

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 15, 2010, at 9:00 a.m., in the Lane Auditorium of the County Office Building on McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from March 8, 2010.

PRESENT: Mr. Kenneth C. Boyd, Mr. Lindsay G. Dorrier, Jr., Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Mr. Dennis S. Rooker, Mr. Duane E. Snow and Mr. Rodney S. 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 9:01 a.m., by the Chair, Ms. Mallek.

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session: FY 2010-11 County Budget.

Mr. Tucker noted that the Board had completed work sessions on General Government categories in the budget, and also had a work session the Schools' budget. This work session will focus primarily on the Capital Improvements Program. If there is time, the Board can discuss some of the items which have been added to the list of unfunded items. He said staff just received information on yesterday's General Assembly session.

Mr. Bill Letteri, Director of Facilities Management, addressed the Board. He said a large number of staff members helped to assemble the information that will be presented today. Today he will present the County Executive's recommended CIP for FY 2011-15. This recommendation comes to the Board through the various processes for CIP review – including the Technical Review Team and the CIP Oversight Committee. Due to the current economic times, it was recommended that they look at existing balances and programs to determine if there is an opportunity for liquidation and reclassification and reallocation of those balances. He said his objective today is to receive Board comments and feedback on the CIP, although formal action is not required today.

Mr. Letteri said one objective today is to receive the Board member's comments on the recommended CIP, to weigh in on transferring part of the reserve balance in the CIP to the Undesignated Fund Balance of the General Fund in order to shore up the County policy of retaining an eight percent balance in that fund. As per the Board's request, a number of projects have been suspended pending this conversation. For projects that are not affected by that, staff hopes those projects can be released so they can proceed. He said staff will present the adjustments required since the Board last saw the CIP at the joint work session. At that time it was planned on a 77¢ (equalized tax rate) and subsequently the Board directed staff to use a 74¢ tax rate. What has emerged is a "maintenance-only" type of CIP program for the next five years.

Mr. Letteri said the last part of the presentation will look at the categories of projects, prior appropriations and balances. Staff would like to receive the Board's final directions on this budget.

Mr. Letteri presented the three major revenue factors that impact the CIP. The first is the gross transfer to the CIP which is a formula-based transaction each year based on overall revenues. At this time, the formula is a standard of about 15¢ on the tax dollar adjusted for transportation and ACE and other items so now it approximates about 11¢ on the dollar. He pointed out that in the last two years there has been a tremendous decline in that revenue representing about a 32 percent decline. Matched against that is the amount the County must pay for Debt Service. Over that same time period, the amount of Debt Service to be paid has risen. Debt Service must be paid before the transfer is made, so net revenues transferred to the CIP have been quite reduced. The County had been accustomed to head room of about \$10.0 million between what was paid in Debt Service and what was transferred. The only other factor that helps the CIP is in what are called "other revenues" such as prior year surpluses, interest earnings, grants, proffers, etc.

Mr. Snow referred to a chart on the screen (Reduced Transfers/Revenues to the CIP) and asked about the spike in FY '08-09. Mr. Letteri said that represented about \$30.0 million in loan proceeds for School projects.

Ms. Mallek said since they are now being paid off, that increases the total of Debt Service. Mr. Letteri said it is now proposed to decline since a lot of projects are being removed from the CIP which would have been debt financed. That number should continue to decline and hopefully revenues will increase so that cushion of \$10.0 million will be restored.

Mr. Letteri referred to the chart entitled "Reduced Transfers/Revenues to CIP General Fund" and noted that the General Fund transfer is down 32 percent while Debt Service has risen by about nine percent. In the last couple of years the net transfer to the CIP has decreased almost 92 percent from about \$10.0 million down to less than \$1.0 million. Other Revenues have declined precipitously from \$39.0 million to \$8.0 million.

Mr. Letteri said there have been many process changes made in the CIP process over the last couple of years. It is a much more rigorous type of weighting system that identified goals and objectives. It is a very objective ranking system. Staff talked about the need to suspend the capital needs assessment. Typically that would be a part of this presentation. They feel that a long-term look is an

important part of the CIP process, but this year, given the uncertainty of trying to predict what might happen in two or three years, they elected not to address that specifically.

Mr. Letteri said the Board had adopted a set of guiding principles. Maintain public safety as a key component of Albemarle's livability; provide and maintain educational facilities and technologies that enhance teaching and learning; support and enhance Albemarle County's overall quality of life and community desirability and livability, including projects that contribute to the arts, education, community events, outdoor recreation, historic and cultural heritage, and social opportunities; improve and maintain critical County facilities to a 40-year useful life to improve functionality of buildings and preserve assets; provide well-located, safe and efficient facilities that offer quality customer service and increase employee productivity; incorporate environmentally sensitive and energy efficient systems into County facilities; and respond to technological innovations and incorporate technological rather than spatial solutions when appropriate; pursue innovative arrangements for financing approaches including, but not limited to, public/private partnerships; ground lease of County properties in high value areas; leaseback and lease-purchase options and intergovernmental cooperation; assist departments in preserving and maintaining the County's investment in buildings, land, infrastructure and equipment; recommend projects based on a prioritized ranking system and the effective utilization of available outside funding sources (Federal, State, other) in addition to appropriate County funding levels; pursue opportunities for collaboration between General Government and the Schools working together to advance opportunities for different generations to come together in any publically financed facility; support working with community non-profits (especially those receiving County funds) to seek opportunities to benefit all County residents by sharing spaces.

Mr. Letteri then summarized the adjustments that had to be made to balance the CIP seen at the work session to get to the 74¢ tax rate. He said the CIP Oversight Committee, in making their recommendations, said the County might have to move to a 74¢ scenario and articulated a set of adjustments they thought would be appropriate. He summarized: Tourism funded projects have been removed (including ACE), and those funds channeled to support park activities that are consistent with tourism goals; ACE funding was eliminated except for FY 2010-11 and that will be funded with one-time transportation dollars; the County and Volunteer apparatus program has been delayed for one year; the 800 MHz radio system installation has been delayed; the CAD system for ECC has been delayed; the ECC Emergency telephone system has been delayed. All of these were scheduled to come up for replacement in the next couple of years, but have been pushed out a couple of years. The Police mobile data computers were delayed; the Police patrol video cameras have been delayed, and that program reduced. Stormwater program funding was reduced – this program had been funded at \$1.0 million a year until last year when that was reduced to \$250,000 – this program funds it at \$250,000 but thereafter it will be reduced to \$100,000 a year. The Keene landfill project has been reduced – they felt these contingency funds could be needed if there were a problem with that closed facility - the site is consistently monitored.

Mr. Letteri said the recommended FY 2010-11 CIP funds critical maintenance for government facilities, Parks, Courts, libraries and schools. There are over 150 structures, over 50 acres of roofs, over 3.0 million square feet of facilities, and over 4,000 acres of land – with a conservative estimate of \$300.0+ million in assets and facilities. The funds provided in this budget are adequate to maintain the critical infrastructure at a core level.

Mr. Boyd asked if staff will be looking for properties that are no longer needed and cost money to maintain. Mr. Letteri said they can do that, but that wasn't intended to be part of this discussion today. He said that 1,200 of the 4,000 acres owned by the County are actively managed and used.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that some of that land is parkland. He said that over 1,800 acres of parkland have been added over the last several years. He agreed that if there is land that will not be used by the County anytime within the foreseeable future that could be converted to cash for a project that is felt to be important, the Board might consider doing that. Mr. Tucker said staff has already begun that process. If some of this land might be used in the long term, it would likely cost a lot more to purchase in the future.

Mr. Snow suggested this matter be placed on a future agenda for discussion.

Mr. Rooker asked if greenways were counted in the 4,000 acres. Mr. Letteri said "yes."

Mr. Letteri said a key element of the plan is that it funds mandates and obligations including Ivy and Keene landfill remediation, joint municipality obligations, leases, and voting machines; reflects no new funding for capital projects including fire stations, schools, roads, libraries or parks over the next five years; and, maintenance/replacement projects are primarily debt funded which ordinarily is not the preferred approach. That is done for the School System because many of their maintenance projects are very long term in nature, but on the Local Government side there are smaller projects that don't always lend themselves to borrowing money over long periods of time.

Mr. Boyd and Mr. Snow asked for an example. Mr. Letteri explained that on the School side, there might be a mechanical renovation that could cost between \$200,000 and \$300,000 with a useful life of 15 years or more years.

Mr. Boyd said he was referring to General Government projects. Mr. Letteri explained that on the General Government side a lot of the projects are things like carpet replacement which are usually paid for in cash.

Mr. Boyd asked if that means there will be borrowing for those types of projects now. Mr. Letteri responded that to balance this plan with current revenues, some of those funds must be borrowed.

Mr. Rooker said that's just not a prudent approach. Mr. Letteri said when reallocation and liquidation of funds is discussed a first priority will be on getting rid of that debt and paying cash for those items. The second is the transfer to the General Fund.

Mr. Letteri said that is a summary of the CIP as it is recommended today. On the General Government side, the recommended CIP includes less than \$30.0 million over a five-year period, with no money to be put into community and neighborhood development, transportation, or master planning implementation, and funding was reduced in almost every category. He will discuss each category later and explain what is involved

Mr. Letteri reported that Stormwater Management funding is down to a reduced level, substantially less than the previous four years – and this funding will meet mandated levels, just barely. The Schools have been reduced to a maintenance-only type operation with some of the funds proposed to be appropriated including things that are matched up with grants. If the grants “go away”, so will the projects. He said there is about a 64 percent decline both in FY 2011, and for the whole five-year period of the CIP generally, It is about a 67 percent reduction from the adopted plan in FY 2011, and about 55 percent for the Schools over the five-year period (\$36.0 million).

Mr. Rooker said the current, adopted plan was already reduced. Mr. Letteri said that is correct.

Mr. Boyd said that last year a lot of projects were just put off a year, and then this year they were deleted entirely. Mr. Letteri said that is the reason the adopted FY 2009-10 budget showed \$25.0 million - a lot of those were the deferred projects that were brought forward, but have now been deleted.

Mr. Rooker said there has been a 97 percent reduction in the capital plan, and he asked if that is over the two-year period. Mr. Letteri confirmed that it is.

Mr. Letteri said the only thing funded in Administration is \$456,000 in the fifth year – there is no way to know whether the Federal Government will impose a requirement to actually switch out voting equipment. He said staff thinks it is likely to happen at some point in the future.

Ms. Mallek said the General Assembly did not pass the waiver, so the County is under a burden from Richmond to do something. After the census she thinks the County will make changes to the precincts, and she asked if there is money in this plan to do what staff already knows will be required. Mr. Letteri said a change was made this year by purchasing some laptop computers that could accommodate the current requirements, but he does not know whether what was passed by the General Assembly will impose additional requirements.

Mr. Jake Washburn, Registrar, said that the current CIP was at \$106,000, for the electronic poll books, but dropped to about \$85,000 – which the County wanted to liquidate. That's a real concern. He said that there would need to be voting machines much sooner than 2016, as by 2011 the precinct will grow after redistricting. He thinks that following the 2011 redistricting, the County will have to add a minimum of two additional precincts. The dilemma is they are still under the moratorium of purchasing additional touch screen machines. Mr. Washburn stated that in the summer of 2011 the County would be faced with the choice of either buying a few optical scan machines to put into a few precincts “to make do,” or buying one for every precinct. He added that the problem with not putting them in every precinct is that the public will view not having that option as being unfair. He added that each machine is \$7,000 and there are 30 precincts for a total of \$210,000. If they just add a couple of machines for the precincts running two different machines, they would have to teach Election Officers how to run the different systems. He asked the Board to reconsider cutting the \$85,000.

Mr. Rooker responded that the first priority is to meet mandated legal requirements. Mr. Letteri added that it's very hard to know the specifics and timeframes of the requirements. Ms. Mallek commented that it would be really helpful if the State chose one that counties were allowed to buy.

Mr. Letteri added that making these liquidations is always risky step. Mr. Rooker replied that it's a lot more risky when it's a mandated program, and it's very likely that there will be some expenditures that aren't known yet.

Ms. Mallek commented that it could be triple what the County is putting aside. Mr. Letteri agreed.

Mr. Letteri said that in the area of courts, there are maintenance-type expenses such as carpet, mechanical replacement, roof repairs, and minor replacements to keep these facilities operational – with Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court costs split between the County and the City. In the case of the Old Jail facility, at one time there was quite a bit more money set aside for renovation and restoration of the building. These monies provide minimal upkeep so the building does not fall down.

Mr. Thomas asked if the costs were assigned based on population. Mr. Letteri responded that they are split 50/50 in the case of the Juvenile Court.

Mr. Dorrier asked about the possibility of transferring the Old Jail to the Historical Society. Mr. Tom Foley, Assistant County Executive, said the decision to transfer the facility to the Historical Society has not been made yet. Staff will be bringing some additional information back to the Board.

Mr. Letteri replied that he has met with the Historical Society in some preliminary discussions, and they agreed to outline their level of interest and capability. Mr. Foley indicated that the Board would discuss that as a separate issue, emphasizing that the building is in a state of major disrepair.

Mr. Dorrier commented that it could be part of their historical walking tour. Mr. Foley said that there is a lot of talk left to be done, but the condition of the building will necessitate a very expensive renovation.

Mr. Snow stated that the building would be eligible for some restoration grants if it belonged to the Historical Society.

In terms of public safety, Mr. Letteri said the primary dollars are for apparatus replacement. The plan reflects a delay of one year in the entire program. The Regional Jail Security system is the County's portion of the debt service for that restoration and upgrade. Mr. Letteri reported that there are funds in the CIP for the 800 MHz radio replacements – the handheld units that will continue to need replacement over time. The CAD and telephone systems for the 911 Center are joint projects with the City and the University. He said that currently the technology is more than 10 years old, and while vendors are continuing to support this technology it is likely they will soon no longer support them. It is a matter of timing as to when these will have to be upgraded.

Ms. Mallek said she is concerned about putting this off for so many years because there are a lot of parts of the County where the fire and rescue personnel are out of reach now, and without the new system and the new boosters they were working on, there will be problems. Mr. Letteri commented that this represents one of staff's higher priorities when the Board gets to recommendations for reallocations.

Mr. Rooker said the County has a fire and apparatus budget that is larger than what the County use to allocate to fire and rescue 15 years ago. He expressed concern that apparatus is being replaced, when the emergency communications system seems to not be up to par. He asked if the CIP Oversight Committee has looked at whether there needs to be money spent on trucks rather than the ECC equipment. He asked what the \$3.296 million in FT 12/13 represent and is that the amount of money needed to spend.

Mr. Boyd said that last year the CIP Committee decided on a rating formula. He explained that all of these items have been filtered through the CIP evaluation process, and the apparatus showed up higher on the priority list.

Mr. Snow commented that he has visited the fire stations in his area, and they have indicated that the equipment they have now is sufficient.

Mr. Thomas agreed, stating that he has been told that the equipment is acceptable for the time being.

Mr. Dan Eggleston, Director of Fire and Rescue, explained that the Department had worked with their Advisory Board a few years ago to define the fleet size and the replacement criteria for apparatus, and the CIP reflects the two policies passed by that Board. He emphasized that in order to achieve significant and meaningful savings in the CIP, the fleet size and replacement criteria should be revisited with a recommendation returned to this Board.

Mr. Rooker said that this seems like a wise step, even though money is not being appropriated in this fiscal year for these five-year plan expenditures.

Mr. Boyd stated that he brought up the issue of equipment replacement at several Advisory Committee meetings, but not much attention was given to it at the time.

Mr. Bryan Elliott, Assistant County Executive, commented that mission has to be considered as well as age, mileage, and hours. He stated that the next phase of the CIP will look at equipment that wasn't replaced in the last round.

Mr. Boyd said another thing the Board has talked about, but the volunteers do not like, is fleet rotation which would greatly increase the fleet, but cannot be done as long as they have different colors.

Mr. Tucker suggested that it comes back as a recommendation from the Board.

Mr. Boyd suggested that the staff also talk to the School system regarding fleet rotation on their busses and a shift to shorter routes.

Mr. Thomas said that it seems there is adequate equipment in the case of a major emergency, but there doesn't seem to be enough personnel and volunteers to man all the trucks. The County has purchased two trucks in the last year, and the volunteers keep them in great shape.

Mr. Elliott said, if it is the consensus of the Board, staff will look at evaluating the replacement policy and folding it in with next year's CIP.

Mr. Boyd suggested bringing back to the Board the weighting criteria the Committee used in making the decision that the apparatus was more important than the CAD or 800 MHz.

Mr. Rooker said the question that needs to be addressed is whether the replacement policy is resulting in more frequent expenditures.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that the equipment is catching up with the land use decisions that were made, as there are four and five-story buildings out at NGIC and four and five-story buildings under construction and occupied Crozet that were completely out of reach of the equipment that existed at the time.

Mr. Thomas said the Board shouldn't forget the volunteers because they are the most important aspect of the fire companies, and they are very dedicated. Mr. Dorrier added that the volunteers need to be included in the decision-making process.

Mr. Foley mentioned that the Advisory Board is part of all decision-making. He added that there is money left over from the 800 MHz project that would help address some of the dead spots in the County. This is just replacement of the handhelds.

Mr. Eggleston noted that the re-banding process is a separate project in itself, which is supported in part by the telecommunications industry. He then asked if it was the Board's desire to look at the replacement criteria and reevaluate the fleet size and configuration.

Ms. Mallek asked if the County is ready to go ahead with the 800 MHz if some money were found or if there is still lots of planning to do.

Mr. Elliott responded that when Mr. Letteri reviews the CIP priorities with the Board, he will have some recommendations about de-appropriating funds in other areas to move the ECC projects forward. He added that there are no apparatus expenditures planned for FY11, and this would be a good opportunity to review the policy for replacement and fold it into FY12 recommendations.

Mr. Foley said that it was determined that the radio replacement could be delayed, as there is some good solid equipment that doesn't necessarily have to be replaced immediately. Mr. Eggleston agreed.

Mr. Letteri then went to the category of Public Works. This category is general maintenance for General Government facilities, and the other four items represent formal obligations for remediation or the septic receiving facility that is the County's share of the debt service on that facility – and the storage facility lease.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the Keene Landfill proposal requires an expenditure of \$52,000. Mr. Letteri responded that it is proposed to be a contingency amount funded by the County that would be rolled over into future years if it is not used. He explained that the remediation is complete, and this is just a mandate for the monitoring although no major problems are expected.

Mr. Boyd asked if any of the public works projects in FY 10/11 are financed, or if they are paid in cash. Mr. Letteri replied that the County will pay cash in FY11, and then is proposing to balance the plan by borrowing the balance for the four-year program.

Mr. Foley emphasized that their top priority in finalizing this for the Board was to move away from borrowing for maintenance. Staff thinks that's a bad practice. He added that in the first year staff made sure they were not borrowing for maintenance so that they would have a chance as they revise and update the plan to continue to not borrow for maintenance.

Mr. Boyd asked if the County had gone beyond its' required debt ceiling. Mr. Foley replied, "no".

Mr. Rooker asked if Moore's Creek is being financed. Mr. Letteri confirmed that financing for Moore's Creek is being paid back over 20 years.

Mr. Letteri reported that there is no funding proposed for the five years in the category of Community Development – which represents transportation, master planning implementation, neighborhood improvement programs, street-lighting, sidewalks, etc. He said that the CIP is intended to be the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan and Board strategies, but there are no funds available other than some accumulated balances that will be discussed later.

Mr. Rooker said that the situation is problematic when the goal is to attract new people into the growth areas, based upon additional services being in the growth areas. Not having those things, i.e., bicycle lanes, sidewalks, etc., is a disincentive for people to do what they want them to do.

Ms. Mallek noted that if the people at Gray Rock had known it would take 20 years to get a sidewalk to downtown Crozet, they probably wouldn't have built there.

Mr. Letteri reported that there are no new projects for Parks, Recreation, and Culture – and the CIP includes just core maintenance needs.

Mr. Dorrier asked if Biscuit Run was included in here, and whether the County had input into the process. Mr. Tucker responded that this would be a State process, and when the time comes the County will likely have input.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that the State closed down six parks this year and it may be a while before a new one is opened.

In the category of Libraries, Mr. Letteri stated that the City co-branch Library repair/maintenance is the County's share of the obligations on jointly-operated Library facilities, and there are funds in the CIP for basic repairs to the Scottsville branch.

Mr. Tucker pointed out that the Board would be considering the Library repairs as part of their discussion on the entire Library system.

Mr. Letteri explained that there was a major renovation project slated for the Central Library, but that was removed from last year's CIP – although there are five major heating and cooling systems that will need to be replaced.

Mr. Boyd asked if the County is paying 58%, same as operating costs. Mr. Letteri said he believes that is correct. Mr. Elliott added the costs of replacements and refurbishments fall under the same formula as operating.

Mr. Dorrier asked if someone from the County reviews the process to determine when maintenance will occur. Mr. Elliott replied "yes"; Mr. Letteri's office works closely with the City and the Library.

Ms. Mallek asked if the \$476,000 on the "A" list is for the Gordon Avenue Branch and Central Library. Mr. Letteri said the major mechanical replacements for Central should not be on that; there may be other small repairs that have to be addressed this year. The Facilities group at the City meets with his team and annual reviews in detail their proposed maintenance schedule and justifications.

Mr. Snow asked if the Central Library and Gordon Avenue Library are jointly owned. Mr. Davis said the County jointly owns both of them 50/50 with the City. (He later corrected his response and advised that the Central Library is jointly owned but that the City owns the Gordon Avenue property.)

Mr. Letteri said Information Technology represents those upgrades for the County server and various equipment used for operations. These are core maintenance dollars to keep the systems operating.

Mr. Letteri said the ACE Program has been largely reduced, but it is proposed for a portion of funding in FY11 from funds transferred from the balance in the Transportation Fund.

Ms. Mallek added that the last four years of this charge is zeroed out.

Mr. Rooker explained to new Board members that this was a program the County was spending about \$1.5 million on, a penny on the tax rate, and it was widely supported by many groups in the community. He doesn't recall anyone coming to a public hearing and speaking out against the program. It is certainly a significant downgrade to be going to a mode where the County no longer has an ACE Program.

Mr. Boyd stated that this would be an excellent place for revenue-sharing dollars as it benefits the entire community.

Mr. Rooker said that it should be discussed, but that would still mean the County would need to contribute. He added that this also means the County loses the opportunity for State matching funds, even though this year there likely won't be any. He expects that in the out years, there will be federal and state funds available to communities that have these type programs although the County will no longer be able to take advantage.

Mr. Thomas asked if there have been any discussions with the City about that. Mr. Rooker said it is something that can be added to the April 24th discussions with the City.

Mr. Letteri reported that stormwater management would be maintained at the prior funding level of \$260,000 for FY11, but would then be reduced to about \$100,000 thereafter.

Mr. Letteri said that the School CIP is also primarily a maintenance-only program, and this represents a minimum level to keep the facilities at operational levels. It does not make any significant improvements to any facilities over the five year period. Mr. Letteri said that of the \$20.0 million total, \$2.5 million is funded in cash – which staff finds to be a reasonable level given the nature of these expenditures.

Mr. Snow asked if these were additional funds beyond their submitted budget. Mr. Letteri clarified that these are capital expenditures, not operational funds.

Mr. Rooker said that the School pays their share because their CIP funds come off the top – neither General Government nor Schools get the money that goes to capital projects.

Mr. Snow asked about the administrative technology funds. Dr. Bruce Benson, Assistant Superintendent for Planning and Operations, explained that those funds are used to buy replacement equipment – primarily for administrative offices and departments. Dr. Benson said that instructional technologies pay for classroom computers and equipment, and there is no money in there for FY10 and

FY11; federal stimulus monies had been earmarked for that purpose, but the State will likely not make those funds available next year.

Mr. Snow asked what is included in that category. Dr. Benson replied computers, servers, anything related to administrative technologies.

Ms. Mallek asked if any of these are the result of directions from Richmond. Dr. Benson replied, "yes". There are a couple of different places where they get monies for technology purchases in the School budget. There is also flow through monies from the State.

Mr. Dorrier asked how this fits in with the instructional coaching model.

Dr. Benson responded that that model addresses the deployment of staff to meet an SOQ requirement for technology support and instructional support – and those are just barely being met at this point. The state requires that there is one FTE and one technical support person per thousand students to assist with instructional technology use in classroom.

Mr. Foley said that it seems the State has put that instructional technology money back in. Dr. Benson said that some of this would be reinstated – possibly \$720,000 – but the number is not nailed down yet. He added that this is done by a purchase and reimbursement request system which is designed to support the Commonwealth's online testing initiative. He noted that that is shown as Project "E" in the Board's information.

Mr. Foley indicated that the number is around \$752,000 at last count. Dr. Benson added that there is specific kinds of equipment they can purchase and request reimbursement.

Mr. Snow asked what the difference is between this and what's in the School budget. Dr. Benson said that Mr. Price explained this in his budget presentation last week. The School Division did have some concerns about what they thought they would have available in terms of capital monies for purchase versus where they landing before the General Assembly completed its work. It looks like they will see a little additional money in terms of the technology grant monies, but they are still concerned about not having the instructional technology funds available towards being able to use the State's stabilization monies that has now been rolled up into basic aid.

Mr. Letteri said that concludes the function area discussion. He thought it would be helpful to mention that it is a maintenance-only type program.

Mr. Letteri reported that the categories that were highly ranked but not funded include the Levy Building renovation, which is intended as a jointly funded facility to house General District Court operations and perhaps those of the City in a combined way. He added that the City appears to be not willing to pursue that at this point, so some discussion about its disposition ultimately will have to happen in the next year or so.

Mr. Boyd asked if that space is needed, as it was originally approached as a temporary stopgap measure.

Mr. Letteri explained that it was intended for space while the Juvenile Court was renovated, but now that project is over. He added that they continue to have acute needs in Circuit Court and General District Court operations in the existing Courthouse that will need to be addressed in some form, and whether Levy would be an appropriate solution is being studied at this time.

Mr. Foley said that the City is backing away now, as there are new projections for need.

Mr. Letteri stated that at one time there was significant funding to restore the Old Jail, but that is not on the table now given the budget situation. Renovation will take more than the maintenance dollars that were programmed. He said that the County is working with the Historical Society on a plan, which includes a possible transfer of title to them.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that if the decision were not to refurbish the old building, the property does sit on a very valuable piece of real estate.

Mr. Dorrier compared it to the Hatton Ferry, adding that there are possibilities for other outside revenue sources.

Mr. Letteri said that it is a technical discussion at this point, and tax benefits to developers and others are being considered – but there are also operations concerns such as parking and access that could affect the Court operations. It's a complicated question at this point and one of the reasons why the Board decided to embark on this study was to make sure that they understood what those issues were before spending any money.

Mr. Foley pointed out that this is one reason why the Board appointed a committee that was broader than just the Historical Society which was to look at the bigger issue.

Mr. Boyd said that Mr. Rooker's thought is that the property could be developed by the private sector, maintaining its historic character but still providing some enumeration for the County.

Ms. Mallek added that another factor as mentioned is that the facility can't impact the Court operations.

Mr. Rooker said that it's been sitting there on a valuable piece of property for some time, just deteriorating. It would be helpful for the Board to see a report on the historic nature of the building. Although the building has a long history, it never appeared to him to be a very architecturally significant building. It's been used for a various things over the years and it is a judgment as to whether the building should be retained as a historic resource or used for some other purpose in relation to the Court system.

Mr. Dorrier stated that if no one is in charge of the building, there is no buy in and it will deteriorate more. He thinks the County needs to take responsibility for it and make sure it's not ignored.

Mr. Rooker responded that all those things cost money. He added that he would like to see the expense shift away from the County into a situation that generates some revenue, otherwise it is just a deteriorating asset on the backs of the taxpayers.

Mr. Dorrier said he thinks they do not need to outsource the expense of the building; it can be kept in-house. A committee can be formed to come back to the Board every six months and provide an update.

Mr. Letteri commented that there may be items in his presentation that can be tabled for a more in-depth future discussion. He then talked about projects that have been eliminated. In the category of public safety, all the major projects including fire stations have been eliminated from the program. Mr. Letteri reported that there are potential agreements with Worrell Enterprises and the University to occupy the fire stations, and while there are studies to move in that direction there are no construction dollars programmed to accomplish that. He said that other projects shelved include the Seminole Trail station upgrade, the training facilities, and the Evidence & Specialty Unit storage. These are all projects that were previously identified by the Operations. Mr. Letteri stated that other public works items include window replacements for the County Office Building, some of the recycling centers, and various security improvements throughout County facilities.

He said that Community Development categories that have been funded at healthy levels in the past have no new monies programmed for the next five years – although some of those accounts do have fund balances. Mr. Letteri stated that there was a plan for an intergenerational center with JABA, but it did not make the funding list. Under Parks and Recreation, he also said that there were improvements planned for many of the parks in the County system, but all have been eliminated – including the greenway program, river and lake access improvements, and general park enhancements.

Mr. Boyd commented that there are some greenway programs that are in process that are not being eliminated. Mr. Letteri said that is correct.

Mr. Letteri reported that the Crozet Library has been suspended, although there has been a very significant start on the project planning with lots of community input and a schematic design. He said that the plan now is to do at the very least some site stabilization and perhaps a parking area that would serve the community in the interim. Mr. Letteri added that there is expansion needed for the Northside Library, but that is also on hold. The County does have a five year extension on the existing facility and will continue to serve the County at its current capacity.

Mr. Letteri said that the Schools' major CIP projects – including substantial renovation to the southern feeder schools – have been replaced with increases in maintenance for FY12 and FY 13, to keep those facilities functional and operational for the immediate future. The funding does not include any of the renovations or improvements that are considered important. He stated that there is about \$34.2 million in that category that was not funded.

Mr. Letteri reported that staff believes the critical core maintenance issues are being funded in the Capital Plan, as well as obligations and mandates. There are no new projects for capital or things considered necessary for operations and it does delay some critical regional ECC projects. He added that more debt is included than would be preferred which staff will address in the recommendations. There is still an undesignated balance in the General Fund side that is less than the goal of eight percent, and it is hoped that can be addressed in the recommendations.

Mr. Letteri said that concludes the recommended CIP portion of the discussion. No action is required today. Later in the meeting staff may make some suggestions and ask for direction to make some changes to the Plan which it can bring back to the Board in April.

Mr. Letteri reported that the liquidation reallocations are prior appropriations that have been made over the years, and it is not unusual that capital-type programs take many years to implement. It has staff's practice in large capital programs to appropriate in one year the entire budget necessary to do the projects. He said that it also represents the accumulated balances in transportation accounts, master planning accounts, and through strong revenues. Mr. Letteri stated that prior to FY09, the County has been rolling over about \$38 million in projects that are ongoing, and much of this has been already expended or committed in terms of projects. He added that there have also been additional appropriations of \$18 million in FY10, so the budget balance as of July 1 is approximately \$57 million. Mr. Letteri explained that this is made up of three categories for projects. Category A are projects that are underway and committed; Category B are projects that have had a lot of staff work and commitment to these projects, and Category C are projects that are recommended for reallocation of funds to address other problems.

Mr. Snow asked if the \$57 million is fully funded as the budget is presently constituted. Mr. Letteri replied, "yes". Mr. Snow asked if the Board decides to remove something from that budget, it could be used for other additional uses from previous discussions. Mr. Letteri said that is correct. He added that these would be one-time funds that could provide a one-time solution, rather than long-term solutions. Mr. Letteri emphasized that staff would like to look at cash applications rather than supporting more debt.

Mr. Snow asked how much of the budget was funded debt? Mr. Rooker commented that the debt payments are in the CIP.

Mr. Letteri further explained the specific categories, noting that Category A represents committed funds that are substantially underway in some form – with most of the funds already expended, purchase orders issued, and contract negotiations in process. He explained that sources of funds include grants or restricted funds, sometimes including borrowed funds and commitments to joint municipalities such as the City or University.

Mr. Thomas asked if the YMCA contribution is committed.

Mr. Davis explained that the County entered into an agreement that funded the YMCA. The money was appropriated and there was no contingency to not pay that money. He said that it is already appropriated in this fiscal year.

Mr. Boyd commented that it could always be un-appropriated.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that the YMCA has a right to obtain the funds, noting that when the decision was made the Board had a different composition. He said that there was a survey done of general recreational needs in the community, and one of the things that came forward was a recommendation by Parks and Recreation to satisfy some of the needs in the community for various indoor recreational services by building two facilities that the County would build and operate, similar to the YMCA being discussed. Mr. Rooker stated that there was about \$30 million of capital potentially in their expenditures for the County, but there would have been an ongoing operations expense associated with each of the facilities. He indicated that at the time, he and Mr. Boyd encouraged partnership with community groups – and the YMCA came forward in discussions with the County and City. Mr. Rooker said that the original plan was to build it at PVCC, but eventually the site moved to McIntire Park – and the YMCA has proceeded with their funding over the last four years based upon a commitment by the County to put \$2 million in the project. That commitment is part of the YMCA's presentation to the community and the County has appropriated the money. He thinks that at some point unless something significant changes, you have a moral obligation to go through with the commitment that is made by the appropriation of funds to a nonprofit that is basing their entire project around those financial commitments.

Mr. Boyd agreed, but said these are different times, and the Board is sitting here looking at cutting services such as fire and rescue. The County is cutting \$200 million over a five year period and he is struggling with that money which has not yet been used.

Mr. Dorrier commented that he has been concerned that there will not be enough community use of the facility.

Mr. Thomas said that he supports the YMCA, was a board member for about 18 years, but is concerned about other priorities for the County not being funded. He would like to see the funds uncommitted if possible.

Mr. Letteri indicated that staff has put that item in Category A based on previous Board discussions and prioritization. He suggested that if there are other items in this category that should take precedence, the Board could put them on a list for further consideration.

Mr. Dorrier commented that the YMCA project doesn't qualify as "substantially underway" as the criteria stipulates.

Mr. Elliott explained that the YMCA has moved through the City's site plan review process and the project is close to having bids issued. All indications are that they will be moving forward with construction this summer. He added that it would take approximately one year to build the new facility.

Mr. Pat Mullaney, Director of Parks and Recreation said that it would probably take about 18 months, and they are planning to begin construction after the Dogwood Festival.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that it's important to remember the rationale for going into the project in the first place, as the Board agreed this was a way to provide "substantial recreational amenities" to citizens of the County without an ongoing operational expense and just a small percentage of the capital expense. In his mind this is kind of the ultimate of leveraging County dollars in a way that doesn't impose an ongoing operational cost burden to the citizens.

Mr. Mullaney noted that the \$2 million was originally put in the CIP a long time ago for an urban gymnasium somewhere on school property. For that \$2 million dollars now, they are getting a \$15 million facility that will last 50 years and serve the needs of County residents with no ongoing operating costs.

Mr. Boyd mentioned that at the time there were fewer options available from the private sector – such as Four Seasons and ACAC, both providing indoor aquatic services to the community.

Mr. Dorrier commented that there are about 18 facilities that provide these types of services.

Mr. Boyd said that he is big supporter of the YMCA and their programs. He is just concerned that this will take money away from other priority areas, noting that he was a big proponent of providing competitive swimming opportunities.

Mr. Snow stated that his problem with funding this now is that it's happening in the course of conversations about cutting school funding and closing libraries.

Mr. Rooker said that it would not be a wise move to shift the money over to operating, where it would be spent one time and then gone.

Mr. Snow said the money could be allocated over a number of years to help alleviate some of the expected budget shortfall.

Mr. Boyd commented that at this point, the money for the Crozet Library should be put back on the table or it could go into the reserve fund.

Mr. Davis emphasized that the money for the YMCA is committed by contract in this fiscal year, and if the Board wants to explore their legal options it should be done in a closed meeting.

Mr. Letteri suggested that there are numerous projects and programs. He suggested proceeding with his presentation to show the impact of applying their recommended liquidations and reallocations to the CIP. After they have an understanding of that, the Board can go back and look at individual projects and categories. They also can put any projects on a list of items for future discussion.

Mr. Letteri then explained that Category B is similar to Category A, but as a formal matter under Category B, purchase orders have not been issued in whole or in part for some of this money, so some of it is formally uncommitted. He added that specific uses have been identified, and projects represent important elements of adopted master planned or community development efforts. Mr. Letteri said that the funds are also contingencies set aside for various operational expenses or purchases – such as apparatus repairs, landfills, parks, and master plans – the only difference being that some of the funds are not formally committed at this point.

Mr. Rooker asked about the “squad replacement” (\$798,000) item.

Mr. Elliott explained that squad vehicle is a large piece of apparatus to be replaced, and these funds were appropriated in FY10. In order to bring this new unit on line, they need to renovate their building which is also being programmed into the Plan. It now seems likely that the spring of FY11 is a more realistic timeframe according to fire and rescue. He added that the rescue squad itself is paying for the building renovation.

Ms. Mallek asked about Ambulance 501 and if it was completed.

Mr. Elliott responded that Ambulance 501 is in Category C. WARS had several units that were on the apparatus plan and this unit they went out and purchased on their own. They did ask for approximately \$50,000. He added that WARS has asked for liquidation of \$128,000 out of a total of \$178,000 under Category C - \$50,000 of which is earmarked for a command vehicle. This was considered by the Board last Fall.

Mr. Letteri said Category C is appropriations staff believes could be reallocated or liquidated in whole or part. He reported that the other liquidation items include: courthouse funds balance of \$29,000 as that project is complete; the Old Jail maintenance – which had \$62,000 allocated for wall stabilization and other immediate restoration needs, but now is recommended for delay until options are pursued with the Historic Society. Based on comments from Mr. Washburne, the Board may wish to reconsider liquidating the \$85,000 for the voting machine replacement.

Mr. Dorrier commented that the County could do some of that study work themselves on the Old Jail.

Mr. Letteri responded that there would need to be professional engineers involved, and there are some historic characteristics to the building that require certain expertise.

Mr. Letteri also reported that the Brush Truck 53 project is where the Crozet station has gone in and reused their pump equipment and remodeling its chassis, yielding significant savings.

Mr. Thomas said that it is nice to see that reuse.

Ms. Mallek stated that it serves as a model for other companies to follow that track instead of buying new vehicles.

Mr. Letteri reported that there's a fairly good chance that there would not need to be money allocated for four pieces of new apparatus, as previously thought.

Mr. Elliott explained that all four were proposed for debt financing, originally approved by the Board several years ago. In Summer 2008 the Board took action to re-appropriate the funds and release

the funds to CARS – and the County has been waiting for word from them as to the status of these pieces of apparatus.

Mr. Thomas indicated that CARS was supposed to have an answer for the County by today.

Mr. Eggleston mentioned that the ambulances listed here are due to be replaced again soon because they are on a five year life cycle.

Mr. Elliott noted that if the Board decides to liquidate these, they could come back through the apparatus replacement policy for reinstatement, but it is basically holding out debt financing – and repayment schedules are forecasted with them included.

Mr. Boyd asked what the City contributes to CARS.

Mr. Rooker responded that they don't contribute anything to operations or capital.

Mr. Elliott said that when considering the Squad 133 item at \$300,000, it is a squad vehicle costing around \$750,000 – so the County agreed to fund the \$300,000 of the apparatus.

Mr. Snow asked why the City isn't contributing.

Mr. Rooker replied that they never have, because they donated the site – which they consider their one-time contribution to CARS.

Mr. Letteri said that a balance of \$385,000 has been accumulated to address various street-lighting concerns, and many of these locations have been identified as priorities. He stated that staff believes a liquidation of \$200,000 would be tolerable, and would still allow for some core needs to be addressed.

Mr. Dorrier asked how much money is left. Mr. Letteri replied approximately \$185,000.

Mr. Rooker commented that those items are expensive. The County is not going to be able to do a lot with \$185,000. He noted that just one single project he looked into was estimated at \$200,000 for an area that had lots of complaints, outdoor drug sales, etc. – but it was never done because of the cost.

Mr. Letteri agreed that the money doesn't go very far when it comes to lighting projects, as each light pole can cost \$80,000 - \$90,000.

Mr. Letteri then reported that the County is under a formal agreement with Moore's Creek septic receiving, and they have not quite finished the facility and assembled cost information – but the County will not be billed until next fiscal year, so this year's allocation can be liquidated. He explained that the Records Management system includes funds set aside to revamp the entire program, and he is looking at utilizing his own staff – along with Information Technology personnel – to reduce the overall cost of implementing this program.

Mr. Foley noted that this will serve the entire County, and Community Development will be the first pilot to establish the way they go about doing this to ensure mandates are being met.

Ms. Mallek asked if there are any funds from the State to help with this project. Mr. Foley replied, "no", not as part of this project.

Mr. Letteri said that a portion of the regional transportation monies are recommended to be reduced – by \$200,000. He also stated that there is \$3.2 million accumulated in local transportation funds, and staff is recommending a partial reallocation of those funds to support other efforts – leaving approximately \$2.0 million to augment what VDoT might be doing, and critical connections identified in master planning development.

Mr. Rooker asked if it would delay Jarman's Gap. Mr. Letteri stated that it would not. Mr. Letteri also said that there is a \$700,000 - \$800,000 overage in budget, but that may be offset by a similar amount leftover from the Meadow Creek Parkway project. There may be the ability to transfer some funds.

Mr. Letteri reported that part of the road revenue-sharing money is committed for Jarman's Gap (\$1.5 million) and Georgetown Road (totally funded), but there is uncertainty as to whether these funds will be available in the future for other projects. He said that Mr. Benish has indicated that there will be a revenue-sharing program next year that the County can participate in, but this would not leave a lot of funds for the County to work with if they use this balance now.

Mr. Rooker commented that leaving this fund empty is a problem, because the County has taken advantage of the 50/50 matching fund program with the State for a long time. He thinks it is a mistake if the program comes back and the County does not have funds in its plan to leverage the State dollars.

Mr. Letteri noted that the renovations to the Auditorium are complete, so those funds can be liquidated, and the Tourism Visitors' Center money set aside for the property during the title exchange was not needed so those funds can be liquidated. He said that the design funds for the Henley Middle School renovation – which has been postponed – are no longer needed and thus can be liquidated. Mr.

Letteri commented that this project was brought in under budget of about \$600,000, reflecting in part a good bidding climate.

He reported that there have been several steps taken already with the Crozet Library, including purchase of property, engaged architect, an extensive community engagement process, and most of the funds appropriated are committed or expended. Mr. Letteri said that staff is proposing a liquidation of about \$200,000, including a reduction of the architect's contract to reflect the fact he will not have to produce final bid documents at this time. Staff will have to add scope to the architect's work to allow them to design an interim solution that provides some parking for community downtown.

Mr. Letteri summarized that the liquidations equate to \$5.0 million total – some in cash, and some of it being debt. He said that by reducing or eliminating the debt-related projects, the question becomes what is the impact to the CIP, and that impact is in the form of reduced payments on debt service – which generates an additional \$750,000 for the five-year period. Mr. Letteri emphasized that staff is trying to point out how applying these liquidations will affect the CIP, and what it does to the bottom line reserve balance – with the goal being to have \$2.0 million at the end of the five years.

Mr. Snow commented that the cash goes to the bottom line for an immediate \$3.5 million immediate benefit. Mr. Letteri said that is correct. Mr. Snow said that money could be used for some other items identified by the Board and can go into reserves.

Mr. Letteri said that is correct. He explained that what's presented today is one way the Board could apply these funds, which reflects high priorities, but there are also other ways.

Mr. Foley clarified that these are savings in the Capital Funds, not in the General Fund to add back for libraries, etc. If the Board wants to move some of that money to the General Fund, it would have to amend its policy.

Mr. Rooker asked if current interest payment on debt is included in the General Fund operating expense. Mr. Foley replied that the interest payments on debt service are included in the debt fund – which is part of the Capital totals, not in the General Fund. Debt service is technically an operating expense, but it is not budgeted in the General Fund. He added that it is the total debt payment, which includes principle and interest.

Mr. Letteri stated that the ten percent figure staff uses for debt service is the typical 20-year bond scenario of five percent, which equates to about ten cents on the dollar.

(Note: At 11:04 a.m., the Board took a recess, and then reconvened at 11:11 a.m.)

Mr. Letteri reviewed recommendations on how the liquidations could be applied, with the first being the transfer of \$1.0 million to the Undesignated Fund Balance in the General Fund – which would get the County to that eight percent goal, in keeping with Board policy. That keeps the County's bond rating, AAA, which clearly is of critical importance. Mr. Letteri said that the second application of the liquidated funds would be to pay in cash those items that otherwise would be borrowed for, with \$2.7 million paying out what was originally slated to be borrowed through year four.

Mr. Snow asked what year the \$2.7 million takes the County to. Mr. Letteri replied 2014.

Mr. Rooker asked what would be needed to get through the entire five years. Mr. Letteri said he would need another \$1.3 million.

Mr. Letteri also explained that staff is recommending the critical timing on the ECC projects – both the CAD and telephone systems – which is the program in place for the University and City, and in which the County participates. Mr. Letteri concluded that those items mentioned apply the total \$4.2 million, and balances the County's program so at the end of the five-year period there is a reserve balance and a nominal capital fund of \$2.0 million. No new projects are added, but the financing mechanisms are being changed. He added that staff has suspended work on a lot of work pending these discussions, and except for items affected by the liquidations, staff asks that it be authorized to proceed with all other work in categories A and B. He then presented a slight showing how this application affects the Capital Fund; the change does not make a difference to the transfer over the five years. It does reduce debt service obligations which add to a net transfer of \$894,659 or 18 percent. It affects other revenues by virtue of borrowing less money. It would increase the reserve balance to \$3.0 million of which \$1.0 million would be transferred to the General Fund, leaving a \$2.0 million balance in the CIP. He added that the \$2.0 million is the total; not \$2.0 million per year.

Mr. Foley reiterated that the \$2.0 million has been a target to keep the fluctuation in the CIP; it is not a new amount.

Ms. Mallek asked if the Crozet Library was able to get \$3.0 million or so from federal and other sources, would this be the source from which the County would get the debt started.

Mr. Letteri replied that this is one-time money and doesn't provide a stream of revenue.

Mr. Rooker explained that this is a fund balance to try to maintain on the capital side to deal with the fluctuations on project costs, so it is not really for a new project. Mr. Rooker asked the total cost of the Crozet Library.

Mr. Letteri stated that the project total was \$9.8 million, and the County had originally allocated \$1.8 million, which does not include the expected \$1.6 million from the Friends of the Library. He noted that the projected debt service on the Library project, had it been funded in full, would have been about \$600,000 per year over a five-year period.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that much of the growth in Crozet is occurring in the downtown area, and the Library project was an important piece of the revitalization of the community there. He emphasized that if grant money can be obtained, it should be utilized so the project can be done. Mr. Rooker said that the combination of the favorable bidding climate, potential for grants, and low interest rates is a strong rationale to move forward. The property has already been acquired and the planning has been done.

Mr. Foley added that the only other thing to consider is the operating impact for the Library, which is about \$150,000.

Mr. Rooker suggested that if it looks like the project is moving forward sooner than later, maybe a volunteer effort should be pursued for working in the Library.

Ms. Mallek commented that there has to be paid staff to do the official responsibilities, but a lot of the support work can be done with volunteers.

Mr. Boyd commented that if the County is rethinking its approach to libraries maybe the \$3.8 million could be used for a library system in the County.

Mr. Dorrier added that one problem with that is that \$600,000 comes back from the State to purchase books because it is a regional system. He added that the County should look at rewriting the Library agreement because there should be some support from Buckingham and Fluvanna Counties.

Mr. Letteri summarized that the Board wants the Crozet Library, YMCA, and the voting machines to be put on a list to be reconsidered, but otherwise to go ahead with projects in Category A and B.

Mr. Snow added that the CARS and Fire Department equipment should also be reevaluated.

Board members indicated that those items fell under Category C, and an answer is expected from CARS in the near future.

Mr. Boyd said that there also needs to be some consideration given to volunteer rescue squads that didn't want to participate in revenue-sharing agreements, as that costs the County about \$600,000 per year.

Mr. Foley added that the highway revenue-sharing money should also be on the list for reconsideration.

Mr. Boyd stated that he had some questions about the \$249,000 for "study development" related to athletic fields, including the Crozet Elementary School.

Mr. Mullaney explained that some of that is for turf, but the remaining is for a baseball and soccer field at Crozet Elementary.

Mr. Rooker said that seems like an inexpensive way to acquire a lot more field space.

Ms. Mallek asked if the \$150,000 is needed to remain for the other two turf fields. Mr. Elliott said a private donor has made a pledge contingent upon private donations meeting the match. There is a "soft" commitment of the County that if these funds are raised privately, the donor would provide a match and the projects would move forward. He believes that the pledge is available through the end of the calendar year.

Mr. Davis said because the contingency has to be completed within the next fiscal year, he does not advise removing that money at this time.

Mr. Rooker said this money was actually in the CIP for expansion of lighted playing fields and in high demand by the community, and this was the least expensive way that the County could provide additional lighted field recreational time. The turf fields became a less expensive way to provide for that need.

Mr. Boyd asked about the \$250,000 for the Pantops Fire Station, stating that he thought it was just a minor engineering that needed to be done.

Mr. Letteri said that those funds would include the engagement of a firm to go through the site plan approval process, which is what's required to receive the property; that firm would also produce documents so the County can bid the project. He confirmed that about one-half of that funding is for site plan and property transfer.

Mr. Letteri explained that in order to understand how this building can be situated on that site, there is a level of design required to be done to ensure the circulation would work, what improvements would need to be made, how the area might be graded, etc. That is the reason for the allocation of that money.

Mr. Boyd said it seems like a lot of money to just go through that process. He asked if the entire building would be designed.

Mr. Letteri replied, "no", it would be more of a conceptual design. The site is extremely challenging with requirements for fill, very difficult topography and a lot of access issues.

Ms. Mallek commented that sometimes the land they get presents problems; a similar situation happened with the Crozet Library site.

Mr. Rooker said they were looking at \$1.5 million to \$2.0 million to acquire a site, so the \$250,000 for site planning seems like a good deal.

Mr. Boyd also commented about the \$2.4 million for the Crozet streetscape project, as not much of it has been spent.

Mr. Letteri responded that this project has been in the works for three years, and a great deal of effort has gone into the design components of this – including the streetscapes themselves, Main Street, and 30 or 40 easements required to make this happen. He said that the County has negotiated a contract with Dominion Power to remove all utilities, and that contract is in place and ready to proceed. Mr. Letteri stated that they paid for the utility fees that are associated with doing that, so there are a number of things that are well in progress. The amount of money expended to date is not reflective of the efforts and work that has gone into the project.

Ms. Mallek stated that this has to come first, and then Main Street, and then the Library. She said that they are about three or four signatures away from a 30 day start time.

Mr. Boyd noted that there is \$1.9 million being moved out of master planning for Places29, which is a lot larger project than Crozet. It seems the County has been buying a lot of property in Crozet.

Ms. Mallek commented that this money is to wrap it all up because this is where the County is growing.

Mr. Letteri mentioned that there is about \$300,000 in grant funds associated with this project that are included in that \$2.4 million, and he is hopeful that the bidding for this project will come in favorably as well. He also confirmed that a VDOT grant of \$250,000 is also pending, which would further reduce the appropriation.

Mr. Rooker commented that it's appropriate to put all these items on the table, but there is a problem when grant money has been received and the project doesn't go forward.

Mr. Letteri stated that if they stopped this project, there would be a definite negative impact.

Mr. Dorrier agreed, adding that it comes to a point of no return.

Ms. Mallek added that it would take generations to recover from the "black eyes" if the County backs out of all the easements it has worked so hard to get.

Mr. Boyd said that he is just concerned that his constituents on Route 29 North are going to be distressed that there is no money for anything now on Route 29 North – even implementation studies or master planning.

Mr. Rooker stated that the only way to accomplish that would be to include money in the tax rate for capital improvements.

Ms. Mallek said that Mr. Rooker's two cents on the list would do just that.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Woodbrook lagoon project was going on hold.

Mr. Foley replied that it is moving forward, as there are some grants tied to the project.

Ms. Mallek added that there were some smaller stormwater projects that were put on hold.

Mr. Boyd asked about the engineering work on the East Ivy Fire Station, also listed at a cost of \$250,000 like Pantops.

Mr. Letteri explained that like Pantops, there are a number of complicated site issues that will be part of the negotiations with the University – which is proposing to lease the facility to the County at zero cost, but with the site and circulation issues addressed. He added that the goal for use of these funds is to take this project to enough of a design level to understand clearly what the options are for cost, as the building may be able to be retrofitted in certain ways that will substantially reduce the overall cost of the project.

Mr. Rooker asked what is happening with the City's substation on Route 250, as it was abandoned when they moved to their new facility. That is a flat piece of property, in the growth area, has water and sewer, etc. That would be a much less expensive site to develop

Mr. Tucker responded that it is University property, adding that the idea years ago was to build a joint City-County fire station there, but the City ended up putting a temporary station there.

Mr. Rooker suggested that before the County spends \$250,000 on Northridge, it should explore possible options with the site on Route 250.

Mr. Tucker said there have been no discussions; the City just recently moved forward on the Fontaine site. He added that even in the long term the County is probably going to have to move its Ivy station to another location.

Ms. Mallek said that is part of the problem, having to return the site in about ten years.

Mr. Letteri said the commitment from the University would be a minimum of 15 years.

Mr. Rooker said he thinks they need to look at a comparison of the two sites.

Mr. Foley said that the Board had also discussed in the past insurance rates and service areas, as there is a big break if service is within five minutes of a station.

Mr. Eggleston pointed out that the objective for the East Ivy station is to provide urban services for the west side of the City area, but also to be close enough to the Ivy area – which is densely populated. If you move further east it would probably not give that benefit to the people in Ivy.

Mr. Rooker said he still would like to look at the other site because it could be a permanent site as opposed to a temporary site and is much less physically challenging.

Mr. Boyd asked for clarification between the 504 and 505 funding.

Mr. Elliott explained that the 505 unit is the squad unit that is a function of the apparatus bay getting retrofitted. The squad wants the County to keep this in the plan, but they would not be going out for bid until spring 2011. The 504 is a unit that is being rehabbed, similar to the Crozet brush truck. They are 60 to 90 days away from finalizing that. The County should see some savings from the 231, but this project is currently ongoing.

Mr. Boyd asked about the two sidewalk projects on Ivy Road for \$435,000. He understands that the University of Virginia is interested in some corridor entrance improvements although they are unsettled.

Mr. Rooker commented that the City has sidewalks almost all the way out to the County line. The County has built quite a bit of townhouses in that area and the idea was to provide County residents with some pedestrian accessway in that area. The County has decided whether this is a high priority sidewalk project.

Ms. Mallek said there have been Ivy Road projects in the plan for a long time and some of them have been eliminated.

Ms. Mallek asked if there are grant opportunities for Hollymead/Powell Creek – as they might be able to come under the “Safe Routes for School” if neighborhoods and schools get involved.

Mr. Boyd said that the sidewalk fund has about \$400,000 earmarked for Ivy Road, and some additional for roadway landscaping. He added that his comments are not about whether these projects are not good, but whether it is the right use of money.

Mr. David Benish, Chief of Planning, said that the Hilltop project is a very old project because right-of-way hasn't been obtained from property owners, so the concept here is to move that funding into a school-related project with available right-of-way. He added that the County is participating in the “Safe Routes to School” program, and was tentatively awarded a grant for \$190,000 near the Crozet Elementary School. The County has a priority it will be working through. Next year funds will be requested for Hollymead and the Albemarle High School complex that also includes Greer and Jack Jouett. Mr. Benish emphasized that the Hilltop project continues to bump up against right-of-way acquisition, and some of the remaining funds are slated to be assigned to Powell Creek – such as crosswalks on Ashwood Boulevard and sidewalk connections from north Forest Lakes to the school complex. There are a number of projects where staff can use this money to improve access to the schools.

He also explained that the Ivy Road project is a very old initiative that dates back to a joint City-County-University plan to upgrade that corridor, and this is boiling down to sidewalks and bike lanes along that corridor – with UVA recently expressing interest in improving pedestrian and bicycle access in this fairly active area that's considered to be an “entrance corridor” to the University.

Ms. Mallek asked if UVA funds or County funds would be used.

Mr. Benish said there had been discussion that VDOT was interested in using Revenue Sharing Funds, but County funds are directed towards other projects. Staff has not pursued other grant opportunities but there are priorities with the UVA for enhancement grants. It is not likely this would be prioritized high enough. This project has always been in the County's CIP to provide for more basic sidewalks and bike lanes.

Mr. Rooker said this is a way to work with the UVA on implementing their vision for this corridor, but his concern is that this is another example of money sitting for a long time, but not getting spent because costs increase and the projects lose momentum. He suggested that the CIP Technical Review Committee start evaluating projects that are already planned in addition to new projects so that they can be weeded out if they cannot be executed soon.

Mr. Letteri responded that staff views all CIP projects this way, and a lot of these major allocations – such as transportation, lighting, and sidewalks – have amassed funding for future years, but there are often complications that extend project timeframes. He also said that at this point, there is no additional funding planned for those categories. It is hard to build these funds.

Mr. Tucker emphasized that what really holds this projects up is acquisition of right-of-way.

Mr. Boyd asked if they could, for example, shift some of this money over to one of the fire stations or the library assuming they could deal with the operating costs.

Mr. Foley pointed out that the County is looking more and more at project opportunities.

Mr. Rooker agreed that there has been a better job of project execution in recent years.

Ms. Mallek asked about the sidewalk from the Colonnades to Georgetown Road, as it is a pretty scary stretch of road to be walking if you are a senior. She asked if there is any hope of getting some help from the corporation.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that that situation is more acute than the one on Ivy Road.

Mr. Benish said that most of the sidewalk projects listed are ranked by prioritization, and what staff has tried to do is link to where the private sector has provided links through site plans or proffers. The one on Barracks Road was an emergency project designated because the bus route changed and pedestrians had to walk a greater distance.

Mr. Boyd said that the CIP Technical Review Committee should certainly consider these projects, as Mr. Rooker had suggested.

Mr. Letteri said he has his direction from the Board and will put the items on the list to come back for further discussion on a future date; Categories A and B will move ahead, except those that have been questioned, and they will move ahead with the transfer of the \$1.0 million to Undesignated Fund Balance from the Capital Fund to the General Fund.

Mr. Boyd asked to have the Crozet greenways and the planning Main Street-Crozet projects added to the list of things to be reevaluated.

Mr. Rooker responded that the Crozet greenways are part of the system that Old Trail donated property for, so the County should be mindful that private landowners contributed.

Mr. Mullaney mentioned that some of the funding for that greenway is for a perimeter trail around Crozet Park, which was a request of the Crozet Park Long Range Planning Committee.

Mr. Tucker suggested that there be a motion to transfer the \$1.0 million to Undesignated Fund Balance in the General Fund.

Mr. Rooker then **moved** to authorize the transfer of \$1.0 million to the Undesignated Fund Balance in the General Fund from the Capital Fund. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Going back to the proposed budget items, Ms. Mallek asked how much the cut to JABA is.

Mr. Elliott replied that it is about \$14,000.

Mr. Rooker said that he'd like that to go on the list for reconsideration, but he doesn't want the County to take over gaps in funding from state and federal sources.

Mr. Boyd stated that there may be money made up for the gap in the Sheriff's office.

Mr. Elliott responded that there has been discussion of State reinstatement of funding for Constitutional officers, but there is potential for funding just being shifted so there would be no net gain here for the County.

Mr. Foley commented that Wednesday there would be a review of the entire scenario.

Mr. Tucker then summarized the Board's list. Staff started out with a Board reserve of \$106,755, then added back the Scottsville Community Center rent as a revenue source, as well as revenue from the schools for Family Support. He said that the Board wanted to add back in VML dues, TJPDC, Cooperative Extension, Offender Aid and Restoration, Emergency Housing Repair with AHIP, reinstating

Library funding, Family Support workers, and the Scottsville Community Center. Mr. Tucker indicated that this would create a shortfall of \$423,000 to be made up, and then it was suggested to add two cents onto the tax rate – a little over \$3.0 million – for Capital improvements, which have been gradually eliminated over the downturn. He said that this would mean the County would have to increase the real estate tax from \$074.2 to \$076.2.

Mr. Rooker commented that that's still less than the equalization rate.

Mr. Tucker said that the equalization rate is at \$076.6.

Mr. Rooker said that that rate would keep taxes the same and would provide money for Capital going forward.

Ms. Mallek commented that since there is a discrepancy between the rental and the operations for the Scottsville Community Center perhaps hours could be modified. She also has received requests from seniors in Crozet to save the senior exercise program at the Meadows – some of which is fee supported.

Mr. Mullaney said that the program costs \$5,250 annually. It is a shape-up program for seniors – with about 10 women at the Meadows using the service three times per week. He added that there is no fee charged to participate.

Ms. Mallek stated that she thought the program had up to 30 participants, and perhaps they should be told that it needs to be increased for funding to maintain. She added that some residents from the community also use the program.

Mr. Rooker asked about the usage at the Scottsville Community Center.

Mr. Mullaney responded that the main activity there is the youth basketball program, which has 105 kids on 10 teams; JABA has a meals program every Wednesday serving 50-60 seniors; Bread of Life has a monthly food distribution program there serving about 90 families; and there are also about 200 hours of private reservations there over the year. He said that the budget there is about \$12,000 in salaries, \$10,000 for heat, \$6,000 for electricity, \$2,600 for water, and \$4,000 for repair and maintenance.

Mr. Rooker added that it seems that a reasonable number of people are being served at that center.

Mr. Tucker commented that the Board would begin at this point on Wednesday, with the hopes of wrapping up and advertise for budget public hearing.

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

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adjourn to March 17, 2010, 9:00 a.m., Room 241.

There being no further business, at 12:16 p.m., Mr. Rooker **moved** that the Board adjourn until Wednesday, March 17, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. in Room 241. Mr. Thomas **seconded** the motion.

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

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

NAYS: None.

Chairman

Approved by the
Board of County
Supervisors

Date: 12/01/2010

Initials: EWJ