Mr. Pyles expressed concern of the contingency funding and asked Ms. Whetzel what the difference would be. Ms. Whetzel said it would put them, based on their call volume, \$22,000 less in Revenue Recovery. Mr. Pyles felt that they needed to looking at a funding formula to determine "what is the fairest and most objective way".

Chairman Moore clarified Mr. Pyles' request of the Emergency Services Committee to evaluate and come back with a recommendation to the Board.

Mr. Wills agreed with Mr. Pyles. "Rockingham County has a unique way of dividing its Revenue Recovery. It is based on the personnel that is in that ambulance when it goes out the door. Who provides it is the way it is split. It makes a complicated system for keeping track of it, but that is one reason why we have hired an analyst to come in and will be on staff."

Mr. Karaffa expressed concern of situations with multiple departments and volunteers. "In the deliberations, we are really going to need to look at how much this is going to cost to administer."

NEW HOPE/CHURCHVILLE FIRE AND RESCUE STAFFING (cont'd)

Mr. Wills noted that during the Budget process, it was presented, but not acted upon, a reimbursement number for the departments. They said that it would be readdressed.

Mr. Shull felt that when you talk about the value of the companies, "all of these firefighters are valuable to us. You need to do things across the board for each company the same. You can't fund one company one way and another company different." He noted that it was different with Revenue Recovery with Rescue versus Fire.

Mr. Wills said that he has tried working with the New Hope Company for 18 months. There has never been a specific plan but he felt that the County would assure that services would be provided.

Mr. Wills moved, seconded by Mr. Pattie, that the Board approve the revised recommendation:

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| New Hope Fire & Rescue | | \$74,212 |
| Funding Sources: | | |
| Volunteer Fuel Account | #32020-5602 | \$ 19,950 |
| Volunteer TPP Account | #32020-6010 | 5,700 |
| Volunteer F&R Training Account | #32020-3205 | 28,500 |
| County CIP (F&R) Account | #80000-8152 | <u>20,062</u> |
| | | \$ 74,212 |

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

The Board considered endorsement of plan, as revised.

Chairman Moore advised that this was discussed at the Staff Briefing on Monday and that Fire Chief Holloway was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Pattie moved, seconded by Mr. Karaffa, that the Board endorse the Community Wildfire Protection Plan, as revised.

Mr. Coffield added that the Planning District Commission exceeded their budget in preparing their report. They have asked for additional funding. He suggested that they consider additional grant funding as well as marketing "our" template with other County's in our PDC and recovering their costs from those plans.

Chairman Moore felt that they needed to develop a plan with funds that are available.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

July 24, 2013, at 7:00 p.m.

ROUTE 636 TRAFFIC ACCESS WAIVERS

The Board considered endorsement of waivers for submittal to VDOT.

Timmy Fitzgerald, Director of Community Development, advised that this had been discussed at Monday's Staff Briefing. He noted that the Board shared a concern that if this exception was granted, VDOT would likely want a signal agreement as to who would pay for that signal. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that he had discussed with the developer who indicated that they were willing to enter into an agreement to be responsible for the cost.

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

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

The Board considered draft ordinance for establishing Board of Equalization hearing schedule for a period not to exceed June 30th of the year appointed.

Ms. Whetzel reported that, at the Reassessment Committee meeting on Monday, the plan for scheduling notices and meeting rooms for the Board of Equalization was discussed. They had been informed of a Code Section that may allow for the Board of Equalization to meet less than one full year. The Board is, by Code Section, appointed for an entire year by the Judge; however, there is a Code Section that also states that the Board of Equalization could dispose of all applications for adjustments to assessments no later than a date that the Board sets in a year. Mr. Morgan has drafted language which was attached to tonight's agenda. She noted that this would allow for the Board of Equalization to meet for six months ending on June 30th and that all applications would need to be made to the Board of Equalization by May 15th, which would allow 45 days notice to set appeal. A public hearing will be required.

Mr. Wills suggested that the dates be set so that it would not fall on a weekend. Mr. Morgan said that if it fell on a weekend, the statute is that the applicant would have until the Monday after the weekend to file. He added that the intent is that it can be applied to any reassessment but would look at it more closely and fashion it for this particular year.

Mr. Wills moved, seconded by Mr. Karaffa, that the Board authorize staff to advertise ordinance for public hearing.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

WAIVERS/VARIANCES – NONE

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

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

July 24, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA (cont'd)

MINUTES

Considered minutes of the following meetings:

- Regular Meeting, Wednesday, July 10, 2013

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

(END OF CONSENT AGENDA)

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE BOARD

The Board discussed the following issues:

Mr. Pyles: School Board Project List had been distributed to Board on Monday and made the following comment:

I do appreciate some of the efforts by the School Board. I think that they have listened to this Board to an extent. The changing from the stand-alone central office building of several million dollars to consolidation with us is a great achievement and overdue. It is a good thing. I think they will be down here and everybody will be glad about it. That we were able to take space we had and make it work for the good of the people and efficiency of everyone, I think that is something. It is something that this Board knocked on for two years. I appreciate that. I said some things to the School Board. One thing was, 'why not'? And looking at some of the concerns that we have with the Beverley Manor Middle School in terms of days of education, remoteness, things like that, transportation costs, and I heard one of the Board members, as she was speaking about the project list, pretty much stated most of those things. They got away from being locked into requiring only configurations of K to 5 elementary, 6 to 8 middle, and 9 to 12 high schools. They were looking at these wings at these schools. I appreciate that they are thinking things somewhat differently now and on the first part, for sure, it saved us money. The second part, I don't think so as much. I think what the problem is, and why we don't see things the same way, is because there isn't a comprehensive look at what the job is and the needs are and in a timing sequence. For two years, now, Dr. Pattie has consistently virtually every time Dr. Bishop is here and every time we meet, the Board says, 'We really need a strategic plan from the School Board. A comprehensive strategic plan to let us know where we're going, how we're going to get there, what's it going to cost us, what you want to do, what's going to be the good of it. That really hasn't happened. The News Leader took it a little further and said the School Board needs to plan further out. They wanted to go for the next century. My goodness! Eighty-some years, I don't care about that far out. Even my great-grandchildren will be going someplace else by then and it is very difficult. There is education that comes from planning even if the plans have to be changed; even if the anticipated happenings don't happen. Giving us this project list isolated and very ambiguous as to what it represents is very difficult for me to focus on and I think that we have to help direct the School Board in a comprehensive look of things. If they give us this information, then they will have to look at it themselves. It is like, you know, your son wants a car; he says, 'Dad, I can afford a car. I've got \$500,' and then you'll say, 'Well, you're going to need gas; you're going to need insurance; is that thing going to need tires?' Pretty soon, 'I'll just drive yours, Dad.' It comes down to that. You look at things one way and then when you look at them fuller, the same answer may not be there. We went through quite an ordeal in the first half of this year with this place being full back in the hallway and very little of what they were discussing and bringing to us was on capital needs. It was on salaries. It was on technology. It was on 'our auditorium doesn't have a sound system'. One lady said they didn't have staplers. There were a lot of needs that came up and very few of them were about capital, and, yet, that's what we have here, just capital needs. When I look at them, I am concerned for a number of reasons. Dr. Bishop previously sent us their enrollment list for the year. He was good enough to put program capacity. He was good enough to put the number of students there. When I did my look at that, we have 2,502 empty seats. That doesn't count any space for Governor School or for Valley Vo-Tech, and, yet, we have students there. It cost us \$25,000 a seat for Wilson Middle School, 2,500 seats at \$25,000 is \$62,500,000 worth of capacity we're not using now. If you want to say it's half that, the seats are worth \$1,250, you're still over \$31 million in space that we aren't presently

July 24, 2013, at 7:00 p.m.

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

utilizing. When I look at what they're proposing here, we're going to have more empty seats when we're done than when we go forward. Even with the elimination of Beverley Manor Elementary of 540 seats, we will have to build more seats for the Middle School wings at the two high schools and what they want to do with Wilson Middle School. I don't know what they might want to do at Riverheads Elementary -- more than 600 seats? When I look at what I think they need to do for these high schools, I can see us generating another \$10 million worth of empty seats. Think about Beverley Manor Elementary will be in Beverley Manor Middle School. That's a school that was built for 800, we got it finished and paid for and we're going to have 370 students in it; 430 empty seats in that building. They said, 'Well, we're going to have some space to grow.' Depending on how large they make those wings, there won't be any place to send them. When we build the wings, we're going to have limitations on how many kids can go to the middle and high schools that we have there. We're going to have a tremendous capacity in elementary schools, but not the ability to handle them at the next level. We're not building them for growth; we're going to be having that many more extra seats. So if we start having the \$70 million worth of empty seats, and we have \$80 million right now that we have, yet, to pay on our capital. One of the articles that I read said that what they were looking at \$35 million worth of improvements and they could afford about \$22 million. I'm worried that what we'll wind up, again, you know, I'm worried about us going forward with architect funds because you will allow the camel's nose under the tent, so you started funding it as if you approved it. Before we do that, I think we have to look at a number of things to be able to say, 'Is this the best use of our money' when we look at everything? These are the questions that I am going to forward to Mr. Coffield to send over to Dr. Bishop and the School Board and I hope they don't see them as anything other than attempt for us to do our due diligence and try to avoid a future where we have folks coming in here pounding us for not having salaries when the money is diverted. Every reassessment that I've been here for, the money was 100% thought to go to construction. The only exception is when this Board fought back and split it. Will they want the additional reassessment funds going to that and not address the needs that we heard from 100s of people during this spring? These are the questions, and I think they are fair:

1. How far behind are our teachers to the average compensation for teachers at Rockingham, Rockbridge, Nelson, Green Counties and Harrisonburg, Staunton, and Waynesboro? If we're behind, is it a priority for the School Board to close this gap? If so, please indicate at what period of time the School Board wishes to close this gap.

Let's suppose that we're 10% behind the average and that's what they want to pick up. So that they say, 'For five years, we want to be above the average increases for these others by 2%.' If everybody else is getting 2%, then we would have to give 4% on a continuing basis to get caught up. Is that what they want to do? Is that what they're envisioning, or are they comfortable with us being 10% behind? Let's know if it's a priority for them. If it is, what is their plan? What do they think we ought to do? How much will that cost?

2. What are the technological needs required to bring Augusta County Schools up to an acceptable standard? What is the estimated cost and how quickly does the School Board want to accomplish this?

We heard about computers. We heard about whiteboards, other technology. People even said they didn't have enough staplers.

What are your needs in that regard? Do you have a total figure for it? How do you want to spread it over five years? Do you have to get it done in five? Is it ten? Is it one?

Let's have a dollar figure. What is your target need in technology?

3. What are the replacement needs and cost for the bus fleet over the next five years?

We heard that our fleet was aging. We are going to get to the point where we need to buy 20 buses in one year instead of five or three every year. What do they envision? They know how many miles we drive a year; how many miles on each bus; what do they think our fleet needs? Let's have that figure and what they're thinking of timing for that is.

July 24, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.

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

4. What will you give to the architects as requested scope of each project? For Riverheads Elementary School is a renovation for 600 seat school as it exists or larger? For Riverheads Elementary new structure, is the school still 600 or will it be for a larger school? For the middle school "wings" is this just for classrooms or will any support space be needed?

It's one thing just to put up 10 classrooms that can handle 200. Do we have the music space; the arts space; the auditorium space; the cafeteria space; athletic field needs? Are they going to be a part of the scope of the need? When we look at Stuarts Draft Middle School and its 900 capacity, really the core is just for 720, so you really can't think of that other 180. I wouldn't want us to build the space and say we've got 1,000 capacity building but in reality, we don't. If we need to have these other things, we're going to have to readdress those later on.

What capacity for each is being requested?

When I looked at the proportional splitting of the 754 students at Beverley Manor to be proportional to the same division of population between Riverheads and Buffalo Gap, they would need 218 spaces at Buffalo Gap because they have a 720 school. That would take them to 958, so I said 1,000 seats, that would give them 42 for growth. Is that going to be enough or are they going to have to build beyond that? At Riverheads, I came up with 930 as an end number, and that would give them 42 empty seats. What will they want? Is this going to be a 1,000 capacity building; 1,200 for growth or not? They are going to have to give the architect a number. Let's us have the number before that goes out. For Wilson Middle School, how many additional seats are being requested? Is that going to take it up to the originally conceived 720? Is it just enough to get by? What is it that is intended to be there?

5. What, if any capital projects do you foresee in the next five years for Verona and Cassell?

Cassell has been on the table as long as I've been on the Board. It was there when we were doing Churchville and the others and it has continued. There's been some work there, thanks to a fire, but that caused that to happen. Are they good for five years with that? Do they intend to do anything with that? Let's know, now. I'm just saying five years. Let's know what the 5-year anticipation is so we can do that.

6. If these additions are put in place, what do you see as the expected school enrollments at each of our schools? Please include our space allotments at Shenandoah Valley Governor School and Valley Vo-Tech.

Let's look at how much space we have in total, how we're using it and what our schools look like afterwards. Will we be happy with Beverley Elementary having 370 in an 800 building? Is that acceptable to everybody? It may be, but let's all of us know what the numbers are.

7. What are they using as projection of Augusta County enrollments over the next five years?

We know that next year they are predicting a drop in enrollments. That's what they budgeted. Now, they may have budgeted conservatively and really believe that they will have as many. I don't know. It may, as before, turn out differently. But budget-wise, they are telling us they will have fewer students. That's been the trend. We've been going down little by little for quite a while. We have not grown forever. 1998, I think was our high point and we've gone down since then. Is that a trend that is going to continue? I know the Board members speak and say, 'We've got to be ready for the growth.' There are two different growths in our population. We've gone from 54,000 to 75,000. We've been growing like 12% over 10 years. That has nothing, or little to do, with changes in student enrollments because while that's gone up, school population has gone down. There are so many factors that come into play with that. Economy. Birthrates. People just can't afford kids anymore. We have a new factor that I think they need to really look at. I see more and more ads on television for private schools whether it be Stuart Hall, whether it be over at Charlottesville, whether it be Ridgeview Christian, they're on television now in a way that I haven't seen before.

July 24, 2013, at 7:00 p.m.

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

Why? Because, now, there is this carrot from the General Assembly to get \$25 million of State credit offsets going into these schools, so I think the private schools see an opportunity to pull more public students, the people that were on the edge of being able to afford it, may now be able to afford it. I don't know that they've looked at that. I don't know what it will be. But \$25 million is a start. If we get 1% of it, it is \$250,000 in the Augusta County area to be spread along schools. Will it move 50 kids; 20 kids? I don't know, but it might be that. I would like to know what they see as our enrollment for the next five years. That's our basis for State revenue generation. We've got revenue generation by students, and then we have our taxes. So let's look at the needs, these things in total. This is not a strategic plan, but it is basic information; nuts and bolts, revenue capacity spending that I think are necessary to make educated and prudent and business-like decisions on the future of our County education system. I am going to send these to Mr. Coffield and ask him to get that information back from the School Board.

Chairman Moore asked that Mr. Coffield send the questions to all Board members.

Mr. Karaffa, in reference to adequate technology, asked Mr. Pyles what he hoped to learn. Mr. Pyles felt that it was the School Board's call in what they thought was needed. He would like to inform the public. He basically wants to know what the School Board needs now or what is needed in the future.

Mr. Beyeler suggested that these questions go before the Board for its input before it goes to the School Board. He suggested that this be placed on the August Staff Briefing for further discussion (August 26th).

Mr. Wills reminded the Board that the School Board is moving in the next week and will not have time to answer these questions.

Mr. Pyles felt that if this helped with having a better relationship, he was agreeable to wait. He felt that most of these things should have been understood. "We can't not get answers. Dr. Pattie has asked for two years. We need to have this basic criteria before us."

Mr. Pattie agreed that "we should be asking questions". "I've heard that the strategic plan is being developed. That's encouraging. I would like to see it earlier than later." He did not want to tell the School Board what to do, but he hoped that a "Human Capital Account" would be included.

Mr. Wills: Route 616 weed concerns – asked Mr. Fitzgerald to contact VDOT to check intersections. Mr. Shull said that he has also received complaints and suggested that this be taken care of before school begins.

Mr. Beyeler: McKee event – "It was the nicest exhibit! Educational!"

Mr. Shull: Schools – Riverheads Middle School is needed. Commended Dr. Bishop and the School Board and noted that the plan presented is just a plan. "Nothing has gone into action, but they are discussing things. They are looking at strategic action of how to approach the future and the funding. Give the School Board a little credit. They are trying to get some things done." He noted the cost savings of the School Board moving to the Government Center. "We are now looking at trying to utilize the time management that the School Board has in our Fire and Rescue. It's going to be a tremendous cost savings there (somewhere around \$150,000 to \$300,000)."

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

Mr. Karaffa: Schools Project List – supported wings at the elementary schools and expressed concern of closing the Verona School.

Chm. Moore:

- 1. Felt that this was a good time for talking with the School Board to get a long-term picture in moving forward and to address future needs.
- 2. Reallocation of VDOT money – encouraged Supervisors to review projects in their districts and move forward.

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF

- 1. Road Naming Policy distributed to Board.

Mr. Fitzgerald noted that this request is unique because of it not being an individual citizen requesting the name change. The policy is directed toward citizens leading the effort. If there is a reason for a road to be renamed, the Board can approve the request. If individual property owners are in disagreement with the name of a road, then it requires a public hearing where different alternatives can be discussed. In the case of Route 636, a letter will be sent out to the property owners to make a suggestion of the name change. If the owner is in agreement, there will be no need for a public hearing.

* * *

- 2. Route 743 Extension – Berry Lane – Revised resolution

In August 2012, VDOT was asked to extend maintenance on Berry Lane. One owner opposed this request. VDOT has asked that the resolution be revised to reflect a modification of the distance to be taken into the State system for maintenance.

Mr. Karaffa moved, seconded by Mr. Pattie, that the Board adopt the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Harrisonburg Residency Office of the Virginia Department of Transportation recommends that Route 743 extended be added to the secondary system of state highways as a no cost rural addition pursuant to Section 33.1-229 and Commonwealth Transportation Board policy, because Route 743 extended meets current minimum standards, and provides a public service, and

WHEREAS, the Harrisonburg Residency Office of the Virginia Department of Transportation confirms that no Department funds are required to improve Route 743 extended to meet current minimum design or maintenance standards of the Department, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, this Board requests the Virginia Department of Transportation to add Route 743 extended from the current end of state maintenance to 0.70 miles North of Route 612, pursuant to Section 33.1-229, Code of Virginia and the Rural Addition Policy of the Commonwealth Transportation Board of the Virginia Department of Transportation, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, this Board guarantees a clear and unrestricted right of way, and any necessary easements for cuts, fills and drainage, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution is a revised resolution from the original request made by the Augusta County Board of Supervisors dated August 8, 2012.

July 24, 2013, at 7:00 p.m.

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF

Route 743 Extension – Berry Lane – Revised resolution (cont'd)

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

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

CLOSED SESSION

On motion of Mr. Wills, 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 economic development exemption under Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A)(5)
[discussion concerning a prospective business or industry or the expansion of an existing business or industry where no previous announcement has been made of its interest in locating or expanding its facilities in the county]:

A) Economic Development Prospect(s)

(3) the legal counsel exemption under Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A)(7)
[consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members or consultants pertaining to actual or probable litigation, and consultation with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel, as permitted under subsection (A) (7)]:

A) Reassessment

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

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

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

- 1. Public business matters lawfully exempted from statutory open meeting requirements, and

