

AT A WORK SESSION OF THE ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
HELD IN THE ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE BUILDING  
AT 150 SOUTH MAIN STREET, LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA  
ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2018 AT 4:30 P.M.

\*\*\*

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT THE REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULED FOR  
MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2018 WAS POSTPONED UNTIL THIS  
DATE AND TIME DUE TO INCLEMENT WEATHER.

\*\*\*

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:     DAVID W. HINTY, JR. (CHAIRMAN)  
                                  JOHN M. HIGGINS (VICE-CHAIRMAN)  
                                  DANIEL E. LYONS  
                                  A.J. "JAY" LEWIS, II. (Arrived at 4:32 p.m.)

ABSENT:                         RONNIE R. CAMPBELL

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR  
AND CLERK TO THE BOARD:    ABSENT

COUNTY ATTORNEY:             VICKIE L. HUFFMAN

\*\*\*

CALLED TO ORDER:

Chairman Hinty opened the Work Session and rearranged the two items  
on the Agenda.

**Health Benefits Review:**

Human Resources Manager Heidi Conner briefly reviewed her Agenda  
Item:

"At a recent meeting with OneDigital Benefits, Jim Gordon, Principal,  
provided an update regarding the County's current claims data, reviewed  
processes for the upcoming renewal period, and discussed potential  
strategies for reducing costs and increasing value for the County and  
employees. Currently, the County is performing at a loss-ratio of

approximately 63%, which is better than the industry target of 75%. The loss-ratio is defined as the amount of claims (less amounts over the pooling point) versus the amount of premium. As participants with The Local Choice, Rockbridge County is "pooled" with other localities similar in size in an effort stabilize costs from year to year. A pooling point of \$100,000 has been established by The Local Choice; the County is not responsible for, nor will be negatively impacted for costs exceeding the pooling point. Current enrollment is 198 employees (242 total members). No claimants have exceeded the pooling point. Sixty-eight percent of the enrolled have not met the \$1,000 deductible. Rockbridge County's group is performing very well, and has solid claims data and loss ratios for the last several years. With this information in mind, it is worthwhile for OneDigital to explore the market to research what potential savings may exist through other carriers. The ability to find additional options for coverage could offer more flexibility, control over benefit design, and improved negotiation power during future renewals. Our locality continues to face market challenges due to the lack of competition in the area. Anthem is the dominant carrier in our area and in conjunction with The Local Choice pool, offers the best discounts. During the last renewal process, we were not able to secure any competitive bids. However, with a recent contract between Washington and Lee University and Aetna, we are hopeful that this year will yield more positive results. The FY 2020 renewal process will begin at the end of this month when census data is collected; the RFP will be disseminated in early January. Potential carriers in our area include Anthem, Cigna, Aetna, United, and Optima. Proposals will be finalized when the County receives renewal data from the

current carrier, The Local Choice, during the first week of February. Once renewal information from The Local Choice and other potential carriers are received, the County will need to explore possible strategies to decrease costs and enhance benefit value. These strategies will be based on what results from the market proposals. Some general considerations include increasing County contribution for dependent coverage, offering a base plan with a higher deductible and buy-up options, providing more benefit variety with expanded coverage tiers, combining with the school system to increase buying power, and offering Health Reimbursement Accounts."

**County Decal Discussion:**

Fiscal Services Director Steven Bolster briefly reviewed the Agenda Item and Memorandum provided in the Board's packet:

"Over the years, on multiple occasions, the Board of Supervisors have considered elimination of the requirement for residents to purchase County decals. Ms. Huffman has previously issued five Board reports on the topic, dating back to the mid 2000's. However, no action has ever been taken. The current Board has asked that this topic be revisited. As a result, County staff, Commissioner of the Revenues David Whitesell and Treasurer Betty Trovato have met on multiple occasions over the past several months to review options. Additionally, Chairman Hinty appointed an ad hoc Board committee consisting of Supervisors Higgins and Lewis to review the topic. At a November Committee meeting, Ms. Trovato, Mr. Whitesell and staff presented resultant information and were asked to place the discussion on an upcoming work session agenda, to which Chairman Hinty agreed. A brief history and options (with associated pros and cons)

are contained in the attached memorandum. In an effort to avoid redundancy, Ms. Huffman's five previous memos on this subject are not attached. However, should the Board or citizens wish to review the documents, they are available upon request in the County Administrator's office (or via phone request and digital delivery). In addition to staff, Ms. Trovato and Mr. Whitesell will be in attendance at Monday's work session to assist in presenting the background and options to the Board."

#### Memorandum

##### **"Background:**

Historically, and to our understanding, the primary purpose of requiring residents to purchase County decals was to provide a source of revenue where each resident, vehicle owner was charged a flat rate on vehicles being used by that owner. Additional benefits included:

- A way to help enforce payment of personal property taxes
- Ability to quickly identify a resident of the County - primarily related to waste disposal locations.

Over time, the ability to share information with the Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) evolved. All vehicle title changes can now be more easily shared with localities, so that personal property taxes can be accurately tracked and assessed. Similarly, the Treasurer has the ability to place a DMV stop to vehicle registration renewal. The stop is not removed until payment of the outstanding indebtedness to the County is made. However, the annual decal requirement is still a tool that the Treasurer relies on to help ensure fair and equitable tax collection. Also, the fact remains that for the foreseeable future, the County will still need a method to quickly and accurately identify residents at points

of service - mainly at solid waste collection centers (including the Blue Ridge Resource Authority Landfill). Additionally, the County relies on the revenue source to support governmental services. Currently, decal notices are sent to residents in March each year and purchase is due by April 15. Not all vehicles registered in the County have a decal. Some residents have multiple vehicles, but they may not purchase decals for all. Rather, they are required to purchase decals for only the vehicles which will be used on public roads.

Issues with the current system include:

- From the residents' position
  - o Annual inconvenience of procuring a decal
  - o Difficulty in removing old decals
- From the County's position
  - o Annual task of billing, tracking and enforcing the decal program
  - o Cost of the program
    - Staff time
    - Materials

The current goal is to find a solution which:

- Maintains current levels of revenue at approximately \$535,000 per year
- Provides the ability to quickly and easily identify County residents
- Reduces the amount of time (and money) expended by residents and staff in achieving/maintaining compliance

Option 1 - Status Quo.

Pros

- 1) No staff time required to implement

2) Collection tool remains in use for the Treasurer

3) All vehicles operated on County roads are assessed an equal fee  
(\$25.00)

#### Cons

1) No forward progress

2) Continued frustration by residents on annual decal process (trips to the Treasurer's Office and physical replacement of decals).

3) Continued cost of annual issuance process, including cost of materials and the fact that Treasurer's Office staff could be spending the lost time seeking collection of outstanding taxes.

Option 2 - Eliminate Decals and replace revenues with a fee for each vehicle listed on the personal property tax bill. The fee could be a direct offset (\$25), which would result in increased revenue since the fee would apply to vehicles not currently required to have a decal. In the alternative, the fee on each vehicle could be reduced to an amount (estimated at \$18) that would generate revenues as close to 100% of existing revenues as possible. To address identification of County residents for use of services, a resident could receive a permanent mirror sticker the first time they visit a collection center. Rear-view mirror stickers would be kept at each collection center location and be issued to residents on their first visit to the site after the policy goes into effect. Residents with a valid County decal on the vehicle would be issued one mirror sticker to be applied onsite (and could then remove their County decal). Alternatively, they could produce the vehicle's registration card (which shows the locality where the vehicle is principally garaged) to receive a mirror sticker.

Pros:

- 1) Elimination of decal placement/replacement inconvenience for residents.
- 2) All vehicles would be assessed an equal fee
- 3) With a simple \$25 fee, revenue should increase because some residents have not purchased decals for all their vehicles in prior years.

Cons:

- 1) Residents who did not previously purchase decals for all their vehicles would end up paying more than they have in the past. (Some residents have vehicles that are registered and assessed for personal property tax, but have not purchased decals because they do not take those vehicles on the road. Thus, *some residents could end up paying substantially more than they have in the past*).
- 2) Any effort to address Con #1, by attempting to assess the fee (whether \$25 or some lesser amount) only to on-road vehicles would put the Commissioner of the Revenues in an impossible situation of trying to determine whether a vehicle is intended as an on-road or off-road vehicle. The number and complexity of abatements would increase, putting a strain on the Commissioner's Office.
- 3) Loss of collection tool for the Treasurer.
- 4) Display of County decal is one of the criteria for determining whether a vehicle is operable. Elimination of the decal will require amendment of the inoperable vehicle provisions of County Code and could, in some cases, complicate enforcement.

Option 3 - Eliminate Decals and replace revenues with a calculated increase in personal property tax. Based on prior collections, a calculation would be made to ascertain the percentage increase needed to replace revenue.

Like Option 2, a resident could receive a permanent mirror sticker, for identification purposes, the first time they visit a collection center. Rear view mirror stickers would be kept at each collection center location and be issued to residents on their first visit to the site after the policy goes into effect. Residents with a valid County decal on the vehicle would be issued one mirror sticker to be applied onsite (and could then remove their County decal). Alternatively, they could produce the vehicle's registration card (which shows the locality where the vehicle is principally garaged) to receive a mirror sticker.

Pros:

- 1) Elimination of decal placement/replacement inconvenience for residents and reduces workload for Treasurer and Commissioner of the Revenues.
- 2) If a vehicle is purchased, traded, moved or sold, the Commissioner's Office would only need to make a single abatement for personal property taxes.
- 3) Residents with lower-value vehicles would pay less than the current decal fee.
- 4) Revenue neutral for County IF the plan is implemented with an effective date of January 1, 2020, and revenues are budgeted in the FY 2020 budget.

- 5) Eliminates issue with charging fee on inoperable vehicle or other vehicles not driven on public roads.
- 6) Facilitates collections with additional tools available to Treasurer for tax collections.

Cons:

- 1) Raising the personal property tax would shift the burden to some tax payers, rather than equal fee to all. Those with higher-value vehicles would pay more than the current decal fee.
- 2) Could have a negative impact on residents of the Towns of Glasgow and Goshen. An increase in the personal property tax rate would apply to residents of the Towns and no exemption is available. Since both Towns collect a decal fee, the Town residents would be paying the increased tax to the County, as well as the decal fee to the respective Towns. [In previous attempts to eliminate decals, the County proposed an agreement with each Town providing for the Towns to eliminate their decal fees in exchange for the County paying the Town an amount equal to the increased taxes collected from Town residents. Glasgow agreed conceptually, while Goshen was hesitant. However, the County's ability to increase the personal property tax to off-set decal revenue is not legally contingent upon any agreement with the Towns.]
- 3) Loss of decal enforcement as a collection tool for Treasurer.
- 4) If implemented in January 2019 (current fiscal year), loss of revenue in first year of operation (i.e., there is \$535,000 of revenue budgeted for decals in FY2019, which ends on June 30, 2019). Since decal collections begin in April, most revenues are realized in the

2019 fiscal year. If this change were to occur effective January 1, 2019, the next round of personal property tax revenues would not be realized until well into FY 2020 (October). Thus, the County would need to source lost revenues from unassigned reserves in FY 2019 to balance the budget. If the change was not effective until FY 2020, the revenues could be budgeted for in the FY 2020 budget creation process.

- 5) Loss of revenue from elimination of late filing fee (not significant).
- 6) Display of County decal is one of the criteria for determining whether a vehicle is operable. Elimination of the decal will require amendment of the inoperable vehicle provisions of County Code and could, in some cases, complicate enforcement.

**If the Board wishes to eliminate decals, staff recommends Option 3**

Suggested implementation steps (dates approximate):

- November 2018 - Present draft options to ad hoc Board Committee for consideration/discussion.
- December 2018 - Present Committee recommendation to BOS for review
- January-March 2019 - Budget process for implementation of increase in personal property taxes in October 2019 and elimination of decal fees in Spring 2020 (all FY 2020).
- April 2019 - Hold public hearing. Adopt County Code amendment re: decal elimination and related Code provisions, effective January 1, 2020
- May 2019 - Adopt increased personal property tax rate for FY 2020

- July -August 2019 - Work with Towns for plans and determinations; possible agreements for personal property tax reimbursement
- November 2019 - Personal property tax bills, with increased tax rate, are mailed.
- January 2020 - Begin issuance of new mirror stickers at collection centers and NO decal fees are assessed moving forward."

Chairman Hinty asked how much it costs the County to supply and enforce the decal.

County Treasurer Betty Trovato replied, the Sheriff's Department enforces the decals and the County supplies the sticker. She added, if memory serves her correctly, that she believed the decals themselves costs the County around \$10,000 per year.

Supervisor Lewis asked how farm-use vehicles would be tracked if the Board chose option two.

Commissioner of the Revenues David Whitesell replied that there would not be any way to track farm-use vehicles until the citizen comes into the office and lets them know. Mr. Whitesell then explained that it would then cause additional work on his staff to adjust their taxes. As for parked vehicles, Mr. Whitesell explained that if going with option two, citizens will be billed a fee for each vehicle until that person comes into the office to let staff know the vehicle is parked, at which time staff will have to issue an abatement. He provided an example of an issue that could arise if selecting option two and it was, if a citizen has a parked vehicle one year then decides to drive it the next, no enforcement will be

available because decals were eliminated making it harder to track who has paid the decal fee and who has not.

Chairman Hinty asked how staff at collection sites will be able to determine whether an individual is a resident of the county or city when some of the County's addresses are listed "Lexington".

Mr. Whitesell replied, by looking the address up on GIS to verify the locality.

Mr. Bolster asked the County Attorney if she had an additional comment pertaining to the amendment to the County Code should the Board choose option 2 and eliminate decal stickers.

Ms. Huffman stated that, currently, if a vehicle is inoperable it does not require a decal and the Sheriff enforces the provisions for an inoperable vehicle, such as being screened, or in a garage, not in a front yard. She added that the only criteria to identify an inoperable vehicle would be to visually see it is inoperable.

Supervisor Lewis suggested seeing how other localities have handled the issues that arose after no longer using decals.

Supervisor Lyons expressed his thoughts that a \$25 fee for each titled vehicle whether it is driven or not is not a substantial increase. An example was provided by the County Attorney of one having a number of collectable vehicles has not had to purchase a County decal in the past, now would, depending on the Boards decision. Supervisor Lyons commented that, if one can afford a number of collectable vehicles, the \$25 fee for each vehicle should not be a problem for that individual.

Chairman Hinty shared his opinion that there are individuals he sees driving multiple vehicles, while sharing a single decal for each. He

stated that he is certain they switch the decal over from one vehicle to another.

Ms. Trovato noted that an individual delinquent on personal property taxes is not issued a decal until the taxes are paid. She indicated that she is able to issue a stop payment at the DMV for unpaid taxes, however the DMV now sells a three-year tag. Therefore, the tag is good for three years allowing the delinquent taxes to be unpaid for that amount of time.

Supervisor Lyons asked the Treasurer and the Commissioner of the Revenues if they recommend a change at all.

Mr. Whitesell responded, no.

Ms. Trovato responded, yes.

Supervisor Higgins shared his opinion that using a decal is a good identification tool.

Supervisor Lewis shared his concern about making a decision without hearing what other localities have done provided that there may be a more efficient way to handle this. He indicated that there is some time left to allow the ad-hoc committee to look into some best practices from other jurisdictions.

County Attorney Vickie Huffman shared that the County Administrator had reached out for comment by other localities through VACO to see what they have done. She added that one locality replied that they had eliminated the decals, but because there were so many issues, they plan to go back and use them again.

Chairman Hinty asked that insight be received from Jon Ellestad who went through this while serving as the City Manager for Lexington.

Mr. Whitesell shared his concern about an increase on taxes. He stated that the focus was on those who should be able to afford an increase if having multiple vehicles, when the focus needs to be turned to the elders with fixed incomes who will not be able to afford an increase. Mr. Whitesell added that, by eliminating the decal, it will triple the work on citizens.

Chairman Hinty asked that the Sheriff's Department be included in further discussions as it is enforcing the decal.

Mr. Bolster reviewed the three (3) take-away items from discussions:

1. Ad-hoc Committee to meet again to discuss best-practices from other localities.
2. Talk to Jon Ellestad to see how the City of Lexington managed their change-over.
3. Statistics on Glasgow and Goshen as far as the impacts any change will make on those citizens.

Chairman Hinty asked for a fourth to be added.

4. Involved the Sheriff's Department

With no further discussion, Chairman Hinty closed the Work Session at 5:32 p.m.

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
HELD IN THE ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE BUILDING  
AT 150 SOUTH MAIN STREET, LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA  
ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2018 AT 5:30 P.M.

\*\*\*

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT THE REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULED FOR  
MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2018 WAS POSTPONED UNTIL THIS  
DATE AND TIME DUE TO INCLEMENT WEATHER.

\*\*\*

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:     DAVID W. HINTY, JR. (CHAIRMAN)  
                                  JOHN M. HIGGINS (VICE-CHAIRMAN)  
                                  DANIEL E. LYONS  
                                  A.J. "JAY" LEWIS, II. (Arrived at 4:32 p.m.)

ABSENT:                         RONNIE R. CAMPBELL

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR  
AND CLERK TO THE BOARD:    ABSENT

COUNTY ATTORNEY:             VICKIE L. HUFFMAN

\*\*\*

CALLED TO ORDER:

Chairman Hinty called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m. due to a recess between the 4:30 and 5:30 meetings. He stated that Supervisor Higgins would deliver the invocation for anyone who wished to participate.

Supervisor Higgins delivered the invocation and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Recognitions and Presentations**

Chairman Hinty called for recognitions and presentations. There were none.

## **Citizens Comments**

Chairman Hinty called for citizens comments. There were none.

## **Items to be added to the Agenda**

In the County Administrators absence, Fiscal Services Director Steven Bolster added a discussion item regarding IFLOWS.

## **Approval of the November 26, 2018 Minutes**

Supervisor Higgins moved to approve the Minutes. A second was provided by Supervisor Lyons, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote by the Board:

Ayes: Higgins, Lyons, Lewis, Hinty  
Nays: None  
Absent: Campbell  
Abstain: None

## **County Financial Package**

Mr. Bolster reviewed his Monthly Memorandum, Revenues verses Expenditures Chart, and provided a CIP update which included the following information: staff is working to obtain estimated updated mileage for the Sheriff's Department's replacement vehicles; staff would like to continue operating a fully licensed ALS vehicle EMS vehicle; additional information is being obtained pertaining to the Goshen and Kerrs Creek compactors; and, it was noted, that the Kerrs Creek compactor is actually 10 years old, not 27.

Mr. Bolster then reviewed the County's Appropriation Resolution, adding two (2) invoices for the Clerk of Circuit Court for \$200 each, a total of \$400 added to the resolution.

Supervisor Higgins moved to adopt the County's Appropriation Resolution, as amended, adding two invoices. Supervisor Lyons provided the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote by the Board:

Ayes: Higgins, Lyons, Lewis, Hinty  
Nays: None  
Absent: Campbell  
Abstain: None

\*\*\*

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY,  
VIRGINIA, HELD AT THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING,  
150 SOUTH MAIN STREET, LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA,  
ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2018 AT 5:30 P.M.

On motion by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, the Board, by record vote, adopted the following appropriation resolution and payment of bills for the month as follows:

APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION

**GENERAL FUND:**

BE IT RESOLVED: By the Board of Supervisors of Rockbridge County, Virginia, that the following appropriations are, and the same hereby is made, for the period ending **June 30, 2019**, from the UNAPPROPRIATED SURPLUS of the **GENERAL FUND** and expended as follows:

4-11-71005-5618 Cont-FOR Swimming CIP Projects..... \$7,500.00  
**Total General Fund Appropriations** **\$7,500.00**

**Current County**

11 - General Fund	\$813,366.98
94 - Central Stores	\$8,129.87
372 - Construction Project Fund	\$67,470.00
376 - Capital Purchases Fund	\$12,459.57
<b>Total County Bills</b>	<b>\$901,426.42</b>

**Current Fiscal Agent**

80 - Regional Jail	\$125,256.08
241 - E-Summons Fees	<u>\$1,390.22</u>
<b>Total Fiscal Agent</b>	<b>\$126,646.30</b>
 <b>TOTAL ALL BILLS</b>	 <b>\$1,028,072.72</b>

\*\*\*

**School Appropriation Resolution**

Mr. Bolster presented the School's Appropriation Resolution.

Supervisor Lewis moved to adopt the School's Appropriation Resolution. Supervisor Lyons provided the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote by the Board:

Ayes: Lewis, Lyons, Higgins, Hinty  
 Nays: None  
 Absent: Campbell  
 Abstain: None

\*\*\*

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, HELD AT THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING, 150 SOUTH MAIN STREET, LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA, ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2018 AT 5:30 P.M.

On motion by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, the Board, by record vote adopted the following appropriation resolutions:

**APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION**

**BE IT RESOLVED:** By the Board of Supervisors of Rockbridge County, Virginia, that the following appropriations are, and the same hereby are made, for the period ending **June 30, 2019** in **FUND 50, SCHOOL FUND** and expended as follows:

**Additional Revenue Sources**

4-50-61310-6030-904-100-103 Classroom Materials.....	\$17,725.00
4-50-62120-5807-902-000-100 Materials/Services.....	\$6,006.00
4-50-63400-8103-903-000-100 Capital Replacement.....	\$2,000.00
4-50-64200-6007-904-000-100 Material.....	\$637.00
4-50-68200-5001-908-000-100 Internet Services.....	<u>\$53,472.00</u>
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$79,840.00</b>

**TOTAL FUND 50 APPROPRIATIONS** **\$79,840.00**

\*\*\*

## **Consideration of Volunteer Incentive Proposal from the Fire and Rescue Commission**

Fire and Rescue Chief Nathan Ramsey briefly reviewed his Agenda Item containing the following information:

"As you know, the Rockbridge Regional Fire and Rescue Commission (RRFRC) was formed in 2009, with an objective to analyze and implement recommendations resulting from the Tri-data study. When the County began billing for ambulance transport services, it was determined that the RRFRC would make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors as to how the proceeds of the billing should be expended. It is our understanding that the original intent for use of the funds was for staffing (be it paid career services or supplemental pay to volunteers). As you may recall, in 2015, the Board determined to implement contracted EMS service at two locations in the County. At the time, and with agreement by the Fire/EMS community, the Board dedicated \$100,000 of the annual cost recovery revenues to the help offset the cost of the contract. In addition, the Board has approved using the cost recovery funds to pay for the cost of revenue collection services (Quick Med Claims, Inc.). This typical cost about \$18,000 annually. The Board also approved the cost of the Operational Medical Director annually \$10,000 to be from the cost recovery. With a budgeted annual revenue of \$215,000, this leaves approximately \$87,000 of annual fund generation, which is placed in a growing, restricted account. Currently, and after subtracting the planned expenditures in the current year (\$100,000 - paid EMS / \$18,000 - collection fee / \$10,000 - OMD), the total amount which has built in the restricted account is \$1,060,195. Over the past several years, the RRFRC

Staffing/Finance/Recruiting and Retention Committee has developed/discussed various options for use of the cost recovery funding. The idea has been for the committee to settle on a recommendation to provide to the full RRFRC Board for consideration. The RRFRC would then consider the recommendation and if in agreement, make that recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. During this time multiple options have been discussed. In 2017, performance-based funding for departments was adopted by the Board. This program provides departments with the opportunity for an additional increase to the fourth quarter allotment, based on number of calls answered versus fail to respond (FTR). The program was intended to provide additional departmental incentives for call response, thereby reducing the number of hours members had to spend on fundraising. The program was a pilot, with no guarantee of future funding. However, it was successful to the extent that the Board approved a second year of funding for 2019 (current) year. Based on 18 months of data, the RRFRC requests \$100,000 in continued support of this program for FY 2020.

Recently, the RRFRC also voted to present an additional Volunteer Recruitment and Retention Program to the Board for consideration. This program was developed by the Staffing/Finance/Recruiting and Retention Committee and is targeted at reimbursement directly to individual volunteers for their service. The goal of these considerations would be to provide a recruiting and retention mechanism for volunteers, first in an effort to retain volunteer members and second, to recruit new members.

#### Proposed Volunteer Recruitment and Retention Program

##### Purpose:

The purpose of the Volunteer Recruitment and Retention Program (VRRP) is to establish a means for volunteer Fire and EMS personnel to be eligible to recoup a portion of the costs they incur while volunteering in Rockbridge County.

Goals:

The goals of the VRRP are as follows:

1. Provide fire and EMS services to the communities.
2. Encourage new volunteers to join, train and actively participate with the fire and EMS agencies serving the County.
3. Reduce and/or eliminate failed responses for fire and EMS throughout the County.
4. Offset a small amount of the expenses volunteers incur while they train and serve their communities.
5. Ensure the accountability of the program through use of a time management/scheduling system, agency call response records and the NFIRS system.

The RRFRC approved two potential options for consideration, either separately or collectively.

1) Per Call Reimbursement:

Volunteer fire and EMS personnel shall be eligible to receive reimbursement for responses to calls under the following criteria:

LEVEL	AGENCY	MEMBERSHIP	AMOUNT
A	New member on Probation	Active new member on probation and less than 1 year of service.	\$5.00 per call

B	Individual Agency Probation Complete	Active member not on probation with 1 or more years of service.	\$10.00 per call
---	--------------------------------------	---	------------------

When more volunteers than are necessary respond to an emergency or arrive at the station too late to make the initial response, they shall be placed on 'standby'. These members would be required to remain at the station and be available to respond to any additional calls until the current incident is marked under control, standby personnel are released by the incident commander or the units are returning to the station. Members on 'standby' would qualify for reimbursement under the Per Call Reimbursement at half their normal amount. In order to receive the reimbursement, the members' names (responders and standby) shall be on the NFIRS or Image Trend reporting systems.

Pros:

- Solid basis for budgetary estimate
- Easily tracked/verified/administered
- Encourages accurate and timely call reporting by agencies (which assists in future grant applications)

Cons:

- Less powerful incentive for low-call volume stations

Based on prior-year response data, the estimated FY 2020 budget need is \$175,000.

2) Shift Reimbursement:

Volunteer fire and EMS personnel shall be eligible to receive shift reimbursement for being scheduled and available to respond to calls.

Members with the minimum certifications of EVOC and Firefighter 1 or EMT-B may participate in Shift Reimbursement.

The following shift qualifications will be used for Shift Reimbursement:

- 4-hour shift shall be reimbursed at \$15.00
- 6-hour shift shall be reimbursed at \$20.00
- 8-hour shift shall be reimbursed at \$30.00
- 12-hour shift shall be reimbursed at \$50.00

The shift shall consist of a minimum/maximum of two volunteers per block.

While the volunteer is on shift the following requirements must be met:

- Volunteers shall sign up for their shift in advance.
- Volunteers must remain at the station available to respond to calls while on shift.
- Down time should be spent training, performing vehicle and equipment checks, building maintenance or other items deemed necessary by the department.
- Volunteers shall log their shifts through the County time management system.
- Volunteers at an agency with career staff are encouraged to fulfill their shift requirements outside of the working hours of the career staff. However, if that is the only time a volunteer has available, they can fulfill a shift with the career staff with approval of the agency Chief/Captain. Other exceptions can be made to this requirement by the agency Chief/Captain when they determine that additional personnel are needed to standby due to a weather or special event.

Pros:

- May be a more attractive benefit for volunteers in low volume stations
- Provides a known minimum staffing level for departments utilizing (when a trained team signs up for a shift)

Cons:

- Difficult to budget for
- Difficult to track
- Will require more intensive administration at both the volunteer and career levels

With no comparison data available, the RRFRC estimated the FY 2020 budget need at \$125,000 (capped at that amount).

Opting Out:

Volunteers would be encouraged to participate in these programs; however, participation would not be required. Should a volunteer wish to opt out of either program, they must do so in writing. At that point the "opt out" will be valid until the end of the fiscal year at minimum. Any volunteer who previously opted out and determines they wish to participate must opt-in via writing. The opt-in will begin at the start of the fiscal year. New members who join any time during the year will automatically be enrolled in the VRRP.

Disbursements:

Reimbursements to providers participating in the VRRP will be made by direct deposit on a quarterly basis. The deadline for all completed reports and schedules will be the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month for the previous

month. Due to IRS requirements, tax withholding will be managed by the County of Rockbridge.

Fund Source(s):

The RRFRC recommends that the initial fund source be the accumulated cost recovery restricted account (\$1,060,195). However, if the program(s) remain in place, the cost recovery fund source will not be able to cover all costs in future years.

Additional Considerations

- City of Lexington: The City of Lexington already has a similar pay-per-call and shift standby payment program. Per contract, the County does not contribute any funding to Lexington's program. However, our Fire/Recue contract with Lexington (which expires in June of 2019) contains a requirement that, should the County adopt a similar program, we begin contributing to the City's costs for their program. The estimated additional cost to the County would be between \$50,000 and \$65,000 annually. This condition of the contract has been a limiting factor in the RRFRC bringing forth a proposal to the Board of Supervisors. However, Lexington has agreed to unconditionally remove that condition if the County provides one or both of these new plans to County Departments.

- Buena Vista: Both Buena Vista Fire Department and Buena Vista Rescue Squad have significant "first due" coverage area in Rockbridge County. This proposal is intended to provide pay-per-call benefits to members of those department when responding to calls in the County, but not in the City of Buena Vista. Additionally, Option 2 (shift reimbursement) would not be available to Buena Vista Fire and Rescue Departments under this proposal.

- Additional Anticipated Budget Requests: It is important to share that additional Fire/Rescue budget requests are anticipated.

o EMT Training Partnership with School Division - The BOS and School Board recently received a presentation on this proposed initiative. Budgetary figures are being developed and will be remitted to the Finance Committee for further consideration.

o Fire Association and RERG - Annually, the Fire Association and RERG submit separate budget requests for Countywide agency funding. These requests have not yet been finalized.

o Expansion of Career Staffing - Challenges in emergency response have been communicated to the Board Fire and Rescue Committee, and staffing an additional station has been proposed for consideration in the FY 2020 budget."

Chairman Hinty suggested that an ad hoc committee look at all shared services agreements from this point on.

Supervisor Higgins shared his concern that this new incentive will not bring in more volunteers just as the old incentives did not work. He asked if this is more like hiring paid staff instead of recruiting volunteers.

Supervisor Lewis indicated that this would be a test to see if it will bring in more staff at the agencies and use the revenue recovery to cover the cost for now.

Chairman Hinty asked if the agencies met the deadline this year for audits.

Chief Ramsey replied, yes.

Supervisor Lyons questioned the expense per volunteer for training and outfitting.

Chief Ramsey replied, about \$4,000.

Supervisor Lyons noted that this incentive could save money by recruiting and retaining the volunteer.

Supervisor Higgins asked what changed at Fairfield Rescue that turned its agency around following so many known issues.

Chief Ramsey replied, possibly utilizing a shift schedule.

Supervisor Higgins asked if taxes would be taken out of the quarterly disbursements because the volunteer will receive a check instead of the agency.

Chief Ramsey replied, yes.

County Attorney Vickie Huffman added that, once the member is paid, they are no longer a volunteer but an employee. She noted that she had not received this information until now and would need to look further into this to see if liability insurance would be required seeing as the paid member would become a part time employee.

Mr. Bolster advised that budgets are due on January 17<sup>th</sup> and asked for guidance from the Board as to what Chief Ramsey should include in his FY 2020 budget.

Ms. Huffman asked Chief Ramsey if he knows whether or not having shifts at the agencies will reduce the insurance rates for citizens in that service area.

Chief Ramsey replied, he did not believe so. He added that the rates are based on how many people answer calls, more so on the Fire Departments side.

Mr. Bolster recommended directive from the Board for Chief Ramsey to include the higher of the two amounts, \$175,000 for the estimated FY 2020 budget need, with the understanding that the amount could be decreased but would not increase.

For budget purposes, Supervisor Higgins agreed with Mr. Bolster to include the \$175,000 in the FY 2020 budget with the understanding that the Board is not choosing one option over another, but simply as a placeholder.

**IFLOWs Discussion:**

Chief Ramsey informed the Board that the VDEM is looking to eliminate funding for the IFLOWs program due to budget cuts and their opinion that it is not being utilized enough to fund. He stated that emergency managers in the region have met and agree that the program is needed. He asked the Board to support staffs request and send a letter on behalf of the Chairman to the legislatures advocating that funding for the IFLOWs program continue.

Supervisor Higgins moved to authorize staff to draft a letter on behalf of the Board of Supervisors, signed by the Chairman, advocating for funding to continue for the IFLOWs program for this region. Supervisor Lewis provide the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote by the Board:

Ayes: Higgins, Lewis, Lyons, Hinty  
Nays: None  
Absent: Campbell  
Abstain: None

**Consideration of Rabies Clinic at the South River Volunteer Fire**

**Department:**

Mr. Bolster briefly reviewed the Agenda Item containing the following information: "The Code of Virginia requires that Counties in the Commonwealth ensure that a rabies clinic is held for residents at least once every two years. We are fortunate to have proactive residents, veterinarians, and Volunteer Fire Departments, who advocate for, administer and host such clinics. A rabies clinic has been scheduled for at the South River Volunteer Fire Department on Saturday, January 12, 2019."

Supervisor Lyons moved to approve the Rabies Clinic. Supervisor Higgins provide the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote by the Board:

Ayes: Lyons, Higgins, Lewis, Hinty  
Nays: None  
Absent: Campbell  
Abstain: None

**Consideration of Bid Submission for Fancy Hill Collection Center Project:**

Mr. Bolster briefly reviewed the Agenda Item containing the following information: "From November 8th to December 4th, the County advertised an Invitation for Bids to construct the Fancy Hill solid waste and recycling collection center. The advertisement efforts included local print, the County website, and the Virginia eProcurement Portal (eVA). Four vendors submitted bids to the County by the advertised due date and time. These bids were opened and read on December 4th beginning at 2:00 p.m. at the Rockbridge County Administration Building; see summary table below.

1.	Randy Hostetter Excavating, LLC	\$311,800.00
2.	Haley, Chisolm, & Morris, Inc.	\$383,306.38
3.	O'Byrne Contracting, Inc.	\$480,000.00
4.	A&J Development & Excavation, Inc.	\$485,495.00

The lowest responsive and responsible bid was submitted by Randy Hostetter Excavating, LLC. The bid amount is within the available balance for the approved collection center CIP projects for FY 2019. A resolution authorizing contract award is attached for the Board's review and consideration. The resolution authorizes the County Administrator to execute the contract documents on behalf of the Board of Supervisors of Rockbridge County, and to take such other and further actions as may be necessary and appropriate to accomplish this transaction, which shall be approved as to form by the County Attorney. In accordance with standard procurement policy, if a contract is not reached with the lowest bidder, staff would move to the next bidder and bring a contract back to the Board for consideration."

Supervisor Higgins moved to adopt the resolution. Supervisor Lyons provide the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote by the Board:

Ayes: Higgins, Lyons, Lewis, Hinty  
Nays: None  
Absent: Campbell  
Abstain: None

\*\*\*

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY,  
VIRGINIA, HELD AT THE ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES ON MONDAY,  
DECEMBER 17, 2018

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AWARD OF BID TO AND EXECUTION OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS WITH RANDY HOSTETTER EXCAVATING, LLC FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE FANCY HILL SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING CENTER**

WHEREAS, on November 8, 2018, the County of Rockbridge issued an Invitation for Bids for the construction of the Fancy Hill Solid Waste and Recycling Center; and,

WHEREAS, the County has received competitive sealed bids in accordance with Chapter 43, the Virginia Public Procurement Act, of Title 2.2 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended) and of the Rockbridge County Public Procurement Policy; and,

WHEREAS, three bids shown upon the Bid Tabulation dated December 4, 2018, have been determined by staff to be responsive to the County's Invitation to Bid # 2018-11-001; and,

WHEREAS, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for the construction services is Randy Hostetter Excavating, LLC; and,

WHEREAS, the award of the bid to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder and approval of a contract have been submitted to the Rockbridge County Board of Supervisors.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Rockbridge County, Virginia, as follows:

1. That Randy Hostetter Excavating, LLC, is deemed the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, and the bid is hereby accepted.

2. That Randy Hostetter Excavating, LLC, be, and hereby is, awarded the contract at a price of \$311,800.00 to construct a new solid waste and recycling collection center located at 3975 South Lee Highway in Natural Bridge, Virginia.

3. That upon receipt of the completed Contract Documents from Randy Hostetter Excavating, LLC, and compliance with all remaining requirements therefor, the County Administrator is hereby authorized to execute the construction Agreement, in substantial conformity to the Agreement presented herewith, on behalf of the Board of Supervisors of Rockbridge County, and to take such other and further actions as may be necessary and appropriate to accomplish this transaction, which shall be approved as to form by the County Attorney.

4. That this Resolution shall be effective upon the date of its adoption.

Adopted this 17<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2018.

**Boards and Commissions Appointments:**

**Consideration of Regional Jail Commission Appointments for Spencer Suter and Edward Hosken, Jr.- term will expire 12/31/2018:**

Supervisor Lyons moved to reappoint both members to the Jail Commission. Supervisor Lewis provided the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote by the Board:

Ayes: Lyons, Lewis, Higgins, Hinty  
Nays: None  
Absent: Campbell  
Abstain: None

**Alternate Jail Commission Appointment for the two Towns:**

This item was added to the appointments list. The Towns of Glasgow and Goshen alternate each year in membership to the Jail Commission. Last year, the Town of Goshen made the recommendation. This year, the Town of Glasgow recommends Aaron Britton to be appointed to the Jail Commission.

Supervisor Lewis moved to appoint Aaron Britton to the Jail Commission to complete the Jail Commission membership. Supervisor Lyons provided the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote by the Board:

Ayes: Lewis, Lyons, Higgins, Hinty  
Nays: None  
Absent: Campbell  
Abstain: None

**Monthly Staff Reports:**

Supervisor Lewis moved to accept the Staff Reports. Supervisor Lyons

provided the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote by the Board:

Ayes: Lewis, Lyons, Higgins, Hinty  
Nays: None  
Absent: Campbell  
Abstain: None

**Continued Meeting:**

Chairman Hinty continued this meeting until January 7, 2019 at 5:30 p.m. to provide the Board with an opportunity to make decisions which may be necessary should Supervisor Campbell be successful in his bid for a seat in the Virginia House of Delegates.