

Virginia:

AT A CONTINUED MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 3:00 p.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
Susan Rorrer, Director of Information Systems

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rutherford called the continued meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. with five (5) Supervisors present.

II. FY24 BUDGET WORK SESSION

A. General Fund Expenditures

The Board picked back up at General Fund Expenditures and staff reviewed the budget request submitted by Animal Control. Ms. McGarry reported that the main request from Animal Control was for the addition of a new shelter manager position. She noted that staff had taken the request out of the budget for the time being, which was part of the \$70,761 budget reduction. She explained that the other main budget item was a requested increase in professional services, which would enable Animal Control to provide support when needed to community partners like Hopeful Hounds, who help transport dogs to other no-kill shelters. She noted they had also removed \$1,000 from the telecommunications line as it was historically not needed, and a small amount from the uniforms line. Mr. Harvey asked about transporting dogs out of area. Ms. McGarry explained that Hopeful Hounds would transport dogs that need to be rehomed to no-kill shelters in other areas like New Jersey. She noted that Animal Control Supervisor Kevin Wright wanted to be able to assist with the transportation costs since they were transporting dogs from the County’s shelter. She indicated that Mr. Wright had requested around \$6,700 towards the professional services line to provide the assistance.

Mr. Parr asked how Animal Control was currently staffed. Ms. McGarry indicated that the office was pretty busy, but they had Animal Control Supervisor Kevin Wright, Animal Control Officer Ethan Wood, and newly hired Animal Control Officer Jesse Johnson. Ms. McGarry explained that Mr. Johnson was a former Nelson County Sheriff’s Office deputy who applied for the Animal Control Officer position, and the County was able to retain him. Mr. Parr and Mr. Rutherford agreed that Mr. Johnson would be a great fit for the department. Ms. McGarry reported that Animal Control also had Ms. Miranda Brogan employed as a part-time shelter attendant. Ms. McGarry explained that Animal Control was requesting to make one of the two part-time shelter attendant positions a full-time shelter manager position. She pointed out that staff had pulled out the costs for the full-time shelter manager position and the \$6,700 in funds requested to assist other agencies in relocating dogs. She indicated that it was not necessarily pulled out of the budget as a staff recommendation to remove, rather it was something the Board may want to consider. Mr. Barton asked for Ms. McGarry’s thoughts. Ms. McGarry noted that the full-time position could be beneficial as there were a lot of regulations associated with maintaining the animal shelter. She pointed out that all of the inspections by the state veterinarian had always passed. She noted that those inspections were often done at random, and not scheduled in advance. She pointed out that Mr. Wright wanted the full-time shelter manager to also be ACO (Animal Control Officer) certified so that they may be able to assist in the field if needed. Ms. McGarry indicated that there would be some fees coming to the Board for consideration that could help offset costs. She noted that if the second part-time position was not filled, it would also help offset the costs of the full-time position. Mr. Reed noted that he was not averse to the new full-time position, he suggested they could consider it and see if the revenues could make it work. The Board was in consensus to add \$61,741 for the new full-time position for a total of \$337,704. They did not add in the \$6,700 of additional funds requested for the professional services line.

Medical Examiner - Ms. McGarry noted they put in \$160 but the amount could be amended if needed. She estimated that the cost was about \$20 per need for services by the medical examiner. The Board was in consensus to keep the funding at \$160 for the Medical Examiner as recommended by staff.

Waste Management – Ms. McGarry noted that Waste Management was currently fully staffed. She reported that they had reduced the recycling expense line by \$8,000 to reflect historical expenditures. Mr. Reed asked if any additional services had been proposed like education. Ms. McGarry noted that no specific

services had been included. She explained that tire removal had been reduced by \$3,000 as they were no longer accepting commercial tires, so they were not paying as much to have them hauled away. She noted that they still accepted residential tires, just not commercial tires. Ms. McGarry reported that there was an increased tipping fee at Region 2000 Services Authority, but the budget had been based on a higher tonnage, so she felt that the projections were okay. She indicated that they had budgeted \$393,000 for the tipping fees. The Board was in consensus to fund Waste Management at \$1,410,209.

Building and Grounds – Ms. McGarry reported that the budget for FY24 had some equal offsets. She explained that they reduced the water and sewer expense line by about \$5,000 and the telecommunications by about \$500. She noted there was an increase in the agricultural services and supplies line by about \$5,000. She then noted that \$500 had been added in for rent and lease. Ms. Staton indicated that the mowing was included in the agricultural services line. Mr. Reed asked if Building and Grounds overlapped with Parks and Recreation in terms of mowing services. Ms. McGarry noted that it did, as mowing services covered the Ryan Ballfield and possibly a few other places. Mr. Reed asked if Sturt Park may be included in that line for mowing in the future. Ms. McGarry noted they could use the \$70,000 in the Sturt Park line. The Board was in consensus to fund Building and Grounds as recommended by staff at \$860,026.

Motor Pool – Ms. McGarry explained that the Motor Pool line included expenses like vehicle insurance, repairs, supplies, gas, oil and grease. She noted that Motor Pool was increasing by \$30,000 for gas. The Board was in agreement to fund Motor Pool at \$200,000 as presented by staff.

At Risk Youth – Ms. McGarry explained that the At Risk Youth costs fluctuated a lot. She reported that they had budgeted \$1.6 million for FY23 and they were on track to spend \$2.5 million. She noted that they had spent \$1.9 million to date in FY23. She reported that they were mandated costs by the State, from the Office of Children’s Services. She indicated that the County did get money back on the revenue side, but all of the expenditures were booked in the expense line. Ms. McGarry reported that Children’s Services Coordinator Allison McGarry was projecting \$2 million for FY24. Ms. McGarry noted that Ms. Staton was on the CPMT Board and asked if she may be able to explain why the costs were so much higher. Ms. Staton explained that more children were being served and there were also increases in expenses. She noted that more children were in the program for longer periods of time. Ms. McGarry explained that there were children in residential placements for various reasons, children attending day school for autism and more foster kids as well. She indicated that there was an increase of \$365,043. She also noted that staff was watching the expense amount to see if any monies needed to be transferred for the current fiscal year. Mr. Barton asked about the state funds. Ms. McGarry explained that the local amount was about 31 percent and the rest was from the state. She noted that the total amount was budgeted in the expense line and the state monies would help offset part of it. Mr. Rutherford noted that there were not many options on changing the budget. The Board was in consensus to fund the At Risk Youth budget at \$2,028,756 as presented by staff.

Parks and Recreation – Ms. McGarry noted that the main additional request from Parks and Recreation was for a part-time recreation aide, which was calculated to be \$23,791 in salary and benefits. She reported that staff had backed out the request as it was new. She noted there were some other costs that had been reduced based on historical data. She also noted about \$3,000 had been taken out of trail maintenance. Ms. McGarry noted that Mr. West, Director of Parks and Recreation, had a \$60,000 Virginia Outdoors Foundation (VOF) grant in the amount of \$60,000 and about \$20,000 would be spent in the current year, with the remaining \$40,000 carrying over into the next fiscal year. Mr. Reed noted staffing help was needed for Parks and Recreation as the demands on the department were increasing. Ms. Staton noted that Recreation Technician Mr. Demetrius Vaughan shifted his schedule when needed so that he could be available to cover games in the evenings and on weekends, while keeping his overtime amounts low. She noted that if Mr. West had to away from the office while Mr. Vaughan was off, there was no one else present to cover the Recreation office. Ms. McGarry noted the potential expansion of recreation on the Larkin property in the future. Mr. Reed suggested that adding a part-time position now, could turn into a full-time position later down the road. Mr. Parr felt it would be good to have someone present in the office to assist the public. The Board was in consensus to add \$23,791 to fund the part-time position, which brought the Recreation budget to \$370,397.

Ms. McGarry noted that the current contingency after the changes had been made was \$893,441.

Planning and Zoning – Ms. McGarry reported that the main ask from the Planning and Zoning department was junkyard clean-up grant program for \$5,000. Ms. McGarry explained that since it was a new request, staff backed it out of the budget. She also noted that they had reduced the telecommunications line and travel based on historical spending. Ms. Staton described the program from Ms. Bishop’s request, noting that the Planning and Zoning department’s highest volume of complaints pertained to junkyards. She noted that typically, those in violation were elderly, disabled, or experiencing a hardship, and did not have the resources and/or people to assist them. She noted that the goal was property compliance and public health safety welfare. Ms. Staton explained that the grant program would allow violators the opportunity to apply for funding to have their properties cleaned up pursuant to an agreement with an established company that serviced Nelson County. Ms. Staton noted that in Planning and Zoning’s proposal, it also suggested

waiving the tipping fee at the Transfer Station. She reported that an estimated 10 to 15 properties could be cleaned up and brought into compliance. Mr. Reed, Mr. Parr and Mr. Rutherford noted that was a cheap clean up, if they could clean up a property for \$500. Ms. Staton noted that part of the request was waiving the tipping fees. Ms. McGarry noted they could do a pilot program. The Board was in consensus to fund the clean-up program at \$5,000 for a total budget of \$207,433.

Mr. Reed asked about the salary study information for Planning and Zoning positions. Ms. McGarry noted she had not had a chance to review the information. Mr. Reed asked how they might remedy the situation. Ms. McGarry noted it would be presented to the Board and could be amended accordingly with contingency. Mr. Reed commented on the high discrepancy in terms of comparable salaries, noting how difficult the job was. He noted getting the extra person in the shared position with Building Inspections would be very important.

Tourism – Ms. McGarry noted staff had reduced part-time salaries based on historical information. She also noted reductions to the telecommunications line, postage, and office supplies. Mr. Rutherford asked about checking on the telecommunications costs as they seemed high. Ms. McGarry noted that Tourism was a remote office location. Mr. Rutherford and Mr. Parr suggested looking into VOIP phones to save costs. Ms. McGarry noted they could look into it. Mr. Reed asked if it was appropriate to have the County website under Tourism and Economic Development, or if it needed to go under IT. Ms. McGarry noted that Ms. Kelley had a staff person in her office who was website savvy and had worked on the County's original website. She noted that she also understood where Mr. Reed was coming from. The Board was in consensus to fund Tourism at \$488,670 as recommended by staff.

Economic Development – Mr. Rutherford noted that Economic Development was zeroed out. Ms. McGarry explained that was where the AFID grants went and there were no current grants. She explained that the two AFID grants in FY23 totaled \$60,000 and there were none yet for FY24. The Board was in consensus with the Economic Development line at \$0.

Anti-Litter Grant – Ms. McGarry explained that the Anti-Litter grant was a grant that the County received from year to year. She reported that the County received \$9,966 in FY23. She was not yet sure what FY24's amount would be, but they would appropriate it once they knew. The Board was in consensus with the Anti-Litter Grant line at \$0.

Extension Service – Ms. McGarry reported that the Extension Service was already considered under agencies.

Refunds – Ms. McGarry explained that the Refunds line covered personal property tax refunds or other similar items. She noted that the budgeted amount was a best guess. The Board was in consensus to fund the Refunds line at \$52,000.

Employee Salary Adjustment/Benefit Cost – Ms. McGarry reported that the cost included the 7 percent salary increase and associated benefits costs, as well as the new health insurance number. She noted that it did not include bringing everyone to the minimum thresholds for pay since the Board had not yet adopted the results of the pay study, which included the new pay ranges. She noted that they were working off of the County's current pay scales. Mr. Rutherford noted they would address the pay scales after the 7 percent increase. Ms. McGarry noted that the Governor's budget had a 5 percent pay increase for State employees, so there would be an offsetting amount. She reported that the House and Senate were proposing the 7 percent. She noted that there would be an offsetting amount coming in on the revenue side. She noted that if it was 7 percent, it would be almost \$135,000 that would offset the total employee cost. She noted that they could consider a 5 percent increase because the County was already supplementing State Compensation Board funded positions by greater than 7 percent. She reported that a 5 percent increase would provide all employees with a raise and the County would also still meet the State Compensation Board salaries as required. She noted that a 5 percent raise would cost \$330,140 and the 5 percent would be offset by the 7 percent from the state. The Board was in consensus for a 7 percent salary increase.

Worker's Compensation Premium Increase – The Board was in consensus to fund at \$15,000. Ms. McGarry noted that they did not have an exact number, it was a best guess.

Transfer to Social Services (excludes CSA) – Ms. McGarry presented the Department of Social Services request for FY24, noting there was a slight decrease from the previous year. She was unsure as to why they were requesting less, but noted that it may be due to staff turnover. Ms. Staton noted that the department had three people retiring. The Board was in consensus to fund the Social Services budget in the amount of \$2,111,079 as requested.

Transfer to Debt Service – Ms. McGarry noted that the Transfer to Debt Service for FY24 looked like a big decrease as the major transfer to debt service of \$2.3 million was completed in FY23, along with an additional \$610,000 in funds to establish the debt service reserve and build the County's debt capacity to \$57 million. She noted that the Board had approved this transfer in FY23. She explained that they were

covering the current debt service with the transfer. She noted that the number could change as there was some debt coming off in the current year, so staff was communicating with Roland Kooch of Davenport. She indicated that they may need to rollover the difference into the reserve which could entail increasing the Transfer to Debt Service on the expenditure side but also increasing the revenue side from fund balance. The Board was in consensus to fund that Transfer to Debt Service at \$3,775,368. Ms. McGarry noted that they would see the numbers again as they had a Debt Service Fund.

Transfer for Piney River Debt and Operation – Mr. Rutherford reported that Piney River was currently at \$0. Ms. McGarry explained that they were not currently including a transfer to Piney River. She noted that there had been a lot of problems and repairs which required money to be transferred to cover those capital expenses. She commented that they may have that happen again next year and they needed to go ahead and start budgeting for a new Piney River Pump Station. Mr. Rutherford estimated that would likely be a half of a million dollars to take care of and Ms. McGarry confirmed that it would likely be in that range. She reported that they had left it a zero for the time being and noted that Ms. Staton was still working on the Piney River budget. The Board was in consensus to leave the Transfer to Piney River Debt and Operation at zero.

Transfer to Broadband Fund – Ms. McGarry noted that the amount was at zero as Broadband was self-supporting. The Board was in consensus to leave the Transfer to Broadband fund at zero as presented by staff.

Transfer to Reassessment Fund \$85,000

Ms. Staton confirmed that they currently had \$888,441 in recurring revenue.

Capital Outlay and Non-Recurring Expenses

Staff reviewed Capital Outlay and Non-Recurring Expenses. Ms. McGarry noted that a lot the expenses were related to 911 upgrades. She explained that all of the items in the list were taken as is, except for the removal of one Sheriff's Department vehicle and one Emergency Communications Center (ECC) vehicle. She noted that the Sheriff had requested four vehicles and staff took out one. She reported that the County had an opportunity to receive one of Wintergreen's surplus vehicles to use as the ECC vehicle.

Lexipro Software (Sheriff) – Ms. McGarry explained that it was a subscription cost to the Sheriff's Department that helps to keep everyone up to date on policy updates related to legislative and legal changes. The Board was in consensus to fund the Lexipro Software expense at \$16,031.

ECC UPS Replacements (E911) – Ms. McGarry noted that UPS's were uninterruptable power supply's. She reported that the units in the 911 Center needed to be replaced. The Board was in consensus to fund the replacement expense at \$59,359.

Tower UPS Replacements – Ms. McGarry noted that these units were the same, just at the Tower locations. The Board was in consensus to fund at \$107,000.

Replace Trimble GPS Units – Ms. McGarry noted that they were handheld GPS units. Mr. Reed asked if they might be able to be shared with the Nelson County Service Authority, or whether it may be something that they would also be interested in having. Mr. Rutherford suggested waiting so they could ask Susan Rorrer more questions.

Large Format Printer/Scanner (Building Inspections/Planning & Zoning) – Ms. McGarry reported that Building Inspections and Planning & Zoning had requested the equipment so they would have the ability to scan and send plans to VDOT and other agencies. She noted that the scanning capability would help expedite the process in their office. The Board was in consensus to fund \$10,000 for the large format scanner/printer.

Elementary School Study – \$0, Ms. McGarry noted that funds were included in FY23, but there were no funds included for FY24.

FY22 Compensation Study – \$0, Mr. Rutherford asked if the study had already been paid for. Ms. McGarry noted that was being paid for in the current year and they were not expecting any costs in FY24.

Courthouse Complex Repairs/Painting – Ms. McGarry explained that repairs had been done at the Courthouse in the current year, however they were not anticipating any repairs in the next fiscal year. She noted that most of the repairs were related to the termite repairs next to the Judge's chambers. Mr. Parr asked if that expense line as related to normal maintenance items. Ms. McGarry explained that a lot of the maintenance items were handled out of the Building and Grounds department budget line. She explained that if there were something specific, it would be included in the Courthouse repair line.

Registrar Office Renovations - \$0, Ms. McGarry explained that the renovations had already been completed and paid for in FY23.

Electronic Pollbook Replacement - \$0, Ms. McGarry noted that the replacements happened in FY23 so there were no funds for FY24.

Conceptual Design DSS – Ms. McGarry reported that there was no money in that line as it was in another area of the budget.

Comprehensive Plan Update – Ms. McGarry reported that they were projecting to spend \$131,555 in FY23 and \$93,507 in FY24 to finish the project. The Board was in consensus to fund the FY24 Comprehensive Plan Update expense line at \$93,507.

Ms. Susan Rorrer was present to explain the replacement of the Trimble GPS units. She reported that the Trimble GPS units were handheld GPS units that Building Inspectors carried in the field to collect driveway and address point information. She noted that the information came back to the office to pinpoint the location on a map. Mr. Reed asked if the units were what the Service Authority may want to use. Mrs. Rorrer indicated that the units may work for the Service Authority also. The Board was in consensus to fund \$27,850 for the Trimble GPS unit replacement.

Website Development & Upgrade - \$0, Ms. McGarry reported that the Website project was being completed in the current fiscal year, so there were no funds in FY24.

IT Network Penetration Testing – Ms. McGarry explained that the request for funds came from Ms. Rorrer. She noted that they were projected to spend about \$8,000 in the current year, and \$17,600 in FY24. She explained that it had to do with cyber security measures that they wanted to implement. Ms. Rorrer noted that the need was primarily driven by the State Board of Elections and their local election security standards. She reported that there was a checklist of items that they are supposed to be able to check off to indicate that they are secure. She noted that they planning to complete the checklist within three years. The Board was in consensus to fund \$17,600 for the IT Network Penetration Testing.

Tye River Bridge Deck Repair (BRRT) - \$0, Ms. McGarry noted that the project had already been completed.

Sturt Park Development (Moved from Non-Dep) – Ms. McGarry reported that the line was moved from the Non-Departmental Department to the Capital Outlay Department. She noted that they had been carrying forward \$71,600 from the timber proceeds at the Sturt property. Mr. Reed noted that they were hoping to get a grant to complete the master plan for Sturt. The Board was in consensus on the Sturt funding line in the amount of \$71,600.

4 Sheriff Vehicles and Equipment – Ms. McGarry noted that the Sheriff had request four vehicles and staff had backed out one of the vehicles at a cost of \$63,738. The Board was in consensus to fund three vehicles and equipment for the Sheriff's Department at a cost of \$191,214.

2 Motor Pool Trucks - \$0, Ms. McGarry noted that the trucks were purchased in the current year so there were no funds for trucks in FY24.

2 Maintenance Trucks - \$0, Ms. McGarry noted that the maintenance trucks were also purchased in the current year so there was nothing for next year.

Solid Waste Roll-off Truck - \$0, Ms. McGarry noted that the roll-off truck was purchased in the current year, so nothing for the next year.

ECC First Response Vehicle - \$0, Ms. McGarry noted that they had discussed the vehicle for John Adkins earlier and they would be getting one from Wintergreen.

Emergency Vehicles – Ms. Staton noted that the \$403,293 included the County's share of a new fire truck plus a new ambulance that was anticipated to arrive next year. Ms. McGarry noted that the lead times for these vehicles was significant. The Board was in consensus to fund the Emergency Vehicles budget line at \$403,293.

Business Park Study - \$0

Radio Subscriber Upgrade and Install for County/EMS – Ms. McGarry reported that the amount of \$1.25 million was now looking more like \$1.4 million. She indicated that the County had already taken care of the Sheriff's Department in the past year and the schools paid for their radios. She explained that they still had County and Emergency Services agencies left. Ms. Rorrer noted that these were portable and mobile radios. These would be for County and Emergency services. She explained that the costs had gone up due to the rising cost of chips. She noted that Motorola had to use a broker to help purchase enough chips to

continue manufacturing. She estimated that the radios were replacing were eight to nine years old and they were having a hard time finding replacement batteries in stock. Ms. McGarry noted it was also difficult to have them repaired. Ms. Rorrer explained that Clear could repair certain items but anything that needed to go to Motorola for repairs, could not be done as they were now classified by Motorola to be at their “end of life.” Mr. Rutherford noted they did not have much of an option and the longer they waited, the more expensive they would get. Ms. Rorrer noted that the price of \$1.4 million was with the County getting a 20 percent discount off of state contract price. Ms. McGarry asked if there was a possibility of a discount if the radios were purchased in the current fiscal year (FY23). Ms. Rorrer clarified that the \$1.4 million price was the discount if the radios were purchased in the current quarter, prior to the end of June. She noted that the price went up to \$1.5 million in the third quarter and then \$1.6 million after that. Mr. Rutherford suggested that the Board may have to vote on radio funding outside of the budget. Ms. McGarry noted that they did have some money in the budget that was not going to be spent in the current year. Mr. Harvey suggested that they go ahead and approve the radios.

Mr. Reed moved to approve the \$1.4 million radio purchase in the current fiscal year and Mr. Parr seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

PAR Ag Center Study - \$0

Recreation Center Study - \$0, Ms. McGarry noted that they were currently utilizing the monies for Architectural Partners for the master plan in FY23 and if it went beyond that, they would need to allocate funds.

Phone System Upgrade - \$0, Ms. Rorrer noted that they had repurposed the \$8,000 from FY23 to help with the Election Security upgrades and they did not plan to do anything with the phone system in FY24.

Department of Elections Security Compliance – Ms. McGarry reported that they would be spending \$30,000 in the current year and \$36,900 in FY24. The Board was in consensus to fund the Elections Security Compliance at \$36,900 as presented by staff. Ms. McGarry noted that was part of the three-year compliance plan.

ProVal Migration – SQL License – Ms. Rorrer noted that she did not believe she needed \$6,000 for FY24, so they could take that out of the budget line. The Board was in agreement to take out the \$6,000 from the ProVal Migration and set the amount at \$0.

BOS Strategic Planning CIP - \$0

Heritage Center Water System - \$0

Buck’s Elbow Tower Equipment Replacement - \$0, Ms. McGarry reported that the work being done was budgeted for the current fiscal year.

NG911 Costs – The Board was in consensus to fund Next Gen 911 Costs at \$10,000. Ms. McGarry explained that they had originally planned to complete the work in FY23, but it was pushed to FY24.

VESTA 911 Upgrade for NG911 – Ms. McGarry explained that was a grant funded item so it would be a pass through expense. The Board was in consensus for \$47,100 for the VESTA 911 Upgrade.

911 Call Handling Equipment Upgrade – Ms. McGarry noted that the cost was \$150,000 and the County would get the money back through state reimbursement. The Board was in consensus to fund as presented.

Animal Control Livestock Trailer – \$0, Ms. McGarry noted that the livestock trailer had been done in the current fiscal year.

Animal Control (2) Trucks - \$0, Ms. McGarry noted that the truck purchase had already been completed.

IT Microwave Network Upgrade – Ms. Rorrer noted that the IT Microwave Network Upgrade was in process. Ms. McGarry noted that the project may extend into FY24. She indicated that the planned to expend the funds in FY23, but it was uncertain at the moment. She noted that it was funded within the current year and they would carry over any unspent funds into FY24.

Treasurer’s Office Online Solution – \$0, Ms. McGarry noted that the online solution was completed in the current year and current money expended was \$8,000. She indicated that it was possible that only \$8,000 would be spent, but they were unsure.

Larkin Property Acquisition - \$0, Ms. McGarry noted that had been completed in FY23.

Capital Projects

County Office Building – DSS, Building Inspections/Planning and Zoning – Ms. McGarry estimated that the County would spend \$125,430 in FY23 out of the \$375,000. She noted that they had carried the balance forward for FY24. She noted these costs were related to preliminary architectural work. The Board was in consensus to carry forward \$249,570 for the County Office Building.

The Board took a brief recess.

General Fund Contingency

Ms. Staton provided updated numbers for the General Fund Contingency. She noted that the Recurring Revenue was \$888,441 and the Non-Recurring Revenue was \$375,212.

School Funding

Transfer to School Nursing – Ms. McGarry noted that they were discussing the funding for the school nurses in the schools, not any nursing program. The Board was in consensus to fund the School Nursing program at \$164,935.

Transfer to School Fund – Mr. Rutherford reported that the Schools had asked for an additional \$1,582,639. He pointed out that the County currently had \$888,0000 and if they were going to give any additional funds over that amount, the County would have to look at revenue enhancements. Mr. Parr pointed out that the use of all \$888,000 would zero out the Recurring Revenue. Mr. Barton asked if they would be considering revenue enhancements. Ms. McGarry noted that they would either have to have some form of revenue enhancements, or revisit expenditures, or a combination of both. Mr. Reed asked about the FY23 General Fund Contingency from Recurring Revenue and what they may have left. Ms. McGarry noted that they thought they would be spending it all to cover the large CSA (Children’s Services Act) expenditure projection. She explained that they had budgeted \$1.6 million for CSA and they were projected to spend \$2.5 million. Mr. Barton asked if some of the expenses were reimbursed by the state. Ms. McGarry confirmed that 68.8 percent would be reimbursed back, but they still had to budget the entire expenditure on the County’s side. Mr. Parr noted that the 68.8 percent reimbursement income would show up on the revenue side later. Mr. Rutherford noted the additional \$1.5 million requested by the schools and asked if there was more information on the request. Ms. McGarry noted that the Board was provided a full packet on the school budget. Mr. Reed suggested that it may make sense to discuss revenues and schools at same time. He noted that in a perfect world, they wanted to give the Schools what they asked for, but they needed to determine how to make it all work.

Mr. Rutherford had no issues with holding an extra meeting to discuss the Schools and Revenues at the same time. He noted that they had accomplished most of the budget, with the exception of the Schools and JAUNT. He suggested they discuss JAUNT funding, noting that he did not see the County having the ability to absorb the costs. Mr. Reed noted he had some additional information to provide regarding JAUNT.

JAUNT – Mr. Barton asked if Ms. McGarry had gotten a cost on adding a Gladstone shopping trip once per month. Ms. McGarry noted that she had not gotten a cost, but she had emails out to JAUNT and JABA, because it was possible that JABA may have been funding those trips. She reported that County staff had a meeting with the Gladstone Seniors on April 13th.

Mr. Reed reported that he had reviewed the 2022 JAUNT transit development plan identical to agency book for JAUNT. He noted that they had three different expansion options, which were provided in their budget request. He explained that Option 1 would add back the Wednesday through Friday service with Nelson share of the cost being \$66,000. He felt there was a real need to add that service back in. He then noted that Option 2 would add a service to Stoney Creek and Wintergreen (8 hours per day, Monday through Friday) for about \$108,000. He then noted that Option 3 was a new service for Countywide Demand Response which he assumed was more like Uber, for around \$216,000. Mr. Reed pointed out that the prices were contingent upon receiving a federal funding match. He commented that the transit development plan did not include service to South part of County, noting it was problematic as the Southern part of the County had no service. He noted they also had no estimates for what ridership could be for Gladstone or other unserved areas like Fleetwood.

Mr. Reed reported that he had reached out to the Nelson Community Wellness Alliance (NCWA) about partnering. He noted that an email from Ryan Lightner of NCWA indicated that they had about \$30,000 to contribute to JAUNT expansion, but they would need an agreement that the JAUNT expansion would include transporting trainees in their Community Health Worker program to their needed services which would include the Heritage Center, Library, Courthouse, and possibly Food Lion. He noted that was a small service area but it was not included in any of the options provided by JAUNT with a price tag.

Mr. Reed noted that he was not currently making any suggestions for additional services with JAUNT but he felt that they should have 5-day service to Nelson Center as they used to have. He thought if the Circulator was to include Gladstone, it would be worth looking into. Ms. McGarry suggested they could find out what the Gladstone circulator cost could be. Mr. Rutherford asked Mr. Reed what he was interested in trying to do. Mr. Reed pointed out the additional needs for the upcoming year and they had not discussed the schools yet. He thought that FY24 may not be the year to do it. He thought that the NCWA may be able to rollover their money for the following year. He suggested that when staff met with the Gladstone Seniors, they could try to determine what Gladstone ridership might look like.

Mr. Rutherford asked if Mr. Reed's current suggestion was to go with staff recommendation. Mr. Reed noted yes. Ms. McGarry clarified that staff recommendation would be to maintain the current level of service. Mr. Reed indicated that it would be \$65,967 to have the additional days of service. He pointed out that cost was if JAUNT was able to get federal grant money to match it. Mr. Rutherford noted that it would cost \$103,000 to maintain the current level of service provided by JAUNT. Mr. McGarry reviewed current services. She reported that JAUNT had a Link service on Mondays and Fridays that went into Charlottesville in the morning and returns in the afternoon. Mr. Rutherford noted that if they added in the service that Mr. Reed was interested in, along with the \$103,000 to maintain service, they would be taking another \$100,000 from recurring revenue. He noted that he would not be supportive of that. He noted that he would be interested in maintaining the services they had. Mr. Barton noted the need for service in Gladstone and pointed out that people in that area were more likely to go to Lynchburg. Ms. McGarry reminded Mr. Barton that JAUNT did not provide services to Lynchburg. Mr. Barton understood and noted that was why Gladstone wanted to have the shopping trip once a month.

Mr. Reed noted that he was in favor of maintaining the current level of service at \$103,000. He suggested they see about engaging JAUNT to have services to Gladstone and Fleetwood, as he felt those areas were more in need than Stoney Creek and Wintergreen. Mr. Rutherford suggested service to those areas would be a separate conversation as they had not been presented with any options to include Gladstone or Fleetwood. Mr. Reed suggested that a form of Demand Response would possibly be able to serve those areas. Ms. McGarry noted an excerpt from JAUNT which indicated that zoned based demand response service in the County, with an option to start micro transit, would likely require a feasibility study. She pointed out that it did not sound like JAUNT was ready to start that kind of service. Mr. Rutherford and Mr. Reed agreed that they \$103,000 was a good start, and they could continue the conversation with JAUNT on demand response. Ms. McGarry explained that in order to keep the current level of service provided by JAUNT, they would need to add back in \$36,647 to the budget. She noted that if they wanted to add the additional service days, they would need another \$65,967. The Board was in consensus to add \$36,647 to the budget for a total of \$103,823 to JAUNT.

B. General Fund Revenues

III. OTHER BUSINESS (AS MAY BE PRESENTED)

The Board had no other business to discuss. The Board decided to continue the meeting to the next day and start the discussion with schools and revenues.

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

At 4:52 p.m., Mr. Parr moved to adjourn and continue to April 4, 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.