

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 13, 2006, at 1:00 p.m., County Office Building on McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from March 8, 2006.

PRESENT: Mr. Ken C. Boyd, Mr. Lindsay G. Dorrier, Jr., Mr. Dennis S. Rooker, Mr. David Slutzky, Ms. Sally H. Thomas and Mr. David C. Wyant.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Robert W. Tucker, Jr., County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, and Deputy Clerk, Debi Moyers.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 1:07 p.m., by the Chairman, Mr. Rooker.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session: Albemarle County Financial Plan, FY 2006-07 Recommended Operating Budget.

Mr. Tucker gave a PowerPoint presentation entitled Budget Work Session Overview. Today's work session will focus on Budget Goals, Projected Revenues, Use of Revenues, the FY 2007 Business Plan, and Departmental Reviews. The first public hearing on the budget is scheduled for April 5 at 6:00 p.m. along with a public hearing on the tax rates.

Mr. Tucker said the goals for this budget are: To maintain property taxes at current levels; to increase support for education and public safety; to make a significant investment in the capital budget to meet urbanization challenges; and, to align resources with the Board's budget priorities in the Strategic Plan. He said when developing the budget he has to draw the line somewhere on a real estate assessment figure, and the estimate for 2007 is a 19.4 percent increase. He said it is being monitored on a weekly basis, and he will have an update during these work sessions.

Mr. Tucker said the category in Revenues shown as PPTR is the 70 percent the state had said it would fund for the local car tax. Staff is concerned because it appears that this General Assembly is not going to cover the 70 percent. There is one bill before the General Assembly that would cover the amount needed to pay that 70 percent, but without passage of that bill, the County might have to subsidize in order to maintain the 70 percent.

Ms. Thomas asked when the Board would know about this. Mr. Tucker said he will have a better idea of what County personal property assessments are by the end of these work sessions, but will not know what the State's share will be.

Mr. Melvin Breeden, Budget Manager, said staff must first determine the 2006 personal property values and then determine what 70 percent of that figure costs the County compared to the \$15.0 million which comes from the State. The way the Board adopted the Personal Property Tax Relief Ordinance in January, only the amount of tax relief the State money would allow, would be given, or the County would give the 70 percent and collect less revenue.

Mr. Rooker said he thought the Board had decided it would allocate the percentage. Mr. Davis said the ordinance adopted by the Board in January says the money the State gives the County will be allocated equally among qualifying car owners and that will determine the amount of the per vehicle subsidy by a percent the Board would allocate. There is no authority for the Board to subsidize that amount and boost it back to the 70 percent. The Board can lower the rate, but it cannot do a general subsidy to maintain a 70 percent car tax relief. The percentage of relief will be calculated once the Division of Taxation tells the County how much money it will get. That will then be spread evenly among the cars that qualify on a percentage basis. The remainder of the tax will be collected from the car owners.

Mr. Rooker said it should not affect the County's revenues, because he understands it just affects the amount of tax reduction given to the property owner by the State. It is not going to be 70 percent anymore but some declining number based on that fixed amount. Mr. Tucker said Fairfax County and other localities are anticipating only 50 percent or 60 percent.

Mr. Tucker mentioned that about \$530,000 in one-time money was used to balance this proposed budget, whereas in FY '05-06 \$1.6 million was used. He said \$890,000 has been set aside in the Board's Reserve. Also set aside is \$2.22 million for Strategic Initiatives which he will explain later.

Mr. Tucker said now that 45 percent of the real estate reassessment has been completed, staff has indicated that the increase will likely be 22.5 percent, which amounts to \$1.6 million additional revenue for next year.

Mr. Rooker asked if the 45 percent of the reassessment which has been completed is a representative sample of both commercial and residential properties. Mr. Breeden said he believes it is more residential at this time. Mr. Rooker said he mentioned this because commercial is unlikely to increase in this market as much as residential. He thinks it is unlikely that commercial will increase more than 12 percent over the two-year period.

Ms. Thomas said the County is always caught between the fiscal and the physical year. When talking about this reassessment and its increase, one-half of that is applicable to this budget. Mr. Tucker

said that is correct. There will be a reassessment next year and thereafter the reassessment will be conducted on an annual basis. For the FY 2007 budget, the County will receive one-half of the reassessment, which is the first half of the 2007 tax year, so the June bill will be related to the reassessment.

Mr. Tucker drew the Board's attention to the slide entitled "Board Reserve/Adjustments" and the column for FY '06-07. He pointed out adjustments made since he submitted his proposed budget to the Board: the Regional Jail population is down so a savings of \$53,370 is anticipated; a savings of \$72,560 is anticipated in Juvenile Detention costs; a savings of \$101,863 is anticipated for the ECC; a savings of \$45,000 is anticipated in decals in the Finance Department; a savings of \$68,960 is anticipated for CSA; there will be an increased expenditure for CARS of \$146,265; and an increase of \$1,608,703 in the real estate reassessment, leaving \$2,690,208 to add to the Board's Reserve. That amount is in recurring funds, which could be moved into capital or used for a tax rate reduction or initiatives that came out of the public hearing last week such as the ACE Program or the Housing Trust Fund.

Mr. Tucker drew the Board's attention to the column entitled "Projected Fund Balance/One-time." He said that in December, 2005 he had reported that there would be approximately \$5.8 million by the end of FY '2006. Revenues have been strong because the economy is so strong. These revenues came from Other Local Revenues such as sales and meals taxes, so \$6.5 million is anticipated at this time. If the one-time money used to balance the budget is deducted (\$537,000), and \$1.995 million is deducted for additional Juvenile Court renovation costs, there would still be \$4.038 million in one-time moneys available. He said the Board must be cautious with that money because there is the Crozet Library, the Northern Fire Station, and other projects pending. He has talked with some officials at the University and they are seeing increases in construction costs of 50 to 60 percent. He said that one-time money is normally moved to the CIP for pending projects.

Mr. Foley said staff expects construction of the Northern fire station to cost from \$750,000 to \$1.0 million more. The Crozet Library was originally planned for 15,000 square feet, but the Library Board has recommended 20,000 square feet as a more appropriate size. Staff will bring back revised costs for this project. He said there has always been a CIP Reserve for some of these fluctuations, but it is going to be bigger for these two projects.

Mr. Tucker said when the Board met with the School Board last fall they set the salary scale adjustments. He showed a slide representing those percentages and said there is also a full year of impacts from the reclassifications done last year. The increase in overtime pay is attributable to policemen and public safety employees working overtime for which the County is reimbursed.

Mr. Tucker said the increase in benefits is at about five percent. He said the increase for VRS is \$500,000, as well as \$320,000 for VRS life insurance. He said changes have been made in legal requirements concerning the advertisement of public hearings. The cost of advertising has increased by 24 percent, postage has increased nine percent, property insurance has increased 30 percent, fuel costs have increased 54 percent, and utilities have increased about nine percent. He said if there are no questions Ms. White and Mr. Foley will proceed with presenting the Business Plan.

Ms. Roxanne White, Assistant County Executive, said the question asked most often is why the County would follow a Business Plan structure. She said after the Board adopted its first Strategic Plan, a Business Plan was implemented. Staff feels it is the best way to ensure that resources are aligned with the directions set out in the Plan. It focuses not on making just one-year adjustments to a budget, but looks at resource allocations also and new initiatives. It is a way to organize decisions so the Board can see how staff carries out priorities. She said staff is not looking at this as separate functions of government or different departments, but as what the Board is trying to accomplish overall.

Ms. White said the next slide focuses on how initiatives are organized. She said these are strategic directions from the current plan, as the Board has not adopted its next Strategic Plan. She said this Business Plan is still organized around what has already been approved. Staff will go through the Plan the way the strategic directions were approved: High Quality Educational Opportunities; Protecting Natural, Scenic and Historic Resources; Enhancing the Quality of Life; and Providing Effective and Efficient Services.

Ms. White said the Board will see today some ongoing and new capital and operating projects. Ongoing projects are initiatives that may have had some funding in the first year of the Plan, and still have funding in the next year. Examples are the Monticello High School auditorium, and the initiative to add a certain number of police officers every year.

Ms. White explained that the goal for today's meeting is to give the Board a better picture of how resources are aligned with strategic priorities; to ensure that the Board has a full understanding of all proposed initiatives; to give the Board a broader understanding of how initiatives and departments work together to accomplish goals; and, to let the Board see that initiatives have a longer-term focus that strive to go beyond just an annual basis.

Ms. White said she will not spend time discussing ongoing initiatives since they have already been approved (PVCC Science and Technology Building; Monticello High School Auditorium; Jouett-Greer Site Reconfiguration; Administrative/Instructional Technology). She said there are three new initiatives. The first is the \$2.8 million addition to Cale Elementary School. It will add about 23,000 square feet to the school and increase its capacity from 216 to 648 students. She said the One-Stop Workforce Development Center is currently located at Virginia Employment Commission (VEC) building, but it is not a user-friendly environment. The Workforce Council of the Workforce Investment Board had a

team do a business plan, decide what programs should be offered, look at needed staffing, and then what resources would be needed. A recommendation approved by the Council was to request that localities provide a supplement in the way of resources. They have requested \$50,000 in support spread across the Planning District based on population and unemployment rates. She said Albemarle's share is about \$18,000 in operating money.

Ms. Thomas said she is glad the Board is considering the Operating Budget and the CIP Budget together, but it will take some education for the public to understand the difference. Ms. White said over the last five years there has been an effort to move consideration of the capital budget because it used to be considered separately.

Ms. Thomas asked if the increase in indebtedness for the Cale addition is factored in. Ms. White said the total cost of the project is shown in the Five-year Plan which includes paying for the money borrowed to build the addition. Mr. Breeden confirmed that the operating expense and the debt expense for the Cale addition were factored into the calculations.

Mr. Rooker asked about the project for the Western Albemarle High School moveable wall. Mr. Breeden responded that because of increased costs at Cale and in other projects, this initiative and several other large projects will be delayed.

Ms. Thomas said the Monticello High School Auditorium project should include the moveable wall, so there is no need for a future project to include it. The Board should probably discuss this with the School Board on Wednesday. Mr. Tucker agreed.

Ms. White said the last new initiative is the Educational Equity Program, a program sponsored by Urban Vision. Urban Vision is a new organization whose goal is to improve the success of some neighborhoods by working with the resident population. This program provides after-school opportunities for the children who live in these neighborhoods. They bring in teachers to do after-school programs, and also work with the schools to encourage parental involvement. It is a way to focus on the neighborhood and increase the learning for those children. She said the program has been operating for one-plus years at Friendship Court in the City. They requested \$50,000 from the County to develop two new sites in the County, one at Mallside Court and one at Wilton Farms. Staff recommends funding only one site at \$26,000. The program has a very good track record in the City based on reports from the Schools and through tracking scores in grade schools.

Mr. Boyd asked if this will be an ongoing expense. Ms. White said "yes."

Mr. Rooker asked if it is a General Government expense. Ms. White said that is correct. She said this is one thing staff is doing to fulfill the Board's initiative of providing "high quality educational opportunities" by assisting the School Division with what they are also trying to accomplish.

Mr. Boyd asked how this after-school program competes with what the School System offers. Ms. White said it is different by the fact that the Schools' programs are located at the school, while this program will be focused in the neighborhood where the children live. They have a teacher from the school go into the neighborhood so there is more communication with the parents. There is more communication and parental involvement than there would be in a program at the school.

Mr. Rooker said it is not a large amount of money, and they do run good programs. However, he thinks this should be a school expense because the schools run after-school programs; they should know if this is a good investment in education. The Schools are in a better position to make that judgment than this Board is.

Mr. Slutzky asked if the expense of this program would be reported in the education side of the revenue stream. Ms. White said this is really more of a human services function, something like the Bright Stars or Family Support programs which prepare children for school.

Mr. Slutzky pointed out that the Bright Stars Program seems inherently educationally-oriented, and he thinks it would be more appropriate to put it on the education side of things.

Mr. Tucker suggested that the Board make these comments to the School Board. He noted that Human Services also works with these families.

Ms. Thomas asked if this program might run into similar problems as that with the firefighters, with personnel funding. Mr. Foley replied that teachers are exempt employees and would not be paid overtime. Ms. White suggested the Board discuss this with the School Board. She said programs outside of the regular school day are a new focus for them to consider.

Mr. Foley reported on the second strategic direction – efforts to protect Natural, Scenic and Historic Resources. He noted the ongoing initiatives: Ivy Landfill Remediation; Stormwater Control Program; and, the Greenway Program. He said the ACE Program is shown as ongoing in the budget book, but there is a change. For the first time, the Program will be funded with recurring CIP revenues rather than one-time year-end funds. He said there has been a commitment of \$350,000 in Tourism revenues to the ACE Program. Next year, recurring CIP revenues of \$650,000 will go to the program.

Mr. Rooker said at the public hearing last week people expressed concern about the inability of \$1.0 million to buy the same amount of property as was purchased six years ago when the ACE Program first started, and the fact that the County has not set up a funding arrangement that takes into

consideration the inflation in property costs. He would like for the Board to think about dedicating a penny of the real estate tax rate to the ACE Program; that would keep the revenue indexed for inflation in future years. That is a policy decision, but it would not be an irrevocable decision. He said the Board has undertaken the goal of increasing property in conservation easements over the next four years by 50 percent. That will not be accomplished by spending in real dollars less and less to put property in conservation. Mr. Tucker asked if Mr. Rooker was referring to supplementing the \$1.0 million by whatever equates to one penny, and every year after that the penny would be indexed to handle some inflation.

Mr. Boyd said he would like to see an accounting of what has happened in the last few years. He asked if a million dollars has been spent every year. Mr. Tucker said "yes." Mr. Boyd asked if the demand has exceeded available revenue. Mr. Tucker replied that sometimes it does. Mr. Foley said staff will draft a report for the Board's review.

Ms. Thomas wondered about the recycling program. She said there seems to be a decrease in this budget proposal despite increased use at the McIntire Recycling facility. Mr. Tucker said Mr. Mark Graham and Mr. George Shadman are both working on the recycling program. He said staff is looking at having more strategically located recycling centers in the County. He said the Board needs to understand that would be a major subsidy as recycling does not pay for itself. It depends on the market and the types of recyclables. He will have a report for the Board on this subject early next year.

Mr. Slutzky asked if the County has explored being a consumer of recycled goods. Mr. Tucker said each department makes a concerted effort to buy recycled goods.

Mr. Rooker said there is usually a premium paid for recycled goods. Mr. Tucker said they do cost more. However, the County normally has to take the lowest bidder.

Mr. Slutzky suggested specifying minimum criteria for qualified bidders that includes use of recycled materials.

Mr. Foley said the Crozet Master Plan calls for a recycling site. The whole planning process is going on a regionally-addressed recycling initiative. He said another new initiative is the addition of an Engineering Inspector II in General Services. He reminded the Board that a couple of years ago, they established an environmental management system. It put the County in a position of setting goals and establishing programs to insure the County handles products that have an impact on the environment in an effective way. This new employee would focus on policy development, and the training and monitoring necessary to move that program forward. The other part of this position will be to assist in some of the infrastructure projects in terms of project management.

Mr. Wyant asked if the County needs to purchase easements in order to get the Greenway Program moving forward. Mr. Foley said money has been set aside for purchase of easements for the greenways, as well as the planning needed to establish a greenway system. Mr. Tucker said this would be in areas where the County has lost the opportunity to get land through proffers or dedications.

Mr. Slutzky asked if the County has a way to give people some non-monetary acknowledgement for participating in the program. Mr. Tucker replied that there is no formal program, but staff can look into recognition efforts.

Mr. Rooker said he would find it helpful to have a map showing existing greenways and proposed greenways.

Ms. Thomas said she noticed that the County's contribution to the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority has dropped down by \$250,000. She thinks it is part of the Ivy Landfill remediation and she would like some clarification. Mr. Graham explained that \$200,000 is an operating expense outside of the remediation. Presently, the County is working on an operational agreement in the way of cost-sharing for other operations including recycling. RSWA knows this does not pay its way. Mr. Foley said this does not represent a County decision to reduce its support.

Mr. Slutzky asked about the actual role of this new requested engineer. Mr. Foley replied that Mr. Shadman is the person to speak with, noting that General Services is a very important area in local government.

Mr. Slutzky said there may be Federal moneys available once the new position is established. There a lot of Homeland Security money available for managing risks.

Mr. Foley reported that the third major strategic direction is "Maintaining and Enhancing the County's Quality Of Life", which involves: Making the County a Safe and Healthy Community; Providing a Variety of Safe, Sanitary and Affordable Housing; and, Developing Policies That Address the County's Growth and Urbanization. He explained that ongoing initiatives currently include items such as establishment of new fire stations in areas that currently don't have adequate coverage, and provision of enough police officers to meet the County's staffing standards. He said this reflects efforts to provided needed emergency apparatus, as well as facilities to address other public safety and recreation needs.

Mr. Boyd said he does not think the Paramount Theatre Renovation belongs on this list.

Mr. Rooker said the overall category is "quality of life."

Ms. White said the County committed \$33,000 annually for 10 years to the Paramount Theatre renovation project, and this will be the sixth year of that commitment.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that there is \$26.0 million in projects for fire/rescue listed. These are shown in the current CIP.

Ms. Thomas said this is such a large expense she hopes the County will look at all possible alternatives and be able to continue using volunteers. Mr. Foley said Mr. Dan Eggleston and his staff will make a presentation about this a little later in the meeting.

Mr. Foley said a new initiative for this strategy is the Fire Rescue Training Center/Police Firing Range. It is currently in the study phase. He said \$584,000 is proposed in the FY 2006-07 CIP fiscal year budget to begin construction of that facility. This represents a joint effort between fire/rescue and police departments as a regional project. The City fire and police departments are working with the County on development of the study now. At this time the City, County and University Police are shooting at the Rivanna Hunt Club, which is not a long-term solution. Staff hopes there will be more sharing of those costs as the study moves forward.

Mr. Rooker asked if there was a Homeland Security grant that covered some of that expense. Mr. Foley said there was some money received from Homeland Security for a burn building for the Fire Department.

Mr. Boyd said he does not think it is logical to have the fire/rescue training center at the same location as the firing range. He mentioned that the Rivanna facility is currently being used free, and he does not understand why that arrangement is not good.

Mr. Foley said staff is looking for a location outside of the urban area because of the noise involved with the firing range, and the smoke involved with the burn building. Somewhere all of that can happen needs to be located away from the urban area.

Mr. Boyd said he does not want to create a new area since there is an area which is already designated. Mr. Tucker said staff has been looking at County-owned land which is large enough for these facilities. Mr. Foley said staff has been looking at the old Keene landfill site as a possible location.

Chief John Miller said there is a problem in that the members of the Hunt Club do not want the police practicing there since it takes up a lot of their time. Also, two or three times a year the Club members vote on whether to end this arrangement, so it is very tentative.

Mr. Foley said a couple of months ago when staff started working on the Business Plan, the Board asked about staffing standards and construction plans for fire stations, plus established response goals. Regarding the County's ongoing efforts to improve fire/rescue response times it is important to consider the following three drivers in the plans for establishing three new fire stations. He said these drivers are response-time standards, development area coverage, and the County-City fire contract that expires in 2010 and which requires renegotiation in 2007. He said there is a regional study of potential consolidation of all or a portion of the County's and City's fire operation. The study is important to consider in the planning of new stations, but the gaps in coverage are not driven by meeting the response standard but by uncovered areas for fire response —whether that's a five- or seven-minute response. He said the City plays into this because location of their stations is not within a five- or seven-minute response time. Second, the County is second on the City's "to do" list. If they have other calls in the City they are not available to answer calls in the County. That is particularly important in the Pantops area.

Mr. Foley said before looking at maps of the development areas and the coverage the County provides, he would suggest the Board look at its response standards and the goals which have been set. He said the national standard target response time is five-minutes 90 percent of the time. The County's goal is not that specific, but it is being used. When the Facilities Plan in the Comprehensive Plan is updated, those standards will be reviewed, but five minutes is the industry-wide response time being used and it is shown in the Comprehensive Plan now.

Mr. Boyd asked if response times are being met. Mr. Foley replied that there have been challenges in tracking response times. Staff is working with the ECC to get that information.

Mr. Rooker asked if staff knows whether James City, Spotsylvania and York counties are tracking their response times accurately, or how close they are to meeting their response goals.

Mr. Eggleston replied that Spotsylvania and York have been tracking their response times, and Spotsylvania has been meeting their urban response time standards. He commented that they are doing a good job of tracking their response times, adding that Albemarle does have some data now to see if response times are being met, but it is also using the GIS system to make a time-distance analysis. In several areas, response times cannot be met because of travel times.

Mr. Foley emphasized the issue is driven by the fact that there is no station in the development areas to provide any response. Instead, volunteer stations in rural areas are being asked to respond into development areas, but they are more than five or seven minutes away. He said the County is working at a very basic level now. Going to a seven-minute response time would not solve the problem. He then presented a map of the major development areas in the County, pointing out the location of the Earlysville Fire Department, the Seminole Trail Fire Department and the Monticello Fire & Rescue station. He noted the areas these stations cover. He said that other than the northern development area, the Pantops area

and the area west of the City (is not technically a development area but is the most densely populated area of the County outside of the development areas) are the major areas of concern. A substation is being planned for the Ivy area because there is a population density of 500 per square mile.

Ms. Thomas said she was surprised to see the Ivy area listed as not covered because there is always a fire truck parked near the University Police Station. Mr. Foley said when the City contract is added it fills in part of Pantops and some of the area west of the City but does not cover the Ivy area at all or the northern development area, and provides only a certain level of response to the Pantops area. He added that although the City can access half of that development area which is within five land miles, data shows that the City can only get into that area within five minutes seven percent of the time because of speed limits and the traffic at Free Bridge. He said some of this coverage is by volunteers; the East Rivanna Fire Department does not have paid staff.

Mr. Boyd asked how density (houses and businesses) play into how response times are calculated. There are places in the rural areas where it is not possible to get there in five minutes. Mr. Eggleston said it is based on two things, ability to meet response time standards in the development areas, and the risk profile. He said Pantops has a high-risk profile because there are presently over 700 units for elderly care located there, as well as a 400,000 square foot hospital going in soon, and also a lot of commercial space. He said staff looks at those two things when looking at where to place a station.

Mr. Dorrier said insurance rates are affected by how long it takes firefighters to get to the location of a fire. Mr. Tucker agreed, stating that rates can be improved if coverage is quicker. Mr. Eggleston pointed out that a homeowner must be within five miles of a fire station and must be on a municipal water supply in order to get a lower ISO rate.

Mr. Slutzky asked if the fire station on the Route 250 Bypass serves the Forest Lakes area. Mr. Foley said the CARS station on McIntire Road services all of Route 29 North.

Mr. Boyd asked if the County built a station in the Pantops area and the population there doubled or tripled, would another station be needed. Mr. Foley said stations are being constructed with multiple bays so additional engines can be added.

Mr. Boyd asked the impact of growth on fire services. How is the Board relating that as it deliberates this issue?

Mr. Rooker said it probably impacts the number of calls more and additional apparatus must be added.

Mr. Boyd said he is trying to understand the model being used. The density of the area must have something to do with what is being proposed. Mr. Foley said the stations being built must be sized so that engine companies can be added.

Mr. Boyd said these questions come back to the Board in the way of the infrastructure being provided by the County.

Mr. Rooker noted that there is \$26.0 million for construction of fire stations in the urban areas in the CIP.

Mr. Foley said stations are planned for the development areas, with the exception of Ivy, which is very densely populated. He said the five-minute response versus the five-mile response does have an impact on insurance ratings. The new Northern Station, which is centrally located, will fill in the development area gap. As for the Pantops area, theoretically the City can get into that area, but a station there would cover the entire area. He said the density question is important, especially for commercial. The level of risk in Pantops is extremely high because of the multi-story nature of the area, the hospital and the high concentration of elderly population. Staff thinks that because that area is so concentrated, that resource will be needed.

Mr. Foley said in looking at the Ivy area, the five-minute response time gets into Ivy a little. It is not a development area so does not fall under the five-minute response time, but it is not realistic to call it a rural area with a 13-minute response time. He said the insurance rating was applied to this area, and the addition of a station would not only improve the response time to the area, but would also reduce insurance ratings by fifty percent.

Mr. Dorrier asked if that area is covered by the ACSA system. Mr. Tucker said most of it is. Mr. Eggleston said there are some private systems in the Ivy area, so any person who has a private well would get a reduced insurance premium for having a fire hydrant within five miles. He said that last year people experienced a doubling of insurance premiums because it was found that their homes were more than five miles from a fire station.

Mr. Foley said there had been a question as to why these stations are proposed. It is to fill the holes in the system, particularly in relation to use policies for the level of service which is to be provided. In conclusion, the City and the County response goals mirror similar localities and the national standards. The stations are planned to address a basic lack of coverage in development areas, regardless of response goals. The City's service does not help the County achieve its response goals. The Ivy substation plan recognizes the County's only densely populated rural area. A five-mile standard addresses ISO (insurance) rates and safety.

Mr. Rooker said from an insurance standpoint, unless there is public water or fire hydrants, it does not do any good on insurance cost, and not much of the rural area has both. Mr. Foley said this is the only place in the entire rural areas of the County with the density of population to justify that level of service.

Mr. Slutzky expressed his surprise in learning recently that the average response time in the southern rural area (Scottsville) is more than 10 minutes, and it is 13 minutes in the Forest Lakes area which is in the growth area. He said in the current budget there was an allocation to continue funding two positions at the CARS station, but that funding is being removed so it will impact the northern growth area even more. Apparently, the Airport is willing to accommodate on an interim basis the services that will ultimately be housed at the fire station on Airport Road. Since response time in that area is so slow he asked if it would be reasonable to fund the FTEs that will be hired in October for that fire station, house them at the Airport temporarily, as well as fund the two people already at McIntire.

Mr. Foley said staff is recommending funding of that initiative, but it was left out of the proposed budget; those funds will be included. He said funding the northern fire rescue station three months prior to its opening is recommended in this budget. The budget provides funds for 12 firefighters for engine response and six additional EMS providers for 24/7 ambulance coverage. He said it takes eight people to run an ambulance. When this budget was discussed previously, it was recommended that the two people at the CARS station be moved to the Northern Station to make the total of eight staff members. He will explain that oversight in a minute.

Mr. Foley said the second recommendation is that the EMS staffing begin in October rather than waiting until the fourth quarter of the fiscal year. That will be six additional months of staff to run the ambulance from the Airport before the northern station opens up. He said those are the two major things included in the budget. When staff talks about the unfunded initiatives, they will discuss the EMS staffing issue and explain how funding of that initiative would work. He said CARS has offered to forego some of their contribution because the crew running out of the CARS Station is actually providing coverage in the City, and the City is not providing any funding to support that service.

Mr. Slutzky asked if there is any reason to not go ahead and put staff at the Airport since there is such a long response time. Mr. Tucker said funds will not be available until July. If this were to go forth before that time, the funds would have to come from some reserve. Mr. Slutzky said he would like to raise that as an idea worth considering. He was alarmed at the numbers, but thinks staff has addressed the situation starting in October.

Mr. Wyant asked how things are going on the volunteer side of fire rescue services. He asked if any volunteers have been obtained for that new Northern Station. Mr. Foley said staff has been working for six-plus months recruiting volunteers. He said staff has budgeted for the worst case scenario. He asked Mr. Eggleston to explain staff's efforts.

Mr. Eggleston said that two years ago a recruiting strategy and plan was established with the Earlysville Volunteer Fire Department, specifically for the Northern Station. Due to a lot of changes at the Earlysville station, membership has actually been reduced because many volunteers left the system. Staff met last week with the chief at that station to determine if the volunteer goal can be met. There has been a very aggressive campaign and a lot of people have come in the door. But, people have quit as well.

Mr. Dorrier asked if it is the training involved, or the time required. Mr. Eggleston said the volunteer system has actually increased training and that is not an obstacle; it basically comes down to the time required.

Mr. Foley said staff wanted, through a partnership agreement, to get Earlysville to commit to some of that volunteer support, but they are reluctant to do so until there are some new volunteers. Planning for anything other than basic coverage is hard to do as plans go forth for the new station.

Mr. Boyd stated that he would like to see more effort put into volunteer recruitment before a lot of effort is put into adding paid staff.

Mr. Foley replied that the efforts would definitely continue. If the Board is going to discuss this further, it would be helpful for the volunteer chiefs themselves to share the challenges they have in recruiting.

Mr. Foley said the second issue raised by the Board during discussion of the Business Plan was the major expense related to police staffing. He said response times are driven by three major factors, similar to fire and rescue. First is the staff standard of 1.5 officers per thousand residents; second is achieving development area response time goals of five minutes 90 percent of the time; and, third is the actual staffing of current beats and sectors – there are currently eight sectors and 21 beats.

Mr. Foley reported that the current staffing level of officers is 1.25 per thousand population, the County's goal is 1.5 with the competitive market average being 1.66, with the Virginia average at 2.28, and the national average of 2.5. He said the City of Charlottesville currently staffs at 2.8 per thousand. To even achieve the County's goal would keep the County well below its competitive market which is used for compensation analysis.

Mr. Rooker asked how Albemarle's crime statistics compare to other areas. Mr. Foley said he will discuss that a little later in the meeting.

Mr. Foley said to achieve the current staffing standard would require an additional 25 officers. The County will never get to the staffing standard of 1.5 by adding only four new officers per year if the population grows at the assumed rate of 1.9 percent per year. Adding five officers per year would enable the County to meet the standard by 2016. He said this budget provides five officers because there is also a police investigator added who is a sworn officer. As to the actual staffing of beats and sectors by police officers, current patrol staffing provides one officer per sector per shift. He said most sectors include both an urban area and two or more rural areas. There is a lieutenant, a sergeant and a corporal on each shift, but the patrol officers are responsible for anywhere from five to 208 square miles per shift.

Mr. Foley said there are officers in areas such as investigations, evidence, community policing, etc., but patrol officers are the heart of the service. If just one police patrol officer were added to each sector it would require 24 more officers to provide just two in each sector. It would only bring the County up to the 1.5 staffing standard which has been established. This does not factor in what happens when there is a major event when officers are pulled away from their sector into other sectors. Staff believes the 1.5 staff standard is the minimum and it should try to meet the basic needs before focusing on police response standards. He said the current staff standard of 1.5 per thousand is less than the regional, state and national averages. Achieving the current standard would require an additional 25 officers. The County only provides two officers per sector and that is considered minimal given the large square mileage they cover. There is a need to address response times. He said five officers are needed each year just to keep pace with population growth and it would take ten years before that standard could be achieved.

Mr. Dorrier asked if this coverage is 24 hours per day. Mr. Foley said "yes." There are three shifts, with eight officers each shift.

Mr. Slutzky asked if this budget would help improve the situation. Mr. Foley said there are five officers proposed in this budget to help achieve that 1.5 per thousand, and four of those are patrol offices.

Mr. Slutzky asked the cost of adding additional officers. Mr. Foley responded that each additional officer adds about \$75,000 to the cost.

Mr. Rooker said the County has never been at the 1.5. It has been trying to get there over some reasonable period of time, and this is a start. Another police officer could be added, but he thinks it is important to look at crime statistics to see if the County is adequately providing police service given the level of crime.

Chief John Miller said crime statistics are important. More important is the workload. They had over 60,000 calls for service last year. As much as possible they try to keep officers in the developed areas, but that person may be covering 10 square miles of developed area in addition to a section of the rural area. Fourteen of the 21 beats are larger than the City of Charlottesville. Eight of them are urbanized.

Mr. Foley said increases in crime must be considered, and staff will continue to look at trends. He said the Board should add the five officers this year, and by staying focused on the standard, progress will be made.

Mr. Slutzky asked if crime has gone up nationally. Chief Miller said it has increased regionally.

Mr. Slutzky said the County needs to consider its increasingly urban nature in deciding what staff to add. Mr. Breeden said the cost for an officer is approximately \$100,000 in the first year.

Mr. Foley said there are four additional patrol officer positions proposed in this budget, and one of them is a civilian evidence supervisor. While there has been growth in both police and fire/rescue, the things which have not been focused on include the support positions necessary to keep the whole system functioning. Therefore, this budget proposes adding a fire/rescue battalion chief for one-half of a year. He said with a significant increase in staff, with multiple shifts at multiple stations, it requires that there be a battalion chief to help with this work. He said this position functions similarly to how a lieutenant functions in a police department. He said a police investigator has been recommended even though there has been an effort to reduce the number of investigators on staff. He said some cases have been shifted to patrol officers to follow up on resulting in the investigators having more time to solve some cases.

Mr. Foley said there has been a 500 percent increase in calls to Animal Control in the past twenty years with the same number of staff. The average response time for an animal control officer is currently 2.8 hours. As to the Police Records Clerk position, a study in 2000 showed that the County is five positions short in keeping up with basic records. There is a one and a half year backlog of reviewing records for accuracy which is important in terms of court cases.

Ms. Thomas asked if the General Assembly may pass any bills that could affect any of these items. Mr. Davis said new legislation has increased the liability that owners of aggressive dogs have. It has been made a crime for people with aggressive dogs to allow them to attack companion animals or human beings. He said the high-profile of these types of cases will probably generate more police calls. The bites on human beings by aggressive dogs could be felonies or Class 1 misdemeanors depending on the circumstances. That will generate more police effort to investigate and prosecute those crimes.

Mr. Foley said this is a growing area of the budget and will continue to be in the future. He then turned the presentation over to Ms. White.

Ms. White said another Strategic Goal is for a Safe and Healthy Community, protecting adults and children from abuse and neglect. She showed a slide representing an adult protective service worker, a children's protective service worker, and court appointed special advocates (CASA). She said the CASA Program is fairly small request at \$7,000. This is a non-profit that trains and supervises volunteers who serve as advocates for abused and neglected children. This program received an excellent recommendation from the Agency Budget Review Team. They have a total budget of about \$300,000 from Federal, State and local contributions. They are an important component for working with abused children.

Ms. White said Adult Protective Service referrals have increased substantially over the last five years, due in part to the increasing elderly population in the area. The state standard says each individual worker should have about 104 cases, and right now those workers have approximately 222 cases. She mentioned that at this time there are 4.5 workers in the Adult Services unit but the State standard says there should be 9.63 workers. The gap is approximately 5.13 workers and this budget requests only one additional adult services worker.

Mr. Boyd asked if this demand is due to an aging population. Ms. White said that is part of it.

Mr. Rooker asked if this is a program the state is supposed to fund. Ms. White said it is a mandate. They should be funding 9.63 positions. She said there have been requests to the General Assembly every year to fund the caseload standards, and she has not seen any action on that in a number of years. She asked how long that standard has been in place.

Ms. Kathy Ralston, Director of Social Services, said these caseload standards have been in place for the past six years.

Ms. Thomas asked what happens if the County does not meet the standard of 9.63. Ms. White said the County is not meeting that standard. She emphasized that the state is mandating a caseload standard, but is not funding to that level. In order to not overburden staff in running this program, the County would need to take on this responsibility.

Ms. Thomas asked why the County is not closer to the standard. Is there any thought that the state will step forward in the near future and meet its obligation? Ms. White said based on historical precedent, County staff does not see any action from the state occurring.

Mr. Tucker said the Board will have to decide if it wants to fund all unfunded mandates because they are not currently being funded by the County. If that is the desire of the Board, it would change the structure of this proposed budget significantly.

Mr. Slutzky said he thinks when the Board is deciding whether to reduce the tax rate, it would be important to have that information in order to identify an underserved constituency and its costs. Mr. Tucker said the same argument could be made for the 70 percent car tax, as the State is not funding that either.

Ms. White said the reason this program is listed under this strategy is because it is a safety issue. With the increasing number of elderly, a lot of citizens are more at risk.

Mr. Dorrier asked if these people are covered by JABA. Ms. Ralston said they are not. This is the adult protective service population, people who are identified as being abused, neglected, or exploited either in their homes or in adult living facilities. JABA doesn't provide services to this particular population.

Mr. Dorrier asked the number of cases. Ms. Ralston said there were 340 new investigations last year, but that is not the existing caseload.

Mr. Slutzky asked it would be possible to get the incremental costs associated with meeting mandates when the Board makes its final decision on the budget.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the increase in the caseload is due to "baby boomers," or because there is more emphasis and more knowledge about reporting cases. Ms. Ralston replied that it is probably a little of both. County staff is working with the Police Department on a multi-disciplinary team approach to identify these people. It is a growing population. She said that each time the County approves a new adult living facility in the community, the number of cases increases.

Ms. White said the next chart reflects the gap in the Child Welfare Protective Services Worker program which is not quite as large as that in Adult Protective Services. The State requirement is for 19.17 FTEs, and the gap is 4.17 FTEs. She said that gap is being addressed by adding one child protective services worker. The same issues apply to this program.

Ms. White said the next slide shows the need for a Parks Service Officer to patrol County parks and work in close cooperation with the Albemarle County Parks Department. This is to protect the safety of the Park's users and County property. She said concerns have been expressed by users of the Parks and there has been some property damage.

Mr. Rooker asked if that person would be a licensed police officer. Ms. White said "no", it would be an unlicensed position working closely with the Police Department.

Ms. White said there is a capital project for Mint Springs of about \$200,000 to provide accessibility to the disabled population and includes parking, pathways and fishing piers at the park.

(Note: At this point in the meeting the Board took a short recess at 3:10 p.m., and reconvened at 3:16 p.m.)

Ms. White said the next Strategic Goal is to provide a Variety of Safe, Sanitary and Affordable Housing. She said the first initiative to provide \$250,000 annually for the Down Payment Assistance Program managed by Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA) started over two years ago. It was done mainly because the County cannot lend money to individuals. A combination of one-time revenues and some ongoing funds have been used for this goal. This will be the first year that \$250,000 is being funded from current ongoing revenues.

Mr. Boyd asked if the Board might be able to get approval through the General Assembly as the City did, to make loans. Ms. White said the City has a Housing Authority. Mr. Davis said a charter amendment was given to the City for its authority. Redevelopment housing authorities have that power, but the County does not have such an authority. A lot of cities have authorities and they exercise those types of programs through those authorities. The County does not have the legal authority to loan money to individuals unless it is specifically enabled. In this area, the County does not have that enabling authority.

Ms. White reported that this Affordable Housing program has been serving approximately 15 to 16 families a year with an average of about \$15,000 going to each family. She said this money has leveraged through PHA about \$2.2 million in other below-market-rate mortgage money, such as SPARK loans, etc. She said current production is three loans per month times 12 times \$15,400 which equals \$554,000. The Housing Committee has requested \$500,000 total in that Housing Trust Fund to serve approximately 32 families. Further down in the income levels, the subsidy is larger.

Mr. Rooker said the County has received cash proffers from developers. He thinks it would be helpful to get a list of the amount of money the County is putting into housing plus the cash proffers expected to be received over the next year or so.

Ms. Thomas said she was thinking of this in a different way. If the Board did not put in the extra \$250,000, what amount of proffers would be needed to get to the Board's goal? Ms. White said in the next twelve months there are nine proffered for-sale units. Approximately 500 units have been offered to date, with 166 of them being for sale. There could be an additional 15 to 20 units coming online, but that is not for another one to three years. She said a number of people coming through the PHA program do not qualify because of credit issues and other reasons. Also if staff knows there will be 15 units available this year, staff has to get those buyer's ready to take those units. A number of people in the PHA program do not qualify, so a lot of people have "to go through the pipeline" in order to get qualified buyers. When staff discusses strategic goals with the Board later in the year, they will discuss how to address the proffer issue.

Mr. Boyd said he would like to see a balance sheet and income expenses. The County is basically funding a little company that is handling millions of dollars of taxpayer's money, which includes interest accruals, repayments of loans, etc. There are a lot of things that could be used to project the future. At some point in time, this program should become self-sustaining. He would like to see that as a regular report to the Board. Mr. Tucker said the County does not have enough money in the program at this time to provide information in a format that would be helpful.

Ms. White said the next item is a new initiative, the Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA). About \$45,000 in additional money is going to the PHA with \$20,000 going to the Housing Counseling Program. They will be working with County residents to help assess their readiness for homeownership and help them work through and understand the loan process. They will refer them to lenders and get them pre-qualified, and then refer them to the Downpayment Assistance Program to which the County is contributing \$25,000. She noted that it takes longer to put together these types of financing packages for homeowners, so they need some administrative support which is the reason for the \$25,000.

Mr. Foley said the fourth Strategic Goal is "Growth and Urbanization." Ongoing initiatives include: Neighborhood Plan implementation; roadway landscaping; sidewalk construction; revenue sharing for roads; transportation improvement program; the Crozet Library; and, a transportation engineer. A lot of these projects are underway, but it takes startup time. In this budget there are some operating funds to hire a part-time assistant librarian for the Crozet area, and to help with the development of the library as well as the ongoing staffing needs. He said the County is in the process of finalizing identification of sites for the library so they can be circulated to the public for input. He said hiring a transportation engineer has been shown as an ongoing effort since the Board approved this new position this year. The transportation engineer will try to accelerate some of the Six-Year Road projects, and also some projects that have not qualified for the Six-Year Road Program but which are critical to connecting neighborhoods and to address other transportation needs.

Ms. White said that listed as new initiatives are: an indoor recreational facility (already part of the Capital Budget), and DSS Eligibility Workers. There is a collaborative effort with the YMCA to put a recreation facility on the land being donated by PVCC. She said staff is working on a Memorandum of Agreement between the three parties (the County, the YMCA and PVCC). The YMCA is in the phase of getting major donors for the project before they move into a full-blown capital campaign.

Ms. White said the DSS Eligibility Workers are to try and address the increase in caseloads. The cost is about \$165,000. The caseload in Food Stamps has increased by 70 percent; the caseload for LTC has increased by 28 percent; the caseload for Medicaid recipients has increased by 25 percent; and, the TANF caseload has increased by 14 percent.

Mr. Boyd asked how this information relates back to other charts shown about items concerning adult and child services. Ms. White said these are eligibility workers for programs such as Medicaid assistance and food stamps assistance.

Ms. Thomas said in the Business Plan it says the number of people living below the poverty level has decreased and the number of children below poverty has decreased. Then she read all the information about how caseloads are increasing. She asked that this be explained. Ms. White said Medicaid, which has increased by 25 percent, includes the elderly. Also, about 20 percent of the population is at 200 percent of poverty. There is still a significant portion of the population which is not necessarily under poverty, but the eligibility guidelines go further than that.

Mr. Dorrier asked who is getting these food stamps. Ms. Ralston said that elderly, disabled and low-income working families use food stamps. She said most of the County's eligibility financial assistance programs are based on a percent of poverty, which could be 150 percent, 180 percent, etc. It is not necessarily those people below the Federal poverty line.

Mr. Boyd asked if the "measuring stick" has been changed and that is pushing up the demand. Both Ms. White and Ms. Ralston said that is not the case.

Mr. Rooker said he thought that a lot of people who qualified for food stamps did not apply for food stamps so this is basically to realize the goal of getting more people to sign up for the program. Ms. Ralston said the increase does not include the 52 percent of the population who are eligible and do not participate. She said the only thing the Department has done is to increase outreach in the FAMIS program, which is the children's health insurance program. They got a grant to do outreach on that program. The other increase in programs is just through people who come in for the service. They have not done any aggressive outreach at all.

Ms. White presented information on the staffing gap for the Eligibility Program. She said there are state standards for cases and workers. The County currently has 13 FTEs but needs 18 FTEs, leaving a gap of 5.27 in eligibility programs. That gap is being addressed by the addition of three eligibility workers.

Mr. Boyd asked if JABA gets involved with eligibility. Ms. White said "no." JABA might do some outreach and refer people, but the Federal programs are administered by the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Foley said the last two new initiatives are: General Services Office Associate II to address expanded functions and services to support urbanization (things such as the stormwater program, the transportation engineer, project management, and management of new facilities); and, the Central Virginia Small Business Development Center (SBDC) to support small business development efforts in the "downtown areas." The County has hired a Business Development Facilitator whose primary role is to encourage small business activity that will help keep the new urban areas vibrant. The County will contribute \$5,000 toward the SBDC for its operations for this effort.

Ms. Thomas said she thought that is done by the TJ Partnership for Economic Development. Mr. Foley said that is what the County expects them to do, but there is some focused on certain components of business development. This agency does that. They are focused on the small businesses that need assistance with basic services. TJPED focuses more on the big picture.

Mr. Dorrier said he thinks they would provide assistance if requested, but he thinks the County has to be proactive and go out and seek small businesses.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that the services provided by the SBDC are different from those provided by TJPED. They provide one-on-one individual service to help someone put together a financial plan or business plan to get financing and they make business owners aware of loan programs. Mr. Tucker said this is meant to align with the County's Business Development Coordinator so she will be able to work with small businesses.

Mr. Rooker said potential users need to be made aware that the SBDC is available to them. He agreed with Mr. Tucker that a lot of small business owners don't know this exists. He suggested there be a link from the County's website to the SBDC's.

Ms. White said the last Strategic Direction is "Efficient and Effective Services." There are four ongoing initiatives – County Office Building Renovation; Police Technology Upgrade; GIS and Countywide Technology Upgrades; and, Vehicle Replacement Fund. The two new initiatives are: Data Base Analyst and Programmer Analyst, Classroom Trainer and Technology Trainer; Records Management System; Customer Service (Counter) Planner; and a GIS Specialist – GPS Data Collection. She said the position of data base analyst is critical to the County's high-performance organization in trying to improve use of data to improve processes to provide better customer service. This person will be working with all departments to collect and manage the data, help perform analyses, and develop individual reports. At the present, individual departments do not have this expertise. She said every

department will have access to these skills and training from this person, and it will also help provide some consistency to that data analyses and consistency in reporting across the organization.

Mr. Boyd asked if this has anything to do with the Access Albemarle program. Ms. White said it was generated by focusing on data to improve the County. Being able to access more data and find better ways to report that data is a result of Access Albemarle.

Mr. Boyd said he thought the biggest plus from Access Albemarle would be the availability of data and its ease of use. He asked if someone is being hired to train employees how to use the system. Ms. White said it is more than just training. A lot of analysis of that data is required and many departments do not have the skill level to do that. This person will work with all employees.

Mr. Slutzky said he thought Access Albemarle was to help the public get access to records. Ms. White said Access Albemarle will provide better financial and personnel information. However, there will be a lot of workload indicators used by individual departments that are not a result of those business systems.

Mr. Boyd said the Board just made a mid-year adjustment in the budget for the Access Albemarle project which included capital as well as ongoing maintenance expenses, etc. He wonders why these expenses did not come up then. Ms. White said that will be done after the project is over.

Mr. Boyd said major computer upgrades seem to have "run away" costs associated with them. He wants to keep a close eye on those expenses.

Ms. White said there has been discussion in the past about the "dashboard" type of management report. This new Data Base Analyst will help develop reports using performance indicators and trend data. There are different types of reports needed for different levels of the organization, and this new person will be able to pull that information together.

Mr. Wyant asked if this person will be generating those reports for the Board. Ms. White said this person will be helping train people so they can do it themselves.

Mr. Dorrier asked what skills are needed by a "Great Plains Analyst." Ms. White said the next position, a Programmer Analyst, is directly related to Access Albemarle. A person skilled in Great Plains (which is the basis of the new Access Albemarle project), will be hired. When the system "goes live" it will be a base system allowing the County to do what it does now. That will be replaced with new features such as on-line payments and applications. The programmer/analyst will work with Access Albemarle to integrate information from the County's base system. It will be important to have this person during the first few years as they will help staff learn the Microsoft system. In the first two to three years after the system is in place, it will be important to have somebody who can transfer their knowledge to County staff.

Mr. Boyd asked why the people who are working on the current system are not being converted to the new system. Ms. White said they will be. She asked Mr. Culp to speak about this.

Mr. Mike Culp, Director of Information Technology, replied that it takes some time to get staff ready to work on an entirely new system. He emphasized that it takes time to meet the learning curve, but once the curve is met there is definitely the potential to reduce the number of staff. Making it past that first step will be a challenge. He said the other option is to continue to outsource, but that is far more costly.

Mr. Boyd said there is quite a bit of money in the budget for Access Albemarle training. Ms. White said that is for training the end-users.

Mr. Boyd asked if any of that money is for training staff. Ms. White said they are being trained as they go through the system.

Mr. Boyd said he understands the need for training people during the transition, but he would expect that people be retrained and then through attrition or whatever, staff would be reduced. Theoretically there would be less because this was supposed to be easier than maintaining the mainframe system.

Mr. Rooker agreed.

Ms. Thomas said she has a lot of questions about this whole section on "Efficient and Effective Services." She said she can understand this is really helping people in the County Office Building do their jobs easier. She get suspicious about it, and thinks that the people who are closest to the people putting together the budget are getting what they need but the people who are farthest away – the nongovernmental agencies – have to work harder to get anything, and they would love to have some computer upgrades too. She thinks staff needs to work harder to convince the Board of how great the need is and what the results will be. How is a County citizen going to have their life improved because we've got a classroom trainer and a technology trainer?

Ms. White agreed. She said staff struggled with that also. There are services provided to the customer, and there is a strategic plan to provide all these new services. What you have to remember is that the systems have to be in place in order to deliver those services, part being Human Resources (HR) services, part being Information Technology (IT) services and part being financial services. She

emphasized that if good effective systems are not in place, staff cannot provide good services. Look at the IT Department where a whole new fire/rescue system has been put into place in the last five years. Police mobile/data terminals have been added in all the police cars. There are all kinds of new technology systems in the Police Department. One of the system analysts is assigned to the Police Department and one is assigned to fire/rescue. She said staff was added to the IT Department because it was felt to be better to have them look at the whole County instead of placing them in various departments. She said fire stations have been built which require connectivity, connecting with all the volunteers. At this time, both the Police Chief and the Fire Chief are requesting more help.

Mr. Slutzky asked if Ms. White was saying that implementing the new system and supporting that system will in effect mean hiring fewer people in the future. Mr. Tucker said even with new expensive systems staff has to be hired for support.

Mr. Slutzky said if the new system is not well implemented, it will not be an effective use of resources. This data infrastructure has to be supported in the hope that a benefit will be realized as it is applied. Ms. White said there is the new "City View Program" and it will be a timesaver for the Community Development Department. The on-line payment part needs to be added when Access Albemarle goes online.

Mr. Slutzky said part of the reason for having Access Albemarle is to improve customer service. He said those benefits will be realized if these IT systems are properly implemented.

Mr. Wyant commented that information is needed, and he does not want to be driven by the data. He said there has to be a database programmer to support this program. He said what the Board needs in the way of information will be much different than that needed by staff members. All of the little data gathering gadgets are great, but the data must be needed for some reason. He wants information so he can convey a message to somebody. That is why the GIS System is such a powerful tool when used for other than mapping. He wants to look at that as something that can help the County. Ms. White said the systems can be implemented, but people must be trained on how to use them. Mr. Breeden said there has been growth for some time in the IT Department, but not in other areas. For example, in the Finance Department there are fewer positions than 15 or more years ago. Automation has allowed for that reduction.

Mr. Rooker referred to the written justification for a GIS Specialist. He read: "This position will consolidate current data collection duties of four residential inspectors, which comprises approximately 25 percent of each inspector's time." He said residential building activity is growing, so hopefully another inspector will not be needed. He would like a better explanation before the next work session of the difference between Access Albemarle and the Records Management System. He said there is \$2.0+ million invested in Access Albemarle and the request for the new initiative of a Records Management System is listed for \$559,000 plus a person. He would like to understand what that position will do that is not part of Access Albemarle.

Ms. White said there are two other positions recommended; a Classroom Trainer and a Technology Trainer. These are basic infrastructure positions to help departments. The Classroom Trainer will provide additional training opportunities for all departments to align with the County's core value of learning. She said staff needs to be well-trained. This trainer will provide staff with expertise and train them on job-related skills. It is more efficient to do it in-house than to bring in outside trainers. There is some potential revenue to offset this expense, but no amount is known at this time. Eventually the program may make money for the County as there will be a charge for the classes. Next year some of these classes will be opened to some general School Division employees. The Schools have budgeted about \$50,000 to pay for the cost of some of these training programs. Eventually (using the model of Chesterfield County) these classes will be offered to the outside.

Ms. White said the second position is that of a Technology Trainer. There is no one on staff at this time that can do this training. She emphasized that using technology is now a normal part of everyday work. This trainer will begin to develop a county-wide technology training curriculum; there will be hands-on classroom technology training; and, the most up-to-date technology will be used to improve work and enhance productivity. She said software changes often, so the County must make sure staff is trained on new technology.

Mr. Rooker asked if the classroom trainer will be the person who is actually in the classroom teaching those classes. Ms. White said "yes."

Mr. Rooker asked the difference between these two positions. Ms. White said the Classroom Trainer will be teaching various things, not all technology related.

Mr. Rooker asked what the difference in subject matter will be.

Ms. Kimberly Suyes, Director of Human Resources, said the comment heard most often from Local Government staff is that they need training. She said for the third part of the Competency Based Management system, they developed 12 competencies, among them were communication, valuing diversity, and results orientation. Staff has developed a Course Catalog for training against every competency. The School Division is interested in providing training for their classified staff as well. They will be purchasing training from the County, and surrounding counties have expressed an interest as well.

Mr. Rooker asked if that is training in areas other than technology. Ms. Suyes said that is correct. As to technology, there are many employees who know very basic things about their computer. They

may not be able to manage a calendar in Outlook. They may not be as proficient as they should be in Word. They may not be proficient at all in Excel. If employees are trained appropriately it is felt their productivity will increase. This will provide employees with the training they are requesting, and provide them with the technology training they need to provide effective services to customers.

Ms. Thomas asked if it is more effective to have one teacher who can teach all subjects than to give people assistance in taking outside courses. Ms. Suyes said it is much less expensive to have someone in-house. She does not think the County could provide the training wanted completely in house; they will be outsourcing also. But, in order to have consistency, particularly in the area of technology, it needs to be done in-house.

Mr. Wyant said the Technology Transfer Center for the Highway Research Council in Charlottesville, which is Federal/State funded, also offers many valuable courses. He suggested that staff see what is available. He added that their trainers can come on site to offer classes.

Ms. Suyes said when the County offers courses such as writing skills, someone is brought in to teach that course. But, someone has to coordinate that training. She said Human Resources now offer "Leadership Foundations" which gives basic core competencies such as how to handle conflicts and how to communicate effectively. It is a participatory class where employees are trained and then followed up in their workplace. She said this is a comprehensive effort instead of just having classroom training.

Mr. Rooker said that helps him to understand the difference.

Mr. Foley reported that the next new item is the Records Management System. It has a capital cost of approximately \$560,000 and an operating cost of just under \$50,000 for a person to run the system. He said this is based on public demand for land use records and the volume of records the County has. This will digitize records and there will be a system to store these records in a digital format. This system will better manage those records, but it is not about Access Albemarle which is a system of financial transactions. In this instance, it is an attempt to manage the records which are coming in, and get them in a digital format. Capital costs are for software, hardware and one-time conversion costs. It is expected to provide a benefit in assuring that the County is in compliance with State requirements for records retention and to also reduce space requirements. In order not to have to buy outside storage space in the future, ways must be found to more efficiently use space.

Mr. Rooker asked what percent of the records would be digitized. How many of the present records would be digitized, and would that allow the County to eliminate the hard copies, or must they be stored offsite?

Mr. Mark Graham, Community Development Director, responded that under the Virginia Records Retention Act, the County is required to maintain permanent records in a climate-controlled, fire-suppressed special space. Staff has estimated the ten-year need as 8,000 square feet at \$200 per square foot for a total cost of \$1.6 million for special file storage. He said the Virginia State Library will store the records free in a facility near Richmond, but staff needs access to those records on a daily/hourly basis so there has to be a copy here. Given the cost of space and everything else, the electronic version seemed to be the most cost-effective solution.

Mr. Wyant asked if Mr. Graham could check what happened with VDOT. It started a job at \$4.0 million and it escalated up to \$40.0 million. He cautioned that staff should find out what difficulties they ran into so the County would not have the same experience. Mr. Graham reported that the consultant who prepared the study for the County came up with this solution. He is now working with the Virginia State Library and managing their document conversion process for the State.

Mr. Foley said digitizing this type of information at the present time is rather basic. Staff is just trying to get away from using excessive file cabinets such as those in Community Development. Staff will have to work with the development community as to the information they submit so it can be in digital form and the County will not have to scan the information.

Mr. Graham said there is a public benefit from this process. Anyone who wants information about the history of parcels and properties will be able to get it.

Mr. Foley said demand is growing all the time. In the long run, this should offset the need to hire additional staff. He said there are two other additions to staff: a Customer Service (Counter) Planner, and a GIS Specialist – GPS Data Collections. He said the first one is based on providing better customer service. There is a need to have someone at the counter who can actually answer questions without have to schedule appointments with planners. Hopefully, this will reduce work interruptions, particularly with plan reviewers. Finally, as to the GIS Specialist, there are inspectors in the field now who are trying to organize and collect this information so it can be managed by one person. This person will also assure more accurate mapping for emergency responses.

Mr. Foley said if there were no questions at this time, he would proceed to explaining the Unfunded Initiatives.

Mr. Dorrier asked if staff was using the word "initiative" rather than "mandate." Mr. Foley said none of these requests are due to State mandates. He said these are requests that did not score high enough to be recommended for funding in the regular budget.

Mr. Foley said there is one item he would like to mention that is not listed on the agenda but which was discussed at a recent Board meeting. That is a program concerning removal of signs in the public right-of-way. At the time this was discussed the Board said to bring it back during budget work sessions. However, the budget had already been together at that time, so it does not show in the budget. If any Board member wants additional information about funding such a program, staff will put together a report for another work session.

Mr. Foley said the first unfunded initiative concerns CARS staffing. This has been proposed to address the heavy call load in the urban areas and because of reduced volunteer support. He said Mr. David Hogg, CARS Chief, is present, and can answer questions also.

Mr. Foley said staff proposes to maintain the two ALS providers at CARS rather than moving them to serve the new Northern Fire/Rescue Station. He said CARS has also requested that the County add a third position to cover additional volunteer staffing shortages. He said they are able to cover four days out of the week but need that fifth day to be covered and that requires another person. There is an additional request in the budget for a third position. Staff raised a concern about CARS responding both in the City and the County. At this time, CARS responds to about 60 percent County calls and 40 percent City calls. He said County resources are being used responding into the City. Originally it was due to training, but now that the training is finished, they want to maintain it and are willing to give up their portion of their contribution that is equivalent to what the City would pay for these three positions. Over the next budget year CARS intends to approach the City about picking up their share of the cost of these three positions. He said the net cost to the County would be \$195,000, with CARS foregoing their usual contribution from the County, making the net cost roughly \$146,000. He said the County Executive recommends approval. Staff supports what CARS is requesting and Fire/Rescue staff thinks it is appropriate because of the call load.

Mr. Boyd asked if Mr. Foley was saying this staff would never move to the Northern Station. Mr. Foley said that is correct. Mr. Boyd asked if they would be running calls to the City on a 60/40 basis. Mr. Tucker said that is the County's share of running the urban area. CARS indicated that next year they will request \$48,700 from the City.

Mr. Slutzky noted that this also covers Pantops, and asked if the FTEs who are to man the new station in October are a part of the budget. Mr. Foley explained that there will be two more staff hired for the Northern Station so two people can stay at CARS with the ambulance, and a third position would be added to the CARS station. He asked if the Board wanted to start all of this in July instead of October.

Mr. Rooker asked for clarification of the 60/40 split of the costs on service. Mr. Eggleston responded that it is actually 25 percent, because the ambulance at CARS has 25 percent of its calls in the City, with the remainder in the County.

Mr. Slutzky expressed concern about the 13-minute response time in the growth area; he thinks that is an emergency situation. It is worse than the southern rural area by three minutes. Mr. Foley said from a service perspective, there are two issues involved. There is a first responder program which means the fire departments get to the scene immediately on an EMS call. He said career staff is cross-trained in advanced life support and firefighting, so they are on the scene first. There is a certain period of time before getting into the ambulance and getting to the hospital.

Mr. Slutzky asked how much it would cost for FTEs to man the station on a temporary basis at the Airport until the fire house is opened. Mr. Foley said that can be calculated for the next work session.

Mr. Wyant said bodies don't make the response time, it is the location. Mr. Tucker said the plan was to hire people on July 1, and train them so they would be ready to go to work in October. He said Mr. Slutzky is suggesting that be done as soon as people can be hired in this fiscal year. He will have to calculate the additional cost in this fiscal year to hire those people before July 1.

Mr. Rooker wondered if it would be possible to move the CARS staff to the Airport to cover that area until the station is open. Mr. Foley said the call load issues are greater in the City and the urban area is also a concern.

Mr. Slutzky said there would be a response problem in the Pantops area if those people were moved. Mr. Eggleston explained that the 13-minute response time is how long it takes to get an ambulance to the northern development area from the CARS location. He acknowledged that the original plan was to place the people at CARS for training purposes and then move them north to address the response time issue, but daytime assistance has decreased while the call volume continues to increase.

Mr. Boyd said he thought there were personnel at the Seminole Fire Department. Mr. Eggleston said there are trained firefighters at Seminole, but there is no ambulance at that location.

Ms. Thomas asked if there would be an ambulance placed at the Airport. Mr. Eggleston said there are plans to add an additional staffed ambulance to the system.

Mr. Boyd asked if it would be cheaper to put an ambulance at the Seminole Department, rather than adding new people. Mr. Eggleston said the problem is that staff would have to be taken from the fire truck and put in that ambulance. Seminole runs 3000 calls a year.

Mr. Slutzky asked if the morale of the volunteers is affected when the County pushes them so hard. Mr. Eggleston said in some cases, but they are doing the best they can to answer the number of

calls received. He said the number of calls is outpacing the ability of both career and volunteers to answer those calls.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the County will ever get to the place where it will need to require payment for services. He said rescue squads in other localities are already charging. Mr. Tucker replied that Mr. Eggleston has been looking into this possibility, noting that health insurance often covers such costs.

Mr. Slutzky said the FY '2008 budget covers the cost of staff. He is talking about bridging the gap now because there is an urgent need.

Mr. Wyant asked about response time on the EMS side. Mr. Eggleston said neither Seminole Trail nor the Earlysville station have ambulances. He said the solution for this is the new station, and that is on schedule. He feels it has reached a point where something different needs to be done in the interim to provide those services.

Mr. Foley said staff needs directions from the Board as to whether or not to start before July 1. If the Board wants to do that, staff would need to talk with Mr. Eggleston as to whether he could do it quickly.

Mr. Tucker said Mr. Rooker told him earlier that he had an item to add to the list of unfunded initiatives.

Mr. Rooker said he mentioned the ACE Program earlier. One of the Board's goals is to increase the amount of land in conservation easements by 50 percent over the next four years. He said the County is paying the TJPED \$12,500 a year and a new contribution to the Small Business Organization of \$5,000, so he thinks an equal amount of money should be put into either one or all of, The Nature Conservancy, the Piedmont Environmental Council, or the Virginia Outdoors Foundation, in order to assist them in obtaining private easements. If the Board decided to do this, these organizations would be asked to present a proposal for how the contribution might augment their activities. The Board has an ambition goal and \$17,500 is not a whole lot of money. The County has private partners who are helping it to achieve more than half of that goal. In the interest of balance and also in the interest of achieving the Board's goals, he asks that the Board consider doing this.

Mr. Boyd asked if the County contributes to other private nonprofit organizations. Ms. White said there are many.

Mr. Boyd asked why the PEC would go through this process.

Mr. Rooker said TJPED had to go through the process. His point is that the Board does not have a specific goal regarding recruitment of outside businesses. If the Board puts in money, he thinks it should make the most of that partnership. He said there is a specific goal for increasing land in conservation easements, and the County is looking for private partners to help achieve that goal.

Mr. Dorrier said he had a client who was helped by the Piedmont Environmental Council to put her land in a conservation easement, and she was greatly helped by doing so.

Mr. Slutzky said he thinks it is a great idea.

Ms. Thomas said there used to be someone on the Planning staff who worked to help get conservation easements.

Mr. Wyant said when he worked for the Nature Conservancy last year they did not seem to have any problems on the money side.

Mr. Rooker said he was suggesting that the money be set aside in the budget, and these agencies would be asked to bring a proposal to the Board.

Mr. Tucker asked if Mr. Rooker was suggesting an amount of \$17,500 for each organization.

Mr. Rooker said he was looking at a total of \$17,500 and it would be divided up based on the proposals received. If the proposals don't make sense, then the money would not be spent. If the proposals show that efforts can be increased significantly, he would like to have the money in the budget to do that. Mr. Tucker said there will be money available unless the Board uses all of its Reserve Fund.

Ms. Thomas said she would be interested in getting some proposals. When the Board discussed this some months ago, there was the thought of having a person on staff that could help the County hold easements, and also do outreach work with ACE. If the Board is willing to offer money to an organization and they can do it, she would judge that against whether it would be better to have someone on staff. She has nothing against the general idea.

Mr. Tucker asked if there were other items on the "Unfunded Initiatives" list that the Board would like to discuss this afternoon.

Ms. Thomas asked about "Art in Place" and its relationship to the \$107,000 in the proposed budget for landscaping. She asked if there is a connection with what Art-in-Place is talking about, which is to do landscaping instead of putting sculptures in the medians. Mr. Pat Mullaney, Parks & Recreation Director, said they have dropped the sculptures from the request, it is just for landscaping and that

amount is reduced to \$13,100. Mr. Tucker said no funding was provided for the \$17,000, and when the sculptures are removed, it reduces the amount to \$13,000. Mr. Mullaney said Ms. Thomas is asking about the other landscaping money shown earlier in the presentation. He is not familiar with that part of the request. Mr. Foley said that money is for plantings and some of the things around the "Welcome to Albemarle" signs.

Ms. Thomas said it all shows in the line for "Art in Place." Mr. Mullaney pointed out that the money which is not for Art in Place should be moved to another line in the budget.

Ms. Thomas said the Art in Place people have talked to several garden clubs who will provide the landscaping expertise which may be useful. She wants to get the most for the money spent and she did not know if Art in Place should be brought in as it is presently constituted. She asked for a staff report at another work session.

Mr. Mullaney said Art in Place has identified six potential locations for landscaping. They want to landscape three of those six locations.

Mr. Rooker said he thinks there is support for working with Art in Place. The question is whether this can be done out of the existing budget, or if additional money needs to be appropriated.

Ms. Thomas asked about CTS funding which does not appear on this list. She knows the County is faced with a large increase in funding from the City. Mr. Foley said that will be covered when the discussion gets to individual departments.

Mr. Boyd asked if there will be a new unfunded list after each work session. Ms. White said the list before the Board is the total list of unfunded requests. Staff will be going over these when discussing departmental requests. Some of the agencies who had additional funding increases such as CTS and JAUNT will be discussed later in the work sessions.

Mr. Tucker said he thinks Ms. Thomas was referring to the fact that there is no funding for adding a bus route to the County Office Building on Fifth Street.

Mr. Dorrier said there have been requests from some people about the elderly at Mountainside. Ms. White said that will be covered under Human Services.

Mr. Tucker said Mr. Dave Phillips is present today. He said fireworks for the Fourth of July celebration are not recommended for funding in this budget. The County provided funding last year. Staff knows that Mr. Phillips has received some additional private funding and that is why funding was not carried forward. He suggested that the Board hear from Mr. Phillips this afternoon.

Mr. David Phillips of "Save the Fireworks" said there were some misconceptions from the Fire Marshal showing up on the Fourth of July asking how they could have a fireworks display without notifying him and the thought that they have "tons of money." He said the perception problems are not good. They do not have tons of money in their coffers. In fact, they don't have any money. Every year they expect it will not be funded, and there will be no fireworks display. All the people who organize it are volunteers and actually contribute to the Save the Fireworks to make sure they are able to put on an event the community can be proud of. Last year was the first year the County contributed to the celebration. He said that every year the City gives in-kind services (last year it was \$10,500). He said the Dave Matthews Band contributed \$25,000 last year, and that helped them to make "ends meet." They have other collection efforts underway now. They are trying to preserve this event by setting aside some of the money from the Dave Matthews Band each year to build up a fund. It is not a matter of throwing money around. Some concern was expressed that they spent too much money on last year's show; it was too long. It happened because of getting last minute funding and trying to upgrade the show. They had too many of the wrong size fireworks and the show ran about 15 minutes too long. They would appreciate the County's support for this community event. He said the City has carried the load on this event for many years, but it is now attended by 60 percent County citizens.

Mr. Boyd asked how the amount of their budget. Mr. Phillips said it is \$10,000. Mr. Breeden said it was not part of the original budget last year, but was approved during one of the Board's work sessions.

Mr. Boyd said he is willing to consider the request.

Mr. Rooker asked if the County contributes any services in-kind such as police. Mr. Phillips said that was tried one time, but there is the jurisdictional thing to consider.

Ms. Thomas said she would like for the Board at some point to discuss the seventh Bright Stars Program. She thinks it is the best way to get kids ready to start school without the handicaps that otherwise they bring with them and carry all the way through school. She said it was discussed briefly that the ACE Program money is not being used as much as it used to. The ACE Committee has requested some money for flyers to explain the program. She said that a lot of the people are not high-income people and sometimes do not understand the program. She said the ARB has requested another staff person and asked if that request could be handled by moving present staff people around. Mr. Tucker said that request was for a sign reviewer. Ms. Thomas said they were talking about Albemarle Place, and things that are more temporary. Mr. Foley said staff has done a report on the ARB sign program and will share that information with the Board.

Ms. Thomas said the Board was alerted that none of the Sign Removal Program in the Zoning Department is funded. She just wanted to mention that in case that was the Board's choice.

Mr. Dorrier said he met with Film Festival Director, Mr. Richard Herskowitz, and Mr. Melvin Breeden, because the Festival wants to increase their request to the County by \$4,000. He said the intention is to better promote the Festival.

Mr. Boyd asked if the Film Festival receives any money from the Tourism Council.

Mr. Dorrier said they work with the Tourism Council. They get about half of their money from the University of Virginia. They are trying to get more money from the State, but they need the City and the County to contribute also.

Mr. Rooker asked if this is to promote the Virginia Film Festival or to promote the area as a place to make movies.

Mr. Dorrier said that is the intention; to better promote the area. It is the No. 2 area in the country next to Sundance according to Mr. Herskowitz.

Mr. Tucker said that on Wednesday, staff will bring back the items the Board has mentioned this afternoon. Items mentioned are put on a list so the Board can see their potential costs. He said there are other items in the departmental budgets that will be discussed later.

Mr. Rooker said there is a huge list of things the Board did not get to discuss today. He has a general question about employee benefits. He said in looking at individual department budgets, the increase in benefits across the Board is huge, maybe 18 to 20 percent. He said there was a slide shown earlier that showed the cost of benefits is up only five to nine percent. He said some of them are up 25 percent even in areas where people are not being added. He does not understand the huge increases.

Mr. Rooker said he just noticed that expenses for the Sheriff's Department are up 20+ percent. Last year the Board added several people there, but that seems to be a huge increase. Mr. Breeden said it is basically in utilities at the VB Building which the Juvenile Court is occupying. The County is providing security. As to the utility costs (the City is sharing that expense) about \$20,000+ was moved into the Sheriff's budget.

Ms. Thomas said when she looked at the big budget book, she noticed that there are only two areas where Albemarle is above the average of other counties, and one is in Community Development and the other is Administration of Justice. Ms. White said that on Wednesday, staff will go through the departmental budgets one by one and answer all questions.

---

Agenda Item No. 3. Adjourn. With no further business to come before the Board this afternoon, Ms. Thomas **moved** to adjourn this meeting until 1:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 15, 2006. Mr. Boyd **seconded** the motion, which passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Rooker, Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd and Mr. Dorrier.

NAYS: None.

---

Chairman

Approved by the Board of County Supervisors
Date: 12/06/2006
Initials: EWC