January 24, 2013

Virginia:

AT A REGULAR MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 7:00 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors Room located on the second floor of the Nelson County Courthouse.

Present: Constance Brennan, Central District Supervisor – Vice Chair
Thomas H. Bruguiere, Jr. West District Supervisor- Chair
Larry D. Saunders, South District Supervisor
Allen M. Hale, East District Supervisor
Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor
Stephen A. Carter, County Administrator
Candice W. McGarry, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk
Jackie Britt, General Registrar
Debra K. McCann, Director of Finance and Human Resources

Absent: None

I. Call to Order

Mr. Bruguiere called the meeting to order at 7:15 pm, with all Supervisors present to establish a quorum.

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

II. Public Comments

Mr. Bruguiere opened the floor for public comments and the following person was recognized:

1. Bob Carter, President of Nelson County Historical Society

Mr. Carter distributed and read aloud a letter from the Historical Society regarding the Historic Courthouse Exhibit to be placed in the new entryway as follows:

Dear Mr. Carter:

At your invitation last spring the Board of the Nelson County Historical Society appointed three Historical Society members to serve on a working group to advise the County on consultant selection and development of a professionally designed exhibit on the history and evolution of the Nelson County Courthouse and courthouse complex. Our Society has greatly appreciated the opportunity to contribute our knowledge and expertise to this important educational project.

Please be assured that the Nelson County Historical Society Board is very satisfied with the text, illustrations, and overall design of the exhibit panels and banners, as proposed. We eagerly await the installation of the exhibit in its final form. It has been a pleasure to collaborate with the working group and Thayer Design's Paula and Mark Waller from the start to this final phase of the project. The Wallers have shown great initiative and exceptional diligence both in designing the exhibit and in responding to the contributions of the working group. They are creating an exhibit for the people of Nelson County that will be a valuable educational asset to the new judicial center for many years to come. We therefore concur in the finding of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and the Federal Communication Commission that the County has satisfied the conditions of Stipulation I.A of the Memorandum of Agreement executed for the above referenced project in December 2010.

Mr. Carter then noted the presence of Mr. McGinnis, a member of the exhibit committee and Historical Society and he added that Samantha Embrey could not be present whose father and grandfather were both Clerks of the Court.

III. Public Hearings & Presentations

A. <u>Proposed Relocation of the Office of the General Registrar</u> from its current location at 63 Court Street, Lovingston, VA (lower level of the old Health Department building) to the Daniel Rutherford Law Office located at 571 Front Street, Lovingston, VA 22949.

Mr. Bruguiere noted that the purpose of the public hearing was to take public comment on the proposed relocation of the Registrar's office to the Daniel Rutherford Law Office located at 571 Front Street in Lovingston. Mr. Carter noted that depending on what was decided, staff was ready to move forward with a lease.

Mr. Bruguiere then opened the public hearing and there being no persons wishing to be recognized, the public hearing was closed. Mrs. Britt in attendance then reiterated her stand on the move.

Mr. Saunders then moved to relocate the office of the General Registrar to the Daniel Rutherford law offices building on 571 Front Street in Lovingston and Mr. Harvey seconded the motion.

The Board discussed the possible length of the lease and Mr. Carter noted that Mr. Rutherford was open to a year or longer and that staff would work this out and bring it back to the Board. Mr. Saunders added that he had proposed a one year lease with an increase thereafter of 3% or a fixed lease for three years.

Mr. Hale then noted that the Courthouse complex had suitable space; which was more than adequate to meet the Registrar's needs at no additional cost to taxpayers and that kept the office within the administrative complex. He added that he had heard from one

constituent that supported keeping the office on grounds and was opposed to moving it to a location where the County would pay rent.

Mr. Bruguiere indicated that the move was going to be temporary and was a good move in the interim until space could be built on grounds. He added that he did not anticipate it being for more than 3 years. Ms. Brennan then noted she was more in favor of leasing the Rutherford space on a yearly basis.

There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted 4-1 by roll call vote to approve the motion with Mr. Hale voting No.

B. <u>Presentation –</u> Region Ten 2013 Legislative Priorities (Patricia Hughes)

Ms. Patricia Hughes, the Nelson County Region Ten Board member introduced herself and spoke about Plan C and Medicaid expansion. She explained the purpose of Plan C and noted that they expected a $1.5 Million dollar shortfall. She added that there would be a $500,000 shortfall locally and that this was federally mandated. Ms. Hughes then noted that 481 Nelson County residents were served by Region Ten in 2012 and that for every dollar spent, seven dollars were saved; making it a great benefit to the County.

Robert Johnson, Executive Director of Region Ten elaborated on the Medicaid Expansion and noted that Ms. Hughes was very dedicated and did a great job.

Mr. Johnson noted that part C. involved the Governor appropriating $3 Million dollars this year to provide funding for 0-3 year olds with developmental delays. He noted that an additional $5 Million dollars was needed to make up the shortfall. He added that the Governor also requested $470,000 for discharge assistance for the mentally ill. He added that Region Ten had eleven of these people that they were able to discharge and this funding was important to them.

Mr. Johnson then further discussed the Medicaid Expansion noting that 1 out of 4 people did not have insurance and were self pay. He noted that generally, they pay 1/4 of their costs. He noted that there were 30,000 citizens in the Region who would be eligible for Medicaid and 3,700 would have mental health disorders. He noted that there was a large untapped population who needed services and the expansion would allow people to get these services. Mr. Johnson reported that On October 12, 2012 Region Ten had 347 clients and 207 were uninsured.

Mr. Johnson noted that the Governor opposed this but was less so if the Feds were more flexible with State needs. He noted that he supports a population of dual eligibles with Medicaid and Medicare. He added that the Governor wanted the system to have these in a pilot program and that Region Ten would be in this pilot program. He noted that this would be a cost containment measure and they would do a survey to see how many were in the catchment area. He noted that he was excited about this because of the 100% match for the first three years; however it was decreasing thereafter. He added that jobs would be created over the next ten years and better care would be provided.

Mr. Johnson then introduced the New Director of the Nelson County Counseling Office, Francee Laverty. Ms. Laverty noted that she started in December and was a Nelson County resident. She stated that the priority at the Counseling Center was working with adults with mental illness or intellectual disability. She then went on to describe the Horizon Clubhouse activities and noted the programs with help at home so members could stay in their home community. She added that every person had a case manager, both adults and children. She then described the therapists on staff and the school therapists on site indicating a partnership with the schools and the community.

Ms. Laverty then introduced Angela, a Horizon House member who described enjoying use of the clubhouse and the people there. She noted that she has made friends there, the Staff was awesome and that they did different activities during the day. She also noted that she enjoyed the animals there, such as the hamster. She noted she has more to talk about with her family now.

Ms. Laverty then introduced another Horizon House member, who noted that she enjoyed going to the clubhouse to crochet or knit and enjoyed the people there. She added that the Staff was very willing and able to help; it was a nice place to go to and she looked forward to it.

Ms. Laverty noted that there were several artists at the clubhouse and that their works were displayed at the courthouse. She added that they have had a grant to do adaptive skiing at Wintergreen and had a Walking to Wellness initiative and they were walking daily at 12:30 pm.

Ms. Brennan then inquired as to Region Ten's relationship with ARC of the Piedmont and Ms. Laverty noted that she could not fully describe this but would follow up on it.

Mr. Johnson offered that the ARC was a strong partner and that they had a monthly meeting with the Executive Director to partner on services. He noted that their future would be tied up with health homes to provide more physical care to consumers. He then noted that CIT training was coming their way to work with police officers to work with the mentally ill.

Mr. Johnson then noted his appreciation for the support from the Board and the County and asked for continued support and advocacy for their programs.

C. <u>Presentation –</u> Thayer Design, Inc. Historic Courthouse Exhibit

Mr. Carter introduced Marc and Paula Waller of Thayer Design. Mr. Waller noted that they have been an Amherst County business since 1975 and that their specialty was exhibit and display design. He noted that they have a lot of displays around the state and that they have enjoyed being a part of this project; which was just about ready to go to production.

Mr. Waller described how the proposed banners would look in the entryway and that the panels would run along the 25 foot wall that was opposite the entry. He noted that they would show the Board the preliminary layouts of panels which would be five feet long, three feet wide, and framed on the vertical left and right with stained hardwood. He added that the medium was a plastic direct printed with UV. Mr. Waller then noted a simple scale model of the courthouse square that would be displayed that showed the evolution of the additions over the years; which would be color coded.

Ms. Waller then described each of the panels and briefly noted the theme of each as follows:

Panel 1: A New Courthouse for a New County which described the formation of Nelson County from Amherst County and the donation of the land by James Loving for the first courthouse. This panel also described elements of design used in the first courthouse and contained some related photographs.

Panel 2: The Jeffersonian Jail, CA. 1824 which described Thomas Jefferson's involvement with the Jefferson Jail located on the courthouse grounds. This panel also contains some related photographs of the jail and its design.

Panel 3: 19th Century Prosperity & Progress which described the early evolution of the courthouse square, described the importance of Court Day and the maintenance of the County's land records after Sheridan's Raid during the Civil War.

Panel 4: 20th Century Transformation which described further additions to the courthouse made in the 1900s and included various pictures taken at the courthouse square.

Panel 5: A Preservation Success Story which described the construction of the new courthouse wing relative to the historic courthouse and related photos. Included are quotes from stakeholders as to why the courthouse is a preservation success story.

Mrs. Waller then noted that the design process has been a great collaboration among many people. She then noted that they were scheduled for completion and installation in early March. She added that the committee was doing final revisions in layouts and would have one more proofing session prior to production with a one day installation.

Mr. Hale, a committee member, noted what a terrific job they had done and he noted that final committee member comments were due the following day. He then noted that they had put it all together very well so the Board could see it.

There were no further questions from the Board and Mr. Bruguiere thanked them for the great work they have done.

IV. New/Unfinished Business

A. Approval of Minutes **(R2013-05)**

Mr. Hale moved to approve Resolution **R2012-05** Approval of Minutes and Mr. Saunders 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-R2013-05
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
(December 11, 2012 and December 20, 2012)

RESOLVED, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that the minutes of said Board's meetings conducted on **December 11, 2012 and December 20, 2012** be and hereby are approved and authorized for entry into the official record of the Board of Supervisors meetings.

B. Radio Project Staff Report-Final Motorola Contract Design Review and Project Budget

This item was considered following consideration of item C.

Mr. Carter noted that Staff was presenting a summary of expenses and funding for the radio project as follows:

RADIO COMMUNICATIONS PROJECT

PROJECT BUDGET AMOUNT:	**$ 2,900,000.00**
Original Contract Amounts:	
Motorola Contract	$ 2,599,074.00
RCC Contract	$ 104,645.00
Licensing	
Total:	**$ 2,703,719.00**
Proposed Contract Changes:	
Changes to Project Scope and Equipment	$50,815.51
Additional Subscriber Units and Chargers	$80,195.07
Addition of Wintergreen Fire and Rescue Channel	$130,627.46
Addition of Equipment for NCSA (no cost to County)	($40,526.44)
Total:	**$261,638.04**
TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES AS OF JANUARY 23, 2013:	**$ 2,965,357.04**
Additional Funding Sources:	
Four For life 2012 Funding	$ 16,790.00

Four For life 2013 Funding (estimated)	$ 16,970.00
Fire Program 2012 Funding	$ 39,235.00
Fire Program 2013 Funding (estimated)	$ 39,235.00
Total:	**$ 112,230.00**
TOTAL AVAILABLE FUNDING:	$ 3,012,230.00
TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES TO DATE:	$ 2,965,357.04
BALANCE:	**$ 46,872.96**

Mr. Carter noted that the project has gone through an extensive contract design review (CDR) with all parties to confirm how many of each unit was needed. He noted that some changes were incorporated to enable Wintergreen to be a part of the system. He added that he wanted to get support to sign off on the CDR and move forward. He noted that staff was concerned that the numbers would not work however they were in the black and additional funding did not appear to be necessary. He noted that the funding for the project came from VRA, County, and State funding through the four for life and fire programs.

Mr. Harvey then noted that he did not think that the use of state funding for this was going to fly with the EMS Council.

Mr. Carter noted that this project summary did not factor in any contingency and that use of the four for life and fire funds had not been reported to the Agencies; however it was discussed with the Board as part of the process. He added that the money would be used to purchase equipment for the agencies that they would not then have to spend money on.

Ms. McCann noted that the fire fund had changed the level of accountability for what has to be submitted and Mr. Harvey indicated that they were meeting this requirement every year. Ms. McCann explained that they would have to send in bank statements and would have to provide a lot more information than in the past.

Mr. Carter then followed up by noting that staff was proposing to use these monies for only two years. He added that the County had part of FY11 monies in hand that had to be used by the end of the year.

Mr. Harvey then inquired as to how much of the Wintergreen property tax revenue had come in since their tax status had changed and Mr. Carter noted he would have to check and report back.

Mr. Harvey then noted that the additional Wintergreen cost was $130,000 and that he considered this a wash as he supposed more than this in taxes has come in. Mr. Carter noted that he thought the taxes were billed at $165,000 for the year but that he was unsure if this had been collected.

Mr. Harvey then clarified that the Fire Program Funding came to the EMS Council and was split between agencies and Ms. McCann confirmed that the Four for life funding was Rescue money and the Fire Program was fire.

Mr. Hale indicated that he would rather not divert these funds to the radio project even though the agencies benefit from it. Mr. Harvey noted that the old system would work but was illegal.

It was then noted that the County would have to make up the funding difference of $65,357 now and Ms. Rorrer noted that the narrow banding had to be done by October and that the County's radio project should be done in April.

C. VRA 2013 Spring Pooled Financing Application – Refinancing Courthouse Debt

This item was considered prior to the consideration of item B.

Mr. Carter noted that the Board had asked staff to take a look again at refinancing the Courthouse debt and he noted that Paul Jacobsen and VRA were helping this along. He noted that the original terms with RD were $7,500,000 at an interest rate of 4.13%.

Mr. Carter then deferred to Ms. McCann to present the following refinancing scenarios for consideration.

Courthouse Refinancing Considerations (VRA)

Option 1- 20 Year Term, estimated interest rate 2.43%

Year	RD Loan	Prepayment	Total RD		VRA-Estimated	Annual Savings
FY11	$ 78,611.00		$ 78,611.00		**20 Yr Term**	
FY12	$ 564,555.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 818,373.00			
FY13	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00			
FY14	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 219,733.08	$ 425,584.92
FY15	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 431,921.31	$ 213,396.69
FY16	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 430,137.06	$ 215,180.94
FY17	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 427,919.71	$ 217,398.29
FY18	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 430,160.91	$ 215,157.09
FY19	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 431,855.83	$ 213,462.17
FY20	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 428,001.80	$ 217,316.20
FY21	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 428,455.40	$ 216,862.60
FY22	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 428,131.65	$ 217,186.35
FY23	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 427,096.80	$ 218,221.20
FY24	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 430,305.10	$ 215,012.90

FY25	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 427,871.55	$ 217,446.45
FY26	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 425,011.85	$ 220,306.15
FY27	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 426,735.30	$ 218,582.70
FY28	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 427,803.15	$ 217,514.85
FY29	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 428,178.90	$ 217,139.10
FY30	$ 391,500.00		$ 391,500.00		$ 428,048.05	
FY31					$ 427,637.10	
FY32					$ 426,812.45	
FY33					$ 425,604.90	
Term Totals	**$ 7,690,166.00**	**$ 4,568,724.00**	**$ 12,258,890.00**		**$ 8,357,421.90**	**$ 3,901,468.10**

<u>Option 2- 15 Year Term, estimated interest rate 2.14%</u>

Year	RD Loan	Prepayment	Total RD		VRA-Estimated	Annual Savings
FY11	$ 78,611.00		$ 78,611.00		**15 Yr Term**	
FY12	$ 564,555.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 818,373.00			
FY13	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00			
FY14	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 246,409.21	$ 398,908.79
FY15	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 540,181.65	$ 105,136.35
FY16	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 537,636.90	$ 107,681.10
FY17	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 539,454.10	$ 105,863.90
FY18	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 535,509.50	$ 109,808.50
FY19	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 535,830.33	$ 109,487.67
FY20	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 535,352.96	$ 109,965.04
FY21	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 533,874.71	$ 111,443.29
FY22	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 536,279.71	$ 109,038.29
FY23	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 532,666.06	$ 112,651.94
FY24	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 533,037.96	$ 112,280.04
FY25	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 532,510.86	$ 112,807.14
FY26	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 536,256.93	$ 109,061.07
FY27	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 534,367.33	$ 110,950.67
FY28	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ 531,643.88	$ 113,674.12
FY29	$ 391,500.00	$ 253,818.00	$ 645,318.00		$ -	$ 645,318.00
FY30	$ 391,500.00		$ 391,500.00		$ -	$ 391,500.00
Term Totals	**$ 7,690,166.00**	**$ 4,568,724.00**	**$ 12,258,890.00**		**$ 7,741,012.09**	**$ 4,517,877.91**

Ms. McCann then reviewed both options and noted the annual savings and total savings for each. She then noted the following relative to each option:

Both options for refinancing of the Courthouse debt assume a borrowed amount of $6,705,000. The original RD borrowed principal was $7,500,000 at an interest rate of 4.13%. The savings could increase should the borrowed principal be less than noted. The pre-payment of principal in FY13 could reduce the amount to be borrowed by $253,818. The County could elect to skip the prepayment in FY13 and utilize the funds in another manner.

Annually, the Option 1 refinancing could generate about $200,000 in savings per year for 16 years. The savings over the term of the loan would be approximately 3.9 million. This assumes an interest rate of 2.43% which could vary when the bonds are actually sold. This option does extend the term 3 years beyond the current anticipated payoff in FY30.

Annually, Option 2 would generate savings of about $110,000 per year for 14 years and additional savings in the first year and the last 2 years. The savings over the term of the loan as compared to the RD financing would be 4.5 million. This assumes an interest rate of 2.14%. Option 2 provides $616,410 more in savings over Option 1. This option also provides for the loan to be paid off 2 years sooner (FY28) than the current anticipated payoff in FY30.

The RD financing does offer the flexibility to eliminate the pre-payment in any year to provide cash flow and pay only the base debt service of $391,500. The RD annual debt service is $40,222 less per year than Option 1 and $147,630 less than the estimated annual VRA debt in Option 2. The RD requirement to hold a 10% deposit reserve is excluded from consideration in these examples. The total set aside required is $391,500. These funds are restricted (unspendable) until such time as the debt is paid.

Mr. Carter added that the Option 1 scenario showed the blending of RD debt and use of a part of the double payment for financing. He added that the County would have to blend in about $40,000 of the $253,000 to make the payments. He noted that the savings were free to be used for something else as they would only be using part of the double payment and would still retain a shorter term with the added benefit of throwing off some funds for use elsewhere.

Ms. McCann then noted that the money was in the budget for this fiscal year's prepayment and if the County made this, the amount borrowed would be less and the savings would be increased. Mr. Carter then added that the Board could defer this and put the funds in the budget next year for something else.

DRAFT

Mr. Carter then noted that staff was in the position to move forward with the VRA application and the deadline was February 1st. He added that the Board would need to consider this that night or continue to next week.

The Board asked staff for its term recommendation and Mr. Carter noted that while he liked to pay debt off quickly, he liked the 20 year term because it saved about the same amount of money and there was more money to reallocate. Ms. McCann elaborated and noted that with the 20 year term, the term was extended by 3 years beyond the current plan and with a 15 year term, the debt was paid off sooner. Mr. Carter added that while staff was not ready with the FY14 budget yet, this would increase the Board's ability next year.

Mr. Carter noted that the VRA Bonds would price in May and the rate could change; however internal VRA analysis showed it would not go up more than 20-30 basis points or .2 to .3 percent.

Mr. Harvey noted that he agreed with refinancing and would like to see the debt gone as soon as possible. Mr. Carter then noted that with a VRA financing the debt could not be prepaid.

Ms. Brennan noted that it would be nice to be able to use the excess funds under the 20 year term for capital projects that have been pushed off.

Mr. Paul Jacobsen, Bond Counsel noted that the County has been building a debt service reserve of approximately $50,000 that would come back to the County.

Mr. Jacobsen then noted that which term was chosen was a matter of flexibility and that the County would only lose $36,000 of flexibility of RD commitment in the 20 year option and $140,000 in the 15 year option.

Mr. Hale then noted that if they went the 15 year route, they would still be reducing their annual payments and he thought they should do that.

Mr. Hale then moved that the Board authorize staff to pursue the refinancing of the courthouse debt with VRA, using Option 2, a 15year term at 2.14% and Mr. Harvey seconded the motion.

Ms. Brennan noted she thought they should go with a 20 year term to free up more money to be used elsewhere.

Mr. Saunders noted he thought it was a tossup and could envision needing the money for something else in the next couple of years; however he was waiting to hear the recommendation.

DRAFT

Ms. McCann reiterated that the consideration was paying the debt off more quickly and saving money or having more cash available on an annual basis that could be used in the budget.

Mr. Carter then reported that the School's request would be over a million dollars and if the Board had six hundred to seven hundred thousand dollars, it would get them closer if they did a term of 20 years. He added that unless taxes were raised or revenues bumped up, there was not anything else to give the Board more ability. He noted that he would like to go with 15 years but he thought that 20 years may be best.

Mr. Saunders noted that he did not want to have to raise taxes next year and Mr. Carter noted the increase in the Jail budget for next year and Members noted the over a million dollar request coming from the Schools. Mr. Carter noted that he preferred the shorter term but recommended 20 years for the flexibility. He added that the shorter term would save more; however the money was cheap over the 20 years. Mr. Saunders then noted he would favor a 20 year term.

There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted (3-2) by roll call vote to approve the motion with Ms. Brennan and Mr. Saunders voting No.

Mr. Jacobsen noted that he believed the County could submit its application and if the Board wanted to change the term it would not be a problem; however they would need to know in April. He reiterated that they had the February deadline to get the application in and could revisit it.

Mr. Carter then asked the Board if they wanted to defer the prepayment for this fiscal year and the Board agreed by consensus to go ahead and make the prepayment as budgeted.

V. Other Business (As May Be Presented)

Introduced: JABA Board of Directors Appointment

Ms. Brennan distributed an application submitted by Ms. Diane Harvey for the JABA Board and noted that she would like to move to recommend her for appointment. Mr. Hale seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

Introduced: Blue Ridge Crozet Tunnel Application

Mr. Carter noted that staff was submitting the tunnel application for funding and had asked surrounding localities for support. He added that the City of Waynesboro had indicated that they would like to be a co-sponsor of the application. He noted that he had indicated to them that if they did this that nothing would change with the application and the co-sponsorship would be in name only to enhance the application. He added that he

then thought this may empower them unnecessarily and he wanted to get the Board's direction.

Mr. Hale noted he did not see a problem with it and that it may improve the chances for funding. Mr. Carter confirmed that it was clear that Nelson County was the entity that would manage and expend the money and agreed that it could be helpful.

Mr. Carter then reported that the County had gotten a resolution of support from Albemarle, but not from Augusta because of philosophical differences. He noted that the Augusta Board thought the money should not be spent on projects like this.

Mr. Hale then noted that the Foundation intended to ask for funds from them for the project.

Following discussion, the Board agreed that their consensus was that they favored permitting the City of Waynesboro to be a co-applicant on the application. It was then noted that Bud Carter was working on negotiations with the property owner.

Introduced: School Division CIP Priorities

Mr. Carter distributed a handout of the School CIP program and noted that in a meeting with Dr. Collins and Ms. Irvin that the security analysis had come into play and that Ms. Irvin had noted the School Board priorities. He added that they wanted to wait to see what comes out of the security evaluation first but that this would be their first priority.

He added that their other priorities were listed in an e-mail and that it was noted that the Honeywell study was being done, with the premise being that the savings pay for the capital costs.

Members then agreed by consensus to schedule this topic for the next meeting

It was noted that there may be some federal and state monies for security items coming forward. Mr. Carter then noted that the security analysis would start at Rockfish Elementary and the Paulsens would meet with all relevant parties and would do a table top exercise.

Introduced: Legislative Issues

Mr. Hale noted that he had spoken to David Blount about transportation funding issues and noted he was stunned by the Governor's recommendations to the General Assembly to do away with the gasoline tax and replace it with an increase in sales tax. He then questioned if it was worth the Board sending the legislators a letter on this.

He then noted that research shows that there has been no increase in 24 years and it was based on the gallon and there was no relationship to the cost of infrastructure or the cost of gas. He added that he did not think replacing it with sales tax was the answer and it

also removed it from a separate stream of revenue for transportation funding and put it in the General Fund. He noted an increased tax on diesel was proposed also. He then distributed a handout from ITEP on the subject. Mr. Hale reported that David Blount said that there were a lot of proposals on this and it was likely to come out as the Governor has proposed. He added that if this was done, the State would lose revenue from those that traveled through Virginia.

Members then briefly discussed the state of the transportation system in Virginia and that it needed to be adequately funded. Instituting tolls and indexing the tax rate were suggested means of addressing this. Mr. Hale concluded by suggesting the Members call the legislators on this.

Introduced: Website Grade

Ms. Brennan thanked Ms. McCann and staff for the update to the website on the County's financial information so the County would not get a D grade again; which she noted was not related to its financial situation at all.

Introduced: Jefferson Building

Mr. Saunders noted that the work in the Jefferson Building was finished and that Mr. Parr was pleased about the brick in there. He then asked if the Board wanted to get a price from them to continue with the next phase.

Mr. Hale agreed that it looked good and that they thought the interior walls could be used. He noted that he thought it would be worthwhile to get a price to clean up the rest of the walls in there. The Board then agreed by consensus to get a price quote.

Introduced: Buddy Moore Resolution

Mr. Saunders inquired about a Resolution honoring Buddy Moore and Mr. Harvey noted that staff needed some more history for this.

Introduced: Magistrates Building

Mr. Saunders noted that he would soon have two prices for restoring the windows and doors in the Magistrates Building.

Introduced: Courthouse Concrete

Mr. Harvey asked about an area at the new front steps with old concrete and Mr. Saunders noted that he was upset about the concrete being poured in the cold weather and the contractor not using appropriate blankets. He added that it had been exposed to the elements as well and that it would be tested in seven days. Mr. Saunders then noted that he did not think it would last.

Mr. Bruguiere noted that they could have poured the concrete during the nice weekend weather prior to the cold and Mr. Saunders described having noticed tire tracks up on the curb by the dispatch center door that looked terrible. Mr. Hale inquired as to who was responsible to oversee this and Mr. Saunders reported that F&R was there but that Blair was responsible. Mr. Carter agreed and noted that the General Contractor should have a supervisor on site.

Members briefly discussed the weather forecast for the next week showing some warmer temperatures and it was noted that there was a lot of rain that would affect the concrete as well.

Mr. Hale suggested it would be worth Mr. Carter calling Blair to tell them to keep an eye on this and to not pour concrete if the conditions were not good. Mr. Saunders then noted that concrete took seven days to cure. They then discussed that calcium chloride in ice treatments would tear up the concrete; however new chemicals did not have this and were better. Members then suggested that staff find out what was used on the Courthouse walkways etc.

VI. Adjournment

At 9:08 pm, Mr. Harvey moved to adjourn and Ms. Brennan seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously by voice vote to approve the motion and the meeting adjourned.

DRAFT