

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 10, 2008, at 1:00 p.m., in Room 241 of the County Office Building on McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from March 5, 2008.

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

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Robert W. Tucker, Jr., County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, and Clerk, Ella W. Jordan.

OTHER STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Assistant County Executive, Tom Foley, Assistant County Executive, Bryan Elliott, Director of Finance, Richard Wiggans, and Budget Analyst, Laura Vinzant.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 1:02 p.m., by the Chairman, Mr. Boyd.

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session: FY 2008-09 County Budget: General Government section.

Overview

Mr. Tucker said he would start by discussing the Work Session Calendar. The goal today is to get through some of the Functional Area Details through the Public Safety category. On Wednesday March 12 the Board will start the work session with the School Board's proposed budget, an overview of the VERIP program by Human Resources, followed by amendments to the Capital Improvement Program budget. On Monday, March 17, staff will finish the Functional Areas with Human Services, Community Development, and other Non-Departmental issues. Finally, the discussion will go to the issues the Board identified for further discussion before making a final decision as to funding. The budget to be presented at a public hearing on April 2 will be finalized on the next Monday, or if that is not possible, the last work session will be on Wednesday, March 19.

Mr. Tucker said staff will go through each section today, and there will be ample opportunities for the Board members to ask questions. Staff can clarify issues and identify items for further discussion. Historically, the issues, questions and other items identified during the work sessions are put on a list for the Board to review at its last work session. This is done so the Board can see the entire list of items and decide to fund, or not fund, those items depending on available resources. This process has worked well in the past and hopefully it will work this year as well.

Revenue Summary

Mr. Tucker said General Fund revenues, as the Board knows, are projected to be fairly flat next fiscal year. Local Revenues are projected to increase only 1.4 percent; State Revenues are projected at - 1.9 percent. The overall General Fund is projected to increase 0.9 percent, less than one percent. As an aside, he reminded the Board that one penny on the real estate tax rate equates to about \$1.6 million. The Board needs to discuss the EMS Revenue Recovery Program and how it should be handled. Staff will give the Board an update on State Revenues. The General Assembly will continue to meet until Tuesday, but staff will try to give an update on the state perspective during these work sessions. There is also going to be a discussion about the revenues shown in the Five-Year Financial Plan.

Mr. Tucker said the Board knows there has been a greater than expected decline in the housing market. Real estate projections for the next fiscal year were updated in January, so his recommended budget is based on those revised projections. Planning must be done for future years so that is something staff needs to discuss with the Board. Based on current assumptions, staff has projected a shortfall in year two of about a million dollars, which is FY 2009-2010 of the Five-Year Financial Plan. If the EMS Recovery Revenue money is not available and if State Revenue declines, there could be a shortfall in those out years.

Mr. Tucker said reassessment projections are fairly fluid now, so staff will have to keep the Board updated on those. Every one percent change in the reassessment equates to about \$1.3 million. He said Mr. Slutzky had asked that question before, so he wanted to answer it today.

Expenditure Summary

Mr. Tucker said proposed expenditures are fairly flat although there are some anomalies. There is a 0.9 percent increase in expenditures as well as revenues in the General Fund. Across departmental expenditures, the market increase for salaries is 3.35 percent for Schools and Local Government. Thirteen positions are frozen and 3.5 positions have been eliminated. Health and dental insurance increases eight and six percent respectively, which is less than what staff projected in October and November, 2007. The County's Computer Maintenance Program has been changed from a three- to a five-year cycle. Some amendments have been made to extend the County's Vehicle Replacement Policy as much as possible. Capital Outlay for individual departments is fairly minimal. Overall there is a four percent agency increase which will be reviewed during discussion of functional areas.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the salaries of classified employees are included in this section. Mr. Tucker said the 3.35 percent includes both Local Government employees and all classified employees in the Schools. Teachers are still at four percent, which is the recommendation of the School Board.

Mr. Rooker said the increase for outside agencies is greater than any other component of the budget. Mr. Tucker said that was correct. Over the last several years a policy of granting about a four percent increase has been followed. Some agencies are funded at a higher amount; some are not funded at all, so the average is about four percent.

Mr. Boyd asked for the cost of the eight and six percent increases in benefit costs. Mr. Tucker said staff will get that number.

Ms. Thomas asked if the Board was going to discuss revenues. Mr. Tucker said he had talked about the General Fund revenues. However, if there is anything anyone wants to bring up, he would be happy to entertain questions now.

Ms. Thomas said the Board has discussed fees, but that will not come back for any action for a couple of months. Is there any assumption in this proposed budget about those fees, or is the budget based on the same fee schedule. Mr. Tucker said staff included those new fees as part of the expected revenues.

Mr. Tom Foley said the issue concerning fees will come back to the Board in a couple of months. It has been suggested that if some fees were increased by 20 percent, revenue could be generated to help fund some of the positions that are frozen now. Staff thinks there is an opportunity in the next few months to unfreeze some positions by increasing some of those revenues.

Mr. Slutzky said that could be problematic. If staff tells the Board that in vague terms, the Board may assume those frozen positions can be funded. In setting the tax rate, the Board needs the best estimate possible of what revenue may be assumed, and a proposal for how to address those positions through a different revenue stream. He thinks it is appropriate to bring that up now as opposed to later.

Mr. Foley said when staff presents the Community Development budget during the March 17 work session it will bring that to the table.

Mr. Tucker said staff will bring back a list of other taxes which the State Code allows if the Board so chooses. They allow sources for revenue other than real estate taxes; the Board could decide to increase rates in other areas.

Ms. Thomas asked the appropriate time to discuss revenues if this is not the right time. Mr. Tucker said it would probably be next Monday. To him, the time to do that is after the Board takes a comprehensive look at all the issues and makes a list of what things it may or may not want to fund.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the Board will be talking about shifting money from the Capital Improvements Budget. Mr. Tucker said that is already one of his recommendations.

Mr. Dorrier asked if that would balance the School Budget. Mr. Tucker said it would not entirely cover the shortfall.

Ms. Thomas asked if all payments are equal; is a penny from the CIP equal to and distributed in the same way as a penny on the tax rate. Mr. Tucker replied "yes."

Mr. Boyd asked if fees would be distributed in the same way. Mr. Tucker said they would not.

Ms. Thomas said apparently "in-lieu of taxes" is a revenue item paid on Federal park lands. She wonders if the County has any ability to get that same kind of tax payment when the Army facilities expand in the County. Mr. Tucker said that is something staff would need to look into.

Ms. Thomas said it won't help this year, but certainly it could when looking at the Five-Year Financial Plan. Mr. Tucker said he doesn't think the County receives anything from the NGIC facility now.

Ms. Thomas said maybe the County has not asked. Ms. Tucker said staff will look into the question.

Ms. Thomas said in looking at Wednesday's agenda, another petitioner is asking for a deferral even though the petition has been advertised for public hearing. The County does not charge a fee for advertising a second time. That is another thing to be considered when discussing fees. Mr. Davis said there is authority to do that in zoning fees.

Mr. Boyd said when discussion of fees is scheduled he would be interested in knowing what affect they have on affordable housing.

Mr. Slutzky said when the Board discussed budgeting last fall there was no particular support for freezing 16 positions. In this budget there are 13 positions frozen and 3.5 positions eliminated. Does the Board talk about those later? Mr. Tucker said that is a broad perspective so if the entire Board wants to consider unfreezing those positions, this question can be added to the list for discussion later in these work sessions.

Mr. Slutzky said at the Retreat last fall the Board members were asked to list the things most important to them. He thought there was strong sentiment expressed by the members that they did not want those positions frozen.

Mr. Rooker said he thinks Mr. Slutzky is right. Most of those frozen positions are in the Community Development Department. It would be helpful for Mr. Graham to give the Board some prioritization of those positions, what they mean in terms of doing current work, and some of the strategic things the Board has said need to be addressed. Mr. Tucker said those positions do not stay frozen. There is a process that prioritizes those positions so eventually some of them become unfrozen and are then replaced by others.

Mr. Slutzky said some have been frozen for a couple of years. Mr. Foley said staff reviewed those with the Board. There is a process to be followed to ensure core positions are filled. The Board actually left the 16 frozen positions in the five year plan and noted the savings involved in those 16.

Ms. Thomas said she remembers that only Mr. Slutzky and she thought differently on that issue.

Mr. Slutzky said he may be wrong; but he will have to go back and see what he actually said. Mr. Tucker said it can be corrected now if the Board wants to pull those out. Mr. Foley said many more millions of dollars of adjustments to the Five-Year Plan would have been needed if those positions were going to be funded. Mr. Tucker said staff will identify each department that has a position or positions frozen. If the Board wants to move those to the list, it can be done.

Ms. Mallek asked if staff looks at sales tax receipts from month to month. Mr. Tucker said all tax collections have been reviewed. That is how they came up with the revenue projections.

Mr. Slutzky said one assumption made by staff when doing the five-year planning was a five percent increase in revenues for the next reassessment. Mr. Tucker said that is why he had used the word "fluid" to describe projected revenues.

Ms. Thomas said taxpayers living in the same homes in which they lived last year will be paying real estate taxes of over a million dollars less than they paid last year because new construction makes up that difference. That is why the County is not totally "in the red." She said that answer is relevant when talking about the impact on taxpayers.

Mr. Rooker said residential assessments were down by 1.9 percent. Mr. Tucker said that is correct. Commercial and raw land had some increases that brought the County above the zero percent or negative increase for all reassessments.

Mr. Slutzky said another factor that will hurt the County worse next year is that some properties continued to go up last year after they were assessed and then their value peaked and went down; that fact is part of the 1.9 percent. Presumably between this year's assessment and next year's, their values will only go down. There will probably be a bigger drop off depending on the market.

Mr. Tucker said if there were no other clarifications needed, he would continue with the next section of the presentation.

Functional Area Detail

Administration

Mr. Tucker said there is an overall increase of about \$88,000.00 in all of the departments depicted on the pie chart which is a 0.8 percent increase over Fiscal Year 2008. The **Board of Supervisors'** budget increased just under \$30,000.00, or 5.9 percent. Much of it is due to an increase in overtime, the cost of the Annual Audit which is a little under five percent, and advertising which has gone up by \$12,000.00 or 33 percent. This budget continues to fund the Board's membership in the TJPED and the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Tucker said the **County Executive's** budget has decreased about \$95,000.00 or six percent which is due primarily to reorganization of the Office on Management and Budget. There is a reduction in the ACE publicity line item; it has been reduced by half. That was done because last year only half of that line item was expended and it was the second most successful year in terms of requests received.

Ms. Thomas asked about the video the ACE Committee had assumed was going to take place this year; it never was created. Ms. Lee Catlin said it is still funded. Since there were more applications than there was ACE money to fund them, they wanted to make the timing of the video appropriate.

Mr. Boyd asked staff for an expenditure forecast of the current year. The County is now nine months into the budget and it should be below what was spent last year in several areas. All of the increases have been based on what is projected will be spent. He asked that staff get the Board revised estimates for use during these budget work sessions.

Ms. Thomas asked if that is what the column titled "revised" means, or might the estimates be even higher than what Mr. Boyd is assuming. Ms. Vinzant said the "revised" column includes the cost of frozen positions and any reductions that have been made during the current year.

Mr. Dorrier said normally staff gives the Board an update every quarter and the budget is amended based on that update. Mr. Tucker said the update every quarter is informational. Mr. Foley said the Mid-Year Financial Report included the frozen positions and the impacts. What is shown in the budget document reflects what staff projected in the Mid-Year Second Quarter Financial Report.

Ms. Thomas said in the County Executive's budget there is an item titled "Countywide Performance Management System." She asked if this is what shows in the various departments as their goals and objectives and how the department is meeting those. Mr. Foley said "yes."

Ms. Thomas said this is a fairly new item and she finds it to be very useful. It lets the Board and the public know how the department is doing. She asked if this will be used for each of the departments eventually. Mr. Tucker said it is already being used in most departments. It is not in place for constitutional officers and judges, nor in place for the Board of Supervisors or the County Attorney.

Mr. Rooker said he had a question about the format. In the Board of Supervisor's budget, there is an operating line of \$242,000.00 shown for FY '06-07. He asked what is included in that operating number. Mr. Tucker said the number includes every expenditure in that department exclusive of salaries and benefits.

Ms. Thomas said she thinks it would be helpful to have that number broken down as to categories. Mr. Foley said that back up material is a fairly large document, but a copy can be sent to the Board members if they so desire.

Mr. Tucker said the budget for the **County Attorney's Office** has increased by 6.8 percent or \$57,000.00 primarily due to full-year funding of a new Assistant County Attorney.

Mr. Tucker said the **Human Resources Department** has an overall decrease of \$75,000.00 or -7.6 percent. The position of Organizational Development Specialist is currently frozen.

Mr. Boyd asked if this is just the cost of the County's portion of Human Resources. Mr. Tucker said "yes", this budget only shows Local Government's share of that office's expenses.

Ms. Thomas said she was pleased to see there is a Wellness Program in place, even though there does not seem to be good participation in it yet. She asked if each department determines their target; in going through the budget she noted that in some departments targets have been lowered or raised so it was hard to tell who determines the target. Mr. Tucker said the departments work with the Assistant County Executives to make that determination. Mr. Foley said last year was the first time these targets were shown in the budget. This is just the beginning of a process; many localities in the State are going through the process of developing good measures and KPIs so that is why fluctuation is seen in the targets. Staff will continue to monitor this program in order for the right kinds of targets to be set.

Mr. Tucker said the budget for the **Finance Department** increases by almost \$128,000.00 or 3.3 percent. This was primarily due to reclassification of some positions in the current year. Also two positions, Office Assistant and Tax Clerk, are frozen.

Mr. Tucker said **Information Technology** had a modest budget increase of about \$17,000.00 or 0.6 percent. In that Department there is a frozen position, Office Assistant, and there was decreased funding for software purchases as well.

Mr. Slutzky asked where the reduction for computer maintenance is shown. Ms. Vinzant said it is across all departments so it is shown in each.

Mr. Slutzky asked if staff is suggesting that computers should last five years instead of three years. Mr. Tucker said that is not just for IT, but for all computers.

Mr. Slutzky said he does not think that is prudent. He worries about productivity issues when getting four or five years out in a computer's life cycle. A computer that will not be "Vista" compatible in two years is going to be a dinosaur. When software comes along, it's going to be more demanding of both processor capabilities and memory, and with an old machine the memory cannot be upgraded. He just replaced a computer at home that was almost four years old because he couldn't upgrade the memory above a half-a-meg. Now computers have three gigabytes of memory. He wonders if the County is just kidding itself thinking that what is bought today will be functional four years from now without having significant productivity declines.

Mr. Rooker asked the savings from going from a three-year to a five-year computer replacement cycle. Ms. Vinzant said it is about \$100,000.00 total. Mr. Foley said the IT Department considered this change carefully. The County has an enterprise agreement with Microsoft for replacement of software, etc. to keep the desktop computers current. Considering all of the issues the Board has raised, the IT Department is comfortable with going to that five-year replacement cycle. Staff can provide the Board with more information on this topic, if so desired.

Mr. Slutzky said he would appreciate learning more, and would also like to have someone more versed in technology be present to answer questions.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the Albemarle County School System was included in this computer analysis. Mr. Tucker said it does not include them.

Mr. Dorrier said he thinks there could be "more bang for the buck" if budgets for computers were combined thus purchasing more at one time for less. There are benefits to mass purchasing. Mr. Michael Culp, Director of Information Technology, said school purchasing gets significant discounts but Local Government is not allowed to participate. That is the challenge with bulk purchasing.

Mr. Rooker said he understands there are special deals available to the School System that are not available to Local Government. Mr. Foley said that is correct.

Mr. Foley suggested that Mr. Culp comment on the three or five-year replacement cycle. Mr. Culp said what IT looked at in terms of the three or five-year computer replacement cycle is becoming the industry standard because the computers themselves are becoming more replaceable, the parts etc. As far as computing power is concerned, there is not a big need to replace them as frequently as in the past. Standard machines will be replaced less frequently in the future. Staff can furnish the Board more information about this item.

Mr. Slutzky said he would like to understand this recommendation better.

Mr. Rooker said saving a hundred thousand dollars per year total by going from three to five years is not a large item. If the Board found later that it was not working, an adjustment could be made at that time. Mr. Foley said this is a review of the County's programs and services, and figuring out whether they are at the right level rather than saying the County is short on money so a cut needs to be made. Staff is comfortable that this is a good long-term decision because of the capacity of computers these days.

Mr. Rooker said in the IT budget there was a big increase between last year and this year. He would find it helpful to understand what that increase was last year and what basic categories are included in that number. Mr. Tucker asked Ms. Vinzant for an answer.

Ms. Vinzant said the increase was for Access Albemarle. Funding for maintenance payments began in the current year. Staff does not anticipate the money will be spent in the current year. The big difference between the FY '2007 actual and the appropriated amount for FY '2008 was a \$250,000.00 maintenance contract payment for Access Albemarle. Mr. Foley said it was the cost of all the maintenance and software purchased for the implementation of Access Albemarle.

Mr. Boyd asked if more money will be needed for Access Albemarle. Mr. Foley said the amount shown in the budget is adequate to maintain the maintenance contract and so forth. Staff is in the process of revising the whole Access Albemarle approach and they believe some of the maintenance cost may come down. There is still a lot to work though with Microsoft on how that can be revised, but staff thinks that is a safe number for the budget.

Mr. Tucker said the budget for **Voter Registration and Elections** increased about \$28,000.00 or 6.2 percent. That increase is primarily associated with the Presidential Election in November, 2008. They have a new, unfunded request for \$19,620.00 in anticipation of a high voter turnout. Also, the State Board of Elections has a new policy requiring the Registrar to submit a new voting machine security plan; that may result in an upgrade to security.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the County has 106 voting machines. Mr. Tucker said that number is correct.

Ms. Mallek asked if that number includes the machines bought in June to beat the deadline. Mr. Tucker said "yes."

Ms. Thomas asked if buying all new machines or changing all of the voting machines is now budgeted in the Capital Improvement Program. Mr. Tucker said that is correct.

Ms. Thomas asked if there was a progress report on the voting machine change over. Mr. Jake Washburne, Registrar, said that for the last year House Bill 811 has been pending before the United States House of Representatives, but the House still has not taken any action. This continues to be a problem because it will set new voting machine standards and probably set some type of paper trail standard. What will be adopted is still unknown so if the County were to purchase new machines now, the new machines might not meet the standard set if the House gets around to passing the bill. The best thing to do is to wait until they adopt the new standards.

Mr. Rooker asked if the Act pending before Congress will provide any funding to localities. Mr. Washburne said that every time he has looked at the bill, the wording has been changed. At one point there was a provision for funding, but he doesn't know the current status of the bill.

Ms. Thomas asked if the Voting Machine Security Plan needs to be done before July, 2008. Mr. Washburne said that as a practical matter it cannot be completed until the beginning of the new fiscal year. This new initiative requiring every registrar in Virginia to submit a Voting Machine Security Plan was just announced. That plan will be vetted with the assistance of the Virginia State Police. After that is done, he understands they will return to the local registrars with suggestions on how to improve different aspects of the plan. All registrars are scrambling to put together a submission, but he does not think these plans can get through the process before the first of July.

Mr. Tucker said that concludes the overall review of Administrative Departments. He asked if there were any areas the Board wanted to move to the "list" for further discussion, for example, the additional request of \$19,620.00 for Elections would be an appropriate one to add.

Ms. Thomas and Mr. Rooker felt it definitely should be on the list.

Mr. Slutzky said he wants to mention something he has raised before, even though there was not a lot of enthusiasm among the members. He will raise the issue again because he thinks it should be considered in the context of five-year planning. He thinks there should be staff support available for some members of the Board. For the amount the Board members are compensated it does not allow them to do it on their own. Personally it is not a big problem, although there are those who argue that it is a bar to attracting certain kinds of people to run to be a Board member. One thing he struggles with is the complexity of the job. If Board members have to work full-time to support their family, it would be helpful to have some level of staff support. Albemarle County Supervisor members get about \$14,000.00 in compensation and no staff support, compared to Fairfax County where their Supervisor members make \$75,000.00 a year and have an individual budget of \$400,000.00. He knows there is a lot more complexity to their situation, but he still wonders if anyone else on this Board would find it useful to consider putting into the budget enough money for two board members to share some staff assistance on a part-time basis.

Mr. Slutzky said he is trying to find a solution in the form of an intern from the University of Virginia, but his initial efforts have not proved fruitful. He asked if the other Board members think that is a useless idea or if it should be forgotten. He also asked if the Board might explore this idea for next year's budget and perhaps include \$100,000.00 in operations to fund three full-time people who could be shared by two board members each.

Mr. Boyd asked Mr. Davis if that would in any way be considered a form of compensation for the Board members. Mr. Davis said there are limitations on the Board's salary but he can't think of anything that would legally prohibit hiring additional staff to support the Board.

Mr. Dorrier said a better solution might be a computer upgrade or some sort of lending library. He gave the example of Affordable Housing and said it would be helpful if there were a section listing the latest information on that or any other topic that the Board members could access from their computers. In his opinion, the County has done very little in the way of cataloging the information it has and organizing it to make it easier to find. He thinks the Board needs assistance in that aspect.

Ms. Thomas said she is interested in pursuing the idea; it just isn't appropriate for this year's budget. When asking people whether they would consider being on the Board of Supervisors, the amount of work and the hours needed puts off a lot of people who are still young enough to be raising a family. She is not sure that is the best approach, but there needs to be something done to make the job more feasible for a wider range of people.

Mr. Rooker said he would not support this idea until the frozen positions are unfrozen and the Schools are funded better than they are in the current budget. All of these things involve weighing one priority against another. He would rather have staff that can get done in a timely fashion what is expected of them. It is a matter of priorities and Fairfax County has plenty of money and is funding plenty of things that Albemarle County is not funding. Their tax rate is higher but it is just a matter of priority. Although Mr. Slutzky's suggestion is good, there are a lot of other good ideas that are not being funded.

Ms. Mallek said she is having a difficult time keeping herself organized and keeping the information square. She likes Mr. Dorrier's idea of posting information to a public folder on the County's Website so she would not have to find information on her own.

Mr. Dorrier said it would be cheaper to do something like that rather than what Mr. Slutzky is proposing. Even though Fairfax is a wonderful county, bringing their system to Albemarle might not help that much.

Mr. Rooker said he understood that Mr. Dorrier was suggesting that documents be dropped into categories on the website so you could just click on a category such as Affordable Housing and all of the documents pertaining to that subject would be available for review. In his opinion, one of the most difficult things about the County's website is that he is rarely able to easily find what he is searching for.

Mr. Foley said IT can provide answers to some of these questions. Staff will discuss this idea and bring back information on how it can be made easier to access information on the website.

Mr. Slutzky suggested that when the Board has completed this budget process, it go back and revisit the issue of how the Board members might optimize their time. He is a member of the Toxic Chemical Task Force, and there have been documents he wanted to access, but all of the members of that task force are County employees and he does not have access to the same website that these individuals use. They have to go through the crude process of putting the information into a PDF format and then e-mailing it to him. There are a lot of functional disconnections that could be improved so the Board members could be more efficient without necessarily costing the County money. He asked Mr. Boyd if he had any opinion as to whether or not there is any value in exploring this particular issue further.

Mr. Boyd said he thinks the County has more pressing financial problems to tackle at this time.

Mr. Rooker said he would be interested if IT could come back this year and give an estimate of how much it would cost to add more functionality to the County's website than it currently does have. He said Google makes available a lot of their search parameter stuff for local governments and even private industries.

Ms. Lee Catlin said staff has already taken RFP's to do an overhaul on the website. It has been over four years since the content management system was updated. Staff is aware that the search function is a problem. Hopefully, it can be done quickly.

Mr. Slutzky said if staff has already put out an RFP and solicited bids it must be for specific work. It would be a little "after the train left the station" to come back and ask the Board what type of work is wanted. Ms. Catlin said it is open-ended. They want site navigation improved and the architecture of the site. It is still open-ended as to what the candidates will actually come up with for the County.

Mr. Tucker asked if there were any other areas in the Administration function that the Board wanted to move to the "list", other than the Voter Registrar and Election request. There were no suggestions given at this time.

Judicial

Mr. Bryan Elliott said the Judicial Functional category includes funding for the **Sheriff's Office**, operation of the **County's Court System**, the **Commonwealth Attorney's Office**, and the **Clerk of the Circuit Court**. The total proposed expenditures for this category is just over \$3.8 million, which is an increase of \$111,567.00 or three percent over the current fiscal year. He noted that both the Sheriff and the Commonwealth's Attorney have submitted additional funding requests since completion of the County Executive's proposed budget, FOR a total of about \$8,351.00.

Mr. Elliott said the **Clerk of the Circuit Court** has a proposed increase of \$32,914.00 or 4.7 percent.

Mr. Rooker said he understood this Department was actually supposed to be a State-funded function. The County is once again seeing an area where it is incurring local expenses to help fund a State function. He asked if the revenues for this department are only increasing by two percent from the state. Mr. Elliott said that was correct.

Mr. Rooker asked if most of the expenses of this department are in salaries and benefits. Mr. Elliott said that is correct.

Mr. Rooker asked if the State is providing any significant salary increases for these employees. Mr. Elliott said the State is providing no increases for Fiscal Year 2008-09.

Mr. Boyd said that is the same across-the-board; there are no increases for any State employees.

Mr. Slutzky said a decision was made that the State would save taxpayers money by not raising State taxes knowing full well that pushes the burden down to local government.

Ms. Thomas said this department is not counted when the Board discusses unfunded mandates, but it certainly is one. It is the Board's choice to have the Clerk's employees and everyone else receive a reasonable cost-of-living increase in salaries. The State takes pride in its support of the Clerks, the Sheriffs and the Commonwealth's Attorneys, but then they don't do it.

Mr. Rooker said it is worth pointing out. He understands the net cost number for the **Commonwealth Attorney's Office** is the net cost to the County. This year the County is incurring \$387,000.00 of local expense for the Commonwealth Attorney's Office, which is supposed to be a State funded operation. Similarly, for the Clerk there is \$364,000.00, so when all these things are combined the total is about \$1.5 million to fund State offices in this locality.

Mr. Boyd asked if there is any requirement that the Board do that or does the County just do it. Mr. Tucker said the Clerk is different, but the County has an agreement with the Sheriff's Department and the Commonwealth Attorney's Office stipulating that their employees are on the County's pay plan. The County agreed to fund their requests, but he does not think there is the same agreement with the Clerk of the Circuit Court. The Clerk basically operates within the current revenues they receive from the State.

Mr. Rooker said what is shown in the budget is that half of the Clerk's revenue is coming from local government.

Mr. Dorrier said he thinks the Board needs to look at the Clerk's Office because she has expensive recording machines for all of the records their, plus they take care of all wills going back to Thomas Jefferson's Will, and their books are in awful shape. He said it looks like there needs to be some work done there.

Mr. Slutzky asked if Mr. Dorrier was suggested that the Board increase the budget allocation so they can make improvements in that Department.

Mr. Dorrier said they should at least use what they have and spend the resources wisely. He knows they have competitive bidding for machines but he thinks the County should also have some input. It should be more than just the Clerk picking out a machine.

Mr. Rooker said he understands that all of those things are State authorized and everything is purchased by the State through state contracts.

Mr. Dorrier said the local clerk has some discretion. He wants to make certain that if the County is paying half of the Clerk's budget with local money, there is some local control. He asked Mr. Tucker for his thoughts. Mr. Tucker said that would be nice, but he doesn't think it works that way.

Mr. Rooker said he thinks there is almost no local control over any of these offices. The real question is whether or not the County wants to continue to subsidize salaries to the extent that it is currently doing in order for these departments to hire a minimum number of people to operate their departments efficiently and pay people a reasonable amount of money to live in the community.

Ms. Thomas said the Constitutional Officers used to have quite an effective lobbying group; they were regarded as powerful in the State of Virginia. She is not certain whether that is still true, or if they simply assume local government will pick up the difference. Mr. Tucker said the clerks of the circuit courts still have fairly strong lobbying and authority powers. That does not mean the localities should see a shift of funding from the state to the localities.

Ms. Thomas said if the County always picks up the cost they have no reason to go to the State and ask to be paid sufficiently.

Mr. Boyd asked if the increase from 3.35 percent to 4.7 percent in salaries is due to the addition of staff. Mr. Elliott said it has been at 11 employees for the last several years.

Mr. Boyd said the recommended budget says they are following the 3.35 percent market adjustment for County employees. That is in line with the County, but yet their salaries are going up by 4.7 percent. Ms. Vinzant said that office is always budgeted at the same market as that for County employees. That is done in part because staff does not always know what the State's compensation increase will be at the time the budget is developed, but the Clerk's employees will actually be paid at the State level.

Mr. Boyd asked if there is a 4.7 percent increase in salaries as opposed to 3.35 percent because the State is adjusting salaries higher. Ms. Vinzant said the percentage increase is applied to their actual current salary. However, their salary this year may or may not be what was budgeted last year.

Mr. Tucker said there was a turnover in the position of Clerk this year, when the previous Clerk retired. That is probably why the salary jumped up in next year's budget.

Ms. Mallek said it looks like the 4.7 percent also included benefits. That is probably why there was more than the 3.35 percent.

Mr. Davis said that by law the County is required to provide the employees of constitutional officers the same health benefits and insurance provided to other County employees.

Mr. Rooker said that is required whether or not it is fully reimbursed. Mr. Davis said that is correct. The State Compensation Board controls the salaries on an annual basis. It is controlled by whatever the General Assembly provides for funding; next year it is zero. There are some positions that are 100 percent locally-funded because they have not been approved by the Compensation Board. He knows the Sheriff's Office has several locally-funded positions.

Mr. Boyd said the Board approved those. Mr. Davis said that is correct.

Mr. Elliott said the budget for the **Commonwealth Attorney's Office** increased by \$13,787.00 or 1.6 percent. There is a new request for \$6,000.00 to partially fund a Domestic Violence Coordinator's position. This position has served both City and County residents for a number of years and is presently housed in the City Commonwealth Attorney's Office. The position had been funded through State grant funds; this is another position that is being shifted away from the State to localities. In February, Ms. Denise Lunsford learned the grant for the upcoming year would be short and that has created a \$6,000.00 variance in the amount of funding needed to continue the position and services to domestic violence victims in both the County and City. Over the years, the City has provided in-kind support for this position in terms of office space, telecommunications and IT support. This is the first time the County has been requested to fund the position, but it does appear that over the ensuing years the State will most likely be reducing funding for this type of position. Ultimately the City and the County will have to decide whether or not they want to continue the program. He said Ms. Lunsford is present today and can answer questions.

Mr. Slutzky asked if the City is going to fill their \$6,000.00 gap with more in-kind services or are they going to write a check.

Ms. Lunsford said that during the ten years the position has been funded by the grant, the City provided all of the office space, telephone and equipment, letterhead and things of that nature. She understands that amounted to about \$2,400.00 a year in actual outlay over and above the space. The position was designed to be fully funded by the State, as far as the salary is concerned, for the first ten years, and then it was anticipated it would decrease by a set amount over some number of ensuing years. It was anticipated that localities would pick up the funding and this is the first year of the decrease.

Mr. Slutzky asked if Charlottesville has a reciprocal request for an additional \$6,000.00 in their budget as well.

Ms. Lunsford said she understands they do not this year. Over the past few years they have provided funding for the position in other ways. It is not her intention to ask the County to fund the entire

program as funding decreases, but it seemed equitable to ask the County for funding in FY '2009 because it has not been asked to provide funding over the past ten years. During the two calendar years, 2008 and 2009, \$6,000.00 will be needed each year to fill the gap. There are savings in her FY 2007-08 budget from vacant positions that can be used to fund calendar year 2008. The \$6,000.00 that she is asking for is to help fund the 2009 calendar year. It is her anticipation that the City will be asked to provide funding for calendar year 2010 and subsequent years.

Mr. Slutzky asked if there is a formula indicating what the decrease will be each year. Ms. Lunsford said it is her understanding that it will be 15 percent per calendar year.

Mr. Dorrier asked how this meshes with Ms. Susan Painter's Victim Witness Office. Ms. Lunsford said Ms. Painter's office for the Victim-Witness Coordinators is run through the Police Department; there are three people in that office. Those coordinators are charged with helping victims negotiate their way through the system when criminal charges are placed. They are made aware of court dates and the Crime Victims Compensation Fund. The Domestic Violence Coordinator works solely with victims of domestic violence, whether or not there are charges pending or actually filed, to help them negotiate their way through the system including helping the victims file for emergency protective orders and things of that nature. Some of the work of the Domestic Violence Coordinator dovetails with what Victim Witness Coordinators do. However, the Domestic Violence Coordinator's work is over and above that.

Mr. Rooker asked if Ms. Lunsford thinks it is an important function. Ms. Lunsford said it is a very important function. Having a Domestic Violence Coordinator relieves some of the burden from the Victim Witness Coordinators, which is substantial. For example, earlier today she called the Victim Witness Coordinator's Office to talk about a specific case involving a victim that she is having trouble getting in touch with. The Coordinator could not help her at that moment because she was doing something that a Domestic Violence Coordinator would do. She was doing that because the position is currently vacant.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the \$6,000.00 would enable Ms. Lunsford to claim half of this person's time. Ms. Lunsford said "yes."

Mr. Dorrier asked if she cannot do that now because the person is in the City. Ms. Lunsford said it has been a shared position. They have taken advantage of it for the past ten years because the City has been able to provide both a place to work and resources. If the County decides not to fund the \$6,000.00 for calendar year 2009, it will become a part-time position and will not be as effective as it currently is as a full-time position.

Mr. Rooker said he would like to see this request put on the list.

Mr. Dorrier said he agreed with Mr. Rooker.

Ms. Thomas said she was looking for a policy that says when the County has to pick up the cost on something that has been funded by a grant or by the State. It needs to be looked at carefully to be sure it is something local dollars should be put into. If in subsequent years even more is asked of the County, then the Board will need more of an explanation. Ms. Lunsford said it is not her intention to ask the County to put more and more into this item each year while the City maintains its current level of support. It is her expectation that all parties will increase their funding.

Mr. Dorrier said if the County pays for the position then Ms. Lunsford should have some say in the hiring of the person. Ms. Lunsford said that is right. The grant is actually managed through the City Commonwealth Attorney's Office, but the members of her staff who work with domestic violence issues also work with this person and will be discussing who is hired.

Mr. Elliott said the next department is that of the **Sheriff** which has a decrease of \$1,630.00 or 0.1 percent. There are some Capital Outlay items in the amount of \$7,500.00. A new request has just been received for a maintenance agreement on fingerprinting equipment the State Police require the Sheriff's Department to maintain. This was brought to staff's attention last week and the cost is \$2,351.00.

Mr. Rooker said if this is required by the State Police for a State-maintained office why does the State not provide that maintenance support. Things like this just astound him.

Ms. Thomas said fingerprinting sounds like something the police would do. She asked why it is done in the Sheriff's Department. Mr. Elliott said the Sheriff runs fingerprint checks and this is software for Live Scan Equipment. Sheriff Harding could not be present today, and he had thought a captain would be present for the explanation. The total annual cost is \$3,251.00. Currently, \$900.00 of that amount is budgeted; that is why the net request is \$2,351.00. Sheriff Harding just became aware of this unfunded request and submitted it for funding last week.

Ms. Mallek noted that this request is for a maintenance agreement only and not for equipment. Mr. Elliott said that is correct, it is a preventative maintenance program on the equipment.

Ms. Thomas said the cost seems high.

Mr. Rooker said he would like to know more about this request. Maybe staff can find out why the State is not funding the maintenance of their own equipment.

Mr. Elliott said the next category is **Courts**, broken down into four different areas - **Circuit Court, General District Court, Magistrate and Juvenile Court**. There was an increase of \$7,324.00, or 7.7

percent for the **Circuit Court**. That includes funding for a part-time law clerk and some temporary help to provide office coverage. The budget of the **General District Court** actually decreases \$900.00 or 4.5 percent. The **Magistrate's Office** also had a decrease of \$650.00 or 11.9 percent. However, the **Juvenile Court** budget will increase by \$60,722.00 or 112.2 percent. The bulk of this cost is associated with the opening of the new J&DR Court next January, so \$58,174.00 is the County's share of the cost of the operation of that building for the first six months of occupancy.

Mr. Rooker asked if this is a continuing or a one-time expense. Mr. Elliott said it will be a continuing expense for the County.

Mr. Boyd asked if this is for office expenses. Mr. Elliott said this expense is for custodial, heating, electrical, building operations, maintenance of the parking structure, etc.

Ms. Thomas asked if the cost of parking structure maintenance and utility expenses is shared with the City. Mr. Elliott said that is correct. There is a formula and agreement for that sharing; it is based on utilization and not on population.

Mr. Rooker asked if the \$7,000.00 for a part-time law clerk is for the Judge. Mr. Elliott said the cost of the part-time law clerk is an increase of \$1,640.00 so the total increase for the Circuit Court is \$7,324.00. Of that amount, \$1,640.00 is for the part-time law clerk, \$1,500.00 is for office coverage, and there is a \$2,000.00 increase for jurors and witnesses based on historic use.

Mr. Rooker said it is not a huge amount of money, but should the County be funding a law clerk for a judge when the expense of that office is supposed to be paid by the State. Should the State provide their own law clerks for their own judges; it is the principle.

Ms. Mallek said all of these smaller amounts pile up and it becomes a really large amount of money.

Mr. Elliott said in terms of the Judicial category, staff will add to the list \$6,000.00 for the Domestic Violence Community Service Coordinator and a conditional \$2,351.00 for the Sheriff for the fingerprinting equipment. He said a member of the Sheriff's staff had just arrived at the meeting and could speak on behalf of the Department.

Mr. Boyd said the Board has some questions about the maintenance agreement on fingerprinting equipment.

Capt. Jeff Vohwinkel said the Live Scan machine was installed two years ago. Last year Sheriff Robb decided not to purchase the maintenance agreement for the hardware. The department recently suffered the loss of a printer which cost them \$298.00 for a warranty; the entire package costs about \$3,100.00. Prices were a little elevated because they were based on previous year's accounting and this year they are a little cheaper. They do need the agreement as part of the agreement they have with the Virginia State Police in order to keep that equipment.

Ms. Mallek asked if this agreement covers lots of machinery and not just a few printers that cost less to buy new than what is being paid in the agreement. Capt. Vohwinkel said this covers the software, the CPU, the monitor, the scanner (which cost \$6,700.00 new), so it is cheaper to have the warranty agreement.

Mr. Slutzky asked if this in effect pays 50 percent of the cost of the equipment for a one year warranty. He asked if this is a five-year plan for a one-time payment of \$3,100.00 this year. Capt. Vohwinkel said it is a reoccurring expense.

Mr. Slutzky said that means the County would be paying \$3,100.00 each year, or a similar amount, to protect equipment that is worth only \$6,700. Capt. Vohwinkel said that is just for the scanner itself. The other equipment, the monitor, the printer, and the tower are all separate items.

Mr. Slutzky asked the cost to acquire that equipment originally. Capt. Vohwinkel said he was not sure, but could get the documentation for the Board.

Mr. Slutzky said it would be helpful to know exactly what is covered by the \$3,100.00 and the out-of-pocket costs to acquire all of that equipment initially. He assumes that some of the maintenance cost is for some tech-support for the software. Capt. Vohwinkel said the software is being used throughout the State. All of the information put into these computers is transmitted over the network to the State Police Central Criminal Records Exchange, which is the repository for all of the data.

Mr. Slutzky asked if the \$3,100.00 is a pro-rata portion of the entire State program. Capt. Vohwinkel said it is not. This is just for the hardware and software in the Albemarle Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Slutzky said if the \$3,100.00 is for software that is centralized it would make no sense for them to charge the County for it. If it is a requirement, the Board knows they will have to have it, but it would be helpful for him to understand it. Capt. Vohwinkel said that unfortunately the power unit on their tower was lost just this morning.

Public Works

Mr. Tom Foley said the Public Works functional area of the budget represents just under \$4.7 million with a 4.7 percent increase overall. Primarily that is made up of **General Services** with about 75 percent of the total, **Facilities Development**, which is a new office at about 16 percent of the total, and the contribution to the **Rivanna Solid Waste Authority** at about nine percent.

Mr. Foley said in **General Services** the amount represents a three percent increase. Earlier this year, the Board approved not building warehouse space for the Schools and Local Government but to lease space and that is shown at \$44,000.00. The total lease for this space is about \$70,000.00 - there is already money appropriated this year that will be put toward the cost of the lease so that cost will be about \$44,000.00 in the next year for a combination of School and Local Government warehousing needs rather than building space. This budget will maintain the same level of landscaping and median mowing in the Entrance Corridors. Additional upgrades had been added to enhance that service; it is shown as an unfunded initiative.

Mr. Rooker asked for the amount of that unfunded initiative. Mr. Foley said it is \$45,000.00. The County is currently spending about \$81,000.00 taking care of the grass rather than waiting for VDOT to do it. This year staff was able to enhance funds with some current appropriations. They will try to do as much as possible with any savings that might be realized. At this time it is an unfunded initiative.

Ms. Mallek asked if this service is performed by contracted individuals. Mr. Foley replied that there are only two grounds people on staff so the County contracts out all of its mowing operation.

Mr. Rooker said he would like this item put on the list for consideration. He thinks the County leaves something to be desired in terms of maintenance in the entrance corridors.

Mr. Foley said for Facilities Development there is an increase of 16.6 percent, or \$107,000.00. This represents the establishment of a new office to upgrade the whole Capital Improvements Program. This has been talked about over the last several years. Due to the level of capital projects coming up, staffing has been upgraded as well and that is also reflected in those figures. This year staff did an extensive analysis and looked at both the number of projects and the number of available staff members. Based on that study, Facilities Development requested another Capital Projects Manager. It is unfunded in this budget. Otherwise money to help manage projects will be incorporated into capital project costs.

Ms. Thomas asked if recycling is included in Facilities Development's duties. She has seen that recycling is decreasing and she is not happy with that fact. Mr. Foley said recycling is actually a part of General Services so staff will get an answer and give it to the Board at the end of these work sessions.

Mr. Foley said the contribution to the **Rivanna Solid Waste Authority** covers both operating and capital costs which resulted from the recent agreement with RSWA in terms of sharing costs. This item is level-funded at about \$400,000.00 which reflects the cost of that agreement.

Mr. Rooker said it would be helpful to know what projects are being overseen by the Facilities Development Department. Mr. Foley said that on Wednesday the Board will see an extensive list during review of the Capital Improvement Projects for the next five years.

Mr. Rooker said it is not always clear which projects are actually being overseen by County staff. The Board has discussed having some Local Government participation in overseeing certain transportation projects. He asked for that with respect to Georgetown Road and it would be helpful to understand how "spread out" the people in that department are so the Board could know what can be accomplished. Mr. Foley said staff can provide that information on Wednesday. Mr. Tucker said the Board needs to remember that this department is also handling all of the School projects.

Mr. Boyd asked if that is a savings to the School System. Mr. Tucker said Local Government has always handled actual construction projects for the schools; these are handled by the engineers in the field.

Mr. Davis said School staff helps with the design and the analysis of putting the project together. They deal with the maintenance of those projects after they are built.

Mr. Foley commented that the line item Ms. Thomas just referenced includes both Solid Waste and Recycling Services. There is not a change in recycling cost. There are reduced contract costs for maintenance of the Landfill in the way of regular monitoring. Contract costs have been reduced because some requirements for the 30-year monitoring period have been met.

Ms. Thomas said she still has a question about recycling. When she is approached by the public they always want to know why the County is not doing more or making it easier for people to recycle. It is something the community wants the County to do and it has not been done for years. She has been told that staff is looking into it for next year, or the issue is complex, or there are no markets and she understands about the lack of markets. She thinks everyone loves the camaraderie of going to the McIntire Recycling Center once in awhile, but it's not what the public expects of the County. Mr. Foley said there are two primary answers to that question. First, in the County's CIP there is funding for a recycling center in Crozet in the current fiscal year. There were to be three other recycling centers over the next three years, but that has been put on hold because the RSWA is doing a strategic plan on recycling for the entire community. Incorporated in that study will be the services they recommend the County

provide based on a process that has involved a number of stakeholders, including members of the community.

Ms. Mallek said the Board was told weeks ago that an Executive Summary would be available from the RSWA in a few days. Mr. Tucker said staff is scheduling the RSWA to come to a Board meeting.

Ms. Thomas said this budget starts in July and it does not include any increased funding for recycling centers. It is good that they are a part of the CIP, but she thinks there is need for an increase in this line item if the Board is going to take recycling seriously.

Mr. Rooker said one of the things being considered on a community-wide basis is curbside pick-up. That would obviate the need for additional recycling centers. Mr. Tucker said that is not necessarily so.

Mr. Rooker said it would in the rural area. He thought the curbside pickup was discussed in terms of bidding out to private carriers for area wide collection.

Ms. Mallek said many people in the County do not have access to any waste pickup service. Those people need someplace to take stuff if the County is going to involve them in recycling. Mr. Foley said all options will be looked at to determine the best way to go forward. Because that study is not yet complete, staff was not sure what amount to put in the budget as a placeholder. He said Mr. George Shadman, General Services Director, may have an update.

Mr. Shadman said the comprehensive study started last summer and went through the fall. The County opted not to get ahead of the study between the RSWA, the City and the County. There are options other than building another center like that on McIntire Road. At this time, the County has decided to wait and see what the State has to offer.

Mr. Slutzky asked when the study will be done. Mr. Shadman said he attended most of the meetings and has contacted a couple of people at RWSA and they said something should be available soon. Mr. Foley said staff will try to get the latest update by Wednesday's meeting.

Mr. Slutzky said recycling doesn't mean only picking up recyclables. It there has to be consumption on the other end so there is actually a cycle going on. He wanted to know if RSWA has looked at recommendations for the County to engage in acquisition of materials that are recyclable. Mr. Shadman said all of that is included in the study; everything from small drop-off points to a materials handling center.

Mr. Slutzky said he meant a consumption of materials. In other words, if the County were to buy recycled paper they would be creating a demand for the paper dropped off at the collection point. He asked if both sides of the recycling equation were included in the study or if it is just the supply side, i.e., just looking at collecting materials that someone in the market place might hopefully use. Mr. Shadman said at this time, Ms. Sarah Temple is studying what the County can do in house.

Mr. Rooker said he thinks there will be a recommendation, or a series of recommendations, coming from that study. There are no funds included in this budget proposal to use for implementation of anything. Mr. Tucker said that analysis will contain dollar figure recommendations but actual costs are unknown at this time. There is money in the Capital budget for recycling centers, but staff does not know if they will be manned or not. They have to wait for the analysis recommendation.

Mr. Slutzky said he thinks having some money in the budget would be better than leaving it at zero. There will be some costs for sure. He suggested adding this to the list and even if the estimate were inaccurate, it would be more accurate than just leaving it at zero. Mr. Foley said some operating costs are anticipated next fiscal year based upon the recycling centers proposed in the CIP. That money could be converted to whatever solution is found in the report. Funds are being set aside in the Five-Year Financial Plan during the next fiscal year, which is when something may become fully operational. Planned in FY '2010 is \$150,000.00 for the operating side.

Mr. Rooker said he thinks it would be wise to put some number in the budget, or at least put this question on the list. He does not think the public wants to wait two more years before the County's recycling services are enhanced. Mr. Tucker said staff will add this item to the list and provide the Board with a suggested number.

Mr. Elliott said the category of **Parks, Recreation and Culture** carries a proposed expenditure of \$6.3 million. This is an increase of \$200,000.00, or 3.3 percent from FY '2008. Approximately 50.0 percent of this category is the County's share of operating the Library System. The Parks Department is 37.0 percent of this category, with funding for agencies and festivals being another 11.0 percent. Operation of the Darden Towe Park comprises two percent. For the **Department of Parks and Recreation** there has been a decrease of \$5,182 or 0.2 percent over the current year's funding. Staff has proposed elimination of the **Gypsy Moth Program** and included funding for operation of both the Byrom Park and the Preddy Creek Park at just over \$24,000.00 for the first year of FY '2009. The **Darden Towe Park** operation is slated to increase by \$595.00 to a total of \$151,680.00 for the year.

Mr. Rooker asked if there will be any additional personnel in this Department. Mr. Elliott said there will not be any added personnel.

Mr. Rooker said he noticed that the department will "Maintain existing service and maintenance quality levels while absorbing Byrom Park and Preddy Creek Park without any additional FTE's except for those necessary to open and close on a daily basis." Mr. Elliott said that is correct.

Mr. Rooker said there is an increase of 7.3 percent in salaries which is about double the 3.35 percent. He asked what that results from. Mr. Elliott said there was a shift in how part-time employees are paid. Those employees were essentially under contract, but there was a ruling that the County had to move these individuals to actual waged positions. He thinks this is the first full-year of that shift; that is why salaries show his type of increase.

Mr. Slutzky said he knew Ms. Sarah Temple has been working with the Task Force that will recommend to the Board changes in the County's behavior regarding putting toxins in the schools and in the parks. That will create potential changes in costs, but he does not see any of it reflected in this budget. He asked if anyone knows the impact of that on Parks and Recreation. Mr. Pat Mullaney, Director of Parks & Recreation, said that will be a part of Ms. Temple's report.

Mr. Elliott said the **Visitor's Bureau** has an increase of \$69,540.00, so the County's annual contribution to that is now \$545,700.00.

Ms. Thomas asked if that assumed the County will be closing the Tourism Office on Route 20 South. Mr. Elliott said that under the agreement between the City and the County for the operation of the Convention Bureau, one Visitor's Bureau or Welcome Center is to be operated in the County and one in the City. If that office continues, it may be kind of a hybrid-system in the County with Welcome Kiosks in various locations. There is a Welcome Center in the Crossroads Store on Route 29 South that could be upgraded to an electronic type kiosk. The County may have centers like that in various locations and possibly one scaled-down Visitor's Welcome Center. At this point, staff thought it would be best to leave funding in for that operation.

Mr. Davis said funding for that office is controlled by the agreement and it is based on a percentage of the transient occupancy tax.

Mr. Elliott said for the **Jefferson-Madison Regional Library** there is an increase of \$131,868.00 which increases the County's share of the Library System to about \$3.2 million; that is basically a baseline funding increase. The Library Board requested funds for additional part-time staff at some of the branches. Staff felt the 4.3 percent increase being recommended is what the County could afford this current year.

Mr. Dorrier said he thinks the Board should look at the recommendations for Library funding. He knows people in the outlying areas depend on the libraries but this is a computer age and there is a need to look at their expenditures. He has heard there will be \$70.0 million in Library expenditures in the next ten years. Mr. Elliott said it is \$50.0 million and will include expenditures for the new Northside Library, the new Crozet Library, and a new library proposed for the southern end of the County. He said staff has discussed this with the Library's Executive Director, and he said what they have found is counter to the notion that things are moving to the digital age. The circulation of the library system is up. Their Northside Library has the highest level of circulation of all of their branches and continues to grow. Also, use of the computer kiosk that they have in their library branches is growing rapidly as well.

Mr. Dorrier said what he is trying to zero in on is that we are moving into an age where videos and digital education are being used instead of using books. He thinks the Library System needs to get ready for the new age. Mr. Elliott said there is a growing element of that, but so far the local library system seems to be book-based.

Ms. Mallek said it is being found that even though some people have advanced computer systems or high speed internet in their houses, for many people that type of service is not available except through dial-up that doesn't work very well. These people are using the libraries a great deal.

Mr. Dorrier said it has been a long time since the Board has met with the Library Board. He thinks a meeting would be a wonderful idea.

Mr. Slutzky said when the Board discussed the allocation from the CIP for the library in Crozet, it had this conversation. Everyone, except himself, agreed the County should build a full-sized facility. He asked Mr. Dorrier if he was rethinking his position now.

Mr. Dorrier said the library in Crozet is necessary.

Mr. Slutzky said he agrees.

Mr. Dorrier said whether the County needs to spend \$50.0 million more on other library buildings is another question.

Mr. Slutzky said he raised that question when he suggested the size of the building be increased from 1,900 square feet to 5,000, not 10,000 square feet. At that time, all the Board members wanted to go with 10,000 square feet. He suggested that when the Board gets to the discussion about the next library, they dig into this question more deeply.

Mr. Rooker said the Board discussed the Crozet Library quite a bit. He thinks that every time the Board discusses another facility, it should look at what is appropriate, what the technology is and whether

the type of facility proposed is needed. For the Northside Library, a lot of money is being paid for rent now. Mr. Elliott said rent is about \$250,000 a year.

Mr. Rooker said the question is what kind of building could be amortized for the amount of rent being paid now. Mr. Foley said there were also plans to build two Northside libraries, but last year that number was reduced to one.

Mr. Dorrier said Mr. Slutzky was correct in his analysis about trying to limit funding on bricks and mortar. But, he thinks the Crozet Library project has "already left the station." The \$2.0 million will be well spent there.

Mr. Slutzky said more than \$2.0 million will be spent on the Crozet library. He asked if Mr. Dorrier is saying that the next time the Board has this conversation he would be open to revisiting whether or not it's a prudent investment of CIP funds.

Mr. Dorrier said he thinks the Board needs to come up with some standards.

Mr. Rooker said there are standards. The County adopted the State Library Standards, and the Board made a significant adjustment to the CIP based upon the change made in the northern area facility. Probably \$4.5 million was cut out of the CIP at that time. He agrees the Board should look hard at these projects every time it makes a decision.

Ms. Thomas said one of the unfunded initiatives is a request to have the Bookmobile go to nursing homes/assisted living facilities. She experienced this recently with a friend in an assisted living facility. At this particular facility they started a book club and it has added to the quality of life in that facility. She does not know if any other Board member has an interest in putting in funds for that request.

Mr. Boyd asked if such funds were previously in the budget.

Ms. Thomas said she thinks the Library did a trial run to see whether or not individuals in nursing homes would benefit from such a service. Mr. Elliott said the total for this unfunded initiative is \$45,000.00. Of that, \$16,700.00 is for visits to the nursing homes and assisted living facilities.

Mr. Rooker said he would like it put on the list. He would like to know the costs of continuing that kind of an operation. If the cost was \$16,700.00 of \$45,000.00, what is the other \$29,000.00 for? Mr. Elliott said there was additional part-time staff for several libraries, the Bookmobile for Outreach for nursing homes, and a substitute librarian for the Historical Library. All of those items totaled approximately to \$45,100.00. Of that amount, \$16,700.00 was for the Outreach Program for the nursing homes and assisted living facilities.

Mr. Rooker said that is the part he would like added to the list and he thanked Ms. Thomas for bringing it to the Board's attention.

Ms. Thomas said she would be willing to have the Library prioritize those unfunded requests. It may be that the one program she knows something about is the one that is lowest on their list, and she doesn't want to override an initiative they think will be more effective. Mr. Elliott said their highest priority was additional part-time help for the Northside Library, additional part-time help for Crozet, additional part-time help for the Gordon Avenue Library, a substitute librarian for the Historical Library, and part-time help for the Bookmobile. In fact, the bookmobile is at the bottom of the list.

Mr. Rooker said the other things are internal things at existing library facilities, and this is viewed as a new service. The County had a bookmobile and put a lot of money into it. The County bought a new bookmobile a couple of years ago. In his perspective, if that pilot program received good use at the assisted living facilities it might be more important to continue that service to the County's citizens who are in a more impaired state than to hire an additional part-time person at an existing library. Mr. Elliott said staff will get some data to see the trends for this service in terms of the people served.

Mr. Slutzky asked if **Zona Latina** did not request money or if they were not able to get a request in on time. Mr. Elliott said they are on the next slide in terms of Parks, Recreation & Cultural agencies. Nineteen applications were received but staff is recommending that only 12 of the 19 be funded.

Ms. Thomas said she loves **Fireworks**, but as she has done the last two years she suggests that it be removed if there is not money available for other causes.

Mr. Boyd asked if the request is for \$10,000.00. Mr. Elliott said that is correct.

Ms. Thomas asked if the Board members wanted to put it on the list as a negative figure.

Mr. Rooker said he thinks it should be put on the list. The Board has chosen to fund it in the past, but he doesn't consider it as high a priority as some of the other things that are not being fund.

Mr. Dorrier asked why staff had decided not to fund the **Albemarle County Fair**. Mr. Elliott said no application was received from them.

Ms. Thomas said she thinks the County funded an emergency stipend the year the Fair was completely rained out. Mr. Tucker said that is correct.

Mr. Elliott said if there were no other questions pertaining to this functional area, staff will get additional data on the Bookmobile service to nursing homes and the potential reduction of money for fireworks.

Mr. Elliott said for the **Public Safety** category the total proposed expenditures are \$29,917,200. This is an increase of \$1.33 million or 4.7 percent over the current fiscal year. This category includes funding for the **Police Department, Department of Fire/Rescue, the Volunteer Fire/Rescue Operation**, career staff at six stations, **Emergency Communications Center**, the **Jail**, public safety agencies such as the **SPCA, OAR, Community Attention** and the **Juvenile Detention Center**. Several unfunded initiatives for this category include two battalion chiefs for Fire/Rescue, first year funding for the Volunteer Incentive Program for Fire/Rescue, and additional daytime staffing for the Seminole Trail Fire Department.

Mr. Elliott began by discussing the Police Department. He showed to the Board members a graph of urban response times for the past calendar year. The trend line is trending downward, perhaps not as downward as would be liked, but included on this graph are priority one calls such as vehicular accidents, breaking and entering, disorderly conduct, robbery and suspicious circumstances. The response time to accidents is keeping the County from gaining appreciable increases. In late afternoon or early morning on Route 29 or any of the entrance corridors, there is an elevated response time. The strategy of increasing staffing for the police is showing some results. This will continue to be tracked year after year. For the **Police Department** there is an increase of \$549,150.00 or 4.5 percent more than the current year for a total appropriation of just over \$12.8 million. In this department there are several frozen positions, a Civilian Patrol Assistant and a full-time Animal Control Officer. Last year, funding was provided for a fourth Animal Control Officer but that fourth position is frozen at this time. The Board has directed that four additional officers be included; the cost of that totals \$465,917.00, with \$177,000.00 of that amount being in one-time costs. This will be for a complete full fiscal year for all four officers.

Mr. Rooker asked why the salary expense has only increased by \$249,000.00 if there is \$377,000.00 in new officer expense. Mr. Elliott referred Mr. Rooker to the last line under "expenditures" to see this initiative.

Mr. Rooker said that personally he would like to add to the list only two officer positions for discussion. He supports adding two employees, but he thinks this should be compared to other areas where the County let employees leave and did not replace them.

Mr. Boyd said each year the County was behind in the number of policing staff (that number was based on a much higher percentage of population than the County actually has), but the Board decided to catch up on police officer staffing. He asked when the County will actually meet the State's 1.5 recommendation. Mr. Elliott said at the Strategic Planning Retreat last fall staff assumed a modest population increase and said that by adding four officers per year, at the end of five or six years, the County would be at the 1.5 level if it is able to continue that strategy.

Mr. Dorrier said he will support Mr. Rooker's suggestion to reduce the number from four to two.

Mr. Slutzky said he agrees it should be put on the list, but he does not plan on reducing the number from four to two.

Mr. Elliott said the **Fire/Rescue Department** has an increase of \$625,333 or 9.7 percent to just over \$7.1 million. He said 12 FTEs for the Pantops Fire Station beginning in April, 2009, totaling \$470,000 have been included in this budget; \$234,000 of this amount is in one-time costs. There are two unfunded initiatives; hiring battalion chiefs and a request from Seminole Trail for additional daytime staffing.

Mr. Elliott said **Other Fire/Rescue Services** has an overall increase of \$78,140 or 3.3 percent. This category includes funding to the volunteer fire/rescue stations for a total of \$1.68 million, or an overall increase of \$15,275 or 0.9 percent. The one unfunded initiative in this category is to the Voluntary Recruitment and Retention Program. There are several volunteers present this afternoon and they can address the Board concerning their proposal. Also included in this category is the Fire/Rescue Tax Credit which is projected to increase by \$8,400 or 20 percent to \$50,430. There is also an increase of \$54,535 in payment to the City under the City/County Fire Contract. That contract by formula increases five percent per year. There is also a credit for calls. The number of calls has decreased over the years. However, the contract cost is projected to be \$655,000.

Mr. Rooker asked the definition of "fire/rescue tax credit." Mr. Elliott said the volunteers get a personal property tax credit for serving.

Mr. Slutzky asked if a City truck responds and they are the second truck there, do they get credit for that call. Mr. Elliott said it is based on the alarm, so whenever they respond to a scene in the County, they get payment under the contract.

Mr. Slutzky asked Mr. Tucker to provide information to the Board on "The State of the Gang issue in Urbanized Albemarle" when he brings back information on the Police Department.

Ms. Thomas said she has a question which is tied into the line item titled "Decrease for CAARs." She said that informally the Board has heard from the Western Albemarle Rescue Squad that they do not want any help from the County for purchase of an ambulance. She asked if staff got a letter from them saying what they do not want this year.

Mr. Dorrier said the Scottsville Rescue Squad requested a smaller ambulance, but the County said "one size fits all."

Mr. Elliott said there is a specific committee among the volunteers that worked on equipment standardization and specifications. An ambulance specification is in place as the model for volunteer rescue squads and County staffed squads to utilize. There was a request for a different type of ambulance and that specification/qualification statement has been passed around by the volunteers and is being worked on now.

Mr. Dorrier said he misspoke, he meant to say fire truck.

Ms. Thomas said at a recent meeting of the WARS, they said they cannot wait any longer so they want to use their own money to buy an ambulance. That is only an informational communication.

Mr. Boyd and Ms. Mallek both said the Fire Advisory Committee is actively working on these issues.

Mr. Elliott said most of the funding for **Other Public Safety Agencies** is established by formulas. He said there is a decrease of \$20,000 for the **Emergency Communications Center**. For the **Regional Jail**, there is an increase of 19.0 percent based on jail population. Funding for the **Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention Center** will decrease by \$267,000 based on the fact that Culpeper has joined this center. The **SPCA** has a decrease of \$13,700.00. However, **OAR** will increase by two percent while the **Community Attention Home** will increase by four percent.

Mr. Boyd asked if the decrease for the Juvenile Detention Center is a one-time decrease. Mr. Tucker said it is a reduction because of the number of kids who are dispersed more over the entire area. The center got some one-time money which will be used if the facility ever needs to be expanded. Mr. Davis said that money is in a reserve account for capital.

Mr. Elliott said the questions to be put on the list for public safety include two police officers, clarification of the impact of Western Albemarle's communication and their board's action last week, and additional information from the Police about the gang issue. He asked if other items need to be added to the list.

Mr. Boyd asked what the Board wants to do about the 12 full-time positions at the proposed **Pantops Fire Station**. Mr. Tucker said they probably need to be on the list to discuss at the end of these work sessions.

Mr. Dorrier agreed.

Mr. Rooker said payment for the **City Fire Contract** is in the proposed budget. Also, there is staffing for a station on Pantops. Mr. Elliott said in the original plan staff was looking at having two new stations by 2010. They were being phased in over two fiscal year cycles starting in the fourth quarter of FY '09 with Pantops, and then in the second or third quarter of FY '10 starting with Ivy, so both stations would have been fully operational by the end of the contract period.

Mr. Elliott said there is one other unfunded initiative, and that is the **Volunteer Incentive Program**. There are two representatives from the Fire/Rescue Advisory Board present today who can address the issue. He introduced Chief Jack Mellott from Stony Point Volunteer Company who will lead the presentation.

(Note: At 3:21 p.m., while the PowerPoint presentation was being loaded into the computer, the Board recessed, and reconvened at 3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Mellott gave a PowerPoint presentation and mentioned many statistics. He said the volunteers are stressed with housing costs, increased training requirements, paperwork and the increase in call volume. It has been said that it would take a minimum of 133 full-time employees to replace the operational volunteers in the system. He thinks the volunteer program is an optimal use of tax dollars. The initial request was to support a program comprised of three elements. 1) Training and leadership development. He said motivation is extremely important. They require members to volunteer 90 hours per month; motivating people to do that requires extraordinary skills in people management. 2) Marketing. They must be able to communicate with potential volunteers, particularly with new people in the area who may not understand that the fire companies rely on volunteers for service. 3) Planning and providing for the framework to bring cost neutrality to the volunteers. They can measure success by the number of new volunteers in the system, the retention of new members after their probationary period, and an increase in standardization, with new leaders emerging at the station level.

Mr. Mellott said they are now asking for one-half of the initial request of \$314,000.00. Now, the request is for \$157,000.00.

Mr. Rooker asked what part of that original request would not be funded. Mr. Mellott said until January 1, 2009, they would be planning implementation rather than rushing into something in July, 2008.

Mr. Rooker asked what strategies would be used to obtain cost neutrality. Mr. Mellott said several issues have to be worked out in terms of tax consequences and some of the incentives. Other localities in Virginia have done this, so they can get information from them on ways to proceed. He said it will take multiple years to implement and get this program in place. There is a need to create a "menu" in order to

find out what motivates a volunteer in North Garden from what might motivate a college student who volunteers for the rescue squad. This needs to be set up in a matrix so that the years of training, years of service, and the hours volunteered also determine what the volunteer might be eligible for.

Ms. Thomas said some stations seem to get a lot of volunteers each year, but they also seem to lose as many as they have gained. Mr. Mellott said it seems to change from station to station. He can only speak about the Stony Point Company. The University students who volunteer are only in the community for a short time period, and the residents seem to stay much longer, but they also move to other locations.

Ms. Thomas asked if they had ever used exit interviews to determine why people stop volunteering. Mr. Mellott said he does not know of any exit interview system across the County.

Mr. Boyd asked about the \$314,000.00 figure. Mr. Mellott said that number is broken down into the three parts of the program. There is \$110,000.00 for flexible reimbursement accounts, \$17,000.00 for training and leadership, \$30,000 for marketing and communications for the half year.

Mr. Rooker asked if other localities have used the flexible spending accounts. Mr. Mellott said that is correct.

Mr. Rooker asked if they had been able to comply with tax regulations, etc. Mr. Mellott said he does not know how other jurisdictions are wording their particular incentive programs. State Code allows for other kinds of programs, for example, localities can allow volunteers to have access to their health insurance programs, and volunteers can be reimbursed for tuition. Every locality has its own unique program.

Ms. Mallek said she talked with people in James City County and they have an hourly stipend while on duty, plus an amount per call. One of the volunteers at Western Albemarle figured up his hours for 2007 and found that he would have made about \$3,000 which would have helped him pay his property taxes.

Mr. Boyd wondered if this would involve labor laws. He said the County just went through this with Parks & Recreation where people were getting Federal 1099 forms, and now have to be paid through the regular payroll. Mr. Davis said there have been some articles recently in the Fair Labor Standards Act Journal addressing what constitutes "paid" and what constitutes "volunteer". There is a trend for volunteers to be reimbursed actual costs or be paid a de minimis amount. That is a somewhat of a gray area, but it is possible to have small cash incentives for volunteers.

Mr. Boyd said he would like for the \$157,000.00 to be put on the list.

Mr. Rooker asked Mr. Dan Eggleston, Fire Chief, if this request is something supported by the Fire/Rescue Division. Mr. Eggleston said staff supported moving this request forward as its Number 1 priority. They are not, at this time, able to provide the Board with the data needed for return on investment. That is why they dropped back to propose a training component as well as a marketing component. They can demonstrate their existing marketing return as well as identify nationally how training and leadership is an issue across the board. At this time, the system does not have exit surveys or other surveys to demonstrate the level of return. In general, they support this program. It would be the first time the department had a comprehensive program.

Mr. Rooker said there is a huge savings to County taxpayers by having a viable volunteer force in fire and rescue. The Board needs to do what is necessary to maintain and help that force grow. He thinks this would be a reasonable investment. For the part dealing with flexible benefits, there seems to be a great deal of work necessary in order to understand what would work and what could be done legally. He supports putting it on the list.

Mr. Slutzky said he would like to understand what the impact of this funding would be.

Ms. Thomas said she thinks it needs to be in the budget as a placeholder, but paying it out must be based on a good deal more information than is presently available.

Mr. Preston Gentry said he has been in fire services for many years. He thinks many people leave the volunteer organization because they want to make it a career, and due to the Fair Labor Standards Act they have to quit volunteering. Another reason is the lack of personal time and money. He always asks volunteers at the Crozet Station why they are leaving, and the answer usually relates to those two things.

Mr. Elliott said that concludes staff's presentation for today.

Mr. Boyd asked for a recap of the items put on the list for discussion later.

Mr. Elliott said there is the question about the number of new police officers; the operating impacts of the Western Albemarle Fire/Rescue decision; the new Pantops Fire Station; the volunteer fire/rescue incentive program; and follow-up information from the Police Department.

Ms. Thomas said she had made note of requests concerning the Voter Registrar, the Commonwealth's Attorney, the Sheriff, landscaping and mowing, recycling management, the bookmobile item for the Library, and the fireworks request.

Agenda Item No. 3. From the Board: Matters not listed on the Agenda.

There were no other matters to discuss this date.

Agenda Item No. 4. Recess and Reconvene at 6:00 p.m., University Hall, Charlottesville, for a meeting with the IMPACT group.

Mr. Rooker said he thinks the Board's meeting will not occur until at least 7:15 p.m.

Ms. Thomas said the probable opening time for the Board's meeting is 7:52 p.m.

Mr. Davis said he would suggest that the Board adjourn to an earlier time in the event the meeting advances at a faster speed than anticipated.

Mr. Slutzky suggested the meeting be adjourned after the Board gives its responses to the question posed, and before the evening prayer out of deference to the separation of State and church issues the Board talked about last week.

Ms. Thomas said she had assumed that right after the part of the IMPACT agenda listed at 7:52 p.m., the Board would adjourn. The Clerk has reminded her that the Board meeting has to be adjourned to March 12, 2008, at noon. There has to be a motion made to do that.

At 3:49 p.m., Mr. Rooker **moved** that this meeting be recessed and reconvened at 7:00 p.m. tonight at University Hall, Emmet Street, Charlottesville. Mr. Slutzky gave **second** to the motion. Roll was called, and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

At 7:15 p.m., Mr. Boyd called the Board's meeting back to order.

To begin the meeting, various health officials were asked questions regarding dental health care for indigent adults.

The Affordable Housing issue was presented by three members of IMPACT: Ms. Sherrika Nowell, Mr. Travis Harris and Ms. Susan Pleiss.

City Council members were asked to comment on one question regarding affordable housing.

Each member of the Board of Supervisors was asked this question by Ms. Felicia Johnson and Mr. Dennis McAuliffe: "Will you commit to budgeting \$500,000 in FY '09 to support proposals that come out of the Task Force for rental housing for the working poor in the zero to 30 percent AMI category?"

Mr. Boyd reminded the audience of the many competing items in the County's budget, and said "No" to the question.

Mr. Dorrier said that despite shortfalls in the proposed budget, he hoped that tax credits, "rainy day funds" and other means could be found, and said "Yes."

Ms. Mallek said all should work toward doing so, but at this time her answer is "No."

Mr. Rooker listed many actions presently being taken to make housing more affordable, and said his answer is "No."

Mr. Slutzky said even if it means raising taxes, his answer is "Yes."

Ms. Thomas said she hoped the Board could give a positive answer in the future but now her answer is "No."

All who said "no" also said that he or she hoped the Board would be able to find the money in the budget to fund the request.

March 10, 2008 (Adjourned Meeting)
(Page 19)

Agenda Item No. 5. Adjourn. At 7:49 p.m., with no further business to come before the Board, **motion** was offered by Ms. Thomas to adjourn to March 12, 2008, at noon in Room 241. The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Slutzky. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Chairman

Approved by the Board of County Supervisors

Date: 11/5/2008

Initials: EWJ
