

Council Work Session—January 27, 2015

The work session of the Council of the Town of Altavista was held in the Council Chambers of the J.R. Burgess Municipal Building, 510 Seventh Street on January 27, 2015 at 5:00 p.m.

1. Mayor Mattox called the meeting to order and presided.

Council members

Present: Mayor Michael Mattox
Mrs. Micki Brumfield
Mrs. Beverley Dalton
Mr. Charles Edwards
Mr. Tracy Emerson
Mr. Timothy George
Mr. Jay Higginbotham

Planning Commission members

Present: Chairman Jerry Barbee
Mr. John Jordan
Mr. John Woodson

Also present: Mr. J. Waverly Coggsdale, III, Town Manager
Mr. Daniel Witt, Assistant Town Manager
Mrs. Tobie Shelton, Finance Director
Chief Kenneth Walsh, Police Department
Mr. John Eller, Town Attorney
Mrs. Mary Hall, Administration

2. Agenda Amendments/Approval

Mayor Mattox advised of an amendment to the agenda, a proclamation claiming the “Year of the Senior 2015.”

A motion was made by Mrs. Dalton, seconded by Mrs. Brumfield to amend the work session agenda.

Motion carried:

VOTE:	Mr. Michael Mattox	Yes
	Mrs. Micki Brumfield	Yes
	Mrs. Beverley Dalton	Yes
	Mr. Charles Edwards	Yes
	Mr. Tracy Emerson	Yes
	Mr. Timothy George	Yes
	Mr. Jay Higginbotham	Yes

3. Public Comment-Agenda Items Only

Mayor Mattox asked if anyone would like to come forward and speak on anything listed on the agenda. No one came forward.

4. Introductions and Special Presentations

5. Items Scheduled for the Regular Meeting Agenda

- a) Discussion of Downtown Revitalization Overlay (DRO) District Text Ordinance Amendments-Joint Discussion with Planning Commission

Mayor Mattox advised this was a joint meeting with Planning Commission.

Chairman Barbee addressed Council thanking the Mayor and Council for allowing the Planning Commission to work with them through this process. He stated when the Planning Commission started this process of looking at the guidelines;

Council Work Session—January 27, 2015

they were anticipating input from the property and business owners. He stated unfortunately absent of that input, the Planning Commission has considered several alternatives such as making it voluntary and even doing nothing at all. He stated he remembered it well the night the PC all agreed to make this mandatory, that it would be a very steep uphill climb for Council to approve this recommendation. Property owner rights were the main concern that night and throughout the remainder of the process. It was never the Planning Commission's objective to undermine those rights, but rather to develop and recommend a procedure that would foster consistency, fairness, cooperation, and equality as they chose to exercise those owner rights. He stated the Planning Commission does believe that how you exercise your property owner rights can and does affect your neighbors, their property values, and the economic development potential in a geographically tight commercial area such as the Central Business District. He added hypothetically speaking, part of my rights as a residential property owner is to protect my property value and when a neighbor does something that lowers those values, then my property rights have been violated. The same reality exists in the downtown Commercial district. The Planning Commission believes there are some fundamental issues or questions that need to be explored and some form of architectural guidelines, mandatory or not, be considered moving forward. He asked if Council thought the downtown "old" architecture is of value and worth preserving. Does Council acknowledge that we have a legitimate Historic District that has value and should be promoted as such or is it truly a face as several owners attempted to point out in the public hearing? Were the assumptions or premises that the Planning Commission used to support the need for guidelines valid? What role should the merchants and owners play in the future economic development of downtown versus local government? How important is the central business district to Altavista's small business economic survival, sustainability, and overall development and how much of this is a local government issue versus business/property owner issue?

Mr. George stated he has talked to some of the property owners and it seems some ill will was planted previously with the CDBG; hired contractors and materials used were substandard. He felt the distrust may have started then. He referred to a comment made at the public hearing that business owners were promised their taxes would not increase due to upgrades and that didn't happen. He stated he didn't know if the tax increase was something Council could address and make right but felt it would go a long way in creating a bridge of trust. He felt like in a tight knit community like downtown, what is done to a property does affect the neighbor's property. Mr. George stated he did not want to tell the property owner what they could/could not do and felt there could be some type of compromise worked out.

Mr. Emerson stated the grant monies offered in the CDBG enticed him. He stated the people that he worked with were very accommodating, staff and Region 2000. He noted some of the materials used were not of his preference but he was not allowed to change. Mr. Emerson stated he has spoken with some of the business/property owners; he feels guidelines are needed but this should not be pushed on them. He felt there should be programs, grant monies, in place to entice the business/property owners to want to follow the guidelines. He stated he was not for the program as it stands now.

Mr. Edwards referred to comments made at the public hearing by Mr. Jordan, Planning Commission, that maybe there is another approach that might work better. He felt this was important because a lot of the business folks may have felt they were not a part of putting together the guidelines. Mr. Edwards stated with 52 signatures on a petition he could not support the guidelines but could not neglect the concept of what the Planning Commissioners are trying to accomplish. He felt like perhaps it had not been handled in the correct manner. Mr. Edwards referred to Mr. Perrow's comment that the economics could take care of the building. If the downtown economy is vibrant enough then the property becomes

Council Work Session—January 27, 2015

so valuable that you can't afford to let the building get run down. He suggested going back to the drawing board to find something that works for everyone.

Mrs. Dalton clarified if she had a business in the downtown district, this program does not force her to do anything. If she did decide to upgrade, she would need to submit a plan and then have it approved; and the ordinance covers the issues that would be addressed. She stated she is not hearing from the business/property owners a specific piece of the ordinance that they want to be different. She feels the program is a grand idea; the retail section of the community could be a designation with its charm and visual appeal.

Chairman Barbee advised the Planning Commission is not taking a hard line on that this must be mandatory; they feel there should be some focus on the central business district. He asked Council to think about what impact the central business district has on economic development and what value the buildings and architecture has. He noted a lot of the backlash received was from previous things that have happened and mentioned the CDBG told the property owners what vendors they had to use and this one does not do that.

Mrs. Dalton asked if repackaging with some modifications and better communication would help this process.

Chairman Barbee felt this would help stating no one has objected to the content of the guidelines; it was the way it was being delivered and administered. He noted the town is 5 years into the Historic District designation and there is nothing going on in terms of recognizing the fact that the town has a historic district; no visual to tell people where the historic district is. This is an example of an economic advantage by having a historic district.

Mrs. Dalton asked what the Planning Commission thought of keeping the guidelines as is and it being on a voluntary basis.

Chairman Barbee felt the Planning Commissioners would be open to this.

Mrs. Dalton and Chairman Barbee agreed this could open the door for inconsistencies.

Mayor Mattox referred to Chairman Barbee's question if Council thought the downtown "old" architecture is of value and worth preserving and if the consensus of Council is there is value in preserving the history. He felt the other goal of Council is to not make the property owners feel they have to do things. He has heard incentives be bought up; if the guidelines are followed perhaps the town could pay a portion of what the property owner is trying to accomplish to improve the community. He felt the incentives would be a worthwhile endeavor; accomplishing the goal of preserving the downtown. He asked Council if they would be willing to suggest to staff that they develop a voluntary program that follows the guidelines but also gives incentives to those that follow the guidelines. He noted there is precedence for this as former Mayor Burgess put out \$100,000 grant program for businesses that were not in the downtown district and administer by town staff and this was very well received.

Mr. Emerson stated he sees the value in giving the property owners a reason to change, or update their building. He stated business owners know the condition of the building next door affects their business, noting he is all for the incentives.

Mr. Edwards asked who the incentives would not apply to.

Mayor Mattox stated this would be open for discussion but felt the contributing buildings would have a higher priority and if they didn't take

Council Work Session—January 27, 2015

advantage of the funding, the non-contributing building owners could apply.

Mr. Edwards stated he was uncomfortable with Council creating categories because of the age of a building. He felt Council could help the downtown without it being handouts; needs to be economic development. Mr. Edwards stated he could support it being voluntary but could not support the incentives.

Mrs. Dalton asked if there was leadership among the property owners that would be willing to work with a portion of the Planning Commission and Town Council to craft what might work.

Mr. George stated he was interested in the incentives.

Mrs. Dalton suggested pausing and readdressing the vision at a later time.

Mrs. Brumfield stated she did not realize the property owners did not have to participate at all and in that case it is already voluntary. She stated when money is involved there are strings attached to it. If a property owner is going to participate and accept the money, they have guidelines.

Mr. Edwards stated his impression is they don't have to participate if they don't want to but the way the ordinance is written now, if they choose to fix up their building then they are forced to participate. He said property owners could let the building fall down around them or listen and meet the guidelines as being dictated.

Chairman Barbee clarified routine maintenance and repairs are not included in the guidelines; when something more significant is done to the exterior of the building to the extent of altering the architecture or the materials.

Mr. Edwards questioned the paint.

Chairman Barbee replied as long as the building is painted the same color that was considered routine maintenance.

Mrs. Brumfield did not feel the guidelines were unreasonable.

Mayor Mattox stated if it is voluntary there is no reason for owners to not follow the guidelines. If someone wants to do something that may contribute to the downtown and follow the historical guidelines and enhance their building, should Council not reward those who are trying to do the right thing? These folks are investing their money into the town.

Mrs. Dalton felt there was a backlash for the property owners when they are not addressing the actual document; which makes it hard for her to decide what to do.

Mayor Mattox felt the issue was property rights, being told what to do with your property; it is not the guidelines.

Chairman Barbee pointed out when they did try to get specific on some of the particulars in the guidelines, it was all a misunderstanding.

Mayor Mattox asked what the consensus of Council was. He asked Council if they were interested in offering incentives.

Mr. Emerson abstained from the question because he has used the incentives before. He said the program he participated in before was worthwhile.

Mr. Edwards stated he was opposed unless it was made available to every commercial property owner.

Council Work Session—January 27, 2015

Mrs. Dalton felt the right set of issues was not being addressed.

Mayor Mattox stated he was in favor of incentives when administered by the local government.

Mr. Higginbotham felt things were being mixed and asked where the incentive monies would be coming from.

Mayor Mattox clarified the Planning Commission is asking when they re-evaluate should they include potential incentives.

Mr. Higginbotham questioned why Council didn't vote on the recommendation of the Planning Commission and referred to the number of business/property owners opposing the recommendation instead of bringing it back to a work session. He felt the façade improvement program made some nice changes to the downtown. He stated looking at the book some of the same material is in this program; some of the photographs show the same things that have already been corrected. He did not feel this program works for the businesses and it would be a slap in their face to say Council and the Planning Commission are going to tweak the guidelines. He noted there are expenses with this program. He felt this has to be fair to all the citizens.

Chairman Barbee stated if this is voluntary and not mandatory, the Design Review Board and the certificate of application (COA) could essentially be dismissed and they would just have a set of guidelines to follow.

Mr. George questioned the restrictions if the incentives were town wide.

Mayor Mattox stated the question is with the new recommendation; Council may have to vote on what was presented and come back with something that accomplishes the goals of Council and the Planning Commission but not in the way that was first presented.

Mr. George stated he was in favor of some type of compromise. He felt the charm of a small southern town is worth preserving.

Mrs. Brumfield felt it was a miscommunication; this document tells them what they can do with their property and that's not what it is. She felt if the property owners were made aware that they don't have to participate then they would be fine.

Mayor Mattox stated what he is hearing is the proposal will likely not pass as presented in the past and there are some things that need to be changed to make it more compatible to the downtown businesses and the businesses outside of the downtown. If the guidelines are followed there may be incentives involved. Council is asking the Planning Commission to rework their proposal.

Mr. Higginbotham noted the citizens were told Council would vote on the matter at their February 10, 2015 meeting.

Mrs. Dalton suggested this matter be paused for a few months.

Mr. Tim Thacker, Altavista Online, advised Council it is not necessarily the maintenance issue but it's the steps involved. He also mentioned the fact that a lot of the buildings are not historical buildings but are in the historical district.

It was the consensus of Council that this matter be placed on the May 12, 2015 Town Council Meeting agenda.

Council Work Session—January 27, 2015

After some additional discussion Council decided to place on the February 10, 2015 Town Council Meeting agenda to vote on the presented document, refer back to Planning Commission, or possibly create a work group.

b) Discussion of FY2016 Budget Compensation and Range Adjustments

Mrs. Shelton addressed Council regarding the FY2016 Budget Compensation and Range adjustments. She advised the process for preparing the 2016 budget has begun and added for the past several years Town Council has provided to staff direction regarding the compensation and rate adjustments that would be included in the Draft Budget. Staff has contacted peer groups and the respondents indicated a proposed increase in ranges from 1% to 3%. She mentioned the change in the Consumer Price Index between 2013 and 2014 was 1.6%. During the past five fiscal years the COLA increases have been FY2011 2%, FY2012 0%, FY2013 1%, FY2014 2% and FY2015 2%. The projected cost of the 2% COLA is \$59,000. Mrs. Shelton also asked Council to consider adjusting the salary ranges by 2%; this has no monetary impact unless an individual falls below the new minimum established by the adjustment.

Mrs. Dalton verified this was just a placeholder for preparing the FY2016 budget.

Mrs. Shelton confirmed they are.

Mr. Higginbotham stated whatever the percentage is usually given across the board. He noted there are excellent employees, then there are average employees and there should be some way to evaluate who is doing what.

Mrs. Shelton advised there is a merit rate pool that is based on the performance of each employee.

Mayor Mattox mentioned this refers to the cost of living adjustment (COLA).

Mr. Emerson stated he was okay with the 2% placeholder but was in agreement with Mr. Higginbotham.

Mr. Edwards stated he too agreed with Mr. Higginbotham and felt he would like to see someone work with staff to set up an evaluation program to be part of the guidelines.

It was consensus of Council to use the 2% as a placeholder in the budgetary process for the FY2016 budget.

c) Discussion of Possible Declaration of Public Nuisance-806 12th Street

Mr. Witt advised he has presented a report to Council on the nuisance property at 806 12th Street and also discussed the matter with the town attorney. He stated this was a very unique situation with the property owner. He noted in the past the property maintenance committee has looked at blighted houses and had them removed from the community. He advised this house was gutted by fire in March 2014, it was insured, and the property owner received a settlement check. Once she determined the amount of the check would not cover the repairs, the insurance check was spent, leaving the home a nuisance to the neighborhood. In August 2014 Campbell County Building Inspections posted a warning on the house stating it was a danger and unfit for habitation. He advised based on the code he can have her board up the home or he can board up the home and charge her the fees. He noted in the past the town has financed the demolition of houses interest free for a period of three years. Mr. Witt advised due to the asbestos siding the demolition cost is \$10,000. He noted the property owner is interested in donating the property to Habitat for Humanity and is making application to them for consideration of building a new home on her lot. If Habitat builds on her

Council Work Session—January 27, 2015

property the town would lose any equity for a loan. He asked for direction from Council.

Mayor Mattox stated staff's recommendation is to board up the house, wait to see if Habitat is interested and then readdress if it has to be removed.

Mr. Higginbotham questioned the assessed value.

Mr. Witt advised the land is assessed at \$12,000.

Mrs. Brumfield questioned the number of estimates.

Mr. Witt advised he would secure additional estimates but thus far Mr. Brooks has been the cheapest. He noted he would give the property owner the opportunity to board the house up and after a given timeframe; he will have it boarded.

Mr. Higginbotham felt it should be removed.

Mr. Coggsdale asked how the town would recoup their money.

Mr. Higginbotham stated there would be a tax lien on the property.

Mr. Eller stated if the property owner conveys the land to the town then it would not be a tax sale.

Mayor Mattox stated he is hearing more estimates are needed, wait on a response from Habitat and see if the property owner will convey the property to the town.

Mr. Edwards felt staff should avoid the boarding up aspect because it is blight on everyone.

Mayor Mattox stated staff will investigate the options, look at the three possibilities, see if the landowner is willing to convey the property to the town and the house can be torn down.

Mrs. Dalton questioned if the Town would in turn give the property to Habitat.

Mr. Higginbotham stated the town would try to sell to recoup the monies spent.

d) Discussion of Citizen Request regarding Utility Fees

Mr. Witt advised in early 2014, he was contact by a Mr. and Mrs. Chris Rice about their desire to purchase lots at the dead end of Valley View Drive. At that time they were inquiring about setbacks, use of the unopened right of way, the availability of water and sewer and the cost of connections. This was presented to Council and was approved for use of the unopened portion of Valley View Drive. The town attorney drafted and executed the agreement. At that time the utility rates were quoted as to what the Rices would have to pay at the current rates. Council was also in the process of discussing increases in utility rates. The Rices moved forward with the plans to build the house; unknowing that these utility rates increased significantly July 2014. Mr. Rice approached Mr. Witt and asked if Council would consider honoring the original quote of \$2,100 for the water/sewer connection. The rate increase would cost a total of \$4,100.

Mayor Mattox asked how this can be prevented in the future.

Mr. Coggsdale suggested issuing disclaimers.

Mr. Higginbotham stated if the citizen was quoted the \$2,100 price, the town needs to work with him.

Council Work Session—January 27, 2015

Mr. Edwards agreed with Mr. Higginbotham but felt staff should be more diligent in making citizens aware rates are subject to change.

Mr. George mentioned it is not often that rates increase significantly. He too was agreeable with Mr. Higginbotham.

This item is to be added to the consent agenda for the February 10, 2015 Council meeting.

Mayor Mattox set a work session for February 23, 2015 at 5:00 p.m. with Gay and Neal.

e) Discussion of IALR's PCB Remediation Research Proposal Amendment

Mr. Coggsdale advised at Council's January 13th Regular Meeting, Mr. Michael Duncan (IALR) gave an update on the status of their research project associated with the Town's WWTP Emergency Overflow Pond. During his presentation he requested that the Town consider building a berm parallel to the south side of the pond to be utilized as a "shelf" for the pot experiment. Staff was requested to assemble data regarding the potential cost of the berm. This information was presented to Council for review.

Mr. Higginbotham questioned the location of the berm; stating staff appears to be confused. According to Mr. Higginbotham, Mr. Duncan had indicated the EPA wants them to start planting.

Mr. Coggsdale clarified they would be planting in the pots. This berm is to be utilized as a shelf for the pot experiment.

Dr. Scott Lowman (IALR) addressed Council stating they would begin collecting samples January 28; the challenge is identifying the hot spots. Sludge along the edges of the pond is falling below 50 parts per million and stated they would like to use the map grid formally used to determine hot spots. Dr. Lowman noted the south side appears to be hotter. He stated the most important thing about the research is to take the sediment out and mix it.

Mr. Higginbotham stated the samples have to be gotten and if there are samples that are under 50 parts per one million then it is okay to seed over.

Mr. Bond questioned if the berm will be on the south side and noted that would block his access to the pond. He needs a channel to the two boxes.

Mayor Mattox asked if a berm is needed.

Dr. Lowman stated the main point of this research is to establish proof that it works; which is done in the pot study. The berm would be nice to have access to the hot spots but is not critical to the pot study itself.

Mayor Mattox noted the low concentrations are where the present berm is located.

Dr. Lowman stated the idea with the berm is if it didn't cost the Town too much and may lead to a path of an EPA grant as a testing site. He noted as far as the pot study is concerned the berm is a separate issue.

Mayor Mattox questioned the estimated cost to install the berm.

Mr. Garrett advised the cost would be approximately \$19,400 to extend the berm 600 feet.

Council Work Session—January 27, 2015

Mr. Edwards asked Dr. Lowman how he would accomplish homogenizing the materials.

Dr. Lowman advised they would be mixing with a shovel along the edge where the shelves are.

Mr. Higginbotham questioned if a marker would be placed where the plug was pulled from.

Dr. Lowman advised they would.

Mr. Higginbotham suggested more testing in the pond on the south side; then build the berm.

Dr. Lowman stated 10 samples would be taken.

Mayor Mattox suggested the entire pond be tested to check the concentrations.

Dr. Lowman advised the EPA is very much in favor of testing the entire pond: noting according to the literature PCBs degrade after 5 to 37 years.

Mayor Mattox asked if there was a cost estimate to grid the pond.

Dr. Lowman felt the EPA would be interested in this data and how it matches with the previous data. If the berm is installed it gives them leverage to go to the EPA.

Mayor Mattox referred this matter to the February 10, 2015 Town Council meeting.

Mr. Edwards advised he had asked Mr. Rob Finch to come to the meeting in regards to a drainage problem at his business. Mr. Edwards stated this problem was addressed at a previous Council meeting but has not been resolved.

Mr. Finch addressed Council and advised the problem behind their building has existed 20 plus years. He noted when there is a heavy rain, water comes into the building. It is his understanding from VDOT the drainage cannot handle the water that is coming in.

Mr. Higginbotham stated his understanding is VDOT wants a drainage study done.

Mr. Coggsdale advised he and Mr. Garrett recently met with VDOT. Can the water be channeled to the west side of Main Street?

Mr. Finch advised several of the business owners met with Mr. Coggsdale and felt they had been patient with this problem over the years. He stated they would continue to be patient but wants the problem taken care of.

Mayor Mattox felt this was an important item and referred it to the next work session.

f) Discussion of Take Home Vehicle Policy for Police Department

Chief Walsh addressed Council in reference to the Take Home Vehicle Policy and stated he is requesting take home vehicles for officers that live within the Town limits. He noted he would be moving into the Town by the end of this calendar year. Chief Walsh advised Lieutenant J. T. Younger, had a take home vehicle, resigned as of January 25, 2015. Lieutenant Younger's on call investigative duties were the reason for this vehicle. Chief Walsh asked when replacement is made if this person could be provided a take home vehicle if he/she does not live

Council Work Session—January 27, 2015

too far outside of the town limits. Chief Walsh noted the new Captain lives in town and does not have a take home vehicle; he requested that he be given a take home vehicle effective immediately.

Mr. Emerson stated he could see the merit of this policy and felt it may help with recruitment knowing you have a take home vehicle. He was in agreement to allow the Captain to have a take home vehicle immediately.

Mrs. Dalton asked how many vehicles could potentially be required.

Chief Walsh stated there are enough vehicles to meet the needs currently; he stated his goal is to recruit individuals to move within the town limits and retain officers that live in the town limits.

Mr. George and Mrs. Brumfield agreed with Mr. Emerson.

Mayor Mattox clarified the item going on the consent agenda is take home vehicles for officers that live in the town of Altavista.

It was the consensus of Council to allow the Captain a take home vehicle effective immediately.

Mayor Mattox noted for the investigative position, this officer is encouraged to live in the town of Altavista in order to retain a take home vehicle.

g) Discussion of Strategic Planning Retreat

Mr. Coggsdale advised a little over two years ago, Town Council held a Strategic Planning Session to talk about their goals and objectives. A Strategic Work Plan was adopted that has assisted staff in addressing items that were of interest to Town Council. At that time it was mentioned that a Strategic Planning Session would be held every two years and is a little overdue. With several new Council members, it would be an appropriate time to conduct another session.

It was the consensus of Council that Mr. Coggsdale move forward with planning a Strategic Planning Session.

h) Discussion of Formulation of Town Council Code of Conduct/Ethics

Mr. Coggsdale advised Council is requested to discuss the possibility of developing a Council Code of Conduct/Ethics. He provided them with some samples from the peer groups.

Mayor Mattox noted if Council chooses to formulate this, it will take a good amount of time and asked that this be an item for the retreat.

i) Year of the Senior 2015 Proclamation

Mayor Mattox read the following:

Year of the Senior 2015

A Proclamation

Whereas, Campbell County, Virginia, includes over 8,200 citizens who are age 65 or older, and will increase to approximately 10,000 by 2030; and

Whereas, the older adults in the Campbell County region have made countless contributions and sacrifices to ensure a better life for future generations; and

Whereas, Campbell County is committed to helping all individuals live longer, healthier lives; and

Whereas, more than 1000 services are provided in Region 2000 to help older adults remain healthy and

Council Work Session—January 27, 2015

active; and

Whereas, Campbell County, in partnership with those for-profit and not-for-profit organizations, provides services that address the basic needs of those citizens who lack the resources to seek or obtain such services on their own; and

Whereas, a substantial decrease in the availability of funds coming to this community from the Commonwealth of Virginia, along with increased demands on charitable contributions, has created challenges this community will need to address in the months and years ahead.

Now therefore, I, as Mayor of Altavista, Virginia, do hereby proclaim 2015 as the Year of the Senior. I urge every group, organization and resident to take time during this year to recognize older adults and those who serve and support them as powerful and vital individuals who greatly contribute to this community.

I also urge that City, organization and community leaders work together to address the increasing needs of this valuable community resource, and take appropriate steps to agree on actions which will assure our ability to continue to provide the services needed to sustain their quality of life in the years to come.

Dated this _____ day of January, 2015

By _____ Mayor, Town of Altavista, Virginia

Mike Mattox

It was the consensus of Council to adopt this proclamation.

Mr. Edwards left the meeting at 7:03 p.m.

6. Items Scheduled for the Regular Meeting Agenda

a. Request to Extend Contract for Auditing Services

Mr. Coggsdale requested Council to consider extending the current contract with Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates for auditing services for FY 2015 and 2016. The cost would be the same as the previous years, \$18,437.

It was the consensus of Council to approve the extension of the auditing services contract with Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates for two additional years.

7. Public Comments

Mr. Emerson brought forth the topic of incentives for the police officers living in the town; the take home vehicle policy he felt was good and suggested offering monetary incentives to hired officers that move or live in the town limits and asked Council to consider.

It was the consensus of Council to ask staff to look at incentives for officers that live within the town limits.

8. Adjournment

Mayor Mattox asked if there was anything else to bring before Council.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

Michael E. Mattox, Mayor

J. Waverly Coggsdale, III, Clerk