
Regular Meeting, Wednesday, July 22, 2015, 7:00 p.m. Government Center, Verona, VA.

PRESENT: Michael L. Shull, Chairman
Carolyn S. Bragg, Vice-Chairman
Jeffrey A. Moore
Marshall W. Pattie
Tracy C. Pyles, Jr.
Larry J. Wills
G. L. "Butch" Wells
Timmy Fitzgerald, Director of Community Development
Becky Earhart, Senior Planner
Jennifer M. Whetzel, Director of Finance
Patrick J. Morgan, County Attorney
Patrick J. Coffield, County Administrator
Rita R. Austin, CMC, Executive Secretary

PRESENT: AUGUSTA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Eric M. Shipplett, Chairman
Stephen N. Bridge, Vice-Chairman
Kitra A. Shiflett
James Walter Curd
Gordon Kyle Leonard, Jr.

ABSENT: Christopher M. Foschini
Taylor Cole

VIRGINIA: At a regular meeting of the Augusta County Board of Supervisors held on Wednesday, July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m., at the Government Center, Verona, Virginia, and in the 240th year of the Commonwealth....

* * * * *

Chairman Shull welcomed the citizens present.

* * * * *

Michael L. Shull, Supervisor for the Riverheads District, led us with the Pledge of Allegiance.

* * * * *

Larry J. Wills, Supervisor for the Middle River District, delivered invocation.

* * * * *

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION – JOHN B. DAVIS RECOGNITION

Delegates Steve Landes asked that John Davis, his wife, Patrice, and Carol Brydger, Clerk of the Augusta County Circuit Court, join him while reading the resolution.

Delegate Landes felt it to be an honor to present this resolution from the members of the General Assembly to Mr. Davis. "One thing I know about John is that he has been a great public servant and has done a great job for Augusta County." Delegate Landes noted that this resolution was patroned by Delegate Landes, Delegate Dickie Bell and Senator Emmett Hanger. Delegate Landes added "Unlike some Clerks, John was actually in his Court. I think that speaks to his dedication to his office. I know Carol is following in his footsteps and was previously his Deputy Clerk. We've been well-served and will continue to be well-served. John served not only as a Clerk but, for many years, was an integral part of the Augusta County Public Schools. He had a great reputation as a teacher and administrator. His reputation as Clerk was not only here in Augusta County, but across the Commonwealth. I think any of the Clerks that have been around for a while will tell you that when they first got elected, one of the first people they would call is John. He was always very willing to help folks. That speaks

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION – JOHN B. DAVIS RECOGNITION (cont'd)

to his character and, obviously, his dedication to that office as well. The Clerk has a lot of responsibilities that are set forth in the Code of Virginia and most citizens don't even really realize how that impact them on a daily basis. You have to have somebody that is dedicated and really knows what they are doing."

Mr. Davis thanked Delegate Landes for being a patron of this resolution and stated, "It's an honor of being recognized by the oldest legislative body in the new world. I appreciate all the support that my wife has given me along with Carol, my right-hand person for twenty-five years, for doing a great job. Thank you so much for your support."

Chairman Shull, on behalf of the Board, thanked Mr. Davis for his years of service.

* * * * *

MCKEE'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY RESOLUTION

Amanda Glover, Director of Economic Development, reported that this resolution recognizes McKee's 25th Anniversary at the Stuarts Draft facility. McKee's preference was to have the resolution presented at the facility at a time so that the employees could enjoy the celebration as well. For the benefit of the audience, she read the resolution.

Chairman Shull stated that appreciated the years that McKee has been there and hoped that they will be there many more.

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

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

WHEREAS, Augusta County wishes to recognize the importance of business and industry in making our economy diverse and prosperous; and

WHEREAS, in 1990, McKee Foods opened its Stuarts Draft bakery making oatmeal creme pies, honey buns and other bakery products; and

WHEREAS, McKee Foods Corporation is an integral part of our community and for 25 years has administered its guiding values beyond the confines of the Stuarts Draft facility; and

WHEREAS, currently McKee Foods employees over 1,000 full and part-time employees; and

WHEREAS, McKee Foods values people, integrity, responsibility, quality, productivity and innovation to "find a better way".

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF AUGUSTA COUNTY, VIRGINIA, meeting in regular session, July 22, 2015, hereby recognizes and celebrates the 25th Anniversary of the opening of the McKee Foods Corporation plant in Stuarts Draft and publicly expresses its appreciation for the exemplary manner in which it has applied the above stated values within its organization and to the community through involvement and participation. McKee Foods serves as a role model to all business and industry.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Augusta County Board of Supervisors does hereby congratulate and thank McKee Foods for being an outstanding employer of Augusta County citizens and an exemplary corporate neighbor in the community. The Board of Supervisors wishes further continued success and prosperity for the entire McKee Foods Corporation.

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Board of Supervisors and a copy of this resolution be presented to McKee Foods.

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

MCKEE'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY RESOLUTION (cont'd)

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

UNDERAGE DRINKING PREVENTION MONTH – PROCLAMATION

Patrick J. Coffield, County Administrator, thanked Ms. Jones for substituting for Ms. Newman, Director for the Office on Youth which serves Staunton, Waynesboro and Augusta County. The Underage Drinking prevention is high on their priority.

Keri Jones, Coalition Coordinator with the Office on Youth, received the proclamation.

Ms. Bragg moved, seconded by Mr. Wells, that the Board adopt the following resolution:

PROCLAMATION

UNDERAGE DRINKING PREVENTION MONTH

WHEREAS, underage drinking is a serious public health problem in the United States. Alcohol is the most widely used substance of abuse among America's youth, and drinking by young people poses enormous health and safety risks; and

WHEREAS, alcohol use by young people is extremely dangerous, not only to themselves – but to society as a whole, an estimated 10 million people younger than the age of 21 drank alcohol in the past month in the United States; and

WHEREAS, underage drinking is a growing problem with devastating consequences, many of which parents and caregivers may not be fully aware. Consequences of underage drinking may be associated with traffic fatalities, violence, unintended, unwanted and unprotected sexual activity, suicide, educational failure, drug use, legal and other behavioral problems; and

WHEREAS, youth who start drinking before the age of 15 are four times more likely to develop alcohol dependence or abuse later in life than those who begin at age 21; and

WHEREAS, parents and caregivers have a significant influence on young people's decisions about alcohol consumption, especially when they create supportive and nurturing alcohol-free environments; 83% of youth report parents are the leading influence in their decision not to drink alcohol; and

WHEREAS, parents, educators, and community leaders who work with our young people every day are our best advocates for responsible decision-making; and

WHEREAS, "Let's Be the Influence" is sponsored by the Greater Augusta Prevention Partners (GAPP) Coalition to educate parents and caregivers about the consequences of underage drinking; empower them with the knowledge and tools to begin talking about underage drinking prevention at home; and to engage in underage drinking prevention initiatives; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board of Supervisors of August County, Virginia, does hereby proclaim August 2015, as Underage Drinking Prevention Month in Augusta County, and urge all residents, especially parents and caregivers to support the efforts of those working to prevent underage drinking and participate in underage drinking prevention activities planned here.

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

UNDERAGE DRINKING PREVENTION MONTH – PROCLAMATION (cont'd)

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

This being the day and time advertised to consider a request to amend the Augusta County Comprehensive Plan 2007-2027 by adopting a 2014/2015 Update to the Plan.

Michael L. Shull, Chairman of the Augusta County Board of Supervisors, called the meeting to order. Mr. Eric Shipplett, Chairman of the Augusta County Planning Commission, called the Planning Commission meeting to order.

* * * * *

Chairman Shull stated that the purpose of this meeting is to discuss the update for the Comp Plan and that they will open the public hearing to the citizens so that they can give their comments after Becky Earhart, Senior Planner, gives her presentation.

Ms. Earhart gave a PowerPoint with the following high-lights:

Comprehensive Plan

- Adopted in 2007 with amendments in 2009 (Fishersville Small Area Plan) and 2011 (Greenville from CDA to USA to allow the extension of public sewer to the village).
- State Code requires that every locality have a Comprehensive Plan and review it at least once every 5 years.
- It provides a guide for County decision makers in terms of land use decisions, but also in terms of where to make investments in public facilities.
- There are hundreds of goals, objectives, and policies in every category imaginable from agriculture to water and sewer.
- Perhaps the area that gets the most attention is the Planning Policy Area/Future Land Use Map. People are most interested in what they can do with their property.

Update Process

- As directed by Board (in 2012) - more Review and Update than Rewrite
- Housing Chapter- to meet State Code
- Transportation Chapter- to meet State Code and HB2 impacts
- Led by the Planning Commission
- Sought input from those more directly involved

Sections Reviewed

Rather than using a citizen committee, staff worked with those that have the most knowledge—Staff, Boards and Commission that deal with these topics daily and monthly.

Involved:

- Augusta County Service Authority
- School Board Staff

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

Involved (cont'd)

- County Engineer
- Fire Chief, Sheriff, and ECC Director
- Director of Finance
- Directors of Economic Development and Economic Development Authority
- Library Staff, Library Board and Friends of the Library
- Social Services, Office on Youth, Valley Community Services Board
- Extension Service, Headwaters Soil and Water Conservation District
- Ag Industry Board
- Parks and Recreation Staff and Commission
- Virginia Department of Transportation

Sections Reviewed:

- Introduction
- Strategies for Growth
- Goals, Objectives, and Policies for each content area (Agriculture to Utilities)
- Implementation
- Annual Review
- Capital Improvement Plan
- Planning Policy Area and Future Land Use Designation Maps

Augusta County Quick Facts

- Approximately 970 square miles
- Second largest county in terms of land area
- Over 1/3 is federally and state owned
- 2010 population: 73,750
- 15th largest county in terms of population
- Total area population: 118,502
- Unique challenges - This all goes to creating unique challenges for planning the future of the County. One way we address the challenges is through the Comprehensive Plan.
- 2000- 2010 population: 65,615- 73,750
- 12.4% growth
 - Natural Increase: 1,576
 - Net Migration: 6,559
- Aging population
 - 2010 median age: 42.9
 - 2000 median age: 39.0
- 93.4% White; 4% Black
- 2% Hispanic (146% increase- 1525)

Population and Demographics

- The County's population has grown by more than 12% in that ten year period
- Population shift in 2010: more 40+ population (54.1%) than under-40 population (45.9%) in the County
- 2013 counts estimate Augusta County's population at 74,504
- Limited growth 2010- 2013
 - 754 increase in County
 - 1594 in region- 120,096

The only decline in population over the last 10 years was in the 30-39 age group

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

Population Projections

The County and region are projected to continue to grow. Although the percentage of growth is projected to slow.

- 2020: 80,655
- 2030: 87,580
- 2040: 94,913 nearly 29% growth since 2010
- Regionally- 145,766 by 2040 23% growth since 2010

Building Permits for Dwellings

- Building Permits spiked in the County – 805 (2004)
- 2013: 244
- 2014: 486 (reflection of 250 multi-family permits)

Active Residential Subdivision Lots

- | | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| • Single Family | 1505 |
| • Attached Residential | 1074 |
| • Rural Residential | 32 |
| • Manufactured Home Park | 190 |
| • Multi-Family (with site plans) | 1491 |
| • Multi-Family (with no site plan) | 2000 |

Vision and Strategies

- Reaffirmed
- Promote a compact, coordinated, orderly, and balanced pattern of development
- Establish distinct areas for urban and rural development, as well as a full range of ag and forestal uses
- Implement planning policies and regulations using a reasonable combination of voluntary and mandatory measures

Existing Planning Policy Planning Map was displayed. Principal Building block of the Comp Plan is the policy area designation- 4 different policy areas, plus the government owned land. Policy areas determine where we want growth and where we do not.

1. Urban Service Area (USA)- red: public water and sewer to be utilized, 80% of residential development, most of the future commercial and industrial development
2. Community Development Area (CDA)- brown/orange: public water to be utilized with individual sewage systems- septic or alternative, with the exception of New Hope and that is public sewer and wells, 10% of residential; neighborhood commercial development.
3. Rural Conservation Area (RCA)- yellow: less than 5% of residential, no water or sewer, new rural residential subdivisions.
4. Ag Conservation Area (ACA)- light green: less than 5% of residential, no water or sewer, a lot here and there for farm families. But this is also the area where if you are a farmer you know you can invest in your farming operations and not be encroached upon by a subdivision that the County approves next to you.
5. Public lands- dark green (State or Federally owned)
6. Circles are identified Rural Communities

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

Agriculture

- Ag Industry Board's mission to identify major challenges and support the development of programs aimed at strengthening the ag economy and preserving ag in the County.
- References to Director of Agriculture Development were changed to the County, AIB, or Extension (County had an Ag Director, but position was eliminated creating the need to eliminate those references. The tasks assigned to the Ag Director in 2007 shifted to County overall, the AIB, or Extension)
- Conservation easement language has been modified to reflect possibility of Board approval in USA and CDA (Current Plan supports the placement of conservation easements in RCA and ACA. With this modification, easement holders like Virginia Outdoors Foundation can seek Board approval of an easement in an USA or CDA.)
- Niche markets but recognition of "traditional" ag operations
- Importance of Education for all age groups
- Clustering and Preservation tracts (Still want to study opportunities to decrease the number of houses in ag areas, concerned about the potential for negative impacts of clustering, including the use of the preservation tract which could be a nuisance to the residential development, as well as the ag neighbors, and the County.)

Economy

- Completed the Economic Development Strategy- plan reflects the recommendations in that Plan
- Hired two Economic Development Directors and a Marketing Assistant
- Next steps as identified by the Plan, EDA, and staff
 - Organizational Effectiveness
 - Complementary Businesses
 - Ag Tourism
 - Sites
- Enhance labor resources

Education

- Public and Private Education
- Goals more general in nature reflecting role of School Board in directing public education
- Public education goals were revised with assistance of School Board staff
- Life-long learners who have the skills to thrive in the 21st century
- Recognize the important role the library plays in supporting the education of all our students- public, private, and home-schooled.

General Government

- Efficiency in government operations remains the theme of this section.
- Recommends updating Master Plan for the Government Center
- Explore increased use of technology
- Deleted the reference to Fiscal Impact Analysis and Proffer Guidelines and added language recommending the use of innovative funding mechanisms for public facilities and services
- Strategic investments in infrastructure in USAs
- Added goal to promote environmental sustainability and stewardship to reflect on-going county initiatives

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

- **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN** (cont'd)

Historic Resources

- Largely implemented by private property owners and private organizations
- County's role in preservation will be supportive, rather than direct service delivery

Human Services

- Changes in terminology as recommended by providers
- Increased focus on services provided to youth
- Income and financial literacy for youths, individuals, and families
- Economic Security
- Increased focus on regional efforts to maximize service delivery efficiency and accessibility

Land Use and Development

- Continue distinct areas for targeting growth and preserving agriculture
- Continue to encourage development in the Urban Service Areas and increased emphasis on providing the services that are needed to support that development rather than expecting new growth to pay all costs
- Added a policy for areas where water or sewer are limited. (Basically at rezoning stage, the expectation will be to utilize the remaining capacities without making extensive investments in the expansion of the systems. Once it is used up, you go to private systems- septic or wells with the resulting increase in lot size.)
- Conservation Easement clarification
- Purchase of Development Rights – deleted from Plan

Library

- Major capital improvements have been made since the 2007 plan and the changes in this section reflect the remodeled main library in Fishersville, the library station in Middlebrook, and Craigsville branch library moved to the new Town Hall.
- Goal 1 is more facility oriented, Goal 2 is more service and program oriented.
- Emphasis on technology- both for internal operations, as well as providing services to residents

Natural Resources

- Tributary Strategies replaced by Chesapeake Bay TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) and Implementation Plans.
- Stormwater Program MS4 Program changes reflected
- Regional Cooperation, where applicable
- Sourcewater Protection- Coordinate with the ACSA to adopt new areas

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

Parks and Recreation

- Update to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Recommended- as a stand-alone chapter of the Comp Plan
- Focus on funding park development and programs
 - Grants
 - Sponsorships and Partnerships
 - Land Acquisition policy
 - Sports Tourism
- More use of schools as community centers
- Added emphasis to programming

Public Safety

- Growth in fire and rescue
 - 2007- 44 career staff augmenting volunteers in 8 of 17 stations
 - 2014- 86 career staff augmenting volunteers in 13 of 17 stations
- Emphasis on the importance of volunteer component of the combination volunteer/career fire/rescue system
- Regularly update Fire/Rescue Master Plan
- Support Continued Accreditation of the Sheriff's Department
- Emergency Communications
- Funding for fire flow improvements
- Tanker Strike Team

Utilities

- Major STP upgrades to Middle River, Fishersville, and Stuarts Draft; Sewer extended to Greenville
- Water tanks in Stuarts Draft and Verona
- Encouraging use of funding options to keep impacts on ratepayers, as well as county citizens, at a minimum
- Sourcewater Protection
- Solid Waste and Recycling
- Expand Broadband

Housing

State Mandates

The Comprehensive Plan shall include the designation of areas and implementation of measures for the construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance of affordable housing, which is sufficient to meet the current and future needs of residents of all levels of income in the locality while considering the current and future needs of the planning district within which the locality is situated.

More detail required by State Code. Note that affordable housing is not locality only and not just our area- Staunton, Waynesboro and Augusta County, but as it relates to the region and specifically in the Code- the PD within which Augusta is located- Rockingham/Harrisonburg, Rockbridge/BV/Lexington, Bath, Highland.

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

Housing (cont'd)

Demographics – 2010

Total Housing Units	31,010	
Occupied Housing Units	28,021	90.4%
Owner-occupied	22,814	81.4%
Renter-occupied	5,207	18.6%
Vacant Units	2,989	9.6%
Homeowner Vacancy		1.9%
Rental Vacancy		4.6%
Owner Household Size		2.53
Renter Household size		2.30

In terms of statistics- More than 90% of our housing stock is occupied- less than 10% is vacant. Of the occupied housing units- more than 80% are owner-occupied, but that number is decreasing as we see more and more apartments being built. Not surprisingly- the average size of an owner occupied household is a little bit larger than the renter household.

Units in Structure

Looking at our housing stock over the last 20 years from Census data, there are more Multi-Family units: 5% in 2000; 8.1% in 2010.

Affordability Index

State Code §15.2-2201 defines affordable housing as “housing that is affordable to households with incomes at or below the area median income, provided that the occupant pays no more than thirty percent of his gross income for gross housing costs, including utilities”. When you add transportation costs into the equation, the percentages that households are paying for housing and related costs go up. Housing plus commuting costs less than 34% are considered to be affordable. At the median, our households are paying 28.7% towards housing and commuting costs, put at 60% of the median, our households are paying 47.8% of their income towards those same costs.

Cost Burdened

Cost burdened is a way to look at housing from an individual’s perspective rather than the one individual who is at the “median” level. If a household is paying over 30% of its housing income for housing it is considered to be “burdened”. Not surprisingly, households with less than \$20,000 in income, regardless of whether they are owning or renting their home are likely to be burdened, although the county’s stats are better than the states.

Goals, Objectives, and Policies

- Emphasis on range of housing densities, types, and prices
 - Adaptive reuse, high value, retiree and elderly, handicapped, universal design
 - Location of developments where services are available- transit, access to shopping, medical care,
 - Ordinance changes should be analyzed in terms of initial costs to developer, as well as the long-term costs to the homebuyer/renter/County
- Regional cooperation

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

Transportation

Technical assistance was provided by the Planning District Commission and reviewed by VDOT and consistent with the State Plans.

State Code Changes

- System of infrastructure needs and recommendations
- Must include roadways, bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, railways, bridges, waterways, airports, ports, and public transportation facilities
- Connection of transportation infrastructure to affordable and accessible housing and community services
- Map all road and transportation improvements including cost estimates
- Must be consistent with Statewide Transportation Plans

Maps Displayed (and available on-line)

1. Level of service – Darker colors – level of service is deteriorating. Projection: Most of 81, 11, 64 are now in the D, E, and F category. 262 and portions of Route 11 are going to be D as well as more sections of 340. Areas in and around Stuarts Draft are beginning to have level of service of D or lower. The Plan requires to note where projects are currently planned such as bridge improvement projects (Route 250) and spot improvements to major intersection projects. Mapping includes a new transportation base map with all facilities- roads, airport, railroads, details on bike, ped, and transit and commuting patterns Needs- Level of Service for 2009- last year data was available: Interstates 81 and 64 and parts of 340 are only ones with LOS D and E.
2. By 2035 projected road conditions- Interstate 81 and 64 are failing; 262 and 11 are now Ds along with more sections of 340 and 11. In addition, more County roads are Ds: 608, 256, 612, and Mt. Vernon Road in Stuarts Draft
3. For the subareas of the plan, including the rural areas, projects were identified and mapped. Everything from bridge replacements to intersections, to spot improvements to major road projects.
4. Road projects then had to be prioritized and the top projects had to have cost estimates prepared for them. Some of these projects are already in the 6 Year Plan, but they still had to be included in the Comp Plan. The numbers are not priority numbers, we just went north to south, west to east. From a cost standpoint- everything from a \$220,000 sidewalk project in Stuarts Draft to \$76.6 million to address the I-81 Interchange at Weyers Cave, along with the intersection of Rt. 11 and Rt. 256 are included on the map.

Goals, Objectives, and Policies

- Changes reflect changes in terminology and VDOT's new access management regulations
- Added references to the MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization)
- Walkable communities- sidewalks, multi-use paths, bike lanes, share-use paths, or wide shoulders
- Increase transit options
- Most public roads; if private, designed and built and maintained at no cost to County.
- Eliminated Appendix A which had graphic representation of road cross-sections we wanted in various areas ranging from 4 lane divided highway sections to rural roads due to conflict with VDOT regulations.

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

HB 2 – “New Wrinkle”

- New funding process/formula for some federal and state transportation projects
- Investing limited tax dollars in the right projects that meet the most critical transportation needs in Virginia.
- Not for bridge projects or rehabbing aging pavement, safety improvement and enhancement projects, revenue sharing
- Work in progress
- Evaluated and ranked statewide for funding based on congestion mitigation, economic development, accessibility, safety, environmental quality, and land use and transportation coordination.
- Screening Process for HB 2 funding, must address a need in VTrans and be:
 - Corridor of Statewide Significance
 - Regional Network
 - UDA (Urban Development Area) (Areas in Fishersville, Stuarts Draft, Verona and Weyers Cave and areas outside the City of Staunton would meet the definition of the UDA.)

UDA- §15.2-2223.1

- UDAs are areas that may be appropriate for development at a density on the developable acreage of at least four single-family residences, six townhouses, or 12 apartments, condominium units, or cooperative units per acre, and an authorized floor area ratio of at least 0.4 per acre for commercial development, any proportional combination thereof, or any other combination or arrangement that is adopted by the locality and meets the intent of the code.
- Urban development areas shall incorporate principles of traditional neighborhood design.

From the County’s standpoint, our larger Urban Service Areas that have areas planned for neighborhood or community mixed use meet these criteria, although we don’t call them Urban Development Areas.

UDA Language Added to Plan

Language added to Plan states:

The designated growth areas of Fishersville, Stuarts Draft, Verona, Weyers Cave, and Staunton South and West as discussed herein have been found to meet the intent of the Code of Virginia, section §15.2-2223.1.

Implementation

- Since 2007, many items have been completed, some are in process, some have been studied and rejected, and some haven’t been touched
- 20 Year plan- to be expected
- Measures deleted that have been accomplished
- New measures added

Annual Review

- Designed to be a “scorecard” as to how well the County was doing implementing the Comp Plan
- Time consuming
- Duplication of efforts
 - Annual Reports
 - Budgets
- Draft recommends the deletion of this element

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

Capital Improvement Plan

This is the “biggest wish list of all”. “This is not the actual plan.”

- Revised Section
- 2014-2018: \$148.8 million
 - Schools- \$40.7 million
 - Water & Sewer, Sinking Funds, and Economic Development- \$20m each
- 2019-2034: \$364.7 million
 - Sinking Funds: \$69.6
 - Economic Development and Transportation- each \$60m.
- Courts- Costs yet to be determined

Ms. Earhart noted that, prior to the time this Updated Plan is adopted, hopefully, the Courts item will be updated.

Planning Policy Areas and Future Land Use Designations

Planning Policy Area Map

Policy Area	Existing Acres	Existing %	Proposed Acres	Proposed %
*USA	40,574	6.6%	39,391	6.4%
*CDA	34,881	5.6%	34,369	5.5%
*RCA	82,948	13.4%	83,087	23.4%
*ACA	246,901	39.8%	248,432	40.1%
Public Land	214,409	34.6%	214,410	34.6%
Total:	619,713		619,689	

*USA (Urban Service Area; CDA (Community Development Area); RCA (Rural Conservation Area; ACA (Agricultural Conservation Area)

As part of the review, staff looked at the Planning Policy Area map and looked at places that needed to be changed. As seen on the chart, some changes have been made. Staff is recommending the Urban Service Areas and Community Development Areas be decreased in size. The difference in total acreage is a function of our GIS system and rounding.

What determines the Policy Area?

- Presence of public water and sewer service
 - Now
 - Future
- Existing Infrastructure-
 - Roads, Schools, Community Facilities
- Zoning
- Existing Land Use Pattern
 - Business
 - Ag, but lots of houses
- Ag/Forestal Districts
- Conservation Easements (In places where easements have been placed on parcels, if they were RCA and are adjacent to ACA, we change those parcels to ACA- since we know they aren't going to develop into a rural residential subdivision.)
- Comments at public meetings (comments tonight will be taken into consideration)

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

Fishersville – Planning Policy Areas/Future Land Use (Map displayed)

Looking at the Future Land Use Map, for every parcel in the USA (red) and CDA (brown) there is also a specific land use planned for it- business (red), industrial (purple), medium density residential (brown) which is three to four units per acre; planned residential (pink) similar to Teaverton that has developed with its own set of zoning regulations at a density of four to eight units per acre.

Future Land Use Categories

- **Industrial**, where industrial uses of varying scale and scope would be appropriate
- **Business**, where business uses of varying scale and scope would be appropriate
- **Public Use**, which identifies land owned by, or utilized by, a federal, state or local government agency
- **Community Mixed Use**, which may include a variety of residential uses at a density of six to twelve dwelling units per acre and, on up to 40% of the total land area, retail and office uses and in some, but not all cases, industrial uses
- **Neighborhood Mixed Use**, which may include a variety of residential uses at a density of four to eight dwelling units per acre and convenience retail and office uses on up to 20% of the total land area
- **Village Mixed Use**, which encourages the adaptive reuse of existing structures, as well as infill development, conforming to the existing or historic development pattern in the community; will only be in USAs and CDAs (New Hope, Churchville).
- **Planned Residential**, which may include a variety of residential uses at a density of four to eight dwelling units per acre
- **Multifamily Residential**, which may include residential buildings housing between nine and sixteen dwelling units per acre, as well as manufactured home developments
- **Single-Family Attached Residential**, which may include attached residential units like townhouses and duplexes at a density of between four and eight dwelling units per acre; will be found only in the Urban Service Area
- **Medium Density Residential**, which may include detached residential units at a density of between three and four dwelling units per acre
- **Low Density Residential**, which may include detached residential units at a density of between one-half and one dwelling unit per acre; will be found only in the Community Development Area
- **Urban Open Space**, which identifies land permanently set aside for open space uses such as conservation easements and county recreation areas

Future Land Use Designations

Future Land Use Designation	Proposed Acres	%
Business	5,188	6.7%
Community Mixed Use	3,717	4.8%
Industrial	6,717	8.8%
Low Density Residential	33,327	43.4%
Medium Density Residential	14,611	19.0%
Multi-Family Residential	842	1.1%
Neighborhood Mixed Use	3,401	4.4%
Planned Residential	2,740	3.6%
Public Use	4,167	5.4%
Single Family Attached Residential	815	1.1%
Urban Open Space	1,136	1.5%
Village Mixed Use	155	0.2%
Total:	76,746	100%

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

Rural Community

Most questions tonight was on Rural Community designation. The term "Rural Community" was used as an overlay for the Policy Area Maps, recognizing that places like Sangersville, Centerville, Springhill, Churchville, Augusta Springs were traditionally Rural Communities/Rural Villages. That term was used in the 2007 Plan to recognize that there were some villages spread out in Augusta County. It was also used as a future land use designation. In the 2014 Plan, it was decided to clear up the confusion.

- Retained it as a Policy Area Overlay- Rural Communities
- In 2007, was also a Future Land Use designation- confusing
- Placeholder for more work- planning and zoning
- 2014 Draft eliminates Rural Community as a Future Land Use designation and areas were reassigned-
 - Most became Low Density Residential
 - Where there are public facilities- schools, treatment plants, water tanks- the sites are designated public use
 - Some became Village Mixed Use in the core areas of Churchville, Middlebrook, and New Hope (with the hope that they will redevelop consistent with the existing development pattern- which in most cases is a mix of residential and business uses and in many cases a mix of single family and multi-family dwellings. It did not mean that public sewer was expected in the 2007 plan. If the Service Authority decides to extend public sewer service to an area that does not currently have it, the Comprehensive Plan would need to change that area from Community Development Area to Urban Service Area in order to allow that additional public service to be extended similar to Greenville.)

Future Land Use vs. Zoning

Map displayed. The key thing to remember is the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use designation may be changing for your property, but no zoning is changing. That would take another action, most often it comes at the request of the property owners, to change their zoning and it requires a public hearing and notification separate from the Comp Plan change. For example, Fishersville--The Comp Plan calls for the area outlined in purple to be Planned Residential and yet it is white on the map. That means it is still zoned General Agriculture. There are a lot of zoning colors on this map--Pink- Mixed Use; Green- Single Family Residential; Yellow- Multi-Family Residential; Red- Business; but 95% of the County is still zoned General Agriculture.

Ms. Earhart reiterated that the Comp Plan is a guide. The zoning regulates what can be done on certain property. "We don't rezone everything ahead of time because it messes up land use taxation and conditional zoning. Even if we change the Comprehensive Plan designation for your property, we are not changing any zoning as part of what we are discussing here tonight."

Chairman Shull thanked Ms. Earhart, staff and the different departments for their input into the Comp Plan Update.

* * *

BOARD COMMENTS:

Mr. Moore: Sangers Lane citizens had contacted him about the proposed road improvements. He asked for an explanation.

Ms. Earhart said that the transportation component is part of the Comp Plan. A road improvement project has been identified to upgrade the secondary road from gravel to paved. In talking with the residents, they would like to see that removed from the Plan.

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

BOARD COMMENTS (cont'd)

Part of the area is planned for development area (closest to Staunton) but out towards Barrenridge Road, that is in Rural Conservation and Ag Conservation Area. A request in writing has been received and it will be given to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for their consideration.

Chairman Shull declared the public hearing open.

Chairman Shipplett declared the public hearing open.

Bridget Ragan, of Sangers Lane, mentioned that Sangers Lane runs from where Route 250 intersects with I-81 (where BP and McDonald's are located) and runs back to Barrenridge Road. About 2.5 miles of Sangers Lane is unpaved. She represents the people who live on the unpaved portion of the road who requests that it be removed from the Comp Plan. She addressed their concerns of 1) safety; 2) cost of upgrade; 3) expenditures unnecessary; 4) citizens with most road frontage do not want; 5) Conservation Easements on the road and participation in Soil and Water Conservation programs – do not want to see disturbed.

Rodney Paxton, Mark Breeden, and Pam Breeden spoke in opposition of the proposed change to the Policy area designation change on Sangers Lane to Urban Service Area. They would like to remain in the Community Development Area.

Roosevelt Rowe had recently purchased property in New Hope and learned that no further subdivision could be done for five years. He felt that this period was too long.

There being no other speakers, Chairman Shull and Chairman Shipplett declared the public hearing closed.

Chairman Shull expressed his appreciation for the public interest and participation in tonight's hearing. Going forward, the Planning Commission will be considering the Update and the input received at its August 11th meeting. If action is taken that night, the Board could consider adoption of the Update at its August 26th meeting.

ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENTS:

Mr. Wills: Thanked the public for being present tonight. He also thanked staff for their excellent job throughout. "We have been provided information as it was provided to the Planning Commission throughout the process." He thanked the Planning Commission for its work. "I think it's a very good update and I think we have worked through where the challenges are." In regards to Mr. Rowe's concern, he felt that was a zoning issue.

Mr. Moore: Does not object to removing Sangers Lane from the Plan.

Mr. Wells: Has been an educational experience and commended staff and organizations for their input in the Plan.

Mr. Pyles: Acknowledged the work of the Planning Commission and noted many accomplishments—Libraries; Parks and Recreation (Deerfield, Augusta Springs, Stuarts Draft, Natural Chimneys); Schools (with next two constructions and two closings) will be in good shape. "It doesn't happen by accident. Somebody laid out a plan. They aren't just plans; they're not written in concrete; we can adjust as we get into particular situations, but they are a guidance for us because we took into consideration what the people are looking for." He noted that there is little change in this Plan because there has been very little change in the last five years. "We still work every day to keep making this County better and the Plan and your

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

BOARD COMMENTS (cont'd)

input helps us do that.”

Dr. Pattie: “It was refreshing to see people who didn’t want to see a road paved. Something that I don’t have in my community.” He thanked the citizens for being present tonight. He also thanked the Planning Commission and staff for “making this process go smoothly for us”.

Ms. Bragg: Thanked the public for its participation. “It is so important as we make our decisions and chart a path for the County in where we are going in the future. Continue to be a part of your local government. It is very important.”

Chm. Shull: Thanked the public. “I hope it eases your mind that there were no big changes and it was public input that drew this up to begin with. We talk about smart growth. That was the reason for the Comprehensive Plan some years ago. It is not set in stone. If we need to look at things to change, we have the ability to do that.”

* * *

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Mr. Bridge: Commended Ms. Earhart and staff for keeping the Planning Commission informed. “Staff has come through with flying colors.”

Chm. Shiplett: Echoed what has been said tonight and appreciated the turnout. He adjourned the Planning Commission meeting.

* * * * *

A five-minute recess was taken at 8:25 p.m.

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC

Ruth Talmage announced the appointment of a new Registrar to be Constance Messick. “She is extremely qualified and offers continuity, knowledge, professionalism and years of service.” She begins her new position August 1st.

* * * * *

WAIVERS/VARIANCES

The Board considered the Towns on Imperial Subdivision waiver request to the connectivity requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance (Wayne District).

Timmy Fitzgerald, Community Development Director, advised that this had been discussed at Monday’s Staff Briefing. He noted that Section 21.9.1 of the Subdivision Ordinance requires connectivity of subdivision streets to adjacent properties. It also allows an opportunity for a waiver from that particular requirement. Along with the waiver request, there are requirements that have to be completed prior to approval:

1. All adjacent landowners need to be notified
2. Waiver would not cause an unsafe traffic condition (Safety Analysis was required to show there was no impact on adjacent landowners or Emergency Services)
3. Adjacent property has to have a minimal right-end/right-out entrance off of the highway

Countryside Service Company, L.C. did the Safety Analysis to not make a connection to the Corell property and to show that there could be a right-in/right-out access to the Corell property from Route 250. A recent Staff Report indicated two concerns:

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

WAIVERS/VARIANCES (cont'd)

1. Adequate access for Emergency vehicles
2. General concern for future development of the Corell property which is in the future Comprehensive Plan land use as Medium Density Residential. Medium Density Residential would allow for 50 or 60 homes; however, the topography would not allow for that many. Realistically, it would be 20 or 30 homes on that particular property.

He noted that they do have access on the back side of the property onto Idelwood Boulevard, which an entrance permit could be obtained through VDOT. The property also has the ability to obtain a right-in/right-out on Route 250 that could accommodate the development in that area.

Mr. Fitzgerald added that he has met with Countryside staff in concern of the emergency access and the opportunity to get the road constructed. Janet Miller, from Countryside, is present to provide the Board with an updated plan sheet to address that concern.

Janet Miller (and John Reno), of Countryside, advised that based on recent conversations, they have amended their request and proposed that Countryside construct an 18-foot wide gravel Emergency Access Only road. This Emergency Access road will never be upgraded to a through-street. This Emergency Access road will be gated and locked with a breakaway lock. Construction of this road will occur concurrently with the next construction phase. A drafted sketch was distributed to the Board. Ms. Miller was available to answer any questions that the Board may have.

Chairman Shull mentioned that there were some concerns about the homeowners cost and felt that this would alleviate those concerns.

Mr. Moore previously had some reservations with staff about the safety. He noted that the current subdivision was built with the intention not to put into the Secondary System. The people have invested there with that understanding. Mr. Moore felt that the amendment addressed the safety issue and felt that the Corell property was going to be limited.

Mr. Moore moved, seconded by Mr. Wills, that the Board approve the request, with amended proffers.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

BUSINESS LICENSE REFUNDS

The Board considered refund as certified by the Commissioner of Revenue and approved by County Attorney for the following:

1. Dixie Gas and Oil Corp (Deno's Food Mart/Subway)-Rt. 11 Verona	\$ 9,954.61
2. Dixie Gas and Oil Corp (Deno's Food Mart/Subway)-Rt. 612 Verona	\$ 4,336.70
3. Dixie Gas and Oil Corp (Deno's Food Mart/Subway)-Greenville	\$ 7,986.00
4. Dixie Gas and Oil Corp (Deno's Food Mart/Subway)-Weyers Cave	<u>\$12,748.26</u>
	\$35,025.57

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

HEARTHSTONE LAKE (cont'd)

We are very fortunate to John Kaylor and Doug and Mr. Whitescarver. It is really a credit to them that we put it in a plan and then we worked the plan and good things have happened. I commend this current Board as well as past Boards for it being willing to tackle an undertaking of this magnitude.”

Chairman Shull asked how many has been completed and how many more there were to be considered.

Mr. Wolfe said three Headwater dams have been completed in the South River watershed; working on one in North River watershed (Todd Lake) and Hearthstone. The next one to consider is Stony Creek. Right now it is not eligible because of some violations. Lake Wilda is also being considered. He indicated that four more will need to be considered.

Mr. Coffield added that the completed list included: Robinson, Toms, Inch, Mills (County sponsor without Headwaters), with Todd underway and Hearthstone ready to go to bid.

Mr. Pyles asked about the Service Authority’s dam being included. Mr. Coffield said Coles Run was not included because water reservoirs do not qualify. Mr. Pyles just wanted that noted.

Mr. Wolfe mentioned that there was a question about fishing on Monday. The Environmental Assessment states that the fishing will recover within two to four years after the dam rehabilitation is complete.

* * * * *

STAUNTON AUGUSTA WAYNESBORO MPO – LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The Board considered the two recommended local projects to be included in the constrained list of the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan:

1. I-81 Interchange at Route 256 – Current Estimate: \$54,585,000
2. Route 250 and Route 358 Intersection at Wilson Workforce and Rehabilitation Center – Current Estimate: \$1,219,000

Mr. Fitzgerald advised that this had been discussed at Monday’s Staff Briefing. He said that the MPO is in the process of putting together a Long Range Transportation Plan for thirty years as a requirement of the Federal government. As part of the plan, there will be a proposed project listing in both a constrained and unconstrained listing. The unconstrained listing is basically a “wish list” of projects that are not able to be funded at this time. The constrained list is a much shorter list that matches the projects to the available funding. All of the projects that are currently on the Six-Year Plan are on the constrained list. It is anticipated that the MPO may be eligible for approximately \$16 million of additional funds. Two projects to be considered are noted above.

Today, the Technical Advisory Committee met and looked at the available funding. On the Interchange at Route 256, the possibility was discussed of putting it into smaller projects. There is an opportunity to push funding forward of \$1.2 million which would be enough to get an IMR (Interchange Modification Report) to reflect what improvements and modifications are needed to meet the Federal standards. He reiterated that the Weyers Cave project is to remain on the constrained list with the understanding that the overall cost would still be at the \$55 million, but the funding associated with it would be \$1 million to \$1.2 million so that the study could be done in order to determine what the smaller projects would be.

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

STAUNTON AUGUSTA WAYNESBORO MPO – LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (cont'd)

Mr. Coffield asked if the Planning Commission made a change in the Comp Plan of Sangers Lane, which is also on the unconstrained list, would the VDOT list have to be modified. Mr. Fitzgerald said it was on the unconstrained “vision” list and no action from the Board will be required.

Mr. Moore, as a member of the MPO, added that the intention of the Long Range Plan is a planning document for a number of years and tries to address the needs based on development. The request was to have two projects from each jurisdiction to move forward.

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

Mr. Wills felt that I-64/Exit 91 preplanning was successful and felt that it would be critical to accomplish the same thing for I-81 at Exit 235 in the Weyers Cave area. “It is prudent to do a study and have the plans completed so that anything you do as small projects match with the major project when it comes, that you don’t have to re-do what you have done before.”

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

BROADBAND GRANT

The Board considered local match for Phase II Virginia Telecommunication Planning Initiative Grant.

Funding Source: Economic Development #80000-8145 \$11,250

Jennifer Whetzel, Finance Director, advised that she updated the Board on a grant that the County applied for (Virginia Telecommunication Planning Initiative Grant) at Monday’s Staff Briefing. This grant is offered by the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD). We were one of fourteen applications selected to move forward to Phase II (applications due August 7th). The application requirements note at least a 15% cash match of the \$75,000 grant (\$11,250). Upon award, the County will issue an RFP for the completion of the telecommunications plan. The funds would be expended for a Telecommunications Consultant. One of the areas to be focused on was economic development and fiber installation. The application will be completed with the entire County plan in mind, with a reference to the more specific project focused around Lifecore Drive.

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

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

VDOT I-64/EXIT 91 PROJECT

The Board considered award of contract for Route 285 sewer line extension.

Funding Source: Wayne Infrastructure Account #80000-8017-92 \$68,970.90

Ms. Whetzel reported that this had been discussed at Monday's Staff Briefing. She noted that the County had opened bids for the Route 285 sewer line extension on July 2nd. There were three bidders with the lowest bid of \$347,396. The Board's previous approval for this project dates back to 2011 based on estimates received at the time for this type of work. It was \$332,663; two-thirds was paid by the County; one-third by the Economic Development Authority. Preliminary Engineering has been paid to date, leaving remaining funds for the project of approximately \$278,000. The low bid above is \$347,000. Before the Board tonight, in order to award this project, required funds are needed from the Wayne Infrastructure Account of \$68,970.90. There were also work performed by the Service Authority related to placing sleeves under the road at an estimated cost of \$85,000. Originally, it had been requested that the Service Authority be responsible for that cost.

Mr. Moore moved, seconded by Mr. Pyles, that the Board approve the request of \$68,970.00 be appropriated from the Wayne Infrastructure Account. He also requested the Board to consider up to \$60,000 to come out of the CIP Utility Account if available (Account #80000-8149) to assist the Service Authority with the work they are undertaking relating to the project.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

BERRY FARM CREP

The Board considered renewing 9.5 acres in CREP program at Berry Farm.

Funding Source: Agriculture Development Account #83050-6007 \$7,287.50

Mr. Wolfe advised that the Board had been briefed on this issue at its Monday's Staff Briefing. The County has had 14 acres in the CREP program at the Berry Farm on the east side of the road for 15 years. That contract is due to expire. The Board needs to determine if they wish to re-enroll in this program. He noted that it is not a huge income-generator but is an area that is not useful for anything else. He felt it to be sensible to have it in the CREP program. This site was viewed with the Service Authority and Parks and Recreation; staff has recommended two areas (9.5 acres) to be re-enrolled into the program (map displayed). Most of the area that was excluded was owned by the Service Authority or they are planning future operation in that area. Along with the request, there is a request of expenditure up to \$14,250 for tree planting if required by the County Forester, in which most is eligible for reimbursement. This application needs to be completed by August 1st.

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

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

* * * * *

CRAIGSVILLE PARK

The Board considered contribution in amount of \$50,000.

Funding Source: Pastures Infrastructure Account #80000-8014-93 \$50,000

Mr. Coffield said that the Board received a request from Mr. Pyles at Monday's Staff Briefing. With that request, was a submission of expenditures by the Town of over \$100,000 for improvements. Mr. Pyles has offered up to \$50,000, which is available in his Infrastructure Account.

Mr. Pyles, in reference to Ms. Earhart's presentation, there were some things mentioned in regards to villages in his district. He felt these improvements are important in the rural area if you want to control development. He noted Craigsville as the only incorporated Town in Augusta County. Craigsville has a small impact on the County but it is very important. He felt that the park, behind the school, is a nice community area.

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

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

BLACKBURN SEWER UTILITY FUND DESIGNATION/TRANSFERRED

Mr. Pyles noted a commitment of \$60,000 from the Utility Fund for development of sewer in the Blackburn subdivision.

Mr. Pyles moved, seconded by Mr. Moore, that designated funding be transferred to the Route 285 sewer line extension project.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

MOUNT SOLON FIRE AND RESCUE

The Board considered contribution in amount of \$10,000.

Funding Source: North River Infrastructure Account #80000-8013-48 \$10,000

Mr. Coffield advised that Dr. Pattie made a request at Monday's Staff Briefing that the Board consider a \$10,000 contribution for the expansion of the Mount Solon Fire and Rescue.

Dr. Pattie said that Mount Solon is expanding their facility for new equipment and noted that this is a \$200,000 project.

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

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

MOUNT SOLON FIRE AND RESCUE (cont'd)

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

CAMPAIGN SIGNAGE

The Board considered whether to establish a policy to limit "campaign signage" on County property except on Election Day at polling places.

Mr. Morgan advised that this had been discussed at Monday's Staff Briefing and the Board asked him to provide additional information for further discussion. He reported that the County has no written policy limiting political activity on County property. There have been two designated public forums created on County property: 1) in front of the Government Center, and 2) the Churchville Library. He noted that the problem comes with allowing political candidates to pass out campaign literature at events like Sweet Dreams is that it becomes extremely difficult to then deny specific groups, like hate groups, from passing out their literature, too. In order to protect the Board and Augusta County, and to make clear what areas would be allowed for such activity, Mr. Morgan felt that the Board would need a written policy. He added that this would take time to draft.

Ms. Bragg asked if this only referred to speaking or could candidates continue using public parks for fund-raising picnics and things similar to that. Mr. Morgan said that would be a form of speech or assembly. She asked if it would be allowed at Sweet Dreams to rent a booth space for political candidates instead of wondering around handing out literature. Mr. Morgan understood that this has not been previously permitted at Sweet Dreams by their Board.

Mr. Pyles felt this should be "left untouched".

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

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

MINUTES

Approved minutes of the following meetings:

- Staff Briefing Meeting, Monday, June 22, 2015
- Joint Worksession, Monday, June 22, 2015
- Regular Meeting, Wednesday, June 24, 2015

CLAIMS

Considered claims paid since June 10, 2015

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE BOARD

The Board discussed the following issue:

Mr. Wills: Attended Shenandoah Valley Partnership meeting. "Great meeting! The cooperation now between the localities and the Partnership is a great asset. All localities need to be commended. The private sector money is increasing drastically every year!"

Mr. Moore: Ordinance Committee meeting held Monday morning. Ms. Earhart will be providing an update at the August Staff Briefing.

Mr. Pyles:

1. Dominion Pipeline - presented the Board information and asked for direction. He read from a book referring to "Jefferson and Madison" – on "The Earth Belongs to the Living" – in reference to rogues "In general, men are not rogues. But rogues are usually uppermost nestling themselves in the places of power and profit. These rogues set out with stealing the people's good opinion and then they steal from them the right of withdrawing it by contriving laws and associations against the power of the people themselves." Mr. Pyles felt that people get into office and they take care of themselves to make it so you can't change things. He referred to a Richmond Times article about campaign contributions from Dominion in how much it went to Senator Frank Wagoner who oversaw the changes in the FCC that took away the right to regulate rates from Dominion, which rates could have been lowered and should have been. Dominion has given \$11 million to the General Assembly since 2005. He expressed concerns of the people losing their rights – "Money corrupts; power corrupts; and it's to the disadvantage of the local communities and to the individual."

Last week Emmett Toms, of Dominion, had requested to come by the Service Authority's office for a meeting. The Director said they took this opportunity to voice its continued objections and concerns about the proposed route through the Lyndhurst Source Water Protection area. They also complained about not following up with the Service Authority for promised meetings or never getting them involved when they performed their Karst Geological Survey as well as the lack of adequate reply to their concerns. Dominion has stated that they have discussed water resources and groundwater issues. He expressed concern of having these meetings and not inviting the Service Authority. He reiterated that he has been trying to set up meetings with them for months to meet with their Karst and Water Supply experts. Mr. Toms had informed him that Nancy Sorrells was representing the Service Authority in this meeting. Ms. Sorrells said she has never attended these meetings as a representative of the Service Authority.

Mr. Fanfoni, Director of the Service Authority, had also mentioned that he was having problems with getting Dominion's staff people (Leslie Hart) to return calls. Mr. Toms had said that the Service Authority was not getting their calls returned because of Mr. Pyles. Mr. Pyles said Dominion is not doing things right. "They have to reply to us. They can't take this step of ignoring what we're doing." On multiple occasions, Mr. Pyles said the County has provided the results of a study to determine the County's water recharge area in Lyndhurst and additional information. A PowerPoint was displayed to the Board. Mr. Pyles noted that the only time he has spoken was on behalf of the Board. He added that Ms. Bragg had gotten an invitation to go to Senator Kaine's office. She provided what the County's concerns were. (Information was given to the Board.) This has been done for months, but Dominion commented that they

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

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

Dominion Pipeline (cont'd)

never received any of this information. He reminded the Board that he had gone with Ms. Sorrells and others with the Atlantic Coast Pipeline to Washington to meet with FERC and present information with their concerns.

A map was displayed showing the Lyndhurst water recharge area which services the largest single well to Augusta County. It does not need to be filtered and it is a critical water supply. He stressed how the blasting, the Pipeline, as well as the karst threatens the well.

Mr. Pyles reiterated that they are not able to get answers from Dominion. "That is a corruption of power because they don't have to listen to this Board. We have no authority over them. Emmett Toms is either incompetent or operating in bad faith. We have responsibility for supplying the water for 35,000 residents of Augusta County. We're responsible for the Landfill security for 110,000 people and we can't get an answer! And we can't get replies because there is corruption! There are people that don't need to listen to us because there are Delegates who gave up their authority to Dominion. We have to have a way to fight back! We are letting our people down by not being more strident and more demanding of Dominion. If we let this go on, shame on us."

Mr. Pyles suggested that some type of legal action needs to be considered to reassert the County's authority. He suggested that the Service Authority draft a letter as to what has been requested and have received no response. Endorsement should come from both the Service Authority and the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Bragg asked if the PowerPoint that was taken to FERC been shown to any of the legislators. Ms. Sorrells said Dominion and FERC received it. A flash-drive was given to Senator Kaine.

2. Aid to the Commonwealth – information distributed to the Board. Board suggested that a letter be submitted to VACo to look at funds to be given back to each locality. "It was our rainy day fund and we need to have it returned." Mr. Coffield said this would be placed on the August 12th agenda.

Chm. Shull: Staunton News Leader article – was not pleased with article. "This Board has bent over backwards to work with Staunton. We get denigrated every time with the newspaper. We've sat and talked. This thing has been going on for several years, now. I know consolidation started in January when the Staunton City Manager was in the office with Pat and I came in. Steve said in that meeting that they had considered it from Staunton's viewpoint, but no action has been taken. Four weeks ago, today, we met in the Judge's Jury Room. We haven't seen anything. I would like to, at least, have some inkling that they are trying to move forward by August 12th. If they have no preference to move forward, then they need to tell us. It seems like that they were wanting us to say no to their offer. Well, as it was pointed out in the study the other day, like Mr. Wills said, 'We're glad that neither one accepted and it was put off long enough that we could see what our needs are.' My fear is that if the referendum doesn't pass, we will not be able to bring it back up for 10 years. After Judge Ludwig retires from the bench, we have some other judge direct us that we have to build something to take care of the courts. Unless it is a consolidated effort from Staunton, I really don't want this County to go out on its own and have to buy land in Staunton. There is

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

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

not enough room there. We have one little portion of that block there. It means that we would have to buy a whole other block in order to put the facility that is needed to take care of the court needs. I think the Editorial Board and everybody needs to start asking Staunton when are they going to step up. We've been looking at this for a long time. If we have to buy land, we will have build a garage if we stay in Staunton. We saw \$44 million the other day. Mr. Coffield sort of laid out how it could be paid for without raising taxes. If it goes over \$44 million, I don't think those figures are going to hold true. Are we going to be forced into that a few years down the road? I don't know if we need to look at getting Moseley to give us a cost of what it would cost us downtown. I think we need some kind of cost so that we can show our public what it would cost us above and beyond if we have to go down that road by ourselves in Staunton. The Judge asked us to put a price together for the referendum. I think it's fair to our citizens to have a price of what it would cost us downtown, too."

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF

Staff discussed the following issues:

1. Aid to the Commonwealth – information distributed to the Board.
2. Middle River Regional Jail Tour – Monday, August 17th, 10:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. – asked if any Board member wanted to attend.
3. Courts
 - Funding scenario/proposal distributed to Board:
 - 30-years loan
 - Bond rates – 4%
 - Principal & Interest - \$2.4 million annually
 - How to pay for it:
 - 2017 pre-committed in Depreciation Accounts
 - FY16 – increased taxes \$1,796,700
 - 1-2 to Schools
 - 1-2 to County CIP Account (\$889,000 – 30-year period)
 - MRRJ buy-in – 39% over the next 10 years (\$587,000 installments)
 - Ladd Elementary School - \$3 million committed
 - \$1.4 million toward cost – Growth \$75,000 accumulative for 30-year period
 - 2033 – shortfall for 6 years – surplus exceeds decreases

Mr. Pyles added that the expectation is that once the court is here, there will be various activities—more traffic, more people going to restaurants, more real estate sales – possible additional \$150,000 new revenue. There is also an expectation of savings in operations.

* * * * *

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION

On motion of Ms. Bragg, seconded by Mr. Wills, 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) Pending Economic Development Prospect(s)

On motion of Dr. Pattie, seconded by Mr. Moore, the Board came out of Closed Session and adjourned subject to the call of the Chairman.

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

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

* * * * *

PLANNING COMMISSION - APPOINTMENT

Mr. Pyles moved, seconded by Dr. Pattie, that the Board accept the resignation of Taylor Cole and appoint E. Thomas Jennings, Jr., to serve an unexpired term on the Planning Commission, to begin immediately, and expire June 30, 2016.

July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

PLANNING COMMISSION - APPOINTMENT

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

DOMINION PIPELINE

Mr. Moore suggested that Chairman Shull of Board of Supervisors and Chairman Pyles of the Augusta County Service Authority seek an audience (meeting) with the Governor to express concerns regarding local water quality issues.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

Chairman

County Administrator