

Virginia:

AT A CONTINUED MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 10:00 a.m. in the Former Board of Supervisors Room located on the fourth floor of the Nelson County Courthouse in Lovingston, Virginia.

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rutherford called the continued meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. with four (4) Supervisors present and Mr. Harvey arrived shortly after.

II. FY24 BUDGET WORK SESSION

A. Review of Requested Information from 3/28/23 Work Session

Ms. McGarry provided a review of the information that was requested at the March 28th budget work session. She noted that one of the items requested had been the County employee salary increase calculations, including the state reimbursements, as well as the School Division employee salary increase and state funding. She provided a spreadsheet to the Board with the breakdown in costs. She indicated that she did not plan to review the information in depth but they could return to it as needed during the work session. Ms. McGarry noted that she had also provided copies of the FY24 Debt Service Schedule to the Board as requested. She reported that the value of the penny in real estate was calculated at \$316,995. She explained that the value of the penny came from taking the FY24 Estimated Real Estate Tax Revenue of \$20,604,678 and dividing it by \$0.65 (current real estate tax rate), which equaled \$316,995. Ms. McGarry noted that the Board had been provided with copies of the Local Choice Health Insurance Renewal Analysis. She also provided Transient Occupancy Tax Calculations which showed the additional revenues that could potentially be brought in based on an increase in the rates.

	<u>6% Rate</u>	<u>7% Rate</u>	<u>7.5% Rate</u>	<u>8% Rate</u>	<u>9% Rate</u>	<u>10% Rate</u>
Total Revenue	\$ 2,160,000	\$ 2,520,000	\$ 2,700,000	\$ 2,880,000	\$ 3,240,000	\$ 3,600,000
Revenue at 5% Rate	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 1,800,000
New Revenue	\$ 360,000	\$ 720,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,440,000	\$ 1,800,000
5% Restricted Revenue	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,080,000
Unrestricted Revenue	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,440,000	\$ 1,620,000	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 2,160,000	\$ 2,520,000

Ms. McGarry reported that the Nelson County Broadband Authority funds on hand as of February 28, 2023 were \$310,841. She indicated that the FY23 operational revenue was \$160,277 and the operational expenditures were \$49,445, leaving a net positive cash flow of \$110,832. She pointed out that would be what the Board could expect going forward if the County were to assume the operational costs and revenue from the Broadband Authority.

Ms. McGarry noted that Mr. Barton, Mr. Reed and the Board had inquired about any real estate tax relief ability using income as a basis for that relief. She indicated that she had included The Code of Virginia Title 58.1 Taxation, Chapter 32 Real Property Tax as a reference for the Board. She explained that the only authorized real property tax relief that included an income based component was the tax exemption for Elderly and Handicapped. She confirmed that the County was already offering tax relief to Elderly and Handicapped. Mr. Barton asked if the elderly and disabled tax relief could be increased. Ms. McGarry noted that she did not think that it could be increased. She explained that the Commissioner of Revenue used a matrix to determine eligibility and the level of relief a person could receive. She noted that the level of relief was not the same for everyone as it based on net worth and household income. She indicated that she would have to determine whether any of the matrix components could be adjusted or not.

Ms. McGarry reported that the tax relief currently provided in County Code Article II Real Property Tax were the Abatement of Tax Levy on destroyed or damaged buildings, and a Special Assessment for Land Preservation. She reported that there were a few items not in the County Code, noting there was a local option to have a partial tax exemption in redevelopment or conservation areas or rehabilitation districts. She noted that there was an exemption for Disabled Veterans being provided for by the Commissioner of Revenue, however it needed to be added to the County Code. She indicated that they also needed to add the Exemption for Surviving Spouse of Members of the Armed Forces Killed in Action to the County Code. Ms. McGarry noted that there was a location option to provide exemption for Surviving Spouses of Certain Persons Killed in the Line of Duty. She reported that there were a variety of other exemptions, credits, partial abatements, apportionments and classifications that were local options to include.

Ms. Staton reviewed decisions made at the March 28th budget work session. She noted that the Board had decided to take on the additional health insurance costs for the employees which brought the recurring revenue to \$1,090,462 and non-recurring revenue at \$369,212 for a total General Fund Contingency of \$1,459,674. Mr. Reed asked what was remaining in contingency for FY23. Ms. Staton reported that FY23 contingency was currently \$938,279. Ms. McGarry noted they were expecting to use all of the contingency for the increase in CSA (Children's Services Act) expenditures.

B. Agency Funding Review

The Board discussed agency requests and made the following funding decisions:

Nelson County Health Department \$357,526
Nelson County Local EMS Council \$495,962
Nelson County Extension Service \$57,216
PVCC \$2,513
Region Ten \$150,000
Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District \$34,067
CASA \$3,500
Central Virginia Economic Development Partnership \$10,000

Community Investment Collaborative (CIC-CVSBDC) requested \$8,534. Ms. McGarry noted that many agencies were losing funding due to the end of COVID funding received from the federal government. Mr. Rutherford suggested level funding. Ms. McGarry reported that the Board had funded them \$4,000 over the past few years. The Board was in consensus to level fund at \$4,000.

Foothills Child Advocacy Center – Ms. McGarry noted that they were asking for \$1,000 more. Mr. Reed reported that their services had expanded in Nelson over the past year and were able to serve twice the number of children from the year before. The Board was in consensus to add the additional \$1,000 as requested for a total of \$5,000.

Gladstone Senior Meals \$9,000
Habitat for Humanity – Piedmont Region \$2,500

JABA – Ms. McGarry reported that JABA was asking for \$5,075 in additional funds. She noted that the majority of their increase was to cover the costs of increasing minimum wage. Mr. Reed noted JABA had asked for flat funding the past four years. Ms. McGarry noted that the County had an aging population, so they would need more services in future. The Board was in consensus to fund the additional \$5,075 as requested for a total of \$106,575.

The Board decided to discuss JAUNT later in the meeting.

Jefferson Madison Regional Library – Ms. McGarry noted that the total increase the Library was asking for was \$13,584, which was a 3.9 percent increase. She reported that the County share of the regional cost was decreasing by about \$2,500. She noted that part of the cost increase was an added bookmobile and outreach services, as well as it being Year 2 of their minimum wage adjustment plan. She also noted increases to health insurance costs. Ms. Staton noted that the Library was fully funded with an additional \$16,610, which they could decrease to the requested \$13,584 amount. Ms. McGarry noted that the library was also considering a book kiosk in which the initial cost for the unit would be covered by the Friends of the Library and the County would be contributing toward the operational costs of the unit (i.e. power, internet). The Board was in consensus to fund the additional \$13,584 for a total of \$359,570.

MACAA – The Board was in consensus to fund an additional \$4,590 as requested for a total of \$36,000 in funding to MACAA.

Nelson Community Development Foundation \$69,661

Nelson County Economic Development Authority \$3,100

Nelson County Humane Society/Almost Home SPCA - \$0, none requested. Ms. Staton noted that they had not made any requests for the last few years. Mr. Barton commented that they received a lot of contributions.

OAR/Community Corrections – The Board was in consensus to fund an additional \$932 as requested for a total of \$12,907.

Mr. Rutherford noted that they did not have requests for funding from Rockfish Senior Meals, Schuyler Senior Meals or Sexual Assault Resource Agency (SARA). Ms. McGarry confirmed that no requests had been received.

Shelter for Help in Emergency (SHE) – Ms. McGarry explained that SHE offered shelter for victims of domestic violence and noted that the Victim Witness Coordinator had a good working relationship with the group. She indicated that they were asking for an additional \$426. The Board was in consensus to fund the additional \$426 for a total of \$8,926.

TJEMS Council – The Board was in consensus to keep the staff recommendation to level fund TJEMS at \$10,000. Mr. Rutherford suggested getting input from the Nelson County EMS Council as to what the impact from TJEMS might be.

TJPDC – The Board was in consensus to fund the additional \$210 requested for a total of \$20,622.

Virginia Career Works \$0

Virginia Institute of Government \$1,000

Wintergreen Performing Arts \$4,500

The Board discussed the JAUNT funding request. Mr. Reed noted that JAUNT had provided some service expansion options for the County, along with the costs for those services. Mr. Reed pointed out that the Nelson share of the cost was contingent on receiving sufficient federal funds to cover half of the cost. He did not know if the Board could make the funds conditional pending JAUNT's ability to obtain the federal funding. He noted that the cost to add in the Nelson Circulator on Wednesdays through Fridays would be an additional \$65,967. Mr. Rutherford asked if there may be any questions that they had for JAUNT before they made any decisions.

Mr. Reed suggested skipping the new service to Stoney Creek and Wintergreen for the time being. He felt that it may be worthwhile to look at Countywide demand response ridership. Ms. McGarry noted the cost for demand response was around \$215,000. Mr. Reed suggested it would be good to get clarity on what the demand response would look like. Mr. Rutherford suggested flagging JAUNT and revisit it later. Ms. McGarry indicated that it would take an additional \$36,647 in order to maintain current services from JAUNT. Mr. Barton asked what it would cost to provide the Gladstone Seniors with a monthly shopping trip to Lynchburg. Ms. McGarry noted that she would have to follow up on that. Mr. Reed noted that the Countywide circulator was the only service that could possibly include Gladstone and Fleetwood. Ms. McGarry noted that the Countywide circulator cost was probably so high do to the geography of the County.

Ms. McGarry reported that for FY24, the County would be receiving a one-time credit of about \$23,151. She explained that JAUNT was returning money to the localities and Nelson opted for a credit. She also reported that she had been in touch with Tracy Henke of the Nelson Community Wellness Alliance (NCWA). She noted that the Wellness Alliance had received the \$3 million grant and they were looking to collaborate with the County on funding some expanded JAUNT services that would suit their needs as well. Mr. Reed noted he could follow up with Ms. Henke and see if they were close to determining what that could look like. Ms. McGarry noted that the County would get the \$23,151 credit regardless of the funding scenario chosen by the Board. Mr. Rutherford suggested revisiting JAUNT later in the week and asked Ms. McGarry to follow up with JAUNT regarding the Gladstone trip and other questions from the Board in regards to demand response. Ms. McGarry noted that JAUNT was citing the increase due in part to decreases in CARES funding. Mr. Parr commented that he had an issue with agencies referencing loss of COVID funding. He noted that they should not have relied on that funding as a permanent thing.

Ms. McGarry noted the proposed new service Stoney Creek/Wintergreen circulator from JAUNT. She reported that Wintergreen had previously contributed to JAUNT for that service. She suggested that they could reach out to the resort to see if they may be able to contribute. Mr. Reed noted he could follow up with Wintergreen.

The Board took a brief recess.

C. General Fund Expenditures

Staff reviewed General Fund Expenditures. The Board was in agreement to fund the following departments:

Board of Supervisors – Ms. McGarry noted that there was an increase in medical plan costs and an increase in professional services related to audit expenses. Ms. Staton also noted a small increase in the books/subscriptions line, as well as a mileage reimbursement increase. She also reported that the County's CPA costs were increasing. The Board was in consensus to fund their budget for FY24 at \$155,308.

County Administration – Ms. McGarry noted that the overtime line had been reduced some. She explained that part of the reduction was in salary and wages as Mr. Carter had retired. She also noted that mileage had been reduced as well as telecommunications. The Board was in consensus to fund County Administration at \$327,426.

County Attorney – Ms. McGarry noted that they were projecting additional increases in FY24 with the Region 2000 lawsuit. The Board was in consensus to fund the County attorney budget line at \$100,000.

Commissioner of Revenue – Ms. McGarry noted that there was an increase in requested funds to help cover the higher postage costs and office supplies. The Board was in consensus to fund the Commissioner of Revenue as recommended by staff at \$293,958.

Treasurer – Mr. Rutherford noted that staff had reduced the Treasurer's budget by \$1,750. Ms. McGarry explained that reductions funds from repairs and maintenance, as well as surety bonds and office supplies. She noted that the big increase in their budget came from an increase in cost for investment services, which meant that banks were charging more in fees for the investment of funds. The Board was in agreement to fund the Treasurer at \$383,496.

Finance – Ms. Staton explained that like the County Administration office, they had a reduction in the salary and wages line. She noted an increase in the professional services line for audits, which the cost was shared with the Board. She also noted an increase in cost for the Bright financial software. She noted that they were looking to utilize some offsite training which made a slight increase. She stated that they were looking to implement a staff appreciation program for employees at a cost of \$1,000. She explained that they wanted to work on employee retention. Ms. McGarry indicated that they did not know what the staff appreciation would look like but they would return to the Board for approval once they had a plan. The Board was in agreement to fund the Finance budget line at \$358,013.

Technology – Ms. McGarry explained that maintenance service contracts were the bulk of the increase. Ms. Staton noted that the Technology department had a lot of items fall into capital outlay as they were large purchases like radios. Ms. McGarry noted that some of the increase was due to computer replacement that was on rotation. Mr. Reed noted that the Technology department was going to be working with the Service Authority to update the GIS. He asked if any of that work was reflected in the budget. Ms. McGarry was unsure where things were on the mapping work with the Service Authority but she noted that funds were in the budget to cover parcel maintenance of GIS and data development. She assumed that a budget amendment would be needed once a cost was determined for the additional mapping with the Service Authority. The Board was in agreement to fund Technology at \$331,890.

Land Use Panel – Ms. McGarry reported that staff had reduced the Land Use budget by \$1,500 as they did not historically spend that much. Mr. Reed asked how often the Land Use panel conducted reviews. Ms. McGarry noted that they were done annually. She indicated that there was more expense during a land use reapplication year as everyone had to reapply. Mr. Barton asked who was on the panel. Ms. McGarry explained that the Commissioner of Revenue appointed the panel and they were typically people with an agriculture background who checked the applicants' properties to ensure the property use was in line with the application. Mr. Barton asked if the panel found any inaccuracies. Ms. McGarry indicated that she was unsure but the Commissioner of Revenue would know. She noted that there had been a pay increase included in the budget for the Land Use panel. The Board was in agreement to fund the Land Use panel budget at \$4,068.

Board of Elections – Ms. McGarry reported that the Board of Election line had increased about \$10,000 which was related to the pay rate increase for the Electoral Board and the poll workers. Ms. Staton also pointed out that there would be a June primary, so they would also have to have early voting starting 45 days ahead. Mr. William Smith, Electoral Board member for Nelson County, noted that there was no legislation pending to change the 45-day voting rule. Ms. McGarry also noted that the cost for programming the voting machines had increased. The Board was in agreement to fund the Board of Elections line at \$66,263.

Registrar – Ms. McGarry indicated that the salary and wages line in the Registrar's budget was higher. Ms. Staton reported that the Registrar was requesting to hire a chief deputy registrar due to changes that could occur in the department. Ms. Staton explained that this would allow preparation for a smooth transition

and noted that the Registrar wanted that person to begin work on July 1st. She also noted that they had a person potentially in line with a lot of experience, and it was the staff recommendation to fund that position for half of the year. Ms. McGarry noted that they wanted to bring in someone with experience and had developed a succession plan. She indicated that the Electoral Board would hire the position. The Board approved the Registrar's budget per staff recommendation at \$221,003. Mr. Rutherford noted that if Ms. Britt needed additional funding for the position beyond staff recommended for the half year, they could discuss it further.

Courts - Ms. McGarry noted that the increase included the adult drug court. Ms. Staton noted that the drug court was an additional \$172,000 for the first year. Ms. McGarry confirmed that the cost was passed through as they would receive the revenue back on the other side. Ms. Staton noted that the grant funding was coordinated with the Commonwealth Attorney's office. Ms. McGarry reported that the Court Services detention home costs were included. She noted that they were projecting \$120,000 for FY23 in expenditures. She explained that they were putting in \$50,000 for FY24 Court Services detention home costs. Ms. McGarry noted that Circuit Court was showing a decrease in funding but that may be grant related. The Board was in consensus to fund the Courts at \$753,783 as recommended by staff.

Commonwealth Attorney – Ms. McGarry noted that there had not been any budget decreases by staff. She explained that part of the decrease related to the part-time salaries in FY23 while the Commonwealth Attorney was on military leave. Ms. Staton noted that the Victim Witness budget was included in the Commonwealth Attorney budget. She explained that there had been a reduction in federal grant funding for the Victim Witness Program. Ms. McGarry noted that asset forfeiture funds were not included in the budget as those funds would be re-appropriated in the fall. She reported that it was the same for the Sheriff's Office's asset forfeiture funds. Mr. Barton asked about the Commonwealth Attorney salary and what he was paid. Staff noted that it was a Compensation Board position and the County supplemented his pay also. Ms. McGarry indicated she could provide that information to Mr. Barton if he wanted. The Board was in agreement to fund the Commonwealth Attorney's budget as recommended by staff at \$641,449.

Sheriff – Ms. McGarry pointed out that the Sheriff's Office also showed a decrease but their budget was not cut. She explained that they had a lot of grant funding which varied from year to year. She noted that the grant funding was not appropriated until the grant was awarded or money was received. Ms. Staton reported that the Sheriff's Office was asking for their evidence clerk position to be reinstated as they had given the position up to fund other opportunities. She explained that the requested funding for that position was included in the \$53,153 taken out by staff so that they Board may consider and discuss it. Ms. McGarry noted that the Compensation Board would fund around \$13,000 to help offset the cost of the position. She reported that the asset forfeiture proceeds had a balance of \$115,000 that would carry forward in the fall once the certified balance was known. Mr. Reed felt evidence clerk position should be added back in and funded. The Board was in agreement to add \$51,053 to cover the requested position which brought the Sheriff's total budget for FY24 to \$2,215,866. Ms. McGarry noted that the Sheriff had requested funding for four new vehicles, which they would discuss during Capital Outlay.

Public Safety and Emergency Services – Ms. McGarry noted that the Public Safety line was mainly the Dispatch and Emergency Communications Center budget. She pointed out that their budget had about an \$89,000 increase. Ms. McGarry noted most of the increase was in the Salaries and Wages line. She reported that they were looking to fill the Emergency Communications Supervisor position in FY24, which was approved in FY23. She explained that the position had not been filled as they had been trying to fill regular Dispatch positions. Ms. Staton noted that John Adkins had requested more funds for training as the department needed to work towards being fully trained. She also noted that the Salaries and Wages reflected the change in the pay scale, which would be effective on July 1st. Ms. McGarry also indicated that they had included about \$20,000 in overtime. The Board was in consensus to fund Public Safety and Emergency Services as presented at \$686,817.

Emergency Services Council – Ms. McGarry explained that this was for the whole Emergency Services Council Department. She noted that the Local Emergency Services Council was part of the overall budget. She explained that there were still costs like disability insurance for the agencies, Line of Duty coverage, gas, oil, and grease. She also pointed out that the budget contained the Fire Fund and Four for Life funds. She noted that the Fire Funds and Four for Life Funds were appropriated after the start of the fiscal year when they knew what the amounts were. Mr. Harvey noted that the Fire Funds were just pass through monies. Ms. McGarry confirmed that the funds went to the EMS Council to be distributed among the departments. Ms. Staton noted that it was the same process for the Four for Life Funds. Ms. McGarry noted that they had increased the funds in the Gas, Oil and Grease line as they had spent more than budgeted in FY23. The Board was in agreement to fund the Emergency Services Council at \$631,090 as presented by staff.

Ms. McGarry provided an updated contingency amount at \$1,029,797.

E911 Program – Ms. McGarry noted that the E911 Program budget saw some increases in maintenance service contracts relating to the radio communication system and the microwave, which increased about

\$30,000. She pointed out that the cost for contractual services had also increased. She explained that the contractual service increase was offset on the revenue side as they received some reimbursement from NextGen 911 Services in the amount of \$31,000. The Board was in consensus to fund the E911 Program budget as presented by staff at \$645,418.

Forest Fire Service \$20,986

Paid EMS Program – Ms. McGarry noted that the County contracted with Wintergreen Fire and Rescue to run the EMS program. She explained that part of the increase was due to being fully staffed and in FY23, the Board had approved a second 24-hour service ambulance. She noted they had an anticipated increase for worker's compensation, medical supplies and mileage. Ms. McGarry explained that the County paid mileage for the use any non-County owned ambulances. Mr. Rutherford noted that staff had cut about \$33,000 from the request budget. Ms. McGarry explained they had backed out about \$500 from other operating supplies based on historical expenditures. She noted they had deducted about \$4,500 in computer equipment. She explained that they had not typically spent that much and there was not a specific need noted. Ms. Staton explained that Curtis Sheets had the funds as a placeholder. She explained that the Toughbooks computers used by EMS staff had exceeded their useful life, but they intended to use them until they were no longer functioning. Ms. Staton indicated that the amount requested for the computer equipment would only replace two Toughbooks. She then noted that they had backed out the funds to replace an auto pulse device at a cost of about \$14,000. Ms. Staton explained that Wintergreen Rescue was loaning an auto pulse device to the Nellysford station until they could get a new one. She noted that there was a new auto pulse device that had been purchased as part of a new ambulance, but they still needed a second one. Mr. Reed noted it may be better to have Wintergreen asked for the funds when they needed them for computer replacements. Ms. McGarry agreed they could do that, noting that was why they had reduced the computer line by \$4,500. Ms. McGarry noted that Mr. Sheets had also requested a \$14,200 contingency for the Paid EMS budget which staff had backed out. The Board was in consensus to fund the Paid EMS at \$1,401,614 as recommended by staff.

Regional Jail – Ms. McGarry reported that the Regional Jail increase was due to an increase in the 5-year average percentage of usage (14.7 percent). She noted that it also included an interest only portion of the interim financing to provide for Architectural and Engineering (A&E) services related to the jail renovation project. She reported that the interest only payments were about \$38,0000 and the rest of the increase was operational. Mr. Barton noted that there had been significant increases in jail expenses since 2020. He indicated that he wanted to have a conversation with the Commonwealth Attorney on the number of bed days, noting that he wanted to know what to anticipate for the future. Ms. Staton reminded the Board that the implementation of the adult drug court was an attempt to alleviate the incarceration rates. Ms. McGarry noted that the Commonwealth Attorney was utilizing alternative incarceration methods like home electronic monitoring (HEI). Ms. McGarry noted that she could send more information to the Board on the jail budget details. She reported that the FY23 5-year average percent of inmate population was 12.99 and for FY24 the average percent of inmate population was going to be 14.74. She noted that operational budget for FY24 was \$1,354,606 with the debt service portion \$38,766. She commented that from FY18 to FY22, it looked like the inmate population had decreased but because it was based on a 5-year average, they were still including some of the higher years. The Board was in consensus to fund the Regional Jail budget at \$1,393,432 as presented by staff.

Building Inspections – Ms. Staton reported that Building Inspections had requested a new position, noting that was a portion of what had been backed out of their budget. She explained that the new position proposed was to be a shared administrative assistant with Planning and Zoning to aid in handling phone calls and people coming to the office so that the rest of the staff could focus on their work. She noted that the position had a projected annual salary projected at \$35,000. She noted that with the benefits added in, it brought the position cost to \$50,824. Ms. Staton noted they were looking to back out a few costs based on historical costs, like postage, telecommunication and office supplies. Ms. Staton noted that the full cost of the new position was currently included in the Building Inspections budget. Mr. Reed was in support of the new position. Ms. McGarry noted that the logistics of the shared position would need to be worked through. She reported that the salary and wages line increased staffing changes within the department. Ms. McGarry noted that for the proposed new position, they would need to determine who the supervisor would be. Mr. Reed noted that could be determined internally. Ms. McGarry agreed. The Board was in consensus to add in \$50,824 for the new position for a total of 429,232 for the FY24 Building Inspections budget.

Animal Control – Ms. McGarry reported that Mr. Wright had requested a shelter manager position. She explained that the shelter manager would be responsible for managing the shelter and maintaining compliance with regulatory agencies. She noted that the shelter manager would also be ACO (Animal Control Officer) certified to be able to assist in the field. She indicated that staff had removed the shelter manager position for the Board to consider. She reported that Animal Control currently had two part-time shelter attendant positions, noting that the full-time shelter manager position would replace one part-time shelter attendant position. Ms. McGarry noted that they had backed out \$6,720 out of the professional services line, which was a new request to provide funding to organizations that help transport dogs out of County and state to other no-kill shelters. She noted it was backed out so that the Board could consider it,

March 31, 2023

as it was a new thing. Mr. Reed suggested they revisit Animal Control as a subsequent meeting to allow more time to review and consider the new requests for funding.

D. General Fund Revenues

III. OTHER BUSINESS (AS MAY BE PRESENTED)

The Board looked at dates to meet the following week. It was noted that they needed to make decisions regarding the tax rates by April 6th.

IV. ADJOURNMENT (CONTINUE TO APRIL ____, 2023 AT ____ FOR A BUDGET WORK SESSION)

At. 12:26 p.m., Mr. Parr moved to adjourn and continue to April 3, 2023 at 3:00 p.m. Mr. Reed seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, the Board approved the motion by vote of acclamation.