
Staff Briefing Meeting, Monday, September 22, 2014, 1:30 p.m., Government Center, Verona, VA.

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

VIRGINIA: At an adjourned meeting of the Augusta County Board of Supervisors held on Monday, September 22, 2014, at 1:30 p.m., at the Government Center, Verona, Virginia, and in the 239th year of the Commonwealth....

* * * * *

VDOT ROADS

1. The Board discussed the VDOT status report of August 25, 2014, staff briefing meeting.

The Board accepted the report as information.

2. The Board discussed FY2016 Revenue Sharing.

The Board authorized placing on the September 24, 2014, regular agenda for consideration.

3. The Board discussed FY2016-21 SYIP

The Board authorized placing on the September 24, 2014, consent agenda for consideration.

4. The Board discussed MPO designation for Weyers Cave.

The Board authorized placing on the September 24, 2014, regular agenda for consideration.

* * * * *

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

1. The Board discussed the Economic Development monthly report of August 25, 2014, staff briefing meeting.

The Board accepted the monthly report as information.

2. The Board discussed Ladd Sale Agreement amendment.

The Board authorized placing on the September 24, 2014, regular agenda for consideration.

3. Lifecore coordination meeting – Mr. Moore asked Rebekah Castle/Amanda Glover to set up meeting with primary sponsors.

September 22, 2014, at 1:30 p.m.

* * * * *

VRA – WATER TANK

The Board discussed VRA bond resolution for Mill Place Commerce Park water tank project.

The Board authorized placing on the September 24, 2014, regular agenda for consideration.

* * * * *

VRA – MIDDLE RIVER REGIONAL JAIL

The Board discussed VRA bond resolution (refinancing) for Middle River Regional Jail.

The Board authorized placing on the September 24, 2014, regular agenda for consideration.

* * * * *

ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board discussed Ordinance Review Committee recommendations regarding the following:

- 1. Panhandlers – authorized to advertise for public hearing.
- 2. Amusement rides – authorized to advertise for public hearing.

The Board authorized placing these two ordinances on the September 24, 2014, consent agenda for consideration.

* * *

- 3. Domestic chickens – referred back to committee for drafting of ordinance for resubmittal to the Board for consideration to advertise for public hearing.
- 4. On-the-farm Activities – pending future Committee recommendation (tentatively scheduled for October 20 Staff Briefing)

* * * * *

FIRE AND RESCUE

- 1. The Board discussed the Fire and Rescue status report of August 25, 2014, staff briefing meeting.

The Board accepted the monthly report as information.

* * *

- 2. The Board discussed EMS 4 for Life.

Jennifer Whetzel, Finance Director, reported that a legal opinion was received from the Office of the Attorney General pertaining to the appropriate use and distribution of the 26% Return of Locality monies which are a part of the \$4 for Life funding as set forth in the Commonwealth’s Budget Bill. She further mentioned that Code of Virginia, § 46.2-694, specifically addresses that funds shall only be provided to licensed, nonprofit emergency medical service agencies for the purpose of training and purchase of necessary equipment and supplies. The County has been preparing the annual report for the funds. Staff will prepare a policy and procedure for distribution of funds in accordance with allowable uses under the Code.

The Board accepted this report as information.

* * *

September 22, 2014, at 1:30 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)

3. The Board discussed Master Plan Update.

The Board received a PowerPoint presentation. Fire Chief Holloway requested Board guidance regarding:

- A) Is the level of services, fire and EMS including response time expectations, currently within parameters that are acceptable?
- a. Response Times
Chief – countywide on scene average time; 8.1 Fire and 9.62 EMS –concerned about maintaining. Volunteer participation and levels is a challenge and needs to be considered. Wills - look more at out the door times. Karaffa – expectations vary by agency location and coverage area. Moore – look at agencies taking the longest and try to improve rather than using the combined average.
 - b. Staffing Levels
Wills – policy initiated for rescue units to provide staffing levels, but receiving push back from some volunteer agencies. Shull – not a problem to ask for and should be expected. Wills – Chief needs Board support on this issue when approached by rescue agencies. Moore – asking for availability is perfectly inline. Pyles – perfectly reasonable, recommends encouraging with incentives.
- B) Apparatus and Equipment Current and Future:
- a. Currently individual agencies determine their apparatus needs and specifications for their given area of service
 - b. Is this acceptable or would it be beneficial to look at settling minimum apparatus design requirements for service areas based on NFPA Standards and ISO recommendations?
- Chief – Tanker Strike Team has been a proven asset. Not all agencies need certain apparatus; they may want something, but need another. Wills – encourage agencies to get what they need. Chief – is it over-managing when it deals with volunteers? Moore – does ISO currently give recommendations for stations? Chief – ISO gives geographical recommendations. He recommends a ladder truck on the northern side, another where there is industry and construction (Stuarts Draft), and a third in the hospital area. (ISO recommendation – 3 ladder trucks for the County). Karaffa – if see a hole recommend they meet the need in the area, but if want to go above and beyond it is the agency’s choice if have the funding to do so. Pyles – should be a needs analysis done. Chief – should minimums be set? The County owns a tremendous amount of equipment that in the future probably won’t be replaced or will be replaced with different piece. Pyles – enlighten agencies by creating and identifying where the weaknesses are and how it would be beneficial to the County. Move towards benefit of the County and incentives to get what is needed; define, help manage, and encourage. Shull – agrees, but don’t infringe on volunteer agencies capable of going above and beyond and don’t dictate, recommend for the needs of the County. Moore – equipment turned over to us will be replaced in the best interest of the County. Chief – current contract with Company 11 (ACFR, Inc.) is to replace with like or better. He also said issues may come up shortly regarding agencies in trouble. Coffield – we account for County owned and the amount of money being borrowed, but not for the volunteers. The ladder truck is now at 20 years replacement, but will be 30 years because ambulance purchases hurt apparatus account and we would have to borrow money. He said there are no clear cut guidelines and we are looking at different avenues to improve services.
- C) Infrastructure Present and Future Multiple Options to Consider
- a. Maintaining all existing stations and retrofitting
 - b. Centralized station locations – fewer numbers (new stations and/or renovate current ones)

September 22, 2014, at 1:30 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)

Refer to Slide 11 from Fire-Rescue Powerpoint; 17 stations – some may not serve future needs

- Many stations not designed for 24/7 staffing
- Locations may not be in line with growth and development

Chief– will get costs. Options; centralize station locations, all 17 combination, all career at some. The numbers continue to stay above 5% north. When key players that lead in volunteer organizations leave you lose mentors. Chief – asked for direction from the Board on this. Karaffa – looking at cost and number of facilities there is merit in centralizing. With good roads connecting it is not unreasonable for centralized County locations and volunteers can continue to operate their own agencies. On the western side of the County continue to augment. The big issue is too much cost in buildings, people, and apparatus; east, north, and south. Pyles – develop something when somebody fails, right now pay for people and get value. If station failing let it fight to stay open, but don't shove out by requiring ten instead of two. Wills – EMS calls putting pressure on volunteers, maybe centralize rescue buildings and encourage volunteer agencies to go strictly fire if issues. Pyles – agreed.

D) Challenges regarding Service Delivery Personnel

- a. Assuring a safe work environment both volunteer and career, adequate personnel available to respond.
- b. Training Job Performance Requirements-Standards-Regulations
- c. Time Requirements of personnel providing service on a 24 hour around the clock basis answering 18,000 plus calls per year.
- d. Lack of sufficient number of volunteers to meet service demands for the multiple disciplines associated with fire and EMS service delivery. Career staff is filling in as required and in some cases providing the services.

Chief – two career 6am to 6pm minimum, he recommends four per station or hope for volunteers. Currently multiple agencies are put on calls due to volunteer participation and/or level of training. A lot of training involved, some mandated, and there are job performance expectations. Minimum EMT level requires over 200 hours. The organization cannot currently afford to operate under all NFPA standards. Number of calls has reduced and continues this year due to changes in procedure. Special operations is almost totally dependent on career staff. Currently 79 career operational personnel (includes Battalions).

Wills – SAFER grant; personnel will already be on payroll when it opens, it would be hard to get another grant to continue. Pyles – maybe they can help with the next grant for more personnel. Wills – will Board approve and support this?

Mr. Wills asked the Board to give the Chief replies and comments through email. He said it is the Chief's intent to have the plan complete in the next couple of months to use for direction over the next five years.

* * * * *

WAIVERS/ VARIANCES – NONE

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE BOARD

The Board discussed the following:

Mr. Karaffa:

1. Berry Farm – sought Board concurrence to schedule a meeting with adjacent and interested property owners. Mr. Pattie expressed concern for soccer/athletic field complex and indicated preference for passive recreation
2. "Smaller" schools – supported community-based elementary schools, specifically, Beverley Manor and Verona Elementary Schools. Also noted that money . . . especially new school construction, does not always equal improved performance.

September 22, 2014, at 1:30 p.m.

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

Mr. Pyles:

- 1. Requested from School Board:
 - a. Additional information regarding \$18.6 million cost estimate for Riverheads Elementary School
 - b. Breakdown of student reassignments by school associated with proposed closures
 - c. Asked that responses to questions be provided prior to October 8th Public Hearing.

Mr. Moore: Crozet Tunnel bids opened for Phase 1 (Nelson County side).

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF - NONE

* * * * *

CLOSED SESSION

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

- (1) **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) Greenville Sewer

On motion of Ms. Bragg, seconded by Mr. Karaffa, the Board came out of Closed Session and adjourned subject to the call of the Chairman.

Vote was as follows: Yeas: Pattie, Karaffa, Shull, Wills, Moore, Bragg 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, Wills, Moore, Shull, Bragg and Pyles
 NAY: None

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

* * * * *

Chairman
 H9-22sbmin.14

County Administrator