

At the recess meeting of the Giles County Board of Supervisors on Thursday, June 18, 2009, at 6:30 PM in the Giles County General District Courtroom, 120 North Main, Pearisburg, the following were present:

Richard McCoy	Chairman (At-Large Member)
Paul Baker	Vice Chair (At-Large Member)
Howard Spencer	Western District
Eric Gentry	Eastern District
Barbara Hobbs	Central District
Chris McKlarney	County Administrator
Kevin Belcher	Assistant County Administrator
Susan Kidd	Board Secretary
Richard Chidester	County Attorney

CALL TO ORDER/INVOCATION

Mr. McCoy called the meeting to order. The invocation was offered and Pledge of Allegiance recited.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Baker moved to approve the minutes of May 21, 2009. Second by Mr. Gentry. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. Baker, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. McCoy.

DAVENPORT FINANCIAL REPORT – R. T. TAYLOR

Mr. Taylor reported that the Literary Loan money has been deferred until the fall of 2009. This financing proposal will bridge the gap for the school projects until the county receives their money from the state. He said there may be some federal funding that can be used for this, but they do not have all the details on that at this time. Virginia received \$190 million through the stimulus act and the Literary Loan list has \$190 million in projects on it. They should know more about that in the next month or so. This board has already adopted a resolution in case that does get approved.

There was an RFP issued and Suntrust was able to do all of the financing instead of having to break it up between a couple of banks. This does include the ability to prepay at anytime without penalty. The rate is 3.24% and does not encumber any assets of the county. The IDA will meet on July 9th and closing should occur the next day. Ms. Hobbs asked if Suntrust was solvent. Mr. Davenport said they have pledged to loan the county \$13.5 million. Ms. Hobbs said that doesn't always mean a whole lot. Mr. Davenport said his firm does not investigate all the banks, but they do have a database of banks they send these RFPs to. Mr. McCoy felt this was a better deal than in the past. Mr. McKlarney noted the debt service this year is built into the school budget.

Mr. Chidester explained the documents that were being presented related to the resolution drafted by Sands, Anderson, Marks and Miller. The way these are paid back are on semi-annual payments. The board is approving a resolution that will allow the IDA to make those payments. Mr. Spencer asked if the 3.24% was for the life of the loan. Mr. Chidester said it was a fixed rate and the maturity date is December 15, 2010. Mr. Taylor said the maturity date fits within the timeframe to qualify for school construction money. Mr. McKlarney explained that it will either be through bonds or stimulus money; they just do not know yet. Mr. McCoy said the stimulus money would represent a significant savings on the loan. Mr. Taylor said it would and that is the indication they have received. This will either be qualified as school construction bonds or Literary Loan funds at 2%.

Mr. Baker moved to adopt the resolution on financing of \$13.5 million with Suntrust at 3.24% as presented and send this to the IDA. Second by Mr. Spencer. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Mr. Gentry, Mr. Spencer, Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Baker.

2009-10 BUDGET

A public hearing was held on the 2009-10 budget on June 11, 2009. One comment was heard at the hearing and the tax rate was set at 52¢ per \$100 for real estate. Mr. McKlarney read the budget ordinance into the minutes (attached).

Mr. Gentry moved to approve the 2009-10 budget as presented with the real estate tax rate at 52¢ per \$100. Second by Mr. Baker. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Baker.

EXPENDITURE LIMIT

Mr. Gentry asked if the limit on expenditures would remain in force. Mr. McKlarney noted it was in force through June 30, 2009. Mr. Gentry felt this needed to be continued into the next fiscal year.

Mr. Gentry moved to extend the \$500 limit on expenditures without board or county administrator approval through the 2009-10 fiscal year. Second by Mr. Baker. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Baker.

Ms. Hobbs said everyone who receives money from the board needs to be notified of this so they are aware of the limit. She said the board knows there was money spent in this budget year after the limit was adopted. If there is no penalty for doing that, then what is the use. Mr. McCoy said everyone should have been notified of the limit this year. Ms. Tickle said they were and she would send approved budgets and another notice for this year. She said some of the problem before was for items already ordered or contracted for. She asked if this only applies to purchased services, not to utilities. Mr. McCoy said that was correct.

HOME CONSORTIUM

Mr. McKlarney stated that the IPR board has a request to make regarding a CHODO to be used by the Home Consortium. Mr. Gentry said Community Housing Partners would act as agent for Giles County with the scope of the specific agreement to be decided at a later time. They hope to use this with as many in-county people as necessary, but they need this to do the leg work. This specifically deals with the CHODO. Ms. Hobbs asked if she understood they would make every effort to use Giles County people. Mr. Gentry said there are people in the county currently doing projects and they want to continue that if it is possible. Ms. Hobbs asked if the local board would still be in control of the projects. Mr. Gentry said they would be very much in control of them.

Mr. Gentry moved to go forward with the IPR's recommendation of the Community Housing Partners as agent for Giles County to be scope specific. Second by Mr. Spencer. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Baker.

IPR ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McKlarney shared a letter requesting the board reappoint or make changes to the local group over IPR housing.

Mr. Spencer moved to continue using Giles County Housing and Development Corporation as the administrator for the IPR projects. Second by Mr. Gentry. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Baker.

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CENSUS 2010

Mr. McKlarney noted that this resolution is one of the items the Census Bureau is using to try to boost awareness and participation in the 2010 census. He read the resolution into the minutes (attached).

Ms. Hobbs moved to approve the resolution in support of the Census in 2010. Second by Mr. Baker. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Baker.

Ms. Hobbs asked if the Census Bureau has appointed local representatives yet. Mr. McKlarney said there is a committee in the county trying to raise awareness. They will also be speaking to local civic groups. He noted that the representative told them at Intergovernmental Meeting that only 70% of Giles County citizens responded. If they cannot make contact with someone after numerous attempts using various methods, they are not counted. It is important that everyone be counted. Many government allocations and programs use this information to determine funding. Ms. Hobbs asked how someone would volunteer; she had a call from a lady interested in doing that. Ms. Kidd will get a contact number for Ms. Hobbs to pass along.

REGIONAL ASSESSMENT

Mr. McKlarney alerted the board to information in their packets from Pulaski County concerning a regional assessment effort. This is for information only at this time and to see if there is any interest. He said the Constitutional Officers should be involved in this discussion as well.

PUBLIC HEARING – SPECIAL EXCEPTION – CAMP/SIZEMORE

Mr. McCoy opened the public hearing. Mr. McKlarney presented a special exception request for a private for profit, nonprofit, or public organization camp. The property owner is Sizemore, Inc. and the agent for the application is Rick Sizemore. The price is approximately 18.29 acres and located in the RRA-1 Zoning District in the Pembroke area. He explained that everything they have requested to do with the structures is permitted as an existing use with the zoning ordinances with the exception of guests staying overnight in the cabins. That is the reason for this request. Mr. McKlarney noted there have been no comments received concerning this request. Mr. Gentry said he thought Mr. Sizemore had done everything he said he was going to do and he did not see any problem with the request. The board had no further comments and referred the request back to the Planning Commission for recommendation.

SENIOR CENTER

Ms. Helen Gillespie offered information for discussion of options for the Senior Center programming with minimal impact on the taxpayers by partnership with other existing organizations. Mr. Spencer noted that most elderly are tax payers too. He felt this should not be emphasized as just a cost cutting measure. This is a service option for the programs. Ms. Gillespie stated that she was always concerned about not wasting tax payer money, but did feel the budgeted amount should be spent on that program. That has never been an issue. The savings are just looking at this solely from a budgeting sense.

Ms. Gillespie presented information on past and current programming at the Senior Center. She also introduced the possibility of offering more or different programs by working jointly with other organizations. Ms. Hobbs said they should first determine if seniors want to participate in those programs. She asked why not have a director at the Senior Center and who the “we” was that is referenced in the presentation. Ms. Gillespie noted that she worked with Mr. Belcher on this presentation and the ideas presented. She references a coordinator in this presentation because she still oversees that position at this time. She noted that a full-time position at the Senior Center may not be the best use of county staff. They proposed using two part-time staff as a more cost effective measure. Also, they are looking at having the ability to bring in different people with varied backgrounds and abilities. It is asking a lot of one person to be completely adept in all the areas they need to be.

A draft of a proposal from the Agency on Aging to operate the Senior Center was also presented. Ms. Hobbs noted that the present location of the Senior Center should be maintained; if not, that facility will go back to the Town of Pearisburg. Ms. Gillespie agreed the facility would not move; they only looked at other buildings because of the small space. The trouble now is they are sharing that space with the congregate meals program and parking is also an issue. Mr. McCoy asked about rotating the senior activities throughout the county –

offering some in Narrows and Newport and not just in Pearisburg. Mr. Belcher said they have tried having activities in other locations with mixed results.

Ms. Gillespie presented the proposal from the Agency on Aging in more detail. They would be able to offer more programs, coordinate with other agencies and localities, and provide assistance with transportation. Some board members expressed concern that the county would lose control over the Senior Center if the Agency on Aging was the operator. Mr. Belcher said the proposed advisory council would be specific to Giles County. Ms. Gillespie said she did recommend the Agency on Aging operating the Senior Center. She felt that was best from an administrative standpoint. They bring resources and awareness of other events. Giles is a small community and there are a lot of programs going on. One director oversees a large fitness center and senior programs. She enjoys and looks forward to continuing to develop programs for the Senior Center. She did feel though that the Agency on Aging would be able to enhance services and reach the goals the board wants for seniors. Ms. Gillespie said there have been some negative issues and stumbling blocks at the Senior Center and they have tried to move past those. This proposal is an opportunity to move forward and address the needs of Giles County seniors. Ms. Hobbs asked if they had talked to any other group that the Agency on Aging manages. Ms. Gillespie said she had not. They work closely with other organizations and she would try to talk to them. She noted that she has also talked to some seniors about this and it was received with a positive outlook. Ms. Hobbs said her concern was has the Agency done anything like this before; Ms. King at that group is relatively new to the position. She would just like to know if they manage anything else. Mr. Gentry said he was concerned that the county would not have a voice in the operation of the center. If they get started and the county does not like what they are doing, what changes can the board make. He would like to see more details on the proposal – for example, where would the other representatives on the advisory board come from. Also, what would the cost be if the board hired in-house. That should be researched and compared. Mr. McCoy agreed that if the board is interested in moving forward, they need more details and information. He said he did not know if it was worth putting that Agency through that process if the board was not really interested in it though. Mr. Gentry said he was concerned if they have experience with this type program and the cost. Ms. Gillespie said that is a question she asked – what is the agency bringing that the county is not currently doing. They have experience and programs that they propose to bring. Ms. Hobbs said if the Agency is not doing this type of thing for anyone else, then they only have experience in nutrition programming and transportation. That is not the type of expertise needed in the county to run the Senior Center. Ms. Gillespie the expertise she is talking about are the agencies that currently fall under the Agency on Aging and the different strengths they bring.

Ms. Gillespie said a part-time employee would be a staff member at the facility who would be implementing the programs on-site. Ms. Tickle noted they would have to add \$13,000 and fringe benefits for a full-time person versus two part-time. The Agency on Aging would want \$25,000 to oversee the Senior Center. Ms. Tickle said the current budget has \$24,900 for a new director but the board can change that. The total budget for the Senior Center is about \$75,000 with programming and building maintenance in that also. Ms. Hobbs noted the board would have no control over those employees. Mr. McCoy asked if Ms. Gillespie had a back-up recommendation. She said the two part-time employees would be her next choice. That is how it is operating now. Mr. Gentry noted the budget is set and the center is still operating under it. This would not increase that so he felt the board needed to think about it. Board members agreed to take the information under advisement and make a decision at a later date. Mr. Gentry asked if they could get more information from the Agency on their specific experience. He said seniors have good ideas and are quick to want to share those. He did not think quarterly meetings would be a good solution. He also wanted to know if they have done anything similar in other places. Mr. McCoy was concerned about the future costs and if they would build in increases. The board could consider this a cost savings and move forward, then the Agency might ask for a 10% increase next year. Then, it would no longer be a cost savings. If they are not willing to limit the amount of increase, then the board could not really do business with them.

Mr. McKlarney said they would take the questions and concerns and talk with the Agency on Aging. It may be a good idea to bring them in to meet with the board. Mr. McCoy said he was keeping an open mind, but also would say he was not fond of the Agency on Aging proposal. Mr. Baker said this is a big issue and it should be based on what seniors want. Ms. Hobbs said if they are looking at the Agency on Aging, they need to say the board would control the Advisory Board and the people hired need to be Giles County residents. The board felt it was worth getting some more answers and information from the Agency before proceeding.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Gentry moved to go into Executive Session under Section 2.2-3711, for A1 Personnel and A7 Legal for Contracts. Seconded by Mr. Spencer. Approved by the following vote: Mr. Baker, Yes; Mr. Gentry, Yes; Mr. McCoy, Yes; Mr. Spencer, Yes; Ms. Hobbs, Yes.

Mr. Spencer moved to return to regular session and only personnel and contracts were discussed. Seconded by Mr. Gentry. Approved by the following vote: Mr. Baker, Yes; Mr. Gentry, Yes; Mr. McCoy, Yes; Mr. Spencer, Yes; Ms. Hobbs, Yes.

SOCIAL SERVICES APPROPRIATION

Mr. Gentry moved to appropriate \$150,000 for Social Services and \$75,000 for CSA for the month of July, 2009. Second by Ms. Hobbs. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Baker.

SCHOOL BOARD APPROPRIATION

Mr. Spencer moved to appropriate \$2,300,403.15 for the School Board for July, 2009. Second by Ms. Hobbs. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Baker.

Ms. Hobbs moved to appropriate \$250,000 in supplemental budget allocation for the School Board for June, 2009. Second by Mr. Baker.

Discussion: Ms. Tickle noted this was additional money that has already been received and put in the flow through category.

Motion was approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Baker.

PAYMENT OF WARRANTS

Mr. Baker moved to appropriate \$473,480.46 for payment of warrants as presented. Second by Ms. Hobbs.

Discussion: Mr. Gentry asked about a handwritten check to Edwin Meredith for painting at the Treasurer's Office. Ms. Tickle said the Treasurer's office sent the request to Ms. Vaught for a handwritten check and said the painting was done and person needed to be paid immediately. It was paid out of the repair line in the Treasurer's budget. Ms. Vaught asked Mr. Belcher to approve the handwritten check. Mr. McCoy said he thought the county maintained county buildings. Mr. Gentry said he also thought the board said no to this request from the Treasurer's office in regards to using county money. This should come from the Treasurer's PSA money, not from county funds. Ms. Tickle said she could do that if the board approved to do so. Ms. Hobbs said when the board was talking about that, she thought it was referring to carpet and furniture. Mr. McCoy said actually this request is over the spending limit without board approval anyway. Mr. Gentry said he could not approve that check and it was a bad idea to say one thing and let them go ahead and do what they want anyway. There is a reason for that to be in effect. Mr. McCoy said his question is that he thought the county maintained the buildings. Mr. Gentry said he thought the board was pretty clear with the Treasurer about how they felt about using county money for office renovations. They said they could not do it at that time but to come back after the end of the fiscal year. Ms. Hobbs thought that referred to office furniture. She said the Sheriff got a dog that was not approved by the board and they did not stop that check. Ms. Tickle noted that the money for the dog was donated, not out of county funds. She can move the charge from Treasurer's budget to his PSA money, but the board has to approve that. There will be a significant amount of that carried over into the next fiscal year. Mr. Duncan moved \$6,400 last fall from PSA to his budget. At the end of May, he had

spent about \$8,000. Mr. McCoy asked if the way it worked was that Mr. Duncan moves PSA money into his budget and then spends it out of there. Ms. Tickle said he can do that unless the board says he cannot, but part of that is carryover. Mr. McCoy asked why he didn't spend directly out of the PSA account instead of moving it. It does not have to be placed into this budget. Ms. Tickle said it would just affect the amount of PSA funds to be carried over.

Mr. Baker moved to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Gentry moved to appropriate funds in the amount of \$473,480.46 with the \$710.36 being charged to the Treasurer's PSA money instead of the Treasurer's county funds. Second by Mr. McCoy. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Baker.

APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Spencer moved to reappoint Lewis Webb to the New River Community College Board for a four-year term ending June 30, 2013. Second by Ms. Hobbs. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Baker.

Ms. Hobbs moved to reappoint Irene Hodge to the New River Community Action Local Board for a two-year term ending June 30, 2011. Second by Mr. Baker. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Baker.

Mr. Spencer moved to reappoint Susan Kidd to the New River Community Action Local Board for a two-year term ending June 30, 2011. Second by Mr. Baker. Approved unanimously (5-0). Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Baker.

Mr. Spencer moved to reappoint Roger Browning to the Planning Commission for a four-year term ending June 30, 2013. Second by Ms. Hobbs. Approved 4-1. Voting YES: Ms. Hobbs, Mr. Spencer, Mr. McCoy, Mr. Baker; Voting NO: Mr. Gentry.

No further business was introduced. Mr. McCoy adjourned the meeting until the next meeting scheduled on Tuesday, June 30, 2009 at 6:30 PM in the Giles County General District Courtroom.

APPROVED:

Chairperson

ATTEST:

Clerk

**GILES COUNTY
PROPOSED BUDGET – PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE
FISCAL YEAR 2009-10**

The Giles County Board of Supervisors will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 11, 2009 at 7:00 PM in the Giles County General District Courtroom, 120 North Main Street, Pearisburg, Virginia, to hear citizens and other proposed budget and tax rates for Fiscal Year July 1, 2009-June 30, 2010. Giles County recently completed reassessment, and the tax rate below represents 0% effective real estate tax rate change. The proposed tax rates and budget follow:

Description of Tax and Existing Rate		Proposed Rate for FY 09-10	Effective Change
Real Estate	\$0.63 Per \$100	\$0.52 per \$100 at 100% assessment	NONE
Motor Vehicles	\$1.89 Per \$100	\$1.89 per \$100 at 100% assessment	NONE
Personal Property	\$1.89 Per \$100	\$1.89 per \$100 at 100% assessment	NONE
Machinery and Tools	\$0.99 Per \$100	\$0.99 per \$100 at 100% assessment	NONE
Merchants Capital	\$0.79 Per \$100	\$0.79 per \$100 at 100% assessment	NONE
Public Service Levy	\$0.63 per \$100	\$0.52 per \$100 at 100% assessment	NONE
Mobile Home Levy \$100	\$0.63 per	\$0.52 per \$100 of assessed value	NONE
Motor Vehicle Decal Fee	\$15.00 per Vehicle	\$15.00 per Vehicle	NONE

The proposed penalty for late payment of taxes is 10% of the unpaid balance not paid on or before the due date. Real estate taxes are due on July 10, 2009 and December 5, 2009. All other taxes are due on December 5, 2009. Ten percent (10%) interest charges are proposed to begin July 11, 2009 and December 6, 2009, following the tax due date. The Giles County recommended budget synopsis is prepared and published for information and fiscal planning purposes only. The inclusion in the budget of any item or items does not constitute an obligation or commitment on the part of the Board of Supervisors of Giles County to appropriate any funds for the item or purpose. The budget has been presented on the basis of the estimates and requests submitted to the County Administrator by the several office and department heads of the County. There is no allocation or designation of any funds of the County for any purpose until there has been an appropriation for that purpose by the Board of Supervisors. The budget is for information and fiscal planning purposes only and will not be approved, adopted, or ratified by the Board of Supervisors until at least seven days after the public hearing.

The public hearing is held pursuant to Section 15.2-2506 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, and is for the purpose of allowing the public to question and comment on the proposed budget. The board will also hold a public hearing on the new Budget Ordinance. All citizens of Giles County are invited to attend and state their views thereon, subject to reasonable time limits as shall be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

BUDGET FY 2009-2010

REVENUE CATEGORY		EXPENDITURE CATEGORY	
Real Estate Taxes	\$5,304,265	Education	\$27,604,838
Public Service	\$1,032,000		
Personal Property	\$1,332,342	County Operations	
PP Tax Relief	\$1,227,860	Public Service - Water /Sewer	
Mobile Home	\$50,000	Systems & Engineering	\$2,481,372
Machinery & Tools	\$2,641,138		
Merchants Capital	\$155,572	Economic Development	\$386,760
Penalties & Interest	\$142,691		
Other Local	\$1,921,611	Courts / Law Enforcement	\$3,869,722
Permits/Fees/Rental	\$87,320		
Use of Money/Property	\$290,495	Tax Collection & Assessment	\$720,605
Charges for Services	\$169,099		
Recovered Costs	\$844,644	Emergency Services	\$424,232
Non Categorical Aide	\$165,280		
Commonwealth Reimbursement	\$3,365,058	Social Services/CSA &	\$3,167,844
Other Categorical Aid	\$396,063	Community Services	
Recreation Revenues	\$475,000		
Industrial Development Authority	\$1,026,044		
Water/Sewer Fees	\$525,000	Debt Service	\$872,120
Schools (State & Federal)	\$20,362,343		
Loans/Grants	\$8,270,500	Recreation	\$734,847
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$127,250		
Delinquent Collection Fees	\$30,900	Capital Improvements	\$9,787,394
Reserve Fund Balances	\$3,636		
General Fund Transfer	\$167,162	Contingency	\$63,539
TOTAL	\$50,113,273	TOTAL	\$50,113,273

Resolution

By

Giles County Board of Supervisors

In Support of the United States Census 2010

WHEREAS, The U. S. Constitution has required a national census be conducted once every 10 years since 1790;

WHEREAS, the Census is a count of everyone residing in the United States and all residents must be counted – people of all races and ethnic groups, both citizens and non-citizens;

WHEREAS, Census information is used in determining the number of seats each state will have in the U. S. House of Representatives as well as allocations of federal funds to states and communities;

WHEREAS, Census information is used to determine the need for social services, block grants and other essential grant programs in communities and as a guide for planning new hospitals, roads, job training centers, and schools;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board of Supervisors of Giles County of the Commonwealth of Virginia does hereby resolve to support the activities of the U. S. Census 2010 and to issue a call to all citizens of Giles County to “Be Counted In 2010.”

Resolved this the 18th day of June, 2009

Richard K. McCoy, Chairman

Official Seal of the County