

**AT A CONTINUED MEETING** of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 1:00 p.m. in the Former Board of Supervisors Room located on the fourth floor of the Nelson County Courthouse in Lovingston, Virginia.

Present: J. David Parr, West District Supervisor–Chair  
 Ernie Q. Reed, Central District Supervisor – Vice Chair  
 Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor  
 Jesse N. Rutherford, East District Supervisor  
 Dr. Jessica Ligon, South District Supervisor  
 Candice W. McGarry, County Administrator  
 Amanda B. Spivey, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk  
 Linda K. Staton, Director of Finance and Human Resources  
 Sheriff Mark E. Embrey, Nelson County Sheriff’s Office  
 Susan F. Rorrer, Director of Information Systems

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Parr called the continued meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. with four (4) Supervisors present and Mr. Harvey arriving shortly after.

**II. FY25 GENERAL FUND BUDGET WORK SESSION (AS TIME ALLOWS)**

**A. Approval of Anthem Health Insurance Plans and Rates (R2024-18)**

Ms. McGarry noted that the Board had some follow up on the Anthem Health Insurance Plans and Rates. She noted the prepared resolution reflected Option 1 that the Board had chosen at their last meeting. She explained that the resolution would make the plan adoption official and would allow staff to proceed with the health insurance renewal process.

Mr. Rutherford moved to adopt **Resolution R2024-18** as presented and Dr. Ligon seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion unanimously (4-0) by roll call vote and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2024-18  
 NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
 FY25 HEALTH INSURANCE RENEWAL AND ESTABLISHMENT OF RATES**

**WHEREAS**, Nelson County participates in the Local Choice Health Benefits Program and the renewal deadline for the next plan year of July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025 is April 1, 2024, and

**WHEREAS**, premiums for the next plan year include an increase of 11% for the current Anthem Blue Cross Blue Shield plan offerings;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that Nelson County’s 2024-2025 health insurance plan year renewal rates be hereby established for active employees and retirees as follows and submitted to Local Choice by the renewal deadline of April 1, 2024:

Active Employees	FY25 (July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025)		
	Employee	County	Total
<b><u>Key Advantage 250</u></b>			
Single, Comprehensive	\$ 94.00	\$ 845.00	\$ 939.00
Dual, Comprehensive	\$ 616.00	\$ 1,122.00	\$1,738.00
Family, Comprehensive	\$ 1,167.00	\$1,369.00	\$2,536.00
Single, Preventative	\$ 92.00	\$ 826.00	\$ 918.00
Dual, Preventative	\$ 602.00	\$ 1,097.00	\$ 1,699.00
Family, Preventative	\$ 1,141.00	\$ 1,339.00	\$ 2,480.00

<b><u>Key Advantage 500</u></b>	<b>Employee</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Total</b>
Single, Comprehensive	\$ 85.00	\$ 765.00	\$ 850.00
Dual, Comprehensive	\$ 557.00	\$ 1,015.00	\$ 1,572.00
Family, Comprehensive	\$ 1,056.00	\$ 1,239.00	\$ 2,295.00
Single, Preventative	\$ 83.00	\$ 746.00	\$ 829.00
Dual, Preventative	\$ 544.00	\$ 990.00	\$ 1,534.00
Family, Preventative	\$ 1,031.00	\$ 1,209.00	\$ 2,240.00

<b><u>High Deductible Health Plan</u></b>	<b>Employee</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Total</b>
Single, Comprehensive	-	\$ 686.00	\$ 686.00
Dual, Comprehensive	\$ 402.00	\$ 867.00	\$ 1,269.00
Family, Comprehensive	\$ 803.00	\$ 1,047.00	\$ 1,850.00
Single, Preventative	-	\$ 665.00	\$ 665.00
Dual, Preventative	\$ 390.00	\$ 840.00	\$ 1,230.00
Family, Preventative	\$ 780.00	\$ 1,016.00	\$ 1,796.00

<b>Retirees Not Eligible For Medicare (Before County Supplement)</b>	
<b><u>Key Advantage 250</u></b>	<b>Retiree</b>
Single, Comprehensive	\$ 939.00
Dual, Comprehensive	\$1,738.00
Family, Comprehensive	\$2,536.00
Single, Preventative	\$ 918.00
Dual, Preventative	\$ 1,699.00
Family, Preventative	\$ 2,480.00

<b><u>Key Advantage 500</u></b>	<b>Retiree</b>
Single, Comprehensive	\$ 850.00
Dual, Comprehensive	\$ 1,572.00
Family, Comprehensive	\$ 2,295.00
Single, Preventative	\$ 829.00
Dual, Preventative	\$ 1,534.00
Family, Preventative	\$ 2,240.00

<b>High Deductible Health Plan</b>	<b>Retiree</b>
Single, Comprehensive	\$ 686.00
Dual, Comprehensive	\$ 1,269.00
Family, Comprehensive	\$ 1,850.00
Single, Preventative	\$ 665.00
Dual, Preventative	\$ 1,230.00
Family, Preventative	\$ 1,796.00

<b>Retiree Medicare Plans (Before County Supplement)</b>	
Advantage 65 (Dental & Vision)	\$218.00

B. March 15<sup>th</sup> Work Session Follow-up

a. Sheriff’s Vehicles – Sheriff Embrey

7 Sheriff Vehicles and Equipment

Sheriff Mark Embrey was present to discuss his vehicle requests. He reported that the Sheriff’s Office would be fully staffed on May 1<sup>st</sup>. He reviewed a list of current Sheriff’s Office vehicles and indicated that four (4) vehicles would be retained for use as spare vehicles – one (1) Chevy Tahoe K-9 unit, and three (3) Ford Explorers. He noted that five (5) vehicles currently in the fleet were of no use to the Sheriff’s Office due to high mileage and other issues. He indicated that he wished to return those vehicles to the County – one (1) Crown Victoria and four (4) Dodge Chargers. He reported that there was a sixth vehicle that he wished to turn over to the County, a Lexus 4-door sedan, which was seized under Asset Forfeiture.

Sheriff Embrey thanked the Board for the additional funding in December to bring on personnel. He noted that they were adequately staffed in the positions needed for levels of supervision. He also thanked the Board for the purchase of the two (2) Amherst County Patrol K-9 units. Sheriff Embrey reported that K-9 Bane was now in use and assigned to K-9 Handler Slate White. He noted that the K-9 program was working out well.

Mr. Rutherford asked how many miles should be expected on a vehicle for active deputies. Sheriff Embrey noted that they expected about 45,000 miles per year on a deputy’s vehicle. He indicated that he would be looking at a vehicle replacement schedule of about three (3) years. Mr. Rutherford asked what how many vehicles per year the Sheriff expected to cycle out, with a fully staffed department. Sheriff Embrey indicated that the new norm would be to cycle no less than five (5) vehicles per year. Mr. Rutherford asked if seven (7) vehicles would get them caught up, and then five (5) vehicles every year after that. Sheriff Embrey noted that it would. Sheriff Embrey indicated that they wanted to phase out all sedans and stick with Ford Explorers going forward. He noted that the Explorers had more room and a higher safety rating. He reported that the three (3) vehicles purchased in the previous year under the prior administration were currently in Staunton getting outfitted.

Mr. Rutherford asked the timeframe from procurement to delivery of the vehicle. Sheriff Embrey noted it should be less than 30 to 60 days. He noted they were ordering through the Virginia Sheriffs Association where they could get Chrysler/Dodge through Bedford, or Ford through Sheehy in Richmond. He reiterated their preference for the package through Sheehy with Ford. Mr. Rutherford estimated that it took about one (1) month to get the vehicles outfitted. Sheriff Embrey agreed. He reported that they were ordering their equipment through Tidewater Police Supplies. He noted that they had gone away from Clear Communications since they were so backed up. He reported that they were working with a company in Staunton, AVS, which was created by former Clear employees. He noted that many other agencies in the area were also working with AVS. Sheriff Embrey explained that they went away from Clear, not due to lack of performance, rather they were unable to provide him with a schedule timeline for completing the outfitting, and they were in need of vehicles. He indicated that they still dealt with Clear for radio programming. Sheriff Embrey noted that Clear would come to Nelson to do the radio programming onsite.

Mr. Rutherford asked about the radios and whether they would continue with Motorola or go with Harris when the contract was up. Ms. Rorrer noted they were at the point of maintaining the radios and replacing the technology on certain schedules. She indicated that they were discussing and planning for when the County would want to move to a trunked radio system which would give greater capacity for more channels and more separation of different groups. She commented that in order to determine whether it would be cheaper to go with Motorola or Harris, they would have to find out. Ms. McGarry noted that all of the radios they were getting ready to distribute were Motorolas.

Dr. Ligon asked Sheriff Embrey how revenue generation was going. Sheriff Embrey noted he had not seen revenues come through General District Court, but they had been busy and the numbers were phenomenal. He indicated that he would have statistics for arrests, charges and summonses by March 31st. He reported that he would be holding his first town hall on April 3<sup>rd</sup> at the Nelson Center. Ms. McGarry reported that staff had projected \$

Ms. McGarry noted that budget had included four (4) Sheriff's vehicles. Mr. Rutherford noted if they fully funded the vehicle request, it would be an additional \$192,000 off of the Non-Recurring, which would bring Non-Recurring down from \$400,000 to \$200,000 or so. Ms. McGarry indicated that was correct. Ms. Staton noted that with the change in the Health Insurance, they had \$28,536 in savings that would go back to the Recurring Contingency. Mr. Rutherford asked how much one (1) Sheriff's vehicle would cost. Ms. McGarry noted that a fully equipped vehicle would be about \$65,000. Dr. Ligon asked if Sheriff Embrey needed seven (7) vehicles. Sheriff Embrey indicated that he would like to have seven (7) vehicles. He noted the vehicles that would be turned back over to the County, along with the spare vehicles coming out of regular use. Mr. Parr asked if there was anything on the return vehicle list that may fill either a Motor Pool or ECC First Response Vehicle.

Ms. McGarry noted that the County would use any functioning spare vehicles they got back. She indicated that she did not know if those vehicles were usable beyond the regional area. Sheriff Embrey noted that he could part with any of the vehicles marked to be kept as spares, with the exception of the K-9 Tahoe. Mr. Rutherford indicated that he could see getting closer to five (5) or six (6) vehicles, particularly if they are doing away with the Motor Pool vehicle and ECC Tahoe, with the Sheriff willing to cooperative with staff to fill the gap on the Motor Pool. Mr. Parr noted he was still concerned with the Motor Pool vehicle since it sounded like the ones coming from the Sheriff's Office may not fill the need. Mr. Rutherford asked what the Motor Pool vehicle would be used for. Ms. McGarry explained that the \$40,000 vehicle put in for Motor Pool would be for travel out of the area, and it would be for all County departments to use when needed. She noted that they did still have a 2014 Explorer and she thought it was still in decent shape. She indicated that the Explorer was reserved a lot for various departments.

Dr. Ligon asked if they could allocate a certain number of vehicles to the Sheriff and then circle back for more discussion after they saw the revenues. Ms. McGarry noted the revenues that are reported in court would not be an exact match to the revenue that the County would see. She indicated that there could be opportunities throughout the year where they would be able to make some one-time purchases for vehicles and different things. Mr. Rutherford noted he would be supportive of giving the Sheriff five (5) to six (6) vehicles and then the Sheriff could report back in the summer on revenues and the Board could determine whether they were able to make a one-time purchase. Dr. Ligon commented that the School number was big. Mr. Parr noted they currently had four (4) Sheriff's vehicles in the budget and he asked what the Board wished to do. Dr. Ligon, Mr. Parr, and Mr. Rutherford were all in favor of six (6) vehicles. Ms. McGarry agreed that the School number was big, but those were primarily funded through Recurring funds. She noted that the vehicles would be purchased with Non-Recurring funds that they were covering with one-time carryover from the current fiscal year to the next.

The Board was in consensus for six (6) Sheriff's vehicles.

Mr. Parr asked what the new vehicle funding amount was. Ms. Staton explained that the Sheriff's original request was \$448,000 for seven (7) vehicles. She noted that staff reduced that request by \$192,000 to four (4) vehicles at \$253,068. She reported that with the Board's addition of two (2) more vehicles, it brought the total funding for six (6) vehicles to \$384,000.

Mr. Rutherford asked for the current Non-Recurring funds amount. Ms. Staton reported that Non-Recurring was now \$313,288.

Ms. McGarry asked if vehicles were driven home nightly. Sheriff Embrey noted that they were. Ms. McGarry asked how they were doing with the vehicle idling. Sheriff Embrey commented that if he heard it, he asked them to shut it off, with the exception of the K-9 units. Mr. Parr noted that he was told that the reason for the vehicles left idling was because the radios did not work if they were outside the vehicle. Sheriff Embrey commented that he did not know about the radios. He explained that when the vehicles

were off, the laptops disconnected, so when the deputies got back in their vehicles, they had to log everything back in, rather than being able to jump in the car and go when a call came in. Mr. Parr noted he had asked a State Trooper about the idling and that was when he heard about the radios. Sheriff Embrey indicated that the State Troopers used a different radio system. Ms. Rorrer explained that the State Troopers had radios that were dependent upon hitting a vehicular repeater that was in the car.

ECC First Response Vehicle

Ms. McGarry asked if they should return to make changes to the ECC vehicle and the \$40,000 Motor Pool vehicle. She noted it would offset what had just done. Mr. Rutherford noted that they could wait on the ECC vehicle. He suggested Adkins could acquire a retiring Explorer from the Sheriff's Office. The Board was in agreement to remove the ECC First Response Vehicle which provided a savings of \$72,500.

1 Motor Pool Vehicle

Ms. McGarry asked if the Board wanted to discuss the Motor Pool vehicle further. Dr. Ligon suggested they look at the Lexus from the Sheriff's Office. Ms. McGarry reported that the Lexus was older and not in the best shape. Ms. Spivey noted that it had been used by the former Major Cindrick to drive back and forth. Mr. Parr suggested that it may be a good time to put vehicles like that up for bid.

Animal Shelter Roof Replacement

Ms. McGarry reported that they could try and do roof replacement at the Animal Shelter during the current fiscal year, rather than waiting. She noted that since the roof was leaking, they would work to get it replaced sooner. The Board was in agreement to proceed with the roof replacement in the current fiscal year.

Ms. McGarry noted that they may have made up the difference in adding the two (2) Sheriff's vehicles after taking out the roof replacement expense and the ECC vehicle.

Mr. Rutherford asked what the County's total budget was. Ms. McGarry noted that it was about \$49 million.

b. Capital Outlay – Susan Rorrer

The Board discussed the following Capital Outlay items and funded the amounts indicated unless noted otherwise:

IT Network Server Replacement \$30,000

Ms. Rorrer explained that it was a routine server replacement based on the age of the server. She noted that the server operated as the County's domain controller, and it also managed backup processes and stored backup data. She indicated that she replaced the server every five (5) or six (6) years. She noted that it was not just for the hardware, but also the services from the vendor like assistance with configuration and setup of the server. Ms. Rorrer reported that she did not have a formal quote, rather the amount was a rough quote that she had received in past 30 to 60 days.

Circuit Court A/V Replacement \$18,000

Ms. Rorrer reported that the Circuit Court A/V Replacement was driven by the end of life/end of support for what was currently in the courtroom. She noted that the State was looking at two (2) prospective vendors to determine which system they were going to recommend for use in Virginia localities. She indicated that the \$18,000 amount was supposedly a worst case price scenario. She noted that the system did need to be replaced as the manufacturer was no longer supporting the cameras and equipment. She noted that they had managed to maintain a maintenance contract, in the event of serious issues. Ms. Rorrer indicated that they were waiting on the State for guidance, and then the system would need to be replaced.

IT Network Penetration Testing \$21,000

Ms. Rorrer explained that the network penetration testing was currently done annually, but they were looking at a solution where penetration testing and vulnerability scanning would be ongoing rather than just once per year. She noted that the testing and scanning was a requirement of the Local Election Security Standards from the Virginia Department of Elections. Dr. Ligon asked if the vendor was selected by the State. Ms. Rorrer indicated that the annual penetration testing and vulnerability scanning requirement was from the state, noting that there was a lengthy list of requirements from the state. She reported that the County was currently looking at a vendor that they were purchasing off of a procurement contract. Ms. McGarry explained that procurement could be done off of a State contract, or through cooperative procurement, which saved localities the time spent vetting vendors and negotiating the best pricing. Ms. Staton noted that the State allowed them to piggyback off of contracts. Mr. Rutherford asked if staff had recommended the expense. Ms. McGarry noted it was recommended as presented.

Phone System Configuration (Federal Standards) \$10,000

Ms. Rorrer explained that there were two (2) federal laws currently in place, Kari's Law and the Ray Baum Act, which were both related to being able to identify a caller's specific location when using a telephone system in a building. She commented that she believed they should already be doing it, but the County had a new maintenance provider for the phone system that was in the position to help them clean that up and come into compliance. She commented that other than complying with the law, it was a huge thing because they did not want to be in position where they had a delay in finding someone who was having an emergency. Dr. Ligon asked if it was specific to large buildings. Ms. Rorrer noted it was, but in the County's case, they had five (5) sites that were remote from the Courthouse and connected to the phone system by fiber.

Microwave Batteries DC Plant \$98,850

Ms. Rorrer explained that all of the microwave equipment basically all ran on battery power. She noted that commercial power came in and charged the batteries, and rectifiers converted the power to DC and supplied the equipment. She reported that the current DC plant systems were 13 years old and were at end of life and end of support. She noted that they were all put in with the microwave network and, they just needed to be replaced. She indicated that a lot of the cost associated with the replacement was in the batteries. Mr. Reed asked where they were housed. Ms. Rorrer indicated that they were located at the various tower sites. She referenced Devil's Knob, Sugarloaf, and the Courthouse tower.

Dr. Ligon asked if there were any grants available to help with any of the costs since some of the items were related to state mandates. Ms. Rorrer noted that with the Department of Elections State Mandates, there was a new cyber security grant program. She commented that since its inception, the state had only decided that the first disbursement would be for them to come assess what they think the locality should spend the funds on that they would provide following the assessment. She noted that they had applied for the State to pay for the County to be assessed.

Replace CAD/Mapping Workstation \$6,000

Ms. Rorrer explained that it was the replacement of the computer aided dispatch (CAD) computer in the 911 center. She noted that was what the dispatchers used to track all of their units, calls, statuses, and to input call information. Mr. Rutherford referenced when his home caught on fire. He asked what the timeframe was from when a 911 address was produced to when it went into the CAD system. Ms. Rorrer noted that technically, it could happen fairly quickly. She estimated that once per month they pushed out mapping updates. He noted in the case of his home, his address did not come up in the CAD system. Ms. Rorrer noted that during that window of time, they may not have had a GIS person in that position.

Radio Improvements Wintergreen \$196,000

Ms. Rorrer noted this subject was a little complicated. She explained that Wintergreen had always had their own radio system. She noted that they were having difficulty maintaining their aging system. She indicated that Wintergreen had always relied on hand me down radio consoles from the County. Ms. Rorrer indicated that the County's current hand me down would not be a good solution for Wintergreen as it would be very expensive to install and space was also a limiting factor. She noted that there was also no guarantee as to how long that system would last them. She explained that Wintergreen's current system had more replacement parts available due to people hoarding parts as systems came out of other localities. She indicated that the County's system was more unique, so there were not a lot of spares around. She noted that they had been thinking about how they could spend money to benefit everyone as a whole moving forward, and was not potentially throwing money down the drain. Mr. Harvey suggested that the communications needed to all be the same. Ms. Rorrer commented that this would work towards having that. She explained that it would add two (2) radio console positions, which could potentially be reduced to one (1), except for the fact that they liked to try and maintain Wintergreen as a backup location in the event that the County had to abandon their 911 center. Ms. Rorrer noted that this would allow for someone to be able to operate from the Wintergreen location to carry on the processing of 911 calls and radio communications. She noted that this was the reasoning for the recommendation of the two (2) radio consoles. She explained that they would add the two (2) radio consoles and the County would connect them to the County's radio system over the fiber, rather than connecting them to Wintergreen's old, dying radio system.

Ms. Rorrer then explained that the County currently had base stations installed at that location that allowed Wintergreen to talk on the County's frequency. She noted that the only way that Wintergreen could talk on the County's station, was to have the base station at the gate house. She noted that the radio improvements would allow for the County to move the base stations from the Gate House at Wintergreen to the shelter at the Courthouse, to replace old base stations that the County was using. Ms. Rorrer estimated that \$11,000 of the funds would be used to move the base radios from the Gate House to the shelter at the

Courthouse. She noted that about \$176,000 would be the cost of the two (2) radio console positions and connecting them back to the County's 911 center and radio system.

Dr. Ligon asked how often the County updated their radio system. Ms. Rorrer noted it was complicated. She indicated that the radio consoles remained in use until their end of life. She noted that the proposed new consoles were the only way to add console positions for Wintergreen on the County system now. She commented that she thought Wintergreen was on board to just migrate to utilizing the County's radio system. She noted that from an engineering standpoint, she was not sure to what extent. She explained that Wintergreen used the radio for more than just public safety. She noted that all maintenance personnel were on the same system. She pointed out that it was probably more traffic than Nelson wanted to absorb on its existing frequencies.

Ms. Rorrer explained that trunking would allow County to utilize the frequencies they had, but carve out more channels where for example, the bus drivers could have their own channel. She noted that could only happen with trunking and the County was currently on a 1:1 transmit and receive frequency per channel. She reported that the Sheriff had a frequency, Fire and Rescue had a frequency, County Government had a frequency, and Nelson County Operations had a frequency. She noted that they were limited to four (4) frequencies. She indicated that moving to trunking might allow for them to have 50 different talkers that did not hear one another or walk over each other's traffic while they were communicating. Mr. Reed asked if trunking would allow Wintergreen to still have their internal system and then the County's system would deal with 911. Dr. Ligon assumed it would replace their internal system and then they would have a channel for Maintenance. Ms. Rorrer noted that ideally, Wintergreen would share some of the costs, and maybe offset some of the County's costs. She indicated that the question was how much Wintergreen had to contribute to the overall system.

Dr. Ligon asked how much the trunking cost. Ms. Rorrer noted that she had heard it was not as expensive as starting over, but she did not have a number. She commented that she thought trunking was the way for the County to go, noting that there would be some additional functionality and features that they could take advantage of. Ms. Rorrer noted that it would not happen overnight and it would take some planning. She stated that the radio improvements for Wintergreen were not a step where they were wasting money, it would improve things for Wintergreen and take them a little further down the road while they plan for a trunked radio system.

Dr. Ligon asked how long it would take to get information on trunking. She did not like the idea of spending \$196,000 in the next fiscal year and then trunking the following year. She noted that she would like more information. Ms. Rorrer noted that the equipment would still be good with the trunking. She estimated that it would take three (3) years to get trunking in place, and she noted that she did not even have a ballpark range on price. She guessed it could be in the millions of dollars.

Ms. Rorrer noted that they could alternatively choose to purchase one (1) console to put at Wintergreen that would talk to the County's system, or they could ask Wintergreen how much money they would be willing to contribute to offset the cost. Dr. Ligon noted that she liked both of those ideas, and she asked Mr. Rorrer to gather information on trunking. Mr. Reed asked if they were to have a strategic plan for a trunking system that would work, whether they would still need to deal with the cost of the consoles. Ms. Rorrer indicated that they would still need a radio console with a trunked system.

Ms. Rorrer noted that some changes had been made to Wintergreen as it related to what 911 calls they answered and what 911 calls were getting dispatched from Wintergreen partly due to staffing issues. Ms. McGarry also noted that Wintergreen was having a hard time keeping up with the training and the new protocols for dispatch centers. Dr. Ligon asked for clarification on what the update would provide. Ms. Rorrer explained that Wintergreen would be talking to the County over the fiber and then the base radios would be moved to the Courthouse to allow the County to talk to Wintergreen on their system. Base radio would be moved so WTG could talk to the County on fiber. Dr. Ligon asked whether they were flagging the subject again. She noted that she was inclined to agree to one (1) console. She indicated that she would like to learn more about the trunking. Ms. McGarry noted they would not be wasting money by doing the consoles at \$196,000, and it would improve things until they proceeded with a trunking system. Ms. Rorrer commented that in the 911 world, it was always a bad idea to just have one, noting that it was best to have one and a backup. She noted that with the second console at Wintergreen, if another position was added in the County, that console could be moved to the Courthouse and put into use. Ms. McGarry noted that there were a lot of conversations taking place between County staff and WPOA (Wintergreen Property Owners Association) staff on how to make the EMS communications much better for everyone. Ms. Rorrer noted that Wintergreen was interested in partnering with the County to provide fire and rescue, and police to the County as well. She commented that it was becoming cost prohibitive for Wintergreen to do some of the things that they had historically done. Dr. Ligon asked if Wintergreen had been asked to contribute costs. Ms. McGarry noted those conversations were ongoing with staff.

Mr. Reed suggested they have a plan in place to move to a trunking system, determine the timeframe and costs associated with it, and then discuss a partnership scenario with Wintergreen to accomplish it. Ms. Rorrer indicated she had also considered whether Central Virginia Electric Cooperative would be a good partner on the radios, noting that she did not think they had radios communications throughout the County. Mr. Harvey suggested that they get a group together to determine the needs.

Mr. Parr commented that what he was hearing, was that the trunking option was a separate conversation from the \$196,000. He noted that the \$196,000 was money that would still be well spent, even if they did the trunking system. Ms. Rorrer reiterated that the money would be well spent now, or if they moved to trunking. She noted there were no guarantees that it would not need to be replaced before they got to trunking. Dr. Ligon commented that they still did not know when the current system would age out. Mr. Reed noted that they had never anything that even came close to guarantee on when something was going to age out, it just happened, and it happened when they notified the County that it was at the end of support. Ms. Rorrer noted that the product end of life was to be determined by the manufacturer, which determined when they would need to get on board with a new platform.

Mr. Parr, Mr. Reed, Mr. Rutherford and Mr. Harvey were in consensus to keep the \$196,000 in for the Radio Improvements at Wintergreen. Mr. Rutherford asked what additional information Dr. Ligon may want. He noted that the budget was ongoing and things could be changed or modified later on. She suggested that they needed to have a plan in place to move forward with the upgrades. Mr. Parr noted that they were all in agreement on that. The Board was in consensus to keep the \$196,000 in the budget.

Phone System Upgrade \$7,800

Ms. Rorrer explained that the \$7,800 would allow the County upgrade the phone system to be SIP capable so that they could lease SIP trunks rather than a PRI. She commented that it did not have to be done right away, but it was something that the County needed to position themselves for the future. Ms. Rorrer also noted that the County's current internet service provider (ISP) was Segra. She indicated that the County would be moving to Firefly as an ISP as soon as their contract was up with Segra, which was in a little over a year. Ms. Rorrer explained that the phone system upgrade did not require new equipment, it was licensing and configuration only. Dr. Ligon asked if they would be wasting money if they were making a switch to Firefly in 2025. Ms. Rorrer indicated that it would not. She explained that Firefly would be providing internet only, not phone service. The Board was in consensus to fund as requested.

Department of Elections Security Compliance \$36,900

Ms. Rorrer explained that the request for year three (3) of a contract with Assura that helped the County to comply with local election security standards.

IT Network Event Logging Solution

Ms. Rorrer explained that the IT Network Event Logging Solutions was for compliance with logging requirements as part of the security standards. She noted that the County did not currently keep logs, hardly at all, because they were storage intensive. She commented that there was not enough space to store the logs to the extent that the County's cyber security insurance provider, or the State, would like for the County to maintain. She indicated that the purchase would provide the logging solution as well as the associated storage capacity requirements. Dr. Ligon asked if the new server would store all of the logs. Ms. Rorrer noted that it would possibly be stored on the Cloud. Mr. Rutherford asked to what level was the County providing its own servers and why, as opposed to outsourcing it. Ms. Rorrer noted that they were considering the Cloud more. She explained that previously, the County had preferred to maintain its own servers in house because they were not at risk of being unable to access something if the internet was down and it was also safer. She indicated that they would look more to the Cloud. She noted that she could not currently answer to what extent they could use the Cloud. She expressed concerns that having the County's active directory and domain controller on the Cloud would make the County vulnerable. Mr. Rutherford commented that having the servers maintained by the County made them vulnerable to data breaches. Dr. Ligon commented that it was almost safer in the Cloud. She asked if going to the Cloud would change the cost of the new server. Ms. Rorrer noted she could look into the options of using the Cloud for storage. Ms. Rorrer noted she could look into the options of using the cloud more. Mr. Rutherford noted using the Cloud could remove some liability from the County. Dr. Ligon asked if VACorp would have some suggestions. Dr. Ligon and Mr. Rutherford noted that they both moved their businesses to the Cloud. Mr. Rutherford asked to strongly consider cloud options. Dr. Ligon noted that there would be a few items they would have to spend money on. Ms. McGarry noted that staff could check with VACorp. Ms. McGarry noted that the County's entire financial system was on its own server.

The Board flagged the IT Network Event Logging Solution for \$12,000 for the time being.



BOS Meeting Streaming/Indexing/Transcription Solution

Ms. McGarry noted the meeting streaming solution from Granicus was quoted at \$76,000. Mr. Rutherford asked if they had considered duplicating the School Division's setup for meetings. Ms. Rorrer noted that IT staff had talked with Mike Cargill with the School Division to get some guidance. She noted that Mr. Cargill had a lot of experience with camera work. She noted that they did not have someone on County IT staff that had that knowledge and experience. Mr. Reed noted that Mr. Cargill also staffed the entire meeting.

Mr. Rutherford noted that the TJPDC used Owl Labs which was about \$1,000 for setup. He noted that it had voice detection and a 360 degree camera that turned to the individual speaking. He commented that it did allow for closed captioning. He suggested giving Owl Labs a try. He noted that the quality of the TJPDC meeting online was really good. Mr. Reed noted that sometimes, it did not get the right person on the screen while they were speaking, but otherwise it was pretty seamless.

Dr. Ligon suggested that the Board needed to come up with a list of things they wanted a company to provide and find that company. She asked what the true goal was. Ms. McGarry noted that it had not been driven as much by the Board. She commented that she was not sure how important it was to the Board that the County have an optimal streaming solution for the public. She noted that there had been a few outspoken people from the public that had said it was not a great experience. Mr. Parr asked if the public knew that it cost \$52,000 to set it up and \$21,000 per year to run it. Ms. McGarry noted that they may not know. Ms. Rorrer estimated that less than 10 people were watching the meetings. Mr. Reed commented that the last meeting was better than it had ever been, with having the new board and split screen. The Board was not in favor of funding the \$76,000 for the streaming solution.

Mr. Rutherford noted his only priority was the eliminate the user and allow for some automation using a system like Owl Lab. Ms. Rorrer noted that Granicus had warned against relying on YouTube to store the meeting videos, as they could remove videos due to content. Mr. Rutherford suggested downloading all of the videos. Dr. Ligon commented that if they had the minutes, that was all that was needed. Ms. McGarry confirmed that once they had the minutes, they could technically remove any recordings. Ms. Rorrer suggested that the Board could choose to put a smaller amount of funding in the budget to cover any small improvements to the setup. Mr. Reed commented that it did make sense to hold onto the videos until the minutes were approved. Mr. Rutherford noted that they did not want to actively delete the YouTube videos. Ms. McGarry agreed that she liked keeping the videos, but it did make it subject to FOIA (Freedom of Information Act). She noted that if you had it, you had to provide it; versus if the minutes are completed, they could get rid of the video and recordings that were not required to provide.

Marcus Alert System \$0

Ms. Rorrer explained that she had left \$20,000 in the budget for the Marcus Alert System, just in case there was a desire to proceed with having a mental health database that people could register to. She noted that it allowed for them to be able to track them, and in the event of a 911 call, they would know that person could potentially be there. She indicated that because of the County's population size, they were not required to comply with the small portion of the requirement. Ms. Rorrer commented that she did not see any reason to proceed with the Marcus Alert at the current time. Ms. McGarry commented that the current solution that had been discussed was to maintain a database within the CAD system. Ms. Rorrer noted that to her knowledge, they had not had anyone call wanting to register. The Board was in agreement to remove the \$20,000 for the Marcus Alert system.

IT Microwave Network Upgrade

Ms. Rorrer explained that the electronic elements of the IT Microwave Network System were upgraded last year. She noted during the upgrade, there was a link that failed between the Lovington tower and Hightop. She indicated that after extensive troubleshooting, it was determined that one of the antennas was bad, and there was funding available to replace both antennas and the wave guide. She noted that the proposed upgrade in the next fiscal year was this was to replace the remaining eight (8) antennas and wave guides which were about 13 years old. Dr. Ligon asked if the remaining towers were functioning within the proper parameters. Ms. Rorrer noted that they were currently within tolerance but they would start to have failures. She reported that the microwave carried all of the County's radio traffic and was essential for the Simulcast Radio System, which was where all of the towers broadcast time synced radio traffic. Dr. Ligon asked how long it would take to get an antenna. Ms. Rorrer noted it would probably take about six (6) months to get the antennas, waveguides and a crew to install them. Ms. McGarry commented that she felt that this fell into the guise of being proactive versus reactive. Dr. Ligon asked if all of the equipment was the same age. Ms. Rorrer confirmed that it was all installed as part of the original system. Ms. Staton noted that the cost was about \$36,600 per antenna. Ms. Rorrer explained there were two (2) antennas per site. Dr. Ligon asked if it was feasible to have spare parts like the antennas and wave guides on hand. Ms. Rorrer noted

that it could potentially happen. She indicated that it cost a lot of money to troubleshoot problems. Ms. Rorrer also noted the process to replace the antennas and relicense the frequencies with the FCC took time. Mr. Rutherford asked who installed the antennas. Ms. Rorrer explained that there was currently a contract with the manufacturer, Nokia, who subbed out the work to Backhaul Engineering out of Richmond.

The Board flagged the IT Microwave Network Upgrade at \$292,900 for the time being.

The Board took a brief recess.

Dr. Ligon expressed an interest in Land Use and the evaluation process. She noted some localities evaluate properties annually and the property owners are required to provide proof of land use. She recalled that when completing the forms for Nelson, it was honor based and a Board of people approved it. She noted that she did not have to prove that she made money on cattle, she just had to say how many cows she had. Dr. Ligon indicated in other localities, she even had to provide a copy of the check she received, in addition to applying annually. Ms. McGarry noted that the Board in Nelson did make site visits to verify that what was reported, was there. Dr. Ligon noted a lot of people were exiting the cattle industry. She suggested that if Nelson were to move to annually, the former cattle people may rent out their farms, rather than letting the land sit. She noted that the Saunders had given up beef cattle. She also reported that Bath County just switched to yearly and required proof. Dr. Ligon noted that Buckingham pushed for conservation easements for farmland. Mr. Rutherford noted that conservation easements ran in perpetuity. Ms. McGarry noted Agricultural and Forestal Districts may automatically qualify for land use, but she would have to check.

C. Expenditures Review continued  
a. Agencies & Non-Departmental

Staff reviewed the following agency requests with the Board.

- Nelson County EMS Council

Ms. McGarry reported that the EMS Council was requesting an additional \$6,689 in funding for FY25, for a total of \$502,651, which was a 1.35 percent increase from last year. Dr. Ligon commented that when reviewing the disbursements, they were rewarding departments for being least efficient. She noted that Piney River had done a good job in switching their phone and internet over to Firefly to save money, while Roseland had not made any changes and they were paying twice as much, but they were being reimbursed for being least efficient. Ms. McGarry noted that the question of how things were reimbursed was an EMS Council question. She noted that a Fire or EMS only department received a base amount of \$11,000 while a combined Fire & Rescue agency received \$16,500 base amount. She noted that the other expenses shown were the actual expenses submitted from the previous year. Ms. McGarry explained that the County funding was provided in a lump sum to the EMS Council and it was then from there. Mr. Rutherford noted that it was perplexing that there was nearly \$20,000 in telephone expenses alone. He asked if that was just for phones, or possibly cell phones as well. Dr. Ligon noted that Piney River was far more active than Roseland and located just down the road, with a significantly less phone bill. Ms. Spivey noted that Roseland may not have had Firefly in the previous year. Dr. Ligon asked who helped the agencies become more efficient and better run. Mr. Rutherford suggested that the EMS Council may be able to approach Firefly regarding a deal for phone service for each of the agencies.

Dr. Ligon asked how Roseland Rescue was paying more for oxygen than Wintergreen. Ms. McGarry indicated that Roseland may pay for oxygen that was stored for other agencies.

Dr. Ligon commented that in 2018 the State came in and evaluated the EMS Council and said they needed to do better. She asked if they had done better. Ms. McGarry noted that Dr. Ligon was referencing the Assessment Report that VDEM (Virginia Department of Emergency Management) did in 2018. She commented that the Board was told that they needed to step in and have better management, but it never happened. She noted that maybe this was the year. Mr. Parr asked why Roseland Rescue's electric bill was so high. Mr. Rutherford noted that the building was highly inefficient. Dr. Ligon commented that by asking these questions, she did not mean that they needed less money, rather someone needed to advocate. Mr. Rutherford suggested that it be brought up to the Council. He noted that he did not know how the insurance portion worked. Dr. Ligon asked if Ms. McGarry would share the report with the rest of the Board. Ms. McGarry noted that she would. Mr. Rutherford noted the other utility costs for each department. He asked when the next meeting of the EMS Council would take place. Mr. Parr noted it was the next evening and he would be there as the Board representative on the Council. Mr. Rutherford asked why each agency got the same base amount. Dr. Ligon noted that Gladstone and Roseland did not really run any rescue calls. Mr. Rutherford asked if they had ambulances. Ms. McGarry noted that they both had rescue squads.

Mr. Harvey commented that they should be able to see who was running the calls. Ms. McGarry noted that John Adkins had the call data. Dr. Ligon noted that she had seen Roseland ambulance at Vito's but she had never seen them answering calls. Ms. McGarry explained that the volunteer squads rotated their equipment into with the Nelson EMS crew, and then they were paid mileage for loaded miles for when their vehicle was used.

Mr. Rutherford asked how the oxygen was handled and whether Rockfish might be getting their oxygen from Wintergreen. Mr. Parr noted that Rockfish did not have an oxygen line in the budget. He asked where that money flowed through. He asked if they were getting oxygen from another department, like Roseland possibly. He commented that the delivery may be going to Rockfish, but the bill was included in the Roseland bill. Ms. McGarry noted that was how she thought it might be working, but she could not swear to it. Mr. Parr noted that he would ask about that at the EMS Council meeting.

The Board decided to return to EMS Council later.

- Nelson County Health Department \$357,637

Ms. McGarry reported that the Health Department asked for \$111 more, which she noted that staff had included in the budget. Dr. Ligon asked if the State funded the Health Department at all. Ms. McGarry noted that they did. Dr. Ligon asked if the State paid rent. Ms. McGarry noted that they paid a portion of the rent, but a lot of it was local. She explained that the Department of General Services (DGS) negotiated the Health Department's lease directly with the property owner they were leasing from. Mr. Rutherford asked what the status of the Health Department was. Ms. McGarry reported that she had spoken to the new Director of the Health Department, Ryan McKay. She noted that Mr. McKay had said that the Heritage Center had been working out financing issues and had told the Health Department that the new move in date was July. Ms. McGarry commented that there was nothing happening at the Heritage Center currently and she thought that the contractor currently being used was waiting to be paid for the work done so far. Ms. McGarry noted that she thought that was about to happen as the financing was now in place. Ms. McGarry noted that Mr. McKay was skeptical of the building being ready in July. She indicated that a meeting was to be scheduled between her, Mr. McKay, DGS and the Heritage Center, to get a better idea on the timeline. Ms. McGarry noted that Mr. McKay had indicated that Blue Ridge Medical had been very gracious in allowing them to stay as long as needed so far. She noted that a few of Blue Ridge Medical's accounting staff had been moved into the Health Department office area. Ms. McGarry reported that Nelson County's local share was 45 percent and the State's share was 55 percent. The Board was in agreement to fund the Health Department at \$357,637 as requested.

- Region Ten Community Services Board \$150,000

- Piedmont Virginia Community College \$2,117

Ms. McGarry noted that PVCC asked for \$396 less for a total of \$2,117.

- Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District (TJSWCD) \$35,089

Ms. McGarry reported that the TJSWCD asked for \$1,022 more, which was a three (3) percent increase.

- Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) \$20,912

Ms. McGarry reported that the TJPDC requested a \$290 increase in funds.

- Jefferson Madison Regional Library (JMRL) \$382,965

Ms. McGarry reported that Jefferson Madison Regional Library had an increased request of \$23,395 from FY24. She explained that the increased share to the County's regional costs was \$1,389. She noted that there was an increase to Nelson's costs to run the Bookmobile services of \$490. She then reported that Nelson's local cost increase of \$18,490 included increases to address a local two (2) percent cost of living adjustment for staff, as well as a staff raise of either three (3) percent or five (5) percent, based on years of service. She noted that there was also a 7.9 percent increase in the Library's health insurance costs. Ms. McGarry explained that the increase also reflected the end of the credit that JMRL had provided to help

staff with a minimum wage adjustment, the gap in the remaining FY24 was \$3,026. She noted that a lot of the increase involved compensation and health insurance.

- Thomas Jefferson EMS Council

Ms. McGarry reported that the Thomas Jefferson EMS Council had requested an additional \$500 over last year for a total of \$10,500. Mr. Harvey noted they were very important and provided a lot of grants. Ms. McGarry indicated that TJEMS also provided training for the agencies. The Board discussed TJEMS funding again after JABA.

- Jefferson Area Board on Aging (JABA) \$111,904

Ms. McGarry reported that JABA was asking for \$111,904, increase of \$5,329 over last year. She noted that JABA was looking to provide services to 100 more people in the coming year. She reported that JABA was currently serving 500 people. Mr. Reed was in favor of giving what was asked. He noted they had gone a few years at level funding. Dr. Ligon noted the aging population in Nelson and commented that JABA could provide a lot to citizens in Nelson. Read stats for aging Nelson population. The Board was in favor of funding JABA the additional \$5,329 for a total of \$111,904 as requested.

- Thomas Jefferson EMS Council

Mr. Rutherford noted he had inquired as to how supportive TJEMS had been, and he not gotten good reviews. He commented that when the Board had reduced TJEMS's funding a few years ago, no one ever called to discuss the reduction in funding. Mr. Rutherford stated that he did not want to give them the additional \$500. He did not think that Nelson was getting the \$10,000 worth of support they were paying for. Mr. Harvey commented that they were using it for a good cause. Ms. McGarry reported that TJEMS had requested the additional \$500 due to economic conditions. Mr. Parr noted he would get more information at the Nelson County EMS Council. The Board decided to wait to discuss TJEMS funding until after Mr. Parr brought back additional information from the Nelson County EMS Council meeting.

- JAUNT \$90,179

Ms. McGarry reported that JAUNT had asked for \$13,644 less. She noted that JAUNT had indicated that the reduction was partly due to stabilizing demand, as well as internal operating efficiencies being implemented. She indicated that JAUNT had noted that there could be an opportunity to seek increased services if the County wished to continue the same level of funding. Ms. McGarry noted that she was not sure what JAUNT had in mind when they mentioned the potential for increased or additional services that the County could get. Ms. McGarry noted that she was unsure of the current state of JAUNT and asked whether they had a new Executive Director in place. She noted that Brad Burdette was the Chair of the JAUNT board, but she had not heard whether they hired a replacement. Mr. Reed noted that the TJPDC transportation study work was in process and could be helpful. Dr. Ligon commented that JABA's success hinged on JAUNT operating. Mr. Reed suggested that they could work with JAUNT to see what a proposed increase in services would look like, given the reduction in their request. Ms. McGarry noted they could do that. The Board was in agreement to fund JAUNT as requested.

- MACAA (Monticello Area Community Action Agency)

Ms. McGarry reported that MACAA had asked for \$38,665 which was \$2,665 more than the previous year. Ms. McGarry noted that staff had backed out the additional \$2,665 for the time being. Mr. Parr noted that MACAA had pulled out of the after school program and Head Start. Mr. Reed noted that it was not permanent. He reported that MACAA was having staffing issues. Mr. Parr commented that MACAA was not coming back as MACAA, rather someone else was taking it over and the current employees were having to reapply for their jobs and take about a \$6 per hour pay cut. Mr. Reed noted that the staff were transitioning from part-time to full-time. Mr. Parr noted that the Nelson County School System was having to pay their staff \$40 per hour to go and tutor 13 kids at Rockfish. He noted that MACAA employees were able to file for unemployment during summer break. Mr. Reed noted that MACAA had subbed the work out to another company. Dr. Ligon asked why they should fund MACAA at all if they were not doing anything. Mr. Reed noted that MACAA was looking to end their lease at the Nelson Center and move to Heritage Center which would increase their ability to start a childcare program. Mr. Rutherford noted that MACAA needed to let the Board know what was going on. The Board discussed the services that MACAA was providing to Nelson County. Ms. McGarry noted that MACAA leveraged local funds to get federal funds. Mr. Reed felt they should be supportive of MACAA. Mr. Rutherford noted that MACAA should have reached out to keep the County in the loop. Ms. McGarry suggested they could invite agencies to discuss their budget requests. The Board was in agreement to have Sarah Hanks come to speak.

- Shelter for Help \$8,926

- Foothills Child Advocacy Center \$9,255

Mr. Parr noted that Foothills had an 85 percent increase in their FY25 request. Mr. Rutherford explained that Foothills handled cases where children were victims of bad things, and helped facilitate the intake process in a safe environment. Mr. Parr asked how they came into play with Social Services. Mr. Reed noted that Social Services did not have the ability to do the intake because they did not have the necessary facilities, so Social Services referred cases to Foothills. Mr. Reed noted that the new Social Services building would have intake availability there, so at some point, Social Services would be providing their own intake. Ms. McGarry noted that in FY22, Foothills helped eight (8) Nelson County children who experienced abuse, and provided support for families. She reported that in FY23, that number increased by 250 percent to 28 children. Mr. Parr noted that increase was a direct result of drug use. Ms. McGarry reported that the cost for services was about \$3,085 per child. She noted that Foothills was expecting 30 children in the current fiscal year. Mr. Rutherford was in support of funding the request. The Board was in favor to add the requested \$4,255 in for a total of \$9,255.

- Offender Aid Restoration (OAR) \$12,907

Ms. McGarry reported that OAR had requested a \$1,062 increase in funding. She noted that they were asking for \$550 more for pre-trial services. She also noted that they were requesting a 10 percent increase to provide a cost of living increase, to strive for equitable and comparable compensation for staff. Dr. Ligon asked about OAR's services. Ms. McGarry explained that OAR was mandated to provide pre-trial services and did not have the ability or authority to decline new clients or stop providing services to current referrals from the court. She reported that pre-trial service to Nelson County had more than doubled in the last year. Mr. Rutherford suggested that Dr. Ligon reach out to the Sheriff and Commonwealth Attorney to find out more about OAR. Dr. Ligon noted she could reach out to some people for more information on services provided and report back. Ms. McGarry noted that for local probation, OAR was serving 30 people. Mr. Parr indicated that he was good with the staff recommendation to level fund at \$12,907. The Board was in agreement to level fund at \$12,907. Mr. Parr noted that if Dr. Ligon got more information, they could discuss it. Mr. Reed noted they could bump up the funding if needed.

- Economic Development Authority \$3,100
- Central Virginia Economic Development Partnership \$10,000
- Nelson County Community Development Foundation \$69,661
- Community Investment Collaborative (CVSBDC)

Ms. McGarry reported that Community Investment Collaborate CVSBDC had requested \$8,708 in funding for FY25. The Board decided to circle back to discuss this funding later.

- CASA \$3,500

- Gladstone Senior Center Meals \$15,000

Ms. McGarry reported that Gladstone Senior Meals was asking for \$20,000. Dr. Ligon asked where the increase came from. Ms. Staton noted that was what the Board gave to Gladstone last year. Ms. McGarry noted that was because Gladstone had reported that they had around 60 people. Dr. Ligon noted it was packed when she went. She commented that out of the group, there were possibly six (6) Nelson residents there that she knew out of 40 people. She noted that the food was good and she loved their sense of community. She commented that all of the seniors there were connected to Nelson in some way. She noted that the seniors were doing lots of fundraising for the Fire Department, which they admitted was not active. The Board reviewed the Gladstone Senior's and it was noted that the group would have about \$24,000 on hand at the end of FY25. Dr. Ligon noted that she would like to give them \$9,000, which was what was

March 18, 2024

provided in the previous fiscal year. Mr. Reed and Mr. Parr suggested splitting the difference and funding Gladstone at \$15,000. The Board was in consensus to fund Gladstone Senior Meals at \$15,000.

- Rockfish Senior Center Meals \$12,367

Mr. Parr noted the request was an additional \$67. The Board was in favor of funding Rockfish Senior Meals at \$12,367 which included the additional \$67 requested.

- Virginia Institute of Government \$1,000

Ms. McGarry reported that the funds were due paid to the Virginia Institute of Government. She noted that Virginia Institute of Government provided a lot of technical assistance.

- Wintergreen Performing Arts \$9,000
- Habitat for Humanity – Piedmont Region \$2,500

b. Employee Compensation

The Board did not discuss employee compensation.

c. General Fund Transfers

The Board did not discuss General Fund Transfers.

D. Revenue Review

Mr. Rutherford commented that he wanted to keep the current tax rates in this fiscal year, the same going into the next fiscal year, for Real Estate, Personal Property, Machinery and Tools, and Mobile Home tax. Mr. Reed noted that he would like to discuss it further at the next meeting. Mr. Harvey asked when they needed to make a decision. Mr. Rutherford noted that they needed to decide by that Friday. Mr. Reed noted that he wanted to look at the revenue numbers before any decisions were made.

Mr. Parr asked how they were doing with the budget agenda. Ms. McGarry reported that they had gotten through Agencies and Non-Departmental. She noted that they would need to discuss Employee Compensation at some point, as well as General Fund Transfers. She indicated that they had talked about everything except the Social Services budget, Debt Service, and Schools. She noted that they would also need to discuss Revenue. Ms. Staton noted that they did have a few items to revisit as well. Mr. Rutherford noted that the Revenues would be a priority because of the deadlines. Ms. McGarry explained that the deadline was mainly pertaining to how they had to advertise, if there were to be an increase.

**III. OTHER BUSINESSS (AS MAY BE PRESENTED)**

The Board had no other business to discuss.

**IV. ADJOURN AND CONTINUE TO MARCH 20, 2024 AT 7 P.M. FOR A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

At 4:12 p.m., Mr. Rutherford moved to adjourn and continue to Wednesday, March 20, 2024 at 7:00 p.m. for a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan at Nelson County High School. Mr. Reed seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion by vote of acclamation and the meeting adjourned.