

MEETING #16– March 31

At a Workshop Meeting of the Madison Board of Supervisors on March 31, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. at 302 Thrift Road:

PRESENT: James L. Arrington, Chairman
Jerry J. Butler, Vice-Chairman
J. Dave Allen, Member
Eddie Dean, Member
Pete J. Elliott, Member
V. R. Shackelford, III, County Attorney
Lisa Robertson, County Administrator
Teresa Miller, Finance Director
Jacqueline S. Frye, Secretary

Chairman Arrington called the meeting to order and established the presence of a quorum, noting that all members are present.

Chairman Arrington then commenced the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance and a Moment of Silence.

Chairman Arrington asked if there were any additions or corrections to the agenda, to which it was advised that Mr. Gary Pond from the Rural Health Initiatives (Veteran's Administration) will be unable to attend today's session as previously denoted.

1. Workshop Agenda Items:

a. Madison County Volunteer Rescue Squad (Presentation by Steve Grayson):

Steve Grayson, member of the Madison County Volunteer Rescue Squad, was present and advised the organization is in the process of placing a contract on a piece of property for future expansion which will probably be a five (5) to ten (10) year process. Additionally, the property is currently zoned commercial and was rezoned in 1989 for this use (commercial usage), but the proffers didn't include this since it was zoned as a 'money making' deal and the use of a public building isn't denoted as such. Therefore, the condition of the existing contract with the organization will be to have the condition rezoned to include an allowance for the use of the public building. In closing, he stated there are no immediate plans, but EMS will be included into the equation as a joint venture.

Mr. Grayson advised the County currently has an established rezoning fee of \$2,250 and he would like to ask the Board to consider waiving the proposed fee since the Madison County Volunteer Rescue Squad will be making the application. He also advised the

property is located on Route 29 (Walton Thompson property) north of Warren Breeden's property, just prior to Gate Road and consists of 12.5 acres.

Chairman Arrington questioned whether it is the consensus of the Board to suspend the usual rule of not voting during the Workshop Session, or whether to hold off until the next scheduled meeting in April.

Mr. Grayson advised that in order to meet the May 2011 deadline, a decision must be made by April 4, 2011; however, he doesn't want the Board to do something out of the normal routine.

After discussion, on motion of Supervisor Allen, seconded by Supervisor Dean, the Board voted to suspend the rule of not voting at the Workshop Session, with the following vote recorded:

James L. Arrington	Aye
Jerry J. Butler	Aye
J. Dave Allen	Aye
Eddie Dean	Aye
Pete J. Elliott	Aye

After discussion, on motion of Supervisor Allen, seconded by Supervisor Dean, the Board voted to waive the rezoning fees associated with the Madison County Volunteer Rescue Squad's application to rezone the Walton Thompson property (12.5 acres), with the following vote recorded:

James L. Arrington	Aye
Jerry J. Butler	Aye
J. Dave Allen	Aye
Eddie Dean	Aye
Pete J. Elliott	Aye

Supervisor Elliott questioned what would take place in the event that zoning changes within the next five (5) to ten (10) years and this application has already been approved.

The County Attorney advised that a request for new conditions would need to be submitted, as there are cases in which 'sunset clauses' are implemented. In closing, he advised that once fees are waived, it's waived for the duration, although a building permit could be attained in the future; however, the only item being requested at this time is a waiver of the rezoning fees.

Supervisor Dean questioned whether there was precedence established when the fire company requested the rezoning of their building.

Betty Grayson, Zoning Administrator, was present and advised that the County has never done a rezoning for the Madison County Volunteer Fire Department of the Madison County Volunteer Rescue Squad, but have waived the building permit fees.

Supervisor Dean advised that he has no problems waiving the fees for volunteer's but feels such a request for the landowner is another matter.

The County Attorney advised that the volunteer services will be submitting the application as the 'contract buyer.'

Mr. Grayson advised that a contract is in place that is contingent upon the rezoning request and terms have already been negotiated. However, once the conditional rezoning, if approved by the Madison County Planning Commission, procedures will continue with closure of the contract.

b. Proposal for Use of Transfer Station (Presentation by Thora Pullen):

Thora Pullen was present and explained that she relocated to Madison County from Rappahannock County. While in Rappahannock County, the landfill had a small building in which people were allowed to place usable items (i.e. clothing, furniture, etc.) that citizens could come in and take (if needed). Additionally, she explained that after the loss of her husband, and she frequently sought usable items from the building at the landfill. Also, there is a list that she got from Rappahannock County that denoted items that aren't acceptable (i.e. refrigerators) and basically accepts clothing, shoes, lamps, sweepers, etc.). Not only do the recyclables help local citizens, but the process also keeps usable items from being deposited into the landfill. In closing, she stated that she'd like to see a little building situated at the local landfill to accommodate this purpose and advised that if applicable, she will put effort into fundraising to purchase a building, or see if a local business would be willing to donate a building for this cause, and referred to the building as a 'share shack.'

Chairman Arrington asked if the building in Rappahannock County is manned by anyone, to which Ms. Pullen advised there isn't anyone specifically assigned to this task, but there is an individual that goes down to the building once a week to clear out items that have gotten old, although this isn't a requirement.

In closing, Chairman Arrington advised that the Board will take the suggestion of a 'share shack' under advisement.

c. Criglersville Elementary School (Presentation by Susan Apel):

Susan Apel was present and advised the Board that she is involved with a group that has helping to clean up around the Criglersville Elementary School and they desire to make it usable for the general public. Also, she provided input on looking at possible uses for

the building and advised there is a program to assist with repurposing the building to make it more viable. This process has been done throughout the State of Virginia to:

- a) A Governor's School located in Richmond, Virginia;
- b) A former school building in Nelson County, Virginia;
- c) The Penn Center in Henry County, Virginia;
- d) The Robert R. Moton Museum in Farmville, Virginia;
- e) The Canon Rock Retreat House in Canon Rock, Virginia;

Additionally, this process is being undertaken throughout the United States and she feels the facility can be repurposed for the following:

- a) A community center;
- b) A coffee house;
- c) A theater;
- d) Office space;
- e) Summer art camp;
- f) Farmer's Market;

And also advised the group would really like to pursue some future use for the building and property. Also, they have had individuals from national organizations who have offered their expertise (field representative and architect) with this type of property and have also offered financial options, tax advantages, and they will offer their services at no cost to the County. In closing, she advised that the group would also like to schedule April 16, 2011 as a clean up day at the facility (i.e. putting mulch at the front of the building and on the playground and replacing some of the broken swing seats).

Supervisor Butler stated there are concerns of public safety because of the condition of the building, and questioned whether members of the group would have a problem with signing a waiver before entering the building.

Ms. Apel advised that the field engineer and architect have advised they will not have any problems with abiding by the request, as they do this sort of thing on a routine basis.

Supervisor Butler asked if there was any type of a discreet plan to denote future uses for the building; also, he advised that funding is critical at the present time and there are no funds budgeted for any improvements to the facility.

Ms. Apel advised the groups' purpose is to not ask the County for funding, but to figure out other avenues in which funding can be attained to move forward (i.e. grant funding and donations).

Supervisor Butler asked if a definitive plan could be made available to the Board before any future plans are put into place.

Ms. Apel advised this type of plan isn't available at the moment, as she will need to be free to talk with the field representative and engineer first after they review the facility and provide feedback as to what would be the most appropriate uses for the facility.

Supervisor Allen questioned the potential for asbestos and lead in the building and not knowing the environmental impacts on humans; therefore, he questioned whether the County can attain a binding waiver.

The County Attorney questioned that the Board has already dealt with the issue of allowing people to enter the building at a prior meeting.

Additionally, he suggested there could be a requirement that Ross Shifflett, Director of Facilities, or one of his staff members accompany individuals. However, he advised that an architect or field representative can enter, but there are concerns about allowing volunteers enter and there being the possibility that someone could be hurt.

Supervisor Dean advised the County should have about four (4) independent studies that were performed by several outside architectural and engineering firms on the facility.

Supervisor Butler advised that he has reviewed several of these studies and the County Administrator had a notebook with all this information. In closing, he advised that he would be happy to make a copy for Ms. Apel.

Chairman Arrington stated there is a great deal of documentation available and there is also a problem with the facility being situated in a flood plain.

Chairman Arrington asked if any members had a problem with allowing Ms. Apel to proceed with today's request.

Supervisor Butler advised that he believes the state agency responsible for ensuring that all regulations that pertain to a flood plain are met actually assist governments resolving some of the issues associated with the factor. Additionally, if the committee is formed, he suggested they look into the flood plain issues and determine if there are regulations available that will assist with bringing the building back into service.

Ms. Apel stated the field representative and architect have expertise in the above referenced areas and work solely to repurpose older buildings and do not deal with any necessary construction.

Ross Shifflett, Director of Facilities, was present and questioned who maintains liability on the playground at the facility. In closing he also verbalized the guidelines that pertain to equipment improvements made at other local school grounds (i.e. Waverly Yowell Elementary School).

The County Attorney advised that the facility (including the playground area) is County-owned property so does handle the liability. Additionally, the County has 'sovereign immunity' and any improvements that are made need to be approved by the County.

Ms. Apel advised that she used to be a preschool director and is very familiar with playground safety, resurfacing, and how deep the terrain can be.

The County Administrator advised it should be made clear as to who is allowed to enter the building (i.e. field representative from National Trust and architect) and not the citizen group.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to allow Ms. Apel, the field representative (National Trust) and the architect to enter the building under the supervisor of Mr. Shifflett or one of his departmental personnel and no other citizens.

Supervisor Allen advised there have been many groups over the years that have expressed interest in the building and questioned how the Board will handle the publicity generated by today's action when other groups ask for access.

Chairman Arrington advised the Board will have to make a decision on a 'case by case' basis, to which Supervisor Elliott agreed.

Supervisor Butler also advised if there are other groups who desire access, they could join the existing committee to provide input.

Ms. Apel advised that she will keep the Board and County Administrator informed of future findings.

d. Zoning Ordinance Amendments (Continued from March 8, 2011 Regular Meeting):

Chairman Arrington advised that he has concerns about the recommendation to allow sawmills and meat processing (deer) facilities in an agricultural and conservation area 'by right.' Additionally, he advised if allowed, the County will have no control over where these types of ventures are established in areas where the lots do not exceed five acres (5.0). In closing, he advised if a sawmill is established on a five-acre (5.0) lot, it will bring forth problems with excessive noise, which will also apply to a meat processing business (concerns were brought forth when Buffalo Hills, Ltd. Came into the area).

Supervisor Allen reminded the Chairman that the ordinance pertaining to meat processing was tabled by the Madison County Planning Commission.

The County Administrator advised that Ordinance Amendments pertaining to:
a) Wild Game Processing; and

b) Biofuels;
were both tabled (they were combined into one Ordinance).

Also, the Ordinance Amendment that pertains to sawmills was combined with farmer's market and farm winery.

Supervisor Butler advised that he feels sawmill operations should require a special use permit and those already in existence could be 'grandfathered', to which Supervisor Elliott concurred.

In closing, Supervisor Elliott advised there are too many areas within the County where a sawmill operation can be established within a subdivision without the requirement of a special use permit.

Chairman Arrington advised that his feelings are the same as earlier mentioned and also include meat processing businesses.

The County Attorney advised that the second aspect of the aforementioned amendment can't be changed due to new legal issues (those sawmill operations already in existence).

Chairman Arrington questioned whether the proposed amendment could exclude a sawmill operation and questioned whether the County Attorney should redo the amendment that pertains to this issue.

The County Attorney advised that the Madison County Planning Commission made a new definition of a 'farm sawmill' (current Ordinance denotes it as a 'sawmill'), and restricted the use. Therefore, he questioned whether the category of a 'sawmill' should be eliminated and only allow a sawmill operation by special use permit in an A-1 and C-1 zone. Also, he advised that an appropriate use can be attached to conditions as established with a special use permit.

Supervisor Dean questioned whether an additional public hearing would be required if changes are incorporated, to which the County Attorney advised wouldn't be necessary.

Supervisor Allen questioned if the first three (3) paragraphs of the amendment would be the only thing needed.

The County Attorney advised the Board not to take any action today, but allow him time to redraft the document and present it at the April Regular Meeting.

Chairman Arrington advised that he also has concerns about the definition of a 'farmer's market' and the clause that denotes 'a building, structure or place used for the sale of

farm or farm products, or craft products to consumers where fifty-one percent (51%) or more of the products are grown or produced by the operator/owner, or under the operator/owner's direction; a farmer's market must be located at or beyond the setback line and must use an existing entrance as access.'

Supervisor Dean questioned if this wording was taken from the State Code.

The County Attorney advised the wording isn't from the State Code, but is something that initiated from a recommendation by Brad Jarvis, Extension Agent, and he believes the concept simplified his initial definition of a farmer's market.

The County Administrator advised that she also feels that in order to give farmer's a greater ability to have a viable business at their own location, the Madison County Planning Commission implemented this wording to cover unified farmer's market operations (similar to what's at Hoover Ridge), but also farm stands on personal farms. In closing, rather than allowing anyone may sell goods at a small outdoor market on their property, the wording was initiated to allow producing farmers a means of engage in a variety of activities on their personal property. In closing, as a result of economic development, small farmers are becoming more successful because they are allowed to do more things on their property than before.

The County Attorney advised there is a large 'locally grown' farm movement and this definition was an attempt to address and allow this type of activity.

The County Administrator also advised the term 'farmer's market' doesn't just include the farmer's market that takes place at Hoover Ridge, but could be any small stand that a local farmer might want to establish at their personal property.

Supervisor Butler stated he also has concerns about the requirement of fifty-one percent (51%) in that if the location is on County property, then County citizens should be allowed to sell value added produce and meat products as well, along with other items (excluding jewelry, crafts).

Brad Jarvis, Extension Agent, was present and advised that members of the Madison County Planning Commission inquired about establishing some foundation within the State Code to offer some references to the local code; however, the closest guideline that could be found pertained to Virginia wine regulations that indicate what percentage of Virginia grapes have to be squeezed and put into a bottle. Also, at one time, the requirement was fifty-one percent (51%) and this changed within the past three (3) years and is now seventy-five percent (75%). Currently, there is no exact definition as to what a farmer's market would really require as a percentage of production, therefore, the local farmer's market requires at least seventy-five percent (75%) although there was a debate whether fifty-one percent (51%) was 'good or bad.' In closing, he advised that a 'producer is a producer' and although fifty-one percent

(51%) would make the individual's production relatively valid, and seventy-five percent (75%) denotes full investment and support of the market.

Chairman Arrington questioned the response on 'value added products.'

Mr. Jarvis advised that 'value added products' are allowed at the local farmer's market and this is encouraged. In closing, he advised the issue hasn't been regarding anyone selling jam that was produced from strawberries bought at the local grocery store.

Supervisor Butler questioned the thoughts if someone bought raw hams, cured them, and desired to sell them at the local farmer's market, to which Mr. Jarvis advised has been discussed and the 'Virginia grown' standards do accept and support the sell of this type of activity. In closing, Mr. Jarvis advised that the farmer's market is very open toward a 'Virginia grown' product and wouldn't contradict the established standards.

Supervisor Elliott questioned whether an individual would be allowed to sell fruit at the local farmer's market that was purchased elsewhere within the State of Virginia.

Mr. Jarvis advised that he would allow the aforementioned product for sale as long as the individual meets the seventy-five percent (75%) share and has three [3] other items to sell.

Supervisor Dean asked if there have been many applications to sell things that have been turned down, to which Mr. Jarvis advised that he hasn't turned any applications to date.

Chairman Arrington asked Mr. Jarvis if he has reviewed the proposed amendments, to which Mr. Jarvis said he has and also advised he doesn't feel a change will be seen from fifty-one percent (51%) or seventy-five percent (75%). In closing, he advised the farmer's market is open to an Ordinance that will allow people to sell 'by right', but still lean toward a seventy-five percent (75%) market share because this requirement denotes the provider as being 'long-term' and a 'genuine producer.'

Supervisor Butler advised questioned whether the clause "permitted by right in C-1" should also include 'permitted by right in A-1', to which Mr. Jarvis advised that he would think this should be correct.

The County Attorney advised that any of the County's Ordinances that allow 'permit by right' in a C-1 automatically include the same guideline for an A-1 zone.

The County Administrator emphasized that what is allowed 'by right' in the County's Zoning Ordinance doesn't mean that a property can't say "I'm not going to allow this to be done on my property." In closing, she advised that the Board also needs to declare whether or not the County will allow a property owner to use their property for certain

activities, but today's provision advises this type of activity is allowed under today's Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Jarvis stated if he received an application to a product that is required to be inspected (by Virginia law) then he has the producer sign off on the application that they have complied with all State regulations. Additionally, the Virginia Department of Agriculture comes in to perform certain tasks when the sale of cooked ham is brought for sale (i.e. inspection of cooking process, packaging, curing, etc.) just the same as the procedures undertaken for a restaurant.

Supervisor Butler questioned if existing meat products being sold at the local farmer's market meet the standards.

Mr. Jarvis advised they do and once an application is turned in, he makes sure everything is in place (to included cured ham); however, processed meats are under federal guidelines (not state).

Supervisor Butler questioned whether a hunter would be allowed to sell rabbit and squirrel meat, to which Mr. Jarvis advised there can be no selling of these types of items animals, but chickens can be sold (as outlined by the state code) without having a federally inspected facility.

Mr. Jarvis also advised the State of Virginia is challenged annually in the General Assembly about direct marketing; however, the only that has been authorized by the Generally Assembly at this point is if a producer sells less than 20,000 birds (broilers or turkeys) one doesn't have to have a federally inspected facility, but can 'home kill', package a sell these meat products without inspection. Furthermore, notification must be given that this is being done and products need to be labeled 'not produced at a state or federal inspected facility' in order to make the consumer aware of what they're purchasing. In closing, this requirement is in place for all 'value added' products excluding jams and jellies, but must be labeled 'not produced in a federally inspected facility.'

Supervisor Butler questioned whether animal skins can be sold at the local farmer's market, to which Mr. Jarvis advised to the best of his knowledge, these items can be sold as long as the regulations established by the Department of Game & Inland Fisheries is met.

Supervisor Elliott stated some citizens question why they aren't allowed to bring items purchased in another locality to the local farmer's market for sale on County-owned property, and they feel they're being deprived.

Mr. Jarvis stated the aforementioned request doesn't meet the 'sell by right' guidelines. Additionally, there are venues for commercial sales (i.e. Pratts), but he looks to keep the farmer's market 'production oriented' and is more keen on working with actual

producers. In closing, he advised it's his responsibility to expand the possibility of farms in Madison County. In closing, he advised if the County would provide a separate venue, these individuals could take advantage of the local farmer's market and if folks bought wholesale and then resold items here, they'd be very competitive advantage.

Supervisor Allen stated it appears the community wants to support agri-business in Madison County and he feels this amendment is a means of doing this if the fifty-one percent (51%) will keep someone from establishing a flea market next to his personal residence, which is a good thing for the County.

Supervisor Allen questioned if a special use permit is in place and an Ordinance is adopted that makes the existing regulations less stringent, does this invalidate the special use permit.

The County Attorney advised that if a special use permit is in place, there's no proposal to change the conditions involved with the permit; however the new conditions will effect future applications, but the existing special use permit will remain as already in place (i.e. grandfathered). In closing, he advised in the event the new amendment changes, the new conditions will then be applicable.

Supervisor Elliott stated the Board can add additional uses to the local farmer's market.

Supervisor Allen stated when increases uses were initiated in other areas where local markets exist, the operation failed; there is something working well in Madison County and he sees no reason to mess it up.

Chairman Arrington asked if it was the consensus of the Board to take action on the proposed amendments during the next regular meeting, or if there were any updates that would be needed.

Supervisor Elliott stated that he feels auctions should be by 'special use permit' in a B-1 zone and not 'by right.'

Supervisor Dean concurred with the aforementioned comment and advised there are many small tracts of business property, as a means of not creating something in the County that will not be desired. In closing, he suggested that auctions be allowed 'by right' in a B-1 zone.

Supervisor Butler questioned if a special use permit will be required for auctions held at the local firehouse or for non-profit organizations.

Supervisor Allen advised that the aforementioned requirement will be for 'occasional use.'

Supervisor Elliott also advised that if auction is held on a private farm, this should be allowed 'by right'; however, if the merchandise is moved to an alternate location for the auction, a special use permit should be required.

Supervisor Butler expressed his agreement that a special use permit should be required if merchandise is moved to an alternate location to be sold.

The County Attorney advised the above referenced requirement will create difficulty for yard sales or sales at the firehouse and rescue squad. In closing, he advised the commission is trying to permit the aforementioned types of sales without requiring a special use permit, as long as they're not occurring regularly at the same location.

Supervisor Butler questioned if the above referenced activities were exempted, and thinks the Board should just deal with auctions (excluding tent events, horse shows, land sales, etc.), as this seems to be the primary issue. In closing, he questioned if tent sales will involve Plow & Hearth.

The County Attorney advised that Plow & Hearth tent sales will be included. Additionally, he advised the commission wanted to make it clear that occasional uses don't require a special use permit.

The County Administrator advised that Plow & Hearth may not be included because there is a condition that 'no more than three (3) cumulative days (for the sale activity) within a thirty (30) day period. Also, Plow & Hearth tent sales typically last longer than thirty (30) days, and are held many times during the year; therefore, they will continue to be handled the same as what is currently being done.

The County Attorney stated an assessment was made of Ordinances from other localities and the current definition was derived from those assessments.

The County Administrator advised if something is going to occur more than three (3) cumulative days, there may well be a distinction from an auction house environment and taking place routinely in the same location. In closing, if the aforementioned activity occurs routinely, it establishes a business location in which regular sales activity takes place, and she suggested the Board determine what it to be allowed to happen (on occasion) anywhere in the County and what type of activity people will be required to attain a special use permit for.

Supervisor Butler stated if auctions are going to be held for several days, the County should be made aware. In closing, he feels the auction can take place and the Board will have to evaluate conditions based on the amendments.

The County Administrator advised that most people will notify her or the Zoning Administrator in advance to see if something is allowed; typically, whether the plan is specifically laid out, both parties will suggest that a special use permit be purchased. In

closing, she stated there are activities that occur in most places that are allowed under their Zoning Ordinance.

Supervisor Allen verbalized concerns that some locations aren't equipped to handle excessive roadway activity.

Supervisor Butler advised that he feels items should be sold where they're housed and not transported elsewhere.

The County Administrator advised that the Board will need to clarify the specifics.

Supervisor Allen advised that he cannot support the aforementioned concern.

Supervisor Elliott advised that a special use permit shouldn't apply to any non-profit organizations.

The County Attorney advised that today's issue isn't a zoning analysis and that every issue can't be resolved with a Zoning Ordinance.

The County Administrator stated the concerns are a matter of degree, as routine sales are more than a basic yard sale.

Chairman Arrington suggested the Board entertain more discussion before taking any action on this topic.

The County Attorney advised that the Board will need to determine a plea and direction is needed, as there will always be various scenarios.

Supervisor Elliott asked about a 'blanket' special use permit.

The Zoning Administrator advised that during the early 1970's, the Madison County Young Farmer's was required to get a separate special use permit for each event they held at the grounds; in time, they asked for a special use permit to cover everything that goes on at the site.

Supervisor Dean questioned what is necessary in order to maintain 'grandfathering.'

The Zoning Administrator advised there must be two (2) years of non use (this causes a termination) at a particular site, as denoted in the County's Zoning Ordinance.

Supervisor Dean questioned if this guideline was from the State Code, to which the County Attorney advised he wasn't sure if abandonment of a use was considered standard.

The County Administrator advised the Madison County Young Farmer's definition of 'non use' may allow temporary uses on personal property.

Jimmy Rider was present and stated that an auction was held at the fire hall (once in a lifetime event) and no special use permit was required.

Supervisor Dean stated the Board will need to make some decisions and may need to adopt the amendments 'item by item.'

The County Attorney advised the Board can adopt items and motion changes as the process continues.

After discussion, Chairman Arrington suggested further discussions on the amendments should be added to the April Regular Meeting Agenda.

The County Attorney clarified that changes will be made to allow a sawmill by special use permit in a C-1 zone and an auction, by special use permit, in a B-1 zone; other changes will be made during the April Regular Meeting.

Supervisor Butler questioned why the auction site was denoted as an 'establishment.'

e. Skyline CAP (Presentation by Kim Frye-Smith):

Kim Frye- Smith, Executive Director of Skyline CAP, was present and provided a brief overview of the services her office offers to address the poverty needs at the local level within the County. Additionally, in lieu of assessments that are done, there have been many foreclosures within the County and her office has been able to react and focus efforts to assist those families in need. Furthermore, funding support from the County is spent in the most valuable areas. In closing, she thanked the Board for its continued support.

Supervisor Butler asked Ms. Smith to explain how her office interacts with the Department of Social Services.

Ms. Smith advised that her office offsets referrals from the Department of Social Services since clients. In closing, she advised that most of her clients don't qualify to receive services provided by the Department of Social Services because of their income level.

f. Discussion of Proposed FY2012 Budget:

The County Administrator reminded the Board that the FY2012 Budget will need to be adopted at the April Regular Meeting, as tax bills will need to be mailed by May 1, 2011.

Supervisor Butler thanked the County Administrator for all the research that was done on a possible reduced work week; he also questioned whether a one-day (1) furlough would generate any savings on fringe benefits.

The County Administrator advised any savings will depend on which employee(s) is/are being sought to undergo the furlough.

Supervisor Butler questioned whether one (1) public safety could do at least one (1) furlough day.

Robert Finks, Director of Emergency Communications, was present and advised that his office works in three (3) shifts during the week with two (2) dispatchers working twelve hour (12) shifts. Additionally, he could manage a one-day (1) furlough a week if he can choose which day this could take place; however, he will need to look at the existing work schedules. In closing, he advised he is unsure what this would do from the highest to the lowest paid salary, and also advised that one (1) furlough day per month will cause a problem as there are employees who have request leave at least three (3) months in advance and it wouldn't be fair to place someone on furlough when they have already been advised they could take leave they have earned.

Supervisor Dean advised that a furlough day would not change the salaries for the Constitutional Officers.

Chairman Arrington advised that he feels the 37.5 hour work week and overall projection is better than the previous ideas that were presented.

Supervisor Allen provided a spreadsheet that he had completed to denote a five cents (.5) real estate tax increase and a ten cents (.10) increase on personal property. Additionally, he suggested that each department undergo a 3.5% decrease overall (by line item categories) without cutting current salaries. Based on his findings, at least \$30,000 could be saved during the year.

The County Administrator advised that \$2,300,000 was initially kept to improve the County's cash flow.

Supervisor Allen advised that a contingency fund is necessary, in the event medical expenses increase and need to be addressed.

Supervisor Butler also commented on an increase in insurance coverage.

Supervisor Allen advised the numbers he used for personal property may be a bit low.

The County Administrator questioned a percentage reduction for position salaries set at equal pay.

Supervisor Allen advised that he did not include any adjustments to salaries but operations only. Additionally, he feels if there will be cuts, then each department should determine where and not attach any salaries.

J. L. Taylor was present and questioned if a furlough day would equate to \$30,000 annually.

The Finance Director advised the Board to remember that public safety will still need to be covered in the event a furlough day is allocated.

Chairman Arrington questioned the Board's previous commitment to reduce the tax year on farm machinery and tools, and whether this action will need to be delayed.

Supervisor Allen advised that he thinks this commitment should be honored.

Supervisor Butler questioned if the tax year should be decreased by one year.

Chairman Arrington questioned whether this action will be one of 'fairness' as many citizens may feel the current level of ideas should be modified and that the farmer's are being given a break when all others citizens aren't.

Supervisor Dean advised that the prior commitment was made with the condition to be evaluated on an annual basis. In looking at the current tax issue, this is the year than an adjustment can be made. Also, a tax in a time everything else will increase will be seen as an injustice. Therefore, he suggested this commitment be thrown out because of the small amount that will be involved. In closing, the numbers can't be analyzed and he would like to study this factor before putting out further thoughts on this issue, as well as look into other options.

Supervisor Elliott stated he feels the tax on farm machinery and tools needs to be continued, as he also has a hard time committing to something being done that may cut funding to the school system and feels this area will need to be assessed as well.

Supervisor Allen advised that he shared the information presented today with Dr. Eberhardt, Superintendent. In closing, he feels the farm machinery and tools tax needs to go away.

Supervisor Butler suggested the first two (2) items on the Ordinance for the Transfer Station be deleted and all past items continue to be weighed but increase the current commercial fees.

The County Attorney questioned what a one cent increase on real estate taxes would yield, to which the County Administrator advised would equate to about \$197,000.

Supervisor Elliott also advised that many County buildings are failing; roofs need to be repaired and/or replaced and if the County's fund balance is reduced, where will the funds be attained.

Supervisor Allen advised that the Board may need to look into funding the CIP long-term.

The County Administrator advised that enough funding should be kept to cover monthly expenses. Additionally, she advised that Albemarle County keeps a fund balance of \$2,400,000 and a small amount for contingency so their total budget times twelve equates to one (1) month of expenditures, which is almost half of the total balance.

Supervisor Butler questioned whether the Board will need to schedule an additional day to meet prior to the April Regular Meeting.

Supervisor Dean suggested the Board continue today's meeting to Wednesday, April 6, 2011 at 6:00 p.m. and adjourn at 7:00 p.m. in the auditorium at 414 N. Main Street.

g. Other Matters (to be determined by Chairman):

Becky Cromwell came before the Board to present a grievance issue.

Supervisor Dean advised that a grievance issue needs to be handled according to the guidelines denoted in the personnel policy and the Board can't go opposite from what has been presented and adopted.

Chairman Arrington advised Ms. Cromwell that she must follow the written policy as denoted in the section on employee grievances.

h. Adjournment:

With no further discussion or action being required by the Board, on motion of Supervisor Dean, seconded by Supervisor Allen, The Board voted to continue to Wednesday, April 6, 2011 at 6:00 p.m. in the auditorium, with the following vote recorded:

James L. Arrington	Aye
Jerry J. Butler	Aye
J. Dave Allen	Aye
Eddie Dean	Aye
Pete J. Elliott	Aye

James L. Arrington, Chairman
Madison County Board of Supervisors

Lisa A. Robertson, County Administrator
And Clerk to the Board

Date Adopted by the Board: May 10, 2011

Copies: James L. Arrington, Jerry J. Butler, J. Dave Allen, Eddie Dean,
Pete J. Elliott, V. R. Shackelford, III & Constitutional Officers
