
Regular Meeting, Wednesday, August 26, 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

VIRGINIA: At a regular meeting of the Augusta County Board of Supervisors held on Wednesday, August 26, 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.

* * * * *

Tyler Housh; Zach Harper; and Jaiden Loveless, of Boy Scout Troup #52, and Stewart Middle School, led us with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Tyler enjoys skateboarding; Zack enjoys being outdoors and hopes to be a Sheriff in the future; Jaiden enjoys reading, swimming, biking and stated that he was here tonight to earn his Citizenship and Community Badge.

* * * * *

Chairman Shull, Supervisor for the Riverheads District, delivered invocation.

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC - NONE

* * * * *

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Board considered amending the Augusta County Comprehensive Plan 2007-2027 by adopting a 2014/2015 Update to the Plan. The Planning Commission recommended approval with revisions.

Becky Earhart, Senior Planner, reported that this was discussed at Monday's Staff Briefing. She noted that a public hearing was held in July. The Planning Commission supported the following revisions:

1. Sangers Lane Road Project:
 - Draft Plan calls for Sangers Lane from Balsley Road to Barrenridge Road to be improved to meet 2 lane Secondary Road Standards.
 - Residents along the road request project to be deleted.
 - Recommendation is to delete the project from the text and the maps in the Comp Plan.

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

2. Forgotten Lane Policy Designation Area

- Draft Plan calls for area to be changed from Urban Service Area to Community Development based on limitation to the public sewer system
- Property owner wants to retain option to develop at density compatible with what is adjacent to him since access will be off Forgotten Lane (a map was displayed designating property)
- Recommendation is to keep TM 59-81 in USA.

3. Capital Improvement Plan (text changes to be made)

Courts

- Moseley Study has now been completed
- Cost estimate for a new facility in Verona- \$44 million
- Recommendation is to amend the text to reflect the completion of the Needs Assessment and the \$44 million cost estimate

4. Sheriff's Department

- Current Public Safety Goals, Objectives, and Policies language supports maintenance of accreditation from the Virginia Law Enforcement Professional Standards Commission
- Sheriff has withdrawn from program
- Staff Recommendation had been to amend the text to read:
Support the efforts of the Sheriff's Department to seek accreditation and/or reaccreditation from the Virginia Law Enforcement Professional Standards Commission
- Planning Commission Recommendation is to amend the text to read:
Support the efforts of the Sheriff's Department to seek professional accreditation and/or reaccreditation

The Planning Commission considered the following comments but is not recommending any change in these areas:

5. Ramsey Road (map displayed) – property across the street is recommended for Rural Conservation Area (RCA). Concerns were expressed of transition from Industrial to RCA; however, the Industrial property was not advertised for any change; therefore, there is no consideration of a change currently.

6. New Hope – (map displayed)

- Resident concerned about growth in New Hope
- Doesn't support the land use designation change from Rural Community to Low Density Residential and Village Mixed use
- If New Hope develops wants to see it slow and deliberate
- Doesn't support strip development pattern

7. Hermitage Road – (map displayed)

- Draft Plan calls for this area to be changed from Urban Service Area to Community Development Area based on topography and likelihood of extension occurring.
- Residents want to retain the ability to have public sewer extended at a later date.
- Staff Recommendation is to change all this area to Community Development Area as proposed and not to put it back in the USA.

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (cont'd)

Ms. Earhart added that if a health hazard occurs, it has been suggested that it can be reviewed again and entertain other considerations.

Ms. Bragg moved, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the Board approve the Comprehensive Plan 2014/2015 Update with revisions.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

Patrick J. Coffield, County Administrator, commended Ms. Earhart, Planning Commission, staff and all the Boards and Commission members that “participated with input and greatly contributed to the Plan’s development. The process involved a lot of meetings and a lot of public discussions. This Plan will put the County in good stead today, tomorrow, five years from now as it continues to be the foundation of good solid planning that I believe Augusta County has benefitted from throughout the timeframe Becky has served as our County Planner.”

Chairman Shull added that this Plan is a guideline and can be revised when needed.

* * * * *

FIRE AND RESCUE – SAFER GRANT

The Board considered acceptance of SAFER Grant in the amount of \$2,691,260 (2-year grant funding).

Carson Holloway, Fire Chief, advised that this was discussed at Monday’s Staff Briefing and was available to answer any questions the Board may have.

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

Dr. Pattie advised that he supported the overall grant but expressed the concern of not being able to reduce the number of firefighters to some number less than 20. “The second-due response rate is currently 2.1 and 3.3%, which is down from 2014, which was 2.2 and 3.2%. We’re performing pretty well, so adding 20 firefighters will generate diminishing returns. I don’t know how much better we’re going to get, but I do think we will be able to get more assets out on fire and rescue calls. I’m concerned that is going to deplete the Volunteers. Trying to find 20 paid staff in firefighters is going to be challenging and difficult. Three and a half years from now, when our financial situation changes, and we don’t have any more grant money, I wonder if we’re going to have the ability to absorb \$1.3 million annually. Again, I am supportive of the overall grant. I think it will be good for us and will give us some flexibility as we can evaluate the future of Fire and Rescue in Augusta County.”

Ms. Bragg agreed with Dr. Pattie. She was disappointed that the grant was “all or nothing” and expressed concerns of funding in the future. “I, too, have concerns about the Volunteers because that is where I think a large number of these positions are going to be filled from.”

Mr. Wills had the same concerns three years ago when the farst grant was first accepted. A positive note was the fact that a program has been started at Valley Vo-Tech to get students involved at a young age in Firefighting training. In having this program, the County can “basically guarantee them a job when they come out of Valley Vo-Tech. We’re not the only locality that faces these kinds of issues. To be able to utilize the funds for a couple of years is a positive step.”

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

FIRE AND RESCUE – SAFER GRANT (cont'd)

Chairman Shull agreed that the whole Board had concerns. “We value the tax dollar in how we spend it. The numbers in Valley Vo-Tech are 13. It’s just getting put out there in the schools. I hope the news media will broadcast it more. The Volunteer Coordinator is working with the schools to try getting students more involved. Hopefully, in the years to come, we will get an increase in students. This is one way to get more volunteers and we have to keep looking at other ways to retain the volunteers.”

Mr. Pyles added that “20 is a good many of career people, but we still have an enormous number of volunteers out there. To some degree, more career people can take some of the load off of volunteers who have put in so many hours that they burn out and they drop away. I think, if you go into Preston Yancey, they were being overworked there and there were far too many calls and everybody just bailed out. I think we have had the opportunity over there to build back volunteers and have them come in. Since our last discussions, we have to try to look at the difference between consolidation and disbursement of agencies. I think, with the size of our County, there are some issues with consolidation. You need more people to man our Deerfield, Mt. Solon, Wilson . . . some of the places that are out there because of 1) the time of the service, and 2) the time it takes to get out there can be critical life and death situations. We are going to have, and I think we will continue to have, a lot of good volunteers for Fire. Guys are happy to come out and fight fires. It doesn’t take near the training and intensity that it does to be an EMT. I think our Fire side is going to be all right and we get great benefit from our volunteers, fundraising, and buying ambulances. But where our structure has to change is with Rescue because with Rescue, the folks that are doing that takes quite an effort and not everybody wants to do it. It is a matter of life or death. I think some of the things that we have in our hybrid systems to going to be the model for what we do otherwise. What we’re doing at Weyers Cave is a very good thing. It is similar to what we did at Preston Yancey; it is what we did at Riverheads. What we are essentially changes putting in a career Rescue station among the volunteer Fire Department. That may be some way we have to go. For these first two years, this is for Fire. As we evolve out and we see what goes on, I think more of them will be assigned to EMT areas and do that. There are a couple of issues that came up with the grant funding and it dying, is what we ran into after the first grant was coming to an end the first time, and Chief Holloway came to us, saying ‘We’ve got good people who are in these SAFER positions and they can be offered permanent jobs someplace else; how do I tell them that they are going to have a job?’ What we said, at that point was if we can’t afford all 21, when we get to the point that we see that, as people leave the agency, we won’t replace them, and we will work by attrition down to that number we can afford. I think that we use that model in the future and it can reassure our people, but allow us to get to the place that we feel is the right dollar level out there. We do hope that we can come up with some savings. I think if we can knock out over-time; there is around \$300,000 that goes there. If we can take that down to \$200,000, or \$100,000; you’ve got five of the people paid for there. There are some other things I think can happen and we will have some growth in the budget, I believe. I think some things that we saw that changed in our BPOL revenues and new businesses, there are hopeful things out there. I do see us as to having walk very carefully as these get introduced to our volunteers, but I think we can do that. I don’t want to take any more money from them. I think we need to keep that whole. What a pleasure it will be to have a couple too many than a half dozen too few. I think that’s a better thing for the County and we can work at this without it costing the taxpayer. We can figure it out in two years and then get it right.”

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

* * * * *

ELECTORAL BOARD – POLLING PRECINCT

The Board considered Electoral Board and County staff’s recommendations for Phase I work plan.

Funding Source: CIP Electoral Board Account #80000-8049 \$10,000

Mr. Coffield advised that this was discussed at Monday’s Staff Briefing.

Ms. Bragg moved, seconded by Mr. Pyles, that the Board approve the request for Phase I work plan.

Chairman Shull explained to the public that this concern was expressed by the Department of Justice. He stated that when these buildings were built, it passed the State Building Code and questioned why it was a problem now. He mentioned that Phase II has not even been priced out, yet, and noted that there were some buildings that would never be compliant with the current Code.

Mr. Pyles added that “\$10,000 is not worth fighting the Federal government. The next level, it may be time to put a foot down.”

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board considered Ordinance Review Committee recommendations regarding advertising the following ordinances:

- a. Chapter 2 - Economic Development Department
- b. Chapter 17 - Small Purchase Procedures
- c. Chapter 19 - Building Permit Fee Structure
- d. Chapter 25 - On-the-Farm Activities
- e. Chapter 25 - Mini-Warehouses
- f. Chapter 25 - Commercial Vehicle Regulations

Ms. Earhart reported that this had been discussed at the Staff Briefing on Monday and reminded the Board that the purpose for tonight is to determine advertisement for public hearings. She addressed the following ordinances:

- a. Chapter 2:
 - Economic Development Department would not report directly to the Board of Supervisors
 - Would become a regular County Government Department
 - Advertisement required, but no public hearing

Patrick J. Morgan, County Attorney, added that, under the State Code, not every ordinance considered by the Board has to be considered with a public hearing. Economic Development Department and Small Purchase Procedures are examples of not requiring a public hearing.

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS (cont'd)

- b. Chapter 17:
- Small Purchase Procurement- increase the “not expected to exceed” cost from \$50,000 to \$100,000.
 - Consistent with State Code.
 - Advertisement required, but no public hearing
- c. Chapter 19:
- Amend fee structure
 - Relocating structures: \$0.15 per square foot of heated space instead of value of the work.
 - Demolition- Eliminate the fee if a permit is not required by USBC; increase fee from \$10.00 to \$25.00 if required
 - Signs- No building permit if sign is exempt from USBC; \$25.00 permit fee per permit instead of value of the sign.
 - Advertise; BOS only

Ms. Earhart noted that these first three ordinances could be advertised for the September meetings (September 23rd).

- d. Chapter 25 – On-the-Farm Activities:
- Adding definitions:
 - Agricultural operation
 - Agritourism Activity
 - Bonafide Production
 - Substantial Impact
 - Limited Special Events- no more than 2 per year; no more than 2 days per event; owner or operator of farm; 7 a.m.- midnight; on-site parking; attendees and vehicles based on acreage
 - Added beer breweries and distilleries from accessory use section, as well as wineries in this section for consistency
- e. Chapter 25 – Mini-Warehouses (a revised attachment was placed at the Board’s seats):
- If within 100’ of residential land or land planned for residential, Administrative Permit if:
- Buildings are no more than 35’ tall
 - No doors facing residential land may exceed 8’
 - No individual building larger than 2000 sq. ft. or aggregate of 10,000
 - All buildings, structures, access drives, aisleways setback from residential at least 100’
 - No building or structure within 200’ of an arterial street

If you can’t meet these standards, SUP by BZA. This would allow a more case-by-case review by the BZA.

Mr. Wills asked Mr. Morgan if a Special Use Permit was required for all mini-storages in General Business, was that more restrictive. Mr. Morgan said, in looking at that restriction, the proposal would have to be determined how more intensive it would be than what was advertised. An example: If you would not be able to advertise to rezone property from Agricultural to Residential, but then consider it Industrial. Mr. Wills did not have a problem with Industrial zones having mini-warehouses, but he did in General Business zones. He felt that General Business zones needed to be better protected.

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS (cont'd)

f. Chapter 25 – Commercial Vehicle Regulations:

Definition: Any vehicle which displays business or commercial advertising lettered or attached thereon, or any vehicle that sits on at least 2 axles and is designed to carry freight or merchandise, whether loaded or empty, or any vehicle licenses and/or operated as a “for hire” vehicle, or personal vehicles used for business or commercial purposes, whether full or part-time. For the purposes of this chapter, a vehicle and pull-behind trailer is considered a one unit, unless otherwise limited by specific district regulations.

Accessory Use to Single Family Dwellings

In residentially zoned and GA lots less than 1 acre, commercial vehicles allowed with the following limitations:

- 1 commercial vehicle per lot over manufacturer’s GVW of 10,000 lb. and it can’t be parked on the public street or right-of-way or in front yards, except the driveway
- No semi-trailer of a tractor-trailer, garbage truck, construction equipment, dump truck or wrecker with an empty weight of 20,000 lb. or more
- Any commercial vehicle parked shall be owned and operated only by an occupant of the dwelling unless there is a SUP

Ms. Earhart asked for clarification as to whether or not the Board wanted to add an option for 1 commercial vehicle **over 10,000 lb.** may be parked on a lot that isn’t the owners with a SUP (by having permission from a neighbor to park vehicle on their property).

She suggested that if this is done, there should be specific standards for the SUP so that a vacant lot would not become a parking lot.

SUP for Off-site parking of a Commercial Vehicle

- Lot must contain a Single Family Dwelling
- Only 1 commercial vehicle on the lot over 10,000 lbs.
- Can’t be parked in the front yard, except the driveway, unless BZA determines it is compatible with neighboring properties
- No vehicle exceeding 10,000 lb. may be parked in the street
- Must be parked within 200’ of the lot line of the dwelling it is accessory to

Home Occupations- Class A

- For clarity adding that all parking associated with the home business be off-street and not located in any required front yard, except the driveway, unless in full compliance with Accessory Use Section.
- Deleting the numerical limitation on commercial vehicles but must meet requirements of Accessory Use Section
- Adding that you can have a landscaping, lawn care, and mobile motor vehicle repair businesses as home occupations if all equipment, materials, and utility vehicles are kept off-site. Requires documentation

Home Occupations- Class B

- For clarity adding that all parking associated with the home business be off-street and not located in any required front yard, except the driveway, unless in full compliance with Accessory Use Section.
- Deleting the numerical limitation on commercial vehicles but must meet requirements of Accessory Use Section

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS (cont'd)

- Adding that you can have a landscaping, lawn care, and mobile motor vehicle repair businesses as home occupations if all equipment, materials, and utility trailers over 16' are kept off-site. Requires documentation

Ms. Earhart explained that the three zoning ordinances would require public hearings by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors at a later date in October (October 28th).

Ms. Bragg, in reference to the mini-warehouses, felt that she needed more time to view property before making a decision and asked if this could be deferred to the next meeting (September 9th). Mr. Moore agreed with Ms. Bragg's suggestion.

Mr. Wills suggested that the language of being able to park a vehicle on a neighbor's property should be deleted.

Mr. Moore moved, seconded by Ms. Bragg, that the Board authorize staff to advertise the first three ordinances (Chapters 2, 17, and 19) for the Board of Supervisors in September (September 23rd) and to advertise d (On-the-Farm Activities) and f (Commercial Vehicle Regulations), with amendment of removing language of placing a vehicle on neighbor's property with a Special Use Permit for October 28th public hearing. Mini-Warehouses (e) will be placed on the next agenda (September 9th) for further discussion.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

NEW HOPE COMMUNITY CENTER

The Board considered supplemental appropriation for roofing project.

Funding Source: Middle River Infrastructure Account #80000-8012-88 \$486

Mr. Coffield said this was discussed at the Staff Briefing on Monday.

Mr. Wills 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.

* * * * *

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON

The Board considered extension of agreement for an additional twelve-month period.

Mr. Coffield advised that this was discussed at the Staff Briefing on Monday and noted that those funds are included in the FY15-16 budget.

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON (cont'd)

Ms. Bragg moved, seconded by Mr. Wills, that the Board approve the extension.

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

 Nays: None

Motion carried.

Chairman Shull explained to the public that Ms. Woods is the County’s Legislative Liaison and works with all the legislators and coordinates the County’s legislative priorities with the Board.

* * * * *

COORDINATION AMERICA

The Board considered input received from Coordination America Staff Briefing presentation.

Mr. Morgan advised that this was discussed at Monday’s Staff Briefing. He explained that this was an organization that assists local governments in addressing environmental matters with the Federal government and attempts to getting a close working relationship with the local and Federal governments.

Mr. Pyles suggested that the presentation be treated as informational at this time. He was not overwhelmed with the presentation and felt that more research was needed.

Mr. Moore agreed with Mr. Pyles. He felt that the Forest Service comments may benefit the County and suggested that the County contact them offering assistance if needed.

Mr. Pyles said he would continue his research and bring back any valuable information to the Board.

Chairman Shull felt the presentation provided some good information. Mr. Fitzgerald had mentioned on Monday that Dominion has not provided all requested information to FERC. Senator Kaine had commented of slowing down the process to provide time for receipt of responses.

Mr. Pyles added that the Board of Supervisors and the Service Authority Board should be credited for what Senator Kaine did. “It was information that was provided via Ms. Bragg and through other things that was sent to them—with the studies that we funded on karst, on groundwater supply, on the water sourcing, etc. It is fine to write a letter stating that we are against it, but it is something else to send all this documentation by experts in their field who has looked at these particular issues as opposed to just a 5000-ft. examination that comes from Dominion, we have boots on the ground studying it. I think steps that we have taken to fund things and provide information has been helpful.”

Ms. Bragg asked if this information has been sent to other legislators.

Mr. Pyles said that a letter was going to be considered. He noted that two weeks ago Dominion met with the Service Authority. He did not feel they should attack them by saying they had not provided information if they were in the process of doing that. He checked with the Service Authority on Monday to see if anything had been received from Dominion. The Service Authority said they had received a little information regarding some forestry issues. At the meeting, Dominion stated that they had some other issues to discuss with Mr. Monroe. Mr. Pyles did not want a “Bill of Particulars” to go out to Dominion before giving them some time to produce the information that has

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

COORDINATION AMERICA (cont'd)

been requested.

Ms. Bragg asked about the attempt to visit the Governor. Mr. Pyles said that needs to continue to be considered as we proceed with discussion with FERC and Dominion.

Timmy Fitzgerald, Director of Community Development, asked for clarification on becoming a cooperating agency. He felt that they should confirm with FERC that the County would not like to become a cooperating agency at this time.

Mr. Pyles moved, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the Board does not become a cooperating agency with FERC and to leave open its option after the filing.

Ms. Bragg offered to provide the Board with the complete Senator Kaine letter.

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

 Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

WAIVERS/VARIANCES

The Board discussed the Gardner fireflow waiver.

Mr. Fitzgerald advised that this had been discussed at Monday's Staff Briefing. He reiterated that the new policy on water connections provides for a waiver provision in certain circumstances. Dr. Gardner would qualify for a waiver under that policy; however, because of it being a commercial building and located in the Urban Service Area, the ordinance requires fireflow to be met or to be waived by the Board of Supervisors. Before issuing a waiver for a connection to the waterline, the Board would need to consider the fireflow waiver. Dr. Gardner was available to answer questions the Board may have.

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

Mr. Wells asked if the structure was an enclosed structure.

Dr. David Gardner, 52 Fadley Road, Weyers Cave, Virginia, stated that the structure is going to be open-air; however, it will have doors that can be closed, but it will not be heated or air-conditioned. Mr. Wells expressed concern of the possibility of having a fire causing the loss of a person, would that increase the County's liability exposure. Mr. Morgan said he did not believe it would.

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

 Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

MINUTES

Approved minutes of the following meetings:

- Regular Meeting, Wednesday, August 12, 2015

VDOT – ROUTE 636 LIFECORE DRIVE

Adopted the following Route 636 Lifecore Drive Closeout Resolution:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Augusta County has completed Project 0636-007-468 (Lifecore Drive Addition), and

WHEREAS, the project sketch and VDOT Form(s) AM4.3, attached and incorporated herein as part of this resolution, defines adjustments required in the Secondary System of State highways as a result of construction, and

WHEREAS, certain segments identified on the incorporated Form AM4.3 are ready to be accepted into the Secondary System of State Highways, and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, this board requests the Virginia Department of Transportation to add the segment identified on the incorporated Form AM4.3 to the Secondary System of State highways, pursuant to §33.2-705 of the *Code of Virginia*, for which sections this Board hereby guarantees the right of way to be clear and unrestricted, including any necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drainage, and

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

* * *

NRCS – HAYS CREEK WATERSHED PLAN

Adopted resolution for closeout of the Hays Creek Watershed Plan.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE BOARD

The Board discussed the following issue:

Mr. Pyles:

1. RECYCLING COMMITTEE - REAPPOINTMENT

Mr. Pyles moved, seconded by Dr. Pattie, that the Board reappoint Carl R. Cline to serve a term on the Recycling Committee, to begin September 25, 2015 and expire June 30, 2016.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

2. Rock crest problem in Deerfield – last meeting occurred 13 years ago and was told nothing could be done because of endangered species. Met with VDOT and

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

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

Mr. Fitzgerald. It was suggested to widen the road on the riverside. He liked the idea and stated "We have a little light at the end of the tunnel."

* * *

Ms. Bragg:

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY (CAP-SAW) - APPOINTMENT

Ms. Bragg moved, seconded by Dr. Pattie, that the Board appoint Nadine Gergel-Hackett to serve a two-year term on the CAP-SAW, to begin immediately and expire June 30, 2017.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

YOUTH COMMISSION – APPOINTMENT

Ms. Bragg moved, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the Board appoint Jeff S. Long to serve a three-year term on the Youth Commission, effective immediately, to expire June 30, 2018.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

PARKS AND RECREATION – APPOINTMENT

Ms. Bragg moved, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the Board appoint Matthew C. Altis to serve an unexpired term on the Parks and Recreation Commission, effective immediately, to expire June 30, 2016.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

RECYCLING COMMITTEE - REAPPOINTMENT

Mr. Wills moved, seconded by Mr. Moore, that the Board reappoint Riley Murray to serve a term on the Recycling Committee, to begin September 25, 2015 and expire June 30, 2016.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

* * *

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

Mr. Wills:

1. Comprehensive Plan – commended Ms. Earhart “magnificent job! Her ability to communicate with our different commissions has been outstanding. I wanted her to know that we appreciate it as a Board.”
2. School Bus accident yesterday – “Firefighters, volunteers, paid staff should be commended for their response. You hope you never see an accident like that, but to know that things went as planned, gives us a lot of confidence in the ability to work together because multiple agencies had to be involved. I want to thank them and commend them for their response yesterday.” Mr. Pyles added they the people in Deerfield were very complementary of our Emergency Services – “that they were out there; they acted appropriately; and they reassured the kids as they needed to.”

Mr. Moore:

LIFECORE SHARED USE PATH – EASEMENTS

With the update from Mr. Komara (VDOT) at Monday’s Staff Briefing, he learned that the Rural Rustic improvements had begun at Old Goose Creek Road. Maps were displayed indicating two easements that Mr. Moore would like to be able to secure from the Hoys who have agreed to sell the easements in an amount of \$2,000 and asked if the Board would approve the costs to be appropriated from his Infrastructure Account or if it needed to be placed on the September 9th agenda.

Mr. Pyles felt that when this project began, the Hoys strongly supported it and it increased the value of their property tremendously and he found “it a little ‘not polite for them to expect us to pay them for making the property much more valuable’.” He said he would not stop the motion.

Mr. Moore moved, seconded by Ms. Bragg, that the Board approve the appropriation not to exceed \$2,000 from the Wayne Infrastructure Account to record the two easements.

Funding Source: Wayne Infrastructure Account #80000-8017-93

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

AUGUSTA COUNTY LIBRARY - APPOINTMENT

Mr. Wells moved, seconded by Ms. Bragg, that the Board appoint Peggy B. Sheets to serve an unexpired term on the Augusta County Library, to begin immediately and expire June 30, 2016.

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

Nays: None

Motion carried.

* * *

August 26, 2015, at 7:00 p.m.

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

Chairman Shull:

1. School Bus accident – He had spoken with Dr. Bond who expressed being pleased with County staff and volunteers “and the professionalism of how things went out there”. Today, he spoke with Dr. Bond and learned that the driver was released from the hospital and one child remained in the hospital. Commended the career and volunteers Fire and Rescue personnel who responded.
2. Lockdown today because of the two individuals who lost their lives in Roanoke (news reporter and camera man). “Sad to see the loss of two lives at such an early age. That could happen here. Hopefully, we don’t have to face that.”

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY STAFF

Staff discussed the following issues:

1. Jail Tour for newest members from Harrisonburg and Rockingham; Waynesboro, Staunton and Augusta participated. “Great networking among all the elected officials! Great appreciation for all the services. Even though it is a jail, we are charged for the care and carrying out the orders of the courts. We also have the responsibility to do what we can to help prepare them for re-entering public life. It was demonstrated how our Trustee programs, Work programs, Work Release programs and Educational work . . . It’s more than just jail cells. It is extremely coordinated in a very safe and humane manner.” Mr. Wills added that the people from Rockingham and Harrisonburg were reassured that the decision they had made was the right one. They had commented that they were glad that the County continued negotiations “to make the deal”. Mr. Wells was impressed with the changes that had taken place in the last 12 years since he had retired.
2. Day Care – Mr. Pyles had mentioned at Monday’s Staff Briefing. With more people going back to work, the need for day care subsidies increases. The State of Virginia has budgeted \$552,000 for SAW for subsidized day care. Applications qualifying for more exceeded what was budgeted. The State has allowed the County to encumber an additional \$200,000 but were told to place everyone else on a waiting list. In the past, when funds ran out late in the fiscal year, people were cut off. The State is hopeful that other areas will not use all of their allotments and then they can cover the \$200,000. There is an outside chance for additional funding above the funding currently authorized. Mr. Pyles mentioned that he had received a call from a citizen who was paying half her salary for day care. “That’s the kind of thing, I think, we want to keep people engaged and help the working poor.”

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business to come before the Board, Mr. Pyles moved, seconded by Mr. Wills, 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
h:8-26min.15

County Administrator