

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on April 5, 2006, at 9:00 a.m., County Office Building on McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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, Clerk, Ella W. Carey, and Director of Planning, V. Wayne Cilimberg.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 9:09 a.m., by the Chairman, Mr. Rooker.

Agenda Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance.
Agenda Item No. 3. Moment of Silence.

Agenda Item No. 4. From the Public: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There was no one present to speak under this item.

Agenda Item No. 5. Recognitions: Virgil Lee James - Fire Rescue Volunteer.

Mr. Rooker presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Virgil (V. L.) James, Jr. for his 50 years of service as a member of the Crozet Volunteer Fire Department. The certificate read: "On behalf of the citizens, local government staff and the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, we would like to recognize Virgil (V. L.) Lee James, Jr. for his tireless efforts in not only serving the community of Crozet, but the citizens of the County, as a member of the Crozet Volunteer Fire Department since January, 1956. During his tenure, V. L. served as Assistant Chief, Chief, and in numerous positions as a Board member. V. L. was instrumental in Crozet acquiring its first self-contained breathing apparatus in the 1960's. In addition, V. L. has always been in the top percentage of personnel for the volume of calls run. We are grateful for the time, energy and dedication V. L. has committed to protecting the citizens of Albemarle County. We as a community are strengthened and uplifted by those who step forward to volunteer their services in support of improving the quality of life of our residents. We offer our sincere appreciation to V. L. for his dedication and recognize him for his service to Albemarle County."

Mr. James thanked his wife for her support, thanked the County's Fire/Rescue Administration and the Board of Supervisors for their support of the Fire/Rescue department. He said it is a major topic due to the growth now being experienced in the County. He thanked all fire and rescue personnel in the County – both paid and volunteer.

Mr. Lee James, V. L.'s son and a member of the Crozet Volunteer Fire Department, thanked the Board, County staff and administration, saying his father has been a fireman for as long as he can remember, with lots of night pages to respond to fires. Mr. James said he got to take a ride in the fire truck cab when he was a young boy, and he still rides on the same pieces of equipment with his dad.

Mr. Rooker recognized and congratulated Ms. Roxanne White, Assistant County Executive, for receiving the John L. Snook Award for Child Advocacy.

Agenda Item No. 6. Consent Agenda. Mr. Wyant **offered** motion to approve Items 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4, to carry Item 6.1 over to the next meeting, and to accept the remaining items on the Consent Agenda for information. The motion was seconded by Mr. Boyd. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.
NAYS: None.

Item 6.1. Approval of Minutes: October 19, November 2 and December 7, 2005.

Mr. Wyant had read the minutes of October 19, 2005, and found them to be in order as presented.

Mr. Rooker had read the minutes of December 7, 2005, pages 1 – 22 ending at Item No. 11, and found them to be in order as presented.

Mr. Dorrier had read the minutes of December 7, 2005, pages 22 (beginning at Item No. 11) to the end, and found them to be in order as presented.

By the recorded vote set out above, the minutes which had been read were approved. Those not read will go to the next meeting for approval.

Item 6.2. Adopt Petty Cash Resolution to Add Petty Cash Fund for Monticello Fire Station.

It was noted in the Executive Summary that Virginia Code § 15.2-1229, provides that the County may adopt a resolution to establish petty cash funds not exceeding \$5,000 to be used to transact daily County business. The Board of Supervisors last established petty cash funds by a Resolution adopted on July 6, 2005. Staff recommends adoption of a new Resolution to create an additional \$250.00 petty cash fund for the Fire and Rescue Department at the Monticello Fire Station. This new petty cash fund would allow for the payment of claims for financial commitments of station staff. Staff recommends that the Board adopt a Resolution to add a petty cash fund at the Monticello Fire Station and reestablish the existing petty cash funds.

By the recorded vote set out above, the Board adopted the following Resolution:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Virginia Code §15.2-1229, provides that the governing body of any county may establish by resolution one or more petty cash funds not exceeding \$5,000 each for the payment of claims arising from commitments made pursuant to law; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors adopted a Resolution on July 6, 2005 establishing the current petty cash funds; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors now desires to establish a petty cash fund for the Fire and Rescue Department at the Monticello Fire Station and reestablish the existing petty cash funds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia establishes the following petty cash funds:

Finance Department	\$ 3,350.00
Social Services	200.00
Police Department	1,800.00
Sheriff's Department	100.00
Fire and Rescue	150.00
Fire and Rescue - Monticello Fire Station	250.00
Commonwealth's Attorney	300.00
Parks & Recreation	<u>100.00</u>
Total	<u>\$ 6,250.00</u>

Item 6.3. General Services Grounds and Facilities Maintenance Workers – utilization of current contract funds.

It was noted in the Executive Summary that over the past two to three years the Board has had various work sessions regarding the importance of ensuring attractive urban areas and addressing other needs resulting from the County's growth and urbanization. In addition, the current fiscal year is the first for the new Stormwater Program that has set higher expectations for the establishment and maintenance of adequate stormwater facilities to meet Federal and State mandates. This will require maintenance of stormwater facilities on a regular schedule rather than on an as-needed basis, in addition to the immediate response needed for system failures as they occur. In addition, staff has recently been notified by VDOT that because of budget cuts, the frequency of their maintenance crews mowing the road sides and medians will be greatly reduced, likely requiring additional effort by the County. Because of these new expectations, the Department of General Services has evaluated the increased demand on the department, available funding, and the County's arrangements for handling current levels of service.

The Division of Public Works, the division within General Services that would handle the duties outlined above, currently consists of the following operations: building and facility maintenance, custodial services, and copy center and mail delivery. Some of the major responsibilities of the division, excluding new expectations, include: landscaping, street sign installation, the repair and maintenance of County buildings, stormwater facility maintenance, roadside and median mowing, and other exterior maintenance. Historically, these duties have primarily been completed with a combination of service contracts and reliance on the Virginia of Transportation (VDOT). To address changing demands, while also maintaining current levels of service, staff has reviewed how to better utilize current funding spent on private contracts to address the County's growing needs and expectations.

In considering how best to address increased levels of service and the need to respond more quickly to circumstances in the field, General Services believes the County can no longer rely almost solely on contracted services. Beyond current staffing to provide basic custodial and maintenance services for County buildings and grounds, General Services currently has only one staff member responsible for the maintenance of "public" facilities. This position has primarily been focused on the management of contracts for stormwater facility maintenance, median mowing and the installation and maintenance of street signs. Given the new expectations, staff believes utilizing some portion of current contract funding to hire two grounds and facility maintenance staff would best address the needs at this time. This plan would not eliminate the need for service contracts, but would allow the department to direct the work needed on a day-to-day basis instead of being placed on a contractor's schedule and accommodated as needs can best fit into their work schedule. To effectively meet the higher level of expectations, staff

believes this approach will provide a balance between contracting out services and having the ability to respond quickly to issues in the field and ensure quality control on an ongoing basis.

The primary responsibilities of these new staff will be stormwater facility maintenance and minor repairs, roadside mowing, sidewalk vegetation control, and improving the aesthetic conditions of our entrance corridors and other urban areas. Duties beyond these higher levels of service include maintaining the exterior of the County Office Building on McIntire Road to free Parks and Recreation personnel to concentrate their efforts on park facilities and trail and greenway maintenance and responding to calls of illegal dumping along rural roads of the County.

Through careful scrutiny of the current and proposed FY 2006-07 budgets, these two positions can be financed without requesting additional funding. It is estimated that a total of \$131,000 will be necessary to start this program. Of that total, \$50,000 would be a one-time expense for the purchase of necessary equipment, i.e. vehicle, trailer, mowers, trimmers, and other hand and power tools. The balance would be recurring expenses for salaries, benefits, and administrative support. The money would come from a combination of accounts from the Public Works and Stormwater budgets as follows:

1-1000-43005-301210: Stormwater Contract Services	\$65,000
1-1000-43002-331901: Detention Basin Maintenance	\$24,000
1-1000-43002-331920: Polo Grounds Property Maintenance	\$ 2,000
1-1000-43002-332200: Grounds Maintenance Contract	\$10,000
1-9010-43100-800666: Facility Maintenance	<u>\$30,000</u>
Total:	\$131,000

Again, funding for contracted professional services will remain in the budget to balance contracted services with the proposed General Services staff. Staff recommends that the Board approve the hiring of two General Services Grounds/Facility Maintenance Workers at a Grade 7 from existing funding as outlined above.

(Discussion: Mr. Wyant asked if it is possible for the County to do work within the right-of-way, and asked about the obligation for stormwater facility maintenance. Mr. Tucker responded that the State and Federal governments both require that detention basins must be maintained and mowed. He said the County has tried in the past to put that responsibility on the homeowners' association, but that is not working; there are basins all over the urban area.

Mr. Davis said there are a number of regional detention basins that have been dedicated to the County which are the County's sole responsibility to maintain.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the City has a full-scale crew to handle theirs. Mr. Tucker responded that they do and their system contains pipes instead of basins.

Mr. Wyant said he is bothered by the fact that agreements are written with homeowners' associations but they do not follow through on their end. Mr. Davis replied that stormwater maintenance agreements require a yearly inspection by the County; there is not enough manpower to meet that requirement. He added that the inspectors and workers being requested for General Services will help deal with that issue.

Mr. Tucker said this has come about over the last 15 years. The County did not want to spend funds to hire staff to clean these things out so as part of subdivision approval, homeowners' associations were required to do it. Over that period of time it has been found that these owners are not organized well enough to get it done. It is hard to take them to court, people are moving in and out all the time and the County does not know who the homeowner association's president is anymore. It is a real hassle. He acknowledged that a lot of the regional basins are the sole responsibility of the County.

Mr. Rooker said that this discussion about cleaning out the basins the County owns and has been going on for a long time. The County still has to inspect private basins for compliance.

Mr. Wyant said there would likely be an increase in contractual service costs for inspection and maintenance as well as additional staff people anyway. He thinks that as the County grows, it needs to pay more attention to these issues. Mr. Tucker said since the County encourages development to occur in a dense urban way, it is not easy to pass that responsibility along.

Ms. Thomas said there will probably be more homeowners' associations unable to meet their obligations.

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, pointed out that there is a Federal mandate concerning stormwater management, and it requires inspection. He said the Stormwater Ordinance does have a provision by which property owners can petition the County to take over those facilities. By policy, it has been routinely done with the residential development. He added that this issue came up while discussing the Stormwater Management Plan. The reality is that this is only "the tip of the iceberg.")

By the recorded vote set out above, the Board approved the hiring of two General Services Grounds/Facility Maintenance Workers at a Grade 7 from existing funds as outlined in the Executive Summary.

Item 6.4. Resolution to accept Sun Ridge Road in Sun Ridge Subdivision into the State Secondary System of Highways and to post a bond with VDOT in an amount of \$6,000.

(Discussion: Mr. Wyant asked about road bond in the amount of \$6,000. Mr. Davis responded that this was an unusual situation. This was an unpaved road project initiated by the County. There is no developer involved to meet VDOT's bonding requirements for the first year of maintenance. He said VDOT made a request of the County to insure that any costs that might arise in the first year would be covered. The \$6,000 is enough to satisfy that requirement.)

As requested by the County Engineering Department, and by the recorded vote set out above the Board adopted the following Resolution:

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the street(s) in **Sun Ridge Subdivision**, described on the attached Additions Form LA-5(A) dated **April 5, 2006**, fully incorporated herein by reference, is shown on plats recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Albemarle County, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation has advised the Board that the street(s) meet the requirements established by the Subdivision Street Requirements of the Virginia Department of Transportation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Albemarle Board of County Supervisors requests the Virginia Department of Transportation to add the street(s) in **Sun Ridge Subdivision**, as described on the attached Additions Form LA-5(A) dated **April 5, 2006**, to the secondary system of state highways, pursuant to §33.1-229, Code of Virginia, and the Department's Subdivision Street Requirements; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board guarantees a clear and unrestricted right-of-way, as described, exclusive of any necessary easements for cuts, fills and drainage as described on the recorded plats; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County assures that it will reimburse VDOT for any necessary maintenance expenses incurred by VDOT to maintain the road to its standards, not exceeding six thousand dollars (\$6,000), during the first twelve (12) months after acceptance of this road for maintenance by VDOT; and

RESOLVED that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

* * * * *

The road(s) described on Additions Form LA-5(A) is:

- 1) **Sun Ridge Road (State Route 1397)** from the intersection of Route 1510 (Northfield Road) to the cul-de-sac, as shown on plat recorded 09/14/1959 in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Albemarle County in Deed Book 352, page 237, with a 50-foot right-of-way width, for a length of 0.14 miles.

Total Mileage – 0.14 miles

Item 6.5. FY 2003/04-FY 2005/06 Strategic Plan Progress Report.

It was noted in the Executive Summary that the County's FY '04-FY '06 Strategic Plan time period will end June, 2006. This year is a transitional one for the County's Strategic Planning efforts, as a new strategic plan is under development for FY '07-'10. This year, County staff members are completing the objectives outlined in the current plan and are working closely with the Board to develop specific goals and objectives for the new plan. The Board's strategic directions for the County have been fairly consistent over the years, so many of the efforts undertaken in the current plan will serve as spring boards for the County's strategic efforts in the coming years.

A progress report on the current Strategic Plan objectives was forwarded to the Board (on file in the Clerk's Office). As has been the case in the past, this report reflects activities since the last update. While this report indicates that the majority of the remaining objectives have been completed within the desired timeline, staff will continue to focus on these areas. For example, the County will continue its strategic efforts to address the Board's priority areas by further implementing strategies in the rural plan, and addressing transportation and water resource needs.

Since this is a transitional year, the County's Recommended FY '07 Business Plan is tied to the FY '04-FY '06 strategic directions. The Board identified the County's top priorities for the new plan prior to this year's budget deliberations. They have held several work sessions to review the County's Recommended Budget. The County's FY '07-FY '10 strategic priorities are guiding the County's fiscal planning efforts for FY '07 as well.

This progress report for the County's current FY '04–FY '06 Strategic Plan is provided for the Board's information. Staff will hold work sessions with the Board on April 5 and April 12 to continue to obtain the Board's guidance as staff develops the County's upcoming FY '07–FY '10 Strategic Plan.

(Discussion: Ms. Thomas commented that the Board agreed that Objective 2.1.2 which states "Country stores would be co-equal in status with phasing and clustering of development" would be delayed because of staffing needs for the Development Process Review Committee.)

The Board received this report for information only.

Item 6.6. Information on Impact of Living Wage Adjustment for Albemarle County.

It was noted in the Executive Summary that during the Board to Board presentation on March 1, the Supervisors posed a question to the School Board Chairman on the "living wage" issue. They asked if the School Board had looked at the impact of increasing the "living wage" for the School Division. Board Chair, Sue Friedman, indicated that it had not been reviewed, but the issue could be researched and information presented back to the Board. Human Resources and OMB staff have prepared background information on the living wage and the fiscal impact of an adjustment for both the School Division and Local Government. The School Division will receive this same information at their April 20th meeting.

The living wage is an annual income (or the equivalent hourly wage) that enables a person working full-time to meet their family's basic needs. These basic needs adjusted for the costs in a given locality include the combined annual costs of housing, food, childcare, healthcare, transportation, taxes and other necessities. Described below are two different methods for calculating the living wage:

1. **The Economic Policy Institute (EPI)**, a non-partisan think tank, bases its analysis on seven categories of need shown below and estimates that a family income for two working adults and two children needs to be \$44,592 for the Charlottesville Metropolitan region. When this annual income is divided by full-time work or 2080 hours, the living hourly wage is \$10.72.

Table I
January 2006 Hourly, Monthly, and Annual Estimated "Basic Needs" Budget
for the Charlottesville Metropolitan Area (Two Working Adults, Two Children)

Need	Monthly Cost	Hourly Cost
Taxes	\$349	\$1.00
Other Necessities	\$359	\$1.03
Transportation	\$375	\$1.08
Health Care	\$401	\$1.16
Food	\$587	\$1.69
Housing	\$744	\$2.15
Childcare	<u>\$904</u>	<u>\$2.61</u>
Subtotal	\$3,716	\$10.72
Annual Total	\$44,592	\$44,592

2. **Federal Living Wage Responsibility Act, 2003.** The federal government defines the living wage as consisting of two factors:

(1) an hourly wage (or salary equivalent) sufficient for a worker to earn, while working 40 hours a week on a full-time basis, the amount of the Federal poverty level for a family of four (as published in the Federal Register by the Department of Health and Human Services under the authority of section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))); and

(2) an additional amount, determined by the Secretary based on the locality in which a worker resides, sufficient to cover the costs to such worker to obtain any fringe benefits not provided by the worker's employer.

For 2006, the official poverty threshold across all 48 states for a family of four is \$20,000, which for a full-time worker equates to \$9.62 an hour. It is important to note that the \$9.62 reflects wages only. The cost of benefits a worker would need if they were not offered them by their employer is estimated by the federal government to be an additional \$2.50 an hour for a total wage of \$12.12.

3. **Market Competitiveness.** The University of Virginia recently increased their lowest entry wage to \$9.37 per hour based on recent market survey data and estimated that their total benefit package added an additional \$3.45 above wages for a total compensation of \$12.82 per hour for the lowest paid employee. The City of Charlottesville recently raised their lowest entry wage to \$9.36 per hour based on the 2005 Federal living wage standard. Albemarle County's lowest pay rate for entry level positions is currently \$8.63 an hour. The proposed classified salary scale for 2006-2007 will increase that minimum rate to \$8.84 per hour. County employees have a benefit package, which is approximately 30 percent of salary or an additional \$3.80 an hour for the lowest paid employee, which equates to a total hourly compensation of \$12.64 for the lowest paid employee.

Financial Impact of a Living Wage Adjustment

Option 1 - Increasing the Living Wage to \$9.62/hour. There are currently 116 employees making less than \$9.62/hr; six in Local Government and 110 in the Schools, mostly custodians, food service workers and after-school workers. The cost to increase the living wage to \$9.62 based on the Federal living wage guidelines would be \$106,250; \$11,180 for Local Government and \$95,071 for the Schools.

Option 2 - \$10.72 – Increasing the Living Wage to \$10.72/hr. There are currently 287 employees making less than \$10.72 an hour; 13 in Local Government and 274 in the Schools. The cost to increase the living wage to \$10.72 as estimated by the EPI for a family income of \$44,592 would be \$259,597; \$20,685 for Local Government and \$238,912 for the School Division.

Option 3 - \$9.37 – Increasing the Living Wage to be market competitive with the University and the City of Charlottesville. There are currently 78 positions making less than \$9.37 an hour; five in Local Government and 73 in the Schools. The cost to increase the living wage to \$9.37 to be market competitive with the City of Charlottesville and the University would be \$24,104; \$1,890 for Local Government and \$22,214 for the School Division.

BUDGET IMPACT:

LIVING WAGE	\$9.62/hr	LIVING WAGE	\$10.72/hr	COMPETITIVE	\$9.37/hr
County Total	\$106,251	County Total	\$259,597	County Total	\$24,104
Local Govt Total	\$11,180	Local Govt Total	\$20,685	Local Govt Total	\$1,890
School Total	\$95,071	School total	\$238,912	School Total	\$22,214

This report provides information on potential living wage calculations, as well as the financial impact if the Supervisors chose to increase the living wage for the lowest paid employees to \$9.62 or \$10.72 or the \$9.37 competitive market adjustment comparable to the University and the City of Charlottesville. If the Supervisors have an interest in pursuing either of these options, Human Resources will need additional time to analyze the impact on salary compression for other employees if the lowest paid wages were increased and to determine the total financial impact of proceeding. The School Division will be reviewing this same information at its meeting on April 20.

(Discussion: Ms. Thomas said that she would like to have this subject returned to the Board for discussion but only if a majority of the Board members are willing to consider supporting the living wage.

Mr. Rooker agreed that it does need to come back to the Board with all appropriate information, noting that it will affect all salary levels, not just the very bottom.

Ms. Thomas said Local Government only has a dozen employees who are under the \$10.72 living wage figure that came out of U.Va.'s study, but the School System has over 100. Mr. Tucker said staff would be glad to bring this back, but agrees with Ms. Thomas that it should only be studied further if the Board is serious about supporting it.

Mr. Rooker said there would need to be some information on adjustments for compression furnished.

Mr. Slutzky added that he would like to see comparative salary information from the City and their benefits value. Mr. Davis said staff would need to know whether the Board wants to consider the higher standard of \$10.72 in order to provide accurate compression information. Mr. Slutzky said he would not want to constrain the Schools, but he thinks both of those options should also be considered by the School Board.

Ms. Thomas agreed, adding that she would like to know the Board members are serious about considering supporting the living wage standard.

Mr. Rooker asked why the first option – the Federal living wage of \$9.62 – would not be considered. Mr. Davis replied that Options 2 and 3 just measure the extremes, but Option 1 could be considered.

Ms. Thomas commented that the \$9.37 option would make the County competitive, but the other options would be closer to an actual living wage.

Mr. Dorrier asked if this would be a one-time increase. Mr. Tucker responded that the salary scale would be permanently changed, which would mean recurring costs.)

It was the consensus that staff should furnish the Board with information on the budget impact of any change and how it would affect compression. In its analysis, staff would look at each of the options, and also get feedback from the School Board.

Item 6.7. School Board News – April 2006. A copy of the School Board's monthly newsletter is posted on the Web. **This item was received for information.**

(Non-Agenda. Ms. Thomas commented that the National Association of Counties Annual Meeting will be held in Richmond in 2007. She encouraged all the Board members to attend if they can.)

Agenda Item No. 7a. Transportation Matters: VDOT Monthly Report for March 2006.
Agenda Item No. 7b. Transportation Matters: Matters not listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Jim Utterback, VDOT Resident Engineer, introduced Mr. Maurice MacKenzie, Area Construction Engineer, for the Charlottesville and Louisa residencies.

Mr. Utterback said there has been an increase in right-of-way estimates for the Jarmans Gap Road project (approximately \$2.0 million) and for the Meadow Creek Parkway project (approx \$4.0 million). He assumes the allocations can be moved in the Six-Year Secondary Road Plan in order to keep both of the projects on schedule. This may have an impact on the Georgetown Road and Proffit Road projects. He will bring more detailed information as it becomes available.

Mr. Utterback said VDOT held two citizen information meetings this past week. One was for the Georgetown Road project (approximately 87 people attended). The project is still in the comment period. Comments will be pulled together and brought to the Board with a recommendation. The other meeting was on the Jarmans Gap Road project. He will bring those comments to the Board with recommendation on how to proceed, hopefully next month.

Mr. Rooker commented that he had attended the Georgetown Road meeting and he expressed his appreciation for how VDOT staff conducted the meeting. He added that the Meadow Creek Parkway interchange meeting had a good turnout and was also very well done.

Mr. Utterback said the traffic study on Route 250 in front of Western Albemarle High School and Brownsville Elementary school warranted signalized intersections at both locations. He does not know how they will be set, but there will be detectors installed to take into account peak hour volumes.

Mr. Utterback said VDOT has been working on a detour for the Proffit Road bridge project. Norfolk Southern railroad will be replacing the bridge in kind. VDOT is looking at putting portable signals on Route 643 (Polo Grounds Road) in anticipation of traffic diverting onto that road.

Mr. Utterback said he has been working with County staff to bring a resolution before the Board asking to move three rural rustic road projects forward.

Mr. Wyant said he has discussed minimizing the number of lights on Route 250 West and insuring that the lights are synchronized.

Mr. Wyant mentioned that the Albemarle County Service Authority has said they found a couple of deteriorated pipes as they were installing water lines in Crozet. Before road paving takes place, he would suggest doing something about the pipes.

Mr. Wyant said people in the Newtown area have expressed concerns about the road which has been damaged by trucks going into the old Greenwood chemical plant facility. Mr. Utterback said he will check into this

Mr. Thomas said during the Jarmans Gap Road meeting a number of individuals questioned the reason the pedestrian/bicycle facilities do not go all the way to the end of the roadway. Mr. David Benish explained action taken by this Board in March of 2004.

Ms. Thomas said she has received a communication about two family subdivision requests where they were told they cannot subdivide because of VDOT road/sight distance standards. Mr. Utterback asked for a copy of the letter and said he will respond.

Mr. Dorrier mentioned the dust problem on the unpaved section of Route 712 near Route 795, the section that goes by Pine Knott. He asked if VDOT could put down some chemicals. Mr. Utterback said he would have someone look at it.

Mr. Boyd discussed a letter he received from the Forest Lakes Homeowners' Association asking if the County has plans to build a connector road between Ashwood Boulevard and Forest Lakes South. Mr. Benish said there are no plans to construct a connection at this time; he will respond to letter.

Mr. Boyd mentioned some drainage issues on Maxfield Road. He asked if speed limit signs could be installed along the road as an interim measure until the project begins. He also asked Mr. Utterback to see if Maxfield Road would qualify as a rural rustic road.

Mr. Slutzky said that in January he asked VDOT to look at installing a "yield to oncoming traffic sign" at intersection of Rio Road and Northfields/ Hillsdale Drive. He asked the status of the request. Mr. Utterback said he will take a look at the problem.

Mr. Slutzky mentioned the signage at the Hydraulic/Route 29 intersection in front of K-Mart. On Hydraulic there are two lanes that allow a right northbound turn onto Route 29. But, in only one of the lanes can the driver turn right on red. Cars are turning right in both lanes. The signage is confusing.

Mr. Rooker said as VDOT evaluates the Georgetown Road comments, he would ask that they look at implementing some pedestrian safety changes. He thinks it could be a relatively inexpensive project that could be done in the short period of time.

Mr. Rooker asked if there has been any response regarding the Scottsville Town revenue sharing request. Mr. Utterback said he has received a response from Richmond and will share it with the Board.

Agenda Item No. 8. Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District Annual Report, Nick Evans.

Mr. Nick Evans, Chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Soil & Water Conservation District Board, addressed the Board. He thanked the Board for their continued support of the district's programs, stating that the job of watershed protection is never completed and is an ongoing struggle. He said those on the Conservation District Board are committed to working for the best outcomes in terms of water quality and natural resource protection given the reality of a changing landscape. He mentioned that in the past few years, a lot of resources in the County have been put into land conservation easements, noting that Mr. Ches Goodall and Ms. Joy Matthews both serve on the Conservation District Board. He said the district easements are aimed at protecting water quality, and will be held for any piece of property that meets that test. He added that those parcels are often smaller than what the Virginia Outdoors Foundation would consider, or may be irregular in shape – such as 100-foot buffers along streams. He said that placing forested land along a stream into permanent easements makes more sense than constructing and maintaining stormwater detention ponds. This might be the best way to achieve the optimal outcome, but not in every case; it's an option.

Mr. Evans said that in Albemarle, the Conservation District needs to expand its focus – from programs that address traditional agriculture on large farms, which are dwindling in number – to include landowners that are creating small 20-acre farmettes with a couple horses. He explained that most of these people want to do the right thing in terms of conservation management, adding that at the state level the district is working to expand the Best Management Practices cost-share programs to include these smaller parcels, which in aggregate have a huge impact on water quality. He said the city of Charlottesville is joining the district so the "hole in the donut" of the service area is about to be filled. He commented that this is good news in terms of a coordinated effort among all jurisdictions in the watershed, and he encouraged Board members to thank City Council for their participation.

Ms. Thomas noted that the Mountain Protection Ordinance the County has been working on for many years is going to put a lot of emphasis on buffering intermittent and perennial streams. Mr. Evans responded that this is a very positive step.

Mr. Wyant asked if the Conservation District handles stream bank restoration. Mr. Evans replied that they pursue grant funding for various efforts toward stream stabilization – primarily replanting of vegetation as opposed to heavy engineering. He noted that the district works hard to oversee its easements, and foundation pursuit was a way of ensuring funding for personnel to do that.

Mr. Boyd asked if there was a duplication of effort with County staff in the area of riparian restoration. Mr. Evans responded that there is a coordinated effort, not a duplicated effort, with Mr. Ches Goodall and Mr. Mark Graham providing a link between the two.

Ms. Thomas noted that the Conservation District handles things that the County would have to do otherwise. Mr. Evans agreed, stating that the County contracts with them to provide education on stormwater management.

Mr. Rooker thanked Mr. Evans for his organization's efforts.

Agenda Item No. 9. Proposals to Extend Retiree Benefits and to Provide a Matching Amount to Employee Deferred Compensation Plans.

Ms. Kimberly Suyes, Human Resources Director, presented information from the Compensation and Benefits Team in response to requests from the Board to look at benefits for current retirees (PowerPoint presentation). She summarized the following Executive Summary:

Staff was requested to review options and costs to provide retirees an additional benefit due to the high cost of health insurance. This request was initiated by retirees under the County's VERIP program who retired prior to age 60. The VERIP program provides some benefits for five years, or to age 65, whichever comes first. This means the benefits may expire prior to the retiree reaching age 65 or Medicare eligibility.

The current VERIP program minimum eligibility is 50 years of age with ten years of service; it has two different elements: 1) Retirement Income under VRS is calculated both normally and then adding five additional years of service, the difference between the two amounts and the actual VRS amount is paid for a period of five years or to age 65; and, 2) Retirement Health/income – retirees also receive the County Board's contribution toward health insurance for five years or to age 65. Currently this amount is \$5,755 annually. This amount is paid directly to the employee and can be used to pay health insurance or for any other purpose.

Staff reviewed the following options: 1) The VRS Health Credit is currently offered to School Professional Employees. This option was originally considered for all employees, but as the amount offered by VRS is minimal, it would not adequately offset health insurance costs. This option will not be considered further; 2) an extension of VERIP benefits; and 3) to provide a match amount to the deferred compensation plan. The Board requested that the Human Resources Department develop proposals for 2) and 3).

Albemarle County Local Government's success in implementing the County's Strategic Plan and meeting its stated goals will depend on its ability to attract and maintain a high quality and high performing workforce in an extremely competitive environment. The Board recognized the importance of providing competitive salaries and benefits. As indicated in the recent Human Resources Annual Report, an increasing number of employees are reaching eligibility for VERIP and retirement benefits every year. As it is critical for Albemarle County to focus on retaining these employees and recruiting skilled candidates, the County's total compensation plan is designed and evaluated in light of those objectives. Additionally as the Joint Board's adopted strategy is to target benefits slightly above market, the value perceived by employees of our overall benefits program and the costs of those benefit programs are evaluated in recommending new programs. In order to provide comprehensive information, this report provides: 1) Summary of Current Retirement Benefits; 2) Review of Extending Retiree Benefits; 3) Review of Providing an Employer Match to Deferred Compensation; and 4) Options.

1) Summary of Current Retirement Benefits. In addition to the VERIP program, Albemarle County provides the Virginia Retirement System (VRS), a defined benefit retirement plan to all full-time employees. Contributions are paid in full by the County. The following example illustrates the retirement benefits provided to employees and the differences in the current retirement benefits. As indicated, additional benefits are provided as follows:

- Teachers-receive a health insurance credit of \$75 per month.
- Employees in the Law Enforcement Officer System (LEOS) (law enforcement officers, firefighters, regional jail officers, sheriffs) are entitled to earlier eligibility for full retirement (25 service years, compared to 30 service years for all other employees).
- Employees in the Law Enforcement Officer System (LEOS) in a hazardous duty position for 20 years receive an additional hazardous duty stipend of \$892 per month until reaching Social Security retirement age.

2) Review of Extending Retiree Benefits. An issue regarding retiree health insurance is the change in the way organizations plan to pay for the benefits. The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB), which is responsible for developing the accounting rules for State and Local Government, recently changed from a pay-as-you-go accounting basis to an accrual basis. This will have a significant impact on State and Local Government financial statements. A new annual liability, called the Annual Required Contribution (ARC), must be determined actuarially.

- Current Trends in Retirement Health Benefits. Data indicates that the trend in the market is to limit benefits to retirees.
- Extending Retiree Benefits. The current monthly cost of individual only coverage ranges from \$497.33 (low option) to \$525.33 (high option). This proposal would provide a \$500 per month contribution for those retirees with 25 years of service with Albemarle County once VERIP expired before age 65. A lesser benefit amount, for example \$250 per month, would reduce the annual County contribution by 50 percent.

The first chart in the Executive Summary illustrates the estimated cumulative costs of extending benefits, as well as a projection of existing VERIP costs. The second chart illustrates the cost per year and the cumulative costs of extending benefits to existing retirees. The third chart includes current employees who will have at least 25 years of service and will meet full retirement eligibility within five years (adjusting for the five years of

VERIP eligibility). This proposal would provide \$500 per month for current employees who will have at least 25 years of service, will meet full retirement eligibility within five years and retire by July 1, 2011. This benefit would begin once an employee had retired and the VERIP benefit was exhausted; it would be paid for five years or to the age 65, whichever came first. The costs reflected are based on the assumption that all eligible employees would retire at their first year of eligibility; this is the worst case scenario.

3) Provide a Match Amount to the Deferred Compensation Plan. This option would provide a benefit for all employees. As indicated in the February 1, 2006, Executive Summary, considerations are as follows:

- Research indicates that a match to a deferred compensation plan is valuable in recruitment and retention.
- The current trend in the market is that more public sector organizations are offering matches in order to be competitive with 401(k) plans in the private sector. (Adopted market data shows that four out of 29 organizations offer employer contributions, and a Municipal survey of 35 localities in Virginia and North Carolina indicated that 13 organizations provide a match.)
- A match gives employees an incentive to save, which enables accumulation of resources to meet expenses in retirement (such as medical costs). (Studies show that even a small incentive [as low as \$25 per month] can boost participation in a deferred compensation plan. Average participation in public sector 457 plans is 39 percent. When a match is present, the average rate increases to 51 percent.)
- Participation in plan is increased, thereby filling a gap in retirement income. (Data indicates that income replacement by VRS for employees with 30 service years or more is adequate, but those with less than 30 will need to supplement.)
- An employer contribution to deferred compensation is a visible benefit to employees and allows for contributions and earnings to grow tax-deferred. (Albemarle County employee feedback indicates that this is a desired benefit.)

Recommendation: Staff recommends that Albemarle County provides a match amount of 25 percent of the employee's contribution to the 403(b) or 457 deferred compensation plans up to a maximum of \$300 per year. Objectives in designing this match include ease of administration and communication. Selection of a match amount would provide an incentive for all employees to contribute toward their own retirement needs, such as health care expenses.

The budget impact for extending retiree benefits would be: For current retirees with at least 25 years service, the cumulative cost is estimated at \$1,800,000. For current retirees with at least 25 years of service, the annual cost would be approximately \$150,000 in FY '07. The average annual cost for 11 years would be approximately \$165,000. For those employees who retire by July 1, 2011, with 25 years of service, the cumulative cost would be \$5,910,000.

Options for consideration are:

- **Option 1.** Albemarle County would provide \$500 per month, or a lesser contribution, for five years for current retirees who had 25 years of service, whose VERIP benefit has expired and who are not yet 65 years of age.
- **Option 2.** Albemarle County would provide \$500 per month, or a lesser contribution, for current employees who will have at least 25 years of service, who will meet full retirement eligibility within five years and who retire by July 1, 2011. This benefit would begin once an employee had retired and their VERIP benefit was exhausted. They would be paid for five years or to age 65, whichever came first.
- **Option 3.** For all other employees, Albemarle County would provide a match of 25 percent of the employee's contribution to the 403(b) or 457 Deferred Compensation Plans to a maximum County contribution of \$300 per year.

Mr. Slutzky said he would hate to have Options 1 and 2 pitted against Option 3 because the latter addresses a completely separate issue. He does not feel comfortable looking at these as an either/or situation. Option 3 is different. He asked if there was a practical way to fill the gap without putting the burden on the County, noting that some employees who retired early might be getting a windfall. He asked if there is a way to track that. Ms. Suyes said it would be difficult to track, and the Board had asked staff to bring forth information only on current retirees.

Mr. Rooker said he would like to see a benefits package that was slightly above the competitive markets, with salaries at or above the median of the competitive market. He thinks that in an effort to provide additional benefits it would be easy to stray from adopted Compensation Goals. He does not see any rational basis for adding benefits without making a general decision to increase overall compensation objectives.

Mr. Dorrier asked how the VERIP benefit came about. Ms. Suyes said it was implemented before she was employed by the County. It has been utilized as a retention tool, with minimum service of 10 years needed to receive those benefits.

Mr. Rooker said he thinks retirement income in the County is high compared to pensions with private industry. He recently read from an article in the Wall Street Journal about how businesses are trying to get out of paying for medical benefits for their retirees because it is proving to be a significant financial burden. He sees no basis for coming in and piecemeal changing the County's benefit plans without making a decision to change the Board's Compensation Strategy.

Mr. Boyd said he believes offering benefits beyond retirement might encourage people to leave County employment since they would get those even if they took a job elsewhere.

Ms. Suyes clarified that Option 2 is a fairness issue, but might possibly encourage people to leave. She added that when she wants to retain employees, Option 3 would be the one that helps everyone.

Mr. Slutzky commented that Options 1 and 3 encourage employee retention and at the same time addresses an assertive hardship gap for a certain class of retirees.

Mr. Dorrier asked how Options 1 and 3 would impact the budget. Mr. Tucker pointed out the PowerPoint slide that showed the cost of Option 1.

Mr. Boyd said he does not want to move forward with any of the options at this time. He suggested discussing Option 3 at the annual meeting with the School Board in the fall concerning joint compensation policies. He agreed with Mr. Rooker that employers are moving away from these programs, adding that cost estimates are probably low given the rising health insurance costs.

Mr. Rooker commented that most retirement plans are pooled investment programs; perhaps the County could look at partnering, maybe with the University. Mr. Tucker said he does not know what the University offers that could be similar to this because their benefits come through the State.

Mr. Rooker said he is wary of giving money to people just because they are vocal.

Mr. Slutzky suggested that the County look into participating in NACo's retiree health plan, if possible.

Mr. Rooker said there would need to be a pool offered that was less than the County's current health plan since retirees have the option of staying on the County's plan and paying their own premium. He said from ages 60 to 65 people can just take the VERIP money. The real issue is whether the County is providing a reasonable package of benefits to people who are already retired or who are about to retire. He thinks it is a mistake to just put money into something because people complain, noting that people who have made \$45,000 yearly and are now getting \$39,000 yearly from retirement, not counting Social Security, are getting a good retirement package.

Ms. Suyes emphasized that the joint Board-adopted strategy has been to be at 105 percent of benefits and that includes health, dental, retirement, etc. She indicated that the County meets that requirement and is market competitive.

Mr. Dorrier suggested forming an ad-hoc committee to study the entire County benefits plan as it is a complex issue.

Mr. Rooker recommended that the County look at retiree benefits when compensation is reviewed in the fall with the School Board. A decision can be made at that time about what package of benefits the County wants to handle in the global context.

Ms. Thomas said she assumes that only Option 3 will be discussed when benefits are brought up at that compensation meeting, unless the Board feels staff should be directed otherwise.

Mr. Wyant mentioned that he only received half of his salary when he retired, and he did not go back to VDOT and ask for more money.

Mr. Rooker said he would like the information Ms. Suyes presented to the School Board.

Ms. Thomas asked if Mr. Rooker wants to consider Option 3 only.

Mr. Rooker said that is what he prefers.

Mr. Boyd agreed.

Mr. Slutzky noted that he is interested in helping out current retirees.

Ms. Suyes said she understands the Board would like for her staff to include Option 3 as a matching fund for all Local Government and School employees.

Mr. Boyd said he does not feel staff has to come back with Option 3 as it is written. Perhaps there are other options that would be a better competitive offering for employees.

(It was the consensus that additions or changes to the benefits program should occur in the context of evaluation of the overall benefits strategy. Option 3 (matching for all Local Government and School Division employees) may be included as part of the joint Board and

School Board compensation and benefits discussion in the fall. Staff is to discontinue any additional work on options for current retirees and those getting ready to retire (Options 1 and 2). Staff is not limited to Option 3 if it finds another competitive benefit in the market where they think dollars could better be spent.)

(Note: The Board recessed at 11:19 a.m., and reconvened at 11:30 a.m.)

Agenda Item No. 10. Staff Analysis of Reduced BPOL Tax Rate for Direct Sales.

Mr. Joseph Correa, Division Manager, Revenue & Taxation Division of the Finance Department, presented a financial analysis of the impact of a BPOL tax rate reduction for direct retail sales, which had been discussed briefly in March. He reported that staff found direct retail sales in Albemarle County range between \$140.0 and \$200.0 million, but an exact amount is not known because all sales are not reported specifically as such. He said the estimate could be as high as \$300,000 because of the ever-increasing nature of internet/catalog telephone sales. He said the current tax rate on direct retail sales is \$0.20 per \$100, equating to about \$400,000 in revenue for the County. He said had drafted an ordinance which would reduce the tax rate on these sales from 20 cents per \$100 to 10 cents per hundred. If the Board pursues this amendment it would decrease annual revenues by approximately \$200,000.

Mr. Correa said Greene County recently adopted a rate of 2.5 cent per hundred for retail sales. If the Board were to adopt that for Albemarle, that would reduce revenues from the \$400,000 estimate down to \$50,000. Each cent decrease equates to about \$20,000 of revenue. He said staff had set out both the advantages and the disadvantages of changing the rate, noting that the BPOL rate on all businesses might be lowered, not just that for internet sales, adding that each penny for all sales equates to \$380,000 in revenue. He said staff recommends that the Board suggest a rate to be considered, and then set a public hearing.

Mr. Slutzky commented that if Greene is successful in luring businesses there by reducing its tax rate, Albemarle stands to lose anyway. He thinks that as technology continues to progress, other counties will lure businesses away with lower BPOL tax. He asked that the Board move forward with the ten-cent rate reduction. He said that is enough to send a signal without decimating this portion of the County's BPOL revenue streams.

Ms. Thomas said she knows of a bookstore owner and an antique store owner who both make may sales online. She wondered how sales like that and sales by Crutchfield would be monitored.

Mr. Rooker said it is an honor system to pay the BPOL tax. He had asked Mr. Crutchfield to separate out sales in the County versus outside sales.

Mr. Wyant commented that it will be hard for some businesses to make that differentiation.

Ms. Thomas said she thinks smaller businesses would have a more difficult time providing that information. Also, any tax not collected from these businesses will have to be made up somehow by consumers if the County's tax base is to stay the same.

Mr. Slutzky said he believes retailers will leave the County if neighboring localities drop their BPOL tax rates. Albemarle will have to make up lost revenues on the backs of real property taxpayers.

Ms. Thomas replied that she just doesn't buy that argument, because Albemarle has so much to offer people in terms of living.

Mr. Dorrier said that he believes Crutchfield should be supported in Albemarle.

Mr. Boyd asked about Greene's BPOL tax rate. Mr. Correa responded that most localities have a rate close to the 20-cent maximum; Greene is the only one he knows of that has dropped it down. He noted that there is no BPOL tax for manufacturers.

Ms. Thomas said the BPOL tax for wholesalers is five cents.

In response to a question from Mr. Dorrier, Mr. Tucker explained that staff used a 10-cent figure and a 2.5-cent figure as hypothetical figures, but any amount could be used.

Mr. Rooker said he would like to have information on the BPOL tax rates of other localities.

Mr. Dorrier said that John Knapp (Weldon Cooper Center) has provided that information.

Mr. Rooker said he feels the County should establish its tax rate based on what is fair; not because an individual business owner requested that the tax be lowered. He commented that Mr. Crutchfield went to Greene County and convinced them to lower their rate.

Mr. Slutzky said he brought this to the Board because of an inherent fairness problem; the new category of retailer that is emerging is unfairly burdened by it. He felt that given the rise in internet businesses, it might be a disincentive for companies to locate in Albemarle if the tax rate in Greene is well below neighboring areas. Mr. Davis said most localities have rates at 20 cents or slightly lower, except for Greene – which lowered theirs to 2.5 cents. He added that Fluvanna has no BPOL tax.

- B.F. Yancey Elementary School received a donation in the amount of \$100.00 from the JLV Corporation (Green Mountain Country Store). It has been requested that this donation be used to help fund a field trip for Yancey Students.
- Following completion of the FY 2004-05 audit, reappropriation of school carryover funds takes place and portions of building rental funds are returned to schools. These total \$226,292.20.
- Monticello High School received a donation in the amount of \$1,000.00 from Henry and Joann Walker. It has been requested that this donation be used towards the needs of Monticello High School students.
- The Henley Middle School Cultural Enrichment Program, formally the Frederick S. Upton Foundation Grant, has received a grant donation from Douglas and Sarah DuPont in the amount of \$1,000.00 and from J.P. Morgan Company in the amount of \$7,000.00. These donations will support Henley's Cultural Enrichment Program funding its artists-in-residence programs (Sculpture, Writer and Dramatic Interpretation). The projects will involve interactive activities to include hands on learning experiences for students with performing, visual and musical arts.
- The William A. Jones III Chapter of the Air Force Association has awarded Doug Mullinex of Burley Middle School with a Teacher Grant in the amount of \$500.00. The funds will be used to support his class project titled "Solar Car Design: a culminating class project designed to assess student's knowledge of applied physical principles."
- The Junior League of Charlottesville has awarded Stony Point Elementary a grant in the amount of \$1,000.00. The funds will be used to expand the library's reference collection.
- The Freas Foundation has awarded Jack Jouett a grant award in the amount of \$8,000.00. As a supplement to this grant award the Jouett PTO has made a donation of \$4,000.00. These grant donations will be used to purchase a new photocopier for teacher use.
- The Wal-Mart Foundation has awarded Red Hill Elementary a grant in the amount of \$500.00. The funds will be used to purchase non-fiction literary materials.
- The Wal-Mart Foundation has awarded Stony Point Elementary a grant in the amount of \$500.00. The funds will be used to support a two week artist in residence program which will accentuate the importance of diversity and the richness it can bring to a community.

Appropriation No. 2006-058, \$ 38,270.54. At its meeting on February 23, 2006, the School Board approved the following appropriations:

- B.F. Yancey Elementary School received a donation in the amount of \$100.00 from T & N Printing, Inc. It has been requested that this donation be used to help fund a field trip for Yancey students.
- Albemarle County Public Schools received the Title II, Part D, Enhancing Education Through The Technology Formula Subgrant in the amount of \$26,941.54 for FY 05-06. These funds will be used to improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in schools, providing funds for teacher training and curriculum development.
- B.F. Yancey Elementary School received a donation in the amount of \$150.00 from Herring's Trenching and Well Pump Service, LLC. It has been requested that this donation be used to help fund a field trip for Yancey students.
- B.F. Yancey Elementary School received a donation in the amount of \$100.00 from Land Planning & Design Associates, Inc. It has been requested that this donation be used to help fund a field trip for Yancey students.
- Greer Elementary School received donations totaling \$670.00: S.A. Albrecht donated \$50.00, Matthew & Dory Neurock donated \$100.00, Don & Karen Bergstresser donated \$50.00, Mark & Ingrid McLane donated \$20.00, Benny & Lali Mathew donated \$100.00, Carla Anderson donated \$5.00, Cindy Campos donated \$10.00, Katherine Day donated \$20.00, Mark & Amy Robbins donated \$100.00, Jee Soo Shin donated \$10.00, Tatito Senga donated \$10.00, Dari Martinez donated \$5.00, Hunter & Jennifer Wood donated \$25.00, Alfred Dunu donated \$25.00, Carol Yang donated \$20.00, Elizabeth Word-Glennie donated \$20.00, Oscar & Sonia Moreira donated \$25.00, The Paymar Family donated \$5.00, Byung & Chong Ju donated \$10.00, Jie Bai donated \$25.00, the Garbarino Family donated \$20.00, and Kin & Joan Choi donated \$15.00. These donations will help fund the construction of a track at Greer Elementary.
- The School Board agreed to purchase new laptops for their use in the current year. The laptops will be purchased from the School Board Reserve at a cost of \$10,309.00.

Appropriation No. 2006-059, \$ 6,365.00. The Department of Medical Assistance Services (DMAS) administers the State and Local Hospitalization (SLH) program for the Commonwealth of

Virginia. For FY 2005, the total state appropriation is \$10.8 million (84.1%) and the total local share funding will be \$2.0 million (15.9%), for a total funding of \$12.8 million. As in prior years, some localities will experience similar allocations to previous years, and some will be significantly different. The localities that are changing significantly this year are primarily changing due to changes in claims data from fiscal year 2004. DMAS is also implementing a calculation change that meets all the requirements of Section 32.1-343 et seq., of the Code of Virginia, which will result in a more equitable distribution to localities. DMAS has proposed a two-year phased-in approach which should result in a smoother transition for localities. As a result, an additional \$6,365.00 is needed for the County's share of the State and Local Hospitalization program for FY '06.

Appropriation No. 2006-060, \$2,558,534.71. The Board of Supervisor's approved policy allocates 100 percent of unbudgeted revenues and 60 percent of departmental expenditure savings to the CIP Reserve Fund for future capital needs, capital repairs and maintenance items and/or debt service. The policy further states that the remaining 40 percent of expenditure savings may be used for other projects at the Board's discretion and approval. The policy was developed to establish guidelines for the use of end-of-year revenues and expenditure savings. The preliminary estimate of the transfer to the CIP Reserve Fund was approved by the Board at its meeting on October 5, 2005, with the understanding that the appropriation of those funds would be finalized when the fiscal year audit was completed. This appropriation authorizes the transfer of \$1,475,017.82 in unbudgeted FY '05 revenue and \$1,083,516.89 in FY '05 expenditure savings to the CIP Reserve Fund pursuant to this policy.

Appropriation No. 2006-061, \$13,675.00. The Virginia State Police and the State Compensation Board are working together to have 95 percent of fingerprints and photographs submitted to the Virginia State Police by Sheriffs and Regional Jails done by LiveScan by July 1, 2007. LiveScan is an integrated booking system that electronically captures, prints and transmits fingerprints and data and has significant benefits over traditional ink methods. The State Compensation Board will contribute \$6,960.96 of the \$13,675.00 cost with the County's \$6,714.04 share being funded with the General Fund Balance.

Appropriation No. 2006-062, \$ 20,000.00. At its meeting on March 9, 2006, the School Board approved the following appropriation:

- The Saint John the Baptist in the Woods Foundation has made a grant in the amount of \$20,000.00 to the Club Yancey Program. The Foundation is a founding partner and has agreed to make an annual contribution which will assist with funding the Site Coordinator's salary and compensation expenses.

Appropriation No. 2006-063, \$ 625.00. In November, 2005 the local Sam's Club donated \$625.00 to the Fire/Rescue Department to recognize and reward volunteers. Fire/Rescue has requested that the funds be appropriated into the Volunteer Recognition budget code within the Fire/Rescue Recruitment and Retention cost center.

With no questions from Board members, the public hearing was opened. With no one from the public rising to speak, the hearing was closed and the matter placed before the Board.

Mr. Boyd **moved** for approval of the budget amendment in the amount of \$2,892,191.95 and to approve FY 2006 Appropriations No. 2006-057, No. 2006-058, No. 2006-059, No. 2006-060, No. 2006-061, No. 2006-062, and No. 2006-063.

Mr. Dorrier **seconded** the motion which passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.
 NAYS: None.

(Note: The appropriation forms are set out in full below.)

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
 APPROPRIATION NO. 2006--057
 DATE: 04/05/06
 EXPLANATION: Education Donations and Programs

TYPE	FUND	DEPT	OBJECT	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	SUB LEDGER		GENERAL LEDGER	
					CODE	AMOUNT	DEBIT	CREDIT
2	2000	18100	181009	Donation	J2	5,929.50		
2	2000	51000	510100	Appropriation - F/B	J2	226,292.20		
2	3104	18000	181221	Upton Found Grant	J2	8,000.00		
2	3104	18000	189900	Miscellaneous Revenue	J2	14,500.00		
1	2201	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	5,028.00		
1	2202	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	9,421.00		
1	2203	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	512.00		
1	2205	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	5,993.00		
1	2206	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	2,125.00		
1	2207	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	2,797.00		
1	2209	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	3,652.00		
1	2210	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	13,843.00		
1	2211	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	7,451.00		
1	2212	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	11,101.00		
1	2213	61101	550400	Travel-Education	J1	4,929.50		
1	2215	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	8,894.00		
1	2216	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	5,473.00		
1	2217	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	7,590.80		
1	2251	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	982.20		
1	2252	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	19,393.00		

1	2253	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	11,729.00		
1	2254	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	18,178.40		
1	2255	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	32,519.20		
1	2302	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	18,641.40		
1	2303	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	7,697.60		
1	2304	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	1,000.00		
1	2304	61101	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	33,270.60		
1	3104	60207	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	500.00		
1	3104	60211	312500	Prof. Service Instruction	J1	500.00		
1	3104	60211	601200	Books & Subscriptions	J1	1,000.00		
1	3104	60251	601300	Ed/Rec Supplies	J1	500.00		
1	3104	60252	312500	Prof. Service Instruction	J1	8,000.00		
1	3104	60253	800100	Mach/Equip- Adtl	J1	12,000.00		
	2000		0501	Est. Revenue			232,221.70	
			0701	Appropriation				232,221.70
	3104		0501	Est. Revenue			22,500.00	
			0701	Appropriation				22,500.00
TOTAL						509,443.40	254,721.70	254,721.70

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
 APPROPRIATION NO. 2006-058
 DATE: 04/05/06
 EXPLANATION: EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND GRANTS

TYPE	FUND	DEPT	OBJECT	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	SUB LEDGER CODE	AMOUNT	GENERAL LEDGER	
							DEBIT	CREDIT
2	2000	18100	181109	Donation	J2	350.00		
2	2410	60100	999981	School Board Reserve	J2	10,309.00		
2	3131	33000	330125	Technology Subgrant	J2	26,941.54		
2	9000	18100	181127	Greer Track Donation	J2	670.00		
1	2213	61101	550400	Travel-Education	J1	350.00		
1	2410	62110	800701	Computer Equip/Repl	J1	10,309.00		
1	3131	61311	160200	Stipends	J1	24,880.51		
1	3131	61311	210000	FICA	J1	2,061.03		
1	9000	60204	800909	Greer Elementary Track	J1	670.00		
	2000		0501	Est Revenue			350.00	
			0701	Appropriation				350.00
	2410		0501	Est Revenue			10,309.00	
			0701	Appropriation				10,309.00
	3131		0501	Est Revenue			26,941.54	
			0701	Appropriation				26,941.54
	9000		0501	Est Revenue			670.00	
			0701	Appropriation				670.00
TOTAL						76,541.08	38,270.54	38,270.54

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
 APPROPRIATION NO. 2006-059
 DATE: 04/05/06
 EXPLANATION: Additional Funding for State & Local Hospitalization Program

TYPE	FUND	DEPT	OBJECT	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	SUB LEDGER CODE	AMOUNT	GENERAL LEDGER	
							DEBIT	CREDIT
2	1000	51000	510100	Appropriation - F/B	J2	6,365.00		
1	1000	53012	571350	State & Local Hospit.	J1	6,365.00		
	1000		0501	Est. Revenue			6,365.00	
			0701	Appropriation				6,365.00
TOTAL						12,730.00	6,365.00	6,365.00

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
 APPROPRIATION NO. 2006-060
 DATE: 04/05/06
 EXPLANATION: Appropriation and Transfer of FY05 Revenue Surplus and FY05 Expenditure Savings to CIP

TYPE	FUND	DEPT	OBJECT	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	SUB LEDGER CODE	AMOUNT	GENERAL LEDGER	
							DEBIT	CREDIT
2	1000	51000	510100	Appropriation - F/B	J2	1,475,017.82		
1	1000	93010	930010	Transfer to GF CIP	J1	1,475,017.82		
2	1000	51000	510100	Appropriation - F/B	J2	1,083,516.89		
1	1000	93010	930010	Transfer to GF CIP	J1	1,083,516.89		
2	9010	51000	512004	Transfer from G/F	J2	2,558,534.71		
2	9010	51000	510100	CIP F/B	J2	(2,558,534.71)		
	1000		0501	Est. Revenue			2,558,534.71	
			0701	Appropriation				2,558,534.71
TOTAL						5,117,069.42	2,558,534.71	2,558,534.71

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
 APPROPRIATION NO. 2006-061
 DATE: 04/05/06
 EXPLANATION: Funding for LiveScan equipment in Sheriff's Office

TYPE	FUND	DEPT	OBJECT	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	SUB LEDGER CODE	AMOUNT	GENERAL LEDGER	
							DEBIT	CREDIT
1	1000	21070	800100	Mach. & Equipment J	1	13,675.00		
2	1000	23000	230202	State Comp. Board J	2	6,960.96		
2	1000	51000	510100	Fund Balance J	2	6,714.04		
	1000		0501	Est. Revenue			13,675.00	
	1000		0701	Appropriation				13,675.00
TOTAL						27,350.00	13,675.00	13,675.00

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
 APPROPRIATION NO. 2006-062
 DATE: 04/05/06
 EXPLANATION: Education Contribution

TYPE	FUND	DEPT	OBJECT	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	SUB LEDGER		GENERAL LEDGER	
					CODE	AMOUNT	DEBIT	CREDIT
2	3157	18000	181254	Misc. Revenue	J2	20,000.00		
1	3157	60213	111400	Salaries-Other Mgmt	J1	15,434.01		
			210000	FICA	J1	1,176.35		
			221000	VRS	J1	1,571.64		
			231000	Health Insurance	J1	1,758.00		
			232000	Dental Insurance	J1	60.00		
	3157		0501	Est. Revenue			20,000.00	
			0701	Appropriation				20,000.00
					TOTAL	40,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
 APPROPRIATION NO. 2006-063
 DATE: 05/04/06
 EXPLANATION: Donation - Volunteer Fire/Rescue Recognition

TYPE	FUND	DEPT	OBJECT	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	SUB LEDGER		GENERAL LEDGER	
					CODE	AMOUNT	DEBIT	CREDIT
2	1000	18100	181109	Donations	J2	625.00		
1	1000	32016	312200	Volunteer Recognition	J1	625.00		
	1000		0501	Est. Revenue			625.00	
			0701	Appropriation				625.00
					TOTAL	1,250.00	625.00	625.00

Agenda Item No. 12. **Public hearing:** Wickham Pond, request to amend the Albemarle County Service Authority jurisdictional area for water and sewer service to Tax Map 56, Parcel 92, located in the Crozet Community, on Route 240, adjacent to the Highlands Subdivision. (Notice of this public hearing was advertised in the Daily Progress on March 20 and March 27, 2006.)

Mr. David Benish, Chief of Community Development, said the applicant is requesting ACSA Jurisdictional Area designation for water and sewer service for the Wickham Pond development approved by the Board at its meeting on January 4, 2006. The 20.5 acre property is located on the south side of Route 240, adjacent to the Highlands subdivision. The property is located within the designated Crozet Development Area, in the White Hall Magisterial District. The parcel is currently designated for "water only to existing structures." The applicant is requesting water and sewer service to serve the development. The Board previously reviewed this request on March 1, 2006 and set this public hearing for comment on this proposal. The subject property is located in the Crozet Development Area. The water supply for Crozet is provided by the Beaver Creek Reservoir. Sewer service is provided by the Moore's Creek Treatment Plant via the Crozet Interceptor. The Comprehensive Plan recommends serving the Development Areas with public water and sewer service. This parcel is located within the Crozet Development Area, so designating it as part of the ACSA Jurisdictional Area for public water and sewer service would align with County policy.

Mr. Benish said that in December of 2005, as part of the Board's consideration of the Chitester request to amend the Jurisdictional Area in another part of Crozet, staff noted that while most of the Crozet Development Area is designated for water and sewer service, there are some parcels that have restricted designations ("water only", "water only to existing structures" or "limited service") or that are not included in the Jurisdictional Area. At that time, the Board directed staff to do the necessary research and set a separate public hearing to designate all properties within the designated Development Area for water and sewer service. Staff is in the process of doing the research to prepare for a comprehensive amendment of the Jurisdictional Area for Crozet, but will not be finished before this request goes to public hearing.

Mr. Benish said as a general policy, staff has advised that public utility capacity be reserved to support development of designated Development Areas. Since this property is located within a designated Development Area, the provision of both water and sewer service to the property would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan public utility policy. Therefore, staff recommends that the Board approve this request to amend the ACSA Jurisdictional Area designation to "Water and Sewer" service for Tax Map 56, Parcel 92.

With no questions for staff, the public hearing was opened. With no one from the public rising to speak, the public hearing was closed and the matter placed before the Board.

Motion was immediately offered by Mr. Wyant to amend the ACSA jurisdictional area designation for water and sewer service to Tax Map 56, Parcel 92, to serve Wickham Pond. Ms. Thomas **seconded** the motion, which carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.
 NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 13. **Public Hearing:** SP-2005-033. Westfield Road Center (Sign #62). Proposed: 3-Story 9,500 Sq ft building for office use with 2 residential units on approx 0.55 acres. Zoning Category/General Usage: C-1 Commercial - retail sales and service uses & residential uses by special use permit; EC Entrance Corridor overlay. Section: 22.2.2.6, Special Use Permit, which allows for residential uses allowed in Section 18, R-15 Residential (15 units/acre), in the C-1 Zoning District.

Comprehensive Plan Land Use/Density: Community Service-community-scale retail, wholesale, business and/or employment centers & residential (6.01-34 units/acre). Location: Tax Map 61W, Section 2, Block B, Parcel 1A; on the south side of Westfield Rd (Rt 1452), approx 300 ft from the intersection of Seminole Trail (Rt 29) & Westfield Road. Magisterial District: Rio. Concurrent Application: SDP 2005-00136. (Notice of this public hearing was advertised in the Daily Progress on March 20 and March 27, 2006.)

Ms. Echols reported that this is a request for a special use permit for construction of an office building located on a half-acre site near the corner of Route 1452 and Route 29 North behind the Albemarle First Bank. She indicated that the property is currently zoned C-1 so a special use permit is required for residential use. The proposal is for a 5,500 square foot, three-story building, with offices on the first two floors and residential on the upper floor. She said the ARB has reviewed the project and recommended a few minor changes which can be accommodated in the site plan process. She said the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval, along with a critical slopes waiver, with conditions as outlined in the Executive Summary.

Mr. Boyd asked if the County does fiscal impact studies on special use permit requests. Mr. Benish said that is not a normal practice, but is done on a case-by-case evaluation focusing on rezoning requests. He added that if it was a large, major residential request as a special permit, staff might do that analysis.

With no questions for staff, the public hearing was opened. With no one from the public rising to speak, the public hearing was closed, and the matter placed before the Board.

Motion was immediately offered by Mr. Slutzky to approve SP-2005-0033 with the two conditions recommended by the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Boyd. Roll was called, and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.
NAYS: None.

(**Note**: The conditions of approval are set out in full below.)

1. The site shall be developed in general accord with all sheets of the plan entitled "Westfield Road Center," date February 28, 2006, and prepared by The Gaines Group; and
2. A maximum of two (2) residential units may be permitted

Agenda Item No. 14. Closed Session.

At 12:08 p.m., **motion** was offered by Mr. Slutzky that the Board adjourn into closed session pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia under Subsection (1) to consider appointments to boards, committees and commissions.

The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Mr. Boyd. Roll was called, and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 15. Certify Closed Session. At 1:49 p.m., the Board reconvened in Room 235. **Motion** was immediately offered by Mr. Slutzky that the Board certify by a recorded vote that to the best of each Board member's knowledge only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed session were heard, discussed or considered in the closed session.

The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Dorrier. Roll was called, and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 16. Boards and Commissions - Appointments.

Motion was offered by Mr. Boyd to:

Reappoint Mr. Robert Foster, as the representative of Local Accommodations/Hotel Business, to the Charlottesville-Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau (CACVB) Management Board, with said term to expire June 30, 2008.

Appoint the following individuals to the Development Review Process Task Force as representatives of respective areas: Board of Supervisors: Mr. Ken C. Boyd and Mr. David C. Wyant; Planning Commission: Ms. Marcia Joseph and Mr. Eric Strucko; Development Community: Mr. Michael

Barnes and Ms. Valerie Long; Citizens: Mr. David P. Bowerman, Mr. Bruce Dotson, Mr. Michael Hancox and Ms. Ann Mallek; Professor Robert Spekman, Darden Graduate School of Business is to serve as facilitator.

The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Dorrier. Roll was called, and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 17. FY 2007-2010 Strategic Plan Work Session #3.

Ms. Allshouse reminded the Board that the 2002 Citizens Survey showed that 85 percent of respondents considered water protection one of the most important County priorities. She explained that staff took the priorities identified by the Board in September and formed measurable goals and objectives from them. She said her report today would focus on resource protection and water supply, noting that there are committees in place working on biodiversity, water supply, scenic and historic resources, etc. A lot of land use planning has to do with protecting water, adding that the County has taken some leadership with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, stormwater management, and groundwater protection. There are at least 28 strategies in the Comprehensive Plan for water protection. In September, 2005 the Board set as priorities implementing additional strategies to protect resources, to obtain final approval of a water supply plan, to develop a comprehensive wastewater plan, to implement an integrative water resource management plan, and to fund stormwater management.

Ms. Allshouse emphasized that coordination of efforts is important, as the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority (RWSA) leads direction on the water supply and wastewater plans. Albemarle also has to work with State and Federal agencies and other jurisdictions. She mentioned that the work on natural resources and water has to be fit within the work plan for the Community Development Department, and they already have a full schedule. She said the Stormwater Management Plans require a funding strategy, and that will also be a challenge. The measurable goal staff has written is that by 2010, working in cooperation with the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority and others, the quality, supply, and protection of water will be increased.

Ms. Allshouse said that by June, 2007 RWSA will get approval for a water supply plan, obtain a wastewater permit, and develop a drop management plan, adding that County staff will be working with them. She said the County also wants to develop a long-term stormwater management funding strategy by June, 2008, codify water resource strategies by June, 2009, and incorporate an integrative water resource plan into the Comprehensive Plan by June, 2010, along with enhancing the riparian buffer program. She said riparian buffers protect drinking water and support the Chesapeake Bay Program's goal of restoring 2,010 miles of buffer by the year 2010 (610 miles of stream buffers in Virginia).

Ms. Allshouse said the most important thing about a riparian buffer is that it reduces sedimentation deposits into reservoirs, noting that staff recommends requiring buffers on all streams – including intermittent streams, and in agriculture/crop lands. Staff also recommends replanting buffers while keeping people from destroying them in the first place, and pursuing additional resources for protection. She noted that there the State, County and Chesapeake Bay Program all have specific goals for buffer restoration.

Ms. Allshouse reported that staff wants to have better measurements based on outcome and results – obtaining approvals by RWSA, improvement in water quality such as with urban streams, having the funding mechanism in place for stormwater management, and citizen satisfaction with water protection. She added that with the 2004 Citizens Survey, 71 percent of respondents reported satisfaction with the County's efforts to protect water.

In response to a question from Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Allshouse confirmed that there are also educational initiatives to inform people of the importance of riparian restoration.

Ms. Thomas noted that by 2010, the Chesapeake Bay is supposed to be no longer "impaired water" or the EPA can take over the protection. She said it's possible that the year 2010 might get pushed back to 2015, and the EPA can also crack down harder on things like sewage output. She said the County has not yet developed buffers or in other ways reduced impact on the Chesapeake Bay. She is not happy saying that by June of 2010 there will be increased quality, supply and protection of the County's water resources. She asked why that goal has to wait until 2010.

Ms. Allshouse responded that the date can definitely change, but this Strategic Plan is for FY 2007-2010.

Mr. Rooker said the Board has discussed having the plan in place by June of 2007. Mr. Tucker commented that 2010 is the target date to have all those things in place, but some could be accomplished before then.

In response to a question from Ms. Thomas about specific tributary strategies, Mr. Mark Graham reported that it has been handled in a general fashion and the State has not required much on the non-point source side. On the point source side – wastewater treatment plants – the State is looking at a fairly impressive strategy for nutrient reduction through upgrades in those plants.

Mr. Rooker asked about the ratio of point source and non-point source pollutants that go downstream. Ms. Allshouse replied that it varies from location to location. Mr. Graham noted that the Upper James River is about two-third non-point source and one-third point source.

Mr. Rooker asked how the goals for the Chesapeake Bay Program could be achieved since the State is so focused on the point source, and the non-point source regulations are loose and without funding. He asked about \$200.0 million in available funds for assisting localities with point source treatment, and wondered if the County could possibly obtain money for the upgrade of the Moores Creek Treatment plant. Mr. Tucker said the County does not know whether it will get any of those funds for the upgrade.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that the County definitely wants to participate.

Ms. Thomas said Mr. Tom Frederick, RWSA Executive Director, mentioned that the rate for water might go up by \$10 a year for the next 10 years to cover upgrades in sewage treatment plants. She expressed her distress that it's going to take the County four years to achieve some of the things that have been set as goals for water protection.

Mr. Graham said that most of the things being discussed are already underway or getting ready to begin. It is just a matter of putting it all together and putting it down on paper, plus whatever additional strategies staff comes up with in the process. He added that with riparian restoration, there is an existing stream buffer program through the County's Water Protection Ordinance, and it could possibly be enhanced.

Mr. Rooker asked if it would make sense to have a plan before component parts are implemented, or if it makes sense to implement a number of component parts and hope they fit into the plan. Mr. Graham said some critical parts must be addressed because of other mandates; there are things the County wants to do in addition. He added that the final step is to look for where there are gaps and overlaps and try to address them.

Mr. Rooker commented that it would be helpful to have an outline of the 10 items it ought to include, to make it easier to evaluate how the issues are being addressed along the way so the Board understands that the things being done will fit into the plan.

Mr. Wyant asked where the effort will be put knowing that two-thirds of the pollutants are in the Upper James. Mr. Graham said there is a Federal mandate that must be responded to. An issue was raised as to whether there should also be a countywide program focusing on the mandate. Directions given to staff at that time were to start the program focusing on the mandate making sure staff has that under control. Staff was to look at funding strategies while also looking at whether the County was interested in expanding the mandate making it a countywide stormwater master plan.

Mr. Wyant asked what is being done to meet the mandates. Mr. Tom Foley, Assistant County Executive, replied that a few years ago the Board funded a \$370,000 increase to cover staffing positions and development of plans for facilities in place. Mr. Graham noted that the County is just finishing the second year of a five-year program. Everything is on track.

Mr. Rooker said there is a mechanism in place to gage what measures can be implemented that have the greatest impact for the dollars spent, on downstream water.

Ms. Thomas said she has been to several meetings about what other localities are doing for their own water protection measures. There is a real hunger for these kinds of educational programs, and she would encourage the Board to think about it might want staff to do in another year.

Ms. Allshouse thanked the Board for their guidance.

(Action: The Board concurred that the water resources objectives and strategies would be included in the draft FY 2007-2010 Strategic Plan.)

Agenda Item No. 18. Community Development Work Program, Work Session.

Ms. Lori Allshouse said staff wants to integrate the Board's strategic plan priorities into what Community Development staff is doing. She reviewed the timeframe for future discussions, including the public review period of the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Slutzky said the tone of the white paper includes a significant thread in support of the land use tax structure as a means of protecting water resources. He is not sure he completely agrees with that emphasis on the existing land use tax structure a way of doing that.

Mr. Rooker said that one of the strategies in the Rural Area Plan is to look at land use taxation, and the white paper is not anything the Board is opting for or approving. Mr. Tucker responded that staff was to bring that back and examine it.

Mr. Graham said staff has laid out a number of things in the work program that are worth exploring, but the biggest items of concern relate to the Board's Strategic Plan. He said the first priority is for master plans, which the Board has done on a case-by-case basis, rather than setting a schedule for implementation of the remaining master plans. Looking at the Strategic Plan, he said, with a goal set for

completing that, staff wanted to go ahead and get something in front of the Board. There are really two major components to master planning –development of the master plan, which is a lengthy process with lots of public input, and the review, where there's consideration of the master plan by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. He added that staff recognizes there is a public demand to get plans done as quickly as possible but there is only so much review that can be done at any given time. The recommended order is finishing up one master plan before picking up the next – finishing up the Pantops plan before picking up Rivanna Village plan next year, while still trying to finish the Places29 Master Plan. He said that after Places29 is finished, staff would then pick up the Southern Urban Area Master Plan, followed by plans for Development Areas 6 and 7 – the west side along the Route 250 Bypass. He stated that with Places29, staff has assumed that Zoning Map Amendments would not be put on hold while that master plan is undertaken.

Mr. Rooker asked if a separate plan will be done for the old Blue Ridge Hospital site. Mr. Graham said that is being contemplated, but nothing is finalized, adding that they have expressed an interest in bringing something forward.

Ms. Thomas said it would be nice to have a master planning process that allows for input from surrounding communities and allows the Commission to look at a larger area than they often do when considering a new development. She wondered if there are some pieces of the process that can be used now for master planning.

Mr. Slutzky said transportation intersects the master planning for smaller areas. He is concerned that there might be isolated units of master planning that don't relate well to each other. He thinks the most effective approach would be to start with a more comprehensive transportation planning exercise before there is a hodgepodge of internal coherence with no overarching coherence.

Mr. Rooker said part of the twenty-year road plan process is to create a long-term plan for transportation in the area, which is something that is to be done every five years; the UNJAM process is a regional transportation planning effort. He said the CHART-adopted projects are included and evaluated in the master planning process for each master plan, which is required under Federal law. A lot of projects are included in the twenty-year plan although they are not required by Federal law to be included. This is done in order to get a better understanding of how the area wide transportation system is supposed to work.

Mr. Slutzky expressed concern that there is a profound lack of integration between the overall transit strategies and the County's master planning efforts. He is nervous that the County will end up with an outcome that is not satisfactory. He cited Places29 as an example of how transportation planning efforts aren't meshing.

Mr. Boyd asked when the CHART plan will be up for review again.

Mr. Rooker replied that the process starts a year from now. It takes the committee two years to do a new twenty-year road plan, emphasizing that CHART takes everything from the master planning process as recommendations. The County influences that twenty-year road plan.

Ms. Thomas said if there is no coordination, it is the County's fault. Two members of this Board sit on the MPO now.

Mr. Boyd asked if the thousands of homes being considered in the master planning process are also being taken into consideration in transportation plans. Mr. Tucker responded that the density in the Comprehensive Plan is considered.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that the twenty-year road plan attempts to anticipate the Comprehensive Plan recommended densities, but the reality is there are not the funds needed to build all the projects.

Mr. Boyd asked if the proposed Southern Connector would solve problems associated with the proposed Biscuit Run development.

Mr. Rooker replied that the only thing that would totally solve transportation problems is to completely stop growth in the area, as most volume capacities on major roads today is over 1:1.

Mr. Slutzky asked if the County is inviting growth to certain areas first – such as Crozet – versus others by staggering the master planning. He asked if the advantage of integration is being lost. He is not sure that taking these things in succession independent of transportation is in the long run smart.

Mr. Rooker responded that the County should undertake whatever process gives the best result. Any suggestions for improvement should be considered seriously. He said that instead of raising questions, the Board needs to come up with some solutions. It needs to integrate transportation into land use. He added that Albemarle County is one of the few communities (with Places29 planning) that is doing what the General Assembly is contemplating requiring be done on a statewide basis.

Mr. Slutzky commented that no proposals for Places29 acknowledge connectivity to Pantops, although there has been discussion of such a connection.

Mr. Rooker said the County has funded the study for an Eastern Connector.

Mr. Slutzky said Places29 does not take that roadway into consideration.

Mr. Graham said based on what the Board did last year, staff amended what was being studied in transportation for Places29 including all options, and how the North 29 area would be impacted depending on where an Eastern Connector were built.

Mr. Rooker said if you are a Supervisor for an area and you see a flaw in the way something is being looked at, you can raise the issue, even in the middle of the process, not at the end.

Mr. Slutzky said he met with Mayor Brown of Charlottesville to discuss how Places29 proposals don't take into account regional planning, and that the Eastern Connector is not reflected in any of the proposals. He is concerned that plans are not being integrated, and wondered if the County should take a step back and look at how they should be connected.

Mr. Rooker asked if Mr. Slutzky feels the master planning process should be slowed down.

Mr. Slutzky said he is not necessarily advocating slowing it down, but said that if it is not slowed down, it needs to be funded more aggressively. One possibility would be looking at the proffers from future ZMAs and emphasizing the need for investment in the master planning process.

Mr. Tucker said the Board needs to consider whether they want the master planning and land use planning to lead or drive transportation, or vice-versa. Staff is trying to integrate them. He mentioned that there are improvements being considered in the Southern Urban Area, noting that the biggest problem has been lack of funds for the projects.

Mr. Rooker reminded the Board that a report they heard this morning indicated the right-of-way for the Meadow Creek Parkway would cost \$4.0 million more than the previous estimate; the total Secondary Road funds for the County this year is \$3.7 million. He added that the Jarmans Gap Road improvements have increased by \$2.0 million just in right-of-way acquisition costs due to inflation.

Mr. Slutzky said if the County accepts proffers at a per unit amount, perhaps some of the infrastructure costs could be offset through things like impact fees.

Mr. Rooker responded that if the County stopped growth in the County – except for by-right development – that would likely push growth into the rural areas. He emphasized that the County does not have state enabling authority for impact fees – statutory authority. He said the Board has to deal with the hand it was dealt. He suggested having a session/meeting where this is all that is talked about. He said everything the Board decides to do has some reaction on the other side, and it needs to be aware of that.

Mr. Slutzky agreed to a session that focused on how to maintain the current pace and have a master planning exercise that effectively integrates transportation plans. He does not want to slow down the master planning exercise and shut down growth in any way in the designated development areas, because the outcome would be forcing growth into the rural areas. He just wants to make sure the plans are integrated. Mr. Tucker said it might be helpful to have all transportation projects laid out so the Board can see what is happening simultaneously.

Mr. Boyd said that is what he thought would happen with the transportation plan.

Mr. Rooker commented that all the CHART projects are on a map.

Ms. Thomas said it's idealistic to think that the County could master plan the detail of all development areas.

Mr. Boyd said he sees no effective plan – even with Places29 – to deal with drive-time congestion on Route 29, getting people from employment centers to living centers. There is not even a practical solution to it.

Mr. Rooker responded that the origin/destination study for the Route 29 Bypass cost over \$1.0 million.

Mr. Boyd said he was told it was \$50,000.

Mr. Rooker said Albemarle contains the only eight-lane section of Route 29 in the state, and the County is addressing drive-time on 29 corridors in several ways: by filling in the gap areas where it is not eight lanes, parallel road plans, synchronization of traffic lights, etc. These are all included in the traffic modeling (for Places29). He emphasized that the only way he knows to approach the need is to map out what is wanted in transportation improvements and do the best to get it funded.

Mr. Slutzky said his bigger concern is how development activities will be oriented because of the Berkmar Road parallel road, and the Free State Road side, along with the conversation about connection to the Pantops area. He is concerned the County is moving down without clarity about transportation strategies regionally, which would be helpful to the Places29 planning exercise.

Mr. Rooker said that there have been traffic studies done with Places29 to show what transportation improvements and alternatives are needed. He asked Mr. Slutzky what he thinks should be added; what is not in there now? He said Mr. Slutzky is a member of the MPO, and he is a member of the Board of Supervisors, so if there is something – a road, a connector - that he does not think is being looked at that ought to be looked at – put it on the table.

Mr. Slutzky responded that when he met with Mayor Brown and Mr. Harrison Rue of the Planning District Commission, they talked about how one of the three proposals includes using the "Ruckersville Parkway" as a transit corridor. He predicted that there would likely be negative backlash surrounding that idea. He added that none of the proposals take into account an Eastern Connector, and that would change how the different neighborhoods are laid out relative to each other and relative to the rest of the growth area. He asked why that does not show up.

Ms. Thomas said it is her understanding that the extension of Free State Road is in one of the options (Alternative #2).

Mr. Graham suggested that he set up a meeting with Mayor Brown, Mr. Rue, representatives from VDOT, and others who have been involved in transportation planning, and get the concerns on the table prior to scheduling a work session for the Board to see if these people are comfortable with Places29 as it is going forward. He is not sensing that the Board will be able to resolve the question on the remaining master plans today.

Mr. Slutzky said he wouldn't want to represent to Mr. Rue that he is speaking on behalf of the Board, unless the Board felt it was appropriate.

Mr. Rooker responded that the Ruckersville Parkway will never be built, as there is no money to ever build a road of that kind. The project would probably cost \$150.0 million at a minimum.

Board members agreed that the Ruckersville Parkway should not be included in the modeling for Places29.

Mr. Boyd **moved** to direct staff to remove the Ruckersville Turnpike from consideration with the land use alternatives for Places29. Mr. Slutzky **seconded** the motion, which passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Ms. Thomas noted that the location study proposed goes from Meadow Creek Parkway as proposed at this time toward the east. The location that has been a County priority for years has been from that point toward the west. She said Free State Road requires a bridge, and is a very expensive road, adding that it was fought by representatives before.

Mr. Slutzky said the Free State Road version makes a big difference in how the northern end of the growth area is made denser. It might influence how the growth area is organized in the eyes of the public. He does not want to slow the process down, but he would like to accelerate the transportation component.

Mr. Rooker said the Board voted to put \$250,000 toward a study for an Eastern Connector, including a location study. As part of the study, there would be consideration of land use impacts, environmental impacts, traffic impacts, cost evaluation, etc., and it would likely take a year to complete.

Mr. Graham said staff is looking for a consultant right now, adding that the projection for the Eastern Connector puts it likely at Rio Road, Polo Grounds Road, or Proffit Road. He said the transportation modeling tries to account for those options, but it is not being shown on the Places29 alternatives yet because no one knows the location of such a road. He added that if Pantops and Places29 are kept as they are, nothing will change staff's workload over the next year, but it will the following year.

Mr. Boyd said he thought the order of Zoning Text Amendments was going to be changed. Mr. Graham responded that he had a recommendation to "flip them" primarily because of the Biscuit Run proposal.

Mr. Dorrier asked why the County is waiting until FY 2007-08 for a regional water supply plan. Mr. Tucker a lot of that is related to the regulators, and how quickly they will approve the plan. He noted that the plan is being finalized and will be submitted this summer to the regulators.

Ms. Thomas said what she is saying about master planning is because the southern urban area is getting a bigger project than most areas and it will have an impact in all directions. Mr. Graham responded that staff is looking at it in all directions. He commented that there is a gray area between a land use change and a master plan, because it is such a big plan (Biscuit Run).

Mr. Boyd asked if that developer has been asked to do traffic studies into the City of Charlottesville. Mr. Graham said "yes."

Mr. Boyd asked if the developer could do even more in the way of studies.

Ms. Thomas commented that the County has no duty to rezone that land.

Mr. Rooker said the developer has held community meetings, and is doing a regional transportation study. He added that there will also be a broad look at water resources. If a framework plan – which is somewhat less than a full master plan – could take a broader look at the southern

development area now and provide a first step for the master planning process, it should be done. Mr. Tucker said that would mean running a public process for three master plans at one time, which would be difficult.

Ms. Thomas commented that she does not really view what the developer is doing as master planning, as there are pieces that are not being done.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that there should be caution exercised that the traffic plans are being done with accuracy, to make sure all traffic impacts are taken into consideration. He asked whether there was a public input process that could be integrated into consideration of this very large development. He asked if a public information meeting could be scheduled before the Planning Commission meets to consider this project. Mr. Foley said that setting up a public information meeting would be a very proactive step.

Mr. Rooker said he views this process as something similar to the Places29 process. Mr. Foley said the difference is that there would not be master planning for the Southern Urban area right away, as there is with some of the other plans.

Mr. Graham reported that in 2005, the Planning Staff brought the Rural Areas Plan forward with 12 key implementation strategies. Staff has captured all of those in their work plan except for Land Use Taxation, which was left out. He said the other strategies have been laid out on the schedule, and asked if it would be appropriate for staff to put the land use taxation issue in the schedule.

Mr. Rooker asked if anyone objected to putting it in the 2008-09 work plan.

Ms. Thomas replied that she felt it would be a good time to do it.

Mr. Rooker suggested that in 2008-09 the Board look at the remaining strategies and have the Board set a prioritization with respect to what's left.

Mr. Wyant commented that people do not understand what options are available for their rural land, and the information needs to reach property owners.

Mr. Graham reported that the first round of changes in the work plan has been made in the Neighborhood Model Zoning Ordinance amendment. There are a number of areas in the Comprehensive Plan that tie either directly or somewhat directly to the Strategic Plan, such as the Economic Development plan. He reported that staff deliberately deferred the Proffer Policy earlier this year, adding that the Board might want to consider it next year.

Ms. Thomas asked when a transit plan might come into play with the schedule. Mr. Graham replied that staff could put it as a placeholder in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Rooker noted that the MPO is looking at the establishment of a regional transportation system – working with the City and University – and is in the early stages of looking at how that might work. He explained that in the past the University has not been interested, but recently agreed to participate. Everyone wants to understand how the economics might work – including the increase in costs for the existing transit service for next year. He said Williamsburg, the College of William & Mary, and James City County are further along in the process of looking at regional transit, and one person working with them has agreed to help with a plan for Charlottesville/Albemarle/UVA. He said this is a process that will take several years.

Mr. Boyd asked about the Historic Resources survey covering both FY 2006-07 and FY 2007-08. Mr. Graham said it cannot be completed in one year.

Mr. David Benish replied that FY 2006-07 is the completion of the Historic Resources Department database, and FY 2007-08 marks committee Work beginning to do similar work as they did with country stores – for churches and schools. It is a different type of survey.

Ms. Thomas commented that the department is currently surveying a particular type of school building – built in the 1920's – which was a "cookie-cutter" model for schools.

Mr. Boyd asked about the Route 250 West Task Force, and why there were not committees for other roads.

Ms. Thomas noted that when it was decided not to widen Route 250 West, the Board decided to form an advisory committee so developments taking place along Route 250 would have some way of getting citizen input, but VDOT doesn't pay attention to them. She added that the committee also questions whether they should exist, as they are frustrated with VDOT.

(Note: With no further discussion of this item, at 3:53 p.m. the Board recessed and reconvened at 4:07 p.m.)

Agenda Item No. 19. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Wyant reported that the Crozet Advisory Committee met last week, and has agreed to set regular meetings – the third Thursday of every month. He mentioned that there is no minority representation on the Committee and asked if there should be another member added to the committee.

Mr. Rooker responded that if Mr. Wyant is aware of a good addition to the committee, he should recommend him/her to be added, and everyone would likely be receptive to increasing the size.

Mr. Wyant said there was a meeting of business people in Crozet with about 15 to 20 people in attendance. He heard a lot of complaints about bicyclists violating traffic laws, especially when they're riding side-by-side. Mr. Tucker commented that it is not illegal to ride that way, but most riders try to stay in a single line.

Mr. Wyant noted that it is dangerous when bicycles and farm equipment are sharing the road. The Board members suggested that the Bicycle Committee develop a safety sheet to post along different bicycle routes. Mr. Benish said he would forward this to Mr. Juan Wade.

Ms. Thomas reported that at the Planning District Commission meeting, there was an update on air quality monitoring, and the DEQ specialist said that ozone and nitrogen dioxide are local so they want to catch emissions by putting an air quality station five to ten miles downwind from Charlottesville on a public site in the Southwest Mountains area; so far they have been unable to locate a site.

Ms. Thomas said the Mountain Overlay District Committee is having a six-hour meeting on Friday, April 7, 2006, in the County Office Building and will be making recommendations to the Board soon. It is something the community has worked on for a long time. But, there's more agreement now than there has been in the past.

Ms. Thomas asked if the Board plans to respond to Colonel Chiu's (NGIC) offer to meet regarding traffic issues.

Mr. Rooker asked staff to contact him to set up a meeting.

Mr. Boyd asked about moving forward on the plan for parking and walking trails on the Preddy Creek property. Mr. Tucker said the trails are already developed, and there is an effort to get the four-wheelers off of them. Mr. Pat Mullaney will provide the Board with an update.

Mr. Dorrier reported that the Lewis & Clark Exploratory Committee met at Sam Black's Tavern in Greenwood. They have received grants totaling \$100,000 from the Perry Foundation and another local foundation. He noted that there were about 100 to 150 people at the event, adding that Mr. Coran Capshaw moved the entire tavern to its current location.

Mr. Rooker said the MPO is in the process of attempting to finalize the FY 2006 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). A draft of that plan is on line at www.tjcdc.org for anyone who wants to review it.

Mr. Rooker asked for additional information on the recent collapse of part of the Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court Building during construction, and wondered if it would affect the project cost and schedule. Mr. Foley replied that structural engineers have come in to assess the damage.

Mr. Davis noted that there are several parties that could claim responsibility for what happened, and they are all insured. Mr. Tucker added that the City is managing the project, and is keeping the County informed of what's happening.

Agenda Item No. 20. At 4:26 p.m. the Board recessed and reconvened in Room 241 at 6:00 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 21. The meeting was called back to order at 6:02 p.m. by the Chairman, Mr. Rooker.

Agenda Item No. 22. **PUBLIC HEARING** to receive comments on the Board's Recommended Operating and Capital Budgets for FY 2006-2007. (Notice of this public hearing was advertised in the Daily Progress on March 26, 2006.)

Mr. Tucker said there were some changes identified at a recent Board work session, noting that growth management strategies are directed by the County's Comprehensive Plan, which has focused

since 1971 on directing growth into designated development areas while preserving the rural character and natural resources of the County. He mentioned that the plan has yielded a 35 square-mile urban city-like environment with 690 square miles of rural area to be protected and preserved.

Mr. Tucker said this financial plan is geared toward supporting the Board of Supervisors' vision for the County through the Strategic Plan and the Comprehensive Plan. The goals for the rural areas are to preserve agricultural and forestal lands and activities, protect water supplies, and conserve natural, scenic and historic resources. In the urban areas, he said, the goals are to promote compact development rather than sprawl, create self-sufficient mixed-use communities and provide for a full range of incomes and housing types.

Mr. Tucker said there has been a shift in where the majority of residents are living over the past eight to ten years, with an additional 14,500 people, or 53 percent% of the County's total population living in designated development areas. Those areas have reached densities requiring the County to plan for and invest in them in different ways, adding that this brings challenges and service pressures more similar to a small city than a traditionally rural or suburban county. He said results from the Citizens Survey show that the concept of focusing growth in designated urban areas to prevent sprawl and protect the rural character of the County continues to be supported by a significant majority of County citizens. When asked to rank the most important Strategic Planning priorities, he said, citizens indicated that rural area and resource protection related goals all ranked in the top 10 – protecting water supply and quality (99%), preserving natural resources and open space (95%), preserving farmland and forest (93%), and more parks and recreational space (91%).

Mr. Tucker mentioned that citizens have provided guidance and input regarding quality urban areas as well. According to residents of Albemarle County, infrastructure and services are keys to increasing the likelihood of someone preferring to live in an urban area as opposed to a rural area. Some of the goals that support the Board's vision as a community are offering a high quality of life while preserving natural resources and visual beauty for future generations, maintaining property taxes at current levels, increasing support provided to education and public safety. He emphasized that rural and natural resource protection remain a priority, but there is significant investment needed to accomplish that. He said there remains an emphasis on improved customer service by County staff.

Mr. Tucker reported that the operating budget is \$259.8 million, which is an increase of \$26.6 million, or 11.4 percent over the current fiscal year. He said that 62 percent, or \$16.6 million of the increase is allocated to the School System, which remains a high priority, and 14 percent or \$3.8 million of the increase goes to public safety initiatives, and \$1.2 million is placed in the Board contingency for FY 2007-08 public safety needs. He added that the budget also provides for expanding eligibility requirements for tax relief for elderly and disabled citizens. He mentioned that the Revenue-Sharing Agreement with the City of Charlottesville totals \$10.1 million next year, a four percent increase from the current year. There is \$1.4 million in recurring funds as an ongoing commitment for the ACE program and CIP funding of two-cents on the tax rate has been restored for various capital projects.

Mr. Tucker said the FY 2007 Capital Budget amounts to \$39.0 million and is built on the current real property tax rate of \$0.74 cents per \$100 value. He noted that the increase from his recommended budget to the Board's proposed budget amounts to approximately \$170,000, and under the administration function there was a savings of about \$45,000 because of a change in the vehicle decal program. There have been some reductions in expenses for the Regional Jail, Juvenile Detention and the ECC budgets, based on some revised estimates. There are some increases in funding provided to the Charlottesville-Albemarle Rescue Squad and the Drug Court, and additional funding for the proposed northern fire/rescue station for EMS staffing next year. There is a slight increase for Art-in-Place, and an additional Bright Stars Program adding \$154,000. There is also a small increase for "Save the Fireworks" and the Virginia Film Festival.

Mr. Tucker reported that CIP changes from his recommended budget add about \$390,000 to the ACE program, with the equivalent of one cent of the County tax rate going for that program. He added that there will also be an addition to the Capital Reserve of about \$690,000.

Mr. Tucker said local revenue has increased based on revised reassessment figures of about \$1.6 million for next year, and \$1.29 million in capital projects recognizing a transfer from the Fund Balance. The largest expenditure next year will be for School Division operations, at 47 percent, combined General Government/Capital Debt and School Capital Debt at 17 percent, and General Government funding at about 23 percent of total budget expenditures. He summarized that the real property tax rate would remain at the current level of \$0.74 cents per \$100 of assessed value. There is a significant investment needed to meet the challenges in public safety, urbanization, education, rural area preservation, and efficiency/customer services, along with anticipating fund reserves for future needs.

With no questions for staff, the public hearing was opened.

Mr. Dennis Odinov addressed the Board, commenting that as early as fiscal year 2003, the budget statement promised a strategy to ensure the implementation of completed neighborhood master plans. He said \$115,000 annually has been budgeted to accomplish this purpose, and unused funds have accrued to the next year. He said that funding for master planning has basically been prioritized on an ad-hoc basis by project, and again this year the County is starting the same process. He thinks there should be a comprehensive approach to master planning, saying that if the strategic direction of master planning is important enough to be a priority for four straight years, it should be directly linked to the budget, with accountability and a sense of urgency. What the County seems to be doing is altering goals to meet resources, instead of identifying what resources are needed to meet goals. He pointed out that these

planning funds have been spent but the planning initiatives have not been done – for Pantops, Rivanna Village, etc. What needs to be done is calendarize spending for master planning by specific project given a starting date, a finishing date, and going through the eight different phases of a master plan and identifying how much is going to be spent each time. He has submitted a petition with almost 400 names asking that master planning for the Village of Rivanna be in the early part of next fiscal year, not its latter part.

Mr. Joe Samuels, Vice-Chair of the ACE Committee, addressed the Board. He thanked the Board on behalf of the committee for its support of the ACE program, particularly the increased funding in light of rising real estate costs. He noted that ACE has been one of the most important aspects of achieving the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Sue Friedman, Chair of the School Board, thanked the Supervisors for supporting Albemarle schools as a “world class educational experience” by providing the resources for teachers, classrooms, and equipment.

Mr. Todd Palmquist, Director of the Piedmont Workforce Network, addressed the Board. He said the main purpose of his organization is to provide WIA programming to jobseekers and businesses in Area Six – encompassing a 10-county area that includes Albemarle. Funding this year would enable them to increase their services to area residents. He reported that for the 18-month period ending January 2006, his group enrolled 427 new people, of which 147 were Albemarle County residents. During that same period, they exited 266 people – of which 94 were county residents, and 43 left the program with credentials, and another 65 left the program employed in a position that on the average increased their salary by \$3,500 per year.

Mr. Vito Cetta addressed the Board on behalf of the Albemarle Housing Committee. He said the Housing Initiative Fund is presently funded at \$250,000 annually, and the committee would like it to be funded at \$500,000. Last year they helped 22 families purchase houses. There is plenty of Federal money for low-interest loans, but the weak link is down payment assistance. He said the average down payment assistance last year was \$37,000 – with half coming from the County and the other half coming from the Federal government, totaling \$820,000 last year in the County. He added that the Piedmont Housing Alliance is able to handle many people, and their eventual goal is to help over 50 families.

Mr. Kevin Wood addressed the Board on behalf of the Piedmont Housing Alliance. He said there is a need for more down payment assistance for the County Homebuyers’ Assistance Program. He said that starting in July, 2005 they placed \$2.5 million in first mortgage moneys and another \$714,000 of single-family regional loan fund first mortgage funds. He noted that the down payment assistance was about \$400,000 from Albemarle County, and \$419,000 in DHCD Home Funds. He said they projected the nine to 12-month figure as \$1.0 million per year combined with down payment assistance, and for next year there is only \$250,000 each from the County and DHCD Funds.

Ms. Shelly Murphy, Director of Program Services for PHA, addressed the Board. She oversees the Regional Home Ownership Center serving first-time homebuyers. Currently they have 93 active Albemarle County clients in a database, with 43 of them within six months of purchasing homes. The PHA has to compete for the first mortgage money from the State. They applied for \$13.3 million for the region and got \$8.0 million. In response to Mr. Boyd’s question, she explained that the \$37,000 figure is an average, which combines DHCD with local funds.

Mr. Boyd asked the maximum amount for down payment assistance. Ms. Murphy said it varies based on median income, but \$40,000 is the high end, adding that other sources come in and fill the gaps. She added that the average cost for the homes they are helping clients with is about \$180,000, noting that it is not always easy to find homes in that price range.

Ms. Monica Periosami addressed the Board, speaking on behalf of Western Albemarle County High School students in support of the proposed School Board budget. She said that as of January, 2006 the median house price was \$449,000, with homes in the competitive market at about \$326,000. She said the salaries of teachers in Fluvanna County are similar to those in Albemarle, even though the cost-of-living there is less. She said the Fluvanna Board of Supervisors is on the verge of passing a 5.5 percent raise for teachers, putting them nearly even with Albemarle teachers with five years experience. She said that as students, they care about their teachers and their salaries.

With no one else from the public rising to speak, the hearing was closed. Mr. Rooker said the Board would be voting to approve the budget at its meeting on April 12.

Agenda Item No. 23. **PUBLIC HEARING** on Proposed FY 2006 Tax Rates. (Notice of this public hearing was advertised in the Daily Progress on March 26, 2006.)

The public hearing was opened. With no one else from the public rising to speak, the hearing was closed. Mr. Rooker said the Board would be voting to approve the tax rates at its meeting on April 12.

Non Agenda. Mr. Davis reported that because of a scheduling situation with the Planning Commission, there needs to be a special use permit public hearing before May 3 for the American Cancer Society's Pink Ribbon Polo Event to be held at the King Vineyards.

Mr. Wyant **moved** to hold a Public Hearing on May 3, 2006, on SP-2006-03. Ms. Thomas **seconded** the motion, which passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No 24. Adjourn. At 6:35 p.m., with no further business to come before the Board, **motion** was offered by Mr. Wyant, **seconded** by Mr. Dorrier, to adjourn this meeting until April 12, 2006, at 3:00 p.m.

Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Slutzky, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier and Mr. Rooker.
NAYS: None.

Chairman

Approved by the Board of County Supervisors
--

Date: 09/13/2006

Initials: EWC
