

March 16, 2011

Virginia:

AT A CONTINUED MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 1:00 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors room located in the Nelson County Courthouse.

Present:

Allen M. Hale, East District Supervisor
Constance Brennan, Central District Supervisor
Thomas H. Bruguere, Jr. West District Supervisor - Vice Chair
Joe Dan Johnson, South District Supervisor – Chair
Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor
Stephen A. Carter, County Administrator
Candice W. McGarry, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk
Debra K. McCann, Director of Finance and Human Resources
Susan Rorrer, Director of Information Systems
W. David Brooks, Sheriff
Jean Payne, Commissioner of Revenue
Erma Sue Harris, Treasurer
Judith Smythers, Circuit Court Clerk
Phil Payne, IV, Commonwealth Attorney

Absent: None

I. Call to Order

Mr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:03 pm with four (4) Supervisors present to establish a quorum and Mr. Bruguere joining the meeting at 1:15 pm.

II. FY12 Budget Work Session

A. Meeting with Constitutional Officers

1. W. David Brooks, Sheriff

Sheriff Brooks noted that he recognized that these were hard economic times, however he related the importance of training in addition to the academy training and that he would like to see his reduced training funding restored as well as funding for uniforms, and police supplies. He added that the police supplies were things that they required to do their jobs such as tasers. He noted that their equipment was aging and needed to be replaced.

Sheriff Brooks questioned the reduction in the Health/Medical line and Ms. McCann explained that staff had built in a 15% increase and the actual increase was less, so the reduction was the difference in that. She noted that this would be the case in all departmental budgets.

March 16, 2011

Sheriff Brooks then reported that the Part Time traffic enforcement had been very beneficial and that fatalities on Route 151 have been zero. He stated that he would leave funding of the solid waste enforcement up to the Board.

Mr. Johnson inquired as to whether the costs of funding speed enforcement were made up and Sheriff Brooks noted that revenue generated this Fiscal Year so far was approximately \$209,000.

Ms. McCann reported that the premise behind the part time speed enforcement funding reduction was that when the revenue was realized, they could ask for more money to support that. Mr. Carter added that their revenue projection was less for the coming year so as enforcement stepped up, then more funds would be appropriated for this. Ms. Brennan asked if the cost of the enforcement had ever exceeded the revenue and Ms. McCann noted that it had not under Sheriff Brook's administration, but it had previously. Sheriff Brooks noted the amounts brought in over the last several fiscal years to be \$636,313 in total.

Mr. Carter clarified that staff was not objecting to or was against future requests for funding; rather the reduction was based on past practices and the amount of revenue that was projected. He added that he was not opposed to this but that the funding should be adjusted as the revenue adjusts.

Ms. McCann noted that the submitted estimated revenue was \$150,000 which is \$100,000 less than what will probably be realized. Sheriff Brooks noted that he wanted to make sure that they would meet the number submitted. Staff noted being conservative and that there may be a new Sheriff that would not continue speed enforcement at the same level.

When asked if it was a problem to do what staff suggested, Sheriff Brooks said it was not and that Mr. Carter had been fair.

Members then agreed by consensus that their intent was not to debate or discuss budgets right now, but rather to just receive input to be discussed later.

Mr. Johnson then summarized Sheriff Brook's comments and asked him to note his wish list which included: giving the Sheriff's Department and Dispatchers a raise, getting an impound lot, implementing an inmate work release program to help clean courthouse, grounds, and install road signs, making Jennifer Campbell full time, and purchasing a 4WD hybrid vehicle for the paper server.

Mr. Bruguere then joined the meeting at 1:15 pm.

2. Judy Smythers, Circuit Court Clerk

Ms. Smythers noted she was happy to answer any questions the Board had and they asked if there were any changes that the Board should be aware of. Ms. Smythers noted that she had budgeted for microfilming but that may be reduced by an unknown amount. She reported that revenues generated from her office were on target this year like last year; and may be a little higher. She also noted that they would have funds to transfer to the County from delinquent tax sales this year.

March 16, 2011

The Board inquired as to where the returned funds came from and Ms. Smythers noted that they are from recording fees, local fines, and assessments from criminal cases. She added that the majority came from recording fees, and that the County gets a portion of any of the 200 revenue codes in her budget.

Mr. Carter added that the Circuit Court Clerk's office is the trustee of funds from Real Estate tax sales and that funds are held for two (2) years on delinquent tax cases and if unclaimed, they are then transferred to the County. He noted that an heir would have to prove to the County that they were entitled to the held funds and has never happened thus far. He noted that by the time the money is to be transferred to the County; adequate notice to the public has been provided.

In conclusion, Ms. Smythers noted that her wish list included more storage space, as she is completely out.

3. Phil Payne, Commonwealth Attorney

Mr. Payne noted that he had no problems with the budget as proposed. Mr. Carter advised the Board that \$10,000 in part time salaries had been removed and Mr. Payne indicated that he has been able to do without the part time secretary and was using temporary help for one day per week on average, depending on vacations. He added that he had enough funds budgeted and that Ms. Giles needed some relief from the phones to focus and she was comfortable with it as it stands. He noted that the other use was for part time investigator services for the office on cases that needed dedication and for cold cases.

Mr. Payne noted that he could not think of anything that was not being covered. In response to questions, Mr. Payne noted that there were no more part time salary expenses going forward related to the murder case and that use of those funds was more a scheduling matter for staff. He added that when Ms. Giles goes on vacation, he uses a pool of retired people to fill in and that Jonae Buckley also fills in to have coverage.

In conclusion, Mr. Johnson summarized that Mr. Payne could use extra help but could manage without it and that there was nothing needed in the foreseeable future.

4. Erma Sue Harris - Treasurer

Ms. Harris thanked the Board for their support, and noted that she was okay with the proposed budget. She noted that her only concern was that she has asked for office security and that while it was being worked on, the sooner it was done, the better.

Mr. Carter added that the courthouse expansion project would approve the installation of wireless panic buttons in her office and the County Administrator's offices etc. he added that people will be screened when the new courts building opens which should help with security as well as the presence of two (2) security officers, one of which would be roaming around some.

Mr. Carter confirmed he would check on the wireless button and noted that they had discussed installing bank teller type windows that would make that office more secure.

March 16, 2011

Mr. Bruguere inquired as to the percentage of wages that comes from County vs. the State Compensation Board and Ms. McCann noted that the State paid for 80% of her salary and that the total reimbursement from the State would be \$94,468 next year. She added that the County pays out \$248,971 with benefits and that the County is paying the difference, which is about 62%.

The Board and staff briefly discussed that the percentage paid for the Treasurer has been same for twenty (20) years, but that the state has reduced its funding for office positions. It was also noted that the State does not cover anything for health insurance.

In conclusion, Ms. Harris stated that there was nothing built into her budget for future items and she noted that the office was already taking credit cards, payments online, and could accept electronic checks. She added that the percentage paying by credit card was increasing every six (6) months.

5. Jean Payne – Commissioner of Revenue

Ms. Payne acknowledged her proposed level budget and noted that there was nothing coming up within her office's functions, including no software upgrades.

In response to questions, Ms. Payne noted that the land use panel was still in place and that their budget was separate from hers.

Members and staff discussed that if a property under land use is transferred, then the new owner has to apply for the land use exemption. It was also noted that if a property owner records a plat and the acreage is different than on the tax maps, the next year it will be revalued according to the new acreage, along with the land use.

It was also discussed that if a property is taken out of land use and developed/subdivided then when the lots are sold, the County can do a roll back for six (6) years of back taxes which includes the current year plus the past five (5) years. If the land sits there, it would stay in land use, because it is when the use of the land changes that it is taken out, even if it has been subdivided. It was noted that this could be a loophole; however it encourages the maintenance of open spaces. The Board noted that it was a shame that corporations were not exempt from land use, but that too did preserve the open spaces in the County.

Mr. Hale inquired as to what could be done or should be done about parcels not of record that were not in the system or lost land that was found. Ms. Payne stated that these could be put in the land book with the last known owner's name and then it would be sold by the Treasurer. Mr. Carter noted that when the County did GIS, they matched up the parcel lines to try to identify these but it was not an exact science.

Ms. Rorrer added that they would need to consider having plats electronically submitted with GPS coordinates to be able to identify these, but that this could cause other problems. Mr. Hale noted that this would add considerable expense to surveys, due to the cost of the equipment/programs to do it.

Mr. Johnson asked if there was anything that compared the taxed land and land to see if it matched up and Mr. Carter noted that the land book is concise and shows everything; but it was a matter of finding

March 16, 2011

things that were not on the record. He noted that it was not perfect, but they were trying to get it as perfect as possible and every so often something was found.

In conclusion, the Board asked about a list of tax exempt properties and Ms. Payne noted that it listed about 1,000 cemeteries, churches, and government, etc. She noted that non-profits however were not tax exempt at this point.

B. Draft General Fund Budget Introduction

Mr. Carter complimented staff and the Constitutional Officers on the process. He noted that the budget, as presented, proposes a bottom line of \$32,734,782. He then gave a quick budget narrative noting that the budget was balanced and that staff was not proposing a tax increase. He noted that as the budget developed, there was not much recurring money but there was a substantial amount of nonrecurring money going towards capital improvements. He noted that the proposed budget has captured completing the radio communications project within the budget. He noted that overall the budget was coming in slightly below this year's amount and that staff was being careful and were good stewards of the funds. He noted that he had recommendations for further consideration and would defer to Ms. McCann to provide the details. Additionally, he noted that staff has budgeted funds in the capital fund to do Architectural and Engineering for the health dept and old courthouse renovations to be ready to go, however staff was still working with Davenport, Inc. on how to finance this and would report back.

Mr. Carter then noted that Ms. McCann would step through the budget overview and highlight items in the state budget that had an impact on the local budget.

Ms. McCann then reported the following:

FY12 BUDGET OVERVIEW

LOCAL BUDGET IMPACT OF STATE BUDGET COMPROMISE

K-12 Public Education:

The budget compromise plan provides for increased education funding to localities. The Conference Report adds non-recurring supplemental support for Nelson's school operational costs in the amount of \$104,440. The plan decreases the retirement employer contribution rate for teachers which impacts localities by reducing state revenues reimbursing the retirement cost for certain employees. However, the lower rate provides a savings of \$68,828 because retirement for all employees is not reimbursed by the state. Additionally, state funding for textbooks is reduced by \$7,034.

Ms. McCann noted that the Schools have revised their budget for these changes.

Constitutional Officers:

Budget language is included to limit the Compensation Board's retirement reimbursement cap for constitutional officers and their employees at no more than the FY11 state employee rate. The FY12 rate is in fact lower than the FY11 rate which will reduce reimbursements to localities for retirement of constitutional officers and their employees. Additionally, the Compensation Board presently pays 50 percent of the Virginia Risk Management liability insurance and surety bond premiums on behalf of Constitutional Officers. Language has been amended to provide for the recovery of 100 percent of the cost in FY12 from localities. The budget provides for some restoration of funding for Sheriffs to offset

March 16, 2011

a portion of the shortfall resulting from the failed passage of the Virginia Public Safety Fund fee during the 2010 session of the General Assembly. However, the resulting impact to Compensation Board reimbursement is a reduction below FY11 funding levels.

Ms. McCann noted that this resulted in a lowered reimbursement from the state of an overall reduction of about \$8500.

Line of Duty Act:

The shifting of state funding responsibilities to localities under the Line of Duty Act, as contained in the FY10-FY12 state budget, remains unchanged from the governor's introduced budget. The budget requires local governments to pay all benefits for professional and volunteer public safety officers killed or permanently injured in the line of duty. Local governments must make an irrevocable decision by July 1, 2012 to opt out or be deemed to be included in the state plan. Localities may choose to self-fund or participate in the state program. Localities will be responsible for past and future liabilities of the former state program.

Ms. McCann noted that the estimated cost would be just over \$30,000 and was included in the budget based on the state plan. Mr. Carter added that it was a mandated cost but the County could elect to stay with VRS or go to VML or VACo sponsored programs and that staff would get the information in the next several months. He noted that staff was using volunteer lists from the agencies, which was a lot and that he was not aware of the County having had any legitimate claims before. It was noted that volunteers were .25 of a full time person in terms of costs and Mr. Bruguere noted that the Board should lobby to reverse this unfunded mandate.

REVENUES

Current year revenues are expected to exceed the FY11 budget amounts based on our current forecast. Both real estate and personal property taxes will exceed budget amounts due solely to increased collections of delinquent taxes. This has also triggered increases in penalty and interest collections. Other significant increases are projected for local sales tax, meals tax, building permit fees, court fines, landfill tipping fees, and communications sales tax. Areas that will not meet budgeted projections include proceeds from real estate tax sales and revenue recovery (ambulance billing). Anticipated carryover is currently incorporated into the FY12 budget proposal to pay for various non-recurring expenditures and provide for a contingency fund.

FY12 revenue projections for local, state, and federal revenue are expected to show a slight decline from current year estimates. Non-Revenue receipts which are primarily transfers from other funds will decline significantly. In FY11, other funds were used for the reassessment and the school window and roof project. The FY12 budget proposes the use of other funds (Capital Fund) to cover part of the costs for the public safety communications system upgrade and a lesser amount than the previous year for remaining reassessment expenses. Grant funding is expected to increase by \$1,089,845 over the expected grant receipts for the current year. A Public Safety Interoperability Communications grant (PSIC) in the amount of \$1,200,000 is the significant impact causing an increase in grant funding. This grant was budgeted in FY11 but will not be utilized until FY12.

March 16, 2011

Sources of Revenue	FY11 Projected	FY12 Projected	Difference
Local	\$ 25,168,691	\$ 25,149,343	\$ (19,348)
State	\$ 2,939,558	\$ 2,921,786	\$ (17,772)
Federal	\$ 537,074	\$ 534,475	\$ (2,599)
Non-Revenue	\$ 920,952	\$ 644,132	\$ (276,820)
Grants	\$ 674,674	\$ 1,764,519	\$ 1,089,845
TOTAL	\$ 30,240,949	\$ 31,014,255	\$ 773,306

Ms. McCann noted that Real Estate taxes were up solely due to delinquent tax collections and Mr. Carter complimented the Treasurer's Office on their efforts to collect these.

Ms. McCann then referred to the FY11 Revenue Projections Exceed Budget-Primary Impact sheets and noted that the County was not making its projections on Paid EMS, Court fines, and Building Permits. She noted that the Paid EMS decline was due to the lag in reporting and processing of claims. She noted that the collected money was deposited weekly by the billing company in Virginia Beach. She added that staff was working through issues with Fidelis on how proactive they were when they sent billings out and insurance information was being collected. She noted that transported patients were asked to supply their insurance information to the billing company. She added that staff had discussed suggesting to the Board that they move the number up and address any shortfall with contingency funds; which could be discussed later.

Ms. McCann noted that the table above was comparing projections and that if compared the budgeted amounts, there would be an increase. Ms. McCann clarified that the Non-Revenue amount includes transfers and that staff was proposing the use of capital funds to cover costs and not much of the reassessment fund was being brought over.

EXPENDITURES

Departments were requested to submit level funded budgets. Agencies were also asked to be considerate of the economic climate when submitting their budget requests. Generally, the FY12 expenditure budget provides for level funding of departments and agencies. Total proposed expenditures exceed the current year projected expenditures by \$3,587,471. Of this amount, \$2,895,628 is an increase in capital outlay and non-recurring expenditures (including school capital outlay provided by the general fund). Other additions include contingency funding of \$441,332, an operational increase of \$250,000 to schools, a full year of personnel, maintenance agreements, and utilities for the new judicial wing, increased regional jail costs of \$50,000, a one percent employee pay adjustment (\$43,000), and the cost for the county's required contribution per the Line of Duty Act (\$30,500). Significant reductions include reassessment expense, E911 equipment expense, and the supplemental payment for Piney River water and sewer operations/debt.

Ms. McCann noted that they were looking at only about \$70,000 in county supplement for Piney River water/sewer operations and that the County was not being billed for as much. She noted that they were

not purchasing grinder pumps because they were still using the supply on hand. She added that these were being repaired, when pulled and staff was keeping a tight inventory on the County's pumps.

Capital Projects as proposed are shown in the chart below:

Capital Purchases/Projects:	Amount
Microwave Network (grant)	\$ 1,355,000
Devil's Knob Tower	\$ 100,000
Crozet Tunnel (grant)	\$ 160,000
Blue Ridge Trail (grant)	\$ 335,000
Recreation Complex PER	\$ 18,000
Public Safety Radio/Simulcast	\$ 1,100,000
Comprehensive Plan Update	\$ 38,323
Skid Steer-Transfer Station	\$ 37,000
AutoPulse Device-Paid EMS	\$ 10,000
Sheriff Vehicles (3)	\$ 68,175
Animal Control Trucks (2)	\$ 46,000
School Window Project	\$ 504,672
School Buses	\$ 296,028
TOTAL	\$ 4,068,198

Devil's Knob Tower: Ms. McCann noted that Susan Rorrer was coordinating the Devil's Knob Tower with the PSIC Grant.

Public Safety Radio/Simulcast: Ms. McCann noted that \$500,000 in carryover funds and \$600,000 from the capital fund would be utilized as well as a timed financing to capture two years of fire fund and four for life funds and the reduction in debt from FY12 and FY13 to be able to fully fund the financing of the project. Staff noted that an updated list of radio inventory will be needed.

AutoPulse Device-Paid EMS – Mr. Carter noted that this device would be used out of the Nelson Station.

School Window Project – Mr. Carter noted that this amount was based on estimated costs provided by the schools. He noted that this was in addition to what has been already allocated (\$800,000 plus) I and is to cover the mold remediation etc. Mr. Harvey and Bruguiere indicated reluctance to spend this kind of money give that the air quality testing showed the air quality was better inside the building than out, which should mean nothing needed to be done. Mr. Carter clarified that they were not proceeding, but that staff has included the funding for this based on the plan. Mr. Johnson asked staff to look up the cost of what was windows only and Mr. Carter noted that the largest expense was at TRES to remediate the base perimeter and that only \$20,000 was shown for removal and replacement of drywall. He added that this item would entail further reporting to the Board and that staff was just providing funding to cover it and it could be moved elsewhere as desired.

March 16, 2011

School Buses: Staff noted that four buses were included, with two being funded out of recurring funds and two out of nonrecurring funds.

NEXT STEPS

Staff has presented a balanced budget for the Board's review. We would like to establish meeting dates for the Board to further review and provide input. We can also establish meeting dates to meet with the Board committees (Capital Outlay, Schools, and Agencies).

Mr. Johnson suggested that the committees should meet with staff on their areas prior to the next meeting.

The Board discussed keeping tax rates the same and agreed by consensus to do this. It was noted by Mr. Hale that the surplus was justified if used judiciously and provides for a contingency.

Mr. Hale then noted that the Capital Project that was most pressing, that was not included, was for the courthouse renovation. Staff noted that funds were budgeted in the capital fund for moving ahead on the A&E for this project.

Members then further discussed the tax rates and Mr. Harvey moved that the Board advertise leaving all of the tax rates as in the previous year and Mr. Bruguere seconded the motion.

Ms. Brennan clarified that this was all tax rates and noted that the Board was usually provided a resolution on this and that staff could bring something forward at the next meeting.

Mr. Carter noted that staff wanted to look at Planning and Zoning fees and bring them back for the Board's review; noting that Nelson's were the lowest in the region and did not cover costs and the County was subsidizing these.

Staff noted that a resolution to establish PPTRA would also have to come forward.

There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

Mr. Bruguere reported that a dispatcher had noted to him that their salary range was lower than that of the new security officers. Mr. Carter advised that the security officers were coming in at the first step of the law enforcement scale and would be certified as police officers. Mr. Bruguere noted that he was recommending an adjustment and not a raise and that he would meet with Ms. McCann and Mr. Carter on this adjustment for Dispatchers.

Ms. McCann reported that staff wanted to propose additional part time positions in dispatch to go to eight hour shifts and have three people scheduled to provide coverage. She added that this may cost an additional \$30,000.00.

March 16, 2011

Mr. Bruguere stated that he wanted Dispatchers to be all County funded and supervised; and Ms. McCann reported that the County would lose the funding from the state for their dispatch positions; however everyone agreed it was not good having two bosses over there.

Mr. Carter and Ms. McCann noted that the Sheriff was only supplying four dispatchers, when five were designated as dispatchers. They noted that they could not shift state dispatch funding to other positions per the state. Mr. Harvey and Mr. Bruguere noted that they would work on this some more. Mr. Carter stated that there were still gaps in the schedule and concerns about coverage for vacations, holidays etc. and an eight hour shift would give the flexibility to have at least two people there all of the time.

Staff then noted concerns about the prisoner work release program and having prisoners working in the courthouse; noting that they would need to be supervised and transportation was an issue.

Members discussed scheduling work on the budget for the 24th, with the consensus being to continue in April and to proceed with consideration of a tax rate resolution. Members agreed to proceed with meeting with committees between now and the first April meeting.

Staff noted that a meeting with NCSB was scheduled for Monday at 9:30am, however if no NCSB members confirmed, they would recommend to cancel it.

Mr. Hale commented on staff asking Departments to provide level funded budgets; noting that they should look at needs beyond level funding and where cuts could be made. Ms. McCann noted that the Departments were instructed to provide information or justification for things beyond level funding needed with Mr. Carter noting that they did look for cuts and some budgets were below last year's levels.

In response to questions, Ms. McCann noted that it was the last year of paying the bus leases and there was a decline in debt service; with the captured savings from this to help pay for the radio project.

Ms. McCann noted that staff would provide the other fund budgets when ready, probably in April. She then noted that the General Fund Balance was approximately \$9 million and the County was only earning \$60,000 per year in interest on it. Mr. Carter noted that the County could only invest in risk adverse investments per the code and the Treasurer was using sweep accounts and money market accounts to invest the funds.

III. New/Unfinished Business

A. 2011 Redistricting - Authorization to Schedule Public Hearing (R2011-17)

Ms. Rorrer distributed handouts with new maps and data and Mr. Carter noted that staff had been set to go; however the Board now had new plans to review based on input from Mr. Johnson who had received negative feedback from some constituents.

The numbering of the plans was clarified by Ms. Rorrer, who noted that there was not much difference between them with the exception of running the South District boundary line down the power line rather than going out to Oak Ridge Road. These two were noted to be plans #10 and #11.

March 16, 2011

Mr. Johnson reported having gotten feedback that Foster Town did not want to be separated from the rest of Shipman and Ms. Brennan added that constituents in Beech Grove were not happy.

Ms. Rorrer reported that an alternate plan (#12) included changes to the Beech Grove Area, the West District crossed Route 29 into Tye River, Foster Town was back in with Shipman, and some were moved out of the Central into the East District, which necessitated the need to look at polling places in Faber. She noted that twenty-five (25) people would move from the Central to the East District and would vote in Schuyler. She reported that to the North, the east side of Cub Creek Rd would go into the Central and the west side would go into the West District.

Mr. Bruguere noted that he wanted all of Cub Creek and suggested not dividing it; stopping the line at Creekside Ln. He also suggested that they hold the line at Route 29 and not cross over.

Mr. Hale suggested that it did not make any difference, the Districts needed to be compact and equal in voting representation and that he did not believe that they ought to be putting people into particular districts since they were only voting for the Supervisors with this.

Mr. Johnson noted that the deviation was reduced by almost a percentage point in plan #12. Mr. Carter advised that the federal deviation threshold was 10%; and Ms. Rorrer noted that the Department of Justice did not like anything into the 9% range.

Ms. Brennan agreed that plan #12 looked a little weird and noted that she would like to go back to plan #11. The Board and Staff then revisited plan #10 and Ms. Brennan noted that she was good with this plan adjusted for the power line boundary.

Mr. Johnson noted that he was just being responsive to concerns coming out of his district when he proposed the changes.

Mr. Hale then moved to approve resolution R2011-17, Resolution Authorizing a Public Hearing on a Proposed Ordinance to Reapportion Local Election Districts based on plan #10.

Ms. Rorrer noted the proposed Precinct adjustment for the South District to include a polling place in Lovington. Mr. Carter noted that they would have to vote on the plan after the public hearing.

Mr. Bruguere seconded the motion and Supervisors briefly discussed that the voting precinct for those down Route 56 East to the James River would be in Lovington rather than Schuyler.

There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted (3-0-1) by roll call vote to approve the motion, with Mr. Johnson abstaining and Mr. Harvey being absent for the vote, and the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION R2011-17
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A PUBLIC HEARING ON A PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO
REAPPORTION LOCAL ELECTION DISTRICTS

March 16, 2011

WHEREAS, pursuant to Title 24.2 Elections. Chapter 3. Election Districts, Precincts, and Polling Places. Articles 2.1, 3, and 4, of the Code of Virginia, 1950, local governments are required to reapportion local election districts by ordinance, provided public notice has been given in accordance with §24.2-306;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors does hereby authorize a public hearing to be held at **7:00 o'clock p.m.** on **April 12, 2011** to receive citizen input on a proposed ordinance for passage to reapportion local election districts within Nelson County.

Mr. Carter noted that staff would have the maps and descriptions written up for the public hearing.

B. Other (As May Be Presented)

Introduced: EMT Certification Hours

Mr. Bruguiera noted that more hours were now required for EMT certification, which meant that the County will need to hire more EMTs.

IV. Adjournment

At 3:50 pm, Mr. Hale moved to adjourn and Mr. Bruguiera seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously by voice vote to approve the motion and the meeting adjourned.