MEETING #5 January 24

At a Budget Work Session of the Madison County Board of Supervisors on January 24, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. in the Thrift Road Complex located at 302 Thrift Road:

PRESENT: Doris G. Lackey, Chair
R. Clay Jackson, Vice-Chair
Jonathon Weakley, Member
Robert W. Campbell, Member
R. Clay Jackson, Member
Kevin McGhee, Member
Ernest C. Hoch, County Administrator

ABSENT: V. R. Shackelford, County Attorney
Phillip Tartaglia, Finance Director
Jacqueline S. Frye, Deputy Clerk

Agenda:

1. Call To Order

2. **Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence**

The Board of Supervisors commenced their meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence.

3. Determine Presence of a Quorum/ Adoption of Agenda

All members were present and a quorum was established.

It was the consensus of the Board to accept today's Agenda as presented.

4. Agenda Items:

a. Budget Discussions:

Commonwealth Attorney: George Webb was present and provided an overview of the triple murder case; it was thought that additional costs would be imposed upon the County in the event there was a change of venue; the paralegal is still needed to assist with preparations of the case and will be needed throughout the trial; the funding request has been approved through the end of the budget year; he anticipates the trial will continue through September 2014.

Currently $16,200.00 has been asked to fund the paralegal (through June 2013) and additional funding is being requested within next year's budget.

Mr. Webb advised the funding is actually projected through October 14, 2014); the Judge has imposed a time frame and has advised the case will not be continued, due to the length of time already invested in this particular case; additional funding being requested is exclusively for this case. At this time, he's unable to provide a firm cost of funding that will be needed. It appears folks in the Tidewater area aren't being very cooperative; they can't be arrested since there is no justification for doing so. The local Sheriff's department has done all they can with the assistance of the Virginia State Police – this is a circumstantial case although the evidence isn't circumstantial. A salary increase is being sought for the Assistant Commonwealth Attorney; a new computer is also needed.

a. **IT Equipment:** The County Administrator questioned if there isn't a need for additional IT equipment.

Mr. Webb advised this has decreased due to the new copier – all office staff can now print to this machine; problems occurred last year with the VCIN system (continued to go down) – this issue was resolved by Mr. Moncrief.

b. **Assistant Commonwealth Attorney Salary:** This salary is partially paid through an ongoing grant (totaling $40,000.00) and specifically includes that the individual work on domestic violence cases, although this isn't the majority of the types of cases handled through the office. A copy of the letter will be forwarded to the County Administrator for review. The incumbent currently resides in Orange County and they're trying to hire him to fill an existing vacancy which pays in excess of $90,000.00. This incumbent has an extensive amount of experience.

Supervisor Weakley questioned why the aforementioned position isn't treated like a Constitutional Officer, to which Mr. Webb advised that an application has been made to the Comp Board; however, based upon how they allocate funding, there doesn't appear to be enough funding and the stress factor isn't high enough for them to ascertain funding the position.

Chairman Lackey questioned whether funding was provided based on population, to which Mr. Webb advised his salary is based on population; however, the position being discussed in based solely on circuit court felony cases alone and the number of defendants – not charges.

Mr. Webb advised that some forfeiture funding has been received that will be provided to the Treasurer's Office in the amount of $2,700.00. All funding is based on statistics.

Mr. Webb advised the individual was offered hospitalization compensation (totaling about $6,000.00) as opposed to a salary increase during the past year; he doesn't get VRS as the position is considered to be part-time by the Comp Board; the salary increase being sought is $7,500.00.

c.) <u>Thomas Jefferson Criminal Justice Board:</u> Mr. Webb advised the TJCJB provides the majority of benefits in the Charlottesville area, although they do offer assistance with all misdemeanor/probation services in the Commonwealth Attorney's Office; most of the individuals on probation don't have a VADL and visit the office 1x to 2x monthly and are administered drug testing and are assigned to community services; if there was someone available all the time, more community service would be assigned if there was someone in place full-time to supervise individuals. OAR provides direct services to those who haven't committed a violent crime; individuals are required to check in 1x weekly, pre-trial and post-trial services are also implemented on misdemeanor cases, and employment is verified and/or encouraged.

Chairman Lackey questioned if there are any programs specifically targeted to literacy, drug abatement or alcohol treatment.

Mr. Webb advised that counseling and substance abuse assessment is implemented; mental health counseling is performed if needed, and there are other agencies located in Culpeper County that provide counseling, although he feels the effectiveness of these services depends solely on the motivation of the defendants involved; the County has been using non-violent offenders housed at the jail through their work release program.

Supervisor Campbell asked if there were any programs available for private enterprise to hire defendants on a daily basis (i.e. workforce).

Mr. Webb advised the jail does have a work release program; however, there must be someone willing to pick the defendants up, bring them back; supervisor must be provided; the Judge will make individuals eligible, but OAR doesn't provide these types of services, but will refer defendants to potential employers and State agencies; the local jail has done away with the home incarceration program due to the expense involved and the fact that many defendants abused the program. Juvenile offenders are under the rule of a different probation officer and aren't handled through OAR - a probation office works out of Charlottesville, VA; juveniles can't be mixed in with the adult prisoners. Madison County isn't eligible to participate in the drug program (not an adjoining County) offered by OAR in Charlottesville, but Greene County defendants can attend the program. The only programs offered for our locality include:

a) Incarceration
b) Supervised probation

Supervisor Weakley questioned whether the same type of events being offered are similar to what Mr. Fray offered in the past when he sat as the Probation Officer.

Mr. Webb advised that Mr. Fray provided services on his own merit and was extremely dedicated; the existing Probation Officer is only in the County about 1x weekly to provide updates for the Judge during juvenile court sessions; this

individual currently covers several other localities but does provide intake services and decides what cases will go to court and whether a petition will be issued. Also, there are different rules in place for juveniles that must be adhered to; many children who get into trouble aren't dealt serious consequences; the Judge has the authority to dismiss any charges if it's deemed the juvenile has complied.

Supervisor Jackson asked if the trend of crime has increased here.

Mr. Webb advised there are 'wanna be' gangs (i.e. Bloods, Crypts) trying to operate here a few years ago; some were awarded some serious time for their actions; drug problems are in place here with heroin use being on the rise, which he feels is coming from Culpeper County; when the economy is bad, there is an increase in prescription drug abuse as well; burglary is also linked to substance abuse with violent crimes stemming from alcohol usage – these problems seem to be in place throughout the State of Virginia; some localities are experiencing serious problems with methamphetamine; crimes involving check fraud are increasing due to the falling economy; domestic abuse has increased since 2008 which he feels is also due to economic stress and appears to be 'seasonal.'

Mr. Webb advised that folks need to be motivated to do something to improve their quality of life; there aren't any family guidance services offered here; he feels there are inmates in the regional jail that should probably be housed in a mental institution.

Supervisor Jackson questioned whether the school's request for a family advocate would be an asset.

Mr. Webb urged the County to look into doing this; he feels if services are provided to the kids while they're in school, this will be a definite asset in the long run and will be money well spent; he suggested the County not be blind to some of the things occurring in various school environments (i.e. bomb threats, weapons, etc.).

Social Services & CSA: Valerie Ward, Director, and Christie Cloniger, CSA Coordinator, were present for today's session.

The County Administrator advised that details have been provided from Ms. Ward pertaining to how things work between state funding and local funding; he explained the social services department has its own budget which is run by use of state and local funding; breakdowns will be provided regarding personnel and fringe benefits – finer details will be provided if requested; CSA's budget has very little personnel (one employee) – most of the money is budgeted to cover the costs of services needed by the children who receives services coordinated through the school system and social services.

Ms. Ward advised that her office has fifteen (15) employees who participate in the County's healthcare plan; she also explained the mission of her office to help folks triumph over poverty, abuse, neglect and to strive for a better future for themselves,

their families and their community; there have been significant increases in the need for foster care (currently includes 33 children); seven children will be entering into adoptive families out of the foster care system. Additional highlights provided included:

- Some children are funded directly
- Specific categories involved (i.e. AFDC, E-4)
- Eligibility guidelines
- Funding mechanisms involved (i.e. DSS, State, Local, CSA)
- Assessment of fees
- Foster care (average funding range - $448 to $40,000.00 +)
- Needs assessment
- Foster care guidelines

There are a number of children who are funded directly – one category is AFDC foster care – she's anticipated there will be $218,000.00 federal and $91,000.00 being from the state; those not falling into this category (4E) are funded by DSS – all children aren't funded through CSA. Eligibility is a complex process that is assessed of the family situation involving children placed into foster care. Madison has a higher percentage in foster care than the surrounding localities; room and board can be taken from federal funds; counseling services are funded through CSA. The major expense occurs if eligibility determination isn't made correctly, there is a charge back. Foster care is one of the largest areas of the DSS budget. All children in foster care are assessed to determine their needs – the denotation of 4E determines where the funding is taken. CSA has a determination of the average funding for foster care; fees are assessed by need and can start at $600.000 per month; a residential program may cost $40,000.00 per month; the average payment made to foster care parents is determined by a Virginia assessment; emergency rate is $1,100.00 per month plus a basic rate from $400.00 to $600.00 per month. Funding to foster parents can range from a base cost of $448.00 per month to $3,600.00 per month depending on the needs of the child. Foster parents must undergo an extensive background check and special training. It's difficult to anticipate next year's case load; there are some children exiting into adoption and custody – it's hoped this process will balance out costs. In some areas, the County is top in the State in providing services and making sure the children's needs are met; some of the foster care statistics have some children eventually being placed in residential treatment. If a child needs to be placed in congregate care in order to have their safety needs met, then this is something that DSS is willing to bring to fruition.

Concerns verbalized by the Board concerned:

- Guardian copays
- Current labor statistics
- What's type of assistance is being provided to help folks become more independent

Ms. Ward advised that each child entering foster care is screened before any type of determination can be made; child support is handled through DSS and reimbursement comes through CSA to cover any expenses; if a child is receiving CSA funded serves as a part of their special education/individual educational plan, co-pays can't be required of those mandates, as each citizen is entitled to a free public education.

Ms. Cloniger provided an update on CSA programs being offered; currently, there are (84) individual in the program – the total is ever changing.

Concerns were verbalized regarding the number of children being admitted into residential care treatment and what measures are taken when a child is the victim of incest/rape.

Ms. Cloniger advised the 'tier' of treatment options (i.e. foster care, residential, parental placement). The idea is to utilize the least restrictive form of care and then move to something more severe if the least restrict method isn't successful; funding being requested will be about $950,000.00 instead of the assumed amount of $760,000.00 – which will equal to about $11,000.00 per child.

The County Administrator advised that state funding equals two thirds and the County contributes one third; annual costs are closer to $30,000.00 per child (fees vary from one type of placement to another based on the needs of the child).

Ms. Cloniger advised that by the time children are referred to CSA for services, a court mandate has been ordered, as indicated by the Judge ruling over the case.

Ms. Ward advised that in cases where a child is the victim of incest/rape, the case is referred to DSS for investigation through child protective services and law enforcement; a court process is also put into place for criminal prosecution for the proposed perpetrator; if the child is in the custody of DSS, a foster care goal will also be implemented through the court system.

Ms. Cloniger advised the outcome of the perpetrator getting away is greater than convicted of the alleged crime; she also advised the existing caseload has increased – case managers generally only get to meet with their client once a month.

Treasurer: Stephanie Murray, Treasurer, was present for today's session.

The County Administrator advised there were no questions regarding the departmental budget; however, it was suggested the Treasurer attend and greet the Board or provide any information deemed appropriate; the funding denoted in the data processing category will remain the same as the past year.

Ms. Murray advised the data processing does assist with collection of taxes, especially the delinquent notices; the amount spent usually remains the same each time; a $30.00 delinquent fee is added to tax payments if payment isn't received

prior to the deadline; if payments are paid online, there is a convenience fee charged to the citizen by PayPal.

The County Administrator advised the Treasurer has requested additional part-time clerical help; the request was to increase the existing part-time line item from $3,000.00 to $7,837.00 (14 hours per week for $10.00 per hour) – the current part-time clerical is retiring.

Ms. Murray advised the individual remained on a little longer due to the retiring of a full-time employee and the hiring of someone new; she will provide a copy of her comp board budget to the Board for review; based on her workload study, she needs 3.88 people in order to run the office effective – currently there are three (3) individuals in the office; hiring a permanent part-time individual for the above reference hours would be a definitely asset to the office overall. In closing, she advised her current budget was larger due a former Deputy Treasurer making a higher salary.

A discussion continued regarding the base tax, revenue received, delinquent tax fees collections, possible vehicle and/or property seizure.

The Treasurer advised that whenever someone is experiencing difficulty in paying their taxes, she will make an effort to work with them and draw up a repayment plan; she advised that any fees involved with a vehicle seizure are charged to the delinquent taxpayer; in the event seized property is sold and doesn't cover the entire amount required, the delinquent taxpayer is still indebted to the County.

It was questioned the number of years an individual can be delinquent before they fall into tax lien status.

Ms. Murray advised there are individuals who feel if they pay someone else's taxes, they become owners of the property, which isn't true; the Virginia Code advises an individual must be 'two complete years delinquent'; notices are sent to inform there will be thirty (30) days to contact the Treasurer to pay the oldest tax assessed and establish a payment agreement to get up-to-date. In closing, the Treasurer's Office does try - if contact isn't made, the cases are turned over to Sean Gregg, Attorney, for collection, title search, and then placed up for sale at public auction; taxes are usually paid in full for properties going into foreclosure.

Commissioner of the Revenue: Gale Harris, Commissioner, was present at today's session.

Ms. Harris advised her she has requested a laminating machine her in her departmental budget, as she'd like to laminate the older tax maps to preserve them; the Zoning Administrator would also like to laminate her older property maps; the maps housed at the courthouse don't contain any of the proposed property changes.

The County Administrator advised the existing office equipment line item has actually decreased.

Ms. Harris advised the older tax maps are used by citizens and the Zoning Administrator when there are concerns as to how properties looked in the past; it has been suggested these old maps be scanned before they're laminated; some of the new maps (since 2004) have been digitized.

The County Administrator advised there were discussions in the past about scanning the old property cards; however, it's time consuming – this project needs to be done at some point but the proper equipment will be needed in order to accomplish that.

It was also reported the old County records aren't a part of the information that will be channeled through Tyler Technologies Systems (financial system is separate); all information currently in the RDA system will be transferred, excluding the old property cards or maps as these items aren't financial, but are stored on VAMANET; GIS and parcel information can also be found on the County's website.

The comp board pays about 90% of the salaries within the Commissioner's Office; there is no proposed salary increase for the departmental employees denoted in the departmental budget document; the salary breakdown was reviewed for clarification; the total budget request for the Commissioners including the six percent (6%) increase in health insurance is $166.00 less than last year's departmental budget.

Chairman Lackey suggested measures be taken to ensure the County's historical records are preserved; she also asked if there was any increase/decrease in the land use program.

Ms. Harris advised the acreage involved in the land use program has remained relatively steady; more have been denoted in conservation during the past few months; when owners switch from the land use program into a conservation easement, the land use value becomes the assessed value for that particular property.

Discussions continued regarding the change in taxes if a property is changed from conservation easement; it was also advised that tillable land is usually changed to crop production and not timber; there was also question about the CPI discussion and how the index is effected when land moves from farm use into conservation easement, and is eventually equal to property held in land use.

Ms. Harris advised that no changes regarding the aforementioned changes have been reported to the Commissioner's Officer to date; she also advised that agricultural land (in the land use program) is assessed at $525.00 per acre; forest land is assessed at $300.00 per acre; property changed from land use into conversation easement is assessed at $525.00 per acre (no deferred amount);

property in the land use program is all assessed the same, but the owner only pays the lower value which is a deferred amount. It was also reported there have been investigations into possible 'land use abuse' which did yield a few violations; those reported to have abused the program and subject to a 'roll back.' In order to qualify for participation in the land use program, a citizens must show proof of $1,000.00 net income for (5) acres or (500).

The County Administrator advised if land is in land use, it's still worth $8,000.00 per acre, but the owner is getting a deferral rate of $525.00 per acre; in regards to conservation easement, the higher number is removed and the value is simply $525.00 per acre, which could hurt the locality's composite index amount; recognition should be given to the fact there's quite a bit of conservation easement here and this must be calculated separately.

The Commissioner advised the aforementioned information on the land use program is submitted to the State for review and advisement.

It was also reported there are currently 13,000 acres of County land in the land use program that isn't taxed at the full rate) (81% of landowners do not pay full taxes); total square miles in the County equal 33,000; . The total square miles in the County equal 33,000 (i.e. 110,000 acres in land use, 13,000 in conversation easement; 4,300 acres in the park and game-land); the annual taxable income is listed on the VAMANET website; individual information on how much is paid is prohibited from being disclosed…..the lump sum amount can be attained from the Treasurer's Office.

Supervisor Campbell verbalized concerns about the elimination of the farm machinery tax, as some feel there has been a 'shifting' of taxes – the shortfall has to be made up somewhere.

PRA:

Mr. Dean, PRA Board Member, has reported the PRA would like to retain the funding received from sports; the PRA was looking to provide an increase to Mr. Carpenter, PRA staff; plans are to move some funding around, as they were approved by the prior Board to receive a specific funding – they currently have two (2) staff members and they use folks on an interim basis to assist with lawn care.

The County Administrator advised the PRA hasn't asked for any additional funding and are currently working within the budget established last year; they offset the budget by providing about $16,000.00 back to the County in revenue to offset their existing budget. Additionally, PRA has asked for balanced funding, although they are moving funding around; the part-time clerical staff works about (13) hours per week.

PRA is currently hosting online registration, purchasing uniforms and hosting instructor programs; information was provided from Mr. Price, PRA Member,

regarding a desire to appear before the Board regarding signage and a pavilion at Hoover Ridge.

The County Administrator advised that PRA's total budget for the past year was $300,000.00; their budget was increased last year from $90,000.00; the PRA wasn't paying for fuel or insurance, as this was always paid from the Facilities departmental budget; rent for the farmhouse ($6,000.00 annually) was paid out of youth sports funding in the past and it was decided this would be eliminated, and PRA would contribute $16,000.00, with the County's investment being $110,000.00 of local fund.

Supervisor Campbell questioned why the County would be responsible for handling PRA funding, as they're a separate entity, despite past accusations of embezzlement by an individual.

The County Administrator advised at some point, the Board discussed the issue of the PRA Board to become independent; however, in order for this to be acquired at this time, they'd need to have to increase their costs considerably in order to have sufficient personnel in place to handle all aspects of running the authority, similar to what the County has in place; this action will not decrease the County's budget.

Supervisor Jackson feels the PRA is a good investment of funding and management.

It was also reported the improvements the PRA would like to make at Hoover Ridge is being funding through their own department raised through donations and/or fees charged for sports participants; all equipment noted is still owned by the County, but is being utilized by the PRA through the MOU; the intent with the MOU was to develop a basic lease agreement; there are still many facets the PRA and the County are both working on and it's felt best to remain with the existing document as it is. In time, the PRA may one day be fully independent and not need funding from the County.

Supervisor Campbell verbalized concerns about liability in the event someone is injured; he also questioned the number of staff listed for the PRA and whether there are a number of special assistants.

The County Administrator advised the PRA is covered through VACo (as through the County) for the property; the County will retain ownership even if the PRA decides to be a full, separate entity apart from the County; at this point, the PRA has no authority to do anything at Hoover Ridge without the authority of the Board; he also provided a brief overview of the salary recommendations for the Director hired by the PRA, along with the part-time staff and benefits paid; payroll is implemented through the County along with payment of all bills.

Additional concerns verbalized by Supervisor Campbell pertained to additional part-time staff working through the PRA.

It was advised the PRA uses two (2) trucks that belong to the County – there has been no 'in kind' transfer of any type; these vehicles were made available to the PRA through the Facilities Department; PRA has spent about $3,400.00 in part-time maintenance for the year out of a $15,000.00 budget; $1,700.00 in clerical (YTD) and $1,900.00 in part-time custodial duties; 25% of their budget has been spent thus far for the fiscal year; part-time staff are paid $10.00 per hour.

It was advised the PRA will more than likely spend more during spring which is the growing season; much of the work done has been performed by volunteers thus far.

Extension Office: Brad Jarvis, Director, was present to provide input on his departmental budget; a sheet was provided along with the budget request for the department. Additional information provided included:

a) A pie chart of office financial information;
b) Newsletter/program report (AG, Extension, SNAP Nutrition);
c) Employee agent listing (full and part-time staff, septic systems assistant, volunteers)
d) Partnership with AARP tax preparers

Chairman Lackey questioned if any of the departmental staff are shared with surrounding localities, to which Mr. Jarvis advised the only staff member who is shared is Adam Downing, as he's the District Agent; two (2) other staff members are also housed in Madison but assist in Orange County.

Mr. Jarvis advised the Program has been very successful with all they currently do; funding is provided through the State (from Virginia Tech), County and grant funding is constantly being sought in actual dollars (not in-kind); funding request for this year is $93,207.00 - $407,000.00 is the actual cost to Virginia Tech to support the extension office; although he's unsure of the grant funding that will be received this year, funding is expected to be received in the amount of $12,500.00.00 from the Chesapeake Bay Foundation on July 1, 2014 to cover the cost to build an outdoor classroom at Waverly Yowell Elementary School – a curriculum will be develop and be utilized by various groups – volunteer time from the 4H Club will be the match (staff administration). Funding listed in today's report doesn't include donations received or 4H funding received from the annual fair.

Supervisor Campbell questioned the top numbers which includes a 6.9% pay increase, which is more than what most have provided.

Mr. Jarvis advised the FICA portion is higher, as mandated by the State; FICA is separated from salaries listed; VRS and healthcare are included in the FICA numbers (i.e. fringe benefits package).

The County Administrator advised the County pays about twenty percent (20%) of the Extension Office's departmental budget – remaining percentage is paid by the State (Virginia Tech).

Mr. Jarvis advised the County pays for telephone service and office supplies; the State pays for all travel; the County only pays for mileage involved with travel related to professional developmental training (i.e. seminars). Currently there are 450 kids currently involved in the 450 kinds enrolled in the 4H program – there are about 300 that are involved in in-school programs per year (ages 5 through 18); the Map Ed program involves about 700-800 people (i.e. nutrition; lactation counseling, etc.) and is a grant program hosted by Virginia Tech.

Information was also provided on the mentoring program (i.e. livestock, agriculture); the 'farm to table' program; and the farmer's market; also working with new producers to teach them ways to market their business hire help in order to promote their business; programs initiated through the extension office promote agriculture in the locality.

Discussions continued regarding slaughterhouse facilities, to which it was advised there isn't a strong desire by anyone to fund a processing endeavor here. There was also discussion about a cannery – a citizen is currently working with a group to host a feasibility study to open a facility at the GWC in Culpeper County.

It was advised there are other entities seeking to utilize the GWC in Culpeper, Virginia, although nothing concrete has been put into place thus far; Virginia Tech has just invested funding into the development of a food lab that will open in the spring of 2014.

Mr. Jarvis advised the extension office is the 'educational arm' for social services; educational techniques are also provided within the school system as well to promote vocational skills (i.e. SOL scores); workshops hosted by the 4H are done so as to reach all children regardless of race or socioeconomic status.

The County Administrator advised there have been ongoing discussions about space in the County; the extension office does require a considerable amount of space to hold the programs offered; the office space provided is also utilized by several groups and private functions held by citizens; there is an economic interest in having the extension office in the County due to the significance of agriculture and local youth here. .

Mr. Jarvis advised the existing space has been specifically designed for the extension office; it's also a public access site for the internet (through Virginia Tech's server); there is only one (1) County-owned computer in the extension office. In closing, he advised the MOU between the extension office and the County hasn't been reviewed or updated in many years; a copy was provided for review and advisement; a report was also provided on stink bug control and vineyards.

Additional Items:

Outside Agency Payment Schedule:

Planning/Zoning: No changes noted.

Schools: The County Administrator advised there will need to be some meetings to discuss budget with the school system; main issue that guidance will be needed will be to discuss large, new expenses (i.e. Sheriff's Office, healthcare, employee increases (or not), salary increases for some). School is looking to receive an additional $1,000,000.00. school system is still working on revenue; think they will receive about $300,000.00; school's final budget will be needed by the 11th; public hearing will be scheduled on February 3rd ; school will be asking to rollover funding from the general fund; several unfilled teacher positions; proposing for a 2% salary increase for the teachers; school is seeking a 2% increase for teachers ($250,000.00) – increase in VRS ($300,000.00); $321,000.00 was allocated to the school system during the last year in order to balance their budget (FY2013). Unsure what savings the school system will save during this year; $90,000.00 in new money was allocated to the school from the FY2012 budget; If there is a rollover of revenue this year; potential funding could be accessed from other county line items (i.e. capital fund, contingency fund, rescue squad funding request, etc.); the capital fund, contingency fund funding could be utilized from the capital fund ($250,000.00); room for minor adjustment without a tax increase to the citizens.

Supervisor Weakley wants to hold the line on any raises; pick up healthcare; significant funding requested by the school system and the Sheriff's Office; salary study will need to be reviewed to assess pay/classification.

Chairman Lackey suggested funding be placed in the contingency fund and make salary adjustments within six (6) months or hold off for a year before any allocations are made.

Supervisor McGhee advised that adjustment can be dependent on revenue projections before implementation of any salary adjustments.

Supervisor Campbell verbalized concerns that funding placed aside will eventually be spent.

There was also concerns as how to attain a better idea on anticipated revenue and assess what types of trade-offs can be implemented; not allow contingency to go too low; will not be a 2% salary increase unless taxes are increased; ideas on whether taxes will or will not be increased.

It was the consensus of the Board to try to retain taxes at the existing rate; no new funding without an increase; perhaps incremental increase be made accordingly rather than to impose a significant increase in a few years (i.e. 1, 2 or 3 cents) as

opposed to a five or six cent raise in a few years. Expenses are steadily increasing; future revenue is tied to things that are beyond the Board's control.

Additional points of interest reflected on the following:

- New administration (Governor) will tax increase at the State level affect the County; perhaps some of that increased funding will be returned to the County.
- Bulletin regarding bills that will cost the localities funding.
- Changes in Medicaid may be made available to some social services' clients.
- Big push for the Medicaid expansion;
- More money in mental health – may alleviate the County from having to pay local dollars for mental health concerns – may offer additional services.
- Number of cars utilized by social services; County doesn't control their budget; not much can be done at the local level.
- Educational changes at the state level (4 year old program); head start program can be eliminated.
- Cut budget and place funding in contingency for difficult times; not in favor of incremental tax increase each year.
- Sheriff can be provided two (2) cars instead of (3); establish a number and set funding aside.
- New County phone system is needed
- Perhaps pay cash for one (1) car and pay cash instead of financing (i.e. rotate debt service).
- Fleet service (i.e. Sheriff, school) – perhaps look at returning to a rotation basis after existing debt service items are rolled off.
- Tax rate over the past ten (10) years.
- Current debt service items – law enforcement vehicles, E911 equipment (radios), Waverly Yowell Elementary School – all interest rates are very low.
- In the event a tax increase may be necessary, the current issues (i.e. funding for CSA, law enforcement vehicles, school system) can be explained and justified to the citizens.
- Summaries on projected revenues for the coming budget year based on additional revenue received from sales tax are included in today's revenue sheet provided and projected revenue in the there is a tax increase by one cent ($10,000.00) and two cents ($300,000.00);
- Look at cutting the Sheriff's budget request for new funding (in half) and cut the school's request (in half); possibly look at anticipated revenue and assess how close the proposed budget is to balance; existing need for bullet proof vest and overtime; suggested highway safety funding be used to fund other needs.
- The Sheriff's personnel policy allows for unlimited leave to be accumulated; the County is currently paying a salary for one deputy who is currently out on extensive leave due to workman's compensation.
- A grant has been received to assist with the purchase of a server for the Sheriff's Office, which will reduce the Sheriff's funding request for a server.

- Revenues and expenditures; cuts will be necessary in order to fund the requests as presented (by CSA, Sheriff, school system).

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to review the information received during the past three (3) days before agreeing to any types of cuts.

Discussions continued regarding the placement of money in the contingency fund and earmarking it for a specific purpose; there was some concern that a reason will be found to spend simply because the funds were available

The County Administrator advised that most line items in the budget don't contain any overage of funding; feels the Sheriff didn't budget enough in his departmental budget for fuel; leftover funding at the end of each budget year is rolled over into the general fund; the County is being fiscally responsible – costs will continue to increase; funding be built up for the County is actually creating a reserve – investment in the future.

Further points of interest included the following:

- Spending money on microfilm; funding required to patch the school ($12,000,000.00).
- Need to invest in the County; maintenance on building, replacement of vehicles; there isn't anything to cut within the departmental budgets; four (4) positions were cut within the past year. No one has asked for anything excessive; going to need a new telephone system – current system is no longer manufactured.
- Assess what each agency has and indicate of a shelf life of equipment.
- Space planning will be required before any additional money is spent to fix specific items.

All members were asked to assess today's documents and highlight items that anyone feels can be cut; also research all organizations that receive funding and advise if any type of savings can be found there. It was suggested that the Tourism Director's **salary be split in half with half coming from the Chamber of Commerce and half from the TOT Fund.**

After discussion, it was advised the next budget workshop be scheduled for Wednesday, January 29th, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. at the Thrift Road Office.

Supervisor Weakley questioned the process concerning the three (3) vacancies on the Commission; it was suggested the Board establish a Committee (two members from each Board) to meet and discuss this issue and assess what amount of members will be most efficient and effective for the County.

Supervisor Jackson suggested establishing an additional committee can be alleviated by having the Planning Chair attend a future workshop to provide input and discuss today's concerns.

Supervisor Campbell suggested the County receive applications for the vacancies and that a selection be made from those applications; individual shouldn't just be appointed.

Chairman Lackey verbalized favor to reduce the size of the Commission and removing a Board appointee to the Commission.

Input was provided on topics designated for the January workshop session; it was suggested some of the items be pushed to the February Regular Meeting and/or the February Workshop Session due to the length of discussion involved.

The County Administrator advised of the impending resignation of the existing Finance Director.

b. Information/Correspondence (if any)

None.

c. Adjournment

With no further action being required by the Board, Chairman Lackey adjourned the meeting.

_____
Doris G. Lackey, Chairman
Madison County Board of Supervisors

_____
Clerk of the Board of Madison County Board Supervisors

Adopted on: March 11, 2014

Copies: Doris G. Lackey, R. Clay Jackson, Jonathon Weakley, Robert Campbell, Kevin McGhee, V. R. Shackelford, III & Constitutional Officers

****

Agenda
Budget Workshop Session
Madison County Board of Supervisors
Friday, January 24, 2014 at 9:00 a.m.
Thrift Road Complex
302 Thrift Road , Madison, Virginia 22727

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. ***Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence***
3. Determine Presence of a Quorum/Adoption of Agenda
4. Agenda Items
    a. Budget Discussions
    b. Information/Correspondence (if any)
    c. Adjournment