

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 9, 2009, 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, 2009.

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

ABSENT: None.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 2a. Work Session: FY 2009-10 County Budget.

Mr. Tucker said today's agenda would include a revenue update. Mr. Bill Letteri, Director of Facilities Development, will then go through the Capital Improvements Program and the list of items Board members had asked staff to consider additional funding.

Mr. Richard Wiggans, Director of Finance, stated that staff has looked at revenues for next fiscal year as well as the current fiscal year. He reported that the estimated total decline for FY08-09 is \$377,000 – or .2 percent in overall revenue. He said that staff will be presenting the third quarter financial report in May, and a plan to meet projected shortfalls – noting that local government would probably handle the decline through operational savings and additional position vacancies in the current year. Mr. Wiggans noted that general property taxes are expected to increase slightly, but other local taxes and revenues are projected to decline.

Ms. Thomas asked what tax rate the local revenue is based. Mr. Wiggans responded that revenue is based on a 74.2 cent tax rate.

Mr. Slutzky pointed out that there seems to be a continuous pattern where staff is overestimating revenues. It seems that the methodology for determining revenues needs to be revisited.

Mr. Wiggans replied that two years ago there was a \$9.0 to \$10.0 million surplus in revenues, and what is being experienced now is unprecedented. He agreed that when the budget was prepared for this fiscal year, the revenue estimates were too high but that has not been staff's pattern over the years. This year staff has been about \$8.0 million short of what was budgeted.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that .2 percent is not a huge percentage deviation from projection, and several of the numbers the County uses come from the state.

Ms. Thomas mentioned that the state's projection for sales tax has not been met.

Mr. Wiggans responded that the state was projecting a 5 percent increase in sales tax revenue in December for FY10, and no revised estimates have been given.

Mr. Wiggans then commented that the economic slowdown is expected to continue into next fiscal year, and staff is anticipating a .5 percent decline in revenues from what Mr. Tucker had in his recommended budget. Mr. Wiggans pointed out the local government share of this \$1.0 million revenue reduction for next year equates to about \$388,000, which would be addressed through additional position vacancies – five or six freezes that would bring the total to 55 or 56 positions.

Mr. Slutzky asked if staff felt that freeze could be achieved without furloughing anyone.

Mr. Tucker replied that at this point it seems possible, with some salaries funded through projects in the CIP. The management of these CIP projects will be charged back to the actual project funding. For example, the inspector's salary will be funded through the project.

Mr. Wiggans reported that personal property taxes are projected to decline by \$1.0 million – about a 4.5 percent decrease, reflecting continued trouble in the auto industry. New cars are not being purchased. NADA values used to assess vehicles are declining, particularly on SUVs and heavy pickup trucks. He said that the taxes such as sales, consumer utility, business license, vehicle registration, food and beverage, are expected to increase slightly.

Mr. Slutzky asked what the rationale is for projecting a sales-tax increase.

Mr. Wiggans replied that state economists and other economists are projecting a turn-around that would begin by the end of the year.

Mr. Boyd mentioned that some economists project a turn-around to start in Virginia before it does in other states.

Mr. Wiggans said staff anticipates the slow down in the construction industry to continue. He added that the budget is based on a decline in assessments for the January 2010 reassessment period. Staff is projecting overall about a 2 percent decline in values.

Mr. Rooker noted that at some point people will have to replace their vehicles, as sales start occurring out of necessity.

Mr. Letteri reported that the proposed Capital Program has been reduced by over \$100.0 million over the five-year period – a combination of reduction in cash-funded projects, borrowing, and project deferment. He indicated that there is a \$112.0 million increase in FY15-19.

Mr. Letteri reported that \$14.0 million of the \$100.0 million was represented in School project reductions, primarily through scope changes and deferrals; the coming fiscal year has been reduced by \$5.3 million. He then highlighted School projects planned for funding for FY10 which included four gymnasium projects, and those renovations would include new lighting and air conditioning but the floor refinishing would be a separate project.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that Parks and Recreation uses the gyms as well as students.

Mr. Boyd commented that the schools were not particularly forthcoming with their CIP projects.

Mr. Rooker asked if the CIP Technical Committee went through the list of projects point by point.

Mr. Dorrier said information was provided to the Committee.

Mr. Boyd responded that the list of projects wasn't officially "voted on."

Mr. Letteri mentioned that the \$3.8 million in maintenance represents a lot of small projects for all of the 28 campuses, with a lot of them being mechanical needs based on the Schools' assessment of the condition of their buildings.

Mr. Boyd asked if they are actual projects or earmarked dollars.

Mr. Letteri said the Schools make an attempt to identify specific projects.

Mr. Dorrier asked if there was any requirement for the projects to be done next fiscal year.

Mr. Rooker replied that the CIP Committee has passed this along as though the maintenance projects were needed in the near future.

Mr. Boyd said that in the CIP meetings, there seemed to be no interest by the School Board representatives in delaying their projects. The Schools were also going to see if there were any other changes they could make because he had questioned the \$11.0 million in technology changes over the next five years. He does not feel comfortable that they had a good technical review of the CIP.

Mr. Dorrier reiterated that the Committee did not vote on the list specifically.

Mr. Boyd said he did question some of the projects, but they were not more forthcoming. He was curious as to why they could not do more to reduce their CIP the same as local government.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that the Schools reduced their CIP by over \$5.0 million from the original.

Ms. Thomas commented that the reduction is pretty significant.

Mr. Boyd pointed out that they delayed projects to achieve that reduction.

Mr. Rooker said that the idea of the combined CIP Committee was to scrutinize and vote upon what was going to be included in the CIP. He thinks that all current year projects need to be scrutinized by the Committee. The whole idea was to get away from the idea where the Board was just presented with a CIP from the schools and that was the CIP. If they want to do it that way, they ought to pay for it. He added that he wants to know the details, or have the CIP Committee representatives look at those expenses and decide if they are needed for the current year.

Mr. Letteri responded that the Technical Review Team is involved first, and their charge is to evaluate the projects and ensure they are in keeping with policies and are justified; the CIP Oversight Committee doesn't go into that level of detail.

Mr. Thomas Foley, Assistant County Executive, commented that the detail on the maintenance projects may not have been included in what was presented to the Oversight Committee, but if the Board feels they need more information staff can bring that to them.

Mr. Slutzky suggested that the Board have a larger conversation about how the CIP is approached.

Mr. Tucker replied that this would tie in with what the Resource Management group had suggested in terms of looking at identifying whether CIP or capital debt service should be included in the School's operation percentage. He thinks that maybe the Oversight Committee needs to start taking a vote because it appears that they move forward based on a consensus.

Mr. Boyd agreed, but stated that local government has made an effort to make specific cuts in the CIP and the Schools don't seem to share the same process. He does not think the Schools provide the same level of detail that local government provides. He does not think it is by intent, but instead just the way things have always been done.

Mr. Rooker reiterated that the whole idea of the joint CIP committee was that those questions would be asked. He added that there should be a formula-driven dollar amount allocated to the CIP, with the Committee operating on that budget for capital dollars and aligning projects accordingly.

Mr. Foley said that this process has included a lot more scrutiny than it used to, but if the process is not quite right then it should be reevaluated.

Mr. Boyd commented that the Oversight Committee should go through projects individually and judge them on their merits.

Mr. Letteri mentioned that this year is unique, as the amendment year has an abbreviated process; this year the Committee focused on reducing projects and how that would be accomplished.

Mr. Slutzky explained that Mr. Rooker is suggesting that a set amount be put into the CIP, with allocation within that frame being a separate matter.

Mr. Rooker asked at what point there would be an opportunity to decide not to do something, adding that he is troubled with the implied inability for the Board to act when an item comes forward for appropriation.

Mr. Foley responded that there are two opportunities – with the recommendations brought forward in December and an invitation to the Board to request more detail, and a time during the budget process to ask questions.

Mr. Rooker commented that the idea is to develop a joint local government/school plan that is within budgetary constraints and is ultimately agreed on by the Committee and passed onto the Board with recommendations. He said that he is troubled that the Committee didn't really endorse the specific projects within the CIP. We have a whole process set up that culminates with that Committee making a recommendation based upon all kinds of lower level input before it gets there.

Mr. Slutzky suggested that staff send to the Board summary information with each item.

Mr. Rooker replied that his concern is not the information in the packets, but some certainty that the projects that come to the Board have been reviewed by the Committee and agreed upon as those that should move forward. He said that for this budget year some projects could be tagged prior to appropriations.

Mr. Tucker asked if he wants the CIP Committee to reconvene.

Mr. Rooker answered that they should convene before any financial commitments are made for these projects. They can be included in the budget but the Board does not have to appropriate money for them, just including it in the budget does not create the financial commitment.

Mr. Tucker stated that there are issues with timing, especially with school projects.

Mr. Dorrier said that it's important to clarify whether the projects are done in-house or with staff.

Mr. Rooker and Mr. Boyd indicated that these projects are all outsourced.

Mr. Davis pointed out that these projects are usually done in the summer. He said that there is a process where contracts can't be signed until there is money appropriated, but sometimes there are contracts signed with a non-appropriation clause. No money can be spent until it is appropriated.

Mr. Boyd commented that some of these projects were already far enough in the works that there wasn't much the Committee could do, noting that there was a lot of detail for local government projects but not school projects.

Ms. Thomas said that it would have been helpful to know that before today.

Mr. Rooker suggested that prior to financially committing to these capital projects, the CIP Committee convene and get as much detail as needed for the Board's Committee representatives to feel comfortable with approving them.

Mr. Tucker added that perhaps he should say to the Board in December that action is needed, and tell the Committee the same thing.

Ms. Mallek asked if the CIP projects are in a priority list.

Mr. Letteri replied that the school projects are not.

Mr. Slutzky said that Mr. Tucker seems to have direction as to how to proceed with a work session for this year, and next year it could be handled as discussed.

Mr. Tucker commented that the Oversight Committee would be reconvened.

Ms. Thomas asked if the Committee has a chair.

Mr. Tucker responded that there is not, and that may be part of the problem.

Board members suggested that Mr. Boyd serve as Chair for this year.

Mr. Letteri said that he facilitated the Committee discussions this year, but there has not been a formal chair.

Mr. Tucker explained that the Committee is comprised of two elected Board members, two elected School Board members, a Planning Commissioner, and Chris Lee as a citizen representative.

Mr. Foley agreed that when this budget is done it would be a good idea to review the process.

Mr. Letteri reported that of the \$100.0 million reduction, \$82.0 million came from local government projects – a lot of which were delayed to the second five-year period.

He stated that there is a list of maintenance projects presented within his report, the most significant being the volunteer and EMS apparatus replacement program.

Mr. Rooker asked if it was necessary to fund \$2.7 million of capital replacement items, given the financial situation and the fact that revenue recovery has not been implemented. He asked what in this category is crucial to operations.

Mr. Boyd explained that there is usually a replacement schedule for equipment.

Mr. Foley said that there are three criteria that equipment for replacement must meet – mileage, mechanical condition, and one other criteria.

Mr. Tucker added that changes have been made to police vehicle replacement schedules, with police vehicles now coming up for replacement at 120,000 miles instead of 100,000.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that three Scottsville Rescue Squad ambulances programmed for replacement in FY 2012-13 have been accelerated.

Mr. Foley said that it goes to the Advisory Board, but he could bring forth that information.

Mr. Letteri said that there is a policy for equipment replacement that comes to the Board, and the Committee is charged with adhering to that policy.

Mr. Rooker asked if the County sold its used equipment, noting that perhaps it still has a useful life.

Ms. Mallek responded that the fire department in Crozet is rebuilding one used vehicle in order to save about \$150,000 and replace an ambulance that has 185,000 miles on it.

Mr. Foley commented that the Board could certainly reconsider their policy, as has been done with police vehicles.

Mr. Rooker suggested noting items of concern and having the Oversight Committee look at them and consider their urgency when they convene.

Mr. Letteri reported that there are no major changes in the Public Works, and the Moore's Creek project allocation represents debt service. He explained that the amount going into neighborhood plan implementation has been reduced, and the road-sharing program has been left unchanged.

Mr. Rooker asked if the \$1.1 million for the Ivy Landfill Remediation has been spent over the last couple years.

Mr. Tucker indicated that it tends to go up and then drop back off.

Mr. Davis pointed out that it's based on a formula.

Mr. Letteri reported that the Parks and Recreation allocation is for tourism-related expenditures or maintenance, as most park projects were deferred; the GIS expense is for server upgrades; ACE funding was reduced.

Mr. Slutzky said that he would like to see the ACE money moved to the Board's discretionary fund this time only in the event it might be able to be used if the economic situation improves.

Mr. Letteri indicated that there is \$600,000 left in the ACE Program of general fund revenues.

Mr. Rooker asked how the scenario would play out if revenues came in even lower than projected.

Mr. Davis responded that applications for ACE come in the fall and the Board then authorizes an appraisal.

Mr. Rooker said that the ACE process could be stopped along the way if necessary, adding that he thinks it would be a mistake to pull that plug today.

Mr. Slutzky asked what the current backlog of ACE properties.

Mr. Davis stated that the Board is being asked on their next agenda to make authorizations for FY09 projects to go forward, and it usually takes three to five months to close those projects. He said that the consequence of adopting Mr. Slutzky's strategy would be no applications and no appraisals for the next round – FY10.

Mr. Rooker noted that the decision to do that wouldn't need to be made until September.

Mr. Foley pointed out that the money affected from the general fund to the capital fund is about 85 percent debt service.

Mr. Boyd also mentioned the need to discuss the unallocated CIP funds, such as the \$225,000 for turf. He said that he is reconsidering his support of it, given the School Board's apparent lack of interest.

Mr. Foley said that if the goal is to create more reserve, staff can show some ways to accomplish that in the CIP.

Mr. Rooker stated that if the turf money is put elsewhere, the Board may end up back in the position of trying to provide lighted fields in a different way that might be more costly.

Mr. Pat Mullaney, Director of Parks and Recreation, said that at the next School Board meeting they would be deciding whether to proceed with one field, and if so his intent is to put \$75,000 toward that project and hold the other \$150,000 until the other projects happen.

Mr. Letteri reported that the stormwater allocation is part of the two-cent reduction in transportation, urban infrastructure, and ACE; the \$1.0 million was reduced to \$250,000 per year over the next five years.

Ms. Thomas noted that some of that might be matched if the Rivanna River Basin Commission dam application comes through.

Mr. Tucker indicated that Ms. Donna Shauneseay from JAUNT is in attendance, reminding Board members that they were deliberating whether to fully fund the organization at their request or at a lesser amount.

Ms. Shauneseay addressed the Board and said that JAUNT needs about \$151,000 to "keep them whole," but if they raise fares they would only need \$120,000.

Mr. Slutzky asked if there were new initiatives in the \$151,000 that could be shelved.

Ms. Shauneseay replied that there are no new services included here, and even some old initiatives have been trimmed.

Mr. Rooker explained that there is a \$50,000 allocation based upon a formula for increased ridership in the County and wondered if this is for a projected increase.

Ms. Shauneseay responded that the ridership is already there, this is not a projection.

Mr. Rooker commented that there is a \$100,000 loss in state funding, and asked why Albemarle should be responsible for picking up the entire amount.

Ms. Shauneseay replied that only \$43,000 would come from Albemarle, with the remainder coming from other localities based on ridership.

Mr. Tucker explained that the request is for \$53,000 for a baseline increase due to 1,000 more County passengers forecast for FY10.

Ms. Shauneseay said that JAUNT is dealing not only with baseline increases, but increases in other costs.

Mr. Slutzky asked what amount would be needed to prevent JAUNT from raising fares.

Ms. Shauneseay responded that \$151,000 would be needed, noting that JAUNT should have asked for more money last year from the County but requested the same from every locality served instead. The Board is sort of looking at two years in a row of ridership increases in one fell swoop. She indicated that if there is no increase this year, the only way to be level funded would be to raise fares – which has not been done since 1995. Ms. Shauneseay expressed frustration that JAUNT is not allowed to raise fares in the urban area, which is where most of their ridership is.

Mr. Tucker clarified that by raising fares \$1 in most areas, JAUNT would need \$120,000; for there to be no fare increases JAUNT would need \$151,000.

Ms. Thomas asked if they were getting any increase from the recently passed State budget.

Ms. Shaunesey replied that stimulus money can only go to capital, and perhaps this could be used for vehicle replacement – but there are issues with changing the FY10 plan.

Mr. Rooker said that it might be wise to consider amending JAUNT's current budget to create a situation where maintenance of effort would be based on a lower amount – which might free up money to be used from a service standpoint. He noted that the fee increase may result in reduced ridership, emphasizing that there hasn't been an increase since 1995.

Mr. Slutzky responded that while that is true, this is the worst possible year to be raising rates – especially for this segment of the population. He said that he would like to provide funding so that rates are not increased.

Mr. Rooker stated that essentially the County would be funding a state obligation, and the question is whether this portion should be picked up by the County and fares should have been raised incrementally over the years.

Ms. Mallek said that she would like to find a way to pick up this obligation, as people who use the service need to get to the doctor, work, etc.

Ms. Thomas commented that the revenue-sharing program with VDOT was raised from \$1.0 million to \$1.5 million in order to capture more money from the state; it doesn't make sense this year because there is no match. She said that there is at least \$500,000 that is there for transportation, and JAUNT is a form of transportation primarily for people in the rural area who need the service.

Mr. Rooker replied that he doesn't understand how increasing contributions to JAUNT by \$100,000 sends a message of non-support. He said that the \$1.5 million should be used as a Board contingency instead of spending it, which would help buffer a 2.5-cent tax increase.

Mr. Slutzky asked for other Board members to weigh in.

Mr. Boyd agreed with a suggestion from Mr. Rooker that all the numbers be broken down and presented to show what portion Albemarle would be funding of the state's vacated amount in relation to other localities JAUNT serves, along with figures that include the impact of different rate-increase scenarios.

Mr. Tucker said that information could be brought back to the Board on Wednesday.

Mr. Rooker said he does not think we should say we have to increase the rates by 33 percent this year. He thinks there should be some increase in rates on an annual basis. He agreed that it would be helpful to have that information before making a decision.

Mr. Slutzky said he would like to see information on how this group of individuals is different from traditional transit riders who may find other means of transportation.

Ms. Shaunesey said they only have a little amount of data for small urban areas and there is no data for rural areas.

Ms. Thomas added that JAUNT has provided figures that one-third of riders are going to work, one-third are going to medical appointments, and one-third are going to community college and other activities. She does not know that the Board would want to reduce that ridership.

Ms. Shaunesey said the reason the fares have not increased in the rural areas is because earlier Boards had a concern of equity between the rural and the urban areas.

Mr. Rooker asked what percentage of ridership in the County is urban versus rural.

Ms. Shaunesey replied that the ridership is about 60 percent urban and 40 percent rural.

Mr. Dorrier said recently when Senator Tom Perriello visited the Town of Scottsville, he discussed the possibility of federal funds coming back to the community for this ridership program.

Mr. Boyd asked if JAUNT means test people for what they can pay in fares.

Ms. Shaunesey said "no", they only reduce fares if they have a disability or are a senior citizen. They do periodically survey their passengers, but it is very general information about income levels.

Mr. Rooker expressed frustration that complaint letters come to the Board instead of state officials.

Mr. Tucker said staff will contact Ms. Shaunesey to get this information and bring it back to the Board on Wednesday.

At this time, the Board continued with the CIP discussion.

Mr. Dorrier then referred to the implementation of Neighborhood Plans which is slated for \$850,000 in the first year, noting that the funding dropped off over the years. He asked if that money should even be allocated if there aren't specific requests at this time.

Mr. Letteri responded that the Planning Department was asked to carefully consider what reductions they could make, and one of the reasons it is higher in the first year is to accommodate crosswalks in urban areas.

Mr. Rooker said that this would be a "pay as you go" allocation, and is not something that the County is committing money to by approving it in the budget.

Mr. Boyd commented that it's the same situation as the turf field allocation.

Mr. Tucker explained that the \$850,000 would be brought forward as part of the total CIP budget appropriation.

Mr. Foley said that it should be clarified that the amount is for the crosswalks.

Mr. Slutzky added that it should be run by the Oversight Committee.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that as a rule he is not comfortable with appropriating money for broad categories where individual projects have not been identified, adding that he wants the Committee to prioritize items for the current and future years.

Mr. Letteri continued his presentation, indicating that the primary source of funding for the CIP is the growth formula transfer and then borrowing at the school and local government levels; surplus from prior years, reserves, proffer monies, interest income, tourism funds, and grants are also revenue sources. He explained that a simpler formula would include establishment of a base calculated at 15 cents using 2009 figures, then changing it by factoring in the percentage of increase or decrease in revenues.

Mr. Letteri outlined the gross transfer amount of \$19.0 million to \$20.0 million for the CIP, noting the debt service amount of \$17.0 million to \$18.0 million per year with the resulting net amount providing revenues being a small amount of the total. He reported that other revenues are about \$2.0 million to \$3.0 million per year, with loan proceeds providing most of that.

Mr. Slutzky asked if a debt service negotiation at the state level would change those numbers.

Mr. Letteri replied that it would.

Mr. Rooker asked how much in Tourism Funds would go into Capital.

Mr. Letteri responded that the \$350,000 in ACE money in the allocation includes the Tourism funding. He said that the goal has been to keep a \$2.0 million reserve, and the adopted plan is "pretty significantly" short of that. Mr. Letteri stated that for this program they have assumed no surpluses for FY10 or FY11, with \$1.0 million for FY12 and \$1.5 for the subsequent two years (in our current revenues).

Mr. Boyd said that the Board should rethink putting surplus dollars in the CIP and instead consider it for reserve funds.

Mr. Foley said that staff could bring policies related to this back for Board consideration.

Mr. Letteri provided information on debt service accumulated each year, stating that projects that have been pushed out to future years would impact this substantially.

Mr. Rooker commented that the Board would not likely adopt a CIP that would show a negative reserve, so that would mean either more money transferred to capital or a reduced capital budget. He noted that debt service is increasing, and the Board needs to be very cautious about approving projects that will continue to make it climb. Mr. Rooker emphasized that funding all of the projects pushed into the out years seems unrealistic.

Ms. Thomas said that the other effect of this is to be cautious in talking about projects in the out years, such as the access to the reservoir in 2014 that she mentioned during the recent SFRR Task Force meetings. She does not think the Board should be talking about anything being there beyond 2013, in terms of what we're leading the public to expect.

Mr. Foley responded that it would be helpful to get the Board a little more engaged in projects in the out years, as that would help the CIP process next fall.

Mr. Letteri reported on possible County borrowing mechanisms including the VML/VACo pool, lease revenues, or bond referendums. He explained that on the School side almost all borrowing comes through VPSA, with a small amount of maintenance projects funded in cash. He said that there is a policy of 2 percent of assessed value and 10 percent of general fund/school fund revenues on the debt service side. Mr. Letteri explained the debt capacity policy as a percent of property values, noting that the

County is below the 1 percent mark – with the maximum by law being 2 percent. He added that he thinks that the County could technically add \$160.0 million in debt and still be below the 2 percent maximum; it would be above the AAA.

Mr. Rooker commented that it's likely the number of localities that qualify for a AAA-rating would decrease. He also said that there is no need to have a big capital improvement project each year, as that will lead to more debt as it is paid back over a longer time-frame. Maybe the County should only do one major project every four or five years.

Mr. Slutzky commented that he is not aware of any projects brought forward that are unnecessary or excessive.

Mr. Rooker responded that there is \$850,000 in this plan for Neighborhood Model improvements, and just four or five years ago there was nothing like that in the CIP. The County is doing things that have not been done previously to make the urban area a better place to live.

Ms. Mallek added that citizens are not expecting things to happen overnight. It is a long-term plan.

Mr. Letteri pointed out that for every dollar borrowed the County needs 10 cents in revenue.

Mr. Boyd asked why the County is concerned about a AAA-bond rating when it's never been used for anything.

Mr. Letteri responded that the County is part of the VML/VACo pool, and he agreed that the rating probably isn't having that much of an impact.

Mr. Letteri reported that the County will be borrowing for a number of projects in the coming five years – the Juvenile Court expansion that is almost complete, the Hollymead fire station, and the Pantops and Ivy stations.

Mr. Boyd asked how many projects are already committed to.

Mr. Letteri responded that the Juvenile Court and Hollymead fire stations are the only ones that come to mind.

Mr. Letteri reported that it would require a 3-cent increase to balance the entire 10-year period. He said that there are several scenarios for Board consideration, including adding a penny back to the capital plan, not funding revenue-sharing for a few years, and other hypothetical models. Mr. Letteri said that adding a penny adds \$1.56 million, or \$4.8 million over five years – which could be used for borrowing or some combination of funding cash projects. He stated that if the VDoT road-sharing program revenue could be reduced by \$1.5 million for the next two years, window replacements could be moved up as could the Crozet Library, Court improvements could be done sooner as could the Pantops fire station. He also confirmed that the accumulated transportation balance was at \$5.9 million and is now at \$3.9 million.

Mr. Tucker said that the Board will have to decide at some point whether the County takes over projects for VDoT, as they had agreed to move some of them up.

Mr. Thomas commented that the VML's listing of the state budget paints a picture for local governments in two years that is bleaker than they have ever seen it in her analysis, but that will be buffered in the interim because of stimulus money.

Mr. Rooker stated that it appeared that VDoT was going more in the direction of providing transportation dollars to communities that would match them, but now they are abandoning that funding entirely.

Mr. Tucker said that it's a slippery slope when localities start funding VDoT projects, but people expect the County to take care of roads.

Ms. Mallek commented that the roads will become dangerous in the short term when potholes are not repaired and roads remain unplowed.

Mr. Letteri also indicated that there is CIP money for police radios, etc.

Mr. Rooker expressed concern that the County has provided "enhanced gadgets" for fire, rescue, police, etc., noting that while they are important, the Board made a huge investment in the 800 MHz system with the idea that it was state of the art. The County is still paying for that.

Mr. Slutzky asked if it was fiscally responsible to put CIP projects off into the out years when construction costs are likely much less now.

Mr. Rooker agreed, but said it's equally important to evaluate the projects in the CIP slated for the out years, as not all of them are necessary for the community.

Mr. Tucker indicated that there would be more information coming back from staff on the JAUNT issue next week, as well as Oversight Committee review of the Neighborhood Plan implementation projects.

Board members confirmed that they were supportive of the \$1.5 million for VDoT revenue-sharing being used as a reserve.

With regard to staffing in Social Services, Mr. Tucker said those positions are currently funded in the budget, although they can be considered frozen positions.

Ms. Thomas responded that her point is that it seemed wise to be able to short-circuit the length of time it takes to replace someone in that department, with positions starting ahead of time so as not to leave gaps in staffing when staff members retire.

Mr. Tucker stated that if those vacancies occur on July 1, unless someone was brought on Board beforehand, it would be hard to achieve that.

Mr. Bryan Elliott, Assistant County Executive, explained that one retirement has been announced in Adult Protective Services, with most other vacancies occurring with office associate positions.

Mr. Tucker also mentioned that there would be several retirements in the Police Department in the coming years, but there is COPS money available for up to three years for officer positions. He said that three vacated positions would likely be able to be filled with this funding, but that money would run out in three years.

Mr. Tucker said that other than navigating through the Social Service area, the Mohr Center and JAUNT are the other areas of concern, adding that the Oversight Committee's upcoming evaluation might allow for additional money to go into the Board reserve.

Mr. Slutzky asked if – given the 57 frozen positions – there is enough attrition to meet the goal of not laying people off.

Mr. Tucker reiterated that his plan is not to lay off anyone and avoid furloughs, but it is impossible to predict what will happen with the economy in the upcoming months.

Mr. Slutzky recommended that the Board wait until next Wednesday to talk about the tax rate because there are several town halls and public meetings that will take place before then.

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

Ms. Thomas asked if everyone had received the letter from the Ivy Farm people regarding the Charlottesville Marathon.

Mr. Rooker replied that only he and Ms. Thomas received it, and he sent an email to John Miller and Chip Harding about the impropriety of closing off subdivision roads.

Mr. Tucker said that legally, they cannot close them off.

Ms. Thomas mentioned that there are measures that other races implement that this marathon is not doing, such as having cars run through the middle and notifying residents through the mail.

Mr. Tucker suggested that he invite Chief Miller to attend the Board meeting next Wednesday to discuss this.

Mr. Rooker commented that the Police closed off Ivy Farm for hours and people could not get out of the subdivision.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adjourn. With no further business to come before the Board, at 3:40 p.m., Mr. Rooker **moved** to adjourn to Wednesday, March 11, 2009, 3:00 p.m., in Room 241. Ms. Mallek **seconded** 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.

Chairman

Approved by the Board of County Supervisors
Date: 06/03/2009 Initials: EWJ