

April 7, 2016

**Virginia:**

AT A CONTINUED MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 3:00 p.m. in the General District Courtroom located on the third floor of the Nelson County Courthouse, in Lovingston Virginia.

Present: Constance Brennan, Central District Supervisor  
Thomas H. Bruguiera, Jr. West District Supervisor  
Allen M. Hale, East District Supervisor – Chair  
Larry D. Saunders, South District Supervisor  
Stephen A. Carter, County Administrator  
Candice W. McGarry, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk  
Debra K. McCann, Director of Finance and Human Resources  
Susan Rorrer, Director of Information Systems

Absent: Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor – Vice Chair

**I. Call to Order**

Mr. Hale called the meeting to order at 4:02 PM, with four (4) Supervisors present to establish a quorum and Mr. Harvey being absent.

**II. FY16-17 Budget Work Session**

Introductory Comments:

Mr. Hale noted that although Mr. Harvey was not present; he had indicated to him that he was not in favor of a tax increase.

Mr. Carter suggested that the Board and staff work down the considerations list and then determine next steps.

Mr. Hale noted he would like to address compensation in terms of the School Board so that they fully understood that. He added that he was unclear as to how what the state did and what the locality did related to each other.

Ms. McCann explained that the State has authorized Standards of Quality (SOQ) positions which would get a 2% raise effective 12/1/16, subject to the State hitting the new revenue projections. Mr. Carter added that the schools had more personnel than the state funded SOQ positions. Ms. McCann further explained that revenue of \$60,000 or a little less was to be received from the State and these funds were incorporated into the School's budget. She noted that the requested amount of \$755,000 was over and above that and would fund the results from their pay evaluation. She noted that the new school pay scale would make a \$1,250 annual adjustment every five (5) steps and this caused a cascading effect. She

April 7, 2016

advised that per Shannon Irvin, a 1% raise cost \$175,000, so 3% would be \$525,000. Ms. McCann clarified that their proposition did not provide for an across the board raise. She noted that their theory on the pay scale structure was that once implemented, only 20% of their workforce would get a pay adjustment in each fiscal year. She noted that there was a large outlay of funds initially; however the potential outlay in future years could be less.

Mr. Hale noted that last year they provided for a 3% raise for both the Schools and the County and they have tried to keep them parallel in % increases in compensation.

Ms. Brennan noted that they typically gave them the funds and they did what they wanted with it and Ms. McCann confirmed that they did do a 3% raise last year. She noted that for the County, the cost of a 1% raise was \$45,000 and staff had included \$150,000 in budget. She explained that per the Board's directive, staff was developing a pay study and \$150,000 may not do a whole lot to put people in the position where they should be; however it was a placeholder right now. Mr. Carter noted that staff would have to get the data compiled and it was indeterminate when the study would be finished.

Mr. Hale then noted that they were not yet ready to address the issue at this point; however he appreciated the clarification. Mr. Carter then recommended that they review the School Board's detailed budget to see the details of their proposal. Ms. Brennan inquired as to whether or not they would meet with the School Board and Mr. Carter noted it was on the calendar; but had not been coordinated yet. He added that they would address the proposed calendar before the end of the meeting.

#### **Budget Considerations List:**

Ms. McCann then suggested that staff step the Board through the Considerations list and Mr. Carter noted to the Board that the focus was on the use of the contingency amounts in the budget and noted that these were \$1.1 million in recurring funds and \$600,000 in nonrecurring funds. He added that the Board had said they wanted to work to their ability and he noted that was their ability and to stay within the constraints of these amounts in the budget.

The Board and staff reviewed the list of considerations as follows:

**Reassessment:** *2018 Reassessment expense in FY17 - \$227,000 - Funded*

Staff noted that this expense was split over two years. No change was made by the Board.

**Treasurer:** *Implementation of Credit Card Fees (savings of 27,000) – Approved on 3/29/16*

Staff noted that this would be a reduction of \$27,000 on the expenditure side of the budget. No change was made by the Board.

April 7, 2016

**Technology:**

*Replace Phone System for \$70,000 -Not funded*

Staff noted that the phone system was purchased in 2002 and needed upgrading to maintain support. Staff advised that 2018 was the end date for support and Mr. Carter noted that the phone system was working fine and there were no problems.

No change was made by the Board.

*Replace Primary Network Server \$20,000- Funded*

Staff noted that the network server had another year and it was requested that replacing it be deferred. Ms. Rorrer added that it was a difficult server to transition.

Supervisors agreed by consensus to remove funding of \$20,000.

*FT Support Technician (GIS/Broadband) \$54,589 - Not Funded*

Staff noted that the position would provide GIS and Broadband support. It was noted that there were new responsibilities related to Broadband which were increasing over time. Mr. Carter then suggested working through the list and coming back to the three (3) new positions.

No change was made by the Board.

**Sheriff:**

*4 Radar Units-recommend purchase w/Asset Forfeiture funds \$8,000 -Not Funded*

Ms. McCann noted that staff suggested to the Sheriff that they use Asset Forfeiture funds as they had \$12,800 available and this was an eligible expense.

No change was made by the Board.

*Clerical position-part-time to full time \$23,806-Not Funded*

Ms. McCann noted that this included \$9,000 from the Compensation Board for the part time position and County funds of \$6,000 to \$7,000. She added that the cost of making this position full time was \$43,159 and assumed draw down of part time Compensation Board monies and use of current Part Time County funds.

No change was made by the Board.

April 7, 2016

**EMS Council:**

*Reduction of Base amount for Montebello Fire only, savings of \$5,500 –Pending*

Staff noted that they had conferred with Jaime Miller and Montebello was only a fire agency now and not both fire and rescue. It was noted that agencies that had both received a larger base amount of funding and they should now only get \$11,000.

Supervisors agreed by consensus to reduce the Montebello Fire funding by \$5,500 to \$11,000.

**E911 Program:**

*Increased Radio Maintenance, \$14,350 -Funded*

Ms. McCann noted this was a slight increase over the current year and Mr. Carter noted the County was just a victim of upgrading its equipment which came with additional maintenance costs. He added that there was not much they could do about it as they wanted to support they system.

No change was made by the Board.

**Paid EMS:**

*Review of potential budgetary shortfalls (FY16 & FY17), \$19,408- Not Funded*

Ms. McCann reported that there have been issues of this going over budget every year and she noted that it appeared that some personnel costs had not been included. She noted these were Workers Compensation Insurance of \$30,000 and 401K contributions of \$20,000. She added that she had confirmed with Theresa Harris and Curtis Sheets that these items were not factored into the numbers given to the County. She noted that Curtis had resubmitted his budget shifting some funds from salaries to the benefits line and then made some other reductions. She noted that this was a \$13,500 increase overall to the budget not \$19,408 as listed. She also noted that they may need a budget amendment for these items for the current year.

Mr. Hale then clarified that even though they failed to include these items in the budget, they have been paid. Ms. McCann confirmed this to be the case and noted it should not be an issue going forward.

Supervisors agreed by consensus to fund an increase of \$13,500.

April 7, 2016

*2 suction units and 2 bone drills, \$2,800 -Funded*

Staff noted that they had requested additional equipment as listed and no change was made by the Board.

**Animal Control:**

*Part-time Shelter Attendant, \$17,085 -Funded*

Ms. McCann noted that currently the department had a Part Time Shelter Attendant and a Part Time Animal Control Officer (ACO) as was previously authorized. She noted that the department had turnover and the Part Time ACO was moved to Part Time Shelter Attendant and then they resigned. She added that Administration had just received notification that the Animal Control Supervisor had resigned effective April 8<sup>th</sup>. She reported that they had been given one week's notice and that the Animal Control Supervisor had taken a Security Officer position under the Sheriff. She advised that staff had spoken with the current Full Time ACO who agreed to serve as Supervisor in the interim; with the potential to become the Supervisor. She then reported that the vacant Full Time ACO position had been filled recently with Stephanie Campbell who had graduated in 2009 from Nelson County High School and had started that week. She added that the department still had Miranda Morgan in the Part Time Shelter Attendant position

Mr. Carter added that he thought the department was in good stead and that the new hire, Stephanie had been working in Buena Vista for a few months. He noted that she was not yet certified but was highly qualified. He added that he was confident that they would offer the Supervisor position to Kevin Wright and he should be able to step up.

Ms. McCann advised that the part time Shelter Attendant position had been advertised and there were people from that pool that they could offer a position to if Mr. Wright wanted to do so. She noted that at present he preferred to wait. She then added that Stephanie Campbell was from Piney River, went to WVU, and had a degree in Wildlife Management.

Supervisors and staff agreed that it was a tough department to keep staffed especially with having to be on call.

Mr. Carter then suggested that this funding be left in the budget for now and the Board agreed by consensus to do so.

No change was made by the Board.

**Motor Pool:**

*2 Sheriff Vehicles plus equipping, \$70,800- Funded*  
*1 Sheriff Vehicle plus equipping, \$35,400 -Not Funded*

April 7, 2016

Ms. McCann advised that funding had been included for two Sheriff's vehicles and equipping and that the Board was asked to consider the third requested one. She noted that the Board had been provided a list of all active vehicles. Mr. Saunders questioned the 99 Ford with no title and Ms. McCann noted that this was a confiscated vehicle and that the current department has tried to get it from the former administration. She added that she has asked Larry Cindrick to resolve it and it was listed on there for her information to follow up on.

Ms. McCann noted that the Board's consideration was funding the additional Sheriff's vehicle and the Board decided to defer this until Tuesday.

No change was made by the Board.

*3 Building Inspections Vehicles, \$77,000-Not Funded*  
*1 Planning Vehicle (sold Subaru previously used) \$25,000- Not Funded*

Ms. McCann noted that Building Inspections had requested three (3) vehicles and had just received a new vehicle from the current year budget. She noted that the department currently had a 2004 Ford Escape and two 2006 pickups. She added that they wanted to turn over the 2004 escape to Planning and Zoning and keep the two trucks. She noted that staff did not feel that the three new vehicles were warranted and Mr. Carter advised that the strategy was for them to have the new escape and trucks and then the 2004 escape would go to Planning, since their old vehicle was sold at auction.

Supervisors agreed with the strategy as outlined and no change was made by the Board.

*1 Tourism Vehicle, \$25,000-Not Funded*

Ms. McCann advised that the Tourism vehicle was added by staff since Maureen had an older vehicle that was unreliable and did not represent the County well. Mr. Bruguere inquired if it would be more economical to pay Ms. Kelley Mileage and Mr. Carter noted he thought not.

Mr. Hale noted that all County vehicles should have County Decals on them.

Mr. Carter advised that Ms. Kelley could be provided with a surplus out police vehicle.

No change was made by the Board.

**Community College:**

*PVCC Capital Contribution (estimated \$27,076 x 4 years) \$27,076 –Funded*

No change was made by the Board.

April 7, 2016

**Planning:**

*FT Planner, \$58,720- Not Funded*

Staff suggested that the Board come back to this. Mr. Saunders inquired as to whether or not the workload of the department had changed. Mr. Carter noted there has been an increase in Zoning Ordinance amendments and he was not sure if it would smooth out or not. He noted Mr. Padalino wanted to do more planning and he thought he could do a lot with another person. He noted that Mr. Massie performed two jobs; however he spent most of his time on Planning and Zoning. He noted this was working okay; however it may be a question of how many more amendments would be coming in addition to looking at the Comprehensive Plan and in house planning activities.

Ms. Brennan asked if staff could provide some numbers on providing for a Full Time Planner and a Part Time Recycling Coordinator and what the difference in cost would be. Ms. McCann noted that \$15.02/hr. for 20 hours would be \$16,815 for the Part Time Recycling Coordinator and the Planning Department pay rate was \$20.22/hr. and Mr. Massie worked 20 hours/wk. which would be approximately \$29,000. She then noted that the difference was a little over \$17,000 and a Full Time planner position with benefits would cost \$58,720.

Supervisors then agreed to address staffing separately and no change was made by the Board.

**Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation:**

*Level Funded \$1,575 -Not Funded*

No change was made by the Board.

**Non-Departmental:**

*Employee Pay Adjustment (TBD from pay study), \$150,000 –Funded*

*Retiree Health Insurance Supplement (increased # of retirees), \$15,540 –Funded*

Ms. McCann advised that the funding of the health insurance credit for retirees was included here. She noted it had jumped from \$10,000 to \$15,000 because of the increase in the number of retirees; which included both County and Constitutional Office employees.

She then explained that Constitutional Office employees received an additional credit from VRS that County employees did not get and the Board could consider equalizing this.

April 7, 2016

Mr. Hale stated he thought it ought to be equalized and Ms. McCann was asked to put together some numbers for them to look at. It was noted that they would need to think about how it would affect those already retired and if it would be effective after a policy was put in place. Mr. Hale noted he did not like the idea of cutting something people were used to getting and the consensus was to make it effective for those retiring going forward.

Ms. Brennan asked if this was considered as part of the OPEB liability calculations and staff noted it was calculated as a liability but it was unfunded and not included in the budget. Ms. McCann noted that some localities funded their liability; however Nelson's was not significant and it had not been deemed worthy at this point. Mr. Carter noted this calculation included sick leave and vacation leave which was washed away upon termination of employment.

No change was made by the Board

*9.2% Health Insurance Increase (in each dept.) offset by VRS decrease, \$47,664 –Funded*

No change was made by the Board.

**Agencies Requesting Increased Funding (Over \$300):**

*Health Department, \$12,092 - Not Funded*

*Region Ten, \$12,704 - Not Funded*

*Regional Library, \$31,858 - Not Funded*

*JABA, \$7,541 - Not Funded*

*JAUNT, \$19,419 - Not Funded*

*MACAA, \$3,996 -Not Funded*

*OAR, \$2,041- Not Funded*

*Nelson County Community Development Foundation, \$2,786 -Not Funded*

*CASA, \$1,000 - Not Funded*

Ms. McCann asked how the Board wanted to handle these and the Board agreed by consensus to defer their consideration.

Mr. Hale noted this was an area that was not able to be analyzed fully yet and he suggested that Supervisors look at the agency budgets and then they schedule a time to focus on these specifically. Supervisors agreed to look at the Agency request notebook before next Tuesday's meeting and if there was consensus to have some of them come in to explain their request, they could schedule that.

Supervisors agreed to consider these separately at a future meeting and no changes were made.



April 7, 2016

**Agencies Not Previously Funded:**

*Piedmont Workforce Network \$2,261-Not Funded*

No change was made by the Board.

**Capital Outlay:**

*Smart Podium-Circuit Court, \$25,000 - Not Funded*

Ms. McCann provided the following background information:

Smart Podium for Circuit Court: The smart podium is an optional consideration for use in the renovated Circuit Courtroom. It provides the ability for lawyers to exhibit documents from the podium to a screen in the courtroom. Currently the Circuit Court is able to pay from state funds for the recording equipment upgrade (approximately \$11,000) for the renovated courtroom. The County anticipates to contract with BT Conferencing for the audio visual equipment utilizing a state contract. We are waiting for the final proposal for this equipment/installation. Currently, we anticipate that the BT Conferencing proposal will provide the Smart Podium functionality with a lower cost. Recommendation is to wait in making a decision until the BT Conferencing proposal is received and evaluated.

Ms. McCann noted that the smart podium was not needed at this point and its functionality would be provided by the Court A/V solution. She noted that a quote was to be provided and the County could use Courthouse Funds for this. She added that the recording equipment quote was down to \$11,000 and Judy Smythers had gotten permission for the State to pay for that; which left the Video Conferencing costs to be paid by the County. Staff noted this was an uncertain cost; however it could potentially be \$150,000.

No change was made by the Board.

*Callohill Maintenance Bldg. Renovation, \$71,000 - Funded*

Ms. McCann provided the following background information:

Callohill Maintenance Renovation: The roof has been completed, but the gutter portion of the roof contract is on hold until certain siding areas can be replaced. Architectural Partners are preparing specifications for the siding so that we can obtain bids (cost TBD). We have paid Skyline Roofing \$28,887 for work completed to date. There is a balance due of \$5,000 for the gutter work. Additionally, proposed work include HVAC replacement by an outside contractor and plumbing and electrical work to be completed by county staff. The costs for this work is approximately \$18,000. In FY16, \$100,000 was budgeted and the proposed budget requests that \$71,000 anticipated to be unexpended in FY16 be carried over to FY17.

April 7, 2016

Ms. McCann reported that they were waiting on doing the gutters until the siding was replaced and then the HVAC and plumbing would also be done. She added that funds for this had been carried forward from the current year; however some of it may be done in this fiscal year.

In response to questions regarding the use of the property, staff noted this would become the new Maintenance Department building.

Mr. Saunders then reported meeting with the EDA and he advised that there were no road maintenance funds in the account to address the road maintenance issues there. He added that the County should do something with the road there to make the property attractive. He added that no one had really looked at this and maybe a Supervisor should be on the EDA Board too.

Mr. Carter advised that no one would take over the maintenance account and there was a \$6,000 maximum in the road maintenance agreement. He further explained that the agreement provided that the members had to pay a \$300 share each year; however no one was collecting it. He noted that at one point the senior Mr. Eggleston was maintaining the account but that was over ten (10) years ago.

Mr. Carter then noted that fencing in the back yard area for the Sheriff's compound area had been discussed. Mr. Saunders noted that in terms of the building, dirt had been pushed up all around the building causing issues.

No change was made by the Board.

*Emergency Vehicles (50% Ambulance/80% Fire Truck), \$320,000 -\*Funded*

Ms. McCann provided the following background information:

Emergency Vehicles: The following is based on information provided by Jaime Miller. Roseland Rescue is waiting for the next funding cycle as they did not apply to the state for grant funding. The next agency in line is Wintergreen Rescue which is need of an ambulance re-chassis. Piney River Fire is the next agency in line for a fire truck.

Ms. McCann noted that she had spoken to Jaime Miller who had confirmed the agencies request for vehicles. Mr. Bruguere noted that a Fire Truck for Piney River would cost about \$300,000 and re-chassis were still expensive depending upon the equipment.

Mr. Carter suggested that the Board leave the funds in the budget and see what requests came forward. Mr. Hale noted he had issue with it being bumped up so much and staff noted that non-recurring funds were used for this.

Mr. Bruguere confirmed that Piney River Fire Department did want to get the fire truck.

April 7, 2016

Supervisors agreed to allot \$240,000 for the fire truck and \$80,000 maximum for the Wintergreen ambulance re-chassis for a total of \$320,000; which was no change from the budgeted amount.

*Transfer Station Excavator, \$135,000 - Not Funded*

Ms. McCann provided the following background information:

Transfer Station Excavator: Estimate to purchase new excavator for Transfer Station- \$135,000.

Information on excavator currently in use:

Daewoo 140 LC

Purchased in 2007

No major mechanical conditions.

A/C has been repaired 3 times-Needs to be replaced.

Approximately 650 hours of use per year

Estimated machine hours 6467

Staff noted that Mr. Truslow has advised that the air conditioning in the current excavator had been fixed and the equipment was working well. He advised that there had been no functional trouble with it and the purchase of a new one could be put off for another year. Mr. Saunders concurred noting that it only had 4,000 hours on the engine and normally one would look at replacement after 5,000 hours.

No change was made by the Board.

*Replace AS400 Server (financial/tax system) \$45,000 - \*Funded*

Ms. McCann reported that this server held all of the County's financial information, it was about seven (7) years old, and IBM was no longer going to upgrade the operating system software. She advised that this was a sign it was at the end of its useful life since at some point, IBM would no longer provide any maintenance support. She added that the County did have a maintenance agreement in place through the end of next fiscal year and the plan was to buy the new server at the end of next year for replacement. She noted its cost was \$45,000 to be paid with non-recurring funds, it supported a critical function, and the County essentially had to do it.

No change was made by the Board.

April 7, 2016

*29/151 Corridor Study, \$29,000 -Not Funded*

Mr. Carter noted that staff was following up on the Board's Retreat items and if they wanted to proceed with this objective; they were positioned to do so. He advised that staff had met internally and would soon be meeting with another consultant to discuss the project. He noted that TJPDC looked at historical things related to the Route 29 corridor so he thought there was some vetting of their proposal to be done. He noted that that staff would try to make it more strategic and less broad based and that it could be brought back for a decision at a later time. He then noted that the study would potentially merge the Route 29 and Route 151 strategies together.

Supervisors agreed that this item was to be determined and no change was made by the Board.

*E911 call handling system upgrade, \$346,000 -\*Funded-\$150,000 grant*

Ms. McCann noted that this item had been included in the budget and \$150,000 was coming from the state and the balance from non-recurring funds. She noted that the current equipment would be in service for five (5) years as of this coming December. She added that the Dispatch work stations were using Microsoft XP which was no longer supported and this was the system that handled 911 calls and it was a critical system.

No change was made by the Board.

*CAD Replacement, \$350,000 -Not Funded*

Ms. McCann noted that the vendor providing the system had gone out of business and another company had agreed to continue its support until 2020. Staff noted that Ms. Rorrer had found a contract from New Kent County that the County could ride using cooperative procurement to save \$31,500. It was noted that the cost would still be \$350,000 and Mr. Carter advised that the strategy was to wait until closer to 2020 to do the replacement.

No change was made by the Board.

**Transfers to Schools:**

*Level Fund-increase attributed to pay study, \$755,371 - Not Funded*

*2 School Buses (1 additional bus purchased in FY16) \$190,000 -Funded*

*1 School Bus, \$95,000 -Not Funded*

*Capital Improvements-Priority 1, \$1,768,500 - Not Funded*

*Capital Improvements-Civil Rights Violations, \$325,000 - Funded*

Ms. McCann provided the following background information:

April 7, 2016

### **School Funding**

Included is summary information regarding revenue and expenditure highlights from the School Board approved budget. The budget reflects an increase over current year of \$1,303,197 with a request of \$755,371 in additional local funds (from the General fund). The primary factor driving the increase is relative to proposed compensation adjustments. As a matter of information, per Shannon Irvin, the cost of 1% raise is approximately \$175,000. Also to note is the overall increase from FY16 in state, federal and other revenues in the amount of \$522,725. The proposed budget currently reflects level funding such that the Board can give this further consideration.

The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is included as information. The proposed budget includes funding for 2 buses but the CIP requests funding for 3 buses. Buses are included in the CIP plan as Priority 1. The proposed budget reflects a request for capital funding in the amount of \$1,768,500 which represents the Priority 1 request (other than buses). This is currently not funded in the proposed budget but is presented here for the Board's consideration.

The proposed budget does include funding for the Civil Rights improvements in the amount of \$325,000. Included as information is a letter from Shannon Irvin dated November 4, 2015 that provides an estimate of the cost for these improvements. Based on the school division's last discussions with DOE, they will not have to complete the work in the greenhouse or renovate the CTE wing restrooms. Per Shannon, the School Division expects the budget to be lower than the original estimate of \$323,618 but the projects have not yet been bid out. This funding is proposed as carryover from FY16 (fuel savings).

Supervisors agreed that the Schools were the big ticket item of consideration. Ms. McCann noted that that they had requested local funds of \$755,000. She noted that they would receive revenue of \$522,000 so their overall increase was offset by this and \$755,000 was the balance.

Ms. McCann noted that the Schools had provided a budget narrative and she noted the operational budget highlights detailing their changes in expenditure totaling \$1,609,774 with recommended decreases totaling \$306,557 for a net change of \$1,303,197. She added that the largest factor was their proposed compensation adjustment and they had added several new positions. She noted that some of these expenses such as the Special Education Rate Package and the Materials & Supplies (Chromebooks) did have offsetting revenues.

Mr. Hale noted that it would be helpful if they could provide funding sources for each of the major expense items. Ms. McCann noted that it may not be easy for them to provide this for some of these; however, staff could ask them for it.

Mr. Hale noted he would like to see where the \$522,000 in new state revenue was going.

April 7, 2016

Ms. McCann then related that the expenses for the new positions were not fully covered and only \$59,000 was provided by the state for the 2% raise in December.

Ms. Brennan noted that she had attended a reading readiness summit at the library and noted the difficulty in Kindergarten classrooms with reading readiness. She noted that they were concerned about the statistics there and Ms. McCann noted that that it could also be class size related.

Ms. McCann suggested that they could ask them to show specific sources of revenue for these items.

Mr. Bruguere questioned the Alternative Education Director position and staff noted that they were looking at having an in-house alternative education program instead of sending them elsewhere. Mr. Carter added that this change did not have any savings for this reflected in their budget and Ms. McCann noted that there should be a reduction shown on the expenditure side of their budget for this. It was then supposed that this could be handled by the Director of Instruction.

Mr. Saunders questioned if Tye River Elementary School was up to par now, and it was noted that it was thought it was not. Mr. Carter added that the schools were projecting a loss in students over the next few years.

Mr. Hale then noted that the final funding decision would be bottom line rather than anything else and that the County was not capable of meeting all of their increases.

Ms. McCann noted the School's had provided a CIP plan that showed their first priority items as follows. Ms. McCann then noted that the budget included funding for two (2) buses rather than the three (3) requested.

Priority 1:

- A) School Safety Division Wide \$ 100,000
- B) Buses for Student Transportation \$ 285,000
- C) Cooling Tower/Heat Pump Replacements (NCHS) \$135,000
- D) Weather Barrier/Abatement- TRES \$1,533,500

Total Priority 1: \$2,053,500

Ms. McCann then noted that the OCR improvements were authorize; however the School's still did not have all of the projects bid and the cost may come in less than the anticipated amount provided to the Board of \$323,000. She noted that staff had budgeted \$325,000 for these and that the School's had indicated fuel savings of this amount in the current year that was to be used to cover this. She noted that they were asked to come back with firm prices once the bids were received.

April 7, 2016

Staff noted that the critical areas had been addressed, such as the windows, roof etc. and that a set aside of \$340,000 for the Tye River building envelope was still in place.

No change was made by the Board.

**Transfers to Other Funds:**

*Increase to Debt Service Fund (existing CH renovations) \$214,116 -Funded*

No Change was made by the Board.

Supervisors briefly discussed the proposed schedule and agreed to leave the tax rates unchanged and proceed with the resolutions to set the Tax Rates and Personal Property Tax Relief percentage on April 12<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Carter then advised that the scheduled work session after the regular Board meeting provided that the Board talk to Departments and Agencies; however they could wait and see if they had any questions for anyone. Ms. McCann then noted that the Departments were very conservative and some of their budgets had been reduced.

Supervisors noted that they would decide Tuesday whether or not to meet on Thursday and if they needed to invite anyone.

Mr. Hale noted that he had gotten the consensus to lock in the same tax rates as the current year and Ms. Brennan indicated she was uncertain about that prior to reviewing the Agencies' requests. Mr. Hale noted then that this was a 4-1 consensus. Staff noted that the Board still had contingency funds to use and Ms. Brennan noted she did not want to raise taxes; however she wanted to give everyone's request full consideration.

Ms. McCann noted that any considerations beyond the Board's present ability would likely be a capital need and they would need to decide if they could cover it or if they would need to finance it. Supervisors inquired about retiring debt and staff noted that the impending retired debt would be going towards the current Courthouse renovation project debt.

Mr. Hale then noted that the County had done two large projects and had been fortunate in the bidding process that they were not more costly. He noted that the current courthouse project would be done by next year. Mr. Carter then added that the strategy was to bridge over the retired debt so as not to increase the debt load.

**III. Other Business (As May Be Presented)**

*Introduced: Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for Pipelines.*

April 7, 2016

Ms. Brennan noted she would like for the Board to adopt a resolution asking FERC to consider a PEIS for the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and others. Mr. Bruguere noted he had spoken to someone who was talking about them asking for this for the whole state. Mr. Hale noted that the request for the Mountain Valley Pipeline had been rejected. He added that he thought it was a reasonable request; however he did not think it would get anywhere.

Ms. Brennan then provided the Supervisors with a draft resolution to review. She reiterated that it asked FERC to look at the four (4) proposed pipelines as a unit across the state and to take into consideration their cumulative effects. She added that FERC needed to look at all four (4) at the same time.

Supervisors reviewed the proposed resolution and took no action.

*Lovingston Healthcare Center Re-use:*

Ms. Brennan noted that she had called the Valley Care Management people and they apologized for not getting back to the County. She added that they noted they had been tied up with opening a new facility, were still interested, and would get back to the County soon.

**IV. Adjourn and Continue Until \_\_\_\_\_, 2016 at \_\_\_\_\_ in the General District Courtroom for the Conduct of a FY16-17 Budget Work Session.**

It was reiterated that the Board would not meet again before the regular meeting on the 12th and at 6:00 PM, Ms. Brennan moved adjourn and Mr. Bruguere seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously by voice vote to approve the motion and the meeting adjourned.