

October 24, 2013

Virginia:

AT A REGULAR MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 7:00 p.m. in the General District Courtroom located on the third floor of the Nelson County Courthouse.

Present: Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor
Thomas H. Bruguiera, Jr. West District Supervisor- Chair
Constance Brennan, Central District Supervisor - Vice Chair
Larry D. Saunders, South District Supervisor
Allen M. Hale, East District Supervisor
Stephen A. Carter, County Administrator
Candice W. McGarry, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk
Susan Rorrer, Director of Information Systems

Absent: None

I. Call to Order

Mr. Bruguiera called the meeting to order at 7: 00 PM with all Supervisors present to establish a quorum.

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

II. Public Comments

Mr. Bruguiera opened the floor for public comments and the following persons were recognized:

1. Michael Allenby, Charlottesville resident and Festy partner

Mr. Allenby noted that he lived in Charlottesville; however he was a partner in the Festy held at Devil’s Backbone in the county. He noted that he saw their events as an opportunity to showcase Nelson County. He noted that 3,500 people attend a normal Festy weekend event and he added that the county would want those demographics coming back to Nelson. Mr. Allenby noted that he wanted to see better connectivity at their events and that their attendees needed the ability to communicate on site and on their way coming down to the site. He then inquired as to whether or not private funds could be used for the local match for the Local Innovation Grant being discussed by the Board for the fiber extension down to Route 664.

Mr. Carter noted that yes, this was a possibility. Mr. Allenby noted that there was a node at the end of the Route 151 fiber route and he would like to see the extension happen and would like to continue the conversation.

October 24, 2013

Mr. Bruguere advised Mr. Allenby to get together with others to discuss having a private public venture with the County. He added that he should also keep talking about this with Mr. Carter and county staff.

III. New/Unfinished Business

A. Sheriff's Department Request for Impound Lot

Mr. Bruguere, Ms. Brennan, and Mr. Harvey noted that they were not in favor of the Sheriff's proposal to put an impound lot in the lower parking area of the courthouse parking lot. Mr. Carter noted he was approached by the Department and he said he would bring it to the Board for discussion. He added that they were concerned there would be a cost in the near future for use of the current location; however Mr. Carter advised that he would report back to them to keep looking for another location.

Mr. Bruguere noted that he was concerned that the new parking lot would get junked up and he noted that previously cars were not disposed of timely.

Mr. Saunders inquired as to there being any alternatives proposed. Mr. Carter noted that there may be other alternatives that he had discussed with Sheriff Brooks; however monitoring these sites could be an issue. He noted that the Jenny's Creek property was fenced and locked and was an option, the Massies Mill property site was noted to be an option since there was a six days a week, twelve hour a day operation right next door at the trash collection site that could monitor it.

Ms. Brennan then supposed that fencing would have to be paid for if the site was not fenced already and Mr. Carter confirmed that the County would have to pay for this and the Sheriff had offered to commit some asset forfeiture money towards this. Mr. Carter then advised that the estimate for fencing provided by Paul Truslow was \$13,220.

Mr. Hale then noted he was also not in favor of using the lower lot. Mr. Harvey noted that the other locations mentioned were not favorable. He added that there could be nice cars that were confiscated, not just old junk cars. He suggested that Mr. Carter look into using the land behind the High School, which would provide for a concealed location.

Mr. Carter then noted that they were currently using property at Front Street Garage free of charge; however the Sheriff foresees this ending. Mr. Harvey then advised that a \$35 per day storage fee was the norm.

Mr. Carter then indicated that the current administration would be more proactive in disposing of these vehicles than the previous one.

It was noted that the County could use the land behind the parking lot; however it was noted that the County would have to build a bridge across the creek there.

Mr. Carter then noted he would speak to Dr. Collins and David Johnson about using the land behind the bus garage for this and Mr. Harvey noted that the schools did have a graveyard area over there also.

Members then reiterated that the location could not be remote and Mr. Carter indicated that staff would keep working on it. The Board then reiterated their consensus that they were not in favor of the proposed site in the lower courthouse parking lot.

B. Jefferson Building Renovation -Exterior Change Order

Mr. Carter noted that Owen had submitted a change order to do the exterior work on the Jefferson building and he noted that if the Board wanted to finish the exterior with Owen, it exceeded the available funding and the County would need an additional appropriation to do it.

Mr. Carter then showed several pictures of the exterior of the building. He noted that Mr. Owen had a subcontractor who learned the brick trade with Jimmy Price and the proposal entailed stripping off all of the cement based cover from the sides. He added that where the building was painted, they wanted to use a paint on solution and then use an adhesive to peel it off. He noted that they could remove layers of paint using this method. He added that it was all brick behind the paint/stucco and that in the past, the brick was covered up with concrete base and it was detrimental to the building. He noted that they would put a lime based application on there and then on the other sides; they would just apply lime based paint. Mr. Carter noted that they would also re-point the brick at the base of the building. Mr. Carter then explained that when they peel off the concrete material it pulls off the surface of the brick with it, so they wanted to use a thicker lime based paint. Mr. Carter noted that removal of the cement material would fix the moisture problem because it currently did not enable the building to breath in and out. It would then have a stucco appearance on the east side.

Mr. Carter then noted that the first thing they would do was take off the paint using peel away #1 and then they would use an adhesive to peel off the paint. He added that they would have to chip away some of the stucco where it was thicker and would not put it back anywhere except for one small area. Mr. Carter added that they would also keep the chimney, would re-mortar the joints, give it a smoother appearance, and paint it. He noted that the first coat of paint and scaffold would cost \$8,950 and each additional coat was \$4,820. He noted that they thought it would take 3 coats to make it right.

Mr. Carter noted that what Mr. Owen recommended was what the Board has heard from Mr. Price and Mr. Parr. He added that he spoke with Mr. Parr and he could not do the work until spring. Mr. Carter added that the price for paint removal did not include implementing heating conditions to do the work. He noted that Owen had indicated that they would try to make it more cost effective; however the total cost of paint removal was \$41,381.60. He reiterated that they said that they would try to get this down but it was not a guarantee. Mr. Carter then noted that the cumulative price of all of the work was just under \$88,000. Mr. Carter then noted that there were courthouse project funds of \$680,233.04 available for this project if the Board so desired.

October 24, 2013

Mr. Saunders noted that he did not see where they would have a moisture problem. He added that what was proposed was the Cadillac option. He noted that the brick could be painted and then if there was a problem down the road, they could still go to this option.

Mr. Carter then reported that he had gotten a recommendation from Randy Vaughn of Wiley Wilson on paint that could be used. He noted that they could do what Mr. Saunders suggested and that Mr. Vaughn had indicated that with the work done on the inside of the building, moisture should not be a problem. He noted that the exterior work could be done for less cost and it would be fixed aesthetically. Mr. Bruguere agreed and noted that working on the stucco may damage more than they thought.

Ms. Brennan questioned how they would know if there was moisture damage on the inside if the exterior was not done the way they suggested. Mr. Carter noted that both Mr. Price and Mr. Parr have said that the cement stucco on the outside was keeping moisture in and it was wicking up through the walls. He added that Mr. Purvis, a subcontractor of Mr. Owen, formerly worked with Mr. Price and he was sure he had the same philosophy.

Mr. Saunders noted that there were many houses with brick and stucco in the county.

Mr. Hale then noted that people involved in the restoration of historic buildings all want to do a restoration that brings the building back and preserves it. He noted that he has heard their arguments and does not doubt that they know what they are talking about. He added that doing less expensive options would work and it would look as good but it would not last. He added that they have looked at this before and he reluctantly concludes that they really should not spend this amount of money on the building exterior at this time; however maybe down the road. He noted that they needed to have it cleaned, patched, re-pointed, smoothed out, and painted. He added that this would cost something but not as much and that the Board needed a figure on that to be able to decide.

It was noted that the removal of stucco and peeling the paint off were the major costs in the proposal.

Ms. Brennan questioned how long the paint job would last and members agreed by consensus that the Board was not ready to go with this proposal but rather wants an estimate for the fixing of the brick and painting.

Mr. Saunders suggested telling Owen that the County would get quotes and Mr. Carter asked for direction on this. Members noted that Mr. Carter could get a price and then get the Board's consensus to proceed if the cost was less than the project overage of \$40,320.51. The Board agreed by consensus to proceed and get the exterior done now instead of waiting until spring.

Members and staff discussed blocking up the hole shown on the picture that was towards the lower side of the building. Mr. Carter noted that this may be a window; however he would have to find out.

October 24, 2013

C. Massies Mill Recreation Center Building

Mr. Carter noted that he has gotten an inquiry from a local resident regarding getting stuff out of the Massies Mill Recreation Center building and he told them he would have to ask the Board. He noted that staff had shown her the property because she had related that she was interested in rehabbing it. He added that then a salvage company had showed interest in the Health Department building.

Mr. Carter then showed pictures of the building and noted that they had tried to patch the roof but they had cut holes in it. He showed pictures of the bathrooms and noted that Paul Truslow thought that they could salvage the soapstone dividers in there. Mr. Carter then showed various interior and exterior pictures that indicated a state of disrepair. Mr. Saunders noted that all of the stainless steel appliances that were there were now gone.

Members and staff briefly discussed the possibility of the use of the furnaces at the Heritage Center.

Mr. Carter reported that he had not heard back from the interested citizen since the site visit.

Mr. Saunders noted that there were some veneer benches in there but they were peeling and there were some old slate blackboards that had been removed and replaced with the newer ones.

It was noted that the building would be hard to secure with the holes in the roof. Mr. Hale noted that he thought the building should be demolished and Mr. Saunders added it should be condemned and was a liability to the County.

Mr. Hale then noted that the Black Dog Salvage Company could not find anything there or at the Health Department to salvage.

Members then agreed by consensus to remove and store the soapstone dividers from the Massies Mill Recreation Center building.

Mr. Hale then inquired how to go about getting a company to demolish the building and Mr. Carter noted that staff had just put the Health Department demolition out to bid. He added that he was checking with VDOT to see who owned the curb and sidewalk.

Members and staff then briefly discussed saving some of the trees on site and Mr. Saunders noted that he had discussed going over the grading plan at the pre bid conference. He noted that the Maple tree would be close but could probably be saved.

Mr. Carter then noted that he had spoken to DEQ about taking the cinderblock to the landfill for fill and that was looking good. He added that it was tested for lead paint and looked okay.

October 24, 2013

Mr. Carter then noted that the IFB was sent to six companies recommended by Joel Loving and that Paul Truslow had gotten interest from local and regional companies. He added that the project was posted on a clearinghouse site and advertised in the NC Times.

Ms. Brennan then inquired as to why they couldn't use the demolition material to fill the hole on site and Mr. Saunders noted it was illegal to bury it.

Mr. Hale then noted he thought that the County ought to move forward to demolish the Massies Mill Recreation Center building and the County should go ahead and remove the soapstone. Ms. Brennan noted that she would like to salvage the furnace for the Heritage Center; however Mr. Saunders did not think it would be beneficial.

Mr. Hale then moved that staff proceed with steps to have the old Massies Mill School demolished but have the soapstone removed and anything else of value.

Ms. Brennan seconded the motion.

Mr. Bruguiere then asked that if it were demolished, could the block be used at the landfill and Mr. Carter noted the County would have to go through the same routine of checking for asbestos and lead paint etc. He noted that he was hoping the County could use it at the Transfer Station as it would be more cost effective.

Mr. Hale then noted that he made the motion to protect the health and public safety of the citizens of the county and the building was an eyesore and a liability.

Mr. Carter then advised that he had looked at the State code on the disposition of public property; however he would need to confirm with Phil that this did not pertain to the demolition of buildings.

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

Mr. Saunders then noted as a point of information that Dr. Criswell still had two pieces of equipment in the Health Department building and that Staff should contact him to see if he wanted it.

IV. Other Business (As May Be Presented)

Introduced: CDBG Grant for Fiber Optic Network Extension

Members inquired about the potential CDBG grant to extend the fiber optic network and Mr. Carter noted that time was not of the essence; however the longer the wait, the more likely funds may be distributed to others.

He noted that putting in an application depended upon how the Board felt about extending it etc. Mr. Bruguiere noted that if it were extended to Route 6 and southward

October 24, 2013

there would be more opportunity for customers. Mr. Hale noted that he still thought the Board needed an analysis of the return on investment. Mr. Carter reiterated that there would be a 50% match required and the program was open submission.

The Board's consensus was to bring this item back. It was noted that the local match could be a public/private initiative. Mr. Saunders noted that he agreed with Mr. Hale; however he also agreed with Ms. Rorrer in that the extension would be a place to get revenue and he would be in favor of it.

Members then asked that this be brought back in November.

V. Adjournment

At 8:00 PM, Mr. Hale moved to adjourn and there was no second. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously by voice vote to approve the motion and the meeting adjourned.