

At the Regular Meeting of the Greenville County Board of Supervisors, held on Monday, May 7, 2012, with Budget Session beginning at 3:00 P.M., Closed Session beginning at 4:30 P.M., and Regular Session beginning at 6:00 P.M., in the Board Room of the Greenville County Government Building, 1781 Greenville County Circle, Emporia, Virginia.

Present           Peggy R. Wiley, Chairman  
                      Michael W. Ferguson, Vice-Chairman  
                      James C. Vaughan  
                      Dr. Margaret T. Lee

-----

In Re: Chairman Wiley called the meeting to order at 3:00 P.M.

-----

In Re: Approval of the Agenda

Mr. Whittington, County Administrator, stated that Staff recommended approval of the agenda.

Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Lee, to approve the agenda as submitted. Voting aye: Supervisors Ferguson, Lee, Vaughan and Chairman Wiley.

-----

In Re: Budget Session

Mr. Whittington addressed the Board of Supervisors stating that the purpose of today's meeting was to wrap up some loose ends regarding the budget.

-----

In Re: Request for Funding from Chowan River Basin Flood Taskforce

Mr. Whittington stated that part of the meeting was to address the Chowan River Basin Flood Taskforce budget request. He stated that the matter was before the Board at its meeting held on April 16, 2012. Mr. Whittington stated that Mayor Jim Council would be present later to appear before the Board and make his request.

-----

In Re: FY2013 Budget

Mr. Whittington stated that in the budget packet was a memo from him regarding the FY2013 budget. He stated that at the end of the last budget session, the Board discussed a

proposed budget of \$14,550.042, a proposed personal property tax rate increase of \$0.50 from \$4.50 per \$100 of assessed value to \$5.00 per \$100 of assessed value and a proposed real property tax rate increase of \$0.06 from \$0.47 per \$100 of assessed value to \$0.53 per \$100 of assessed value. Mr. Whittington stated that Staff was looking at implementing both, not one or the other, but both combined. He stated that the budget session was stalled at that point because the General Assembly did not approve the budget for the Commonwealth and the Compensation Board had not yet distributed their estimated revenues to the localities for FY2013. Mr. Whittington stated that at this time, the General Assembly had approved the budget and the revenue estimates had been distributed to the localities. He then stated that memo attempted to address the unresolved issues regarding the budget. He also stated that it was also important to revisit some of the major conditions of the budget that caused consideration of such healthy tax increases.

Mr. Whittington stated that the County was losing the Brunswick County inmates at the Southside Regional Jail, approximately 50 inmates per day at a per diem rate of \$37 to \$38 per day. He stated that it totaled to be some \$750,000 in revenue lost by the Regional Jail. He stated that there had been increases to the Virginia Retirement System and that the increased costs were provided to the Board at its previous meetings. He then stated that the Greenville County budget system contributions were causing an additional strain on the revenues. Mr. Whittington stated that this was caused by two reasons (1) a shift in the composite index in which the County was now richer and the City was now poorer; so even if the budget had stayed the same, there would have been a shift in the changes of the composite index, and (2) there were similar occurrences to the City over the last three years in which the ADM had shifted from the County to the City so then the City had taken up a significantly more greater portion of the school's budget. He stated that their solution to that change was to freeze their appropriation which meant there was a decline in the school budget and the County was now the beneficiary by which it was now the County's turn to provide an additional \$150,000 more to the school system. Mr. Whittington stated that in the public portion of the agenda, action would need to be taken on a resolution approving the additional funding to the school system.

-----

#### In Re: Fines and Forfeitures

Mr. Whittington stated that the fines and forfeitures through the end April of this year was \$1,197,097 and compared to previous years, the amount was very good. He stated that the projected revenue for fines and forfeitures for this year was \$1.436 million which should bring the County very close to its \$1.5 million target. Mr. Whittington stated that there was legislation that had passed the General Assembly but not yet approved by the Governor that would transfer a portion of fines and forfeitures to the literary fund. He stated that the literary fund had undergone some changes which were now going to be in the form of an amendment that came from the Governor's Office to the General Assembly. He stated that an estimate of \$43,000 of the total of \$1.48 million would be sent to the state. He also stated that the process by which fines came to the County would change if the amendments were approved. Mr. Whittington stated that the fines would go from the court system to the state and the state would determine whether it was going to retain any portion of the fines based on a formula. He stated that the

formula initially two months ago was that if you collected more than 30% of your total fines and forfeitures collected in Greenville County by the Sheriff, as well as the State Police, then the state wanted a share of 50% of the proceeds. He then stated that most recently that percentage of 30% had increased to 40% which was very good. Mr. Whittington stated that at 30%, the County had to pay the Commonwealth around \$120 thousand, at 40% the projection was now at \$43,000, which was a help. He then stated that now the budget amendment coming from the Governor's Office would hopefully now be at 50%; so the County would not have to pay anything if the General Assembly approved the Governor's budget amendment with the 50% figure. Mr. Whittington stated that Staff recommended \$1.4 million from fines and forfeitures for FY2013 budget to stay in the budget, an amount that was unchanged from the last budget session.

There was a consensus among the Board Members to approve Staff's recommendation.

-----

In Re: Compensation Board Reimbursements/Part-time Salaries

Mr. Whittington stated that the following revenue estimates had been received from the Compensation Board. He stated that this item also included the line items for part-time salaries because part-time salaries were part of the revenues that came to the localities from the comp board.

Office	Proposed FY 13 Budget	Comp Board Estimate	Difference
Commonwealth's Attorney	\$405,000	\$407,101	+\$1,350 (1)
Sheriff	\$719,605	\$727,055	+\$4,850 (1)
Clerk's Office	\$205,000	\$217,265 (2)	+\$8,000 (1)
Treasurer	\$70,000	\$68,186	-\$1,815
Commissioner of Revenue	\$85,000	\$83,230 (3)	-\$1,770
Part time salaries		\$7,562	-\$8,868

He stated that regarding part-time salaries, the Compensation Board approved \$3,290 and that the money was a part of the \$407,101 to the Commonwealth's Attorney for part-time salaries. He also stated that the Comp Board would reimburse the County 100% of the salary and fringe benefits and that the \$3,290 should be added to the expenditures for the Commonwealth's Attorney as revenue neutral. Mr. Whittington stated the Comp Board's estimate would increase from \$405,000 to \$407,101 and that on the expenditure side, \$3,290 would need to be added if the Board went with the Staff's recommendation.

There was a consensus from the Board of Supervisors to accept Staff's recommendation.

-----

In Re: Sheriff's Office

Mr. Whittington stated that in the proposed budget for FY2013 was \$719,605. He stated that it was about a \$4,850 increase for the County. He also stated that the Sheriff's Office was funded by the County, as well as the City of Emporia. Mr. Whittington stated that the increase in funding helped the City by 1/3 of the amount and the County by 2/3 from the funding. He stated that there was no part-time funding from the Comp Board so no adjustments needed to be made on the expenditure side but Staff recommended that the Board increase the revenue from \$719,605 to \$727,055.

There was a consensus from the Board to accept Staff's recommendation.

-----

In Re: Clerks Office

Mr. Whittington stated that in the budget now was \$205,000 and that the Comp Board's estimate was \$217,265. He stated that under part-time salaries the Compensation Board had approved \$4,919 to the Clerk's Office for part-time salaries and that the Comp Board would reimburse the County 100% of the salary and fringe benefits. Mr. Whittington stated that Staff recommended the Board keep the entire amount of \$217,265 under the Clerk's Office and that Staff would need to increase the expenditure side of the salaries by \$4,919 to make the budget balance.

There was a consensus among the Board of Supervisors to accept Staff's recommendation.

-----

In Re: Treasurer's Office

Mr. Whittington stated that there was a proposed FY2013 budget in the amount of \$70,000 and that the Comp Board's estimate to the County was \$68,186. He stated that part of that money was for part-time temporary salary but the Treasurer used the money to help support the salary of an existing employee. Mr. Whittington stated that Staff recommended the Board decrease the revenue from \$70,000 to \$68,186 and that there would be no changes to the expenditure side.

There was a consensus among the Board to accept Staff's recommendation.

-----

In Re: Commissioner of the Revenue

Mr. Whittington stated that the proposed FY2013 budget included \$85,000 and that the Comp Board's estimate was \$83,230. He stated that the funding was the operations portion, as well as the salary reimbursement and an additional \$7,562 in part-time salaries. He also stated that the Comp Board approved \$15,123 for use as part-time salary and that the Comp Board would only reimburse the County \$7,500 if the County expended \$15,123 in part-time salaries. Mr. Whittington stated that the Board had awarded the Commissioner the funds for this year and that if the Board would like to treat the Commissioner the same for next year as it had this year, Staff recommended including the \$83,230 from the Compensation Board plus \$7,500 for part-time salaries in revenues. He also stated that \$15,123 needed to be added to the expenditure side of the budget.

There was a consensus among the Board of Supervisors to accept Staff's recommendation.

-----

In Re: Reduction in State Aid-County

Mr. Whittington stated that this was one of the legislative initiatives of VACo during the last General Assembly Session. He stated that for the last three years, the localities in Virginia have had to return \$60 million back to the Commonwealth of Virginia for revenue support. He further stated that in the General Assembly session this year, the \$60 million return had been reduced to \$50 million and that next year it would be down to \$45 million. Mr. Whittington stated that in the budget now for revenue support back to the Commonwealth of Virginia was \$85,000 and should now be reduced to \$70,835, a saving of \$14,165.

-----

In Re: Southside Regional Jail

Mr. Whittington stated that the finance committee continued to meet on the budget for the jail. He stated that in the budget now, \$925,730 was to be included for the Southside Regional Jail. He also stated that the finance committee met on the jail's finances last Thursday and now Staff was recommending that the County's share be \$803,206, which was a reduction in expenditures of \$122,164.

There was a consensus among the Board to accept Staff's recommendation.

-----

In Re: Sales Tax

Mr. Whittington stated that this revenue item fluctuated wildly. He stated that it could be \$500,000 in one year and less than \$400,000 in another year. He then stated that the County had been using the state's estimates for revenue. Mr. Whittington stated that in FY2011, the County received \$421,342 while budgeting \$430,000, which was pretty good. He stated that in FY12, the County budgeted \$405,000 because there was a downward trend from previous years indicating the need to reduce the revenues. Mr. Whittington stated that the County had collected \$423,602 in revenues through the end of April 2012 and if the County collected in the last two months as it had in the other 10 months, it was estimated to collect \$508,322 in FY2012. He stated that the Commonwealth had estimated that the County would collect \$505,148 in sales tax to be distributed to Greensville County in FY2013 which was an increase over the initial budgeted estimate of \$75,148 if the state's revenue estimate was used. Mr. Whittington stated that Staff recommended the Board of Supervisors use the state's estimate, but at some point in the future the figure would drop because of the fluctuation due to the economy.

There was a consensus among the Board to accept Staff's recommendation.

-----

In Re: Recordation Tax

Mr. Whittington stated that in the budget now was a revenue estimate of \$17,500 and that the Commonwealth estimated that the County would get \$12,422. He stated that it was a decrease in revenue of \$5,078.

-----

In Re: Southside Community Corrections

Mr. Whittington stated that the County was awarded \$380,418 in FY2012 to operate the program and that in FY2013; the revenue from the Commonwealth would reduce to \$320,418. He stated that this was a \$60,000 reduction and in addition to that, another \$20,000 would be reduced. Mr. Whittington stated that \$60,000 of the funding was a special grant that was awarded the County to operate a special Pre-trial Services Program which was now ending. He stated that the person hired to operate the program would have to be let go. He stated that at some point that issue would have to be taken up in Closed Session after the budget session. Mr. Whittington stated that another \$20,000 in cuts that had to be added would have an impact on a number of staff members for Pre-trial and Community Corrections this year. He stated that Community Corrections started charging for drug testing a number of years ago that built up a small kitty in the fund balance that would be used to keep staff intact for this upcoming year. Mr. Whittington stated that if the cut remained in place for FY2014, then Staff would probably be back before the Board regarding a reduction in force.

-----  
In Re: Request for Funding from Chowan River Basin Flood Taskforce, Mayor Jim Councill

Mr. Jim Councill, Chairman of the Chowan River Basin Taskforce, stated that he was before the Board to speak about the projects over the years. He stated that with him was Mr. Mark Mansfield with the Core of Engineers, who had been overseeing the project since the first flood through today. Mr. Councill stated that the Governor had stepped up in the current budget and put up 60% of the cost for the rain gages to be installed.

Mr. Martin Mansfield addressed the Board and gave a handout. He stated that the initiative for the rain gages had been underway for a couple of years and had gotten to a point where the parties involved had agreed upon the installation of an integrated stream and rainfall gage network in the Chowan River Basin. Mr. Mansfield stated that the Chowan River Basin was comprised of three major river systems; the Black Water, the Nottaway and the Meherrin, each generally running north and west to south and east. He also stated that the relatively flat topography combined with frequent storm events such as hurricanes, renders the area of being susceptible to flooding which was a pervasive water resources issue in the Chowan River Basin. Mr. Mansfield stated that in recognition of the pervasive flooding issues, the Cities of Emporia and Franklin along with the Counties of Greensville, Isle of Wight, Southampton, Surry and Sussex, partnered with the Norfolk District Core of Engineers, to determine the best way to evaluate the none structural alternative in which the Core of Engineers recommended installing the rainfall gages. He stated that the gages were envisioned to improve flood forecasting in terms of duration and amplitude to better prepare residents and businesses of flooding events. Mr. Mansfield stated that the benefits would include additional warning times prior to flooding events for both evacuation and property management purposes. He stated that five stream gages were recommended for installing throughout the Basin to be placed in South Hill, Purdy, Delaware, Glenton and Branchville. Mr. Mansfield stated that the gages had two costs; 1) initial cost of implementation, shared 50% by the Commonwealth and 50% by the USDS and (2) that the USDS program also required a cost shared maintenance program which would be funded 50% by USDS and 50% by the seven localities. Mr. Mansfield stated that initiative for the gages maintenance cost would cost 1/7 of \$48,400 for each locality which for Greensville County would be an equal share of about \$6,915 annually with a two year initial period and an agreement to be signed by each of the neighboring counties and Greensville County along with the USDS to fully fund the maintenance of rainfall gages for a two year period after installation. He stated that all participants would need to provide its fair share all at all one time with a construction period of this summer and would be in place for most of the hurricane season. He then requested that the Board of Supervisors commit to a two year period of maintenance to be funded by each locality in the amount of \$6,915 annually. Mr. Mansfield then asked if there were any questions and stated that the future cost of the gages usually cost less over the years.

Supervisor Ferguson stated that for years, the County had been trying to do something to clean out the Meherrin River down the Low Ground Road area. He asked if Mr. Mansfield saw any chance in the near future that the Core of Engineers would do something to help.

Mr. Mansfield stated that there were programs available that would cost share with local sponsors to help clean out the rivers. He stated that he would provide the Board with a copy of the reconnaissance study that was funded by Congressman Forbes about a year and a half ago.

Mr. Whittington stated Staff recommended the Board of Supervisors move forward with the rainfall gages and that if the Board did not like it in the two years, Staff would come back to the Board for direction.

Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Lee, to approve the request by the Chowan River Basin Taskforce. Voting aye: Supervisors Ferguson, Lee, Vaughan and Chairman Wiley.

-----

In Re: Interest Payment for Phase III of Southside Virginia Education Center

Mr. Whittington stated that the interest payments were not included in the proposed FY13 budget and had to be included in the amount of \$47,226.

-----

In Re: Impact of Actions on FY2013 Budget

Mr. Whittington stated that the impact of actions on the FY2013 Budget should the Board approve all the actions mentioned above, the FY2013 budget totaled \$14,488,858 and would require the following either number one or number two

- 1) A \$0.06 (6 cents) increase on the real estate tax rate from \$0.47 to \$0.53 or
- 2) A \$0.50 (50 cents) increase on the personal property tax rate from \$4.50 to \$5.00 per \$100 of assessed value and a \$0.04 (4 cents) increase on the real estate tax from \$0.47 to \$0.51 per \$100 of assessed value.

There was a consensus among the Board Members to accept #2 of Staff's recommendations.

-----

In Re: Closed Session

Mr. Whittington, County Administrator, stated that Staff recommended the Board go into Closed Session, Section 2.2-3711 (a) 1) Personnel, 3) Acquisition and Disposition of Real Property, 5) Industrial Development and 7) Legal Matters.

Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Lee, to go into Closed Session, as recommended by Staff. Voting aye: Supervisors Ferguson, Lee, Vaughan and Chairman Wiley.

-----

In Re: Regular Session

Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Vaughan, to go into Regular Session. Voting aye: Supervisors Ferguson, Lee, Vaughan and Chairman Wiley.

-----

In Re: Certification of Closed Meeting – Resolution #12-132

Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Vaughan, to adopt the following Resolution. A roll call vote was taken, as follows: Supervisor Ferguson, aye; Supervisor Lee, aye; Supervisor Vaughan, aye; and Chairman Wiley, aye.

**RESOLUTION #12-132  
CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED MEETING**

**WHEREAS**, the Greensville County Board of Supervisors has convened a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provision of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

**WHEREAS**, Section 2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Greensville County Board of Supervisors that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law:

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Greensville County Board of Supervisors hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed or considered by the Greensville County Board of Supervisors.

-----

Chairman Wiley recessed the meeting until the Conclusion of the Water and Sewer Authority.

-----

Chairman Wiley reconvened the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

-----

In Re: Approval of Agenda

Mr. Whittington stated that Staff recommended approval of the Agenda with no added items.

Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Vaughan, to approve the Agenda as submitted. Voting aye: Supervisors Ferguson, Lee, Vaughan and Chairman Wiley.

-----

In Re: Approval of Consent Agenda

Mr. Whittington stated that Staff recommended approval of the Consent Agenda.

Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Lee, to approve the Consent Agenda containing the following items. Voting aye: Supervisors Ferguson, Lee, Vaughan and Chairman Wiley.

-----

Minutes from the Meeting of April 16, 2012.

-----

Budgetary Matters consisting of the following: Fund #001 – Journal Voucher #81, in the amount of \$535.00, Budget Amendment Resolution #12-133, in the amount of \$49,736.63, Budget Amendment Resolution #12-134, in the amount of \$8,565.92; Fund #012 – Budget Amendment Resolution #12-135, in the amount of \$2,037.01; Fund #013 – Budget Amendment Resolution #12-136, in the amount of \$144.90; Fund #018 – Journal Voucher #5, in the amount of \$3,076.50 and Budget Amendment Resolution #12-137, in the amount of \$2,085.00 and Fund #075 – Budget Amendment Resolution #12-138, in the amount of \$425,727.00, all of which are incorporated herein by reference.

-----

Warrants:

Approval of Accounts Payable for May 7, 2012, in the amount of \$432,577.75

Approval of Payroll for April 30, 2012, in the amount of \$346,484.58

-----  
In Re: Mr. Michael A. Estes, VDOT's Director of Strategic Initiatives

Mr. Estes addressed the Board stating that one of the special projects he was working on was the tolling for I-95. He stated that he had spoken with Mr. Whittington a couple of weeks ago and asked to come down and give an update on the process and a sense of direction that VDOT was headed with the project. Mr. Estes gave out handouts and stated that everything on the handout was located on the webpage. He stated that he was there to inform everyone on how important the corridor was and the needs of the corridor. Mr. Estes stated that he would be talking about a special pilot program being pursued in reference to I-95 tolling under the Federal Government. He stated that the requirement for the program was to document the needs, i.e., if there were an investment needed on the corridor than the current funds available to fund the investment. Mr. Estes stated that there was a \$12.1 billion need verses the current funding levels and he would demonstrate the need for additional funds to go out and the vision of the corridor should be where those funds should be posted.

Mr. Estes stated that the pilot program from the Federal Highway Administration allowed the tolling of a free interstate within three different slots around the country. He stated that right now the Federal Government was holding slots for Virginia, Missouri and North Carolina. Mr. Estes stated that Virginia and North Carolina had the provisional slots for the pilot program and that when they started working on the program, they received the provisional, conditional approval to be into the program by the late/early fall of last year to put together a vision of where they would put the toll revenue generated such as for pavement, structural, operational and/or capacity and safety improvements throughout the corridor. He further stated that some of the highlights of the vision plan were available on the web page, as well as, referencing the focus on safety, system maintenance, mobility (capacity improvements) and economic vitality. Mr. Estes stated that the main focus was working on projects that had been identified through the Planning District Commission, local government and other organizations to try accelerate projects that had been identified as a need but not currently funded. He stated the vision plan was looking at the needs and interests, environmental issues, analysis impacts, along with traffic and revenue studies that set forth the different rates of the types of revenue tolling would bring and what type of diversion it would have off the interstate on the local road network. Mr. Estes stated that one piece of the process would be to put in a formal application under the pilot program with the Federal Highway Administration by late summer. He stated that the different scenarios and tolling strategies being looked at now included the impact of businesses in the communities and evaluating the variation from the most likely options to the least likely options. He stated that the most likely tolling scenario being looked at was two tolling locations, one south of Richmond and one north of Richmond. Mr. Estes stated that they were also looking at evaluating the impact of a large structure over the interstate that would be captured by having a transponder installed in the vehicles going through at interstate speed that would capture the toll. He stated that they were also looking at an alternative of local cost to implement cash collection for frequent users or people from out of state. Mr. Estes stated that the second option would be South of I-95 between the Virginia and North Carolina border. He then stated that the third scenario being looked at was tolling about every 20 miles up the corridor; similar to the North

Carolina model and that the least likely scenario included a toll collection between every interchange that would represent the true per mile fee base.

Supervisor Ferguson asked who would buy the transponders. Mr. Estes stated anyone traveling the interstate and if you chose not to get a transponder, another way would be a video of a snap shot of your vehicle going in capturing the license plate which could have an additional processing fee among other ways being looked at to collect the revenue such as a cash option.

Mr. Whittington asked Mr. Estes to be more specific on the locations of the tolling booths. Mr. Estes stated that he could not commit to the exact location of where the tolling booths would be, but had taken under advisory the communication of commuters from North Carolina to Virginia and from Virginia to North Carolina to work.

Mr. Estes stated that one of his duties included outreach and coordination to meet with the communities to find out what the issues were to be taken into account. He stated that they had reached out to the Planning District Commissions, Policy Board Members and the Local Governments along the corridor. Mr. Estes stated that if VDOT were to get approval for tolling, it would need to be decided where the revenues would be used and an understanding of the priorities for the revenues. He stated that between now and the application process, they had to gather a menu of projects that would be funded with the tolling investment.

Supervisor Ferguson asked Mr. Estes if he thought North Carolina was stilling looking at putting up tolls every 20 miles. Mr. Estes stated that he had not talked with North Carolina within the last few weeks, but he thought that it was still their plans and that they were not looking at a cash option at all. Supervisor Ferguson also asked if some of the money generated would be used for secondary roads or was it strictly for the interstate. Mr. Estes stated that he did not say it could be used for secondary roads. Supervisor Ferguson stated that one of his concerns was regarding Greenville County generating money but the revenue not being used to help Greenville County secondary roads. Mr. Estes stated that one of the issues they were looking at was the impact to local roads. Supervisor Ferguson stated that another concern was when traffic got off of I-95 onto Highway 301 to go north or south; it would cause a back up in traffic. He further stated that Greenville County was a big farming community and farming generated a lot of revenue for the County. Supervisor Ferguson then stated that this community depended a lot on the truckers, saw mills, G.P., etc. to generate a lot of revenue for Greenville County and the tolling would hurt those businesses.

Chairman Wiley asked if tolling tax was the most inefficient way to generate money. Mr. Estes stated that he could not comment on it because he did not know a lot about the different taxes. Mr. Estes stated that they expected to get the preliminary traffic engineers to come in this week, then go back out to the planning organizations to talk more specifically about the plans of tolling because the requirement of the application was to spell out where the location would be, the rates needed, traffic conversion, etc. He stated that the information should be presented to the MPO's and local government in June. He then stated in late June-August, hopefully they would send a final application to Federal Highway Administration and that an environmental review was being done to be taken up with a Public Hearing in the Fall and the winter of 2012 to execute the tolling agreement.

Mr. Whittington asked as the project go forward, what opportunity would there be for the Greenville County Supervisors to have significant input or would it be already handled and everyone had to live with the decision. Mr. Estes stated that hopefully the concerns of the communities would be heard and then he would come back with details of the location and would want more input at that point along with the priorities for the use of the revenue generated.

Supervisor Ferguson asked the time frame of the project. Mr. Estes stated that hopefully there would be an agreement by the end of the year and actual, physical location of the tolling would be at least the next year or by the earliest into the calendar year of 2013.

Chairman Wiley stated that it was going to pose a significant cost factor on the trucking businesses and that Greenville County had a lot of trucking businesses to locate here because there was no tolling here at one point. She stated that this was going to be devastating to the local citizens and that someone in Richmond needed to re-evaluate the process. Chairman Wiley stated that with the way the economy was now, where were the citizens going to get the extra money for tolls?

Supervisor Ferguson stated that there were citizens who also worked in Petersburg and Richmond as well as North Carolina and that the tolls would cause a significant burden.

Chairman Wiley stated that the Board of Supervisors was going to fight the process with everything they had. She stated that this may be a small community, but everyone would band together to fight the process.

Mr. Estes thanked the Board of Supervisors for the opportunity to come down and talk.

There were a question and answer session at this time noting the citizens concerns such as to increasing the fuel tax, Greenville County citizens fighting along with North Carolina on the "No Tolls on I-95, the Trucker's Association banning together to fight along with the Board of Supervisors, the School System concern of the teachers commuting and the impact on recruiting, the impact on secondary roads, the funding needed to be generated verses the funding that would be generated, the burden of citizens on fixed incomes and truckers passing the cost of having to pay tolling down to the citizens.

-----

In Re: Citizens Comments

Mr. Whittington stated that anyone wishing to address the Board of Supervisors now had the opportunity to do so. He asked that they come forward and state their name for the record. There was no one.

-----  
In Re: Resolution #12-139, Approval of Greensville County School Budget for Fy201-2013

Mr. Whittington read the following resolution into record and stated that Staff recommended approval.

**RESOLUTION #12- 139**  
**APPROVAL OF GREENSVILLE COUNTY SCHOOL BUDGET FOR FY2012-2013**

**WHEREAS**, the Greensville County School Board, on February 13, 2012 adopted a budget for the 2012-2013 fiscal year; and

**WHEREAS**, the Code of Virginia, 1950, Section 22.1-93, states that the governing body of a County shall approve an annual budget for educational purposes by May first or within thirty days of the receipt by the County of the estimates of state funds, whichever shall occur later.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Greensville County Board of Supervisors approves a budget consisting of \$6,711,906 in local funds of which \$3,529,691 is projected to be the County of Greensville share and \$3,182,215 is projected to be the share of the City of Emporia.

Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Lee, to approve Resolution #12-139. Voting aye: Supervisors Ferguson, Lee, Vaughan and Chairman Wiley.

-----  
In Re: Reimbursement Resolution #12-140 Declaring the Intent to Reimburse Project Expenditures with Proceeds of Revenue Bonds

Mr. Whittington stated that Greensville County was borrowing money for the renovation of the Phoenix Building for use by the Commonwealth's Attorney. He stated that Staff recommended adoption of the following resolution so that Greensville County could legally reimburse itself with the expenditures.

**RESOLUTION #12-140**  
**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF GREENSVILLE, VIRGINIA DECLARING INTENT TO REIMBURSE PROJECT EXPENDITURES WITH PROCEEDS OF REVENUE BONDS**

**WHEREAS**, the County of Greensville, Virginia (the "County") has included in its capital improvement program the undertaking, acquisition, construction, renovation and improvement of offices for use by the Commonwealth's Attorney (the "Project");

**WHEREAS**, the County previously adopted a resolution declaring its intent to reimburse expenditures of the Project with proceeds of revenue bonds in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$1,600,000;

**WHEREAS**, the County on June 2, 2011 entered into a tax-exempt leasing arrangement with the Virginia Resources Authority in the amount of \$1,355,000 to finance the Project;

**WHEREAS**, the County has determined that additional funding is required to complete the Project;

**WHEREAS**, the County intends to issue, or to provide for the issuance through the Industrial Development Authority of Greensville County, Virginia of, one or more series of revenue bonds in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$500,000 (the "Completion Bonds") to finance the remaining portion of the cost of the Project;

**WHEREAS**, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, and Treasury Regulations Section 1.150-2 thereunder, provide that proceeds of tax-exempt obligations may be used to reimburse a previously paid expenditure provided that certain criteria are met; and

**WHEREAS**, the County has paid and intends to pay certain expenditures with respect to the Project prior to the issuance of the Completion Bonds to finance the Project and to receive reimbursement for such expenditures from proceeds of the Completion Bonds;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF GREENSVILLE, VIRGINIA AS FOLLOWS:**

1. The County intends to issue or to cause the issuance of the Completion Bonds to pay part of the costs of the Project, together with other available funds.

2. The County intends to receive reimbursement from proceeds of the Completion Bonds, when issued, for expenditures made not more than 60 days prior to the date of this Resolution related to the Project that are paid prior to such issuance.

3. Each expenditure reimbursed with proceeds of the Completion Bonds will be, unless otherwise approved by the County's bond counsel, either (a) of a type properly chargeable to a capital account under general federal income tax principles (determined in each case as of the date of the expenditure), (b) a cost of issuance with respect to the Completion Bonds, (c) a nonrecurring item that is not customarily payable from current revenues, or (d) a grant to a party that is not related to or an agent of the County so long as such grant does not impose any obligation or condition to repay any amount to or for the benefit of the County.

4. The County intends to make a reimbursement allocation, which is a written allocation that evidences the County's use of proceeds of the Completion Bonds to reimburse an expenditure, no later than 18 months after the later of the date on which the expenditure is paid or the Project is placed in service or abandoned (but in no event more than three years after the date on which the expenditure is paid).

5. The County recognizes that exceptions are available under the applicable Treasury Regulations which also may permit reimbursement for certain (a) preliminary

expenditures incurred prior to commencement of construction, (b) expenditures in an amount not in excess of the lesser of \$100,000 or five percent of the proceeds of the Completion Bonds, and (c) expenditures for long-term construction projects of at least five years duration.

6. The County intends that adoption of this Resolution shall constitute “official intent” within the meaning of Treasury Regulations Section 1.150-2.

7. This Resolution shall be effective immediately.

Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Vaughan, to approve Resolution #12-140. Voting aye: Supervisors Ferguson, Lee, Vaughan and Chairman Wiley.

-----

In Re: Resolution #12-141, Port of Virginia Economic and Infrastructure Development Zone Grant Program

Mr. Whittington read the following resolution into record and stated that Staff recommended approval. He stated that the Port of Virginia, despite its recent challenges brought on by the economic recession was projected to undergo significant growth within the upcoming years with the completion of the Panama Canal Extension Project.

**RESOLUTION #12-141  
PORT OF VIRGINIA ECONOMIC AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONE  
GRANT PROGRAM**

**WHEREAS**, the Port of Virginia – sustaining 343,000 jobs and generating over \$41 billion in revenues, \$13 billion in payroll, and \$1.2 billion in tax revenue – is one of the Commonwealth’s greatest economic assets; and

**WHEREAS**, the Port of Virginia, despite its recent challenges brought on by the economic recession, is projected to undergo significant growth in the coming years with the completion of the Panama Canal Extension Project; and

**WHEREAS**, the Port of Virginia cannot achieve this growth without the development of the distribution, intermodal, manufacturing, warehousing, and other supply chain facilities necessary to support port operations; and

**WHEREAS**, driving the development of these facilities to specific areas can help reduce congestion in the Hampton Roads region; and

**WHEREAS**, Governor McDonnell is proposing to create the Port of Virginia Economic and Infrastructure Development Zone Grant Program, which will incentive companies involved in maritime commerce and that import and export goods through the Port of Virginia to locate in Virginia; and

**WHEREAS**, creation of this grant program is estimated to have an economic impact of \$7.3 billion, sustaining 14,120 jobs in the Route 460 Corridor and \$5.7 billion, sustaining 11,255 in the Hampton Roads area; and

**WHEREAS**, creation of this grant program will bring much needed jobs and economic development to our community.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Greensville County Board of Supervisors support the establishment of the Port of Virginia Economic and Infrastructure Development Zone Grant Program and respectfully request the House of Delegates and the Senate of Virginia to approve Governor McDonnell’s proposed amendments to the 2013 – 2014 Appropriations Act establishing this zone.

Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Lee, to approve Resolution #12-140. Voting aye: Supervisors Ferguson, Lee, Vaughan and Chairman Wiley.

-----

In Re: Courthouse Carpet Bids

Mr. Mike Veliky, Building Official, addressed the Board of Supervisors stating that the County was working on replacing the floor covering in the courthouse and the Clerk’s Office over a period of three budget years to cut down on the financial impact in one budget year. He stated that the plans called for the bulk of the replacement to happen in the current budget year and the next budget year, the replacement of the carpet would be in the courthouse. Mike stated that three bids were received and opened last week for the bulk of the replacement ranging from a low of \$46,953 to a high of \$69,284.23. He then stated that it concerned Staff with the big cost difference in a bid amount, so last week the low bidder, Patrick Carpet Installations, was contacted for license information and to verify whether they had any complaints against them. He also stated that he had asked for references and were still awaiting that information. Mr. Veliky stated that Staff’s recommendation was to award the project to the low bidder, Patrick Carpet Installation, Inc.

Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Lee, to defer the matter until the Board received more information regarding the company. Voting aye: Supervisors Ferguson, Lee, Vaughan and Chairman Wiley.

-----

In Re: Boards and Commissions Appointments

1. Building Appeals – an At-Large Appointment for a term of three years.

Chairman Wiley opened the floor for nominations of an individual to be appointed on the Building Appeals Board for a term of three years.

Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Vaughan, to defer the appointment until the next meeting. Voting aye: Supervisors Ferguson, Lee, Vaughan and Chairman Wiley.

-----

In Re: Miscellaneous Matters

Various Departmental Reports and Staff Work Programs were prepared for the Board's review and comments.

Chairman Wiley asked if anyone had any questions. There were none.

-----

In Re: Adjournment

With there being no further business, Supervisor Ferguson moved, seconded by Supervisor Lee, to adjourn the meeting. Voting aye: Supervisors Ferguson, Lee, Vaughan and Chairman Wiley.

---

Peggy R. Wiley, Chairman

---

K. David Whittington, Clerk