

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 7, 2011, at 9:00 a.m., Room 241, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from March 3, 2011.

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, Thomas C. Foley, County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Clerk, Ella W. Jordan, Assistant County Executive, Bryan O. Elliott, Assistant County Executive, William Letteri, and Director of Office of Management and Budget, Lori S. Allshouse

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 9:04 a.m., by the Chair, Ms. Mallek.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session: FY 2011/2012 Operating and Capital Budgets.

Mr. Foley began his presentation to the Board by identifying the four concepts on which the proposed FY11/12 budget was developed: transformation, innovation, stewardship and partnership. He said the County has relied on those concepts during the last several years of the economic downturn. He reported that the proposed total budget is just over \$301 million. Beginning with today's meeting, he said staff will provide the Board various components of the budget in greater detail, answer any questions the Board might have and respond to any changes the Board feels are appropriate to make. Mr. Foley reviewed the agenda, pointing out that today's meeting would focus on general government operations, which makes up approximately 30% of the total budget. Wednesday's meeting will focus on the School's Operational Division which makes up about 52% of the total budget. He said School Board members will be in attendance to discuss their costs at that particular meeting. Next Monday, staff will focus on the Capital Improvement Plan in addition to debt service funds. He said schools and general government together make up 11.5% of the capital program. On Monday, at the end, if needed, that can be done working toward over the next few days. As you look at the agenda, as we get to the end of each section, we would like to go through each of the departments and answer questions at the end. In the past, as we have gone through the budget, if there are items you felt you wanted to make changes, we will also create that list as we go and come back to it on the last day to revisit issues. It would be helpful, if Board members could identify items for future discussion or change. At the end of those meetings, the Board will then be asked to approve the proposed budget and tax rates for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Foley reported that the goals that provided the framework for this budget are funding basic obligations and core services, providing financial stability, supporting continued transformation, and looking toward the future with innovation, high performance and economic vitality. He noted that he had provided the Board with the program and service review inventory by category in chart form. He said that staff provided a more complete breakdown of the programs and services by the mandates. Mr. Foley pointed out that the discretionary amount of the \$100 million is about 8%, but the total general fund expenditures total about \$213 million; about 4% of expenditures fall into that discretionary category. He also said that the total funding is \$300 million, so the percentage of discretionary spending in this budget, when considering all expenditures, is closer to 1% to 2%. Mr. Foley noted that the General Fund is the best way to look at that expenditure in terms of the total \$213 million. He emphasized that he does not feel that the 8% is the accurate way to look at this, but it certainly opens up all expenditures for the Board to make judgments on and put that in perspective.

Ms. Allshouse addressed the Board, stating that she would provide an overview of the general fund and discuss revenues and expenditures in a broad way, as well as talk about items such as transfers, reserves, fund balances, and other items that would affect departments cross departmentally. She reported that general fund revenues are anticipated to be \$215.6 million in FY11-12, a \$2.3 million increase from the current budget or 1.1%. Ms. Allshouse said that the County is expecting a .3% increase of \$400,000 in general property taxes, including real estate tax, which decreased, and some other categories that offset that loss. She noted that the category also includes real estate tax, public service tax, personal property tax, mobile home taxes, and machinery and tools taxes along with delinquency and penalty categories.

Mr. Boyd asked which items had increased in the public service tax category.

Ms. Allshouse replied that the public service tax increased by \$200,000, due in part to the new GIS tracking system that allows for better accounting of public service utilities such as railroads and pipelines, and also due in part to increases in delinquencies and penalties. She explained that the next category, other local taxes, is predicted to increase by \$1.4 million through things such as sales tax, which accounts for \$1 million of that amount, due in part to the business auditor's work. Once the Business Auditor identifies an area where we were not collecting, that moves into the category for the next year as an on-going tax. This is one area where staff thinks the economy is helping.

Mr. Foley pointed out that the County plans to add one half-time position to the Finance Department to focus even more on that effort.

Ms. Allshouse reported that other local revenue includes items such as fees, donations, permits, etc., and that category is basically staying flat. She said that state revenue is showing an increase of 1%, with federal revenue increasing by a small amount due to additional federal revenue for categorical aid programs in social services. Ms. Allshouse stated that most of that money is pass-through money. She

also reported that there is no change in the transfer category, which includes items that are transferred into the general fund. Ms. Allshouse said that, last year, there was a slight use of fund balance for one-time capital outlay needs, and this year there are no plans for fund balance use in the general fund.

Ms. Allshouse provided a chart which was put together by Ms. Laura Vinzant, Budget Analyst, Office of Management & Budget, which gave an analysis of state revenues. The chart showed actual state revenues received from FY06-12, with the best year being FY08. Ms. Allshouse said that FY12 is projected to be slightly less than this year, and is less than any amount of money received in any one year during this time period.

Mr. Letteri pointed out that the greatest source of decrease here is the 599 funds, which cover police, and funding for constitutional officers. He added that the County is also picking up the first \$250,000 in CSA expenditures that were not being paid for locally in FY08.

Mr. Rooker asked if all the monies that go to the Sheriff's Department from the State are reflected as revenue.

Mr. Foley responded that all of the constitutional officer funding goes into the General Fund, adding that there is a level of service that is higher than the required mandate, which is based on Board decision.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that most larger localities in Virginia are heavily subsidizing those areas because the State has not fully funded them.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the budget is balanced on the 74.2 cent tax rate, which is the same rate as FY09 and FY10, and the total 2011 reassessment decrease is 1.24%, and one cent on the real estate tax rate is \$1.5 million.

Mr. Rooker noted that, at one point, that one penny was worth \$1.8 million.

Ms. Allshouse reported that multiple-family dwellings had the largest decrease in real estate tax, at 3.08%, with agricultural decreasing by 2.02% for land under 100 acres and by 1.89% for land over 100 acres.

Mr. Rooker asked if the reassessment values took into account the build-out of new commercial property.

Mr. Foley explained that these are just existing values from year to year, and new construction numbers are separately categorized or accounted for.

Regarding general fund expenditures, Ms. Allshouse reported that there is a decrease in most areas, but there are two areas with an increase: administration, which has a 1.9% increase or \$200,000 due primarily to changes in the Finance Department; and public safety. She noted that Community Development is decreasing by 3.3%, and all areas would be covered in detail later in the presentation. Ms. Allshouse reported that the transfer of funding to school operations for FY11-12 shows an increase of \$1.2 million, or 1.2%, following the 60/40 split policy. Ms. Allshouse noted that the School Board's request is unfunded by about \$3.79 million, based on the Governor's budget, but there is a possibility that the State may provide more than originally anticipated.

Mr. Dorrier asked if this would be a similar situation to last year's, whereby schools came in and had more than they thought.

Mr. Foley responded that this would likely be the case with about \$2.3 million more than expected, which would help shrink that gap.

Mr. Snow commented that the Schools' fund balance should easily take care of the difference.

Mr. Foley said that Schools has a fund balance, which is one-time money, and there is a lot of the gap that is for ongoing expenses for things like teachers.

Ms. Allshouse reported that this is the first time since 1982 that there has been a decrease in the revenue sharing payment to the City, which comprises about 8% of the County's general fund and is down almost \$364,000. She said the payment is based on the value of real property and has a bit of a lag, so it is a reflection of that decline. Ms. Allshouse stated that staff recommends transferring \$17.2 million to capital and debt, and there is an increase of \$727,000, or 22.9% for general government debt service.

Ms. Allshouse reported that, in the Board's five-year financial planning process, they talked about setting aside some salary and benefit reserves that might include a \$200,000 public safety study that could lead to some reclassifications in that area, and a \$20,000 residual set aside for any other individual reclassifications. She reported that there is a \$60,000 or 9.6% increase in VREP funding, and there is no merit pool reserve set aside for increases. Ms. Allshouse noted that this budget area has a \$744,000 contingency reserve and a \$484,000 reserve for Ivy Fire Station operations. She said that there is \$25,000 set aside for a target industry study and the Board has a \$250,000 economic development fund, which staff recommends to be replenished in the event they use those funds. Ms. Allshouse reported that there is a grants leveraging fund to allow the County to be as competitive as possible, and this would only be for grants coming in to shore up core services. She also stated that the Board has an undesignated fund balance of 8%, which is used for cash flow, and an additional amount equal to 1% of general fund

and school fund budgets would also be set aside as a stabilization/rainy day fund, bringing the total to 9%, or \$2.6 million.

Ms. Allshouse reported that this budget includes a 1% market salary increase, a 6.5% decrease in health insurance costs, a 6% increase in dental insurance costs, no change in the VRS retirement rate for local government employees, a decrease of VRS group insurance rates from 1.11% to .28% of salary. She said these items basically net each other out.

Mr. Boyd asked how what the State is doing with VRS impacts the County.

Mr. Davis explained that what was adopted in the budget bill had no effect on local governments, only state government.

Mr. Rooker noted that the State is requiring employees to contribute 5%, and is raising their pay by 5%.

Mr. Davis said that existing employees would be held harmless, but new employees would be subject to the new terms.

Ms. Allshouse reported that this budget restores a surcharge of \$3.00 per gallon of fuel for replacement of vehicles. She added that, during the recession, the surcharge was down to \$1.50.

Mr. Letteri pointed out that it is just an inter-departmental accounting mechanism that enables this fund to be established for vehicle replacement, noting that this is not applied to volunteer fire companies as they purchase their fuel on their own.

Ms. Allshouse reported that this budget also recommends an additional one-time funding of \$141,000 for 35 vehicles that need to be replaced because of mileage, repairs and maintenance, most of which are public safety vehicles.

Mr. Snow asked if the vehicle replacement would be in next year's budget.

Mr. Elliott responded yes, that most of the vehicles are police cruisers that need to be replaced. He said that Crown Victorias are being phased out by Ford, and, right now, localities are scrambling to find other vehicles to fit that bill. Mr. Elliott explained that the police department contracts with the vehicle maintenance facility and several local shops to do routine oil changes, and there is one individual in the department who does some work on the fleets.

Mr. Foley stated that most departments are serviced centrally, but police and fire are getting the service done on their own.

Mr. Rooker asked what the total size of the fleet is.

Mr. Letteri responded that there are about 95 vehicles on the local government side, but said he isn't certain how many police vehicles there are.

Ms. Allshouse noted that, at the time the budget was built, fuel was estimated at \$3.34 per gallon and was considered pretty high, but things have changed and this is an area that would need to be watched. She said that they had already increased this part of the budget by \$90,000. Ms. Allshouse reported that the line of duty benefits that cover all public safety officers would likely need to be picked up by the County since the State is no longer picking up that expense.

Mr. Elliott stated that he would be covering four functional areas in his report: Public Safety, Human Development, Parks/Recreation/Culture, and Community Development, which represent about \$60 million of the County's local government operating budget, or 75% of what is allocated for all local government operations. He stated that the public safety budget for FY12 is proposed to be \$30.5 million total expenditures, an increase of about \$1.3 million or 4.5%, with 43% of expenditures attributed to police, 22% to fire and rescue, 11% to the Jail, and 7% to the Emergency Communications Center.

Mr. Elliott reported that the police budget is expected to increase \$567,000 or 4.5% and does unfreeze two police officer positions, which increases the budget by about \$154,000 and continues with three frozen police officer positions that have been frozen over the past several years. He said that, in this budget, the Department proposes to eliminate a records unit supervisor through reorganization and have increased overtime by \$125,000 to reflect Virginia code requirements and for standby pay for the investigations bureau. Mr. Elliott stated that revenues of \$72,000 are included as anticipated for the photo safe program and are earmarked for specific traffic safety programs that the police department would undertake in FY12. He said that there are increases totaling \$383,000 for a variety of functions, including fuel, maintenance and replacement of vehicles, a regional training academy increase, and the line of duty insurance increases.

Mr. Elliott stated that when the budget was built earlier this year, there was an assumption built in to use what was in the Governor's budget and at that time the County was told to expect an additional decrease of approximately \$117,000 in 599 funds. He said that it is possible that those dollars could be coming back to the County, so there may be some freeing up of local money although the budget continues to carry a decrease reflecting elimination of school resource officers in the middle schools.

Mr. Rooker asked if the state was paying the entire cost of the officers or just a percentage.

Mr. Elliott replied that the percentage is 50%, according to Police Chief, Steve Sellers.

Mr. Rooker noted that the capital outlay increase reflected in this budget is 64.7%, which is \$202,000, and asked why capital is a line item expenditure.

Mr. Elliott explained that it would be a miscellaneous line-item expenditure for things like supplies, not exactly major purchases for capital projects.

Mr. Foley clarified that capital projects are defined as at least \$25,000 so the other items are capital outlay.

Mr. Snow asked how the victim/witness program works, as there is \$94,000 allocated for that.

Mr. Elliott explained that it is listed as a discretionary program, but it has been a vital part of a collaborative effort between police and nonprofit agencies in assisting victims of violent crimes and working with them to facilitate resolution of the crime while providing wrap-around services for individuals affected by crime.

Mr. Dorrier mentioned that he started the program in 1980 in the Commonwealth's Attorney's Department, and the victim/witness coordinator has been with the program since it started.

Mr. Snow asked about the revenue generated from the photo-red cameras.

Mr. Elliott explained that the desire of the Police Department and Board members has been to have that revenue returned to specific traffic enforcement initiatives and, based on two months' data, there is an estimate of \$72,000 that would be accrued, used to purchase additional overtime for officers to do specific enforcement or to purchase equipment. He noted that traffic enforcement accounts for about 26% of all calls the Police Department receives, and the County is continuing to leverage other funds for this in addition to the red-light cameras.

Mr. Rooker noted that there are still three frozen police officer positions, and the money could certainly go there.

Mr. Snow agreed, and said he would like to know where the funding is going rather than having that money be open ended.

Mr. Foley pointed out that the County took a position not to take this money and use it for ongoing purposes, as the objective is to see this revenue decline over time.

Mr. Elliott reported that, under the Department of Fire and Rescue, there is a proposed increase of \$128,700 or 1.9%, and the County is continuing the over-hire of one firefighter position, which is not expected to have an impact on the Fire/Rescue budget. He said there is a \$67,000 increase in overtime due to Virginia code requirements, \$17,600 increase for line of duty obligations, and \$457,800 programmed in revenues from EMS cost recovery, up slightly from the current year.

Mr. Elliott said that there is an overall increase of \$190,000, or 7.5%, for other fire/rescue services in the Department, an increase of \$107,000 or 6.4% in support of volunteer fire and rescue agencies, a 1% increase for each department, equivalent to what County employees are receiving, and \$3,000 for each station for one-time expenses associated with backflow prevention devices. He noted that there are two stations that did not request the 1% increase, and CARS is slated to get an increase of 1.9% or \$3,255. Mr. Elliott reminded the Board that the County provides daytime staffing personnel at CARS as well as a portion of their overall costs based upon the percentage of calls run from McIntire in the City and the County. He noted that the County comprises about 51.2% of the calls, with the City at 48.8%.

Mr. Boyd and Mr. Thomas noted that the City does not pay anything towards CARS.

Mr. Elliott reported that there are also insurance premiums, computer maintenance and replacement costs, with volunteers receiving funding for turnout gear and other operating supplies, increasing approximately \$22,900. He said that there is \$43,900 programmed for insurance costs associated with line of duty. Mr. Elliott stated that the Thomas Jefferson Emergency Medical Services (TJEMS), which has historically been funded by the County, is slated to receive a 1% increase, and the fire/rescue tax credit is increasing \$2,000 or 3.5% based on recent usage which is indicative of a number of volunteers now taking advantage of tax credit. He said the County also funds the City fire contract, and inherently built into that contract is a cost of living increase through a multiplier effect included each year, and the overall allocation is slated to increase by \$81,000 or 10%.

Mr. Rooker commented that this is a lot more than the CPI last year.

Mr. Elliott explained that there is a 5% increase per year in the base contract amount for the City fire contract, noting that, in FY09, the County was paying approximately \$655,000 and, for FY12, that total is \$845,638, mostly driven by the 5% increase and an anticipated call volume of 1,800 calls.

Mr. Boyd asked if this contract would be renegotiated with the opening of the new Ivy Fire Station and the moving of the City station.

Mr. Elliott said that a number of the calls out of the 1,800 would ultimately be in that response area, so there could be a significant drop with the opening of the Ivy station. He stated that one area it

does not cover is Pantops, so City calls will continue to occur there, although the County would have the option of pulling out of the contract with the City completely or renegotiating it. Mr. Elliott stated that if they did pull out of the contract completely, residents would have to rely on Monticello, East Rivanna and Stony Point to respond to the Pantops area until the County is able to place a station there.

Mr. Eggleston explained that, region wide, there is a protocol to respond to high level, very urgent issues by dispatching an EMS unit, an ambulance and a fire truck, for quick response and for additional help as needed.

Mr. Rooker asked about having an extra person on the ambulance rather than sending a fire truck out.

Mr. Eggleston explained that, with a ground level fall or similar, there is just an ambulance dispatched to the call, but if it is a higher priority the additional staffing on a fire truck is sent as well. He added that it is more cost effective to do it that way than it is to staff up ambulances for those critical calls that may or may not occur.

Mr. Boyd commented that he would like to see the arrangement become what it is traditionally in most places, a mutual aid arrangement.

Mr. Elliott stated that Chief Eggleston and Chief Werner are looking at the call response in all urban areas to see what that may look like.

Mr. Elliott reported that the inspections and building codes function is a part of the Community Development Department and delivers an important public safety function for the community, and is expected to increase approximately \$1,500 due primarily to increased fuel costs, offset in car insurance and supplies. He said there is an increase of about \$11,500 for replacement fee for fuel and vehicles and an increase of approximately \$52,000 attributable to increases in fees recently instituted.

Mr. Rooker asked if the County has ever considered self-insuring for collision only, as it may be advantageous with a fleet as large as the County's. He said that the amount of external insurance is essentially paid into a pool.

Mr. Elliott said that he would look into it.

Mr. Elliott also reported that the County funds a number of public safety agencies and they are expected to increase \$445,700 or 6.9%.

Mr. Elliott stated that ECC, the jail, the detention center, etc. all rely on state revenues, and the ECC is experiencing additional cuts in the wireless fund representing about \$70,000 that the state has pulled back on in terms of transferring to localities. He reported that over the past several years the jail board has utilized its fund balance to make up reductions in state funding, and this year an increase of \$61,000 is programmed, but it is not a net increase, just a difference in projection. Mr. Elliott added that it is always a guessing game with state funding for the jail and juvenile detention center state allocation. He reported that overall the County's contribution to ECC increases \$84,000 or 4.2%, reflecting that decrease in state aid; the share for the regional jail contribution increases \$225,000 or 7.1%; the juvenile detention contribution increases \$37,000 or 5.5%. Mr. Elliott stated that the County's SPCA contribution increases \$98,300 or 25.9%, based on the Board's approval of a modified agreement with the SPCA as well as the City to move to a per-capita charge; FY12 reflects a \$5 per capita fee. He said that after FY12, the increases would be assessed based on CPI.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that each year the Free Enterprise Forum issues a report on increases in spending by localities, and wants it to be known that the County has little or no control over these expenditures. He commented that it has nothing to do with population growth or CPI increase, adding that there are strategies such as Bright Stars to try to keep the population out of juvenile detention and jail.

Mr. Rooker said some of these comparisons do not take into consideration those larger areas of the budget that are mandated over which the County has no control.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that other localities have animal license fees that could be implemented in Albemarle County.

Mr. Davis responded that the fees in the County are topped out for dog licenses, but he would look into other fees that might be available.

Mr. Elliott noted that, this year, the County would partner with the City to look into operating its own shelter versus using the SPCA.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that this issue was looked at before and determined that, even with the increase in the SPCA contract, it has not been demonstrated that the County would save money by opening their own pound. He added that the most promising alternative may be partnering with another locality, but there is a lot of travel involved in that.

Mr. Elliott said that, in calendar year 2010, the Police Department ran just under 52,000 calls for service and, in the urban areas, they do not meet the Comp Plan response time goal of five minutes, 85% of the time. In the last quarter of 2010, he said the Police Department was able to achieve that 50% of the time. In the rural areas, he said, the response time is 12 minutes on average, which is also under the goal

of 10 minutes in the Comp Plan. He reported that Part I crimes continue to trend down from 2006, just short of 1,930 in 2010 compared to 2,351 in 2006. Mr. Elliott stated that traffic calls for service continue to be the greatest demand on the Department, constituting about 20% of all calls, and the Comp Plan staffing goal remains what is desired. He also said that staff is looking at the 599 funds and would inform the Board on any possible restoration of that money.

Mr. Rooker asked how much of the response time is impacted by traffic conditions.

Mr. Elliott responded that it is difficult to assess, but in the 29 North Corridor and Pantops areas are definitely impacted by the poor traffic conditions.

Ms. Mallek said that you cannot even get from the firehouse to a highway in a car in those areas, and that is why the connecting streets being put in there will be helpful.

Mr. Elliott reported that in 2010 fire stations responded to about 7,300 calls for service, with rescue squad calls per ECC data at about 9,500, and 52% of all calls coming into the stations for rescue or EMS incidents, a growing part of service delivery.

Mr. Rooker asked if it might make more sense to have the ambulance or another kind of vehicle there to run the assistance calls, rather than having a fire truck respond.

Mr. Eggleston responded that they are constantly evaluating the process for those reasons, and if they were to take extra staff and put them in a car there would need to be new hires because the fire trucks are staffed at minimum crew levels of three people. He said that EMS calls are the biggest part of the operation, and that demand is increasing with the aging population. Mr. Eggleston said that if there are additional volunteers there during the day, the station will deploy people in a car so that the fire truck stays in service, but that depends on staffing levels. He emphasized that the agency is always focused on how to best deliver services in the most efficient model possible, and noted that a number of EMS calls are for motor vehicle accidents so they actually require fire truck response to deal with fuels and fluids in addition to personal injuries.

Mr. Rooker asked if there are smaller fire trucks without ladders and additional apparatus, to respond specifically to traffic situations.

Mr. Eggleston responded that those vehicles are made, but the County's fire trucks are more of a Swiss army knife that are capable of responding to a variety of situations.

Mr. Elliott reviewed the items the Board had requested for further evaluation, including collision self-insurance, traffic safety initiatives and animal license fees.

Mr. Elliott reported that in the Human Development section of the budget, there is a \$19 million appropriation, an overall decrease of \$216,000 or 1.1% from the current year. He stated that Social Services is the largest portion of this functional area followed by CSA transfers and funding for human development agencies.

Mr. Rooker noted that the expenditure category for social services includes \$4 million for operating expenses, but doesn't include salaries.

Mr. Elliott explained that those are benefit and service programs that flow through the budget so that funding is specifically for the programs outlined, seven benefit programs and eight service programs, so the fund actually represents the cost of the services being delivered.

Ms. Ralston explained that most of these costs are for purchase of services, such as payment for childcare providers.

Mr. Elliott clarified that the \$11,397,968 is actually inclusive of salaries and benefit costs, not just services.

Ms. Ralston pointed out that the \$4 million figure covers operational expenses such as pens, paper, rent and phones, as well as the purchase of services such as childcare expenses, auxiliary grant expenses, ADCFC, etc. She said that the total social services budget is approximately \$60 million when all money transferred to the community is included, such as food stamp, Medicaid and TANFF program monies. Ms. Ralston also mentioned that there are a number of refugee families that have located here, and in one afternoon recently an eligibility worker dealt with a French Congo family, a Swahili family and an Arabic family. She added it takes a lot more time to interview and process cases for families that have limited English proficiency.

Mr. Rooker commented that the IRC operates one of its three national relocation sites here in Charlottesville.

Mr. Elliott stated that the budget includes funding for a child welfare services supervisors, a position that was restructured in FY11 to be primary coordinator for the CSA program as well as child welfare responsibilities. He said that the budget proposes to reinstitute the assistant director position, noting that revenues from state and federal government are very fluid so adjustments are made moving forward. Mr. Elliott stated that the CSA fund balance had built up a little bit over the years, leaving a fund

balance. He also reported that a major decrease driving operating expense decrease is foster care, which has a \$400,000 decrease, reflecting a decrease in utilization in terms of numbers of participants and cost.

Mr. Elliott reported that there is an increase in local general fund support of \$29,500 or 4.1% for Bright Stars, based on what the Governor's budget proposes in terms of the composite index. He said there is no change in transfer for CSA expenses. Mr. Elliott noted that there is no summer program for Bright Stars, although the case workers do stay in touch with those families over the summer months.

Ms. Ralston said that they work to ensure the children maintain their school level skills so they do not fall behind when they return in the fall, as well as working with families on employment and counseling.

Mr. Elliott reported that funding increases for human development total almost \$84,000 or 2%, with the majority of agencies receiving a 1% increase. He pointed out that the Commission on Children and Families budget has increased by \$11,474 is primarily driven by a change in the space they are occupying, as it is more than what was anticipated a year ago. Mr. Elliott said that JAUNT is increasing \$55,123 or 6.4%, based on actual and projected ridership increases in the area.

Mr. Rooker asked about the impact of fuel cost increases on JAUNT.

Mr. Thomas said that Donna Shaughnessy of JAUNT was interviewed a few days ago and said that it would affect them drastically.

Mr. Elliott also reported that the tax relief for the elderly and disabled is budgeted at \$1 million, which is reflective of what is actually being used annually.

Mr. Snow asked what options JAUNT may have to raise their fees.

Mr. Elliott responded that they have not modified their rate in the rural area for quite some time, which is an option for the Board, but because of the demographics and poverty levels in those areas they have refrained from doing so in the past.

Mr. Rooker noted that to raise a significant amount of revenue fees would need to be raised to a point where it almost eliminates the service for riders because they cannot afford it.

Mr. Boyd said that JAUNT is becoming more of a commuter service than its original intent of serving the elderly and disabled.

Ms. Mallek stated that the bus is running anyway, so why not fill the seats.

Mr. Elliott said that the commuter notion Mr. Boyd mentioned is marginal revenue, because the bus is going to run anyway and those riders would provide revenue.

Mr. Thomas commented that the aging population is increasing, and that will drive up the demand for JAUNT services.

Mr. Rooker added that JAUNT gets a significant state and federal allocation, so what's being done locally is the differential not the entire cost.

Mr. Elliott reported that the County provides funding for 22 agencies, totaling \$3.3 million, and most of them are under the agency budget review team process that is being evaluated this year.

He said that food stamp, Medicaid and TANFF cases remain for the department at an all-time high, but there has been a decrease in applications over the past six months. Mr. Elliott noted that 7% of the population is now receiving Medicaid assistance. He also reported that foster care cases have decreases from 102 in 2008 to 70 in 2010. Mr. Elliott said that CSA expenditures continue a downward trend as well, but emphasized that the state aid to localities reductions have meant that the first \$250,000 of expenditures are 100% local dollars.

Mr. Dorrier asked about the 1000% increase over a three year period for the free clinic.

Mr. Elliott explained that the dental clinic used to be a function of the Health Department but the free clinic recently moved to establish their own dental clinic so that money was shifted over.

---

**NonAgenda.** At 10:53 a.m., the Board took a recess, then reconvened at 11:11 a.m.

---

Mr. Elliott reported that the proposed appropriation for Parks, Recreation and Culture is \$6.2 million for FY12, a decrease of \$22,356 from the previous year, with the Jefferson Madison Regional Library contribution representing 52% of all expenditures, parks and recreation representing 35%, 12 agencies receiving 11% of funds, and operation of Darden-Towe Park at 2%. He explained that the Department of Parks and Recreation has a decrease of \$4,276, reflecting the full year's saving for elimination of the Deputy Director position and some part-time salary and benefits for maintenance work at Byrum and Preddy Creek, which are slated to open this spring. Mr. Elliott stated that through some repositioning and reallocation of funding, the County is able to restore one hour to beach hours and continue the operation for the last two weekends of the summer. He noted that there is also a proposal to purchase an online reservation system for parks and recreation classes and for other scheduling events

related to parks and rec, which mirrors the City's system and includes a \$54,600 cost that is similar to what they spent.

Ms. Mallek commented that she is shocked it is so expensive.

Mr. Elliott said that it is a one-time cost although there will be some modest maintenance fees, adding that this is part of the County's effort to move things to the web, providing more convenience and better service delivery.

Mr. Dorrier commented that he would like to have the Scottsville basketball program funded.

Mr. Elliott responded that that item was cut back in the current fiscal year, as the Board decided, and it was not only the Scottsville youth basketball program but several other programs such as the Yancey open gym program, the mobile tennis program, field trips and even restrooms for some game sites. He added all of those programs and services were reduced and/or eliminated as a result of last year's budget. Mr. Elliott stated we are recommending the Board to continue those forward into FY 2012.

Mr. Dorrier said that he would recommend against it.

Mr. Crickenberger explained that all budget reductions totaled up to over \$50,000, and the contribution to the Scottsville program was for paid officials, as the facilities are provided at no charge. He said that the league felt they could absorb that loss in their registration fees, adding that they have the facility four nights a week plus weekends.

Mr. Elliott reported that the County was the fiscal agent for Darden Towe Park and is proposing a \$2,544 decrease for FY12, noting that the increase in revenue from recreation fees is a function of the growing number of teams and participants.

He said that there is an overall decrease of \$13,500 in agency allocations, with the majority of agencies receiving the 1% increase. Mr. Elliott stated that the Visitors Bureau allocation decreases, noting that the transient occupancy tax revenues lag by two years. He said that for FY10 the income dropped by \$46,248 but it does appear to be trending upward again.

Mr. Rooker asked about the proposal to staff the Crozet Library just to meet basic service needs.

Mr. Townsend explained that they asked for \$31,000 for an additional FTE in Crozet to help with shelving, circulation, etc., as the current staff operates at a 34% higher circulation rate than any other branch in the system although they are the smallest library branch. He added that the additional funding could be transferred over when the new library eventually opens.

Mr. Elliott presented a breakdown of individual library costs, noting the variance between the JMRL Board request and the County Executive's budget as \$94,916. He said that the Crozet line has a \$35,511 variance between what the Library Board has requested and what is provided in the budget, including the new position Mr. Townsend mentioned. Mr. Elliott noted that between 2006 and 2008 the County did add a position in Crozet.

Mr. Rooker said that the question to be answered is whether the employee base there is adequate to provide services to the citizens in that area based upon their current location.

Ms. Mallek commented that because of the increases in circulation at that branch and lack of space in that library, everything must get back on the shelves quickly, and that is why an extra person is especially needed there.

Mr. Snow asked about volunteer involvement at that library, and Mr. Townsend indicated that Crozet has the highest level of volunteer participation based on per-capita circulation.

In response to Mr. Dorrier's question about staffing level, Mr. Townsend said that there are four full-time and two part-time employees in Crozet, with Scottsville having two full-time and one part-time staff. He explained that Crozet has the fourth highest circulation in the system, with Scottsville having the lowest circulation in the system. Mr. Townsend said that there are 125 volunteers throughout the entire system.

Mr. Rooker suggested putting the library matters on a list for discussion, so that the use of volunteers can be addressed.

Ms. Mallek agreed, noting that the volunteers cannot come in unless there is staff there.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that there is significant population growth in that area and the County is not providing the increased library services that it promised way back in 1988, and the question is how to meet that growth. He asked Mr. Townsend to explain the process of recruiting volunteers.

Mr. Townsend said that having library staff talk to regular patrons about volunteering is one of the most effective tools, along with those who step up and offer to volunteer anyway. He stated that each branch has a different set of needs, so a system-wide setup has not been implemented.

Mr. Rooker suggested putting up a sign in the Crozet Library window to recruit volunteers or putting an ad in the *Crozet Gazette*.



Mr. Townsend said that staff is often restocking shelves in the off hours, when the library is not open.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that the request for staff was also to address the need for a librarian to keep the facility open, and a volunteer cannot really replace staff in that capacity.

Mr. Elliott reported that the County funds a total of 12 outside agencies with appropriations of \$3.869 million, ranging from public TV stations to JMRL. He said that in looking at key indicators for parks, recreation and culture, the County is looking to provide part-time salaries and maintenance for Byrum and Preddy Creek, restore swim beach services, and begin an online reservation system. Mr. Elliott stated that there was a drop last year in overall attendance of about 3,200 or 7% in summer swimming, perhaps due to reduced hours and weekends; shelter reservations dropped in the fourth quarter of 2010, perhaps due to cold weather; there was a drop in program participation by about 700, perhaps due to the economy.

Mr. Dorrier commented on the Scottsville basketball situation, and Mr. Crickenberger explained that the budget reduction from last year was not due to a building supervisor but was \$2,000 paid for referees. Mr. Crickenberger said that the loss was covered through registration fees, but the service itself in terms of building and court usage is still provided by the County.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the Wednesday night basketball had been cut out, and Mr. Crickenberger explained that there is a long-standing reservation with a local church that brings in a sizeable amount of revenue, but they still offer it four nights per week. Mr. Crickenberger said that the church was also using the building last year, and there are a total of 10 teams in the league.

Mr. Foley pointed out that additional funding would not address this issue, as it would have to be resolved with a scheduling change.

Mr. Elliott reported that the overall proposed budget for Community Development is just over \$6 million, which is a decrease of \$204,000, and in this category 64% of funds go to that department with eight agencies constituting 22% of the expenditures and housing, soil and water conservation district, and the extension service constituting the remaining funding level. Looking specifically at the Community Development Department, he said, there is an overall decrease of \$214,000 in the net cost of the operation, which continues the staffing reductions of seven positions begun in FY11 in the GIS area, three planners, an intake specialist, an inspector, and the movement of the economic development facilitator into the County Executive's office. Mr. Elliott reported that there is an increase in overall fee revenue built into the budget, which is a function of the fee adjustments that the Board and staff worked on last calendar year.

In the office of housing, he said, there is an overall decrease of approximately \$11,178 or 2.1% less than the current year. Mr. Elliott explained that it continues partial year grant funding for the housing counselor position and also provides for the Housing Director to give assistance to the Finance Department in the area of grants administration and further agency review throughout the fiscal year. He noted that there is a decrease in the Woods Edge rental subsidy, as the County is in the second year of a four-year phase-out of funding, so an additional \$10,000 decrease is reflected in the FY12 budget.

In response to Mr. Rooker's question about staffing for housing projects, Mr. White explained that the County provides assistance to about 407 households with two eligibility workers carrying caseloads of about 200, and one inspector for the entire program along with one person to serve as coordinator and finance person. He said that when considering HUD recommendations for staffing levels, the County is bare bones if not less than bare bones. Mr. White said that the resource utilization study contemplated merging the City and County housing services, and that revealed that the City was also at a bare bones level so combining would not save any staffing.

Mr. Elliott reported that overall contributions to agencies related to community development increased \$9,357 or .6%, with the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service driving a 1.3% increase for them; the CAT transit funding is level although it is the same level of service as FY11. He stated that the County funds 10 agencies totaling \$1.6 million, with CAT receiving \$648,000 of this amount; he noted that several years ago the County decided to fund a new route for Southwood/5<sup>th</sup> Street and an additional route in the northern urban area.

Mr. Thomas commented that CAT is proposing adding a route to Hollymead in the future.

Ms. Mallek said that it would be used by employees trying to get to the stores out there.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that there is a \$50,000 annual proffer there for transit service. He also expressed concern about fuel cost increases, and wants to ensure that CAT does not come back to the County and indicate that operating expenses have gone up.

Mr. Elliott reported that Community Development has experienced a 31% decrease in staffing since 2006 and they are now seeing a slight uptick in building permits since 2009, but still remaining below 2006 levels. He said that the rezoning and special use permit business is near 2007 levels, but this may be due to rushes to get applications in by the end of last year. Mr. Elliott noted that the site development plans and subdivision plat review remain below 2008 levels and those have not really begun to climb, and 70% of the time they are reviewed within 21 days.

Ms. Mallek commented that 70% is pretty low and it seems people are being maxed out in their ability to process things quickly.

Mr. Rooker said that it's hard for him to understand the difference between planning and current development, as there seems to be a lot of overlap.

Mr. Graham explained that current development covers ministerial developments, such as by-right developments, whereas planning focuses more on legislative actions.

Mr. Letteri reported that overall Judicial includes the categories of Sheriff's Department, Commonwealth's Attorney's office, Clerk of Court, and Courts, and the funding level for this department is about \$3.85 million with a recommendation for a decrease of \$43,130 or 1.1%. He said that a significant degree of funding comes from the state, particularly the Compensation Board, and some of the decreases relate to the history of monitoring projections, and the County was likely conservative last year, which accounts for some of this year's decrease. Mr. Letteri said that the Commonwealth's Attorney's office saw a minor change in operations, less than 1/10 of 1%; the net cost of this operation has decreased by \$43,615 or 8.8%, driven largely in changes in estimates.

Ms. Denise Lunsford, Commonwealth's Attorney, addressed the Board, stating that her office has tried to reduce costs over the years through operating expense reductions. She noted that Albemarle has nine full-time staff in the office, compared to Hanover at 18 full-time staff and 4 part-time staff with a budget of \$1,580,000 for FY10-11; Albemarle's recommended budget for FY11-12 is \$910,000. Ms. Lunsford added that there are five attorneys in the office, four who are in court all the time.

Mr. Rooker said that the Board appreciates her approach to the budget and what her office does.

Mr. Letteri reported that the Clerk of Circuit Court office proposed budget decreases \$39,664 or 5.6%, driven largely by operating line items to more closely match what has been experienced over the past year. He said that the local cost would decrease by \$57,000 due primarily to changes in estimates through the Comp Board.

Mr. Dorrier stated that the Clerk is shorthanded, and there are a lot of mandates coming down from Circuit Court judges, and asked Ms. Lunsford for her opinion of the situation.

Ms. Lunsford responded that the Clerk is having some difficulties due to conditions in that office, and staffing has also been an issue.

Mr. Rooker said there were some issues that arose in the audit that was done for that office.

Mr. Letteri replied that she is doing her best to address those, and County Human Resources staff is meeting with them to evaluate the classifications and functions of all of those positions to help her restructure the department. He said that the number of employees there is also determined by the Comp Board.

Mr. Rooker noted that the audit revealed that a part-time person could be brought in to do bookkeeping and bring the Clerk's office up to date.

Regarding the Sheriff's office, Mr. Letteri reported that there has been an increase in the line of duty insurance costs as well as a \$7,500 increase in fuel costs and an increase in vehicle replacement fee costs of \$30,000. Mr. Letteri said that there would be \$2,800 in training academy costs, while the maintenance and utility costs for the J&DR court would be removed.

Mr. Rooker and Mr. Dorrier commented that the inmate population could be better utilized in improving the aesthetics of primary roads, and the prison work program could likely accomplish that for modest investment providing the sheriff could work it out with the courts.

Mr. Foley indicated that is where he has run into challenges in the past.

Mr. Letteri reported that the budget proposes an increase of \$7,800 due primarily to maintenance of office equipment and the cost associated with jurors and witnesses, with very minor changes in the General District Court operations and the magistrate's office. He added that the Juvenile Court utility and maintenance costs are able to be reduced by about \$29,000 now that it has been in operation for a full year.

---

Agenda Item No. 3. From the Board: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Boyd mentioned that three Board members have been appointed to the Biscuit Run Review Committee, and that is going to be problematic for FOIA requirements.

Mr. Rooker suggested having a Planning Commissioner to serve in place of a Board member.

Mr. Boyd offered not to serve on the committee.

Ms. Mallek said that she would be happy to have a Planning Commissioner serve on the committee and would follow up with that.

Mr. Rooker noted that there was going to be active recreation in that area as part of the development slated for Biscuit Run, and he would like for the committee to consider the unmet need for playing fields.

Mr. Thomas mentioned that it could be a possible site for the County Fair, and Ms. Mallek said that is definitely on the table.

---

Agenda Item No. 4. Adjourn to March 9, 2011, 9:00 a.m., Room 241

At 12:14 p.m., Mr. Boyd **moved** that the Board adjourn until March 9, 2011 at 9:00 a.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. Snow, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Boyd and Mr. Dorrier.  
NAYS: None.

---

Chairman

Approved by Board
-------------------

Date: 11/02/2011
------------------

Initials: EWJ
---------------