

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY  
VIRGINIA, HELD IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING,  
150 SOUTH MAIN STREET LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA,  
ON MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2016, AT 5:30 P.M.

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN J.M.HIGGINS  
MEMBERS: R.R.CAMPBELL, R.S.FORD, A.W.LEWIS, JR.  
LATE: D.W.HINTY, JR. (arrived at 6:08 P.M.)  
CLERK TO BOARD: SPENCER H. SUTER  
COUNTY ATTORNEY: VICKIE L. HUFFMAN

**Call to Order**

Chairman Higgins called the meeting to order at 5:31 P.M.

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

**Recognitions/Presentations**

**Introduction of a New Employee- Jonathan Griffin- E&S/Storm Water Administrator**

Building Official Kenny Wilson introduced Jonathan Griffin, the new Erosion and Sediment/Storm Water Administrator. Mr. Wilson noted that Mr. Griffin is a lifelong resident of the Rockbridge area and is married and with three children.

Mr. Griffin thanked the Board for the opportunity to work for the County and shared his excitement about his future with Rockbridge County. The Board welcomed Mr. Griffin.

**Citizens Comments**

Chairman Higgins called for citizen comments. There were none.

**Items to be added to the Agenda**

County Administrator Spencer Suter added a Closed Meeting at the end of the meeting. He read aloud: "A Closed Meeting as permitted by Virginia Code section 2.2-3711(A)(1), a personnel matter involving demotion, discipline or resignation of specific officers, appointees or employees."

**Approval of February 22, 2016 Minutes**

Supervisor Ford moved to approve the February 22, 2016 Minutes. Supervisor Campbell provided the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote, with Supervisor Hinty being absent at this time of the meeting:

AYES:	Ford, Campbell, Lewis, Higgins
NAYES:	None
ABSENT:	Hinty

**School Appropriation Resolution**

Director of Fiscal Services Steven Bolster presented the Schools Appropriation Resolution and recommended approval.

Supervisor Lewis moved to approve the Schools Appropriation Resolution (shown below). Supervisor Ford provided the second, and the

motion carried by the following roll call vote, with Supervisor Hinty being absent at this time of the meeting:

AYES: Lewis, Ford, Campbell, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: Hinty

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, MARCH 14, 2016 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, 2016** in **FUND 50, SCHOOL FUND** and expended as follows:

**New Grants**

**E-Rate 2016**

4-50-61100-8201-910-000 Outlay (Tech Equip).....	\$72,161.00
4-50-61210-3160-900-000 Purchased Svs (Tech Equip)....	<u>\$11,599.00</u>
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>\$83,760.00</b>

**TOTAL FUND 50 APPROPRIATIONS** **\$83,760.00**

**County Financial Package/ Approval of Appropriation Resolution**

Mr. Bolster reviewed his Monthly Memorandum which included the following:

Section I - Commissioner of the Revenue

Activities for Month:

1. Completed a busy Business License season.
2. Continue to work tax relief for elderly and disabled.

3. Continue helping citizens with State income tax preparing & processing.
4. Starting preparations for the Real Estate tax book.
5. Reconciling monthly DMV additions and deletions to gain accurate data.
6. Entering/auditing business personal property reports.
7. Scanning 2016 business licenses and business personal property forms.

## Section II - Treasurer

### Activities for Month:

1. County decals went on sale March 1st; deadline is April 15th.
2. Processing Debt Set-off transactions.
3. Beginning to see 2015 State income tax payments.
4. Land-use Program: on April 1, 2016, any parcel of land not paid in full will receive a letter stating the land is subject to removal from program.
5. Business Professional Occupational License processing continues.

Mr. Bolster then provided the Board with an update on the VRA Refinancing of the Courthouse loan. He advised that, on March 1<sup>st</sup>, VRA communicated to the County that the application to refinance the 2007 Courthouse loan was approved. He noted that the County expects to hear something from VRA on the SWA financing by March 18<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Bolster then provided a procurement update advising that 11 proposals were received for Phase I Environmental Site Assessment services for property located at 2200 E. Midland Trail, the former Lomax Funeral Home. Commonwealth Environmental Associates, Inc. was selected and has completed Phase I; the final report was received on March 1<sup>st</sup>. He noted that there may be additional field work to be done as soon as possible.

Mr. Bolster then added that the Solid Waste Authority had issued a request for qualifications seeking firms for professional legal services. He confirmed that three (3) were received; the evaluation team is expected to perform interviews with those firms over the next week.

Finally, Mr. Bolster advised that he planned to bring a list of potential surplus vehicles and equipment to the next Board Meeting.

Mr. Bolster then reviewed the Expenditures versus Revenues Line Chart and presented the County's Appropriation Resolution.

Supervisor Lewis moved to approve the County's Appropriation Resolution (shown below). Supervisor Ford provided the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote, with Supervisor Hinty being absent at this time of the meeting:

AYES: Lewis, Ford, Campbell, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: Hinty

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, MARCH 14, 2016, AT 5:30 P.M.

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

APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION

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, 2016**, from the UNAPPROPRIATED SURPLUS of the **GENERAL FUND** and expended as follows:

4-11-11010-3001 Professional Services.....	\$13,889.00
4-11-99010-6192 Transfer to Lined Landfill.....	\$42,425.00
<b>Total General Fund Appropriations</b>	<b>\$56,314.00</b>
<b>Current County</b>	
11 - General Fund	\$692,058.02

94 - Central Stores	<u>\$3,230.18</u>
<b>Total County Bills</b>	<b>\$695,288.20</b>
<b>Current Fiscal Agent</b>	
80 - Regional Jail	\$76,314.33
92 - Drug Fund	<u>\$1,942.34</u>
<b>Total Fiscal Agent</b>	<b>\$78,256.67</b>
<b>TOTAL ALL BILLS</b>	<b>\$773,544.87</b>

**Convene Solid Waste Authority (SWA)**

Chairman Higgins convened the Solid Waste Authority at 5:40 P.M.

**Solid Waste Authority Financial Package/Approval of Appropriation Resolution**

Mr. Bolster presented the Solid Waste Authority's Appropriation Resolution and recommended approval.

Supervisor Ford moved to approve the Solid Waste Authority Appropriation Resolution (shown below). Supervisor Lewis provided the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote, with Supervisor Hinty being absent at this time of the meeting:

AYES:	Ford, Lewis, Campbell, Higgins
NAYES:	None
ABSENT:	Hinty

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY, HELD  
 AT THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING,  
 150 SOUTH MAIN STREET, LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA,  
 ON MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2016 AT 5:30 P. M.

On motion of Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, with second by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, the

Authority, by record vote, adopted the following appropriation resolution and payment of bills for the month as follows:

APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED: By the Rockbridge County Solid Waste Authority, that the following appropriations are, and the same hereby is made, for the period ending **June 30, 2016**, from the UNAPPROPROATED SURPLUS of the **SWA-LANDFILL FUND** and expended as follows:

4-19-19070-3001 Engineering Services.....	\$38,845.00
4-19-19070-3901 Permit Fees.....	\$3,580.00
<b>Total SWA-Landfill Fund Appropriations</b>	<b>\$42,425.00</b>
<b>Current SWA</b>	
19 - SWA-Landfill	\$110,055.39
20 - SWA-Recycling	<u>\$33,548.03</u>
<b>TOTAL SWA BILLS</b>	<b>\$143,603.42</b>

Chairman Higgins closed the Solid Waste Authority at 5:40 P.M. and reconvened the Board of Supervisors meeting.

**Event Application- Rockbridge Farmers Market at the Virginia Horse Center**

Director of Planning and Zoning Sam Crickenberger introduced Leigh Anne Claywell and Kristina Day of the Virginia Horse Center(VHC).

Ms. Day, VHC's Food and Beverage Director, explained that she plans to keep the Farmers Market under the same rules and regulations it had been following in prior years.

Supervisor Lewis stated that this Farmers Market is very popular and very successful. He asked why management was changing. Ms. Day replied that the former manager of this event was retiring.

Supervisor Ford moved to approve the Event Application for a Farmers Market at the Virginia Horse Center. Supervisor Lewis provided the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote, with Supervisor Hinty being absent at this time of the meeting:

AYES: Ford, Lewis, Campbell, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: Hinty

**Event Application- Rockbridge Area Health Center's Bull and Oyster Festival**

Mr. Crickenberger presented this Event Application, noting that there was a very recent, additional request. That request was to possibly stage the event in the field across from the old bowling alley. He added that, if it was too challenging, they would keep the previous location. County Attorney Vickie Huffman advised that the applicant would need to hold certain liability insurance since the proposed alternate site was County property and that the use would require a public hearing. That being said, Mr. Crickenberger asked for approval keeping the previous location as shown on the Application.

Supervisor Lewis moved to approve the Event Application as presented. Supervisor Ford provided the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote, with Supervisor Hinty being absent at this time of the meeting:

AYES: Lewis, Ford, Campbell, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: Hinty

## **Discussion on County Fair**

(Chairman Higgins moved this item ahead on the Agenda.)

(Supervisor Hinty arrived during discussions.)

Mr. Suter briefly reviewed the Agenda Item: "As you know, the Rockbridge Regional Fair has been managed by the Virginia Horse Center for several years. As the 2016 Fair approaches, there has been discussion on which direction the Fair should take in the future, and what if any involvement there could be at the County level. Though the Board of Supervisors has traditionally not been directly involved with the Fair, recent discussions have resulted in a request to discuss at a Board meeting. The base issue at hand involves the fact that the VHC is in a difficult position with regard to the Fair. The VHC Board has clearly indicated a willingness to help wherever possible, yet the VHC can be viewed in a negative light if the Fair does not meet expectation. I've invited VHC Operations Director Leigh Anne Claywell to attend, as well as County Extension Agent Tom Stanley. Both may be able to provide some insight and answer Board questions."

Supervisor Lewis advised that, many years ago there was a very active community Board who ran the fair, a fair that included all of the 4H activities, home goods exhibits, and amusement. He stated that the community Board would rent the space at the horse center for \$30,000 for the week and that because of the way the fair was operating, they were able to have funds left over to get started the next year. He advised that some controversy developed when the Board of Supervisors withdrew

financial support for the fair and there was insistence by a previous Board for the Virginia Horse Center to take over the management of the fair. He did note that, over the years, the 4H stock shows/sales have continued to do wonderfully. He stated that the current Board had been providing some money for the 4H program that was intended to be passed through to the VHC as a minor rent. Then, a few years ago, that money was diverted for use in 4H programs, which left the VHC with no the rental fee. This year, he advised, they do have a horse show scheduled in the main arena that will bring in some money to help with costs during the week of the fair, but the problem still remains that there is an excessive burden on VHC staff. He encouraged the Board of Supervisors to provide some assistance to the VHC this year to help get through the fair season happily and successfully.

Supervisor Ford added that the date for this year's fair has been changed to accommodate a request from the 4H stockman's club, due to a conflict with a statewide event that would have taken most of the exhibitors away from the area. He added that the VHC moved the fair later in July so there will be a better turnout of the stockman's show.

Ms. Claywell advised that revenue did increase last year compared to the two prior years. She recommended that no major changes be made this year but asked the Board to consider planning for next year's fair.

Mr. Stanley added that many value the fair, particularly when there is such a nice facility. His perception is that there is a core of people

who would be very interested in sitting on a Board that would conduct and provide leadership for the fair. He stated that there are three parts to a local fair: entertainment (rides and concerts); homestead arts (exhibitors); and the agriculture component. He suggested that the county seek input from the citizens to decide what would work best economically. He noted that 4-H coordinator Megan Bare has some good ideas for the future of the fair. Mr. Stanley then took the opportunity to publicly thank the VHC for accommodating the Extension Office and their projects, noting that there were many times he was able to use the mezzanine at Anderson Coliseum for free, when he did not have the funds to pay a fee. For example, he noted, there was a four (4) day event in October in which 450 school children participated, and the Extension Office was not charged for using the facility.

Supervisor Lewis asked, if there were not a midway at a future fair, what entertainment components could be considered. He noted that there is a fair of similar nature in Botetourt County that is extremely successful and asked for the Board's opinions on that.

Chairman Higgins stated that he has seen the fair go downhill over the years and that the County owes it to the 4-H stockman's club - and the 4-H kids who put so much work into it - to look at this closely. He added that the tractor and truck pulls have been great events, bringing in a lot of visitors. He noted that it would be hard for the VHC to calculate see the financials, how much they lost or made, when having to host the event. He advised that he has met with 7 or 8 individuals who were formerly

involved in the fair - that there are some citizens who are showing interest in membership on a Fair Board. He noted that the current Board has been very generous to the VHC and that it is his understanding that the VHC wants to give back to the county in return. Therefore, he said, let them run the show and give back to the youth, specifically 4-H.

Supervisor Campbell suggested that we seek out citizens who would like to be involved in a Fair Committee, where people can request their participation to become a member.

Leigh Anne Claywell noted that Farm Bureau has moved their dates for the truck and tractor pull this year; it will be held two weeks before the fair at their request.

Mr. Stanley noted that some of the volunteers at the truck and tractor pulls also had an interest in the livestock sale, so this is an opportunity to rearrange the schedule and allow access to both.

Supervisor Ford added that it would not be a bad idea to suggest shortening the number of days the fair runs to make it more attractive for volunteers and livestock exhibitors.

Chairman Higgins asked Supervisor Campbell for a motion to authorize the County Administrator to advertise in the two papers and online for volunteers to send comments in if interested in membership on a Fair Committee.

Mr. Suter asked if the Board had discussed hiring a Fair Coordinator and funding the position, as there are people who specialize in this job; it is a lot easier to volunteer for something when there is a central coordinator. He noted that it might help bring in more volunteers if there were a central coordinator.

Chairman Higgins suggested getting the volunteers together and asking to see if they would like to have a coordinator.

Supervisor Ford asked Supervisor Campbell if he wanted to add that language into his motion.

Supervisor Campbell agreed with Chairman Higgins that the decision be left up to the Fair Committee whether or not they needed a coordinator.

Chairman Higgins reiterated that he would like to see the committee formed first and leave it up to them if they want a coordinator - at which time the BOS would consider supporting the position.

Mr. Stanley added that there is a full spectrum of fairs locally; Rockingham, which has a permanent facility with permanent staff; Augusta which has some paid staff just for the fair and no other events; and Highland, which is all volunteer. He noted that all of them are 4-5 day events, and that Botetourt had a fair that began three years ago and is more of a "field day".

Chairman Higgins added that Mr. Stanley's department does a great job each year providing good events for youth.

Supervisor Lewis added that he appreciates Supervisor Campbell's focus and feels that good results will come out of the discussion tonight. He requested moving on.

Chairman Higgins asked Mr. Suter to go ahead and advertise as Supervisor Campbell had moved.

Mr. Suter asked for clarification on the Board's intent. He asked if their final decision was to advertise using language similar to: "The Board of Supervisors is interested in seeing if there are citizens who would be willing to help coordinate the Rockbridge Regional Fair in the future, beginning with the summer of 2017. Interested Citizens are requested to contact the County Administrator's Office." Chairman Higgins agreed to this language and asked that Mr. Suter receive responses and then coordinate a public meeting.

#### **Discussion on Health Insurance Benefits**

Mr. Suter briefly reviewed the Agenda Item: "As you may recall, the County offers health insurance to its employees and other local government agencies (Constitutional Offices, Jail, etc.). In all, we administer health insurance benefits for 187 local employees. Since 2006, the County has utilized The Local Choice (TLC), a health care pool administered by the Commonwealth. It was created to assist local governments, school divisions, and so forth to smooth out annual highs and lows in health insurance costs, via combining coverage into larger pools. For example,

in a year where we have a very good experience (low claims), the savings we generate for the pool is applied toward a plan member (another locality) who has had a bad year, thereby reducing their overall increase. Similarly, if we have a bad year, our increase can be tempered by the savings from other localities who had a good year. Additional benefits include:

- Simplicity of the program - the County pays the premium and TLC pays the claims.
- Most decisions on benefits and costs are made by TLC.
- We pay no commissions.
- Relatively high prescription drug benefit.
- Dental is included in the package.
- Less of a "roller coaster ride" with regard to insurance plans for employees. He added that in some localities, an RFP is issued for health insurance more years than not, resulting in more work for staff to manage the transition between insurers and more strain on employees in transitioning and understanding the new plans.

"However, there are some potential downsides to the TLC program:

- Little flexibility in benefit options.
- Little or no opportunity to negotiate on plan renewal.
- No flexibility in selection of the dental plan/benefit.
- There is a high chance of having to pay a penalty to leave TLC.

- TLC does not release information on prescription drug, medical/psychological and dental payouts - meaning that it is difficult to provide accurate information to potential proposers, should we wish to leave TLC and take our pool to the marketplace.
- In stretches of continuous good years, the locality receives little or no benefit (again, the localities with good experience rates help support those with poor experience rates).

"Overall, the relationship with TLC has seemed to work fairly well for the County in that our rates have only risen a total of 10 percentage points over the past 10 years - a fairly low overall increase in the health benefits market. However, as reported in the Board's last budget meeting, we received a quoted increase of 6.1% in health insurance costs for FY 17. This puts us in a difficult situation in that we need to enter into agreement with The Local Choice by April 1<sup>st</sup>.

"Recently, the Board Personnel Committee met informally with a local Benefits Plan Consultant to discuss other potential options moving ahead. A benefits consultant can provide certain services for the County, as shown on the attached listing (Services.pdf). Should the Board wish to pursue this method, we would need to procure via a request for proposals (RFP).

"Options at this point are:

- 1) Continue with TLC for the foreseeable future.

- 2) Quickly go out to bid for a new health benefit plan for FY 17.
- 3) Determine to exit TLC in CY 2017. Begin soon to procure the services of a benefits plan consultant who would then assist the County in procurement and implementation of a health plan provider on the open market. Cost of a consultant to manage the transition process could be in the range of \$20,000 - \$25,000.
- 4) Stay with TLC and procure *more limited* services of a Benefits Plan Consultant, who could walk us through the process in a bit more detail and help us determine the best option for FY 2018 and beyond (phase 1). The RFP for limited services could be written such that if the Board ultimately determines that it wishes to go to the open market, the Consultant could then (for an additional fee) expand services to include assisting the County in procuring health care benefits (phase 2). The cost range for these services is anticipated to be much lower for phase 1. If the Board chooses to implement phase 2, additional cost would be incurred."

Supervisor Campbell suggested budgeting the whole amount. He noted that he and Chairman Higgins had met to discuss this and they recommended that the benefit levels stay the same. He asked if there is a penalty if the County drops TLC without notifying them within a certain period of time.

Mr. Suter replied that it was his understanding that about 50% of the localities that exit the program receive a penalty. He explained that

annually, each member (locality/agency) of the overall pool either contributes to or benefits from the pool. If a locality opted to leave after a "good year" (in which they contribute to the pool), there would likely be no penalty. However if they left after a bad year (when they benefitted from the pool), there would likely be a penalty for leaving.

Supervisor Ford added that, over the past several years, the County has been getting strong signals from Augusta Medical and Carillion Clinic that health insurance companies are going to be much more interested in employees making healthy choices. He asked to make sure the consultant could provide the County with advice on how they could transition into an "accountability plan" to help employees become healthier.

Mr. Suter replied that such a plan would be a benefit to the employee, locality, and the entire pool.

Chairman Higgins asked that Mr. Suter look at getting information on how to deal with this study and bring it back to the Board during the summer.

Mr. Suter confirmed that he would develop an RFP for the Board's approval.

#### **Update on Solid Waste Planning**

Mr. Suter briefly reviewed the Agenda Item as Mr. Garrett was on vacation and was not able to attend the meeting. It included: "At its last regular work session on February 22<sup>nd</sup>, the Board directed staff to move

forward in preparation to implement the major items outlined by SCS Engineers in the 2015 Solid Waste Strategic plan. Additionally, staff was instructed to provide regular updates to the Board. Updates will focus on action items related to each of the four (4) major areas of Solid Waste (Collections, Recycling, Transportation, and Disposal). The updates are as follows:

**Collections:**

- Staff is developing an RFP for Engineering Services to provide site design and surveying for potential new collection sites as discussed at the February 22<sup>nd</sup> Work Session.
- Staff has gathered population data and is drafting a phasing plan to present to the Solid Waste Committee for input prior to a full presentation to the Board.
- Staff has been contacted by several citizens expressing concerns over the plan and by several others who wanted to review information on the plan. Specific comments include:
  - concern about the South River Road area
  - concern about the location of the proposed Fancy Hill site and its potential impact on business - specifically the tourism industry.A copy of those comments has been forwarded to the Board.
- Supervisor Lewis has coordinated with the Rockbridge Awareness Group (RCA) and the Brownsburg Ruritan Club for a presentation on solid waste collections plans on March 16<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 PM at the Rockbridge

Baths Fire House. The County Administrator will be making the presentation.

**Recycling:**

- The new compactor and building modifications are complete at the Baler Facility to handle co-mingled recycling materials.

**Transportation (Hauling):**

- The County continues to work with C&S Disposal under the new hauling agreement. The financial impacts remain consistent with projections, with significant costs associated with site cleanup and maintenance.

**Disposal (Landfill Expansion):**

- The County and City of Lexington continue to work together to complete a joint Solid Waste Agreement. The first draft of the agreement is expected from Lexington any day now. Upon receipt, staff will review and comment before providing to the Solid Waste Committee and then the full Board.
- The County received a second round of Part B (technical review) comments from VA DEQ on Friday, March 4, 2016. Staff and Draper Aden Associates have been working with DEQ to coordinate a final response in order to obtain the draft permit.
- The Solid Waste Authority has received three proposals in response to the recently advertised RFP for Legal Services. The review team

(City Attorney, County Attorney, Solid Waste Director) has scheduled interviews for all three proposers to be completed by March 18.

- Bid documents related to landfill expansion (legal/technical) have been drafted by DAA and are currently being reviewed by the County attorney and staff.
- VRA Credit review is ongoing as part of the February 8, 2016 application submittal.

During the next several weeks, staff will be working with multiple outside resources and agencies in hopes of engaging the Solid Waste Committee and ultimately the full Board with additional information."

There was no Board discussion.

#### **Fire and EMS Update/Discussion**

Mr. Suter announced that Director of Fire and EMS Brandon Mitchell was not available to attend the meeting; therefore, he would present Mr. Mitchell's report. He briefly reviewed the report:

"Please find the requested information regarding Rockbridge County Fire and EMS. The information contained in this document will provide an update to the Rockbridge County Board of Supervisors regarding response data, staffing comparisons, "Response 50" program, budget discussion, revenue recovery, Fire and EMS accomplishments, and providing services moving forward.

#### **Fire and EMS Accomplishments**

"The Fire and EMS system has seen many positive changes over the last 18 months - most of which have been a result of budgetary increases from the Board of Supervisors in FY 16. The increase in allotments by 15% and the funding of

equipment testing for fire agencies along with the swift water rescue program have made positive impacts on the overall response system. The overall opinion from the agencies is one of support and involvement for and from the Board. The personnel are genuinely appreciative of the assistance and respect given by the Board. The following items are examples of the success we have experienced:

- Career staffing in Glasgow and Fairfield
- Funding regional swiftwater rescue team that meets criteria for statewide VDEM deployment. Equipment is located at three areas of the county; this has helped improve response to swiftwater incidents.
- Pump service, aerial ladder, fire hose, ground ladder, and Self Contained Breathing Apparatus testing is now funded by the County. This ensures that NFPA and OSHA standards are being met by all agencies.
- Proposed funding for EMS agency equipment testing and recertification. This will provide compliance with NIST, NFPA, OSHA standards.
- National Registry of Emergency Medical Technicians (NREMT) Testing and training designation.
- Tanker strike team deployment for increased water sources responding to non-hydranted areas.
- Increase in positive relationship with agencies throughout county.
- Standardized response to incidents and resource management..
- National Fire Incident Reporting (NFIRS) documentation for responses throughout the county.
- OEMS version 3 software migration for all agencies utilizing Field Bridge system.
- New radio system which will positively impact our operations and ability to communicate throughout the county.
- Active911 system has been implemented and utilized in place of CAD mobile for use with iPad or smartphone.
- All agencies due for EMS inspection were re-certified and licensed.
- Joint training and operations with Bedford County swiftwater rescue and technical rescue teams.
- New 4-gas monitors and display monitor purchased through LEMPG. We now have a total of 8 atmospheric monitors. This has improved our ability to monitor air quality without the individual agencies being burdened with purchasing.
- Promulgated policy for Volunteer Minimum Standards.
- Amended contract with Buena Vista Rescue Squad.
- Developed modified response guidelines for severe weather or other disaster response to allow for efficient use of resources during major emergencies."

#### **2015 Response Data**

"The following information reflects the total number of responses for Rockbridge County, Virginia for calendar year 2015, according to reports generated through Rockbridge Regional Communication Center and Daypro CAD program.

"The total incident count for Rockbridge County in 2015 was 5,475. This was a 5% increase for the same time period in 2104, which reported 5,210 incidents.

Incidents by type are listed below:

- Medical 66% (3,613)
- Fire 16% (876)
- Traffic 9% (492)
- Other 9% (492)

Staffing Comparison									
Current Staffing									
AGENCY		Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Line Total
CO 17	FAIRFIELD	12	12	12	12	12	0	0	60
CO 3	GLASGOW	0	0	12	12	12	12	12	60
	Daily Coverage	12	12	24	24	24	12	12	120

Current hourly rate is \$51.00 per hour with a weekly total of \$ 6,120 or 318,240

Staggered 24 hour - 12 hour staffing									
AGENCY		Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Line Total
CO 17	FAIRFIELD	24	12	12	24	12	0	0	84
CO 3	GLASGOW	0	0	24	12	24	12	12	84
	Daily Coverage	24	12	36	36	36	12	12	168

Current hourly rate of \$51.00 per hour with weekly total of \$8,568 is an increase of 40% and annual total is \$445,536

7 Days per week 12 hour staffing									
AGENCY		Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Line Total
CO 17	FAIRFIELD	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	84
CO 3	GLASGOW	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	84
	Daily Coverage	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	168

Current hourly rate of \$51.00 per hour with weekly total of \$8,568 is an increase of 40% and annual total is \$445,536

Monthly EMS Contract FY 2015/16													\$400,000.00		
AGENCY		July	August	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	Line Total	Budget Remaining
CO 17	Fairfield	14,325	13,177	13,674	13,655	12,980	14,114	15,734	14,777	0	0	0	0	112,436	
CO 3	Glasgow	14,535	14,076	13,101	14,631	13,107	13,808	15,950	15,989	0	0	0	0	115,196	
	Monthly Totals	28,860	27,253	26,775	28,286	26,087	27,923	31,684	30,766	0	0	0	0	227,632	172,368

**Budget Discussion:**

"I have received positive feedback from the agencies regarding the new accounting software. The agencies with exception of one had their budgets prepared and delivered by the due dates, with operational budgets that reflected an accurate picture of expenses. The budgets for FY 18 will provide additional information and provide the opportunity to compare budget requests to actual expenditures and

continue to provide more information to the Board of Supervisors. The budget presented this fiscal year provides the information agreed upon in the Fire Rescue Commission meeting, which allowed the agencies an additional year before requiring the comparison and actual expenses information.

**Response 50 program update:**

"The Response 50 program has suffered from a lack of available personnel to staff the unit for the last 18 months. The revitalization of the program was listed as an early priority upon my arrival. Initially, I met with Mandy McComas to determine the status of the program and then followed up with Shane Wheeler to develop a new staffing calendar and call for available personnel to staff the unit. Staffing began to show an improvement and we were staffing the vehicle 15 days out of the month for approximately 5 months. Staffing began to decrease in March 2015, and we met again to determine the direction of the program. This meeting coincided with the hiring of new medics for the contract EMS service. Several of these personnel showed interest in the Response 50 program and we began to see an increase in staffing once again. The increased staffing continued through the spring and began to decrease early into the month of June. The vehicle has been staffed 10 times total from August 2015 to February 2016. During this time I have researched alternative deployment models for the unit and discussed our options with the Virginia Office of EMS Grants Coordinator. According to the OEMS, we are permitted to change or alter the mission of the vehicle as long as it responds to emergency incidents and is not sold or disposed of without written permission. The equipment could be used by other agencies, with the exception of the cardiac monitor. The cardiac monitor was also purchased through the Rescue Squad Assistance Fund Grant and must remain available to complete a similar mission as listed in the grant. Discussions have taken place between the Office of EMS and RERG regarding options for the unit. Options discussed are listed below:

1. Considering low staffing levels we would suspend the response 50 program and have the vehicle available as a staff vehicle that met response conditions contained within the grant. The county has a capital plan to replace the Emergency Management vehicle in fiscal year 2017. This would be a cost of approximately 36,000.00. The idea was presented to drop the capital improvement purchase and reassign the vehicle.
  - a. Reassign the Response 50 Tahoe to Emergency Management
  - b. Reassign the Tahoe to the Fire & EMS Director and reassign current director's vehicle to Emergency Management
2. We have requested as an unfunded priority the position of a shift commander who would work a 40 hour week and assume fire and EMS response and supervisor responsibilities. The idea was introduced that the Tahoe could be used for this position and ensure response capabilities and eliminate the need to purchase an additional vehicle with a cost of \$36 to \$40 thousand.

## Revenue Recovery

"The revenue recovery account from billed EMS transports has a current balance of \$802,877.00. We aggressively pursued a backlog of Medicare claims in February 2015, with the resulting collection of \$188,648.84. The current collection rate of billable responses has averaged 80% for the last 12 months - which is 12% higher than the national average.

"Volunteer staffing and career staffing both contribute to the revenue recovery fund. I was able to research this through our EMS billing information. Instead of looking at total call volume and then comparing career response, I narrowed the search to billed responses only.

"Beginning February 2015 to January 2016, we have generated a total of 771 billed responses. Of those billed responses 289 were generated by career staff. This number reflects 37.48% of the billed responses.

"Several options have been reviewed regarding the best use of the revenue recovery funds.

- Fund the purchase of two transport ambulances through the Rescue Squad Assistance Fund and place those units in stations and staff with career personnel. The RERG approved this request. The proposed amount of purchase would be for \$357,242 for both ambulances. The grant provides 80%/20% funding. The amount needed from revenue recovery would be \$71,448. We would also request two cardiac monitors at a total cost of \$47,088. The grant would provide 80%/20% funding and the needed amount from revenue recovery would be \$9,418. The total requested funding would be \$80,866.\*
- Utilize the percentage of career responses to assist in the proposed staffing increase to offset the costs in the County Budget. The 37.48% when used with the budget request of \$460,000 would generate \$167,808 from the revenue recovery account if we moved in the direction we discussed. As stated before, I support the increase in revenue recovery funding to support the additional career staffing requested.
- Fund a portion or all of the EMS supply cache for agencies with a current OEMS license. This would include all fire and EMS agencies operating as first responder or transport agencies. This program would provide much needed support of agencies when replacing medical supplies used on EMS incidents. Our initial request would be \$60,000, with a continued request of \$30,000 per year.
- Provide a staffing plan for fire and EMS agencies that compensated volunteer members for either pay per call or pay for block times staffed in the stations. Significant work was done on this topic prior to my arrival. We have discussed the potentials in this program, but no formal meetings of the finance subcommittee of the Fire Rescue Commission have occurred.

*\*If the Board approves, this grant could be submitted in either of two (2) upcoming grant cycles in March 2016 or September 2016.*

### **Moving Forward**

"As we continue to move forward with the intent to provide the best services to our citizens, we will need to focus on data driven decisions for both Fire and EMS service delivery. We must continue to analyze response data and identify areas of improvement to our staffing and deployment models to ensure an effective and efficient service delivery model.

"The information provided in this document reveals staffing challenges by time of day and day of week. We are confident that the requested contract staffing would fill those gaps and decrease our fail to respond or second due notifications. As we continue to improve our CAD system and records management system, our data will become even more effective and allow a higher percentage of accuracy when analyzing for predictive staffing in all areas of the county.

"The continuing need for the County is staffed EMS transport units available to provide definitive care (arrival at appropriate medical facility) when requested. The countywide system has shown much improvement, especially with the career staffing in the County, City of Lexington, and Buena Vista Rescue Squad. The continued countywide view of the entire system will ensure the best possible outcome for service delivery.

"We are also looking at several other options to increase efficiency in the daily operations of the agencies. We have discussed group insurance coverage for the agencies, allowing agencies to purchase tires and fuel from the county, group purchases of standardized equipment such as fire hose, personnel protective equipment (PPE), apparatus for fire and EMS agencies, and other equipment and services. This group purchasing approach has the potential to save tens of thousands of dollars annually by putting out for bid these items or services as evidenced by benefits of the apparatus and equipment testing in this FY 16 budget."

While reviewing the grant under Revenue Recovery, Mr. Suter advised that the requested funding of \$80,866 is not currently budgeted. He reiterated that the grant request could be submitted either in March 2016 or September 2016.

Supervisor Hinty shared that he is all for the grant, but recommends waiting until September.

Supervisor Lewis asked what the need was for the two (2) ambulances listed under the Revenue Recovery section of the report.

Mr. Suter replied that he believed that there is a plan, but without Mr. Mitchell's input, he could not comment on it. He added that there is always a need to plan for replacement of apparatus. He questioned what would be done with the old apparatus if two (2) were replaced.

Supervisor Lewis asked whether, if the County were to replace vehicles owned by squads in Fairfield and Glasgow, these would become county-owned vehicles operated by paid personnel; and if we bought these vehicles he asked how would other rescue squads feel about it.

Mr. Suter replied it was his understanding the RERG supported this grant and that the vehicles would become joint-use vehicles. He questioned who would cover the insurance. He suggested holding off on submitting a grant until he could get more information on the matter.

Chairman Higgins agreed with Supervisor Hinty and Mr. Suter, stating that submitting the grant application this month would be too soon. He recommended waiting until September to provide additional time for the County Administrator and Mr. Mitchell to gather answers to the questions. He added that there is over \$800,000 in a line item that could cover the cost.

Mr. Suter added that waiting for the next grant cycle would allow more time to look at all potential uses of the money, which was the original intent.

Chairman Higgins added that it would also allow more time for other rescue squads to have some input also, because they deserve the opportunity to be involved in the decision-making.

Supervisor Ford added that the very fact that Mr. Mitchell was asking for extended career staffing at EMS stations shows that there are problems with recruiting and retention; he suggested that be looked at.

Chairman Higgins asked Mr. Suter to find out the annual average collected in revenue recovery, as he had previously spoken of using that money to fund the requests.

Supervisor Campbell noted that the South River Fire Department will be hosting a new recruit training soon, using a burning building exercise.

Chairman Higgins asked Mr. Suter if he wanted to get responses from the RERG on this and bring it back.

Mr. Suter stated that this all started with a Sub-Committee of the Fire and Rescue Commission and suggested that it go back to that committee first.

Mr. Bolster added information on the revenue recovery funds, sharing that revenue recovery is budgeted for around \$200,000 a year for this year and next year. He noted that for this year and next, \$100,000 will come out of recovered revenue in addition to the contracted costs for the 3<sup>rd</sup> party firm that helps with collections - around \$13,000 per year. Therefore, the full \$803,000 would not be available to use for funding the recommendations.

## Consideration of Purchase of Property for Emergency Communications Center

Mr. Suter advised that the Regional Communications Board had met earlier in the day; he then briefly reviewed the Agenda Item: "In December, the Board authorized staff to enter into a contract to buy the building which was previously the Lomax Funeral Home, off US 60 east in the City of Buena Vista. The executed contract provided for a \$375,000 purchase price, and an 80 day due diligence period, during which the County could conduct investigation as to the suitability of the building for the intended use. This tight timeframe required some swift action in multiple areas. Listed below are action items and status:

- Phase 1 Environmental report - Complete
- Phase 2 Environmental report - Complete, but test results are not yet available. At present, there have been no signs of fatal flaws.
- Septic system inspection - Complete. No issues found.
- Asbestos testing - Samples taken and remitted for testing. Results not yet received.
- Lead paint testing - Samples take and remitted for testing. Results not yet received.
- Well testing - Due to faulty control panel, we have as yet been unable to purge the well (which has been inactive for multiple years). This is likely not a big issue in that, should results ultimately determine bacterial contamination, a UV treatment system could be installed, or the building could be hooked up to nearby public water (Buena Vista).

- Boundary survey - Complete.

"Additionally, we utilized the services of Moseley Architects to conduct a building assessment and general design. Moseley remitted an initial report indicating a base cost of \$1.99M as a total project cost (including the \$375,000 purchase price). They recently revised that cost to \$2,028,887 to include construction administration costs (costs associated with Moseley's services, should they be tapped as the Construction Administrator). The total cost includes a 10% construction contingency and a 10% design contingency (for items which might be found during detailed design). Moseley also included a listing of "recommended" options (essentially wants, versus needs). Other costs which should be considered include a 25' monopole tower and trenching of cables into the building, costs associated with moving the existing equipment in the current center to a new center, and if existing dispatch furniture is not used, new furnishings. The County has offered to fully absorb the purchase price for the property and then finance the funding partners' percentage of remaining improvement costs for 20 years at 2% interest. A Regional Emergency Communications Board meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 14<sup>th</sup> at 9:30 AM at Lexington City hall to discuss options. At that time, options will be presented to the Communications Board and it is anticipated that the Board will make a final recommendation to the localities. I plan to bring the recommendation to the Board of Supervisors at its regularly scheduled meeting on Monday evening, along

with any comment and additional information which becomes available between now and then.

"It is my understanding at this time that the City of Lexington is not in favor of moving to a new center, while the City of Buena Vista has not made a decision. Thus and without benefit of knowing what may transpire at Monday morning's Communications Board meeting, a recommendation is difficult to make at the time of this writing. The next opportunity for the Cities to discuss this option and make a final determination as to their position is at their regularly scheduled meetings on March 17<sup>th</sup>.

"Given that we have not received the final environmental assessments, it is difficult to offer a firm recommendation at this time. However, I expect to have the results by Monday evening's Board meeting. Should the test results be available and acceptable, and the Board of Supervisors wish to proceed with the purchase, it could opt to go ahead with authorization to make the purchase on Monday evening. Alternatively, it could wait for the Cities' determination as to whether they wish to join the County in moving the Center. In that case, the Board could call a special meeting prior to the March 25<sup>th</sup> deadline to approve notification to the seller that the County will be exercising its option to purchase the building."

During review of Agenda Item, Mr. Suter advised that Phase II results came in on Friday showing asbestos in the joint compound in the walls. He further stated that he had obtained an estimate from an abatement

contractor of about \$50,000 to abate the entire building. He noted that since there are two sides to this building, one for the 911 Center and the other a future EOC, the cost was about \$25,000 for each side.

Mr. Suter also noted during his review of the Agenda Item that the meeting held earlier in the day by the 911 Board resulted in a 3 - 2 vote recommending that the localities move from the existing center to the Lomax facility. He then presented the resolution included in the Board Package that would authorize entering into a contract to purchase the Lomax building.

Mr. Suter then provided the following points:

- All costs included result in a cost share of \$1,745,076 excluding the purchase price.
- Annual Cost: County \$62,426 (which would not need to be paid as the County would be purchasing the facility for \$375,000); Buena Vista \$19,201; and Lexington \$20,871. He noted that VMI would also have some cost as well.
- Over 20 years with 2% interest, Buena Vista would be responsible for \$384,000 and Lexington \$417,000.

He noted that the two City Managers had made it clear in the Communications Board meeting they were not in favor of this plan as they felt the County was moving too fast, the cost are too high, and there is a functioning center now. He noted that one reason that the

new location would be a more suitable center is that it would be owned free and clear.

Supervisor Campbell asked Mr. Suter to double check his numbers on costs over the 20 year period between the two cities.

Mr. Suter stated that, over 20 years with a 2% interest rate, the County would pay, if interest was charged, \$1,248,512; Buena Vista \$384,000; and Lexington \$417,429.

Supervisor Campbell asked Mr. Suter if he felt a second company should take a look at the asbestos and if so what would that cost.

Mr. Suter replied that he has 100% faith in the company which conducted the asbestos testing. He then added that he and the City Managers had also previously discussed the potential for the County to be its own general contractor in order to reduce costs. However, based on the tight schedule and potential risk involved, this idea had been jointly ruled out. He noted that he had asked Moseley to adjust their project schedule to have an equipment room ready by January 1, 2017, should the project move ahead.

Supervisor Campbell added that the Board has been looking at this for the past five (5) years. He moved to agree with the 911 Board and go ahead and prepare this facility for the 911 center, by adopting the resolution to buy the Lomax facility.

Supervisor Lewis asked whether, according to this proposal, the County would own the facility but the improvements would be shared with the members of the 911 Board. Would the county receive any remuneration or rent for the lease on that facility?

Mr. Suter replied that, no, this would not be in the form of rent or lease but rather a loan arrangement where the County would front the partner's share on the upgrade costs. He stated that over time, the cities would need to share in capital maintenance costs, noting again that VMI would have a contribution also.

Supervisor Lewis asked whether in future years these improvements would be to the benefit of the County, or if the current 911 agreement dissolved the County would need to share out the costs of the improvements.

Mr. Suter responded that the original agreement provided for pro rata cost reimbursement, should one of the partners pull out of the existing center. Supervisor Lewis supported Supervisor Campbell's motion. He shared that it is frightening and depressing that regional cooperation could be lost and create extreme hardships on all the jurisdictions and on the region. He added that State funding and grants go to regions who cooperate, and everyone would be in deep trouble if this does not work.

Supervisor Ford reiterated what Supervisor Lewis stated: the County has bent over backwards to include the cities and has been extremely generous in its efforts and offer to keep them involved in this move, and

it is frightening and depressing to think that regional cooperation might be lost and that all of the concomitant support from state and lending institutions could be lost along with it. He stated that the county needs to lead at this point and do the best they can to bring the Cities along; if we don't make this decision now will lose the opportunity to move for all the right reasons into a better headquarters for the 911 call center.

Supervisor Hinty agreed with Supervisors Lewis and Ford.

Chairman Higgins agreed with Supervisor Campbell, asking all to keep this positive and in the right direction in working with the two cities.

Mr. Suter added that it is important to note that he received a memorandum right before the meeting from the Buena Vista City Manager, Jay Scudder. He noted that the document (which was drafted by Buena Vista Attorney Brian Kearney) referenced the April 2013 agreement that created the current, revised Board. He then read aloud the referenced section of the agreement, stating: "The center shall be located in the existing location adjacent to the Buena Vista Police Department on Park Avenue in Buena Vista, Virginia. The jurisdictions agree that all alternative locations will be evaluated by the 911 Board, and if it is determined through such evaluation that another location is more suitable for a 911 Center, a recommendation will be made to the member localities and the center will be relocated subject to available funding sources." Mr. Suter suggested that the point the two Cities are trying to make is that despite the fact that the County has the available funding source, they may not

have the funds to pay the County. He added that there is also a provision that if one locality wants to exit the center that they provide at least a year's notice - notice given in the fiscal year preceding the exit. He added that three (3) other locations over the past several years had been evaluated at the County's expense. He then apologized that this is a fast moving project but the new location was just recommended in November.

Chairman Higgins noted that the Buena Vista City Manager had come to him and related that Jimmy Carter [BV resident and County farmer] had stopped by and advised him that he thought that the Lomax building would be a good location and asked that it be looked at.

Chairman Higgins also noted that we had received nothing formal saying that ACA will not move to repossess the current center. He was not even sure if the required upgrade is permissible and questioned if the building is in compliance with regulations. He recommended adding language to the motion to invite the two City Councils to meet with the Board of Supervisors to talk about this.

Chairman Higgins asked Sheriff Blalock for comments.

Sheriff Blalock commended Mr. Suter for all his work, sharing that he understands his frustrations when localities are pulling in different directions. He shared his fear that the current building is in jeopardy as it is not up to standards, so County would be putting money into a facility to upgrade, not knowing what ACA will do with the facility - as Buena Vista is no longer the owner. He stated that the County has been

reasonable with this offer to the two Cities. He suggested getting the elected bodies together to make this work.

Supervisor Campbell amended his motion to adopt the resolution to purchase the former Lomax facility and to invite the Buena Vista City Council and Lexington City Council to meet with the Board of Supervisors. Supervisor Lewis provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board.

AYES: Campbell, Lewis, Ford, Hinty, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, HELD AT  
THE ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES ON MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2016

Resolution to Authorize the Acquisition and Acceptance from SCI Virginia Funeral Services, Inc., of Two Adjoining Parcels of Real Estate, Consisting of a Total of 2.465 Acres of Land and a Structure, Identified as Tax Parcel #15-A-3 and #15-A-2 and Located at 2200 East Midland Trail (Known as the Former Lomax Funeral Home) in the City of Buena Vista, Virginia, for Regional Public Safety Purposes

WHEREAS, the CITY OF BUENA VISTA ("Buena Vista"), the CITY OF LEXINGTON ("Lexington"), and the COUNTY OF ROCKBRIDGE ("Rockbridge"), herein collectively referred to as the "Jurisdictions", have entered into the Rockbridge Regional Central Dispatch Agreement with an effective date of May 1, 2013 (the "2013 Agreement"), to further consolidate law enforcement, fire, rescue and other emergency services into the Rockbridge Regional Public Safety Communications Center (the "Center"); and,

WHEREAS, in Section 3(b) of said 2013 Agreement, the Jurisdictions agreed to evaluate alternative locations for suitability as a 911 Center and possible relocation in conjunction with future infrastructure or capital upgrades; and,

WHEREAS, Rockbridge has taken the lead and has expended significant funds in exploring options for a suitable alternative location for the regional 911 Center, with space available for a regional Emergency Operations Center; and,

WHEREAS, after ruling out numerous options, Rockbridge discovered the former Lomax Funeral home property was available and listed on the market; and,

WHEREAS, it appeared that this site was financially and physically feasible for the 911 dispatch and EOP Center, and the staff of all three Jurisdictions agreed that further evaluation was warranted; and,

WHEREAS, Rockbridge negotiated a purchase agreement with the owner of the property, SCI Virginia Funeral Services, Inc., for possible acquisition of the property following a due diligence/study period ending on March 25, 2016; and,

WHEREAS, Rockbridge is required under the purchase agreement to elect not to purchase the subject property by March 25, 2016, or proceed to closing on or before March 30, 2016; and,

WHEREAS, based on evaluations of the property supporting its feasibility as a 911 Dispatch and Emergency Operations Center, staff recommends acquisition of the property for such purposes.

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

1. That the acquisition and acceptance from SCI Virginia Funeral Services, Inc., of the real estate, known as the former Lomax Funeral Home site, described as two adjoining parcels of land, consisting of a total of 2.465 acres of land, shown as "Tax Parcel 15-A-3 – 2.011 Acres" and "Tax Parcel 15-A-2 – 0.454 Acres" on a 'Physical Survey for Rockbridge County' dated February 8, 2016, and located at 2200 East Midland Trail in the City of Buena Vista, Virginia, for the purchase price of \$375,000.00, be, and hereby is, authorized and approved.

2. That the County Administrator is hereby authorized to execute the deed and such other documents, and to take such other actions, on behalf of the Board of Supervisors, as are necessary to accomplish the acquisition and acceptance of the real estate described herein, all of which shall be approved as to form by the County Attorney.

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

Adopted this 14<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2016.

**Public Hearing on Removal or Amendment of Non-expansion Covenant of Former Highland Belle Property Conveyed to BARC**

County Attorney Vickie Huffman advised that this item was to set a Public Hearing for March 28, 2016.

Mr. Crickenberger noted that this item would be on the EDA's next Agenda which would be on Monday, March 21, 2016, to consider this matter and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Supervisor Ford moved to schedule a public hearing for March 28, 2016, adding that the conceptual plan presented to the Planning Commission last Wednesday showed a soccer field where one could not be placed due to topography. He added that it was a positive gesture by BARC to show that some public use would be available on the BARC property. However, the space shown is not suitable to create a soccer field.

Ms. Huffman added that advertisement would be for removal or amendment of the covenant, to have the options available.

Supervisor Ford amended his motion to include removal or amendment of a condition of the special exception permit. Supervisor Hinty provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the board.

AYES: Ford, Hinty, Campbell, Lewis, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

### **Appointments**

**Jail Commission- David Hinty- Term Expired 12/31/2015**

**Jail Commission- Spencer Suter- Term Expired 12/31/2015**

Chairman Higgins passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Hinty and left the dais.

Supervisor Lewis moved to reappoint David Hinty and Spencer Suter to the Jail Commission. Supervisor Campbell provided the second, and the motion carried by the following roll call vote with Chairman Higgins abstaining:

AYES: Lewis, Campbell, Ford, Hinty  
NAYES: None  
ABSTAIN: Higgins  
ABSENT: None

Chairman Higgins returned to the dais and took his position as Chairman.

### **Nomination for CSPDC Executive Committee Membership**

Supervisor Lewis suggested that the Board decline making a nomination to the CSPDC Executive Committee.

Supervisor Campbell moved to decline making a nomination to the CSPDC Executive Committee. Supervisor Hinty provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

AYES: Campbell, Hinty, Ford, Lewis, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

### **Staff Reports**

Supervisor Lewis moved to accept the Staff Reports. Supervisor Campbell provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

AYES: Lewis, Campbell, Ford, Hinty, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

### **Citizens Comments**

Paul Estabrook asked for a moment to comment on Solid Waste.

Chairman Higgins granted Mr. Estabrook a few minutes to comment.

Mr. Estabrook, representing Virginia Gold Orchard, stated that his business was a unique tourist-driven business that receives visitors from all over America. He asked why the Board would consider the location near his business for a collection site, as contaminants from the compactor would be released into the air and could harm his fruit. He asked that the Board reconsider placing a collection site near his business. He then added that his business is a test site for USDA and Virginia Tech.

Chairman Higgins stated that the Board will take this into consideration when studying the nearby proposed collection site and will look at all options to make sure this would be the right spot.

Mr. Estabrook advised that the US Supreme Court has upheld the EPA rules on water, which puts very restrictive rules in play. He asked the Board to take that into consideration when looking at the site as it has a nearby spring.

### **Break**

Chairman Higgins called for a break at 7:48 P.M.

Chairman Higgins reconvened the Board of Supervisors meeting at 7:56 P.M.

### **FY 2017 Budget Update**

Mr. Bolster asked that the Board keep in mind that any 1 cent increase on real estate taxes generates \$232,000. He noted that one thing that impacted that draft budget was the local choice rate increased 6.1% for FY2017. In addition, he reviewed several items that he had changed in the budget document, based on the Board's most recent budget discussion. They were:

The Circuit Court Administrative Assistant function and the Victim Witness Coordinator position to receive the same treatment as County employees with regard to salary increase; Commonwealths Attorney request for increased compensation was not supported by the Board; The Commissioner of the Revenue had requested 1 full time position that was

not funded - but as alternative, \$10,000 was added for a part time position.

Under Fire and EMS, the Finance Committee recommended bringing to the Board level operational funding for the ambulance contract. He asked the Board if they wanted to do level funding or do what was requested by Mr. Mitchell and bump agencies up by around \$24,000 (Rescue squad contributions) and \$36,000 (Fire Dept. contributions), and also honor the request to fund 24 hour services for ambulance contract, bumping it from \$400,000 to \$460,000. He asked for guidance.

Mr. Suter asked to ensure that the EMS equipment testing equipment stayed in the budget.

Mr. Bolster added that it is important to note that the 2017 tentative gap is using level funding for the school division only as an exercise and that he expects an actual number within a couple of weeks. He then handed the floor to Mr. Suter, who presented potential changes in compensation for County employees.

Mr. Suter noted he had reviewed this information with each member except Supervisor Lewis, whom he not been able to meet with yet. He stated that, as the budget sits, there is no additional compensation for staff. After the salary study was completed, actions taken impacted some employees but not all. He reported that only a dozen full time employees were impacted, though all permanent part time staff received increases. He advised that he had worked with the finance and personnel committees to put together a proposed increase plan which would provide a 0.25% increase per year of service for each full time employee, to address compression.

He noted that this increase would be capped at 20 years of service. That would impact most employees but not all. He then advocated for an additional 1% cost of living increase for all employees. He listed the total cost:

\$46,184 compression increase

\$19,670 1% COLI

\$16,270 benefits increase

Total of around \$82,000

He stated that there is the potential to go back to all departments and see if they could dig deeper into their budgets find funds for the 1% increase; if so, the impact would be about \$63,000 or \$64,000, depending on the rounding in the benefits. He noted that the two positions this does not impact are the Administrator and County Attorney. He added that he was not requesting anything for himself but feels the County Attorney deserves some consideration.

Chairman Higgins advised that the finance and personnel committees have been working on this for months with Mr. Suter and recommended adopting the recommended increase to "get it off Mr. Suter's plate".

Mr. Suter then asked that the Board consider a future policy which rewards meritorious performance. He noted that it would always remain at the Board's discretion whether to fund merit increases annually. He also requested permission to extend the evaluation period from 1 year to 18 months, (January, 2016 rather than May 2015) in order to reset the

evaluation cycle to better fit the budgetary cycle. The Board concurred.

Supervisor Ford agreed with Chairman Higgins; however, he noted that he was not sure about the Constitutional departments' requested increases, as he has a lack of certainty with what the General assembly recently did regarding Compensation Board increases.

Supervisor Lewis asked for clarification.

Supervisor Ford advised he had read that those who get their salaries paid by the Compensation Board will be receiving an increase, and that there is also a part of the General Assembly's action that includes a compression adjustment. As for the Sheriff's and Regional Jail Commission employees, there is a potential \$80 added to compensation per year of service.

Chairman Higgins stated that he would not mind subtracting the \$80 from the amount.

Supervisor Ford noted that more study has been done for County employees' increases than for constitutional employees'.

Supervisor Campbell stated that the Board needs to follow through with what it said it would do, especially with Board employees, and that it should look into the constitutionals.

Chairman Higgins agreed, noting that constitutionals had every opportunity to look at the County's study, and each decided to make their own proposal regarding pay increase requests. He suggested setting the discussion of Constitutional pay requests over to next budget meeting.

Mr. Bolster asked for direction on Fire and EMS.

Supervisor Lewis stated that the Fire and EMS 24 hour proposal is intriguing and potentially very useful. He asked the other Board members for their suggestions as to whether or not to accept that proposal.

Chairman Higgins stated that he didn't think he had seen enough information to agree to the proposal and had not heard from the other Fire and EMS departments for their input.

Supervisor Campbell stated that he thought we should look at the 24x7 coverage. He requested postponing a decision until September when the grant, spoken of previously, may be submitted.

Supervisor Lewis agreed with postponing it.

Chairman Higgins asked if we applied for the grant in September when it would be awarded.

Mr. Suter replied February or March 2017.

Supervisor Ford asked if it is sufficient [in terms of the budget] to say the funds are available in an escrow account and not add a line in the budget.

Mr. Suter replied that the Board would need to appropriate funds if it was determined to apply for the grant and it was awarded.

Mr. Bolster asked for direction on funding for the volunteer agencies.

Mr. Suter noted that there was a request for a 5% increase and that he had suggested meeting somewhere in the middle.

Chairman Higgins stated that Kerrs Creek and Effinger question why they do not get the same amount as other agencies.

Supervisor Lewis suggested accepting the Fire Association's recommendation.

Chairman Higgins stated that he did not have a problem with that if Kerrs Creek and Effinger were added.

Supervisor Lewis noted that the recommendation is to not include those two departments.

Chairman Higgins stated that it is a very small amount of money and they should be rewarded too.

Supervisor Campbell said the Board needed to look at each department individually or it will make things bad again as some run few calls and some run many.

Supervisor Ford ask that the Board recall that he and Supervisor Campbell spent a lot of time working on budgets with the Fire and Rescue Commission last winter and ended up getting a substantial increase to all departments at that time.

Supervisor Hinty noted that the Board had this discussion years ago and that he agreed with the Fire agencies' standpoint, but the Board needed to look at this to prepare for how to handle it in the future.

Supervisor Lewis reread his motion to accept the Fire Association's recommendation. Supervisor Hinty provided the second, and the motion failed with the following roll call vote:

AYES:	Lewis, Hinty
NAYES:	Ford, Campbell, Higgins
ABSENT:	None

Mr. Bolster noted that the current gap is \$218,489 which includes, as an exercise, keeping the School Board at level funding. He noted that he would also calculate the staff increases that the Board had agreed to and would work with Department heads to find the 1% Mr. Suter had spoken of.

Mr. Suter noted that some departments will not be able to find the 1%, but we will do the best we can.

### **Closed Meeting**

At 8:24 P.M., Supervisor Campbell read aloud the Closed Meeting language: "Closed Meeting as permitted by Virginia Code section 2.2-3711(A)(1), a personnel matter involving demotion, discipline or resignation of specific officers, appointees or employees."

Supervisor Hinty moved to enter into a Closed Meeting. Supervisor Ford provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board.

AYES: Hinty, Ford, Campbell, Lewis, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

Supervisor Lewis moved to reconvene in open session following the Closed Meeting. Supervisor Hinty provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board.

AYES: Lewis, Hinty, Ford, Campbell, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

Supervisor Ford moved that the Board certify that, in the closed meeting just concluded, to the best of each member's knowledge, nothing was heard, discussed or considered except the matter or matters (1) specifically identified in the motion to convene in closed session and (2) lawfully permitted to be so discussed as exempt from open meeting requirements under the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act cited in that motion. Supervisor Hinty provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board.

AYES: Ford, Hinty, Campbell, Lewis, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

#### **Continued Meeting**

The meeting was continued until Wednesday, March 16, 2016 at 7:00 P.M. at the Rockbridge Baths Fire Department.

**AT A CONTINUED MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY  
VIRGINIA, HELD AT THE ROCKBRIDGE BATHS FIRE DEPARTMENT,  
ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2016, AT 7:00 P.M.**

**PRESENT: CHAIRMAN J.M.HIGGINS**  
**MEMBERS: R.R.CAMPBELL, R.S.FORD, A.W.LEWIS, JR.**  
**ABSENT: D.W.HINTY, JR.**  
**CLERK TO BOARD: SPENCER H. SUTER**

The purpose of the meeting was to receive a staff presentation and to discuss solid waste planning with residents. The meeting was hosted by the Brownsburg Ruritan Club, Rockbridge County Awareness Group and Brownsburg Community Association. Approximately 50 citizens attended.

Chairman Higgins called to order at 7:00 PM.

Supervisor Lewis thanked the sponsors and gave a brief introduction, noting that the purpose of the meeting was to explain actions that the Board has taken with regard to solid waste handling in the county and to gain feedback from the group.

County Administrator Spencer Suter then presented a PowerPoint, outlining the four "legs" of Solid Waste management, with a focus on collections. At the conclusion, Supervisor Lewis led a discussion where Board members and Mr. Suter answered questions and took comment.

A lengthy and informative discussion followed in which supervisors Higgins, Campbell and Ford made illustrative and supportive comments which were well received. The two issues, besides siting for a convenience center in the Brownsburg area [which brought limited attention], were the ideas of cameras at existing sites to monitor illegal dumping and the need to be open Sundays, perhaps forgoing a weekday if necessary for budget reasons.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:15.

