

AT A CONTINUED MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 6:30 p.m. in the Nelson County High School Library, in Lovingsston, Virginia

Present: Board of Supervisors
Jesse N. Rutherford, East District Supervisor - Chair
Robert G. "Skip" Barton, South District Supervisor – Vice Chair
Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor
Ernie Q. Reed, Central District Supervisor
J. David Parr, West District Supervisor
Candice W. McGarry, County Administrator
Amanda B. Spivey, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk
Linda K. Staton, Director of Finance & HR

School Board
Shannon Powell, West District - Chair
Ceaser Perkins, South District – Vice Chair
Margaret Clair, Central District Trustee
Janet Turner-Giles, North District Trustee
George Cheape, East District Trustee
Dr. Amanda Hester, Superintendent of Nelson County Public Schools
Shannon Irvin, Assistant Superintendent for Administration
Tammy Ponton, Administrative Assistant to Superintendent
Les Campbell, Supervisor of Maintenance
Mike Cargill, Supervisor of Technology

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rutherford and Ms. Powell called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with five (5) Supervisors and five (5) School Board members present to establish a quorum.

Ms. Powell asked for the School Board members to amend the agenda to include Ms. McGarry’s presentation. Mr. Cheape made a motion to approve the addition of Ms. McGarry’s presentation and Ms. Clair seconded the motion. The School Board members unanimously approved the motion to amend the agenda.

Mr. Rutherford thanked everyone for being there. He noted that he was looking forward to working together with the new County Administrator and new School Superintendent. Ms. Powell echoed Mr. Rutherford’s appreciation for all being present at the meeting. She commented on the importance of building a strong unified County and community that would be shared at the school level. Mr. Rutherford and Ms. Powell both noted the importance of working together and were optimistic about moving forward.

II. PRESENTATIONS

A. Dr. Amanda Hester, Superintendent of Nelson County Public Schools

Dr. Hester provided a presentation on Pathways to Success. She reviewed the mission of Nelson County Public Schools (NCPS), which was to educate students to become skilled, responsible citizens, productive and enlightened who contribute to society. She noted that the vision of NCPS was empowering generations through excellence in education. She reported that all four (4) schools were fully accredited for the 2022-2023 school year. She noted that they would continue to focus on growth and closing achievement gaps in the best way possible.

Dr. Hester provided a Student snapshot. She reported that the school division had 1,473 students in Pre-K through 12th grade being educated in the school buildings. She showed a breakdown of student demographics (White - 69%, Black - 14%, Hispanic - 12%, Multi-racial - 5%, American Indian – less than 1%, Asian – less than 1%). She noted that 61% of the student population was economically disadvantaged.

Dr. Hester highlighted the programs of study available at each of the schools. She reported that the high school offered Dual Enrollment courses, Early College Scholars and Program, Blue Ridge Governor’s School, Advanced Placement courses, Career and Technical Education courses (CTE), Fine and Performing Arts, Talented and Gifted, ESOL (English as a Second Language) and SPED (Special Education). She noted that the middle school also had CTE courses available, Fine and Performing Arts, Talented and Gifted, ESOL and SPED. Lastly, she reviewed the Elementary School Programs which included Core Areas of learning, Art, Music, Talented and Gifted, and ESOL. She reported that there were a wide variety of athletics and extracurricular activities available at both the high school and middle school.

Dr. Hester provided an Employee snapshot. She showed a list of the degree types with the number of teachers per degree: Bachelors (63), Masters (80), Doctorate (2) and Technical (4). She then provided a list with the number of employees per job category: Division Level Administrators (6), School Level Administrators (9), Supervisors and Coordinators (9), Cafeteria Workers (22), Custodians (18), Bus/Car Drivers (53), Teachers (148), Instructional Support Staff (School and Division Level – 17), Support Staff for Maintenance, Technology, and Transportation (12). She noted that every position was critical to operating the schools effectively and efficiently. She commented that going forward, they wanted to focus on recruiting high quality employees for key positions. She noted that the Human Resources department had done a great job getting positions filled for the start of the school year. Dr. Hester indicated that the School Division was currently looking for a Spanish language teacher, and noted the difficulty in finding one.

Dr. Hester explained that they were making a deliberate attempt and effort to build a positive culture and climate. She noted that the theme for the year was OneNelson which was to promote synergy with the schools, county and community. She pointed out that it took everyone to successful.

Dr. Hester reported that the school division had participated in community wide engagement opportunities and used social media to get community members involved. She noted that October was Kindness month and they were working to promote that. She showed a photo of the mural painted by Honor Society students that said “Be the “I” in Kind”. She reported that the schools participated in Unity Day, painting kindness rocks, as well as OneNelson days where the staff wore green OneNelson shirts. She noted that they had Division wide staff tailgate for Homecoming. Dr. Hester reported on the Rockfish Zombie Run, which was a fun community activity held at RRES that was well attended. She noted that they were working to create a OneNelson award and had already received over 30 nominations. She also noted that they had pushed OneNelson t-shirts out to the community for purchase to make feel more included. Dr. Hester mentioned other events like Drive Your Tractor to School Day and Touch-a-Truck.

Dr. Hester noted that they had just completed the 50th day of school that day. She explained that her vision for the School Division going forward was to build a foundation where NCPS was a model for rural school divisions as well as all Virginia school divisions and beyond. She reported that school administration would continue to focus on student growth and narrowing the achievement gap. She noted they also wanted to focus on professional development opportunities to help their teachers and administration. She pointed out that it couldn't just be about data and numbers because they were working with children and wanted them to be successful and maximize their potential.

Dr. Hester acknowledges that there were some challenges as they experienced decreasing enrollment. She noted that greater numbers of economically disadvantaged students and special education students required more resources. She commented that the issues they were having with staffing were similar to other areas across the state, but also noted that the lack of housing did make it more difficult to find teachers. She explained that they didn't want to fully staff with brand new teachers who had been teaching five years or less. She noted that they were still settling into their teaching style. She indicated that they needed veteran teachers to help. She noted that they would continue to be creative in how they recruited people. She commended the work done by Human Resources, School Administration and teachers in helping to recruit staff. She also noted that they had requirements from the Virginia Department of Education that they had to abide by.

Mr. Barton commented on the recruitment of teachers, noting it was tied into housing. He felt recruitment was worth a discussion, noted that everyone needed to be engaged in recruitment. He stated that the quality of the schools was dependent on the quality of teachers. He thought they needed to find a way to provide childcare for teachers and possibly use that as a method of recruitment. He commented that one of the reasons people weren't working was because childcare was so expensive. He noted that a childcare program could be a form of training by having students involved. Mr. Barton commented on the recruitment of quality teachers, noting that young teachers became great teachers if they loved their children. Dr. Hester noted the goal of having all teachers and staff proud and happy to work in the school division. She agreed that having childcare could be a great thing. She noted they were dealing with some current childcare struggles in the division and working with local organizations to find solutions but they could look at expanding it into a provision for teachers.

B. Ms. Candice McGarry, County Administrator

Ms. McGarry noted that they were preparing for budget season. She started her presentation by discussing the beginning preliminary general fund balance on a cash basis. She explained that they started with a fund balance of about \$26.5 million. She noted they had \$7,573,239 in committed fund balances as of 6/30/22. She then reported that the FY23 Budgeted Use of Fund Balance was \$7,563,490. She explained that the generally accepted accounting principal recommended a 90 Day Operating Cash Requirement (25% of General Fund Operating Budget) which was \$5,775,177. She noted they had an unassigned FY23 General

Fund Balance as of 7/1/2022 at \$5,654,449. She explained that the best use of fund balances was for one-time non-recurring expenditures.

FY23 Beginning Preliminary General Fund Balance – Cash Basis

Available General Fund Balance is comprised of all funds including those funds that are committed or assigned for specific uses. Unassigned General Fund Balance is determined as follows:

Estimated Ending FY22 Fund Balance (unaudited):	\$26,566,355
Committed Fund Balances as of 6/30/22:	(\$7,573,239)
FY23 Budgeted Use of Fund Balance:	(\$7,563,490)
90 Day Operating Cash Requirement (25% of GF Operating Budget)	<u>(\$5,775,177)</u>
FY23 General Fund Balance – Unassigned at 7/1/22	\$5,654,449

Ms. McGarry reported that the FY22 Audit was wrapping up. She explained that the audited General Fund Balance would be on a Modified Accrual Basis, which would differ from the current Cash Base Analysis.

Ms. McGarry then reviewed the Primary Local Revenue sources for Nelson, noting that it was primarily a property tax revenue county. She noted that tax revenues included the 2022 Real Estate and Mobile Home tax, which assess \$0.65 per \$100 in value. She reported that the FY23 value of the penny based on real estate tax was \$307,449. She noted that the FY23 Budgeted Revenue for Real Estate and Mobile Home Tax was \$20,224,832. She then reported that the 2022 Personal Property tax was \$2.79 per \$100 in value with the FY23 Budgeted Revenue at \$6,204,102. She explained that the 2022 Machinery and Tools tax was \$1.25 per \$100 in value, but it declined over time due to depreciation. She noted that the FY23 Budgeted Revenue for Machinery and Tools was \$72,189.

Ms. McGarry pointed out that the tax rates showed 2022 because the tax rates were on a calendar basis (January – December) while the budget was based on a fiscal year basis (July – June).

Ms. McGarry reported that they had a Public Service Tax, which was assessed by the State Corporation Commission (SCC) for utilities. She noted they had budgeted about \$1 million for FY23 Public Service Tax revenues. Ms. McGarry reported that the Local Sales and Use Tax was another source of revenue. She noted that the tax rate was 1% of Local Sales, which the FY23 Budgeted Revenue was about \$2 million.

Ms. McGarry then reviewed the Meals and Lodging Tax. She noted that the Food and Beverage (Meals) Tax was 4% of Local Sale. She reported that for FY23 they had a Budgeted Revenue of \$1.1 million. She then explained that the Transient Occupancy (Lodging) Tax was 5% of the amount charged. She noted that the FY23 Budgeted Revenue from Lodging was about \$1.1 million.

Ms. McGarry reported that the Total Local Revenue budgeted for FY23 was about \$36 million. She did note that local revenue collection was affected by shifts in economic conditions. She noted concerns about what the collection rate could look like in terms of local revenues if there were a recession.

Ms. McGarry provided a snapshot of Nelson County’s tourism based economy. She noted that an October 4, 2022 press release shared the 2021 Tourism Revenue for Nelson County as compiled by the Virginia Tourism Corporation, which reported that a total of \$83 million was spent locally in the following categories: Lodging (\$33.3 million, which included second home spending), Food and Beverage (\$17.8 million), Recreation (\$11.9 million), Transportation (both ground and air, \$10.8 million) and Retail (\$9.1 million). Ms. McGarry reiterated that this was money spent in Nelson, not money that was collected by the County in taxes. She noted that the spending was up 27.7% from 2020. She reported that those sectors employed 603 people, and, generated \$16.5 million in labor income, \$1.8 million in state taxes, and \$3.3 million in local taxes.

Ms. McGarry reported that the FY23 debt capacity was around \$57 million at the start of the year. She explained that the debt capacity was the amount of money the County had the ability to borrow while maintaining financially sound ratios in various categories used to evaluate financial position. She reiterated that it was not the amount of money they were paying, it was the amount that the County had the ability to borrow and pay the debt service on. She noted that as of March 2022, a \$57 million debt capacity was based on the following assumptions: a tax exempt interest rate of 4.0-4.25%, or a taxable interest rate of 4.75-5.0%, and an amortization term of 20-25 years. She reported that to date, \$2.6 million utilized to purchase Larkin property. She noted that the County’s financial advisor, Davenport and Company, would be providing an updated debt capacity analysis in November, based on current market conditions. She explained that the higher interest rate climate may impact the County’s total capacity and they needed to get a sense of where they were in the current economic climate.

Ms. McGarry provided a review of the major capital projects that would impact debt capacity. She noted that they were in the planning phase for a new office space that would house the Department of Social Services, and potentially the offices of Planning and Zoning, and Building Inspections. She noted that they were looking to locate the building at the County's Callohill property behind Food Lion. She also noted that the County was in the planning phases of development at the Larkin property. She reported that the County was considering a recreation center and fields, as well as other uses. She noted that the School Division capital improvement projects would also need to be considered as anything done at the schools would affect the debt capacity.

Ms. McGarry listed the County projects/initiatives in process:

- Comprehensive Plan Update
- Larkin Property Development Planning
- New office space planning for Department of Social Services, Building Inspections, Planning & Zoning
- Public Safety Microwave Network Upgrade
- Adult Drug Court Implementation
- Future Solid Waste Disposal Planning
- County Employee Compensation Study
- Tye River Bridge Deck Repairs on the Blue Ridge Railway Trail
- Application and Management of Various Grants and Studies
- FY22 Audit Completion

Ms. McGarry provided the FY24 General Budget Calendar to show the County's budget process. She noted that from October through December, they would work with departments and agencies to collect expenditure budget requests. She then explained that from December until February, staff would work to develop draft expenditure and revenue budgets. She reported that from February through March, staff would introduce the draft budget and conduct work sessions with the Board of Supervisors. She noted that by mid-April, the Board of Supervisors would set the tax rates and the Personal Property Tax Relief (PPTRA%). She explained that any changes in tax rates required a public hearing. She noted that they were all working together to build the budget and it would be helpful to know where the Schools was, so that the Board of Supervisors could take that into consideration in building the budget and look at any tax revenue enhancements that may or may not be necessary. She reiterated that the tax rates needed to be set by mid-April because the tax tickets had to go out. She then noted that the Board of Supervisors would conduct a budget public hearing around March to May. She noted that the new fiscal year budget had to be adopted and appropriated by June 30th.

Mr. Reed asked if the compensation study would be complete prior to the budget discussion. Ms. McGarry noted that they were pushing for that to happen. She reported that the compensation study was in process and they were working to get a completion date.

Ms. Clair asked what second home spending meant. Ms. McGarry indicated she would find out what exactly that meant. Ms. Clair asked if the 600 people lived in Nelson or if she knew where they lived. Ms. McGarry noted she did not know, but would try to find out.

III. SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY VISION/GOALS

Ms. Powell introduced the subject of School and Community visions and goals. She explained to both Boards that this would be a time for each board member to share their vision and goals for the school and the community. She pointed out that the school system continued to be a reflection of the community. She noted that whatever happened in the community would be reflective for the schools. She encouraged both Boards to evaluate visions and goals that are common for the school and community. She asked that they realize that each board may have different goals but the common concern is for Nelson County.

Mr. Rutherford noted the meeting taking place the next day regarding the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Cheape thanked everyone for being present. He noted that County had challenges, and they always would be because they were a small locality. He noted that he understood that it took a long time to get the funding and they did not want to go out and spend it all at once. He suggested that the Board work together on the long term planning of the County and School System. He recommended that the Boards examine the capital improvement plan together, especially for the schools as they are aging. He noted that Tye River Elementary was 27 years old, Rockfish River Elementary was 25 years old, while the Middle School was about 20 years old and the High School was 67 years old. He pointed out that while the High School did have some minor improvements over the years, most recently in 2003, they had some infrastructure issues in the building that would need to be addressed in the future. Mr. Cheape noted that they would need to consider what student enrollment would look like, whether it would continue to trend down, go up, or stay the same. He noted that Ms. McGarry and Dr. Hester worked well together, and he was looking forward to the future and excited to be meeting together. He agreed that housing was a big issue and noted the

difficulties that teachers have had in finding housing in Nelson that was in their price range. He noted that the updates to the Comprehensive Plan might be able to help address some of those issues.

Mr. Reed commented that some of the recruitment tactics to bring teachers in, were the same that were used in economic recruitment for the County. He noted that childcare, housing, salary scales, schools, quality of life and recreation options were critical assets for the schools and the County. Mr. Reed referenced the ongoing pay study in for County positions, noting he would be interested in not only the capital budget going forward, but the salary budget going forward as well. He noted School Board had aspired to make improvements to the salary scale for teachers and support staff. He pointed out that knowing the County and Schools both had the same goal of improving salaries, became relevant to what the taxing options were. He stated that it was exciting to know the goals that both the County and Schools had were similar, if not identical, noting that many of their challenges were also the same. He stated that this was an opportunity to work together.

Ms. Clair thanked Dr. Hester and Ms. McGarry for their hard work, noting she was very excited about the conversation and hoped that the Boards would continue to work together. She agreed with Mr. Reed that the goals of the Schools and the County were the same. She noted that they wanted every child in the County to have the best chances they could have to learn and be successful. She noted that they also wanted to make it possible for the children to come back and live in Nelson if they wanted. She stated that there were two aspects to Nelson County, they had a group of wealthy people, and then the other aspect was that 61% of the student population was disadvantaged. She noted that they needed to find and address achievement gaps. She suggested that it may be possible to see if they could ask more of certain populations in order to help other portions of the population. She noted that she was looking forward to hearing the rest of the group's goals for the Schools and the County. She noted the work in updating the Comprehensive Plan and how that would help them make decisions going forward. Ms. Clair noted it would be interesting to see how they worked together to meet their goals.

Mr. Harvey expressed his concerns about the possible need to increase taxes. He pointed out that not everyone could pay more taxes, some people were doing what they could just to pay now. He said it was difficult to ask for some people to pay more.

Mr. Barton asked about tax relief and how far it could go. Ms. McGarry noted that some of it was done by code and some was outlined in the County code. She noted that she would need to review the criteria of the program to see what could be adjusted. Mr. Rutherford noted some tax relief was done by state code. Ms. Clair noted her intention was not to get into taxation, rather that they should get creative with addressing the issues. Mr. Barton agreed with Mr. Harvey that many people were struggling to pay their taxes. He commented that they also had people in expensive homes at Wintergreen that felt the County's taxes were really low. He asked if there was a way to tax people differently. Mr. Rutherford suggested that the tax conversations could be had with the Treasurer and Commissioner of Revenue to better understand the code and enforcement.

Ms. Powell acknowledged Mr. Perkins as the 2022 City of Charlottesville policeman of the year. Mr. Perkins conveyed his thoughts on salary studies, and other studies, as being unnecessary spending of money. He further explained that they already knew what they needed to do. He noted that the money spent on studies could be better put towards what was needed to be done.

Mr. Parr thanked Dr. Hester and Ms. Powell, and commended them for their leadership. He noted his visions were high level and short. He explained that they needed to have a tax rate that supported all of their budget needs without negatively impacting the tax payer. He pointed out that they needed to grow the tax base and add opportunities and infrastructure to attract families and businesses to come to Nelson. He noted that adjusting the tax rate and taxing individuals at different rates were not the answer. He hoped the Comprehensive plan and Larkin property would help provide opportunities for the future. He noted that they wanted to get people to move to Nelson. He pointed out that they also needed to boost some business infrastructure to help with the tax base. He noted Mr. Reed's comments on recruiting assets and felt it all tied in together.

Ms. Turner-Giles expressed her appreciation for everyone being present to discuss their goals together. She noted her goals were for excellence in the community and excellence in the school system. She wanted to make sure that the County continued to thrive. She noted that both Boards needed to find areas of synergy to work together as "One Nelson". She cited the employee compensation study for the County, noting schools had come to the table many times to make sure that their employees were paid equitably. She noted that to attract and retain employees, it took salary, but it also took housing. She pointed out that they wanted their employees to live in the County and spend their money in the County. She stressed the need for affordable housing for all, noting they needed to provide an opportunity for everyone to live and work in Nelson County. She hoped to find common ground and work together on areas of synergy to make Nelson County what it needed to be.

Mr. Barton agreed that they all shared the same issues and they all had a real love for Nelson County. He discussed the importance of education, noting that all people needed to be able to think for themselves. He stated that it was important to have schools that respected the people who lived in Nelson. He stated that it made sense to have better schools, and that it would draw more people into the County while providing the best education possible for the children. He wanted to have best education for their children. Mr. Barton noted that they needed recreational opportunities for parents to take their children to. He asked where they could start with adding housing in Nelson, noting the newly purchased property. He pointed out that diminishing enrollment was seen as a problem, noting that it was a problem in a sense but it didn't increase the cost of education, rather increased the cost of education per student. He noted that he didn't see it as a financial burden. He expressed concerns about discussions of consolidation. He felt that in his experience, primary schools of about 200-300 students made sense. He didn't feel that consolidation would help the children, but it might help save money. He noted that it was important that the teachers and principals get to know each child and for that child to feel safe. Need person in classroom to feel that they are involved in the classroom and learning. He didn't think a study needed to be done to tell them that it was a bad idea.

Ms. Powell noted that they wanted every student to be successful, regardless of their background. She further noted that they wanted every community member to be successful. She expressed concerns regarding an increasing number of students who were economically disadvantaged. She noted that they had a high Local Composite Index, declining enrollment and aging infrastructure. She noted that regardless of how few or many students the Schools had, the goal was to educate every individual student to their best of ability. She pointed out that there were challenges that weren't within their control, but still could affect them. She noted that it was critical that everyone was a part of each other's plan. She stated that they should not discuss consolidation until they knew what the plan would look like 5-15 years into the future. She asked that the Schools be included in the discussions on the Comprehensive Plan and new property. She asked that they continue the working relationship between the two Boards that had started. She commended Ms. McGarry and Dr. Hester for the working relationship they modeled. Ms. Powell noted they had challenges ahead, but at the end of the day, every student had to matter. She pointed out that as the student population changed, they would need more and more resources each day.

Mr. Rutherford thanked everyone for being present. He noted that he had spent some time thinking about community vision and goals. He noted complexities between local government, the school division, and other agencies. He pointed out that it was not a simple fix. He noted that the need for housing was not an easy fix. He stated that the Schools were a reflection of the community. He referred to the statistic that showed 61% of the student population was disadvantaged. He noted that could be seen throughout the County. He pointed out that some people had found it no longer affordable to live in Nelson County. He commented that they needed to be ambitious when it came to housing stock in Nelson. He noted a recent visit to Danville and how they were trying to address housing and jobs. He reported that during the conversation, the question was which came first, the chicken or the egg. He noted that the answer he received was a pregnant chicken. He explained that they couldn't talk about housing without talking about job opportunities. He noted that the County was working on updating the Comprehensive Plan as well as the Zoning ordinance. He commented on the work done during the budget planning to have over \$50 million available in debt capacity. He noted that work was done with the schools in mind also. Mr. Rutherford noted that they needed to look at how to keep and retain families, to either see population remain steady or even grow a little. He commented that they had challenges ahead but they did have the tools they needed to accomplish a lot of things and they would do the best they could. He noted that the conversation needed to continue and they had to be able to meet one-one-one and two-by-two as things came up. He pointed out that if there were ambitions on tax rates, those discussions needed to happen now, he noted they weren't just looking out for staff, but the community as well.

Mr. Cheape agreed that there needed to be more discussions between the two Boards. He felt that the Boards needed to consider meeting once per quarter so that when the Schools presented their budget, it wouldn't be a surprise. Mr. Rutherford noted they had gotten to meeting bi-annually, which had not happened in while. Mr. Barton noted that Dr. Hester and Ms. McGarry would also need to be meeting and talking. Mr. Rutherford asked that staff confer to determine what meeting schedule could work best. Mr. Cheape and Ms. Powell suggested meeting at the beginning of the year as they get closer to finalizing the budget. Mr. Rutherford asked when the schools looked at having their budget complete. Dr. Hester and Ms. Irvin noted mid-March was the target date and February if possible. Mr. Rutherford noted it would make sense to have a meeting in January or February. Both Boards suggested looking at February as a target meeting date.

Mr. Cheape suggested possibly having joint work sessions if needed as it related to the schools. Mr. Rutherford noted that it was going to be a different year and he was confident in the administration staff on both sides.

IV. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN DISCUSSION

Ms. Powell began the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) discussion. She noted that the costs for the roof and brick projects at the High School were moving targets. Mr. Rutherford noted that he and Mr. Barton were serving on the County's office building committee and they had seen how quickly costs could change.

Ms. Irvin noted School's Capital Improvement Plan, stating that she wished to have it in the County's Capital Improvement Plan as a subset, instead of on its own. She noted that the plan could not be accomplished without the work of the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Irvin noted that the School Board had requested that the capital improvements be identified based on the degree of need. She explained that some of their costs do not go away and should probably be under Operational Costs. She noted that School buses were one of those costs. Ms. Irvin reviewed the recurring costs from the School's Capital Improvement Plan.

- School Buses (4 per year) - \$440,000
- Safety Equipment - \$312,500
- 2 Cars - \$50,000
- 2 Vans - \$50,000
- Cameras for Buses - \$12,000

She explained that buses had to be replaced on a regular bases and the state recommended a 15-year replacement schedule. She explained that they also had safety equipment for which they made a yearly application for grants to attempt to take some of the burden off of County tax payers. She reported that they needed vans and cars to drive students to Lynchburg and Charlottesville every day. Ms. Irvin noted that they also had some really young students who were too little to ride on a bus. She commented that the enrollment numbers did not include Head Start and MACAA.

Ms. Irvin then reviewed the list of Immediate Concerns. She noted that in conversation with Gary Harvey of Architectural Partners, that he suggested to take the 2021 roof estimate and adjust it by 15% for a more current estimate. She indicated that the marked was volatile and it was hard to guess costs.

Ms. Irvin reported that the 2021 cost for the roof was \$5,451,345, and Architectural Partners had indicated to increase that cost by 15%. Mr. Rutherford asked if the Schools had ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funds to contribute to the roof cost. Ms. Irvin indicated that they could contribute but could not cover the full cost. She reported that they had \$1 million coming from State in current year, need to spend by June 30th or it would be carried over. She then noted that they had \$1.7 million of ESSER III monies allocated which brought the School's contribution to \$2.7 million. Ms. Irvin then explained that the Schools had obtained an HVAC grant with a local match which allowed them to have some work done at Tye River and the Middle School. Ms. Clair noted the Schools were dealing with pressing time frames. Ms. Irvin confirmed that they were, and they were dealing supply chain issues. Ms. Irvin indicated that they may need ask the County to carryover the \$1 million after June 30th. She noted that the federal funds would need to be spent by September 2024. Mr. Rutherford asked if the Schools needed to issue an RFP for the roof project. Ms. Irvin noted there was a roofing cooperative procurement through the State and they had been talking to a company out of Charlottesville. She explained that that had ballpark estimates but would not know the cost until bidding subcontractors. Mr. Rutherford noted they move forward in getting the costs so the County could work through funding on their end.

Ms. McGarry noted the Board of Supervisors had dedicated over \$2.8 million in their ARPA funds for the project. Ms. Irvin noted that would bring the funding up to \$5.5 million. Mr. Rutherford suggested that the schools put the project out for bid so the County could move forward. Ms. McGarry asked if any future renovation project could impact the money they were looking at spending on the roof and brick. Mr. Les Campbell noted that was possible because of the roofing vents. The group discussed that there was a chance that some of the roofing work done would need to be undone with potential renovations in the future. Mr. Rutherford asked if those concerns were brought up to the architect. Ms. Irvin indicated that they had not discussed it with the architect as they were unsure what funds may be available in the future. She noted that if they couldn't do anything else, they needed to fix the roof because it was leaking. Ms. Powell noted that they needed to be having conversations about long term plans for School capital projects. Ms. Turner-Giles noted that conversations were necessary to look at future needs. She also expressed concerns about what else was going on under the leaking roof. Ms. Powell noted that everyone was in agreement that they did not want to have wasteful spending. She explained that the challenge with the project was the time constraints on some of the money. Mr. Cheape noted there were a lot of original pieces in the building along with some replaced items that were nearing the end of their life.

Mr. Rutherford noted that the high school renovation was on the Board's mind with the debt capacity. Ms. Powell noted by looking at the future and projected enrollments, they could plan for what they needed the building to look like. Mr. Perkins commented on the different roofing sections, noting that one section had two roofs and one had three. He noted there could be limitations on installing the roof over the existing

layers. Mr. Barton noted that the capital improvements needed to be done. Ms. McGarry pointed out that building infrastructure could have a big impact on learning. Dr. Hester noted that some of the improvements weren't just things they wanted, they were needed. Ms. Powell noted that the tour of the school building would provide a better understanding of what they were asking for. She acknowledged that the schools were a part of the pie, a big part of the pie, that the Board of Supervisors was trying to manage.

Mr. Reed noted the money available to go towards the project and its time constraints. Ms. Irvin pointed out that the questionable section of the roof was the old wing of the high school. She suggested looking at that separately to see if it was worth doing now or wait and do that section later. Everyone agreed that was a good option to consider. Ms. Irvin noted that she would have the roofing consultant at the next School Board meeting to discuss the roof and get the ball rolling. She noted that the brick was a separate cost estimate at \$929,327 and she would anticipate another 15% increase on top of that. Mr. Reed noted that one issue had been getting the information quicker. He asked that the School Board provide that information to the County staff as soon as it was received so they could get to work.

Ms. Irvin noted the red section in the Capital Improvement Plan and indicated that these were immediate concerns that they wanted to address first.

- High School Roof - \$4,745,475
- Building Envelope Repair NCHS - \$829,998
- Road/Parking Lot Repair NMS/NCHS - \$413,793
- Welding Facility Upgrade NCHS - \$682,615
- Storefront Windows NCHS/NMS - \$50,000
- HVAC Control Upgrade at RRES - \$200,000
- Auditorium Lighting NCHS - \$95,738
- Pavement Repair and Resealing - \$125,000

Ms. Irvin then showed the list of Blue section items, explaining that these were things they would like to accomplish within the next three years. She noted that the full renovation of the high school was included within that section. She reported that the architect had indicated that the renovation would be a 44-month project cycle.

- NCHS Old Wing Renovation - \$24,517,032
- Playground Equipment Upgrades at RRES/TRES - \$50,000
- Weather Barrier Installation at TRES - \$1,533,500
- Rooftop AC Units at RRES - \$250,000
- Dust Collector System at NCHS - \$94,500
- Bollards at TRES & RRES - \$82,500
- Window/Door Replacement at Old Maintenance Building - \$58,100
- HVAC Controls at NCHS - \$300,000

Ms. Irvin then discussed the last section, which was the green section. She noted that these were desired improvements if money was available.

- Gymnasium Air Conditioning at RRES - \$75,000
- Field House/Concession Stand - \$1,227,000
- Football Field Scoreboard - \$20,000
- Electrical Service Upgrade NCHS Athletic Complex - \$50,000
- Tractor for Maintenance - \$35,000
- Overflow Parking at TRES - \$150,000
- Field Repair & Bleachers at NMS - \$15,000
- Auditorium Entrance Enhancement - \$200,000

Ms. Irvin then provided further detail by listing the Capital Improvements by location as well as order of priority and color coded based on level of need. She then showed a full list of all of the Identified CIP Projects in descending dollar order. She explained that the School Board tried to handle the projects that they could afford but they weren't necessarily in order of priority. She noted that the establishment of a Capital Improvement Fund would help the two Boards tackle the red items (immediate concerns) together. Ms. Irvin noted that the audit report was coming up and it would identify what the carryover funds would have been. She asked the Board to consider what the carryover amount would have been and put that money towards the CIP projects.

Mr. Rutherford noted that the Board of Supervisors would likely need to have a retreat as they look at the overarching Comprehensive Plan of the County projects. He suggested they look at meeting in December, noting they needed to discuss recreation, housing, and other opportunities. He indicated that they needed for a plan of action and suggested they possibly bring the CIP committee together again and have Mr. Gary

Harvey from Architectural Partners present. Ms. Powell asked that the Board of Supervisors consider what their five to ten year plan might be. Mr. Rutherford noted that would come out with the Comprehensive plan. He explained that things like housing were more like a twenty year goal. Ms. McGarry felt it was important to acknowledge that any investment made, would take time to trickle down to schools and community.

Ms. Powell suggested that they take a quick tour through a portion of the high school to get an idea of the needed improvements. She asked the Boards to limit conversation until they returned back to the meeting room.

V. TOUR OF NMS AND NCHS

Mr. Les Campbell provided a tour of the old wing hallway in the high school, as well as one of the classrooms. He pointed out the condition of the floor tiles in the hallway, along with the crackling sounds that were made when someone walked down certain portions of the hallway. He noted that it was very difficult to find replacement tiles, should they become damaged. He showed one of the classrooms along the old wing, pointing out the lack of receptacles in each classroom. He noted there were only two receptacles, which meant that teachers were having to utilize extension cords and power strips. Mr. Campbell showed walls that were in need of plaster repairs. He explained that the plumbing needed to be upgraded. He also reported that it was difficult to regulate the heating and cooling because of the age of the building and the HVAC equipment.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS (AS PRESENTED)

The Boards had no other business to discuss.

VII. ADJOURN AND CONTINUE TO OCTOBER 25, 2022 AT 7 P.M. FOR A JOINT MEETING BETWEEN THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

At 8:51 p.m., Mr. Barton made a motion to adjourn and continue to October 25, 2022 at 7 p.m. Mr. Harvey seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion by vote of acclamation and the meeting adjourned.

Mr. Cheape made to motion to adjourn and Ms. Turner-Giles seconded the motion, all Trustees were in favor of the motion and the meeting adjourned.