

DRAFT MINUTES
Commission on Local Government
Oral Presentations
Town of Clarksville – Mecklenburg County
Voluntary Settlement Agreement
2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013
Best Western on the Lake Conference Center
103 Second Street
Clarksville, Virginia 23297

Members Present

John G. Kines, Jr., Vice-Chairman
Harold H. Bannister, Jr.
Wanda C. Wingo
John T. Stirrup, Jr.

Members Absent

Cole Hendrix, Chairman

Staff Present

Susan Williams, Local Government Policy Manager
Zachary Robbins, Senior Policy Analyst
Edward Lanza, Senior Public Finance Analyst

I. Call to Order

A. Welcome

Vice-Chairman Kines called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. on January 28, 2013 in the Best Western on the Lake Conference Center in Clarksville, Virginia. Mr. Kines announced that the Commission is present to review a proposed voluntary settlement agreement between the Town of Clarksville and Mecklenburg County. He further explained that the proposed agreement provides for the annexation to the Town of Clarksville of approximately 722.5 acres of territory located in Mecklenburg County; sharing by the Town and the County of certain tax revenue generated and which will be generated from areas located adjacent to the new Town boundaries that are planned for commercial and/or industrial projects; certain utility issues; waiver of future annexation rights by the Town for a period of 10 years; and other matters.

B. Advertisement

Mr. Kines indicated that the oral presentations were advertised by notice published in the *South Boston News & Record* on Monday, January 7, 2013 and again on Monday, January 14,

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 2

2013 and in *The Mecklenburg Sun* on Wednesday, January 9, 2013 and again on Wednesday, January 16, 2013. In addition, notice of the oral presentations was mailed to the local governments contiguous to, or sharing functions, revenue or tax sources with, the Town and County.

C. Introduction of Commission Members and Staff

Next, Mr. Kines announced that the Commission's chairman, Mr. Cole Hendrix, is ill and will not be in attendance. He also introduced the members of the Commission and provided biographical information on each member and introduced the Commission staff.

II. Commission's Review

Ms. Williams explained that the Commission on Local Government is directed by law to review proposed annexations and other local boundary change and transition issues – as well as negotiated agreements settling such matters – prior to their presentation to the courts for ultimate disposition. Upon receipt of notice of such proposed action or agreement, the Commission is directed to “hold hearings, make investigations, analyze local needs and make findings of facts and recommendations” regarding the issue to the affected local governments. With respect to a proposed agreement that is negotiated under the authority of Section 15.2-3400 of the *Code of Virginia* – such as the one proposed here – the Commission is required to report, in writing, its findings and recommendations as to whether the proposed settlement is in the best interest of the Commonwealth.

Ms. Williams announced that Ms. Wingo's term expired, effective December 31, 2012; however, pursuant to Va. Code Section 15.2-2902, she agreed to continue to serve as a temporary member for the purpose of participating in the proceedings and deliberations for this case as well as the final report.

Ms. Williams stated that the Commission is here today as a result of a Notice filed by the Town of Clarksville on March 9, 2012 of its intention to petition the court for the annexation of approximately 6.0 square miles of territory in Mecklenburg County. At the request of the Town and County, the Commission subsequently designated an independent mediator to assist the parties. Since the Town's initial filing, the parties have jointly requested and the Commission has agreed to three 60-day delays in its proceedings to allow the jurisdictions time to try to negotiate a settlement. Their negotiations resulted in a voluntary settlement agreement, which

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 3

was approved by the Clarksville Town Council and the Mecklenburg County Board of Supervisors on November 5, 2012. The Town filed a submission on December 12 requesting the Commission to review and issue findings on the proposed agreement negotiated by the Town and County.

Prior to our arrival here today, the Commission received:

- Resolutions adopted by the Clarksville Town Council and the Mecklenburg County Board of Supervisors requesting the Commission to review the agreement;
- Separate Notices by the Town of Clarksville and Mecklenburg County of a voluntary settlement agreement;
- A copy of the proposed agreement;
- Data and exhibits supporting the agreement, which were prepared by the Town;
- The County's response to the Town's Notice and to the data and exhibits submitted by the Town; and
- Indication that copies of the Notice, the proposed agreement and an index of data and exhibits were mailed to each of the local governments contiguous to or sharing functions, revenue or tax sources with the Town of Clarksville and Mecklenburg County.

Ms. Williams said that the materials relevant to the proposed agreement were reviewed by the members of the Commission and Staff and that, subsequently, separate requests for additional information were sent to the Town and the County on January 21. The Town and County have been asked to respond to those requests by February 11, 2013.

She then reviewed the meeting schedule for the Commission's on-site meetings in Clarksville, explaining that this morning the Commission toured the affected area and that, at 7:00 p.m. this evening, a public hearing will be held.

III. Oral Presentations by the Town and County

Mr. Kines invited Mr. Jim Cornwell, Counsel for the Town of Clarksville, to proceed with presenting the Town's case to the Commission.

Mr. Cornwell introduced Mayor Kevin Allgood; Interim Town Manager Dr. Charles Lee; Vice-Mayor Connie Torres; council members Carolyn Hite, Glen Jurczyk, and Bill Nunn; and Craig Wilson of Community Planning Partners.

Mr. Cornwell provided an overview of the history of Clarksville and its water and sewer systems. He stated that the expansion of the system's capacity had occurred over a period of

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 4

time to accommodate not only town growth but to respond to needs for utility services beyond the corporate limits. Specifically, he explained that the residential area around the former Burlington Industries plant in proposed Annexation Area C was previously served by that plant's utility system until it closed, at which time residents approached the Town to extend its utilities to the area. The Town agreed at that time to extend its utilities, and the residents agreed to support annexation of their properties at a future date. He explained that the recently completed US 15-58 bypass provided improved access to marketable properties that are served by utilities and that the redirection of traffic off of Virginia Avenue will provide the town with the ability to concentrate tourism efforts in the downtown area.

Next, Mr. Cornwell reviewed prior annexation efforts by the Town of Clarksville. He stated that the Town first considered the idea of annexation in 2007 and that the Town hoped to have discussions with the County, which did not materialize, resulting in the contested annexation that was previously filed with the Commission. Since then, the Town and County agreed, as encouraged by the Commission, to utilize mediation to resolve the annexation matter, which eventually resulted in the voluntary settlement agreement that is before the Commission. He then reviewed the legal scope of the Commission's review and stated that he believed the agreement was in the best interest of the Town and the County.

Mr. Cornwell then provided an overview of the settlement agreement. During his review, he raised the following points that are not mentioned in the agreement:

- The town serves almost all of the proposed annexation area with water and sewer.
- "Area A" is a significant gateway to the Town as it is at the western end of the US 58 bypass.
- Police services are currently regularly provided to proposed Annexation Areas A, B1 and B2.
- The town will not experience a revenue windfall, and the County will not experience a significant decrease in revenues as a result of the agreement. The agreement's focus is on long-term, not short-term growth.
- He noted that the language in Section 5 was not intended to bind future governing bodies, and, therefore, "good faith efforts" were to be made by the County to assist the Town in revitalization projects.

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 5

- The language in Section 7 refers mainly to those properties not served by utilities in the northern part of proposed Annexation Area C.

Ms. Williams asked, with respect to Section 3.6 of the agreement, what is meant by “approval by the County” of the future boundary adjustment area, what would happen if the County would not approve such future boundary adjustments, and what criteria would be used to determine the appropriateness of the future boundary adjustments. Mr. Cornwell responded that the town would determine the appropriate area for annexation but that access to the property is the larger issue. Further, he stated he was trying not to place future limitations on the Town or County in drafting that clause.

Mr. Bannister asked for a demonstration of how the revenue sharing components would operate. Mr. Cornwell referred to the definitions in the first section of the agreement for “New Tax Revenue” and “Net New Tax Revenue.” He further stated that “Net New Tax Revenue” is “New Tax Revenue,” minus any economic development expenses. Mr. Robbins asked Mr. Cornwell to further explain “Net New Tax Revenue” and provide an example. Mr. Greg Haley, Special Counsel for Mecklenburg County rose and said a good example of economic development expenses that would be deducted to determine “Net New Tax Revenue” would be when the County provides matching funds for industrial access road extensions.

Mr. Cornwell continued reviewing the agreement, at Section 4.

Mr. Bannister asked if there was sufficient capacity in the utility system to accommodate new users coming into Kinderton Technology Park. Dr. Lee responded that, without knowing what user is locating in the park, that would be impossible to know; he indicated, however, that there is excess capacity in the current system.

Mr. Bannister further asked how the fiberoptic network was paid for at Kinderton Technology Park. Mr. Wayne Carter, Mecklenburg County Administrator, stated that Mid-Atlantic Broadband provided the network at no cost to either locality.

Ms. Williams noted that some of the language in Section 3 is not repeated in Section 4 with regard to when revenue sharing payments are made. She asked if this was intentional. Mr. Cornwell stated that the County’s tax cycle is reflected in Section 3, but it is intended to also be applicable to the Kinderton property discussed in Section 4.

Mr. Cornwell continued reviewing the agreement, at Section 5.

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 6

Mr. Bannister asked if the town has the funds needed to make the utility extensions required by Section 7. Mr. Cornwell responded that, since the town uses an annual budget and that the homeowner would need to show “demonstrable need” for utility services, no funds have been identified. He added that the estimate of the costs of these projects could be determined from information included in the Town’s submitted materials.

Mr. Bannister asked if there were existing residents in the Town that rely on private wells or septic systems, and if the town had a program to extend utilities to them. Mr. Cornwell responded that the Town would extend utilities to those residents “upon need.”

Mr. Lanza stated that the Town has experienced net asset decreases to its enterprise fund over the last few years and that lower water and sewer fee collections would result from in-town utility rates being applied to newly annexed areas, which appear to exacerbate these decreases. He asked if the town has a financial plan to address this issue. Mr. Cornwell referred to Tab 11, pages 8 and 9, noting that the Town expects an increase of \$155,000 in revenues, and a 9% increase in general fund revenues. Mr. Lanza asked further if this would cause the Town to increase its general fund transfers to its enterprise fund. Mr. Cornwell stated that he believes that the Town plans to eventually make its enterprise fund self-sufficient. Dr. Lee said that on Table 13 there is an estimate of the financial impact from the Agreement on the enterprise fund, which is estimated to be about a \$45,000 loss, depending on the number of property owners who choose to connect to the system. Dr. Lee added that the general fund transfers to the enterprise fund have been reduced over the last few years, but, as of right now, a self-sufficient enterprise fund is not possible. Mr. Cornwell noted that, for the most part, the water and sewer infrastructure is in place and that most of the utility work triggered by the agreement would be individual household connections.

Ms. Williams read a portion of Section 7.1 of the agreement, which states, in part: “the Town shall make water and sewer service accessible, within a reasonable time, from a showing of demonstrated need” to existing structures in annexation areas, and that “[t]he Town may not require property owners to pay the cost of bringing those utility lines to the property lines,” however, the Town “may require connection charges to those structures and/or a monthly minimum charge for those not connecting to the new lines if required by the Town’s lending agency.” She then asked if there is any way to assure property owners whether they are going to have to pay connection charges or minimum charges for non-connection to the system. Mr.

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 7

Cornwell responded that the language in the Agreement was only triggered upon a “showing of demonstrated need.” He added that lenders such as USDA Rural Development may require such charges. Mr. Haley noted that, during the negotiations, it was attempted to ensure that: (1) most every annexed parcel had utilities; (2) those that did not have utilities, most notably Old Springfield subdivision, at the end of Old Rock Road, would have town utility service available as the private systems reached the end of their useful life; and (3) that property owners would not be required to pay the cost of extending the utilities. Mr. Cornwell clarified that property owners must prove a demonstrable need - that failing systems exist - in order for the Town to pay for a utility extension. Ms. Williams inquired further about the conditions in Section 7.1 that required users to pay fees if the Town’s lending agreement required it, and Mr. Cornwell responded that, for the most part, the requirement for these users to pay connection fees or non-user fees should not apply, since the Town’s utility system is in place for most of the annexation areas.

In response to an earlier question from Mr. Stirrup, Mr. Wilson stated that of the 46 out-of-town utility customers that would become in-town customers due to annexation, 21 of those are in Area A, and 25 are in Area C.

Ms. Williams asked for further explanation of Section 10.4 which provided additional remedies by suing in the Circuit Court, and how that would interact with the Special Court, which would remain in existence for ten years. Mr. Cornwell stated that the intent of that section was to provide a quick remedy to disagreements in execution of the revenue sharing arrangements, and that the intent would be to bypass the Special Court in these instances. Mr. Haley said that this was one of the few parts of the agreement that was not closely negotiated, and that the language was duplicated from the South Hill – Mecklenburg County Voluntary Settlement Agreement that was reviewed by the Commission in 2000. Mr. Carter added that, in South Hill, the clause was not ever invoked, as the Town met its commitments in a short period of time.

Mayor Allgood came before the Commission and explained that the rapid loss of two major employers, Burlington Industries and Russell-Stover, caused the town to change its vision, including considerations to annex land. He stated that after several attempts to discuss annexation with the County, the contested annexation was filed, ultimately resulting in the negotiated settlement before the Commission. He then cited limited land available for

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 8

commercial or industrial growth and a decreasing population as reasons for the Town to pursue additional land.

Mr. Bannister asked if the annexation were rejected, what the impact would be to the Town. Mayor Allgood responded that the Town should have some control over its future growth. He stated that the addition of Areas B1 and B2 and the Burlington property would provide the Town with the ability to market industrial properties.

Mr. Bannister asked how the Town would address additional infrastructure needs for the annexation areas. Vice-Mayor Torres stated that additional financing may be required if utility extensions are needed, but most of the residents in the area are already served by utilities.

Ms. Williams asked for clarification as to why the Town agreed to extend utilities to Kinderton Technology Park despite a simultaneous push for annexation of that property. Mayor Allgood responded that the Town was approached by the County to see if they would be willing to extend utilities to the area with the assistance of a Tobacco Indemnification and Community Revitalization Commission (Tobacco Commission) grant. This coincided with the Town's need to upgrade a pump station that would be affected by the project.

Mr. Robbins noted that Oakview and the U.S. 15 mobile home park were mentioned as areas where residents desired utility extensions in the 2010 Dewberry & Davis Report, and asked if there has been progress toward serving those in-town areas. Dr. Lee said that service to the mobile home park and some other unserved areas are included in a current USDA Rural Development proposal.

Mr. Robbins asked if Clarksville had ever considered joining the Roanoke River Service Authority, as all of the other Mecklenburg County towns have. Mr. Nunn stated that, at the time, Clarksville's system was self-sufficient and significant costs would have been incurred to connect the Town to the Authority's lines.

Mr. Bannister asked when the Town's \$5,621,000 in water and sewer revenue bonds (as stated on Exhibit B, p. 17, County Notice) would retire. Dr. Lee said this information could be provided to the Commission.

Vice-Mayor Torres came before the Commission and provided a recent history of Clarksville area employment losses and subsequent economic development efforts. She cited Town investments in out-of-town utility extensions as challenges that the town has taken on to

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 9

improve the quality of life in the region, and she said that commercial tax base was important to ensuring that the town was not overly reliant on its residential base. Further, she stated that the Agreement would not result in an immediate financial windfall for the Town, but instead should be considered for its long-term benefits. She noted that the loss of revenue to the County was minimal.

Mr. Bannister asked if the annexation was rejected, what the impact would be on the Town. Vice-Mayor Torres responded that the impact would limit Clarksville to a tourism-based economy and would hinder economic development efforts in the area.

Dr. Lee provided remarks regarding the annexation process and the need for balanced economic activity, and he noted public improvements that are underway. He also remarked that there is a strong community of interest that extends beyond the town boundaries and that much of the debt in the utility fund results from the loss of major industries. With regard to the Town's police department, Dr. Lee stated that the Town intends to evaluate staffing needs upon completion of the annexation but noted that many of the areas to be annexed have been patrolled by Town police for several years.

Dr. Lee next stated that available real estate within the Town is limited by several factors. First, a residential development has been constructed with substandard streets, which will require prospective landowners to bear the burden of upgrading the street. Next, a large area is constrained by the location of the limited-access bypass and wetlands. Finally, he stressed the importance of incorporating the area of the former Burlington Industries property.

Mr. Cornwell provided closing remarks to the Commission, summarizing how the agreement is in the best interest of the Town, County, and the Commonwealth.

At 4:03 p.m., Vice-Chairman Kines called for a ten-minute recess.

The Commission reconvened at 4:22 p.m. Mr. Kines invited Mr. Haley to proceed with presenting the County's case to the Commission.

Mr. Haley introduced Board of Supervisors Chairman Glenn Barbour, Vice-Chairman Gregg Gordon (who is a former Clarksville Town Council Member and is the Board member for most of the annexation areas), County Administrator Wayne Carter, and County Attorney Russell Slayton.

Mr. Haley stated that the original contested annexation proceeding that was filed in March 2012 was an ambitious proposal to annex six square miles and made limited, if any,

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 10

service commitments to the annexation areas. He then reviewed the mediation process, stating that five meetings were held with the mediator between June and October, and remarked that the resulting voluntary settlement agreement was closely negotiated on several points.

Mr. Haley reviewed several aspects of the proposed boundary adjustment areas:

- Area A includes the Rt. 58 business corridor, Buffalo Road and Greystone Estates. There are several parcels with utilities that are available for commercial and residential development. The area has developed as a continuation of the existing town street grid. As a result of the agreement, no utility extensions would be required, except for a small part of the residential portion of Area A. Existing structures, if reachable by existing utilities, would have their connection fee waived [for one year following the effective date of annexation].
- Area B contains two large vacant parcels, strategically located at the intersection of the US 15-58 bypass with US Route 15 South. These have utilities available and are immediately available for development.
- Area C contains the old Burlington plant and several small subdivisions along the lake. The Old Springfield subdivision, in the northern part of Area C, consists of older homes (30-40 years old), with no known failing well or septic systems, however, if failures occur, the town will be obligated to extend utilities to these parcels. Most other residential areas in Area C are served by utilities, and many are available vacant lots. He indicated that it was understood at the time of development of those subdivisions that they would eventually become part of the Town. The future use of the Burlington plant, which is currently being demolished, is unknown. Generally, with the exception of Old Springfield subdivision, Town utilities are already installed in Area C.

Mr. Haley stated that residents in the annexation areas will benefit from trash pickup, Town police response, and in-town utility rates, provided that the residence is currently connected to the Town utility system.

Next, Mr. Haley reviewed the Town's EDA property provisions. The first provision obligates the County to assist the Town in gaining access to the EDA property, and the second provides for the County to share 25% of the tax revenues from the property with the Town. He

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 11

expanded that the definition of “net new tax revenues” as previously mentioned, was intended for Mecklenburg County to recover any capital or up-front costs associated with attracting industrial development, before revenue sharing. Mr. Haley added that the agreement permits the Town, in lieu of revenue sharing, to incorporate the EDA property via a boundary line adjustment. In response to Ms. Williams’ previous question regarding this provision, Mr. Haley noted that the language included in Section 3.6 of the agreement required the County approval of such a boundary line adjustment in order to reflect the requirement in state law that both parties must agree to boundary line adjustments.

Mr. Haley remarked that the most important part of the agreement, from the County’s perspective, are those provisions relating to Kinderton Technology Park. He stated that the Commonwealth and the County have spent over \$3 million on this project, as it is uniquely marketable due to the triple-redundant electric supply to the property as well as its proximity to Hewlett Packard and Microsoft operations in the area. He indicated that the revenue sharing provision on this property would provide 30% of net new tax revenues to be shared with the Town. The agreement also provides for the Town to provide in-town utility rates to this property. Mr. Haley provided information about utility capacity improvements underway in the Kinderton area. Mr. Bannister requested that this information be forwarded to staff.

Next, Mr. Haley reviewed several of the county’s services provided and capital improvements recently initiated or underway. He highlighted that, with respect to public safety, the County now has mutual aid agreements with all Town police departments, including Clarksville, and that, with respect to economic development efforts, the County has several industrial parks and a strong relationship with the Tobacco Commission.

Mr. Haley reviewed the County’s objectives during the negotiations with the Town:

- Assurance that the Town would not overextend itself and that it would be able to provide services to the annexation area.
- Prevent potential hindrances to economic development by ensuring that prospective companies would only have one layer of local government.
- Consideration of the County’s relationship with its other towns.
- Revitalization of downtown Clarksville, specifically, to push for zoning amendments to permit mixed uses downtown.

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 12

- Minimization of the cost and disruption of continued litigation.

Mr. Haley remarked that the County's new strategic plan contains a focus on tourism – and suggests hiring a tourism coordinator. The Town wanted assurance of this commitment in the agreement. As such, the County has funded the position, which is currently being advertised.

Mr. Haley reviewed how the agreement would benefit the County:

- Ends litigation regarding the adversarial annexation action initiated by the Town.
- Focuses on mutual interests with the Town.
- Protects the County's economic development initiatives.
- Has little impact on the County's existing revenues.
- Protects residents of Old Springfield subdivision (and other areas) should residents' wells or septic systems fail in the future.
- Ensures availability of in-town water and sewer rates to Kinderton Technology Park.
- Ensures that the Town is viable.
- Initiates enhanced tourism program.

Mr. Haley then reviewed how the agreement would benefit the Town:

- Provides additional revenue to the Town, of at least \$77,000 in the first year.
- Results in low cost to the Town, as most utility lines are already installed. However, in the event that lines must be extended, due to well or septic failures, the Town would be required to fund such extensions.
- Provides Town control of the future of the Town EDA property.
- Provides attractive residential and commercial land for future development.
- Ends litigation with County.
- Promotes new County emphasis on tourism.
- Engages in a new downtown redevelopment program.

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 13

Mr. Haley next reviewed the benefit to the citizens of the annexation area:

- In-town utility rates.
- Temporarily waived connection fees for utility connections.
- Garbage Pickup
- Town police response.

Mr. Haley acknowledged that there are remaining disputed matters; however, he maintained that these are factual disagreements and are not sufficient reason for the Commission to recommend disapproval of the settlement:

- There are no significant problems with the level of services provided by the County to the proposed annexation area.
- Several properties that were annexed into the town in 1990 with development intentions remain undeveloped.
- The Town's need for revenue should be compared with other towns, not the County.

In response to questions from Mr. Haley, Mr. Carter stated that he has been Mecklenburg County Administrator for four years and, prior to that, he had held several positions within the County. He also reviewed the previous expertise on the Board of Supervisors and the county staff and reviewed Mecklenburg County's history and philosophy of regionalism. Mr. Carter stated that he believed the agreement to be in the best interest of the Town, County, and the citizens of the proposed Annexation Areas.

In response to several questions from Mr. Bannister, Mr. Carter stated that the County does not provide household trash pickup but instead relies on a system of 170 green box sites. He further stated that no County facilities would be transferred to the Town as part of the agreement.

Mr. Bannister asked Vice-Chair Gordon to come forward, as his magisterial district encompasses the annexation area. He stated that, over the past twenty years, since annexation was first discussed, the community reaction has been mixed and that he believes that, without

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 14

the annexation, the Town would be distressed. He summarized that a majority of the people who contacted him were not opposed to the annexation.

Mr. Gordon added, with respect to the earlier discussion about the Town not joining the regional water authority, that, in hindsight, it may have been a mistake, but, at the time, it appeared to be more expensive to join the system than remain separate.

Mr. Lanza noted that testimony has indicated that the primary benefit to citizens in the proposed annexation areas is that they would enjoy in-town utility rates and that there are some citizens in that area that currently do not have water or sewer service. He asked what kind of outreach has been made to the annexation areas to explain the potential benefits. Mr. Cornwell responded that notice of the Commission's hearings was sent to everyone in the annexation areas and that there has been discussion with residents and businesses. Mr. Cornwell also cited a hypothetical scenario whereby an out-of-town residence that is connected to utilities and taxed based on a \$150,000 real estate assessment would potentially save \$750 per year when considering town taxes and reduced utility rates. Mr. Lanza asked if the background for that analysis could be forwarded to staff. In response to a question from Ms. Williams, Mr. Cornwell stated that there was no similar analysis performed for the impact to residences that are not hooked up to town utilities, although he reiterated that those residences would have the guarantee of service through the agreement, should the need arise.

Mr. Stirrup asked if response times to Area C would be improved, given its remoteness from the existing Town. Mr. Carter said that he believed response time would be improved because sheriff's deputies tend to be scattered throughout the County.

Ms. Williams asked Mr. Cornwell to provide any points to supplement those made by Mr. Haley that the agreement is in the best interest of the Commonwealth, Town, County, or annexation area. Mr. Cornwell responded that it is important to consider the continued viability of the communities involved and the overall interest of the Commonwealth. He added that industrial and commercial sites are needed in the town and that a higher level of urban services would be provided to the residents of the annexation area.

Minutes

Oral Presentations

2:00 p.m., January 28, 2013

Page 15

V. Adjournment

Mr. Bannister made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Ms. Wingo, and unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 5:19 p.m.

John G. Kines, Jr.
Vice-Chairman

Susan B. Williams
Local Government Policy Manager

DRAFT