

**MINUTES OF A  
SPECIAL MEETING  
OF THE JACKSON COUNTY  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
HELD ON  
APRIL 27, 2017**

The Jackson County Board of Commissioners met in a Special Meeting on April 27, 2017, 2:00 p.m., Justice and Administration Building, Room A227, 401 Grindstaff Cove Road, Sylva, North Carolina.

Present: Brian McMahan, Chairman  
Charles Elders, Vice Chair  
Boyce Deitz, Commissioner  
Mickey Luker, Commissioner  
Ron Mau, Commissioner

Don Adams, County Manager  
Heather C. Baker, County Attorney  
Angela M. Winchester, Clerk to Board

Chairman McMahan called the meeting to order.

**(1) PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FY2018-22:** Mr. Adams presented the Capital Improvement Plan FY2018-22:

**(a)** Objectives of a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP): The plan was a document that was the result of an ongoing process by county officials to assess the need for major capital expenditures. It would promote discussion regarding priority, feasibility, timing, potential costs, financing options and future budgetary effect.

**(b)** Development of the CIP: The development has included the facilitation and exchange of information and coordination between the county, the school board and the community college on capital planning. The capital needs were determined for county government, public schools and the community college. The priorities have been reviewed and assessed for the proposed capital projects in relationship with the priorities. Recommendations were being presented to the Board of County Commissioners on the project timing, priority and possible financing options.

**(c)** Projects in the CIP include the following:

- Southwestern Community College: Health Sciences Building
- Public Schools: Top Three Priorities, per facility, and Athletic Fields
- County Government: Animal Shelter, Health Department and Justice Center Renovation

**(d)** Financing the CIP:

- Capital Reserve Fund
- Reserve Fund Balance
- Article 40, 42 and 46 Sales Tax Revenues
- Installment purchase debt under G.S. 160A-20

(e) Options to fund SCC and K-12 from Article 46 Sales Tax:

Fiscal Year	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	FY2020-21	FY2021-22	FY2022-23	FY2023-24	FY2024-25	FY2025-26	TOTALS
Projected Amount	\$943,720.00	\$1,376,176.80	\$1,444,985.64	\$1,517,234.92	\$1,593,096.67	\$1,672,751.50	\$1,756,389.08	\$1,844,208.53	\$1,936,418.96	\$2,033,239.90	\$16,118,222.00
<b>Cumulative Total</b>	<b>\$943,720.00</b>	<b>\$2,319,896.80</b>	<b>\$3,764,882.44</b>								
<b>Option 1</b>											
		NC Connect Bond funds	\$5,445,597.00								
Total Cash Available			\$9,210,479.44								
Total SCC Health Sciences Cost			\$19,844,294.00								
Balance Required			\$10,633,814.56								
		Debt issue 1/2019	\$10,000,000.00								
		Cash		\$633,814.56							
		Debt Payments		\$981,333.33	\$959,999.99	\$938,666.66	\$917,333.33	\$895,999.99	\$874,666.66	\$853,333.33	\$6,421,333.29
		General Fund		\$100,000.00	(\$100,000.00)						
		Remaining Funds		\$2,087.03	\$535,183.71	\$1,269,268.55	\$2,108,324.30	\$3,056,532.84	\$4,118,285.14	\$5,298,191.71	

(f) Southwestern Community College Health Sciences Building Project:

- 55,000 sq. ft.
- A&E, Survey, Base Bid & Contingency
- Furnishings and Equipment to be obtained with state funds
- Cost projections \$19,844,294
- Proposed funding schedule:

Funding Source	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	FY2020-21	Totals
Article 46 Tax	\$943,720.00	\$1,376,176.80	\$1,444,985.64	\$533,814.56	\$100,000.00	\$4,398,697.00
NC Connect Bond Funds	\$5,445,597.00	-	-	-	-	\$5,445,597.00
Debt Issue 1/2019	-	-	\$10,000,000.00	-	-	\$10,000,000.00
	\$6,389,317.00	\$1,376,176.80	\$11,444,985.64	\$533,814.56	\$100,000.00	\$19,844,294.00
<b>Cumulative Totals</b>		<b>\$7,765,493.80</b>	<b>\$19,210,479.44</b>	<b>\$19,744,294.00</b>	<b>\$19,844,294.00</b>	

(g) JCPS Capital Outlay Article 40 and 42 Sales Tax:

Sales Tax Revenues:	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	FY2020-21	FY2021-22	Totals
Article 40 / 40%	\$1,178,262.00	\$1,237,175.10	\$1,299,033.86	\$1,363,985.55	\$1,432,184.83	\$1,503,794.07	\$8,014,435.39
Article 42 / 60%	\$1,602,950.00	\$1,683,097.50	\$1,767,252.38	\$1,855,614.99	\$1,948,395.74	\$2,045,815.53	\$10,903,126.14
	\$2,781,212.00	\$2,920,272.60	\$3,066,286.23	\$3,219,600.54	\$3,380,580.57	\$3,549,609.60	\$18,917,561.54
<b>School Capital Expenditures:</b>							
Capital Outlay	\$235,000.00	\$235,000.00	\$235,000.00	\$235,000.00	\$235,000.00	\$235,000.00	\$1,410,000.00
Capital Outlay - Technology	\$400,000.00	\$400,000.00	\$397,500.00	\$397,500.00	\$397,500.00	\$397,500.00	\$2,390,000.00
Capital Outlay - One to One	\$320,700.00	\$320,700.00	\$320,700.00	\$320,700.00	\$320,700.00	\$320,700.00	\$1,924,200.00
Capital Outlay - Maintenance	\$75,000.00	\$375,500.00	\$375,500.00	\$375,500.00	\$375,500.00	\$375,500.00	\$1,952,500.00
SMH Gym, Fine Arts, BR Principal	\$666,667.00	\$666,667.00	\$666,667.00	\$666,667.00	\$666,667.00	\$666,667.00	\$4,000,002.00

SMH Gym, Fine Arts, BR Interest	\$209,250.00	\$190,650.00	\$172,050.00	\$153,450.00	\$134,850.00	\$134,850.00	\$995,000.00
QZAB Debt \$9mil Issue	-	\$600,000.00	\$600,000.00	\$600,000.00	\$600,000.00	\$600,000.00	\$3,000,000.00
Transfer to SCR	\$874,595.00	\$131,755.60	\$298,869.23	\$470,783.54	\$650,363.57	\$819,392.60	\$3,245,759.54
	\$2,781,212.00	\$2,920,272.60	\$3,066,286.23	\$3,219,600.54	\$3,380,580.57	\$3,549,609.60	\$18,917,561.54
Transfer to SCR	\$742,135.00						
Remaining Balance	\$132,460.00						
Capital Reserve amounts available after commitments: School Capital Reserve 4/27/17 \$1,614,891.59							
	\$1,747,351.59	\$131,755.60	\$298,783.54	\$470,783.54	\$650,363.57	\$819,392.60	\$4,118,516.13
<b>Balance Available</b>	<b>\$1,747,351.59</b>	<b>\$131,755.60</b>	<b>\$298,783.54</b>	<b>\$470,783.54</b>	<b>\$650,363.57</b>	<b>\$819,392.60</b>	<b>\$4,118,516.13</b>
<b>Cumulative Totals</b>	<b>\$1,747,351.59</b>	<b>\$1,879,107.19</b>	<b>\$2,177,976.42</b>	<b>\$2,648,759.96</b>	<b>\$3,299,123,353.00</b>	<b>\$4,118,516.13</b>	

(h) School Capital Reserve Projections: Proposed funding schedule:

Funding Source	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	FY2020-21	FY2021-2022	Totals
School Capital Reserve Article 46 Sales Tax	\$1,747,351.59	\$131,755.60	\$298,869.23	\$470,783.54	\$650,363.57	\$819,392.60	\$4,118,516.13
Article 46 Sales Tax	-	-	-	\$2,087.03	\$533,096.68	\$734,084.84	\$1,269,268.55
Totals	\$1,747,351.59	\$131,755.60	\$298,869.23	\$472,870.57	\$1,183,460.25	\$1,553,477.44	\$5,387,784.68
<b>Cumulative Totals</b>	<b>\$1,747,351.59</b>	<b>\$1,879,107.19</b>	<b>\$2,177,976.42</b>	<b>\$2,650,846.99</b>	<b>\$3,834,307.24</b>	<b>\$5,387,784.68</b>	
<b>Proposed Projects</b>							
Top 3 Priorities per Facility		\$700,000.00	\$400,000.00	\$300,000.00			\$1,400,000.00
Athletic Fields		\$1,000,000.00					\$1,000,000.00
Engineering Fees - Athletic Fields	\$74,000.00						\$74,000.00
	\$74,000.00	\$1,700,000.00	\$400,000.00	\$300,000.00	-	-	\$2,474,000.00
<b>Cumulative Totals</b>	<b>\$1,673,351.59</b>	<b>\$105,107.19</b>	<b>\$3,976.42</b>	<b>\$176,846.99</b>	<b>\$1,360,307.24</b>	<b>\$2,913,784.68</b>	<b>\$2,913,784.68</b>

General discussion was held.  
Informational item.

(2) **PUBLIC SCHOOLS:** Present for discussions: Dr. Michael Murray, Superintendent; Dr. Kim Elliott, Associate Superintendent; Ken Henke, School Board Chairman; Gwen Edwards, Finance Officer; and David Proffitt, Director of Technology.

Mr. Adams stated that this was a request from some Commissioners who had follow-up questions for the Jackson County Public Schools (JCPS) from their April 11<sup>th</sup> presentation:

**(a) Question:** In the overall question, a copy of the strategic plan of the school districts was requested and provided. Does the strategic plan identify the requested new positions? Does the strategic plan link the positions to the goals and objectives of the plan? What were the expected outcomes linked to those new positions? How would those outcomes be assessed? What were the exit strategies if the outcomes were not met in the appropriate time frames? Would new hires be made aware of the expected outcomes and that if those outcomes were not met, that funding supporting those positions/programs could end?

**Answer:** New positions requested align with key components listed in the JCPS district strategy plan: MTSS (Multi-Tiered Systems of Support), PLCs (Professional Learning Communities), Instructional Technology and PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention Support).

The new teaching positions would allow the district to hire positions to support new initiatives without impacting class size. These positions focused at the school level would increase student achievement and reduce teacher turnover. New positions requested would support accelerated implementation of district initiatives by providing professional development, train-the-trainer, coaching, modeling and non-evaluative learning walks/fidelity checks. Based on John Hattie's work "Visible Learning", teacher quality and instructional strategies, including feedback, have the highest effect size on student achievement. District leaders would work with new staff to ensure that they were providing necessary support in five targeted areas: Master Literacy, Investigation/Connected Math, Reading Research to Classroom Practice (RRtCP), Foundations of Math (FOM) and Foundations/Reading Mastery/Extreme Reading.

The expected outcomes would be a successful implementation of an MTSS framework for JCPS. This would be measured by positive implementation data collected through the self-assessment of MTSS (SAM). The results should show implementation increased over the next four years by a shift in the MTSS belief survey results and an increase in student achievement results.

Explicit job descriptions had been created for all positions. New positions would be assessed using the state approved evaluation system for their specific role. If the program did not yield the expected results over the course of five years, programs and personnel would be reevaluated.

**(b) Question:** Operations: Based on information provided in the work session, the school district requested \$6.78 mil in operating funds from 2011-2017 and was now requesting \$8.98 mil. If the increase had occurred gradually, over time, the request would have been a more manageable 4.75% increase annually. How was the school district able to operate without requesting a 4.75% increase each year over the past 6-7 years? What steps were taken to save dollars and operate at less that was requested from the school district? The request equals a 32% increase in one year. Assuming the \$8.98 mil was what should be funded, did the school district have a plan that could provide flexibility to the county to "catch up" over several years?

**Answer:** JCPS used federal funding from ARRA, EduJobs and RttT to make-up the shortfall in state funding, then the district used fund balance starting in 2014. The increased funding requested this year was to support unfunded state legislation and implement NEW initiatives critical to academic improvement.

Since 2009, the BOE has reduced positions through attrition. They eliminated paid overtime and for several years they eliminated the teacher supplement, with the county's permission, in addition, they renegotiated copier cost, analyze waste management, utility use, etc., to achieve cost savings, limited professional development and travel and other cost saving measures.

Without the increased funding, they would be unable to implement the much needed academic initiatives called for in the request. Regardless of whether they receive increased funding, they were proposing to use their fund balance to pay for the additional teachers needed to implement MTSS for the first year, resulting in a planned reduction of the BOE's fund balance below the optimum \$1 mil. If the county only provided a portion of the requested increase (\$2.2 mil), the district would be forced to prioritize academic and other initiatives. Increasing the county's investment to \$8.6 mil would make the difference in providing all of the JCPS students the very best education possible.

**(c) Question:** Retirement benefits and locally funded positions: What was the number of locally funded positions? How many were fully funded locally? How many were partially funded locally? For partially funded, were retirement benefits funded partially as well? What was the total dollar amount of locally funded positions? Were these positions assessed on a regular basis? Were outcomes related to those positions being met? How was that demonstrated?

**Answer:** JCPC did not receive enough state funding to support all of their staff and they ended up using local dollars at the end of the year after they had used up the available state funding. For example, all bus drivers were paid from state funds until the state money ran out in April. For the months May and June, all bus driver salaries and the related benefits would come from local dollars. This expense was not included in the original local budget. State transportation funding was cut in 2017 and the amount of final allotment was not known until December.

The district was informed on April 25<sup>th</sup> that the federal funding they had used to fund one technology technician would be eliminated beginning with the 2017-18 school year. With this recent news, they would need funding to support two technology technicians.

**(d) Question:** Class size: The Macon County Superintendent was quoted in the local press about considering redistricting to help with class size and that Macon County had considered redistricting. NC General Statutes clearly places that task on the school district and school board (Chapter 115C). Additionally, past DPI waiver application forms did refer to district reorganizations. In the work session, the indication was some waivers had been filed in the past with DPI. How was reorganization addressed in those requests? What does the data suggest would be the potential benefits of redistricting as it relates to class size?

**Answer:** The state statute authorizes local boards of education to redistrict or to close schools if necessary. The school board chose not to redistrict due to the belief in community based schooling. It was the belief of the board that it was best not to uproot and transfer students in the middle of their k-8 school years.

For example, in the class size waiver submitted to DPI for school year 16-17, organizational problems in geographically isolated school administrative units, in which the average daily membership was less than one and one-half per square mile, was the basis of the requested waiver (refer to Individual Class Size Waiver Request Forms).

JCPS allows in-district cross-school transfers if, and only if:

- The sending principal and receiving principal concur; and
- There was room in the grade level for the student without creating a state waiver request.

Classroom teacher reassignments were reviewed annually to avoid waivers. JCPS strived to limit the number of combination classes in a school. Geography and small schools were a challenge for class size efficiency.

**(e) Question:** Digital Learning Initiative: How was IT support currently processed? What was the number of requests? How many requests per current JCPS IT Personnel? What was the typical amount of time spent per issue? How many additional issues were anticipated? What were the industry norms for the number of devices/IT professional? Would authorizing overtime pay be possible and less expensive than new hires? Would media specialist act as the first contact for IT issues?

**Answer:** Any staff member could submit a tech support request through an online portal or a support email address. When a request was submitted, it was received by the Technology Director and assigned to a technician. Alternately, staff members could report technical issues to the school media specialist or technology contact, who could submit a request on their behalf.

Total support requests created in 2016-17 school year, through April 26<sup>th</sup> were 2,356 or 589 support requests per technician. The median time to resolution for support requests in 2016-17 was 40.4 hours (1.7 days). The number of support requests in 2016-17 was currently 9.5% higher than the number of support requests over the same period in 2015-16. As they added additional devices through the Digital Learning Initiative, JCPS ranked 12<sup>th</sup> in the state at 1 technician per 805 devices.

After adding 1,520 1:1 devices in 2016-17, JCPS ratio would rise to 1 technician per 1,185 devices and their rank would drop to 30<sup>th</sup> in the state. After hours technical support was not needed because they did not have students and teachers in the building.

The media specialist was often the first point of contact in each school. However, most teachers prefer to enter their own support requests. Media specialists could resolve simple issues quickly, however, when they could not solve a problem, using them as a first point of contact actually slowed down the support process.

**(f) Question:** Academic Achievement – what has been done in the past to improve? How were EOGs and EOC exams incorporated into curriculum and student grades to provide some incentives or send a signal to the importance of these exams? What was the retesting process currently used by JCPS? Was there a remediation process?

**Answer:** JCPS incorporated numerous practices as part of the strategic plan to improve academic achievement. The district has implemented Professional Learning Communities (DuFour Research) in all schools. Through PLCs, teachers have the opportunity to look critically at various data points to make decision about instruction, curriculum and environment. This year, they implemented CASE benchmarks. The systemic benchmarking for reading and math in 3-8<sup>th</sup> grade has given teachers valuable data that correlates to EOGs. The benchmark results allow teachers to remediate and target instruction. A strategic plan for PD related to reading, math and coaching was used. Tutors were hired at the school level to support small groups. At the elementary level, teachers provide explicit instruction on test strategies and encourage students to use the strategies. Teachers and administrators contact families to meet with them about successes and concerns for a student’s performance. All JCPS teachers encourage and motivate students to do their best on all of the standardized assessments at the end of the year. For students in high school or taking courses for high school credit, the ECO/NCFE/CTE assessment represents 25% of their final grade for the course. After completing the EOC or EOG, students who were not proficient have the opportunity to participate in JCPS Summer Academic Camp for structural remediation and the opportunity to retest. Per state board policy, students must be offered summer remediation to take a summer administration of the assessment.

**(g) Question:** MTSS: What were the results from other districts that had implemented this model? What were JCPS goals for the plan? How did it link to current JCPS strategic plan? What would happen to lead teachers?

**Answer:** In the statewide rollout, JCPS was in Cohort 3. Cohorts 1 and 2 were one year ahead of JCPS. Full implementation was expected to take over four years. While Haywood and Henderson were also in Cohort 3, they had been implementing RTI and PBIS for some time, which were the main components of MTSS. Both districts had schools with high academic achievement across all subgroups. If implemented effectively and with fidelity, MTSS was projected to increase the student achievement outcome data to 80% proficient with CORE instruction. MTSS was the focus of the district strategic plan. PBIS fits into the MTSS implementation at MTSS focuses on instruction, curriculum and environment for all students.

The current goals for MTSS as they complete the 2016-17 school year:

- PD for school Leadership Teams (MTSS 3 of the 6 critical components)
- PD for faculty and staff
- A critical look at master scheduling
- Resources for problem solving

Resources and support for explicit instruction, scaffolding, feedback and practice goals for the 2017-18 school year were:

- Support school leadership teams with training at the beginning of the school for staff at each school
- Focus on CORE instruction
- Implement consistent process and documents for problem solving individual students

- Complete Module 2 of the MTSS Online Learning Module with district implementation team
- Ensure all schools were in place to offer school level MTSS support, PD and coaching for all staff on consistent resources and strategies.

**(h) Question:** Catamount School. Understood that funding was lost due to students attending, but servicing fewer students has a reduction in costs. Since the catamount school will be housed in a JCPS facility do some of the operating funds from the catamount school reimburse JCPS? If so, what was that amount? (Utilities, supplies, school lunches, additional cost for the lunch preparation, etc. and how were those costs accounted for and reimbursed by the Catamount school?).

**Answer:** The LEA will lose \$6,195.10 for each regular education student. The potential 75 students will come from various schools and grade levels. They must continue to operate classrooms system-wide. The MOU has not been finalized, but it was their hope that it will include a “rent” amount sufficient to cover the cost of the use of the facilities and resources, as well as reimbursement for the time spent by JCPS staff serving any of the students of the Catamount school. HB 1030 states “food and transportation services for the school will be provided by the LEA in which the school was located”.

**(i) Question:** Supplements: what was the turnover rate for JC teachers? Was it higher than neighboring counties? Was it higher than Haywood and Buncombe Counties which were the two counties identified as having higher local supplements? What were the local supplements for other nearby counties (i.e. Macon, Swain, Transylvania, etc.)? Same questions for non-certified employees). For school districts of similar size and county demographics how many have supplements and what were those amounts?

**Answer:**

Location	2015-16 Attrition Rate	Certified Supplement	Non-Certified Supplement
Asheville City	13.90%	8.5%-16%	8.5%-16%
Buncombe	10.78%	8.5%-13%	10.77%
Haywood	10.90%	4.5%-5%	2%
Macon	8.18%	2%	2% (TA only)
Swain	10.34%	0%	0%
Transylvania	11.40%	8.50%	2%
Jackson	16.40%	2%	0%

**(j) Question:** Should supplements be based on class size? (i.e. teacher in grade 7 at school X has 24 students in their course, teacher in grade 7 at school Y has 15 students; was it equitable for the local supplement to be the same dollar amount?) Should local supplements be higher for those teachers in the areas the school district has identified as those that were difficult to attract and retain? Understand the issue with principal and assistant principal pay scales, but was it legal to pay someone using a scale that was not intended to be used for a given job description? Should supplements for leadership positions be tied to school performance metrics?

**Answer:** Student enrollment constantly fluctuates; it would not be a good recruitment and retention incentive to cut a teacher’s supplement in a year in which class size decreases. They considered offering a higher supplement to teachers in hard to staff schools and subject areas. The state has elected not to fix the administration salary schedule; instead, the LEAS have been instructed by DPI to use the salary schedule that was most advantageous to the employee. HB 1030 section 9.3 changed the General Statute that allows school based administrators to be paid from the teacher salary schedule. “A teacher who becomes a principal shall be paid on a monthly basis, at least as much as he or she would earn as a teacher employed by that local school administrative unit”. There was proposed legislation for a state block grant, which would require school districts to develop a salary plan for principals based on locally developed performance criteria.

**(k) Question:** Currently, the school district pays a \$1,000 sign-on bonus. Has that been assessed and does the data suggest such incentives were effective? How do the results for JCPS under the bonus plan compare to similar programs in other counties? How do the results for JCPS under the bonus plan compare to counties that do not use a sign-on bonus? Does the sign-on bonus also require three years of service as the proposed \$750 will? Were teachers who were on improvement plans eligible for the \$750 bonus? Was retention of existing teachers more valuable than attracting new teachers? Should the dollar amounts be reconsidered?

**Answer:** The district reviewed signing bonuses after the first year of implementation. Year one bonuses were paid in two installments (1<sup>st</sup> paycheck and final payment upon the completion of the school year). It was determined to be financially unfair for a late hire to be given the same bonus as an August hire and it did not encourage retention. In the second year, they revised the plan for new hires to be paid monthly through the completion of the first school year to ensure fairness. In spite of this change, the signing bonus still has not encouraged retention. Transylvania County was the only known county in the west that offered a signing bonus and it has been discontinued. Improvement plans were not part of the criteria; all teachers were eligible. The signing bonus did not require additional service. They intend to discontinue the signing bonus and apply those funds to the \$750 bonus for current employees adding hard to fill licensure areas. As evidenced in the realignment, both recruitment and retention were extremely important.

**(l) Question:** Professional Growth: Will all master's degrees, regardless of discipline, be eligible for the higher compensation? Do masters have to be related to the subject that a teacher teaches for middle school and high school? For elementary, were there parameters on what was an acceptable master's degree? Could local supplement be higher for those with master's degrees?

**Answer:** To be eligible for master's pay, the educator must hold a masters in their related area. Local supplements will be higher for those holding a master's degree as a supplement was percentage driven. A person that started their master's program prior to August, 2013, would receive a salary differential for earning a master's degree. If the person started their master's program after August, 2013, the state would no longer pay a salary differential for earning that degree (unless the position required an advanced degree). The intent of the request for additional pay from local funds was to continue the salary differential formerly recognized by the state. These local dollars would fill the state gap in that area, using the same criteria the state formerly used.

**(m) Question:** What was day to day capital? What items were purchased with those funds? Were those costs actual operating expenses that legally should not be supported by Article 40 and 42?

**Answer:** The 2016-17 county budget included \$75,000 of Article 40 and 42 monies, which were appropriated and restricted by the county to be spent on preventative maintenance. Examples of current expenditures were boiler and chiller maintenance, filter replacement, parking lot repairs, HVAC duct cleaning, etc. The county should determine the funding source for the \$86,000 for preventative maintenance and \$290,500 for the manufacturer approved roof maintenance program in the 2017-18 request.

**(n) Question:** What was the total dollar amount for preventative maintenance and what was the plan for spending those funds year to year?

**Answer:** The total projected amount requested for improving preventative maintenance was \$376,500. The district was developing a preventative maintenance schedule, to include contracting preventative roof and HVAC maintenance, as well as rotational water heater replacement and annual electrical panel inspections.

General discussion was held.

*Informational item.*

**(3) CAPITAL RESERVE / FUND BALANCE PROJECTIONS:** Mr. Adams  
 presented: Capital Reserve/Fund Balance Projections: Proposed funding schedule:

Funding Source	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19	FY2019-20	FY2020-21	FY2021-2022	Totals
Capital Reserve	\$1,479,029.86	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$6,479,029.86
General Fund Balance	-	-	\$3,500,000.00	\$3,025,000.00	-	-	\$6,525,000.00
Totals	\$1,479,029.86	\$1,000,000.00	\$4,500,000.00	\$4,025,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$13,004,029.86
<b>Cumulative Totals</b>	<b>\$1,479,029.86</b>	<b>\$2,479,029.86</b>	<b>\$6,979,029.86</b>	<b>\$11,004,029.86</b>	<b>\$12,004,029.86</b>	<b>\$13,004,029.86</b>	
<b>Projected Commitments</b>							
Health Department		\$403,157.86	\$4,500,000.00	\$2,096,842.14			\$7,000,000.00
Animal Shelter		\$350,000.00	\$1,575,000.00	\$1,575,000.00			\$3,500,000.00
Justice Center Renovations			\$150,000.00	\$1,350,000.00			\$1,500,000.00
		\$553,157.86	\$6,200,000.00	\$3,671,842.14	\$1,575,000.00		\$12,000,000.00
<b>Cumulative Totals</b>	<b>\$14,796,029.86</b>	<b>\$1,925,872.00</b>	<b>\$225,872.00</b>	<b>\$579,029.86</b>	<b>\$4,029.86</b>	<b>\$1,004,029.86</b>	<b>\$1,004,029.86</b>

The Commissioners requested that the animal shelter planning be moved to next year.  
*Informational item.*

**(4) SOUTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE (SCC):** Mr. Adams stated there were projects that were currently funded with SCC and if they wanted to proceed forward with the projects, additional funding would be required.

(a) The 2017-18 Budget Requests from SCC:

2016-2017 Budget		2017-2018 Budget		% Change
Total operating budget	\$1,940,028	Total operating budget	\$2,002,725.17	3%
Total capital budget	\$1,405,670	Total capital budget	\$935,800	-33%
Total operating and capital	\$3,345,698		\$2,938,525.17	-12%
<b>Net reduction in request</b>			<b>(\$407,172.83)</b>	

Mr. Adams stated that the request was \$407,172.83 less than last year, but he wanted to note a couple of items. The capital request last year was not funded in the operating budget. The Board chose to use fund balance to fund those capital requests. This was significant because in order for them to proceed, a couple of things would need to occur.

(b) Operating expense detail:

Expense Category	Expense Detail
Management operations, salaries and benefits	\$1,151,552
Utilities and supplies	\$574,370
Insurance	\$171,603
Software, maintenance and general expenses	\$105,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,002,725</b>

(c) Capital requests detail:

<b>Capital Category</b>	<b>Capital Detail</b>
General maintenance and building upkeep	\$395,900
Parking lot site prep and completion	\$314,900
Maintenance building completion costs	\$225,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$935,800</b>

Mr. Adams stated that the \$314,000 and \$225,000 were truly additional fund balance requests.

(d) SCC Summary of FY2017-18 Capital Request: In current Fiscal Year 2016-17, the county approved \$700,000 to build a new maintenance building and \$482,000 to renovate the Summit Building. The total of \$1,182,000 was to be funded from fund balance. SCC was able to divert state equipment funds on a one-time basis to pay for the renovation of the Summit Building.

The updated cost estimate of the new maintenance building was \$1,407,000. SCC was requesting to utilize the current Fiscal Year 16-17 budgeted amount of \$1,182,000 to go towards the new maintenance building. SCC was requesting an additional \$225,000 to complete the project. The additional \$225,000 would need to come from fund balance.

SCC was also requesting \$314,900 to build a new parking lot. These funds would also need to come from fund balance.

The total impact to fund balance in FY17-18 was as follows:

- \$225,000 additional funds needed to complete the new maintenance building
- \$314,900 funds needed to build the new parking lot
- \$539,900 total fund balance in FY17-18

SCC also requested \$395,900 for general maintenance and building upkeep. This was an increase of \$172,230 over the current FY16-17 amount of \$223,670. Since general maintenance and building upkeep was an ongoing cost, some amount of capacity for this type of request should be built into the annual budget. Recommendations for this request would be presented to the Board with the entire proposed budget.

**Consensus:** Add SCC's request for an additional \$225,000 to complete the maintenance building project, to the May 15<sup>th</sup> regular meeting agenda for consideration.

**(5) OTHER BUSINESS:**

(a) Commissioner Mau requested they work towards getting an RFP out to build a solar farm on the landfill. He thought they should consider if this would be a feasible project.

Mr. Adams stated they could put this item on the May work session.

(b) Mr. Adams requested that the Board consider a vote to adopt the revised CIP Plan along with the recommended Budget in May.

(c) Commissioner Deitz requested that the Hall of Fame be added to the non-profit list requesting \$1,500 for consideration.

Chairman McMahan requested to take time to look at a summary of the non-profit requests at the next work session.

There being no further business, Commissioner Elders moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Mau seconded the Motion. Motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Angela M. Winchester, Clerk to Board

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian Thomas McMahan, Chairman