

April 3, 2018

**Virginia:**

AT A CONTINUED MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 4:00 p.m. in the Bridge Room located on the fourth floor of the Nelson County Courthouse, in Lovingston Virginia.

Present: Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor  
Jesse N. Rutherford, East District Supervisor  
Ernie Q. Reed, Central District Supervisor  
Thomas H. Bruguire, Jr. West District Supervisor – Chair  
Larry D. Saunders, South District Supervisor – Vice Chair  
Stephen A. Carter, County Administrator  
Candice W. McGarry, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk  
Debra K. McCann, Director of Finance and Human Resources

Absent: None

**I. Call to Order**

Mr. Bruguire called the meeting to order at 4:03 PM with all Supervisors present to establish a quorum.

**II. FY18-19 Budget Work Session**

Mr. Carter reported on the items below in follow up to the Board’s request for more information:

<u>Commonwealth Attorney</u>		
Part-time Clerical Position to Full Time (Includes benefits & health ins)	\$21,467	Not Funded

Mr. Carter noted the request from the Commonwealth Attorney to make his part time clerical position full time. He advised that the Commonwealth Attorney had almost \$34,000 in asset forfeiture funds that could be used to fund his request for one year and then it could be re-evaluated the following year. He noted that his case load data had shown that the number of felonies prosecuted had doubled and was equal to 1% of the County’s population. He then questioned whether or not that trend would continue and he thought it should be reconsidered in FY20 given that the office had sufficient funds for FY19. In response to questions, Ms. McCann noted she was unsure if he had plans for the use of those funds and she noted being uncertain if asset forfeiture funds could be used for salaries other than on a temporary basis. She noted that those funds had been used previously to pay Dana more and for another assistant on a temporary basis for three (3) months. Mr. Carter noted that staff could check on that and that the additional amount of funding would be approximately \$12,000 without the included benefits and it would be for one year.

April 3, 2018

Mr. Saunders advised he would like to know if the Commonwealth Attorney already had plans for use of the asset forfeiture funds and he did not think his budget should be cut this year. Mr. Carter reiterated that they had more than doubled the prosecutions for felonies and questioned if it would continue. He added that the trend line for that was about 60-70 per year and his was 140 plus. Mr. Harvey noted that some of those felony convictions were people from outside of the county.

Mr. Reed questioned the funding amount and Mr. Carter noted that \$21,000 was requested; however if the health insurance benefit was backed out, it would be less than that.

Mr. Harvey noted he was wary of using his asset forfeiture funds to balance his budget and Mr. Carter advised he would not be and would not get it back in future years. It was noted that the Compensation Board had indicated they probably would not fund the position.

Mr. Rutherford noted that asset forfeiture funds could be used to buy equipment, for capital improvements, and temporary work forces; which were one time things.

Ms. McCann noted that typically funds could not be supplanted; so if County funds were used in FY19, it could be considered supplanting if asset forfeiture funds were used down the road.

Mr. Bruguiere noted he would like to see a five year trend of asset forfeiture funds and Ms. McCann noted that those funds were split 80% and 20% between the Sheriff and Commonwealth Attorney respectively.

Supervisors then agreed by Consensus to add the amount of \$21,467 to the Commonwealth Attorney's budget to make the part-time clerical position full-time.

<b><u>Soil &amp; Water Conservation (Refer to Agency Notebook)</u></b>		
Thomas Jefferson Soil & Water Conservation Board (\$33,075 Funded)	\$10,425	Not Funded

Mr. Carter advised that the Building Official, Chuck Miller had advised him that he could take over E&S Plan review by July 1, 2018 which was currently being done by the TJSWCD and would save the County \$10,425. He noted that it would also be a source of revenue for the County since there was a charge associated with it.

Supervisors agreed by Consensus to not fund \$10,425 for TJSWCD which was the amount associated with E&S plan review, and no change was made to their budget.

<b><u>Transfer to Schools (Refer to School Budget)</u></b>		
No Increased Request for operations/\$9.5 million new state funding (Draft)	\$0	
School Buses (4 requested)	\$340,000	Not Funded

April 3, 2018

Mr. Carter noted that of the \$400,000 in capital funds provided to the schools in FY18, they had used \$100,742 of it. He noted that Dr. Comer had advised him that they had some additional costs for improvements to the ALPHA area and their plan was to use any balance to pay for three (3) school buses if the Board was not funding those as requested.

Mr. Carter then noted that Dr. Comer had not been specific about what was left to do. Ms. McCann advised that they had put in some glass enclosures but had not paid for that yet.

Mr. Harvey questioned where the extra funds for camera upgrades had come from and Mr. Carter noted he thought some was grant funding and then other budgeted funds. Ms. McCann confirmed that grant funds had paid for \$80,000 and they had used another \$80,000 for additional cameras out of the \$400,000 provided by the Board.

*School Resource Officers:*

Mr. Harvey asked if the School Resource Officer (SRO) was in the school budget or was part of the Sheriff Department's budget. Ms. McCann advised it was in both; the County put it in the Sheriff's Department budget; however the County got reimbursed by the Schools for 50% of the cost of the current SRO.

Mr. Carter noted that the Schools had proposed to use money on hand to pay for the three (3) additional SROs with no net increase to the County; they had absorbed those costs. Mr. Harvey asked if the SROs should go through the same pay plan as the rest of the Deputies and Mr. Carter advised that it would be easier to take it out of their budget. Mr. Harvey then questioned if there was any advantage to running their pay through the schools and Ms. McCann noted, with concurrence from Mr. Rutherford that by law, the SROs had to be employees of the Sheriff. Ms. McCann added that even if they were in the School's budget, they would be employees of the County and they would have to show they were paying for part of it. Mr. Carter then advised that their costs should be in the County's Budget.

No change was made by the Board.

**Proposed Admissions Tax:**

Mr. Carter advised that the Board had asked for follow up on a proposed Admissions Tax and he noted that Mr. Payne had drafted an Ordinance for that in 2013 and Ms. Kelley had done some rough estimates of projected revenues a year ago.

He noted that without the additional Authority of taxing participatory sports, if the tax were 5%, the revenues could be \$290,000. If the County were to have the authority to tax participatory sports, a 5% tax could raise \$1.2 Million. He noted further that with a 10% tax without participatory sports authorization, the revenues could be \$580,000 and a 10% tax with that authority could yield \$2.4 Million. He added those figures were all based upon a 100% collection rate.

April 3, 2018

Mr. Carter noted that the County would have to go back to the General Assembly to get the authority to tax participatory sports and Mr. Harvey commented that the players were different now than when that had been previously blocked.

Mr. Carter advised that an admissions tax could be implemented anytime and he added that Delegate Bell had previously said he would sponsor the bill giving the County taxing authority for participatory sports. He noted that in the past, the General Assembly's response had been that the County was not using the admissions taxing authority it already had so they were not willing to authorize more. He added that there was also politics involved.

Mr. Saunders asked if the majority of localities that had the authority to enact an admissions tax were using it and Mr. Carter noted many were including Albemarle and Charlottesville. Mr. Harvey noted that there were few that had the participatory sports limitation and it was noted that Nelson was specifically limited and had been by certain parties from the beginning.

Mr. Bruguiere suggested that the admissions tax be implemented by next fiscal year at 5% and that would show the General Assembly that the County was using the authority prior to going back to obtain authority for participatory sports.

Mr. Carter advised that it was a pass through tax and he could not be sure that the revenue numbers were correct as they were roughly calculated; he added it was unsure how it would play out.

Mr. Reed asked if this could be in place prior to festival season next year and Mr. Carter advised they could do it any time after holding a public hearing. He added that the Board could get some push back on it; however they could dedicate the funds for a specific purpose. Supervisors and staff briefly discussed implementation of the meals tax and the premise of it paying for Rockfish Valley Elementary; which it had.

Mr. Reed suggested they could keep the 5% on the table for mid-year and it was not a bad idea to remind people of the fiscal bind the County will be in. Mr. Harvey suggested it be done now since the Board was not raising property taxes.

Mr. Rutherford asked if they would decide that day when it would be effective and implementation dates were discussed. Mr. Carter advised it could be as of a set date or upon adoption. Mr. Harvey and Mr. Rutherford agreed that January 1, 2019 would be a good date that would allow people time to consider it and be aware of it.

Mr. Harvey suggested setting the public hearing for a 5% admissions tax as of January 1, 2019.

Mr. Saunders then moved to go ahead with advertising a 5% admissions tax effective January 2019 and Mr. Rutherford seconded the motion.

April 3, 2018

Mr. Carter advised that the Ordinance would address the County's abilities and Mr. Bruguere suggested that this authorization for a public hearing be done at the April meeting during a regular session and Supervisors agreed.

Mr. Saunders then rescinded his motion and Mr. Rutherford his second.

Mr. Bruguere noted that this was a user tax, Mr. Saunders noted attending those events was a choice, and Mr. Rutherford noted that most people in attendance of events were not from Nelson and would not care.

Mr. Reed then asked if there would be a line item in the budget for it if it were effective in January and Mr. Carter advised that there would be one established after enactment of the Ordinance. He added that staff would then work with the Commissioner of Revenue on the administrative process for its collection. He noted that they could check with Albemarle on how they handled it.

**School Funding:**

Staff referenced the School's Budget Summary page and Ms. McCann noted that the step increase provided a means for employees to move up their scale related to their years of tenure in the system.

Mr. Rutherford commented that the step increase would only help teachers .5% out of the 2.85% shown on page 43 of the Schools budget overview document.

Mr. Saunders commented that the School's had coaches for the teachers at TRES who could not get kids to pass the SOLs.

Mr. Rutherford then questioned how the Cosmetology teacher position worked and Ms. McCann noted that they currently had a part time position and were making it full time, so their budget showed the new position at .5 FTE. Mr. Saunders questioned the Behavior Specialist position shown in their budget and Mr. Reed noted that person dealt with kids before they got to the SRO; they tried to break the bad behavior cycle before it got that far. Ms. McCann advised that Dr. Comer had noted that they had the most trouble with kindergarten students. Mr. Reed supposed that the younger classes did not have an additional person in class if they had to deal with something and the Behavior Specialist would pull them out of class to deal with those issues. Mr. Saunders noted he understood that those classes had Teacher's Aides to help in those situations.

Mr. Rutherford asked about the new Welding Teacher position listed and Ms. McCann advised that they had been paying the Auto Mechanics teacher a supplement to teach welding at the High School. Mr. Harvey questioned how the Schools could be adding teachers when most systems were eliminating positions. Mr. Saunders supposed that the budget was padded and those funds accumulated over time. He added that the School system had less students, were still hiring more teachers, and were increasing salaries for teachers that could not get kids up to standards. Mr. Harvey noted that there was a special problem at Tye River Elementary that was not a normal issue and they used specialized help to help the

April 3, 2018

teachers there. Mr. Saunders noted that they had not gotten the problem straight there in three (3) years and the State needed to take over. Mr. Reed agreed that they could not handle the social problems there.

Mr. Harvey noted that in the past, the Board had chosen an amount of funding based on certain things that were communicated to them and they chose to use it as they wanted.

Mr. Carter then advised that the Schools were getting approximately \$800,000 in new money from the State. Mr. Harvey noted that the Schools were being provided local funding of over \$8 Million more than was required; however he acknowledged that many Schools did not operate on the minimum. It was noted that most systems had a much lower Local Composite Index than Nelson.

Mr. Rutherford then asked if they should look at the School's listed avoidable increases and pick a number. Mr. Harvey noted he preferred to have a basis for the number and Ms. McCann noted that their listed savings was also a factor for consideration.

Mr. Carter then advised that the summary sheet provided by them showed the additional funding of \$91,258 and \$155,196 that they would get with the Senate and House budgets respectively. He noted that would need to be reconciled once it was decided; however it was still to be determined.

Mr. Carter noted that staff had discussed the option of the Board giving them non-recurring money for capital projects and taking back an equal amount of recurring funds. Mr. Harvey noted they did have a lot of capital improvements needed that they could not keep putting off. Mr. Saunders noted that they were given capital money last year and they had not used it; which was not the Board's fault. Mr. Harvey noted they had made many improvements such as the ADA things that were all accomplished and Mr. Carter advised that was done in the last two fiscal years.

Mr. Harvey then supposed that the cuts in fuel and utility costs they showed were a gamble and Mr. Saunders noted those had been pretty steady over the past few years and they likely knew those costs.

Mr. Carter advised that Dr. Comer had noted to him that they had an additional list of cuts if they did not get full funding from the County. Mr. Saunders added that was the case every year and they already had it figured out. Mr. Harvey then noted that the sports teams had to do so much and it was a struggle and Mr. Carter advised that there should not be any reason for that.

Mr. Saunders noted that he thought a lot could be cut out of their budget. Mr. Harvey noted they had to work with what they were given; however he did not want to see the most important things cut and held over their heads. Mr. Saunders advised that they would use those things as leverage.

Ms. McCann advised that in comparing the proposed School budget from FY18 to FY19, there was an inordinately large difference in the 2% COLA amounts. She noted FY18's document showed it to be \$372,000 and in FY19 it was shown to be \$529,000; a difference of about 42%.

April 3, 2018

Mr. Harvey noted that the worst thing was that trust was declining between the two Boards. He added that Dr. Comer seemed to be best at handling it and had turned back over money after his first year. Mr. Saunders then related that Dr. Comer had noted to him that they had not needed the additional \$65,000 they had asked for last year and had just asked for it and got it. He added that he did not trust their budget, he thought it was loaded, and they do not follow through on what they say they will do.

Mr. Carter advised he was most troubled by the fact that if the Board maintained the status quo at level funding, they would have a compounding effect the next few years and capital improvements were not being addressed.

Mr. Harvey clarified that the total increase in expenditures was \$1,118,327 and they were asking for level funding. Mr. Carter confirmed that and noted that for that money, they were getting everything on page 40 of their budget overview document.

Ms. McCann noted the biennium budget number for next year based on the same number of students, only increased by \$100,000.

Mr. Carter then confirmed that the Avoidable Increases listed were things they did not have to do.

Mr. Reed then noted he thought that if they did not get the funding, the Board should be clear about its reasons. Mr. Carter referenced the five year revenue and expense projections that had been done by staff and he noted that without any new revenue, there was a large deficit for the County; up to \$1.9 Million at five years and if the School funding trend continued, that would increase.

Mr. Bruguere suggested that in order to remedy that issue, the County should cut whatever new funding the Schools got from the State.

Mr. Saunders noted that it was costing the Schools \$16,000 per pupil and in other localities around Nelson it was \$10,000-\$11,000 per pupil. Mr. Rutherford noted that figure did not include the \$3 Million in debt service that the County paid for Schools.

Mr. Rutherford stated that they could not go through with this and punish the socioeconomics of the county; adding that doing so guaranteed a tax increase if they kept all of the School funding in place.

Mr. Harvey noted they could talk to the Schools on the overall increase in budget; noting that it did not matter who provided the funding, they would be back for increases going forward.

Mr. Carter agreed and noted that the Board would have to consider a tax increase or make significant cuts to sustain the trend.

Mr. Saunders noted that the School's website showed lower per pupil costs for FY18 and he could only find a school in Connecticut that had that level of funding. Mr. Carter noted that northern Virginia may be close to that.

April 3, 2018

Mr. Saunders then noted that he thought the County would be doing the Schools an injustice by giving them all of the requested funding and then cutting them in the future. He added he thought it better that they did without all of it in this year rather than cutting out a whole lot next year. Mr. Harvey agreed and noted that the Board's concerns regarding the total increase in the budget should be related back to them.

Mr. Carter noted that they were at the point of deciding what to do on School funding; however they still had plenty of time to give it more thought.

Mr. Harvey suggested that even if local funding was reduced by \$1 Million, they would still be on trend to have a \$500,000 increase in funding.

Mr. Rutherford noted he would like an answer from them on why their 2% COLA numbers were so different from last year to this year.

Mr. Harvey stated he did not want to hurt the kids; however he felt comfortable cutting the overall budget back to no more than \$500,000 over what it was this year.

Mr. Carter noted that the School Board had adopted a budget and the Board would decide what level of funding it would provide. He added that they could only make a decision on local funding as they could not control state and federal funding. He added that the State was not likely to decide on their final funding numbers by the April 10<sup>th</sup> Board meeting, but rather sometime thereafter.

Ms. McCann noted the other consideration was the school nursing and bus money that was not included and Mr. Harvey and Mr. Rutherford both commented that the School's had said they did not need it.

Mr. Bruguere suggested that they have a work session after the General Assembly makes a decision and Mr. Rutherford noted he thought they should give the schools an idea of what they were thinking so they could plan ahead. Mr. Carter then advised that they were not currently under a time constraint.

Mr. Harvey stated that new state funding of \$900,000 this year and \$100,000 next year did not make much sense and Mr. Carter advised that it was based on the change in the local composite index. He added that the biennium budget for FY19-20 would be amended; so the \$100,000 could change but probably not significantly. Ms. McCann noted that when enrollment went down, so did State funding.

Mr. Bruguere then advised he had heard that Tuckahoe School was closing up and it was supposed that would not provide much of an impact to elementary schools.

Mr. Harvey then suggested that staff affirm to Dr. Comer that they were looking at a \$ 1 Million dollar decrease in their budget with Mr. Rutherford and Mr. Saunders noting their agreement and that it may be an opportunity to get capital improvements done. Mr. Bruguere then noted those funds would be used for capital improvements and Mr. Carter advised that unless they did otherwise or directed something else, the Schools intended to buy buses with the balance of the capital funding. Mr. Harvey noted that they had not had a tough budget yet and Mr. Saunders agreed.

April 3, 2018

Following discussion, there was no change made by the Board.

**III. Other Business**

**A. Establishment of 2018 Tax Rates -No Change (R2018-16)**

Mr. Harvey moved to approve Resolution **R2018-16**, Establishment of 2018 Tax Rates with no change and Mr. Rutherford seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2018-16  
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
ESTABLISHMENT OF 2018 TAX RATES**

**RESOLVED**, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors, pursuant to and in accordance with Section 58.1-3001 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, that the tax rate of levy applicable to all property subject to local taxation, inclusive of public service corporation property, shall remain as currently effective until otherwise re-established by said Board of Supervisors and is levied per \$100 of assessed value as follows:

Real Property Tax	\$0.72
Tangible Personal Property	\$3.45
Machinery & Tools Tax	\$1.25
Mobile Home Tax	\$0.72

**B. Establishment of 2018 Personal Property Tax Relief – No Change (R2018-17)**

Ms. McCann explained that the State had eliminated the personal property tax at one time and then decided against that; so now the State provided a flat amount of \$1.7 million to the County and as the values grew, the County could provide less relief. She added that she annually looked to see how much percentage-wise relief of the values the County could provide and she noted it was the same as this year at 39%. Mr. Bruguere stated he was a firm believer in this and that those taxes were very expensive.

Mr. Rutherford then moved to approve resolution **R2018-17** and Mr. Reed seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2018-17  
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
2018 PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX RELIEF**

**WHEREAS**, the Personal Property Tax Relief Act of 1998, Va. Code § 58.1-3524 has been substantially modified by the enactment of Chapter 1 of the Acts of Assembly, 2004 Special Session I (Senate Bill 5005), and the provisions of Item 503 of Chapter 951 of the 2005 Acts of Assembly; and

April 3, 2018

**WHEREAS**, the Nelson County Board of Supervisors has adopted an Ordinance for Implementation of the Personal Property Tax Relief Act, Chapter 11, Article X, of the County Code of Nelson County, which specifies that the rate for allocation of relief among taxpayers be established annually by resolution as part of the adopted budget for the County.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors does hereby authorize tax year 2018 personal property tax relief rates for qualifying vehicles as follows:

- Qualified vehicles with an assessed value of \$1,000 or less will be eligible for 100% tax relief;
- Qualified vehicles with an assessed value of \$1,001 to \$20,000 will be eligible for 39% tax relief;
- Qualified vehicles with an assessed value of \$20,001 or more shall be eligible to receive 39% tax relief only on the first \$20,000 of assessed value; and
- All other vehicles which do not meet the definition of “qualifying” (business use vehicle, farm use vehicle, motor homes, etc.) will not be eligible for any form of tax relief under this program.

**BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED** that the personal property tax relief rates for qualifying vehicles hereby established shall be effective January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018.

**C. Regional Go VA Application for Economic Development Funding (R2018-18)**

Mr. Carter stated that the proposed project would benefit the County and he noted that the project sponsor was PVCC. He added that the program would be located in Nelson to train all levels of wineries, distilleries, and breweries through PVCC either at Democracy Vineyard or the old Cold Storage building in Arrington.

Mr. Carter advised that a \$50,000 local match was required and the County was partnering with Madison County, who would provide an in-kind match of \$7,500. He advised that the County would provide \$42,500 of in kind matching with the majority in legal costs which may need to be worked around. He added that this would be a highly effective program that would be helpful to the County’s industries. He advised that the application was for a couple hundred thousand from Go Virginia that would foster workforce growth and development.

Mr. Rutherford noted he had a large part in working with PVCC on this and that it was a big deal for larger establishments because when they looked for employees, they could not find locals and they were outsourcing jobs from elsewhere; which was money that was leaving Nelson County. He noted that a big target demographic for this program was High School kids. He added that it was an exciting opportunity that would really help incorporate career technical education in the County.

April 3, 2018

Mr. Carter then noted that the application had a good chance of being approved from the regional funding allocation whereas the State pool was more competitive.

Mr. Rutherford noted the third “Whereas” of the resolution stated that “the GO Virginia proposal will expand the program to include craft brewing, cider making and distilling, and will make Central Virginia the hub of the educational component of the adult beverage industry in the Commonwealth and it is anticipated that the project will produce between twenty-three and thirty-five trained workers for entry level positions starting at \$30,000 per year, up to management positions at \$75,000 + per year.”

Mr. Bruguere stated he thought this would be subsidizing people that could afford it, as well as a whole industry and Mr. Carter noted that if the County could mitigate the legal expense, it would not cost anything but time.

Mr. Saunders then moved to approve Resolution **R2018-18** and Mr. Harvey seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2018-18  
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
ENDORSEMENT OF REGION 9 GO VIRGINIA  
GRANT APPLICATION AND PROJECT IN PARTNERSHIP WITH  
PVCC AND MADISON COUNTY FOR TALENT DEVELOPMENT AND  
ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN THE FOOD AND BEVERAGE  
MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY BUSINESS SECTOR  
(CRAFT BREWING, CIDER MAKING, AND DISTILLING)**

**WHEREAS**, Nelson County enthusiastically supports the Region 9 GO Virginia proposal for talent development and entrepreneurship in the food and beverage manufacturing industry business sector, identified as one of Region 9’s top target industry sectors, and

**WHEREAS**, Piedmont Virginia Community College has demonstrated its commitment to the food and beverage industry through its successful viticulture and enology program, which has supported the growth of the wine industry in Region 9 for more than fourteen years, and

**WHEREAS**, The GO Virginia proposal will expand the program to include craft brewing, cider making and distilling, and will make Central Virginia the hub of the educational component of the adult beverage industry in the Commonwealth and it is anticipated that the project will produce between twenty-three and thirty-five trained workers for entry level positions starting at \$30,000 per year, up to management positions at \$75,000 + per year,

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, the Nelson County Board of Supervisors does hereby endorse the referenced Region 9 Go Virginia application and project and is positioned to support the project through the required in-kind contributions in the areas of professional legal services,

April 3, 2018

marketing, Building Inspections, and Planning and Zoning support; in combination with the in-kind contribution pledged by our Region 9 partner, Madison County, for a total in-kind match of \$50,000.

*Introduced: Hesselbart Easement Issue*

Mr. Bruguire inquired about the Hesselbart easement issue and the proposed business license changes.

Mr. Carter advised that the County had suggested a resolution to the Hesselbart issue; however Mr. Hesselbart's attorney said that there still needed to be a deed of conveyance and he, Mr. Carter, had suggested it should be the HOA, which he had passed along to VDOT. Mr. Harvey suggested that the road be abandoned and given back to the property owners and it was noted he already owned the road.

Ms. McGarry advised that she had related to Mr. Bruguire that during the meeting with VDOT on the Hesselbart issue, another issue had come up regarding business license reviews for those business locations changing uses.

Mr. Carter explained that previously, when the Commissioner would get business license applications, she would send them to Planning & Zoning for review and Mr. Payne had advised they could not do that. He noted that at the recent VDOT meeting, the issue came up and Mr. Payne advised that the County could enact an ordinance requiring business license review by the Commissioner, Planning & Zoning, Building Inspections, and perhaps VDOT in order to make sure that businesses were ready to go and legitimate on all fronts. He added this review would apply to business licenses going forward.

*Introduced: Chamber of Commerce*

Mr. Saunders noted that the Chamber of Commerce wanted to get out of the basement of Union Bank and they had a new President who would get it up and going. He noted that they had approached John Bradshaw, Jr. about renting his building on Front Street and they had asked if the County could help with funding. He advised that they had a budget of \$30,000 including \$12,000 for rent.

Mr. Saunders noted that the Amherst County Chamber of Commerce was in the renovated depot owned by Amherst County and was not charged rent; however they had purchased software that they used. He added that many people and businesses did not know the Nelson Chamber of Commerce existed.

Mr. Carter asked if there would be an increase in member dues and Mr. Saunders noted that they could do that and from the last fundraiser money was given to 3-4 different entities. He added that he may see if the new President could come to the Board meeting on April 10<sup>th</sup> and Mr. Bruguire suggested he speak under public comments.

It was noted that John Bradshaw, Jr. wanted \$1,000 for 1,000 square feet making \$1/sf the going lease rate in Lovington.

April 3, 2018

Mr. Bruguere noted that the Chamber was a business that was supposed to help businesses and he was in favor of it.

Mr. Carter then advised that he had emailed George Krieger of the Nelson County Community Development Foundation as the Board had requested and he never responded. He noted that he had checked his email but had not followed up to see what had happened.

**IV. Adjourn and Continue until March \_\_\_, 2018 at \_\_\_pm, For the Conduct of a Budget Work Session to be Held in the Bridge Conference Room of the Courthouse in Lovingston.**

Supervisors briefly discussed that a budget work session prior to the Boards regular meeting was not necessary.

At 5:48 PM, Mr. Harvey moved to adjourn and Mr. Rutherford seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously by voice vote to approve the motion and the meeting adjourned.