

MEETING #51 – November 26

At a Workshop Meeting of the Madison County Board of Supervisors on Monday, November 26, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the Thrift Road Complex located at 302 Thrift Road:

PRESENT: J. Dave Allen, Chairman
Doris G. Lackey, Vice-Chair
Jerry J. Butler, Member
Pete J. Elliott, Member
Jonathon Weakley, Member
V. R. Shackelford, III, County Attorney
Ernie Hoch, County Administrator
Teresa Miller, Finance Director
Jacqueline S. Frye, Clerk of the Board

1. Workshop Meeting Agenda

Chairman Allen called the meeting to order and noted that all members are present and a quorum was established.

2. Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence

The Board of Supervisors commenced their meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Adopt Agenda

Chairman Allen advised there are items that will need to be added to today’s Agenda:
Item 4-h (Rescue Squad Funding Request;
Item 4-i (MOU for the School System;
Item 4-j (Extra day off for Christmas Holiday;
Item 4-k (Organizational Meeting;

Chairman Allen called for further deletions, corrections or additions to today’s Agenda.

On motion of Supervisor Lackey, seconded by Supervisor Weakley, the Agenda is adopted as amended, with the following vote recorded:

J. Dave Allen	Aye
Doris G. Lackey	Aye
Jerry J. Butler	Aye
Pete J. Elliott	Aye
Jonathon Weakley	Aye

4. Agenda Items:

a. Financial Review:



Chairman Allen asked if there were any questions pertaining to the certificates of claims for September 2012 – FY2013.

i. Certificate of Claims [General Operations (September 2012 – FY2013)]

Supervisor Butler questioned an expenditure on page 22 of the report pertaining to the electric bill for the Courthouse (\$3,240.00) and whether this was monthly charge, and if so, is there any way to cut these costs. In closing, he advised there have been instances where the interior lights were on the entire weekend despite the fact the lighting system is supposed to be on a timer system.

Ms. Miller advised the payment was for the month.

The County Administrator advised that he believed most of the building was powered by electricity and that most of the lights and other devices were on a timed system. He also advised the County is in the process of getting a proposal on an HVAC system and updates have been implemented to the existing alarm system.

b. Minutes #47 through #49:

Chairman Allen asked if there were any questions pertaining to the above sets of minutes.

Supervisor Lackey advised about the procedure to report corrections, to which the Chairman advised that an email can be forwarded to Mrs. Frye – once corrections have been implemented, she will re-send them to the other Board members for review and advisement.

c. Tax Deferment (for the Elderly and Disabled):

The County Administrator provided follow-up information on the Ordinance for tax deferment for the elderly and disabled and presented all members with a spreadsheet to denote the total number of deferral based on values from 1999.

The County Administrator provided follow-up information on the Ordinance for Tax Deferment for the Elderly and Disabled, along with a spreadsheet to denote the total deferral numbers based on tax values from 1999.

The County Attorney advised that he hasn't completed a sample document just yet for review as he thought the issue was still in the discussion phases. He also questioned when the Board wanted to move forward with a public hear during this fiscal year. In closing, he advised the public hearing can take place at the same time as the budget amendment for the proposed CIP financing.



The County Attorney reminded the Board that the public hearing on seasonal use has been scheduled the night of the joint meeting on Wednesday, January 2, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. He also advised that due to advertisement requirements, the public hearing on the tax deferment ordinance can be scheduled on Tuesday, February 12, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. and the changes can be retroactive to January 1, 2013.

In closing, the Board suggested something be posted on the website for the citizens.

The County Attorney advised that he will speak with the Commissioner of the Revenue how the bi-annual billing will affect the proposed exemptions, since the deadline in the program is September 1st of each fiscal year.

d. Park & Recreation Authority:

Chairman Allen advised the County has received three (3) applications for consideration for appointment on the PRA Board.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to schedule interviews for the three (3) applicants on Tuesday, December 11, 2012 beginning at 2:30 p.m. in the auditorium.

The County Administrator explained the framework of what has been discussed about the memorandum of understanding for the PRA based on what has been discussed regarding general terms and conditions (i.e. maintenance of Hoover Ridge) and the fact that a lease will also be needed. The documentation being presented today will allow the PRA to develop their own departmental budget and they will be responsible for hiring a Manager to run things.

Supervisor Lackey questioned whether this position will replace the employees that are already in place or will this involve a new position.

The County Administrator advised the individual currently performing maintenance tasks will remain in place through the end of the year. Also:

- a) The PRA will be responsible for hiring someone effective July 1, 2012;
- b) The PRA may keep current staff on a part-time basis;
- c) The PRA would like to find someone on a part-time basis ;
- d) The PRA will try to attract sports team to come here;
- e) The MOU will only be effective through June 30th, 2012;
- f) Funding for the PRA will remain in place (County and Facilities department);

The County Administrator advised the PRA is currently receiving \$112,000.00 from the County; the recent spreadsheet denoted an amount of just over \$86,000.00 plus additional monies that would be funded by the County, with a savings denoted in the Facilities budget. Although a complete breakdown of funding was provided, the County Administrator advised that all numbers are subject to change.



Additional concerns verbalized by Supervisor Lackey regarding item 1-a, 1-f, 1-g and 1-h included:

- a. Who currently manages the Farmer's Market;
- b. Will the County or the PRA assume control over the equipment denoted in the MOU;
- c. Will fundraising by the PRA be subject to an audit;
- d. Will the fields denoted on E-1 and E-2 be maintained/managed that are situated on the School's property;

The County Administrator advised that the Madison Extension Office currently oversees operations at the Farmer's Market that is authorized to be held on County property. Additionally, the equipment referred to in today's document is mainly used to cut the grass at Hoover Ridge, and is a large farm tractor – this tractor is generally only used by the County for snow removal, maintaining the hillside by the scales and the landfill, and for clearing the property behind the courthouse. In closing, the use of the tractor will be 'by mutual agreement', and both parties will need to work together on this endeavor, as the County will have the ultimate say over what takes place at the property.

The County Administrator advised the County has been maintaining the fields located on school property through a combined departmental budget; however, if PRA assumes control, they will be responsible for maintaining the fields and County employees will no longer be sent to handle this task. In closing, he advised that an agreement has been in place between the County, PRA and the school system for quite some time – although the agreement is old, some adjustments will be needed between the PRA and the school system.

Supervisor Butler verbalized concerns regarding Item 1-b pertaining to assuming control over human resources, facility maintenance and upkeep, as he feels this should be re-worded to state, 'HR facilities, infrastructure, maintenance and upkeep, as water and potential sewer and buildings.

Supervisor Weakley questioned whether the wording should be changed from "HR" to "PRA" since there are other properties included in Item 1-e through 1-g.

The County Administrator that water, sewer and buildings will be accomplished by fundraising efforts. Additionally, he advised the County doesn't own the American Legion and has no say in what the PRA does with the property.

Supervisor Elliott asked if the County still paid dues on the piece of property located at Middle River.

Ms. Miller advised this issue was resolved by Lisa Robertson, former County Administrator.



Chairman Allen stated the property denoted as Item 1-g isn't "American Legion" property, as they only own the property adjacent to the building and that the PRA actually owns the skating rink and half of the parking lot located on the property.

Supervisor Elliott advised he wasn't in favor of the County hiring an employee, but is in favor of giving the PRA whatever funding is in the Facilities departmental budget for them to use and do as they see fit to manage the property. In closing, he advised the Board has had a lot of discussion about not filling the position.

Chairman Allen feels the County needs to support the PRA in the short-term and allow them to get on their feet; they will have much to get in place and he doesn't want to see them 'set up for failure.'

Supervisor Weakley advised he doesn't have a problem with today's proposal, but would like to suggest the hiring selection should be done by the PRA, as the individual will be their employee.

The County Administrator agreed it will be up to the PRA to hire an individual; however, he will be happy to sit in on the process if they desire. Also, in response to comments made by Supervisor Elliott, the County Administrator advised that funding could be placed in the PRA's budget; however, it will still be allocated from the County's budget, as the PRA doesn't have their own account in which funds could be placed for them to use – this will not be in place until July 2013, although funding can be earmarked and tracked.

Supervisor Elliott advised in his opinion, he doesn't feel the PRA representatives here today will fail because it's not in their nature to do so.

Supervisor Butler questioned whether the funds could be appropriated into the PRA's accounts; he also asked about the PRA employee benefits (i.e. VRS, retirement). Furthermore, he feels that members of the PRA should be responsible for interviewing and hiring of their own Board representatives. In closing, he had concerns about Item 3-e and 3-f where 'blanks' were denoted.

The County Administrator advised this was done intentionally, as some Board members had expressed a desire to see the PRA be self-sustaining, which is an option; however, he is unsure if this can be accomplished from the start as it is still unknown regarding the establishment of VRS benefits, accounting procedures, auditing services, and retirement, and he doesn't feel this can all be accomplished within the next six (6) months. In closing, he advised the set up will be similar to what's in place for the Department of Social Services, in that the County provides funding, but they will be responsible for running their own operation.



Supervisor Butler feels that if the County is moving toward making the PRA completely self-sufficient, then he'd like to see this accomplished within the next six (6) months by transferring funding and let the PRA move forward.

Ms. Miller advised the above referenced suggestion would require many things to be moved around and other decisions will need to be made. In closing, she advised there's a history as to why financial matters pertaining to the PRA are handled in the manner in which they are; therefore, she suggested this concern be presented to the auditors for advisement.

Although the members advised they are aware of the past issues, they feel things operate in a completely different manner now than in the past.

Mr. Dean advised the PRA is ready to move forward either way, but will need to investigate how to step out on January 1, 2013 with handling the benefits for the new hire (i.e. health insurance, VRS); he questioned whether there is a way for the PRA to become a member of VRS and a part of the County's insurance program. In closing, he is unsure about the process pertaining to VRS but there are other governing Authorities who have opted not to participate in VRS (Rapidan Service Authority), but the Jail Board Authority does participate; therefore, he feels there is a way for a governing Authority to accomplish this, although he unsure if this can be accomplished by January 2013. Also, he feels the process will be much smoother if a transfer of the employee's benefits didn't have to occur effective July 1, 2013.

Ms. Miller advised the PRA is an authority of the Madison County Board of Supervisors; therefore, any employee they would have who is considered a full-time employee would fall under the County's health insurance plan and VRS, as do Social Services personnel, although they do have their own separate health insurance plan, but they are a part of the County's health services group. The Jail is an authority, but they are also affiliated with the Comp Board so they automatically fall into the VRS system. Also, the PRA will be a part of the County's audit, the same as the Social Services Department is a part of the County's general operational audit, although they keep their own books, make their own deposits and pay their own bills.

Chairman Allen questioned which option the PRA Board would prefer.

Mr. Dean advised that he feels the best way to operate would be for the PRA to receive a check and be tasked with the responsibility of management. He also advised the PRA will need help with tasks involving accounts payable and payroll, as he doesn't feel it will be worthwhile to establish new procedures for one (1) employee. Furthermore, the aforementioned tasks are already being done by the County and he feels the PRA may be ready to do something different effective July 1, 2013. In closing he feels Item 3-h regarding discussing the 'pros and cons of PRA being an independent authority doing their own books and payroll could become viable after a full year of preparation is a good plan; however, he does feel the idea



of appropriating a portion of funding at certain time would give the PRA a better chance of success in managing things.

Supervisor Weakley asked if the plan is to be effective January 1, 2013, would all employees associated with current PRA operations be removed and would the split salaried position also be lost.

The County Administrator advised he hadn't anticipated doing that; however, he had envisioned that the next six (6) months would be a transition and that most of the funding wouldn't be moved to the PRA in January 2013, as there are still many issues that need to be identified and resolved. Furthermore, he feels it will be difficult to make a clean cut effective January 1, 2013 as opposed to working the transition through until July 1, 2013, which would be more viable.

After discussion, Supervisor Elliott and Supervisor Butler were in agreement with appropriating funding to the PRA and all funding appropriated to the PRA take full charge over everything discussed today effective January 1, 2013. Supervisor Butler suggested all monies for PRA be appropriated to them. Also, Supervisor Elliott suggested they be given whatever monies are left in their existing line items and be tasked with managing the funds through the rest of the fiscal year.

The County Administrator advised that a percentage of the Facilities budget is used by the PRA and they don't have a line item for all budget categories.

Supervisor Butler asked what percentage of the Facilities budget is utilized by the PRA.

Supervisor Lackey advised the process sounds too complicated to become effective and/or implemented within the next month, as it seems the new budget needs to be in place in order to work out all the details being verbalized today.

Chairman Allen advised he envisioned there will be issues at first and a transition period of about six (6) months will provide time to determine any problems. Furthermore, if the PRA encounters a problem with employing an individual, they can work on this; however, he feels the rest of the process can be eased into. Lastly, it appears that everyone wants to see the PRA stand independently; therefore, he feels that gradually moving forward would be best and less costly in the long run. In closing, he doesn't feel it would be fair to ask County staff to figure all this out within a thirty-day (30) time frame.

The County Attorney advised that a lease will need to be in place prior to January 1, 2013; therefore, he questioned if thirty (30) days would be sufficient time to get this accomplished.



Supervisor Lackey advised there are concerns about the Farmer's Market, and although a site plan has been presented, there is nothing to define the parameters of what the PRA will assume responsibility for.

Supervisor Weakley questioned whether the Board could agree on filling the position, excluding the other conditions discussed.

Chairman Allen asked if the Board would agree to determine a dollar amount for the operation that could be made available to the PRA without transitioning everything all at once, to which Supervisor Elliott feels needs to be brought before the PRA to advise if they will be able to operate on the determined amount.

Mr. Dean suggested the PRA be given something to work with and they will move forward from there.

Chairman Allen explained the County can devise a plan based on the information provided today that will involve allocating enough funding to the PRA to:

- a) Hire a full-time employee;
- b) The Board will determine a dollar amount that will allow the PRA to operate Hoover Ridge through June 30, 2013;

In closing, he advised that a transfer will not be required, but only to make sure the funding is available for the PRA to use.

Ms. Miller reiterated the PRA wants to hire a person; therefore, the Board will need to determine whether:

- a) The individual will be a County employee or a PRA employee;

Furthermore, if the individual will be a PRA employee, the following must be attained first:

- a) A federal tax number will be needed;
- b) A state tax number will be needed;
- c) An Unemployment tax number will be needed;

Furthermore, even though the County will perform the payroll operations for the PRA, they cannot fall under the County's tax (i.e. federal, state); also, if the new employee is ever fired, the County will be liable to pay unemployment benefits; this all needs to be in place by the end of 2012.

The County Administrator advised it isn't known how quickly someone can be hired; therefore, he feels that February 1, 2013 may be a more realistic date to accomplish the tasks, as January 1, 2013 may be a difficult deadline to meet.



Supervisor Butler suggested the PRA be advised of what funds will be made available to them in order to plan their programs, to which the County Administrator reiterated the funding being discussed will all be for maintenance (i.e. grass seed, field maintenance, fuel, equipment repairs). In closing, he suggested the process continue as is and that the PRA be allowed to assume responsibility effective July 1, 2013.

The County Administrator advised that if a certain amount of funding is allocated to the PRA, the County will need to establish another budget line item for them to spend the funds. In closing, he stressed that a new budget will be needed in order for the funds to be transferred. Furthermore, he is concerned that a new hire will need to be shown around and PRA doesn't have anyone available to do this except PRA members and volunteers, and he thought it would be agreeable for him and the Facilities Manager to show the new hire around and familiarize the individual as to what tasks will need to be accomplished.

After discussion:

- a) Supervisor Weakley advised that he was in favor of allowing the transition to occur as outlined in today's MOU, to allow time to resolve many concerns verbalized today.
- b) Supervisor Butler advised the new hire should be a PRA employee and the one employee currently split between the County and PRA should be included as a PRA employee.
- c) Supervisor Lackey advised the transition will be needed; however, she feels the process is ultimately leading to Item-h as denoted in the MOU that advises by January 2014, the PRA will be an independent authority that will handle its own books and payroll procedures.
- d) Supervisor Elliott reiterated his opinion (allow funding to be provided to the PRA and let them move forward).
- e) Chairman Allen agreed that he'd like to see the PRA independent; however, there are potential pitfalls in place that will create problems for the County Administrator and the PRA to have to contend with; therefore, he is in favor of moving forward with a transition period.

Supervisor Weakley questioned how the changes will affect the employee who is split between both parties. In closing, he also verbalized favor of moving the position under the PRA, but questioned what that will mean in the long run, as it appears the PRA feels



more energy is needed to get things up and running; therefore, he feels the change may call for the position to be re-scoped, and who will make decisions for the position.

Supervisor Lackey questioned whether the employee would have to split hours between the County and the PRA. In closing, she advised that job descriptions will also be needed for PRA positions and asked whether the County or the PRA will be responsible for doing this.

Chairman Allen advised if the employee is under PRA, it will be their task to accomplish this.

The County Administrator advised the split employee can remain as is until July 1, 2013, or effective January 1, 2013, the costs for payroll (for the position) can be split between the County and PRA.

Supervisor Butler advised he was in favor of separating as soon as possible, whether it's January 2013 or February 2013, including all PRA employees.

Chairman Allen suggested that a finalized agreement be provided to the Board for review at the December Regular Meeting.

Mr. Dean advised the PRA would like to get moving; however, he did advise that based on the budgeted funding that may be provided, the PRA can't justify having two (2) full-time employees, as there may not be enough paperwork to necessitate a full-time clerical person, which is a concern. In closing, he feels the proposed change date of January 1, 2013 isn't enough time to notify someone who has spent as many years working in the position as the current employee.

Chairman Allen suggested the employee be kept on the County payroll temporarily.

Supervisor Weakley strongly suggested that today's information not be published in the news media with names attached.

e. School System Supplemental Requests:

Chairman Allen advised the school system has presented a supplemental request for three (3) separate amounts:

- i. Unbudgeted local funds (\$12,700.00)
- ii. Cosmetology Student Tuition (\$4,209.00)
- iii. One week of Camp Unakite & Science Equipment [MCHS] (\$8,500.00)

The County Administrator advised that he was unsure as to where the request for unbudgeted local funds was coming from.



Supervisor Butler advised this is the first time he has seen a request for student tuition and whether this type of request has been handled this way before, as most requests are part of general supplements.

Chairman Allen explained that one request is for the cosmetology program and the other is for the Madison Education Foundation.

Ms. Miller explained there have been requests for payment of student tuition, which is usually to cover costs for someone to come in outside of our locality to take a class. In closing, she feels the request for \$4,200.00 is for an additional student, and if it's known exactly what the specific request is for, it will be defined in a letter.

Supervisor Elliott questioned that today's request is for funding that the school system has in the Treasurers' department that they're now asking to be returned to them.

Ms. Miller advised the funds are to be received.

The County Administrator advised that he will get clarification from the school system before any action is taken on this issue, and will confirm the funds have been received through the Treasurer's Office for one of today's requests.

f. Topping Committee Report

The County Administrator advised that more information is being collected on trailers to develop clearer options on this matter. Also, he was contacted by the Greene-Madison Humane Society to schedule a January 2013 meeting in the County's auditorium where they will provide input on their program and activities, and they are interesting in talking with the Topping Committee as well. Furthermore, he hopes to have more concrete numbers to provide to the Board at the January workshop session and hopes to provide information on the concrete wall for the recycling bin at the transfer station; once pricing is received, he will provide that to the Board for review, which he anticipates will be much more expensive than the initial renovation.

g. Transfer Station (identification of vehicles)

Chairman Allen asked that the topic of identification of vehicles for the Transfer Station be added to today's Agenda. He advised the County is using hangtags for the second year and believes something will need to be purchased for the upcoming year. There have been discussions in the past about using windshield stickers with an inscription or using transferrable, plastic stickers that adhere to the windshield that can be transferred from one vehicle to another.

The County Administrator advised that decals can be purchased for a cost; therefore, he feels a window sticker (similar to what's used when an oil change is done) will suffice. In closing, he is looking at what will be the least expensive measure (with or without



numbers) and suggested they be disbursed at the Transfer Station by citizens either showing their old decal or their ID rather than launch a mailing to all citizens.

Supervisor Butler asked about the cost of stickers for cars, to which the County Administrator advised he's waiting to hear figures from the Treasurer's Office.

Ms. Miller explained the procedure that is in place for Orange County and that two (2) tags (unnumbered) are sent to each property owner when they pay their annual taxes for use of the 'green box'. In closing, she advised that a replacement tag is \$3.00.

Chairman Allen asked if the Board could agree to allow the County Administrator to research this issue and present a viable option to the Board for the next year.

Supervisor Elliott advised that he has purchased his hangtag and he isn't willing to use tax dollars to buy another emblem.

The County Administrator advised using your hangtag could be an option; however, the County is almost out of hangtags and a new batch could be purchased without an expiration date but have a number only.

Supervisor Weakley advised that he was in favor of numbering the hangtags.

Chairman Allen advised that citizens can continue to use their old hangtags and be issued another one if it wears out.

Supervisor Lackey was in favor of purchasing decals.

In closing, the County Administrator advised he will attain some pricing and report his findings to the Board at a later date.

h. Rescue Squad (Request for funding)

The County Administrator advised that the Madison County Volunteer Rescue Squad has purchased a piece of property and they're planning how to build a new facility on Route 29, as well as plans for their future. Additionally, they're looking at fundraising and have requested to make a request of the County to help with the endeavor.

Steve Grayson, MCVR member, was present, and advised that the property was purchased about a year ago, and the squad has looked at pictures of various sites and are looking towards breaking ground in four (4) years and hopefully be in the new building by the fifth (5th) year, as it will probably take a year or two to construct the building. Preliminary costs are slated to be about \$4,000,000.00 and the squad doesn't want to borrow, but would like to have at least \$1,500,000.00 in the bank without any additional fundraisers from the public. Additionally, the squad currently has about \$400,000.00 earmarked towards the building – with the generosity from the Topping Estate and several others, the squad has earmarked long before the land was



purchased; based on County numbers and the calls being run, it's anticipated the revenue recovery program will generate about \$500,000.00. Also, the squad initiated this plan in August and has committed 100% of the recovery revenue to go into the building fund; current amount saved is about \$900,000.00, and the squad would like to submit a budget request to the County for \$600,000.00, payable in four (4) installments of \$150,000.00 each. He also advised the building is being constructed to include EMS services in the operation, which was the intent since the beginning, as both groups have a great working relationship and it's felt that both groups should be housed in the same building. He further advised the plan is to develop a fundraising event (based on pledges) and it is anticipated the recovery revenue will cover the costs of the loan to decrease the debt service.

Supervisor Butler asked if it would possible to increase the number of volunteers in an effort to cut back on EMS costs.

Mr. Grayson advised it's the goal of the squad to accomplish this; however, he advised the problem isn't with finding volunteers, but with the amount of training hours that are necessary, the probationary period, and their willingness to commit to the next phase of (advanced life support). Overall, the training process can take over eighteen (18) months and he anticipates that some of the folks who recently graduated will more than likely move onto the next level. Also, the squad has plans to start another class within the next six (6) months and he advised the squad didn't do a good job prior in getting members in and cycling to offset the loss of others. In closing, he advised the goal for the squad is to be able to accomplish their tasks 100%, which may not be very realistic based on the amount of annual calls for service. Also, he advised the squad is looking to construct a 30,000 square foot building which will include sleeping quarters for male and female members (as does the existing building). In closing, he advised planning a building for today's needs is relatively easy; however, planning what will be useful twenty (20) years from now isn't.

The Board members raised concerns regarding the squad not looking to finance a loan.

Mr. Grayson advised that the squad would like to have a debt no more than \$2,000,000.00, if possible, or less, which, based on current financing, it is anticipated that projected recovery revenue would service the debt loan.

The County Attorney asked if the squad has thought about looking and the process that Culpeper County has in place that calls for a special amount to be added onto the taxpayer's assessment bill to go towards the building fund for fire and rescue. He feels the aforementioned mechanism might prove to be a palpable way to fund the project and might really help the squad get their loan from the bank, if it's known about the funds being generated through the County.

Supervisor Weakley advised he wasn't fully familiar with the fund, but that Culpeper County took advantage of a certain footprint and combined their operations center;



they also have a much higher pool from which to generate funds, but he isn't family with the set-up described by the County Attorney.

Mr. Grayson that he determined the requested allocation to be \$150,000.00 a year for four (4) years because he didn't want the local newspaper to report that County taxes will be raised by four (4) cents to fund the rescue squad project.

Supervisor Elliott asked if there were any grant funds available.

Mr. Grayson advised that he hasn't investigated this option, nor was he aware of any grants available; however, this issue will be assessed. In closing, he advised he was aware there are grant funds available for the purchase of equipment, but wasn't aware of any available for construction projects, but feels that a favorable bank rate since the loan is being made to a non-profit organization.

Supervisor Butler suggested the squad look at researching homeland security and USDA under rural development for under-served counties. Although there is a benefit on applying for loans and/or grants, he is unsure of the specific types that are available, but advised they are listed under "grants.com" and many of the departments have the types of grants listed.

Mr. Grayson advised the squad applied for ambulance funding through homeland security in the past, but was unable to get the funds; however, the squad's grant guru is very familiar with that process and he will be asked to research this suggestion.

Chairman Allen asked if the Board would be willing to commit to at least explore today's request in the upcoming budget process.

Mr. Grayson advised the request will be for \$600,000.00 from the County in four (4) annual installments of \$150,000.00; however, whichever method the Board wishes to pursue in order to achieve the end result is irrelevant. In closing, he advised the squad would like to have the funds at before entering into the project which will mean:

- a) Funding is guaranteed; and
- b) Will provide for a \$30,000.00 savings on a loan with a four percent (4%) or five percent (5%) interest rate;

Supervisor Weakley questioned whether this is something that could be put towards a voting referendum, which is usually done during an election, as the citizens may be in agreement with the request and where the funding will come from – if this is identified, then it will come across as a 'no new tax.'

The County Administrator advised if the request could be presented as an 'add on tax' that will be earmarked for a specific fund for fire/rescue and impose a five cent (5) tax increase on each bill.



The County Attorney advised that a referendum can't be imposed if the state code authorizes it; however, he will investigate to see if there is a mechanism in place.

Supervisor Butler asked how much funding does the County provide to the rescue squad currently, to which Mr. Grayson advised is \$100,000.00 annually; however, today's request is in addition to the amount the aforementioned amount.

The Board thanked Mr. Grayson for attending today's session.

Mr. Grayson suggested that anyone with questions outside the scope of today's meeting is free to contact him and he is willing to explore any additional suggestions.

i. School MOU

Supervisor Elliott advised that he attended the recent CIP meeting and has concerns about the MOU between the County and the school system, as he believed the Board would be a part of what the school system did – although the project would be theirs, the Board would be kept informed of what was happening. At the recent meeting, a decision was made regarding HVAC to be placed out for bid, and once this is done, the County will be asked for funding, which he doesn't feel is a means of keeping the County informed, in his opinion. If the school system is deciding to use a certain system and put it out for bid to three (3) contractors, the County should be made aware of the entire process instead of being advised that a bid was placed, received and then request funding. In closing, he is concerned when the County runs out of funding, the work will stop and the County has no input on the project except to provide funding.

Supervisor Butler asked if a Clerk of the Works had been hired, to which the County Administrator advised the project hasn't actually started and the pre-bid meeting was recently held with bids due by December 1, 2012.

The County Administrator advised that he met with the Superintendent at a following meeting, representatives from Crabtree, Rohrbaugh Associates, Inc., and the Engineer, to discuss the HVAC issue and they are still looking at various options, and are trying to come to a consensus from their Board.

Supervisor Butler advised the MOU states that the meetings will provide a minimum report of any changes to the scope of work. In closing, he said the minimum scope of work on the bleachers stated "bleachers" and there were changes which included a press box, concession stand and a new scoreboard that weren't reported.

Supervisor Elliott advised that he was led to believe the bleachers would only involve a replacement of what was originally in place and nothing pertaining to a scoreboard, press box or concession stand.



The County Administrator presented a diagram, of what was in place and what will be in place as per the project; he advised the determination to go with longer bleachers was a cheaper option than the costs to move poles and replace what they had originally planned.

Chairman Allen advised that he understands Supervisor Elliott's concerns regarding the changes not being reported; however, he feels the school system will probably feel that they did report the changes.

Supervisor Butler advised the MOU references that minutes will be kept.

Chairman Allen advised that the school system hasn't officially gotten into the project, but feels the issue of keeping minutes is something that will need to be addressed. Also, he advised the Board cannot provide input regarding the individual systems involved.

Supervisor Weakley questioned if it would be a reasonable expectation to ask the school system for specifics during the CIP meetings.

Chairman Allen advised the first meeting was solely about the bleachers; however, the second meeting posed issues concerning the bathrooms at the middle and high school. In his opinion, it appeared the representatives from Crabtree, Rohrbaugh Associates, Inc., were unprepared for the discussion; the issue of bathrooms was discussed during the first meeting to include a desire to move forward with renovations and not just perform ADA compliance requirements, but the representatives wanted to decide on the scope of work and were unprepared to discuss costs associated with the work.

Supervisor Lackey questioned whether there was discussion about the fact that the HVAC system had not yet been determined, to which Chairman Allen advised they are looking at two (2) different types of systems and there was no concrete discussion.

The County Administrator advised that he also met with the architects and the Superintendent and they have narrowed down to the two (2) systems, although nothing has been finalized to date.

Supervisor Lackey advised who is participating in the discussion of the alternatives (i.e. school board representatives and/or the Superintendent), to which Chairman Allen advised will be the school board or their designee (i.e. Superintendent), the same as this Board will direct the County Administrator to carry out a task on behalf of the County.

The County Administrator advised that representatives from Crabtree, Rohrbaugh Associates, Inc. are looking at the 'pros and cons' of the HVAC systems (i.e. central plan, roof top unit or individual units), but have determined the central plan is too expensive. In closing, he advised that a decision hasn't been made and he anticipates the school system will keep the County informed once they have decided what will be purchased;



however, the decision as to which system to purchase will be the school board's responsibility.

Supervisor Lackey advised that the MOU indicates the County should participant in the decision about what kind of system is being sought and refers to 'projects defined and agreed to at the joint board meeting' and that 'each party will be kept informed and involved as to decisions, progress and any material changes in the status thereof.' At a recent VACo meeting, she discussed the issue of HVAC systems with one of the representatives from Crabtree, Rohrbaugh Associates, Inc. and he appeared to have very little knowledge when presented with questions about HVAC systems. In her opinion, she feels that 'decisions are being made by the seat of the pants' and that when discussing a system that will cost a lot of money and impact, representatives from this Board ought to be in on the discussion and not be told that 'we selected this system.'

Chairman Allen asked the County Attorney to provide input regarding the school board's responsibility and scope of authority and the responsibility of the County and whether the MOU gives the County any authority beyond what is already in place (i.e. funding).

The County Attorney advised that in his opinion, the County developed the MOU which indicates the County will be kept well informed in order to make intelligent decisions regarding funding of the project, although the school board is charged with making the decisions about the project, and this factor doesn't change the state law. In closing, both parties are to keep each other informed so each participant can get to the same point.

Supervisor Weakley commented on whether there should be some suggestive input as regarding product availability for the HVAC systems.

Supervisor Elliott advised he's interested in what is being said regarding why one system is favored over the other so he can make a good assessment when asked to authorize funding for the purchase. In closing, he advised that he has attended two (2) meetings thus far and it appears to him that the engineers were unprepared.

Supervisor Butler agreed with the comment made by Supervisor Lackey regarding the paragraph in the MOU that both parties would be kept informed regarding decisions, progress and any material changes of the projects.

The County Administrator advised he was very vocal at the meeting concerning the pros and cons of the two (2) HVAC systems and asked for numbers. In closing, the HVAC system is the largest piece of the project and is a critical juncture and all questions from all parties need to be answered before a determination is made.



Chairman Allen asked Supervisor Elliott if he wanted to be a part of the meeting held after the initial session or whether he wanted the initial meeting to be more informative.

Supervisor Elliott indicated he'd like the meeting between the governing Boards to be more informative. In closing, he advised that if he isn't informed, he will not agree to provide funding to the school system.

The County Administrator advised that he will provide an outline to the school system to denote the type of structure the Board would like to have during the joint meetings and indicate exactly what will be expected.

Supervisor Elliott reiterated that the remaining Board members are relying on him and the Chairman to provide an overview of the joint meetings.

Chairman Allen advised that neither of the two (2) meetings thus far have met his expectations as well.

Supervisor Weakley questioned whether the contract between Crabtree, Rohrbaugh Associates, Inc. and the school system lays out specifics regarding performance and whether the decision about satisfaction is the school system's responsibility.

Chairman Allen advised there was specific discussion about renovation of the bathrooms and the money involved was above what was initially budgeted for the CIP projects. Although this issue was discussed in prior meetings and agreed upon, the representatives weren't prepared to discuss the initial concept. In closing, he also suggested the County Administrator report that the Madison County Board of Supervisor isn't satisfied with the manner in which the first two (2) joint sessions have gone based on information provided by representatives from Crabtree, Rohrbaugh Associates, Inc.

Supervisor Lackey questioned the performance by Crabtree, Rohrbaugh Associates, Inc. and if they should remain.

Chairman Allen advised if a change is made now, it will delay the project by at least two (2) years.

Supervisor Lackey feels that changes should be made so as to ensure the County receives a quality job and she is worried about the design.

Supervisor Weakley suggested the County be advised as to how the decisions are being made by Crabtree, Rohrbaugh Associates, Inc. and whether they've visited sites that can be compared to the facilities here, and whether the HVAC system will work here.



The County Attorney advised the suggestion by the County Administrator to compile an outline to denote the information the County would like to receive, review, and agree on.

Supervisor Weakley verbalized concerns regarding the projects, in that the architects wanted to widen the restrooms to meet ADA requirements but nothing else.

Chairman Allen advised that when representatives from Crabtree, Rohrbaugh Associates, Inc. reviewed facilities, they identified needs that had to be met, which included ADA compliance. In identifying the projects, the County is looking at renovations, but what was denoted was ADA compliance, which he feels was simply overlooked and should've been caught earlier.

Supervisor Weakley thanked the Board representatives for their time in attending the joint meetings.

Supervisor Butler asked if it would be possible to get an executive summary from the school board each month on where the projects are and what's being planned as a part of the outline request.

The County Administrator advised the above referenced request should be considered as a part of the monthly meeting and will also request an agenda of items to be discussed. Also, the school system is focusing a lot of attention on the HVAC system and they are concerned with the timeline of the project, as if they don't get the bid out soon, they will miss the opportunity to begin the work during the summer break, which is why they probably didn't focus on doing as much with the restrooms. In closing, he reiterated that the Board needs to be kept up to date on what is being done.

Chairman Allen advised it if hoped there will be more productivity during the next meeting and more positive results to report.

j. Extra Day off (December 26, 2012)

Supervisor Lackey advised that the County didn't make a decision to provide County employees with a Christmas bonus; in speaking with some folks, it was advised that an additional day off would be more satisfactory than a cash bonus, and they mentioned December 26, 2012. Employees were given two (2) additional days last year, but she feels that because of economic constraints, the Board should look at giving the day after Christmas as an additional holiday for employees.

Supervisor Weakley advised the suggestion is less days than last year and will impose a lower fiscal impact. In closing, he asked how this would line up with funding available in the budget.

Ms. Miller advised that last year, the time was given to full-time employees who work a regular work week, but not to those who work on a sporadic basis with no set schedule.



In closing, she advised that law enforcement and emergency personnel will be given compensatory time that will need to be taken by June 30, 2013.

Chairman Allen advised that the additional day will impose no budgetary impact if County offices are closed.

Supervisor Elliott verbalized disagreement with the request for additional time off because most employees did get a raise this year that the citizens did pay for – the citizens didn't get a raise and yet, Social Services reports increasing numbers for citizens needing additional services. In closing, he cannot bring himself to allow staff to have a day off when the taxpayers ultimately will foot the bill.

Supervisor Lackey advised that County personnel aren't overpaid and giving an additional day off is something the Board can do for them to show some gratitude for the good work they do and it wouldn't cost the County additional monies, as essential staff will be allowed to take the time off on another day.

Supervisor Butler verbalized concerns about whether the notice of the closure can be posted for the citizens in a timely manner; otherwise, he has no issues with closing the offices and extra day. In closing, he advised there were citizens who showed up at County offices last year and offices were closed.

Supervisor Weakley expressed agreement with the comment verbalized by Supervisor Butler and asked if this topic could be added to the joint meeting agenda for action on December 5, 2012.

The County Administrator advised that the additional day off will not affect the Transfer Station, as this was addressed earlier in the year and staff there will be given compensatory time.

Mrs. Frye advised the notice for Christmas and New Year holidays is always advertised for two (2) weeks, and will probably be published on December 13th and the 20th and an ad will also be placed to announce the Christmas luncheon scheduled for December 20th. In closing, she advised if action is taken on December 5th, the information can be sent to the Webmaster to be posted to the website the next day.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to take action on this issue at the December Joint Meeting on December 5, 2012, although Supervisor Elliott advised that he wasn't agreeing by consensus.

Chairman Allen reiterated that the publication doesn't denote a decision, but to advise the citizens that the Board will act on the suggestion to close offices on December 26, 2012 and may take action on the issue at that time.



Supervisor Weakley suggested that when the County does things, if it could be comparable with what the school system has in place. Also, he questioned whether this is something that could be included in future budget discussions.

Chairman Allen advised that it's hard to compare time off between the school system and the County, as the school system's schedule is so very different.

Comments were made concerning the \$500.00 Christmas bonus given to school staff during the past year, to which Chairman Allen advised that if possible, he would've agreed to do the same thing, but the County wasn't aware of what the school system was doing.

Chairman Allen asked Mrs. Frye to add this topic to the December Joint Meeting Agenda for action.

k. Organizational Meeting (January 2013)

Chairman Allen advised that Supervisor Lackey will be in Louisville, Kentucky on January 2, 2012 and will not return until 10:20 a.m. that day; therefore, he asked if the members would agree to move the Organizational meeting to 12:00 p.m. or 1:00 p.m.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to move the Organizational Meeting to Wednesday, January 2, 2012 at 1:00 p.m. in the auditorium.

In closing, Chairman Allen reminded the Board that the Joint meeting will be held on the same evening at 7:00 p.m.

The County Attorney advised that he has a court case that morning at 9:30 a.m. in Culpeper, Virginia and may be unable to attend the Organizational Meeting at 1:00 p.m.

Chairman Allen advised that the County Administrator is designated to serve as the Alternate. He also suggested that Mr. Webb be contacted and asked if he can stand proxy. In closing, the County Attorney advised that he will talk with the County Administrator and work something out before that time.

i. Closed Session (if any)

None.

i. VACo Financing:

The County Attorney advised the County Administrator has been in contact with VACo; their bond attorney has verbalized an issue as to whether or not the County will need to schedule a public hearing with regard to the bond. He advised the attorney that the County Administrator had been advised by representatives from VACo that a public hearing wasn't needed, but a public hearing would be needed on the issue of amending



the budget, but not for the bond issue. The bond counsel advised the aforementioned information was correct, but strongly suggested the County schedule a public hearing since one does need to be scheduled for the budget amendment. Additionally, the bond counsel advised that banks usually feel more comfortable if a public hearing is held; therefore, discussions were held about the publication schedule and the earliest an announcement could be published would be December 6th and 13th, 2012, and he feels the County will have to wait at least seven (7) days before having the hearing, which will be the evening of December 20th, 2012. If the aforementioned schedule is followed, based on the Board's direction, this would call for the public hearing to focus on the aspect of VACo funding and the budget amendment, which is appropriate. In closing, he advised he is aware the County Administrator had hoped to move forward on this issue by the close of the year.

The County Administrator advised that closing will be acceptable by January 2013, but he would like to have this issue all taken care of before then.

The County Attorney stated the bond counsel advised the information provided by VACo wasn't necessarily incorrect, but from his experience, he recommended the County have the public hearing. In closing, he advised that he has dealt with the attorney before on other matters involving VACo and feels the County should follow his recommendation.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to schedule the public hearing for Thursday, December 20, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the auditorium.

The County Attorney advised that he will publish a notice for the two (2) issues: a) VACo financing; and b) budget amendment. In closing, he questioned if the County would like a VACo representative to attend or will the County Administrator make the presentation.

The County Administrator advised that he will work the issue out with VACo.

Chairman Allen advised today's announcement will satisfy the Virginia Code requirement regarding notification to the Board members.

The County Attorney advised concerns as he doesn't think this announcement will meet the requirements since this is a workshop session. In closing, he suggested that based on Virginia Code, the Board can continue the December Joint Meeting.

The County Attorney advised it has been the general practice of the Board not to take action on the same evening of a public hearing; therefore, he suggested the VACo representative be asked if action is needed that night or if a vote can be taken at the first meeting in January 2013.

5. Information/Correspondence (if any):

Chairman Allen called for information/correspondence and there was none.



6. Adjournment:

With no further action being required, on motion of Supervisor Lackey, seconded by Supervisor Weakley, Chairman Allen adjourned the meeting, with the following vote recorded:

J. Dave Allen	Aye
Doris G. Lackey	Aye
Jerry J. Butler	Aye
Pete J. Elliott	Aye
Jonathon Weakley	Aye

J. Dave Allen, Chairman
Madison County Board of Supervisors

Jacqueline S. Frye, Clerk of the Board

Adopted on: February 12, 2013

Copies: J. Dave Allen, Doris G. Lackey, Jerry J. Butler, Pete J. Elliott, Jonathon Weakley,
V. R. Shackelford, III & Constitutional Officers

