

November 14, 2013

Virginia:

AT A REGULAR MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 2:00 p.m. in the General District Courtroom located on the third floor of the Nelson County Courthouse.

Present: Thomas H. Bruguere, Jr. West District Supervisor- Chair
Constance Brennan, Central District Supervisor - Vice Chair
Larry D. Saunders, South District Supervisor
Allen M. Hale, East District Supervisor
Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor
Stephen A. Carter, County Administrator
Candice W. McGarry, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk
Debra K. McCann, Director of Finance and Human Resources
Tim Padalino, Director of Planning and Zoning
Phil Payne IV, County Attorney
David Thompson, Building Code Official

Absent: None

I. Call to Order

Mr. Bruguere called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm, with all Supervisors present to establish a quorum.

- A. Moment of Silence
- B. Pledge of Allegiance – Mr. Saunders led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Consent Agenda

Mr. Hale asked for an explanation on the transfer of funds for the Sheriff's Department that was included in the FY13-14 Budget Amendment. Mr. Carter noted it was an appropriation of funds in addition to the \$80,000 already approved for Sheriff's Vehicles to pay for the equipping of these vehicles. He added that they had used 4/5 of the approved funding on the first vehicle and needed more to equip the other two cars. Ms. McCann noted that the Sheriff's Department had provided the cost estimate of \$80,000 for cars including equipment for the budget. She added that she had advised them that they could not spend \$5,000 equipping one vehicle and that in doing so, they would run out of money. Ms. McCann then noted that she had suggested that the Sheriff's Department use Asset Forfeiture funds for this and alternately, the Sheriff decided to make the funding request to the Board. Ms. McCann reported that the vehicles cost \$23,000 each and that the radios would have been separate. She noted that the equipping included striping, lights etc.

Mr. Hale then suggested that if they had Asset Forfeiture funds, they should make a contribution of these funds towards this expense. Ms. McCann noted that they had a balance of approximately \$5,000 in Asset Forfeiture funds remaining.

November 14, 2013

Mr. Carter noted that should the Board approve the request, it would not hurt the fund balance at this point given that the contingency fund was still well over a million dollars. He added that the Sheriff's Department had not provided sufficient information when their vehicle estimates were put together for the budget.

Mr. Hale then noted the reason stated in the request for the increase in costs and Ms. McCann confirmed that the vehicles were cars, not SUV's and were less than \$24,000 each.

Mr. Harvey then inquired as to how the speed enforcement revenue was coming in and Mr. Carter noted that he thought they were close to hitting the budget number. He added that staff would report more on that in December/January for the Board's consideration of authorizing additional vehicles.

Mr. Hale then suggested that it would be appropriate for the Sheriff's Department to let the Board know what the Asset Forfeiture funds would be used for and Mr. Harvey advised that it was usually used for guns and vests.

Mr. Harvey and Ms. Brennan then noted minor corrections to the October 8th minutes for approval; which were acknowledged by Ms. McGarry.

Mr. Saunders then moved to approve the Consent Agenda and Mr. Harvey seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion and the following resolutions were adopted:

A. Resolution –**R2013-73** Acceptance of Conveyance – Tyler Property

**RESOLUTION R2013-73
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AUTHORIZATION FOR ACCEPTANCE OF CONVEYANCE
BRUCE K. TYLER & LYNN A. TYLER**

RESOLVED, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that the County Attorney, Philip D. Payne, IV is hereby authorized to accept the conveyance of property from Bruce K. Tyler and Lynn A. Tyler on behalf of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors; the conveyed property being .67 acres more or less, together with various easements, and .933 acres together with various easements all in the Rockfish Magisterial District of Nelson County.

B. Resolution –**R2013-74** Minutes for Approval

**RESOLUTION R2013-74
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
(October 8, 2013 and October 24, 2013)**

November 14, 2013

RESOLVED, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that the minutes of said Board's meetings conducted on **October 8, 2013 and October 24, 2013** be and hereby are approved and authorized for entry into the official record of the Board of Supervisors meetings.

C. Resolution –**R2013-75** COR Refunds

**RESOLUTION R2013-75
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APPROVAL OF COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE REFUNDS**

RESOLVED, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that the following refunds, as certified by the Nelson County Commissioner of Revenue and County Attorney pursuant to §58.1-3981 of the Code of Virginia, be and hereby are approved for payment.

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Payee</u>
\$76.19	2012 PP Tax & Vehicle License Fee	Jactino Sanchez-Garcia 101 Old Courthouse Turnpike Lynchburg, VA 24501
\$98.09	2013 PP Tax & Vehicle License Fee	Terri Johnson 567 Buffalo Bend Road Amherst, VA 24521
\$601.28	2011-2013 PP Tax & Vehicle License Fee	Cameron Enterprises P.O. Box 22845 Oklahoma City, OK 73123

D. Resolution –**R2013-76** FY13-14 Budget Amendment

**RESOLUTION R2013-76
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AMENDMENT OF FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014 BUDGET
NELSON COUNTY, VA
November 14, 2013**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Nelson County that the Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Budget be hereby amended as follows:

I. Appropriation of Funds (General Fund)

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Revenue Account</u>	<u>Expenditure Account</u>
\$ 600.00	3-100-001601-0007	4-100-021060-7007
\$ 702.00	3-100-002404-0007	4-100-082050-6008

\$ 1,302.00

II. Transfer of Funds (General Fund)

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Credit Account (-)</u>	<u>Debit Account (+)</u>
\$ 9,850.00	4-100-999000-9905	4-100-043040-5409

III. Public Comments and Presentations

A. Public Comments

1. John Gooch, Executive Director of Community Energy Conservation Program, Charlottesville, Virginia

Mr. Gooch introduced himself and noted that their operation was located in Charlottesville and that they had a satellite office in Staunton. He noted that they were a non-profit organization that provided weatherization to low income individuals in surrounding counties. He noted that their activities included conducting energy audits, sealing leaks, repairing leaky ducts, installing carbon monoxide and smoke detectors, and even replacing inefficient refrigerators. Mr. Gooch noted that they work with Departments of Social Services for referrals and that there were income level thresholds. He noted that they inspected homes within 48 hours of referral and if the issues could not be fixed with the residents in place, they would relocate them as needed. Mr. Gooch added that he would like to expand their services in Nelson County, as they have only done three (3) homes here. He noted that they were in the process of applying to DHCD as a weatherization agency and he would come for a letter of support from the Board in the near future. Mr. Gooch then noted that for every dollar spent, \$2.50 could be leveraged. He concluded by noting that they were able to spend up to \$2,500 per household.

Mr. Harvey noted that he had seen a program on the news the previous night on something similar to this. Mr. Gooch noted that they did conduct audits where they put a fan in front of a door and took readings. Mr. Harvey noted that Home Depot lent out devices that showed the flow of air and Mr. Gooch noted that this device did as well.

Ms. Brennan noted that a friend's new home still had leakage after having an energy audit done and she asked if Mr. Gooch's organization looked at wood heated homes. Mr. Gooch noted that they did. He then noted that their crisis program could not be utilized for renters but they would do something for them through the weatherization program and it was based on the number of occupants of the house.

Mr. Hale then inquired as to what was considered low income for a two (2) person household. Mr. Gooch noted that for 1 individual it was 60% of the state median income or \$27,209 and this amount increased by \$8,372 per person. He noted that the Crisis Program started at \$1,200 per month and increased by \$435 per person per month. It was noted that Social Security recipients would then be eligible. Mr. Gooch noted that the weatherization

November 14, 2013

program provided for higher priority to be given to the elderly and to those with children living in the home.

2. Ms. McCann then introduced Sara Turner, new to the County Administration Office and noted that she was excited to have her. She added that Ms. Turner was a Physics major and had received her Bachelor's degree and MBA from Butler. She added that she was excited about the skills Ms. Turner brought to the office.

B. Presentation – 2014 TJPDC Legislative Program Approval (**R2013-77**)

Mr. Blount noted that the following were priority areas and that some have been regional priorities for a number of years. He noted that the top priority in the proposed program was public education funding, while focus was maintained on state funding obligations, mandates, and cost shifting in the second priority.

- 1) Public Education Funding
- 2) State Mandates and Funding Obligations
- 3) Transportation Funding and Devolution
- 4) Chesapeake Bay TMDL
- 5) Land Use and Growth Management
- 6) Comprehensive Services Act

He noted that as in the past, the legislative program draft also contained sections that highlighted ongoing local government positions. He noted that changes in these sections under "Areas of Continuing Concern" were underlined where the language was new, while language proposed for deletion was stricken.

Mr. Blount noted that he has done some repositioning to emphasize some items this year and the Continuing Concerns section contained locality specific items.

Mr. Blount then noted that the top priority was public education funding as requested by other localities in the region. He noted that State funding had dropped considerably from 35% to 30% of the state General Fund budget even though enrollment was increasing by 30,000 in five years. He added that he was not optimistic but that there was some opportunity to put more money back into education this year. He noted that this addressed VRS as well and it would be a big ticket item as the recommended rates for teachers was a 3% jump. He noted a 24% increase in what would have to go in to pay contributions. He then noted a change in the GAAP accounting rule, concerning the unfunded liability of teachers' pensions that would mean this would have to be put onto local books.

Mr. Blount reported that the plan urged the state to not to shift its responsibilities to localities. He noted that a task force was looking at the legislative review process and their comments would go to the Commission on Local Government the following week.

Mr. Blount then noted that in the Transportation section, the focus was on the restoration of secondary and rural allocations and the opposition to devolution was maintained.

November 14, 2013

Mr. Blount then noted that in the TMDL position statements, there was a statement related to including a statement in lieu of a plan for the Stormwater Management program as there was in the Erosion and Sediment Control Act. He noted that including this had been discussed in Nelson.

Mr. Blount then noted that their position was to go on record in support of a one year delay in the Stormwater Management Program (SWMP) implementation, moving the deadline from July 2014 to July 2015. Mr. Carter then asked Mr. Blount to include this in the legislative program.

Mr. Blount then reported that the Land Use and Growth Management section addressed the change in the definition of farms and that there was a statement against any lessening of the Board's authority in this realm.

Mr. Blount then noted that the Environmental Quality section contained the statement supporting the Tye River Scenic River Designation and he noted that he would work with legislators on getting the bill in this year.

Mr. Blount then advised the Board regarding the upcoming Annual Legislative Program on December 3rd at 6pm at the Water Street Center. He noted that they would talk about the Affordable Care Act and they had some good presenters scheduled.

Mr. Blount noted that he would include the extension of the SWMP deadline in the TJPDC document and Mr. Carter noted that at the VACO conference a floor amendment was made to this effect to their legislative program. Mr. Blount then confirmed that the General Assembly could change this deadline. He added that it was his sense that there were a number of things being discovered that needed more work and localities were working towards meeting deadlines. He noted that he would not be surprised if these things were addressed through legislation this year. He added that there were different amendments discussed at the Agriculture session at VACO.

Mr. Bruguiere commented that people were dismayed that they were not in the Chesapeake Bay watershed and were having to do this.

Mr. Hale then moved to approve resolution **R2013-77** Approval of 2014 Thomas Jefferson Planning District Legislative Program and he noted that the resolution provided for amendments presented on 11/14.

Ms. Brennan seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion and the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION R2013-77
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APPROVAL OF 2014 THOMAS JEFFERSON PLANNING DISTRICT
LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

November 14, 2013

RESOLVED, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that the 2014 Thomas Jefferson Planning District Legislative Program be and hereby is approved by said governing body with the legislative program to serve as the basis of legislative positions and priorities of the member localities of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission for the 2014 Session of the Virginia General Assembly, with amendments presented by Mr. Blount on November 14, 2013 as well as incorporation of the recommendations put forth by the Board as applicable.

C. Presentation – Stormwater Management Program Implementation (A. Sappington)

Ms. Sappington acknowledged that any extension of the program implementation deadline would not happen until spring and the County still needed to meet deadlines that would occur prior to that. She noted that currently there was a July 1, 2014 deadline for implementation.

Ms. Sappington then noted that she had been working with County staff and Joyce Engineering on the program documents. She added that in terms of the Ordinance, the group went with the bare minimum required.

Ms. Sappington then presented the following PowerPoint:

COMPARISON: EXISTING VSMP vs. VSMP AS OF JULY 2014

ADMINISTRATION:

NOW	• DEQ
JULY	• Local administration

SWPPP:

NOW	• Not reviewed prior to construction
JULY	• To be reviewed locally

She noted that there would not be much difference for developers in the administration of the program, it would run more smoothly with local administration and would dovetail with the E&S program. She added that the SWPP would be reviewed locally, most likely by the Soil and Water Conservation District along with the E&S plans.



COMPARISON: EXISTING VSMP vs. VSMP AS OF JULY 2014

PERMIT COVERAGE:

NOW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through DEQ
JULY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through DEQ but will need local coordination & plan approval

TECHNICAL CRITERIA:

NOW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality & quantity
JULY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality & quantity, but new computation methods & criteria



COMPARISON: EXISTING VSMP vs. VSMP AS OF JULY 2014

FEES:

NOW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid to DEQ for permit coverage • 1 - <5 acres = \$450 • \geq5 acres = \$750
JULY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid to locality & DEQ to cover all costs • 1 - <5 acres = \$2,700 (DEQ share = \$756) • \geq5 acres = \$3,400 to \$9,000 (DEQ share: \$952 to \$2,688)

Ms. Sappington noted that the fees were a tremendous change and were intended to cover the entire program costs. She added that the DEQ portion intended to cover shares of costs for the program and that they were recommended by DEQ statewide based on average statewide costs.



FEES:

Disturbed Area (acres)	Statewide Fee	28% to DEQ (Fixed Amount)	Locality Portion (May Be Changed)
< 1 (Subdivision)	\$290	\$81	\$209
≥ 1 & < 5	\$2,700	\$756	\$1,944
≥ 5 & < 10	\$3,400	\$952	\$2,448
≥ 10 & < 50	\$4,500	\$1,260	\$3,240
≥ 50 & < 100	\$6,100	\$1,708	\$4,392
≥ 100	\$9,600	\$2,688	\$6,912

Ms. Sappington then advised that the Board could petition the State Water Control Board to lower the fees; however it would be the local share that would be lowered and the County would have to document that it could adequately cover its program costs. She added that according to the staffing study done by Joyce Engineering, the fees as presented did not currently cover the anticipated local costs.

Mr. Bruguere then asked if the average homeowner would pay \$2,700 in fees. Ms. Sappington replied that only homes with a really long driveway and homeowners that were clearing more than an acre. She noted that if the residence was within a common plan of development, the fees would be included in the developers plan. She noted that it was intended to cover the build out of the site.

Mr. Harvey suggested that the fees would hurt those putting in lower income homes and that it would put small developers out of business. He added that this would never happen in Charlottesville and that it would hurt rural areas.

Ms. Sappington then explained that if the Soil and Water Conservation District did the plan review, then the local fee would cover this cost via an agreement. She noted that they would review subdivisions with common plans of development. She added that they and the County would work out the MOU which would lay out who would do what on this. She noted that they (the SWCD) would do as much as the Board wanted them to do. Mr. Carter noted that they and staff have been mostly focused on the Ordinance, policies and procedures and timeline etc. thus far.

Mr. Hale noted that he believed that in most cases if a person were subdividing a two (2) acre lot, it would be unusual for it to require a disturbed area of 50%. He further noted that

for those cases seen most often, the landowner could do without disturbing more than one acre.

Mr. Harvey noted that this program went against everything the Board has worked on and it will force developers to develop small lots. He noted he was afraid that people would have no idea what was coming on this until they applied for the plan at the office.

Ms. Sappington then reviewed the following comparison:

LOCAL E&SC PROGRAM vs. LOCAL VSMP		
	EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL	STORMWATER MANAGEMENT
Land disturbance trigger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\geq 10,000$ sq. ft. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥ 1 acre
Water issues addressed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses water quality during construction (related to soil erosion) & channel adequacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses water quality and quantity after development (related to impervious surfaces)
Local implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Administration, Plan Review, Inspections, Enforcement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAME
Fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fees to cover program costs at discretion of locality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fees required to cover state & local program costs (see attached schedule, local share can be altered w/SWCB approval)
State permit coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required

LOCAL E&SC PROGRAM vs. LOCAL VSMP		
	EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL	STORMWATER MANAGEMENT
Permanent practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance plan required (but Nelson County requires recorded maintenance agreement) • No engineering certification for installation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recorded maintenance agreement required • Construction record drawing required (sealed & signed by professional) • Enforcement for long-term maintenance
Agriculture & Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exempt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exempt
Single family homes in "common plan"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handled through Agreement in Lieu of Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covered under full "common plan of development" (ultimate build-out)
Single family homes separately built	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exempt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If greater than 1 acre, plan, permit & fee required.

Mr. Harvey then inquired whether or not the fact that single family homes in a common plan that were “covered under full common plan of development” (ultimate build out) would be on deeds. Ms. Sappington noted that they were supposed to be filed in the courthouse and Mr. Payne added that if they were recorded in the Clerk’s office, then title searchers would catch this like other easements.



BACKGROUND & WHERE WE ARE NOW

- January 29, 2005 – DCR/DEQ began statewide coverage of SWM Program
- September 2011 – amended SWM Regulations became effective
- July 1, 2014 – Local VMSP to be established & implemented
- Every 5 years – DEQ re-issued general permit; localities continue to approve “SWM General Permit Coverage”



DEADLINES

- December 15, 2013 – Application to be local “Program Authority” due to DEQ to include final drafts of:
 1. Policies & Procedures
 2. SWM Ordinance (consensus, intent to proceed)
 3. Funding & Staffing Plan
 4. Partnering Agreement (MOU w/TJSWCD)
- April 1, 2014 – Final adopted ordinance & application due to DEQ
- July 1, 2014 – VSMP Authority approved; local implementation begins

Ms. Sappington reiterated that as of that week, the application deadline to be a local “Program Authority” was changed to January 15, 2013. She added that in order to apply, the

November 14, 2013

Ordinance did not have to be adopted, but there had to be a consensus from the Board that they were heading in that direction.

Additionally, Ms. Sappington noted that the April 2014 deadline had been moved to May 15, 2014 for formal adoption. She advised that the Board do this before this date so it could go forward to DEQ.



TO DO

- November or early December (BOS):
 1. Final staffing plan including draft contracts or MOU's for partnerships
 2. Proposed Fee Schedule
 3. Permission to submit SWM Ordinance as final draft
- December 15, 2013 – Submit application to DEQ
- Early 2014 – Finalize partner contracts/MOUs
- Early 2014 – Public participation for SWM Ordinance
- March 2014 – Final BOS approval of Ordinance
- April 1, 2014 – Submit final application to DEQ
- July 1, 2014 – Local VSMP begins

Ms. Sappington noted that the permission to submit the SWM Ordinance as final draft would come in the form of a resolution from the Board to give their permission to submit. Ms. Sappington reiterated that the April 1, 2014 deadline to submit the final application had been changed to May 15, 2014. She added that she would rather see a year of transition instead of a one year extension.

In response to questions, Ms. Sappington noted that the Board would have to have a public hearing on the Ordinance to adhere to state and local regulations and that in terms of maintenance, Louisa County developed a tracking program for both them and Nelson to use and that landowners could submit certified reports rather than them having to inspect every site. Ms. Brennan noted that it was possible that local engineers could be certified to do inspections as well.

Mr. Harvey then asked if landowners could be made to upgrade on existing projects and Ms. Sappington noted that there were grandfathering provisions included if a project was already started etc. She added that this applied only for new construction; however there was a criterion for redevelopment depending on when the original improvement was done. Ms. Sappington then confirmed that developers would have to submit an E&S plan and a storm water management plan; which would be reviewed together as one plan given that similar information was required.

November 14, 2013

Mr. Harvey then asked how this requirement would affect cable installations and Ms. Sappington noted that cables fell under linear disturbance at the moment, however it would apply to cell towers if more than an acre was being disturbed.

Ms. Sappington reiterated that Joyce Engineering worked with staff and Phil Payne to draft the Ordinance and that the components in the Ordinance were the bare minimum with the only discretion being in the fees. She added that the fees were pretty comparable and that all of the localities that she worked with were planning to adopt the recommended fee schedule.

Mr. Hale noted that some of the definitions may conflict with the local Subdivision Ordinance and Mr. Carter noted that some changes may have to be made to both the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances; however staff wanted to keep this separate. Mr. Harvey indicated that a concern would be family divisions; however he noted these would not be subject to the requirements until land was disturbed.

Ms. Sappington then asked the Board how they would like to proceed in order to meet the deadlines and Mr. Carter suggested that he would like to work on this on the staff level and then reintroduce the topic in December to update the Board and then start formal steps in January. Mr. Harvey noted that he would like to work on it as it went along instead of all at once.

Ms. Sappington suggested that the documents with comments be presented in January and Mr. Carter added that then they would bring the MOU forward with information as to complying with the DEQ deadlines.

Mr. Hale confirmed that the application deadline was now January 15, 2013 and that the Ordinance presented was a draft that would need to be finalized by May 15, 2013.

Ms. Brennan then suggested that the Board discuss the presented fee schedule and Mr. Carter noted that the projected costs to operate the program for the County exceeded the projected revenues from the recommended fees. Ms. Sappington confirmed this and suggested that the County use these fees and then track the program costs over the next two years to see if they needed adjusting. Mr. Carter strongly suggested that the Board not adjust the fees until the County had some experience in operating the program.

Ms. Sappington and Mr. Thompson concurred and noted that plan review and inspections would take longer, there was training involved, and administrative costs associated with it.

Mr. Harvey then asked if some of the storm water inspections could be done at the same time as conducting a building inspection and Mr. Thompson noted that a lot had to be done as it occurred and there was a lot of tracking involved. Ms. Brennan noted the work flow chart of activities that showed what had to be done and when and Mr. Thompson reiterated that there was a significant amount of tracking involved.

Mr. Hale then noted that the \$2,700 fee for an average small subdivision could be divided between each lot and then would be more reasonable on a per site basis.

Mr. Bruguiere noted that he thought that single lots should be exempt. Ms. Sappington noted that she did not think there would be that many. She noted that the Board could petition the State Water Control Board to lower the fee for these and then the County would cover those costs with other funds. Mr. Harvey noted that these could use an “agreement in lieu of plan” like in the administration of the Erosion and Sediment control program and Mr. Carter noted that this was being requested by Nelson and others through legislation.

Mr. Thompson noted that this would limit people from clearing a lot of land for a view for example; however disturbance of half an acre was customary in building a home.

Mr. Blount then noted that at VACO, the steering committee noted that they would approve a 90%/10% split of the fees between the state/locality and Ms. Sappington noted that the 28% split was a problem. Mr. Carter added that Delegate Landes said they would look at this but that there was no guarantee it would change.

Ms. Brennan noted that the flow charts that Joyce provided were very helpful to see the process and timeframe things had to be done in. Mr. Thompson noted that they would have to monitor pollution prevention as well.

It was noted that the County did have to do storm water plans for the schools, the courthouse and the collection sites and the program has been in place already. It was noted that VDOT fit into the program the same as they did now within their regulations.

In conclusion, it was decided that some of the documents would be reviewed with the Board in December and staff would proceed with developing the MOU with the TJSWCD and meet the deadlines as originally set. Mr. Hale indicated that he would work on reviewing the Ordinance.

D. VDOT Report

1. 2015-2020 Six Year Improvement Plan (Primary SYIP)

Mr. Padalino provided the following report regarding the Primary SYIP

Below are the 2011 priorities, with comments included:

1. ~~River Road (Route 6 West) at the intersection with Old Roberts Mountain Road (Route 634)~~ (*addressed through signalization and signs*)
2. ~~Laurel Road (Route 639) at the intersection with Irish Road (Route 6 East)~~ (*removed from consideration and funds transferred to HSIP project*)
3. Richmond Highway (Route 60) at the intersection with Allen's Creek Road (Rt. 622)
4. Spruce Creek Lane (Route 627) at the intersection with Rockfish Valley Highway (Route 151)

November 14, 2013

5. River Road (Route 6 West) at the intersection with Rockfish Valley Highway (Route 151)
6. ~~Route 56 Extension, Lovington~~ *(does not seem to be a feasible project or a current priority)*
7. Front Street (Business Route 29), Lovington *(needs clarification and/or new project title)*
8. Patrick Henry Highway (Route 151) at the "Y" intersection with Tye Brook Highway (Route 56) *(does not currently seem to be a high priority relative to other projects/needs)*
9. Rockfish Valley Highway (Route 151) at the intersection with Rodes Farm Drive (Route 613) *(was not considered to be a high priority relative to other intersections identified in VDOT's 151 Corridor Study)*
10. James River Road (Route 56E) at intersection with Findlay Mountain Road (Rt.647)

Route 151 Priorities (as identified in VDOT's Route 151 Corridor Study project)*

1. Intersection upgrades for Rockfish Valley Highway (Route 151) at intersection with Afton Mountain Road (Route 6) and Avon Road (Route 638) *(selected for funding through HSIP grant)*
2. Intersection upgrades for Rockfish Valley Highway (Route 151) at intersection with Rockfish School Lane (Route 635) *(selected for funding through HSIP grant)*
 - Intersection improvements for the "Martin's Store Substation" location where River Road (Route 6 West) intersects with Rockfish Valley Highway (Route 151)
 - Intersection improvements for Rockfish Valley Highway (Route 151) at intersection with Spruce Creek Lane (Route 627) and Glenthorne Loop (Route 627)
 - Intersection improvements for Rockfish Valley Highway (Route 151) and Tanbark Drive (Route 849).
 - Intersection improvements for Rockfish Valley Highway (Route 151) and Rodes Farm Drive (Route 613)

Previously listed priority projects for consideration

- Front Street (U.S. Route 29 Business) and Main Street (Route 1001) pedestrian and streetscape improvements as identified in Lovington Master Plan and Lovington Safety Study
- Intersection improvements for Richmond Highway (U.S. Route 60) at the intersection with Allen's Creek Road (Route 622)
- James River Road (Route 56) at intersection with Findlay Mountain Road (Route 647)
- Patrick Henry Highway (Route 151) at the "Y" intersection with Tye Brook Highway (Route 56)

New suggestions for consideration (not previously listed and not on Route 151)

- Improvements in the vicinity of the intersection of Thomas Nelson Highway (U.S. Route 29) and Oak Ridge Road (Route 653)
 - Route 29 improvements in Lovingson to improve the three existing crossover turn lanes and to improve safety for pedestrian crossings at Main Street and Front Street South
-

(Please note: Several other important projects were identified in the Route 151 Corridor Study, but they may not be as high of a priority as other projects in other portions of the County. For example, VDOT provided recommendations for improvements at Creek Road near Ashley's Store; at Beech Grove Road; at Bland Wade Lane; and at Lodebar Estate, among several other intersections. Please reference pages 23-25 of the 151 Corridor Study for a more complete overview.*

The VDOT Route 151 Corridor Study also included recommendations for significant improvements at the major intersection of Route 151 and U.S. Route 250 as one of the highest priorities; but that project is not located in Nelson County (and thus is not reflected here as a County priority).

The Corridor Study also included important long-term projects involving the reconstruction of Route 151 from Adial Road (Route 634) to U.S. Route 250, including paved 6-foot shoulders marked as bicycle lanes.

Mr. Carter noted that the Commonwealth Transportation Board was conducting meetings across state and that they wanted comments on the Six Year Improvement Plan by December 6th.

Mr. Carter suggested that the Board look at the previous recommendations with updates and provide any specific recommendations to be submitted to the CTB and VDOT. He added that they should definitely include the two HSIP projects on the list. Mr. Harvey reported that the preliminary survey was done at Anderson's store but he has not noticed anything being done at Route 635. Mr. Carter noted that the two HSIP projects were a couple of years away from completion and that in talking with Don Austin about the priorities, he suggested not submitting a long list of things since funding was limited. Mr. Carter then advised that the two HSIP projects should be included and then the Board should give consideration to the 2011 priorities.

Mr. Saunders noted that #10, James River Road (Route 56E) at intersection with Findlay Mountain Road (Rt.647) has been on the list forever and he had gotten two calls that week about this intersection. Mr. Hale noted that he thought it should be moved up the list since it was a safety concern. Mr. Harvey noted he would have to consider the accident history and he did not think there had been many there.

November 14, 2013

Mr. Saunders noted that there also needed to be something in the County's Ordinances to deal with old, partially burned down houses like the one at that intersection. Mr. Carter advised that Mr. Payne's opinion was that if the building was not a threat to the public then the County could not do anything; however if it was threat to the public then the Board could do something. Ms. Brennan added that she thought this should be revisited and Mr. Bruguere noted that buildings such as this one could be considered an attractive nuisance. Mr. Carter noted that he thought that if a tenant of a building complained, then the County had the right to go visit and address any deficiencies. He noted that to date, the Board had not addressed a maintenance feature of the Code. Ms. Brennan indicated that the demolition of dangerous buildings should be looked at again.

Mr. Carter then directed the Board's attention to the new suggestions from staff in consult with Rick Youngblood of VDOT. He added that staff had spoken to Mr. Youngblood and because of the LOCKN festival; he suggested looking at these items.

Mr. Bruguere agreed with lengthening the acceleration/deceleration lanes into Lovington. Mr. Saunders noted that a sidewalk was required from the new Family Dollar site out to Route 29 which encouraged people to cross Highway 29 into Lovington.

Ms. Brennan noted that the Oak Ridge Intersection was bad even without the festival. Mr. Saunders noted that a suggestion had been made to have a third lane coming out of Tye River Elementary School to the Oak Ridge intersection. Mr. Carter noted that when he mentioned studying that intersection, Mr. Youngblood noted that he thought it would be favorably considered. He noted that it would not have to be part of the plan but the study could be requested in a letter along with the plan.

Mr. Saunders then noted that he gets calls weekly about Route 654, Cedar Creek and that he had asked Don Austin to get a traffic count there. Mr. Carter noted that VDOT did not want any more secondary roads in the system.

Ms. Brennan noted that Tanbark Drive in Lovington needed to be brought up to standards as it was awful. Mr. Carter noted that the road served commercial interests and Mr. Saunders added that one property owner along the road would not contribute to fixing it.

Ms. Brennan then moved to include the two HSIP projects, the intersection of Route 29 and Route 653, the improvements to the crossovers in Lovington on Highway 29, and the Route 56E intersection with Findlay Mtn. Road to the Six Year Plan Priorities.

Mr. Saunders noted that he would like staff to review the issue with the house at the intersection of Route 56 E and Findlay Mountain Road to see if anything could be done.

Mr. Saunders then seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

Mr. Carter then added that if the Board did not object, maybe staff would submit the whole list and note the priorities. He added he would ask Chris Winstead his thoughts on this.

IV. New Business/ Unfinished Business (As May Be Presented)

Introduced: Resolution to Designate the Depository for Revenue Recovery Funds

Ms. McCann noted that since the County was contracting with a new firm for EMS billing, they would be handling deposits differently. She noted that the proposed resolution authorized the use of a bank clearing account and that all checks would be scanned and submitted and then transferred to the County's bank in Lovingsston. She noted that this was a more automated and electronic means for making deposits. She added that this was necessary because there was no Union First Market Bank where the billing company was located. She added that she had spoken with the Treasurer about how it would work and she was in agreement with the process.

Ms. Brennan then moved to approve resolution **R2013-78**, Designation of Depository for Revenue Recovery (Paid EMS) Funds and Mr. Harvey seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2013-78
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
DESIGNATION OF DEPOSITORY FOR REVENUE RECOVERY
(PAID EMS) FUNDS**

ACCOUNT RESOLUTIONS

By the *(circle one)* Board of Directors *I* Managers *I* Members *I* Partners *I* Sole Proprietor of Nelson County Board of Supervisors, " a business organized in the state of Virginia as a *(Indicate entity type)* Government ("Company") approving resolutions designating Kenney Bank and Trust as a depository with authorization to transfer funds:

RESOLVED, that Kenney Bank and Trust (Bank) is hereby designated as a depository in which the funds of this Company may, from time to time, subject to the rules and regulations of the Bank governing the Clearing Account, be deposited by any of its officers, managers, members, partners, sole proprietor, agents or employees, as applicable; and that any such officer, manager, member, partner, sole proprietor, agent or employee of the Company is hereby authorized on behalf of the Company and in its name to endorse for deposit with Bank into the Clearing Account any and all checks, drafts, or other instruments or orders for the payment of money payable to the Company, which endorsement may be in writing, by stamp, or otherwise, with or without designation or signature of the person so endorsing, it being understood that on all such items all prior endorsements are guaranteed by the Company or the Individual{s} legally responsible for the entity, irrespective of the lack of an express guarantee in the endorsement of the Company.

FURTHER RESOLVED that Bank, in accordance with the provisions of the Item Processing Agreement entered into by and between Bank and Company, be and is hereby

November 14, 2013

authorized and directed to transfer funds in the Clearing Account of the Company to the Designated Account as that term is defined in the Item Processing Agreement.

FURTHER RESOLVED that Bank be and is hereby authorized to comply with any process, summons, order, injunction, execution, levy, lien, or notice of any kind (hereafter called "Process") received by or served upon Bank, which in Bank's opinion affects this deposit account and Bank may, at its option and without liability, thereupon refuse to transfer sums from this account and may either hold the balance therein until Process is disposed of to Bank's satisfaction, or pay the balance over to the source of the Process.

FURTHER RESOLVED that the individual authorized to provide certifications for the Company is authorized and directed to certify to Bank the foregoing resolutions and that the provisions thereof are in conformity with the governance and organizational documents of the Company and that the foregoing resolutions and the authority thereby conferred shall remain in full force and effect until the Company officially notifies Bank to the contrary in writing and Bank may conclusively presume that such resolves are in effect.

Introduced: Jefferson Building Change Order for Exterior Work

Mr. Carter noted that previously the Board had requested staff to obtain a change order from Owen Building & Remodeling, Inc. for the repair and painting of the exterior of the Jefferson Building. He noted that this had just been received and that the total cost was \$46,316.00 for the following:

Scraping of all loose paint and prepare exterior walls for paint.
Properly remove, collect and dispose of lead contaminated paint chips.
Wet wash/wipe exterior of building as needed to remove debris and dust prior to painting.
Apply block filler on raw brick surfaces and primer on all other surfaces.
Paint all exterior walls with two coats of Sherwin Williams Conflex XL Smooth Finish A5 400 Series Elastomeric Paint.

The proposal also contained the following note:

Note: We still feel strongly that the original proposal we submitted provides the preferred method for this project, given the age and nature of the masonry. The lime wash in the original proposal would allow moisture to escape the exterior while elastomeric coating will trap moisture in the brick. While the elastomeric coating may provide some waterproofing where it makes contact with the building, water from the ground will still be siphoned and brought into the masonry, providing environments for black mold growth inside the building. A limewash would allow the brick to breathe and release the siphoned moisture.

Mr. Hale noted that he had spoken again to Bob Self about this and he had some hesitation with the removal of masonry. He noted that this could often be harder on brick to remove the stucco; however this needed to go forward.

November 14, 2013

Ms. Brennan recommended that the Board go with Owen's original proposal, which was only \$35,000 more than this one. She noted that they said that using regular paint could allow for black mold growth in the building. She added that they should check out the stucco removal and noted that this proposal was higher than they thought it would be and that the Board should do it right by following the original proposal.

Mr. Saunders suggested that the Board should get another price for comparison.

Mr. Bruguere noted that he thought that if they pulled off the stucco, it would pull off the bricks and there would be more pointing up of bricks to be done.

Mr. Hale noted that he had no knowledge on which way was best; however Bob Self was the chief restoration man at Monticello and he was not enthusiastic about using the recommended method of removing stucco. He noted that he thought painting it would be fine and that Randy Vaughn did not think there was a moisture problem with the building now. Mr. Saunders concurred and noted that with the HVAC systems in and building occupancy, he did not think moisture would be a problem either. Ms. Brennan noted that she would hate to see black mold become a problem in a few years.

Mr. Hale noted that he asked about the peel off method and Bob Self said he was not sold on that.

Members then briefly discussed whether or not the full Board needed to consider these issues and Mr. Harvey moved that Mr. Hale and Mr. Saunders work with staff to complete the Jefferson Building.

It was clarified that they would be given carte blanche to finish the building and that these two members would decide on the exterior rehabilitation.

Mr. Hale seconded the motion and Ms. Brennan expressed her strong interest in proceeding with doing the exterior the other way; however she would trust Mr. Hale and Mr. Saunders to do it. Mr. Saunders then noted that Bob Self was probably the most knowledgeable of all of those consulted.

There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

V. Reports, Appointments, Directives, and Correspondence

A. Reports

1. County Administrator's Report

Mr. Carter reported the following:

A. Courthouse/Government Center Project (All Related):

November 14, 2013

1) Courthouse Addition: Final retainage is pending payment to Blair Construction, as County and Blair staffs are working to resolve the recurrence of water entering the tunnel structure.

Mr. Carter noted that \$37,000 in retainage was being held. He noted that Mr. Payne was looking at this; however the subcontractor would warranty the work once they said it was fixed and they were working on this. Mr. Carter added that staff was concerned that if the money was released, they would not come back if there was a problem.

2) Jefferson Building: Project is nearing completion (contract date is 11-18-13). Pending receipt is a change order for the building exterior rehabilitation.

Mr. Carter reported that the project was nearing completion and the Board would be discussing the exterior. Mr. Carter noted that the Commonwealth's Attorney's office would move in as soon as possible but he would have to speak to Mr. Martin about when. Mr. Saunders noted that his moving would free up that current office to proceed with changes. It was noted that the exterior work should not affect them and Mr. Carter stated he had related that to them and they did not seem concerned. Mr. Carter noted the possibility of the relocation of the Superintendent into the old Commonwealth's Attorney's space.

3) Magistrate's Building: Installation of interior flooring scheduled for completion on 11-20.

Mr. Carter reported that after this, the only thing to do was to charge the HVAC system and then the building would be usable.

B. Broadband Project: Project close out is pending final review/approval by NTIA. First tower lease with Stewart Computer Services (Martin's Store) completed on 11-8. Work in process with AT&T on co-location on Rt. 151 Corridor towers. BRI and CCTS working on completing fiber service connections to (approximately 24 customers – Paul's Creek Subdivision, North Branch School, Heartwood Design and Ashley's Market). Staff continuing to work on possible CDBG application to VA-DHCD (with prior Board approval). A meeting is scheduled with Festy Experience sponsors on 11-26 and BRI has been requested canvas interest in Rt. 151 Corridor expansion.

Mr. Carter noted that once the NTIA grant closed out, this should alleviate concerns held by AT&T regarding collocating on the towers. He then noted that Blue Ridge Internetworks would canvass the neighborhood for interest in expansion of the fiber to Route 664 and also north to the county line in Afton. He added that staff was confirming information on the LMI requirement for the DHCD grant.

C. 2012 Radio Project (Narrow banding): In process. Summer 2014 completion.

Mr. Carter noted that the County was still waiting for the extension approval to June 30, 2014. He noted that he had spoken with Motorola and they have not identified anyone in the Greenbank Office to move the approval of frequencies along. He added that the County may

need to get its Congressman involved. Mr. Bruguire confirmed that they were holding things up right now.

Mr. Harvey added that Susan Rorrer was coming to the EMS Council meeting the following week and he noted that the pagers were needed now. Mr. Carter noted that Ms. Rorrer had explained that the mobiles were installed to work on both bands right now and that the wide band would be removed once the narrowband was up. He added that she said that for the pagers and handhelds, the plan was to wait until the project was ready to go so that they only had to program them once for narrow-banding. He noted that they did not talk much about pagers. Mr. Harvey indicated that there was a problem concerning the ownership of the radios that were removed from the vehicles that had new ones installed and that they were possibly destroyed. Mr. Carter noted that this was a Clear Communications problem and that Lovington had expressed concern with that. Mr. Bruguire noted that they were supposed to sell them back to Elecom and nobody knew for how much. Mr. Harvey noted that he thought for \$500 each and that these were paid for by federal grant funds.

D. Lovington Health Care Center: Project meeting with JABA conducted on 10-28. Follow up meeting, including Rosewood Village representatives scheduled for 11-27.

Mr. Carter reported that an Architectural firm was doing gratis work in developing floor plans for the building and the group had discussed the feasibility of the plan. He noted that concerns were expressed by him and Marta Keene about the financial feasibility so JABA was going to look at the study more in depth to explore more memory care units. He added that the County was recently made aware that Rosewood Village in Stoney Creek had plans to continue with their development. He noted that the market study information was shared with them and that the County, JABA, and the Rosewood Village folks would have a meeting to see if the two projects could work or if there was a way to collaborate on them etc. Mr. Carter noted that the market study showed that the Lovington facility would have to draw occupants from Wintergreen which would be questionable now if the Rosewood Village facility proceeded.

Mr. Harvey noted that he did not think that the building was built for assisted living and Mr. Carter acknowledged that it was a concern that had been expressed. Ms. Brennan noted that the units they were looking at were not that kind and there would be common eating areas etc. She added that it will probably end up being something different and the opportunity for memory care units was better than assisted living. Mr. Hale noted it was worth pursuing.

E. BR Tunnel and BR Railway Trail Projects: 1) **BRRT** – Construction project awarded to Keith Barber Const. Inc. (\$208,509). Completion date is 5-15-14 (renovate depot building, scales, construct cover on Naked Creek Bridge, signage and small extension of trail at eastern terminus). 2) **BRT** – Fed. Hwy Administration approval to bid Phase 1 project is pending. Closing of Tyler property acquisitions completed 11-14. VA-DCR has advised staff funding is directly available for acquisition of western trail easement from ROLC (in process).

November 14, 2013

Mr. Hale recommended that Mr. Carter talk to the City of Waynesboro about this. He added that the County needed to give them an updated appraisal for the trail and did not need to apply for the funds. Mr. Carter reported that he emailed the President of the family corporation (ROLC) about this and he noted it would require a vote of 100 members.

F. EMS (Revenue Recovery Program): Contract with EMS Management & Consultants, Inc. commences 12-1-13.

G. Health Department Demolition: Pre-bid meeting completed on 11-13 (fourteen companies attended). Bid receipt is 11-22 at 2 p.m.

H. 2014 General Reassessment: Assessment notices sent to property owners and assessor hearings are in process (to 11-22 at 1 p.m.). Mr. Eanes will report to Board at the 12-10 meeting. Final certification of Gen. Reassessment to County by 12-13. Appointment of Board Equalization projected for 12-10 meeting. Staff analysis of assessment results in process, pending receipt of final certified valuations.

I. Solid Waste: Variance request to DEQ to move to annual rather than bi-annual groundwater monitoring testing and reporting in process. Public notice completed with 30 day public comment period concluding on 11-20, thereafter final approval decision by DEQ.

Mr. Carter noted that monitoring costs have been \$70,000 to \$100,000 per year and this would be cut in half.

J. Lockn Festival: Sponsors have announced return in 2014. Special Event(s) Permit approval is an incumbent requirement (pending initial submittal).

Mr. Harvey inquired as to when they would get the report on local revenues from LOCKN and Mr. Carter noted that Jean Payne and Maureen Kelley were working on this. He added that some of the lodging taxes were reported as sales tax and this was being undone. He noted that the lodging tax for camping was about \$14,000 and was sent to the state in error. Mr. Harvey noted that he wanted to know the amount of actual dollars coming in and Mr. Carter assured him that they have been asked to follow up.

Ms. Brennan then asked if there was any Board interest in adopting an admissions tax and Mr. Bruguiere noted that the only real income from LOCKN would be from an admissions tax.

Mr. Harvey then added that he would like to know where the initially reported \$1.6 million number came from. Mr. Carter reported that in the past, multipliers had been used to estimate the local impact of the Festy and these same principles were used to estimate the local impact of the LOCKN festival.

Mr. Carter noted that not all vendors were required to get a business license; however Jean Payne was following up on the collection of sales tax. He added that he has suggested to Ms. Payne that each vendor get a Business License in future years. Mr. Bruguiere agreed

November 14, 2013

and noted that he thought that the sales tax needed to be paid before the vendors left. Mr. Harvey then noted that to his knowledge, at the end of each festival day all vendors counted their money in a tent in front of someone and their share was paid.

Members then revisited the question of looking at an Admissions Tax and Mr. Carter noted that to implement this, the County would have to advertise it, conduct a public hearing and adopt an Ordinance. He added that per the State Code, Nelson County had the authority to implement a tax of 1%-10% of the admissions cost and had access to five (5) of the six (6) categories. Members and staff briefly discussed that LOCKN has already been selling tickets and it was unsure as to how this tax, if implemented, would or would not be applied to these sales.

Mr. Carter suggested that staff could look at this for discussion in December. Mr. Bruguiere noted that was fine with him; however, if this were implemented he would like to see the funds to go towards something specific. Mr. Harvey agreed and noted he would support it if the funds went towards building an aquatics center.

K. Other: BOS Input.

Mr. Carter reported that staff was working to develop the provisions for the demolition of the Massies Mill school. Mr. Hale noted that there had been interest in the stage etc. from the folks at the Heritage Center. Mr. Carter added that the Millennium Group had contacted him about going over to the building with Paul Truslow to look at it. Mr. Hale noted that he thought that they should be able to take whatever they want except for the previously discussed soapstone. Mr. Harvey and Mr. Saunders suggested that they should sign a waiver of liability before going into the building. Members and staff agreed that the building was in such disrepair it was dangerous.

2. Board Reports

Mr. Harvey noted that he had no report; however he wanted to give the schools permission to proceed with the ball field lights.

Mr. Bruguiere noted having spoken with Musco Lighting at the VACO conference and they sent him the drawings they had done for the schools. Mr. Harvey suggested checking on local options as there was a contractor in the county willing to help do this.

Mr. Carter noted having also spoken with Musco representatives at VACO and they then sent Dr. Collins an estimate of \$340,604 for the lights, and the electrical upgrade by CVEC would be a little over \$40,000 so it would cost approximately \$385,000 to do it. He added that the last estimate was \$400,000 just for the lights.

Mr. Harvey noted that this was an unfinished project and strides had been made at the schools; therefore he would definitely like to authorize this project.

Mr. Carter then reported that the schools were coming forward with a request for \$170,000 for projects that had already been authorized and completed. He noted that some of the

November 14, 2013

project costs were paid out of last year's budget and included the asbestos floor replacement, resurfacing the track and tennis courts, and the new visitors' side bleachers at the football field. Ms. McCann noted that she thought these funds would come out of the Capital Fund and there was only \$750,000 in funds uncommitted, so approximately \$580,000 would be left. She added that this balance did not include the funds set aside for the building envelope at Tye River Elementary School. Mr. Carter added that they would be coming forward in the near future with school safety improvement funding requests also.

Mr. Harvey then noted that the School Board needed the go ahead to do it and they could break this up into two projects. He suggested that they could also negotiate with CVEC on the power upgrade. Mr. Carter noted that he could not tell whether or not the \$40,000 to upgrade the power would be amortized over time or paid up front. Ms. Brennan noted she wanted to see the whole cost package.

Mr. Harvey then noted that he thought the elementary schools should be close to being paid for and Mr. Carter noted Staff could check. Mr. Harvey noted that the Board would be asking the Schools to proceed with them getting the lighting project in line and engineers were not needed. Mr. Carter noted that it could be possible to utilize cooperative procurement to hire Musco and have them do it turnkey. He noted that the quote from Musco says that the County or Schools were responsible for all of the electrical. Mr. Harvey reiterated that the Board would not be approving the project but would allow them to get things together. Members agreed by consensus to ask the Schools to put together a total cost estimate to complete the ball fields lighting project.

Mr. Hale reported that the Blue Ridge Tunnel Foundation got a grant from the National Park Service to advise the Foundation on partnering with them. Mr. Hale also reported that he would be giving a presentation on the Tunnel project to the Augusta County Board of Supervisors to get them on board.

Mr. Hale then reported that he attended a gathering in Warminster to recognize St. George Tucker who was a revolutionary war hero from Bermuda that organized the Bermuda gun powder project. He added that he was an influential teacher of law at William & Mary and his second wife was a family member of the Cabell Family.

Ms. Brennan, Mr. Saunders, and Mr. Bruguire had no report.

B. Appointments

Ms. McGarry noted that there were no appointments to be made and that candidates were needed for the TJPDC Corporation, the Board of Zoning Appeals, JABA Advisory Council, and the PVCC Board. Ms. McGarry noted that it was to be determined if Mr. Bradshaw wished to be reappointed to the BZA.

Ms. McGarry then noted information provided to the Board at the meeting pertaining to the Board of Equalization. It was noted that staff would check with previous members to see if they wished to be reappointed.

November 14, 2013

It was noted that David Hite and Craig Cooper wanted to serve again and Mr. Hale noted that he would contact Andy Wright.

Mr. Hale reiterated that the County needed someone on the TJPDC Corporation Board that was not him or Tim Padalino and Ms. Brennan needed to recommend someone. Mr. Carter then suggested Mr. George Krieger. It was noted that this Board was the Foundation that could raise money on behalf of TJPDC. Members then asked Mr. Carter to see if Mr. Krieger would do it.

C. Correspondence

There was no correspondence considered by the Board.

D. Directives

There were no directives given by the Board; however Mr. Hale noted he would be absent for the December 10, 2013 meeting.

VI. Adjournment – The Evening Session Has Been Cancelled

At 5:00 pm, Mr. Harvey moved to adjourn and Mr. Hale seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by voice vote to approve the motion and the meeting adjourned.