An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on November 9, 2011, at 4:00 p.m., Room 241, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from November 2, 2011.

PRESENT: Mr. Kenneth C. Boyd, Mr. Lindsay G. Dorrier, Jr., Ms. Ann 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, and Clerk, Ella W. Jordan.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. Mallek.

Ms. Mallek announced that the State Library Director's Board has awarded the Elizabeth L. Lewis Award to the Jefferson-Madison Regional Library Director, Mr. John Halliday, for "enthusiasm, support and direction" of public libraries in Virginia. Attendees applauded.

Agenda Item No. 2. Consent Agenda. Mr. Rooker **moved** to approve Item 2.1 and to accept Item 2.2 on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Thomas **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Item No. 2.1. For Approval: License Agreement for Historical Sign on County Property.

The executive summary states that the City of Charlottesville has requested County authorization to install a 3' X 4' historical sign in front of the County Office Building at the corner of McIntire Road and Preston Avenue. Specifically, the City's Dialogue on Race Program is proposing a sign that recounts the integration of the City Public Schools, including the former Lane High School. The content and location of the proposed sign are shown in Attachments A and B.

The placement of this sign on County property requires the Board's approval and the execution of a sign license agreement between the County and the City. Staff has prepared the attached draft Sign License Agreement (Agreement). Under the proposed Agreement, the size, design, and placement of the proposed sign would be subject to the County's approval and the City would install and maintain the sign at its own expense. Either party could terminate the Agreement. If terminated, the City would be required to promptly remove the sign and to restore the site to its prior condition.

As of this writing, certain aspects of the proposed Agreement remain outstanding. Most notably, a plat identifying the exact dimensions of the sign area and assuring the sign does not conflict with any existing easements has not been received. In addition, the County has not received the City Attorney's comments on the proposed Agreement. Any approval by the Board should be contingent on receipt of an acceptable plat and final terms of the Agreement being in substance and form approved by the County Attorney.

There is no foreseeable budget impact for granting authorization to the County Executive to sign the Agreement.

Staff recommends that, if the Board wishes to authorize the placement of the proposed historical sign in front of the McIntire Road County Office Building, it authorize the County Executive to sign the proposed Sign License Agreement on behalf of the County, contingent on (a) receipt of an acceptable plat specifically identifying the license area; and (b) approval of final language as to substance and form of the license agreement by the County Attorney.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board authorized the County Executive to sign the proposed Sign License Agreement on behalf of the County, contingent on (a) receipt of an acceptable plat specifically identifying the license area; and (b) approval of final language as to substance and form of the license agreement by the County Attorney:

This document was prepared by:
Albemarle County Attorney
County of Albemarle
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902

Parcel ID Number 350134000

This instrument is exempt from taxation under *Virginia Code* §§ 58.1-811(C)(4) and from Clerk's fees under *Virginia Code* § 17.1-266.

SIGN LICENSE AGREEMENT

This Sign License Agreement ("Agreement") is made by and between the **COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE, VIRGINIA** (hereinafter referred to as the "County"), and the **CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA** (hereinafter referred to as the “City”).

The following recitals of fact are a material part of this Agreement:

A. The County is the owner of a certain parcel of land in the City of Charlottesville, Virginia, legally described as Charlottesville City Parcel ID 350134000 (hereinafter referred to as the "Parcel").

B. The City is a municipal corporation of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

C. The County wishes to grant and the City wishes to receive certain Licenses, in, upon, over and across the Parcel for the benefit of the City, its successors and assigns, all as more fully set forth below.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants herein set forth, the public benefit, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt of which are hereby acknowledged, the following grants, agreements and covenants are made:

1. **Grant of License**. the County hereby grants, gives and conveys to the City, and its successors and assigns, a revocable License over, across, under and through the “Sign Area” (hereinafter defined) to erect and maintain a sign in that area, and to permit the use of the Sign Area by the City for the other purposes stated in this grant of License.

2. **Location of Sign Area**. The location of the Sign Area shall be as shown on that certain plat by the Engineering Division of the City of Charlottesville, dated November 17, 2011, and titled “Plat Showing Sign Area for Historic Marker,” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

3. **Use of Sign Area**. The City shall have the right to use the Sign Area to erect, maintain, improve, enlarge or reduce, repair or replace a sign, whose size, design, and placement are subject to the County’s approval.

4. **Repair and Maintenance**. The City shall maintain any sign that it places in the Sign Area in good condition and repair at its sole cost and expense.

5. **Landscaping**. The City shall have the right (hereinafter referred to as the "Landscaping Option"), upon written notice to the County, to landscape, including, without limitation, the planting or removal of shrubs, bushes, plants and trees, within the Sign Area. The landscaping plan of the City shall be subject to the County's approval, which shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed. Should the City exercise the Landscaping Option, the City shall assume all obligations and responsibilities for the maintenance and upkeep of the landscaping within the Sign Area. Should the City not exercise the "Landscaping Option," the County shall retain all responsibility for maintenance and upkeep of the landscaping. The party responsible for the landscaping within the Sign Area shall keep the landscaping in good condition at all times at its sole cost and expense. The City may revoke its exercise of the Landscaping Option at any time and upon such revocation, all obligations and responsibilities for maintenance and upkeep of the landscaping shall revert to the County.

6. **Compliance with Laws**. The City shall comply with all applicable ordinances, statutes, regulations and all other local, state and federal laws applicable to the Sign Area and any sign it places thereon, including the maintenance and repair thereof.

7. **Termination of License**. Either the County or the City may terminate this Agreement by delivering a written notice of termination to the other party at its address listed in Section 10 below. Upon such notice of termination, the City shall promptly remove any sign(s) from the Sign Area, and shall restore the Sign Area as nearly as possible to its prior condition. Thereafter all rights, duties and liabilities hereby created shall terminate.

8. **Transfer By the County**. Whenever a transfer of ownership of the Parcel occurs, liability hereunder of the transferor for any breach of any covenant occurring thereafter shall automatically terminate with respect to such transferor, and the transferee shall automatically assume the burdens and obligations running hereunder to the owner of the Parcel which shall accrue from and after the date of such transfer.

9. **Construction**. The rule of strict construction does not apply to this grant. This grant shall be given a reasonable construction so that the intention of the parties to confer a commercially usable right of enjoyment for the benefit of the City is carried out.

10. **Notices**. All notices and other communications given pursuant to this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be deemed properly served if delivered in person to the party to whom it is addressed or on the third (3rd) day after deposit in the U.S. mail, as registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, postage prepaid, as follows:

1. If to the County:
   County of Albemarle
   c/o County Attorney
   401 McIntire Road, Suite 325
   Charlottesville, Virginia 22902

2. If to the City:
   City of Charlottesville
   605 East Main Street
   Charlottesville, VA 22902-5337

11. **No Assignment By the City**. The City may not transfer or otherwise assign any of its rights or interest granted under this Agreement, and any purported assignment shall be null and void and shall entitle the County to terminate this Agreement and the License hereby granted.
12. **Counterparts**. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original and all of which shall together constitute one and the same instrument.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the County and the City have executed this Agreement as of the _____ day of _______________, 2011.

CITY: **CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA**
By:________________________________
Maurice Jones, City Manager

The City of Charlottesville, acting by and through its City Manager, pursuant to authority granted by resolution of the City Council of the City of Charlottesville, does hereby accept the conveyance of this easement, pursuant to Virginia Code Sec. 15.2-1803, as evidenced by the City Manager's signature hereto and the City's recordation of this deed.

This Agreement is executed on behalf of the County of Albemarle by Thomas C. Foley, County Executive, following a duly-held public hearing, and pursuant to a Resolution of the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors.

COUNTY: **COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE, VIRGINIA**
By:________________________________
Thomas C. Foley
County Executive

____

Item No. 2.2. For Information: Crozet Library Project Update, ***was received for information***.

The executive summary states that in December of 2004, the Board adopted the Crozet Master Plan, which identified the need for a new Crozet Library to provide enhanced library services to the community and to serve as a catalyst for redevelopment in downtown Crozet. In November of 2006, the Board authorized the design and construction of the library.

In May of 2008, the Board approved the formation of the Crozet Library Steering Committee to, along with the design team of Grimm and Parker, facilitate the engagement of stakeholders and the public, to evaluate and balance the various needs and objectives, and to oversee the schematic design phase of the project. The Committee recommended a preferred design, which was reviewed and approved by the Board on June 3, 2009. In December of 2010, the Board further directed staff to complete the Detailed Design phase of the project for purposes of establishing accurate cost estimates and bringing the project to a "bid ready" state.

In June of 2011, an update on the status of the Crozet Library and parking lot projects was provided to the Board, noting that parking lot construction would occur during the summer of 2011, and that building plans would be completed to the point necessary to determine a detailed cost estimate.

Since the Board approved the schematic plans for the Crozet Library project in June, 2009, the following project highlights have occurred:

- Nov 2009 – building design stopped due to capital project funding shortages
- Dec 2009 – parking lot portion authorized to proceed
- May 2010 – site plan review required on-site SWM (for parking phase)
- Nov 2010 – ARB reviewed parking lot plan
- Dec 2010 – Board directed completion of building design
- Apr 2011 – ARB approved parking phase and building phase
- May 2011 – parking lot bid documents issued
- May 2011 – building design details with user group completed
- May 2011 – updated cost estimate completed
- June 2011 – updated cost information provided to Board of Supervisors
- Aug 2011 – plans and cost estimate update received from architectural engineer (AE)
- Sep 2011 – independent local cost estimate and value engineering requested
- Oct 2011 – updated cost estimate based on independent review and AE feedback completed

The purpose of this agenda item is to provide a brief update on the status of the Crozet Library and parking lot projects for background information in preparation of the 5 Year Financial Plan review.

The parking lot construction is nearly completed, and is expected to be substantially completed and in use in November of this year.

The building plans, ready for bidding, are expected to be completed by late fall and a summary cost estimate associated with the plans is attached (Attachment A). Current estimates assuming a bid in early 2012 and utilizing current construction industry economic conditions predict a savings of approximately 8.7% compared to the May 2011 estimate. The estimated construction cost is now approximately $6.25M, bringing the total project cost to approximately $9.83M. The Board previously appropriated $2.0M for the land acquisition and design and construction of the parking lot, leaving a funding need of $7.83M to complete the project. Friends of the Crozet Library have pledged to reimburse the County $1.6M of that $7.83M, leaving an additional net funding need of $6.23M to complete the project.

Approximately $1.5M has been spent to date on acquisition of property and design services, and on parking lot construction. Approximately $0.25M is encumbered for completion of design services, and approximately $0.25M is unencumbered and available for this project.

Unless alternative funding is identified, a $7.83M funding is needed for completion of this project, with an expectation that $1.6M of that amount will be funded or reimbursed by Friends of the Crozet Library. Staff will present additional considerations and options in the context of our discussion of the 5-year plan, including impacts to the operations budget.

This summary is provided for information only and no action is required.

____

Agenda Item No. 4. **Appointment:** Board of Social Services.

Mr. Rooker **moved** to appoint Ms. Laney Kaminer to the Board of Social Services, with said term to expire December 31, 2013**.** Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

____

Agenda Item No. 3. **Work Session:** County's Five Year Financial Plan.

Mr. Foley reported that the agenda is similar to those in the past, but the approach would be a bit different. He said that given the challenges over the past several years, the significant cuts made to both capital and operating budgets, and the Board's strategic plan direction, staff felt it was important to provide the Board with information that would help them consider alternative scenarios and their impacts to they can determine as a Board what future is most appropriate and responsive to the needs faced over the next five years. Mr. Foley said the purpose today is just to provide a range of possibilities. The County continues to face revenue declines, new mandates, and continuing and new obligations while facing increasing demands for an improved capital program and the operating impacts it creates – along with the continued demands of keeping up with costs of service mandates and obligations. He stated that while the staff is smaller than it was before, the County still faces things such as VRS rate increases and other obligations. Mr. Foley stated that given this challenging environment and the Board's strategic direction, staff felt compelled to provide scenarios for Board consideration and thinking as they set direction for the future. He said that Ms. Allshouse has led the process this year and it has been extremely challenging for staff to provide several different scenarios. He thanked Ms. Allshouse and the County staff for their hard work on this. He added that this was the best work that staff has ever done in trying to bring something before the Board.

Mr. Foley stated that there are essential components of the Plan under either scenario. The Board will find that this plan holds the line on taxes when compared to FY09, when the average tax bill was at a certain level. He said that going through all five years of the plan, the County would never get back up to that level of tax bill for the average homeowner. Mr. Foley stated that this plan continues to look for efficiencies, restructuring and repositioning. He reminded the Board that 66 positions have been eliminated with 5-6 positions frozen, $166 million in cuts to the CIP, a 33% reduction in Community Development staff, contracting out services in several areas, and have eliminated or reduced services in a number of areas. He stated that this plan includes additional cuts and reductions, including elimination of four more positions over the next five years, reductions to agencies and repositioning of agency contributions. Mr. Foley said the plan addresses new obligations and mandates for local government, addresses new financial targets to protect the AAA-bond rating, prepares for state and federal revenue reductions and continues to focus on alternative revenue sources at a higher level of revenue collection. All of these things are in each of those two scenarios that will be presented to the Board.

Mr. Foley presented the first scenario, the "status quo scenario," which ensures that the County keeps up with its obligations and recognizes that the economy continues to struggle and includes uncertainty. He said that this option gets by with the minimums and leaves the most pressing issues unaddressed, though it does meet requirements. Beyond holding a line on taxes for the average homeowner, he said, it provides further tax reductions for the third year in a row with slight increases in taxes in the out-years as assessments start to recover slightly – but never get back to the 2009 level.

Depending on the Board's view of the future, this is a viable alternative given the challenging economic times. Mr. Foley stated that this approach would balance the plan at the current tax rate, with minimal increases to the school to address new mandates such as VRS expenses. He said there would be no progress made in funding the capital program, it minimally addresses core public safety needs, continues the delay in improved library services for Crozet and Ivy, and provides modest support for an evolving workforce.

Mr. Foley stated that this is a viable alternative, but there is a second scenario that focuses on the Board's strategic plan. He said that it begins to make modest progress on the goals the Board agreed upon and begins to make investments in the future and their vision of a thriving county. Mr. Foley indicated that it addresses essential components, balances the plan on an equalized rate of 76.5 cents, and holds the line on taxes for the average homeowner but does not provide the same tax reduction as the status-quo plan. He said that it assists the school system in addressing those new mandates simply because the rate is different and the formula would drive more money to the schools. It begins modest steps to address delayed capital needs – increasing the transfers by the formula but also dedicating one-half penny to capital. Mr. Foley said it provides new library services to the Crozet and Ivy areas and assures adequate level of EMS service in the Pantops area through the partnership with Martha Jefferson Hospital while meeting other public safety priorities such as the police firing range and an engine for the new fire station. He stated that it better recognizes staff and supports an evolving workforce, moving closer to market projections.

Mr. Foley said that today's discussion provides a scenario at the current tax rate that funds essential components, provides greater tax relief, but makes minimal progress in addressing strategic priorities. It is a viable alternative depending on your view regarding the future and current demands. The second scenario at the equalized tax rate funds essential components, provides less of a tax reduction, but moves forward in addressing the Board's strategic priorities and those most pressing issues that the County face today. Both scenarios continue to rely heavily on operational efficiencies, restructuring and savings. He then turned the meeting over to Ms. Allshouse.

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of Budget and Performance Management, reported that the planning process began with the Board's retreat in June. The Board also had a work session with the School Board on October 12 in which they discussed compensation and benefits. She said that staff has spent a lot of time since then going through various scenarios and ensuring what is presented is a balanced plan. Tomorrow the Board will be meeting with the School Board and School staff prior to having two more work sessions – December 7 and December 14.

Ms. Allshouse emphasized that this is not the Board's budget, it is just a financial plan based on the best information available today. She stated that assessments are not completed so this is based on assumptions. Staff believes the scenarios support Board priorities. Ms. Allshouse said that this brings together the school, capital and operating plans all into one comprehensive conversation. She stated that there are specific goals followed in establishing the plan, starting by funding obligations and commitments. Ms. Allshouse said that the plan increases the Board's undesignated fund balance to 10% based on the financial advisors' position and to ensure maintaining the AAA bond rating, which this does under both scenarios. She stated that plan addresses critical core service needs, and continues to look for efficiencies, reallocations and restructuring to reposition the organization for the future, with an eye again to supporting strategic plan goals.

Ms. Allshouse said a large part of her presentation is about scenario one which is at the current tax rate. Scenario one is the status quo scenario, which assumes the current tax rate and anticipates a \$1.5 million decrease in local, state and federal revenues when compared to the FY12 adopted budget. She said it also includes a prediction for slowly recovered revenues in the out years. The main challenge is the real estate assessment rates as they continue to decline. Ms. Allshouse stated that the decrease over FY 2013-17, the five years of the plan, is .7%. The federal revenues decline of 14% reflects a shift in the childcare payment program – which would balance out with expenditures, but is now given directly to constituents. She said that real estate revenues are anticipated to decrease by 3% over the period, with bottoming out in FY 2014 and small increases throughout the remaining years of the plan.

Mr. Dorrier asked what the basis for these assumptions is or are they just a guess. Ms. Allshouse responded that predictions are challenging. They brought a revenue team of people together, including assessors, others in the housing market, experts in the Finance Department, etc. She added that they can only make predictions based on information that is currently available.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the County is looking at diversifying its revenue sources, as Mr. Foley mentioned. For the FY 2012 adopted budget there are increases projected for food and beverage taxes, delinquency collections, and audit revenues. She noted that the Finance Department would be focusing more on delinquencies and audits, adding that the food and beverage tax revenues were increasing more than anticipated in FY 2011. Ms. Allshouse reported that there are state aid reductions and the Board recently did a resolution to the state addressing these, and this model for both scenarios assumes that it does not come back up to the levels requested.

Regarding expenditure assumptions, Ms. Allshouse said there would be discussion of personnel, operations and agency allocations, reserves (including recommended uses of the FY11 excess fund balance), budget transfers (School Division, CIP and revenue sharing). She stated that one of the Board's goals is supporting the County's evolving workforce, and under the first scenario there are some increases for the workforce but it may not reach the market level hoped for. Ms. Allshouse said that on the first year in FY13, under the current tax rate, there is a 1.5% increase for salaries, with 1% in FY14, 2% in FY15; establishes a \$280,000 one-time merit pool from FY11 end-of-the-year surplus to be given as bonuses based on performance in FY14 and FY15. In the out years, she stated, there would be a 2% market plus a 0.7% merit increase for FY16 and FY17.

Mr. Foley said that in past models, they have always budgeted for a market increase and about .7% to implement a merit pay system, which is an ongoing obligation once you provide it.

Ms. Allshouse said that Mr. Foley had mentioned some of the frozen positions, and under scenario one the plant does unfreeze three additional police officer positions – two in FY15 and one in FY16. In both scenarios the hiring of a business auditor is recommended beginning in FY13, which would be offset by revenue collection. It is anticipated that the auditor would bring in additional revenue on and above paying for their own salary.

Ms. Mallek asked what happens with the current auditor. Ms. Allshouse said it is her understanding that the current auditor is working only on sales; this would be a business auditor.

Mr. Boyd commented that he thought they had already discussed unfreezing three police officer positions.

Mr. Foley responded that they were able to fund a few officers in changing the plan, but this remained after that so there was no change.

Mr. Snow asked if any of the police officer positions have been filled. Mr. Foley said the force has a number of vacancies right now, which has been a continuous challenge, and they are working on some new recruitment strategies.

Mr. Rooker asked why it has been difficult to fill the positions. Mr. Foley responded that Human Resources has done an extensive amount of work on this and has developed some different strategies for recruitment. He also said the County has been involved in a public safety salary study, and one of the impacts in this plan is $300,000 in addition to $200,000 already approved because salaries had fallen so far behind. Mr. Foley stated that there are a number of other strategies, such as funding education, and they would get into more detail on that later on.

Mr. Dorrier asked about the Auditor providing information to the County and if there is an increased need for this. Mr. Foley replied that the County is doing everything it needs to with its audit right now, and it becomes a part of development of the five-year plan.

Mr. Dorrier asked if individual departments are audited. Mr. Foley responded, “no”. He said that the Board has done a zero-based type budgeting process and staff tries to come in and show how budgets are built and what programs are in place.

Ms. Allshouse said that after the Board’s strategic plan, staff has strategized as to how to increase capacity through use of volunteers – and through restructuring or repositioning they are hoping to enhance volunteer coordination efforts with a Volunteer Coordinator position. She also stated that the plan includes $350,000 for FY13 for public safety reclassifications, and $100,000 in FY13 and $75,000 in FY14-FY17 for potential individual and departmental reclassifications.

Mr. Boyd asked if there would be key performance indicators included as to what the expectations are for the Volunteer Coordinator position.

Ms. Allshouse said that would be a great idea. Mr. Foley explained that the Volunteer Coordinator being considered here is beyond just fire and rescue, covering the whole County. He added that metrics are important as is results.

Ms. Mallek asked if the reclassification of public safety would involve changing benchmark communities. Mr. Foley responded that they are using the same ones and are looking at the entire pool as well as the median of the market, and they are examining localities that are hiring Albemarle’s officers.

Mr. Boyd asked if peer communities would be used that are similar to Albemarle’s demographics for public safety reclassifications.

Mr. Foley said that the market defined that was supported by a community process included a mix of counties – with Greene County and Loudon County both included – and since that was adopted, it was decided that some hard to fill positions might need to come from a more narrowed group. He stated that it was approved by the Board for both management staff and teachers and before this is finalized, they would look at it through that lens.

Ms. Allshouse stated that the plan would also include a $50,000 pool per year for training, used where it would be needed the most, and this would be in addition to any existing training.

Mr. Foley commented that there are minimal amounts of training now, but as more is expected of staff there must be more done to train them.

Mr. Snow said they would also be looking at online training that does not involve travel. Mr. Foley responded that they have already shifted significantly to webinars and online trainings, but not everything can be accomplished that way.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the plans assume a VRS rate increase of 2% as an estimate, and that number might be available by the end of November.

Mr. Rooker asked if that meant 2% of the total amount.

Mr. Foley said that would be in addition to the 15% rate increase, and explained that for every percent that goes up it costs about $300,000 on the workforce – so a 2% increase would mean $600,000.

Mr. Rooker clarified that the increase in cost is actually 12-14%, not 2%. Mr. Foley said that is correct.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the dental insurance rate increases by 7%. Mr. Rooker noted that it was not based on percent of salary but just the premium.

Ms. Allshouse stated that in terms of health insurance, since this is a self-insured plan, both the employer and employee contribute. Staff is recommending reducing the base rate by $300 per employee for an annual contribution of $6,745 per year.

Mr. Foley pointed out that the Board had reallocated some of the health care savings in that area to bonuses last year, with a total contribution that was $650 higher. Staff is now recommending reallocating some of those funds back to other obligations in the budget. He stated that the County has held employee premiums to nothing for four years as other organizations have had to pass some of those costs on, and it can no longer afford to do that.

Ms. Allshouse reiterated that this is the fourth year in a row with no proposed increase in health insurance premiums for employees. The plan assumes an annual increase of 8% in the out-years beginning in FY 14 for both the employee and employer, and this could be reduced based on future claims and changes to the plan design.

Mr. Rooker stated that this would essentially mean an increase of 28-29% by FY17. Mr. Foley said that hopefully the increase won't be necessary, but they would need to look closely at the County's program. This is a fairly conservative number.

Ms. Allshouse reported that other operational assumptions include prior-year program reductions that are continued through the model. She also said that the County is planning to restructure more and the efforts would result in savings equal to the elimination of four additional positions by the end of the plan. Ms. Allshouse stated that it also provides for an operational inflationary increase of 2% in each year, mostly for utility and fuel increases. She also said that for the first time, the plan includes salary lapse or attrition. There are vacancies that occur over time that yield some savings, so this actually budgets that. Ms. Allshouse stated that the plan also provides for operating impacts of the capital projects in the current adopted CIP, which is an obligation built into the plan each year.

Ms. Allshouse reported that since the recession the County has reduced funds to capital, eliminated 66 positions in local government, reduced school transfer amounts, and reduced agency allocations. She said that staff is recommending a slight change in how agency funding occurs, aligning it with the County's approach for departments – a $100,000 reduction in funding for agencies to be allocated in accordance with the Board's approved ABRT Steering Committee recommendations. Ms. Allshouse said that in July, the ABRT began strategizing as to how to fund agencies and brought some changes to the Board as to how to structure criteria for evaluation.

Mr. Foley clarified that it would mean a 5% reduction, which would be allocated by this team based on the Board's criteria for core programs versus enhancements.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the plan also assumes that funding for tourism and festival-related agencies would be considered within the County's tourism allocation to the CACVB, which would be a shift in policy and would not involve dictating what they would fund.

Mr. Foley said that staff wasn't sure whether the language should say "considered" or "required," and that is something the Board would need to discuss going forward – either encouraging or expecting the CACVB to fund them. He stated that they have had a fund balance for a number of years and there is some question as to whether the funding they get is more than they need for their operational costs, and over the five-year period of this plan the County is taking back some of that money.

Ms. Rooker asked how much money is involved. Ms. Allshouse stated that the County spends about $77,000 for festival and agency funding related to tourism.

Mr. Boyd said that he agreed with the shift to CACVB making those decisions.

Mr. Rooker agreed, stating that festivals like Festival of the Book, Virginia Film Festival, etc., bring in substantial revenue and he wants to ensure they continue to get supported.

Mr. Boyd said surely the tourism people would recognize that.

Mr. Rooker stated that the Board should let them know that there is an expectation for that.

Mr. Foley said that it is a big issue as there is a lot at stake, and the money being provided to them is by contract.

Mr. Boyd stated that the CACVB has metrics that they must live up to, and they have been exceeding them according to their annual report.

Ms. Mallek said that prior to deciding this, she would like to have the meeting with the CACVB that has been promised to clarify what is coming to the County versus the entire region.

Mr. Foley stated that there is a reason these bulleted items are under a title, “Repositioning for the Future,” as these decisions would impact the budget going forward.

Ms. Allshouse reported that with the item pertaining to libraries staff is recommending $30,000 to be provided by out-of-area support for people outside of the County, with the County’s contribution reduced by the same amount.

Mr. Foley said the Library will likely come in and ask the County for more money and they will probably add that they could use this additional money for other things. He added that this is just a proposal to address the out of County fee.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the agency allocation would be level funded through FY17. In the past that allocation has been tied to salary increases for County employees, with the overall contribution capped at a certain amount.

Mr. Foley said that the ABRT would use the Board’s criteria to determine where the best investment is.

Ms. Allshouse stated that the last item pertains to Charlottesville-Albemarle Commission on Children and Families (CCF) which assumes a change in the scope of that organization. The CCF has done a very good job of bringing in grant money, and the shift would put more responsibility on them to bring in grant money. She said there would be a $25,000 savings in FY13 through a vacant position for an office assistant that the County would not recommend replacing. A long-term recommendation is to have that agency funded through grants by FY14. Ms. Allshouse stated that the County really values its agencies, but staff has begun to take a closer look at the role of government in some of them.

Mr. Foley noted that there is one position in that agency still funded by the County, which is shared with the City, but this suggests that the operation shift from County-funded to self-funded. He added that the CCF’s role has dramatically changed, with CSAs shifting back to DSS.

Ms. Allshouse reported that in July when the ABRT brought information to the Board as to how to restructure prioritization of agencies seeking funding, a Board member asked them to share information as to how Albemarle compares to other jurisdictions regarding funding. She said that on the comparative report, it is investments of local funds and human service nonprofit programs – so that’s not every agency – and it is a per-capita amount of funding. Ms. Allshouse stated that the information demonstrates that Albemarle is very high per-capita versus comparative communities that the County benchmarks with in many areas; $22.71 per capita for human service nonprofit programs, with the range in other localities being .56 cents per capita to about $6 per capita.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that some of these counties have their own agencies that do this work.

Ms. Allshouse responded that there are jurisdictions that are have their own departments doing that work.

Mr. Boyd asked if there was any way to normalize these figures for comparison. Ms. Allshouse stated that it would require more work.

Mr. Foley said it is also important to get some clarification on that because those localities have generalized some of their information to line up the comparisons.

Ms. Mallek suggested asking VACo for some of this information.

Ms. Allshouse stated that she could resend the email that elaborates on the caveats that were part of this evaluation.

Mr. Boyd asked if she could categorize some of the figures, such as “services for senior citizens.”

Mr. Foley said that staff could provide a list of all the agencies.

Mr. Rooker stated that the figure of $22.71 multiplied by 100,000 would be about $2.2 million, and he finds it hard to believe that Hanover is spending just $50,000 a year for nonprofit agencies.

Ms. Mallek said it is because they have a government that does those things in-house.

Mr. Rooker commented that even with that, he finds it hard to believe.

Mr. Boyd suggested having staff pick a few locations and do comparisons.

Mr. Dorrier said he would like to know why the City’s is twice what the County’s is.

Mr. Foley responded that cities traditionally spend more on human services than counties, but even with those included it only jumps to about $11 per capita. He agreed to have staff come back with some clarifications of the data.

In terms of fund balance and reserves, Ms. Allshouse reported that the assumptions include an undesignated fund balance for FY11 from 8% to 10%, but even after accomplishing that there is still almost $4 million available for reserves, capital and other uses. She said that staff is recommending that $560,000 be held from that for a merit pool, with additional funding for a VRS contingency. Ms. Allshouse said that for FY13 under scenario one, they would hold $600,000 for potential increases in VRS, as follows:

• Merit Pool ($280K for FY 14 and FY 15)	$ 560,000
• VRS Contingency (FY 13)*	600,000
• Federal/State Revenue Contingency	500,000
• Line of Duty Act (LODA) Contingency	500,000
• Transfer to CIP (Schools/Local Gov)	1,498,000
Total:	$3,698,000

- Reserves
    - Plan provides for an undesignated General Fund fund balance of 10% and maintains throughout the plan
    - Plan provides an operational contingency reserve of $250,000 in each year

Mr. Foley noted that VRS is built in on an ongoing basis for the rest of the years.

Ms. Allshouse stated that there may be a decision not to pick up the funding for items that state and federal governments withdraw funding from, but staff felt it would be prudent to set aside $500,000 to cover cuts that may occur.

Mr. Snow noted that the fund balance reserve is more like 12% to 13%. Ms. Allshouse said that is correct.

Mr. Foley pointed out that the 10% would need to be maintained every year. Mr. Rooker said they are not planning on invading the fund balance as it is not really an operating reserve.

Ms. Allshouse said that last year the state had continued to run the Line of Duty Act Program by required localities to pick up the cost, so staff built in $100,000 for FY12 for those costs. She stated that there are indications they will be asking for increases if the County stays in the state line of duty pool, but there are outside pools such as VACo's and VML's that the County could join – and that option would need to be decided by June 2012. Ms. Allshouse explained that line of duty covers both public safety employees and volunteers that are working on behalf of the County.

Mr. Rooker noted that it is a mandated program.

Mr. Foley said it is a huge mandated obligation, and would require that the County manages it very differently – including defining what a volunteer is. Are the volunteers the 750 volunteers or only those that are active by some measure. The County will have to make a decision. He stated that if the County were to go to the VML or VaCo solution, it would also have to shift all of its insurance coverage including general liability, property, etc.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the line of duty insurance covers anyone who is injured on the job.

Ms. Allshouse replied that if someone is acting on behalf of the County in a public safety capacity, they are eligible for line of duty which could include death benefits and health care benefits.

Mr. Boyd asked if this was an annual expense or just a one-time expense.

Ms. Allshouse responded that the $500,000 would just be a one-time expense. There is consideration of creating a self-pool in the County but there does need to be a starting point. She said that more actuary information and analysis would be needed to determine what is necessary, but there are five or six claims right now in the State system.

Mr. Foley said that staff also needs to determine whether the 750 fire and rescue volunteers can claim this or whether the County needs to set up a whole new program, so there is a lot to be done but by next summer they need to make a call on it. It was prudent for staff to put some money aside for this. Staff will come back in the next couple of months with options and to get direction from the Board.

Ms. Allshouse noted that there are a lot of jurisdictions that have pulled out of the State's program, and there is a thought that even more will – so whoever is left would have to pay a much higher rate.

Mr. Foley said this is unquestionably a State shift to localities and a state mandate.

Ms. Allshouse stated that staff would also recommend that the remaining balance be shifted to the CIP for schools and local government, which is typically the approach.

Ms. Mallek asked if the sharing in the CIP is by formula. Ms. Allshouse responded that it is based on need.

Mr. Foley mentioned that without these other items, it would all transfer to capital by policy.

Mr. Boyd asked if this was essentially the divvying up of last year's surplus, and asked if there had been an analysis of where the surplus came from.

Ms. Allshouse stated that about $3.4 million was from departmental savings, a large portion of which was from the lapse factor.

Mr. Boyd said that at some point he'd like to see that analysis.

Mr. Foley stated that staff would bring that back along with percentage of the total budget.

Mr. Boyd said he is trying to determine if any of these are ongoing costs. He also asked if the School system is prepared to tell the Board about its end of the year fund balance. Ms. Allshouse said she does not know.

Mr. Rooker noted that the merit pool would be an ongoing expense if it is continued. It becomes a component of the County's compensation scheme as it has to be replenished in order to continue.

Mr. Foley explained that staff is proposing a merit pool for two years, and after that time it would be funded as a merit salary increase. He also said they have built the VRS commitments into years two through five, as well as a one-time investment for the line of duty insurance.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the plan provides for an undesignated General Fund fund balance of 10% and maintains it throughout the plan. In the Board's operating budget the plan also provides a $250,000 contingency reserve in each year under both scenarios. She said the County had an operating contingency that it did not use from FY11, then it dropped the fund balance.

Ms. Allshouse presented information on the history of revenue sharing with the City. She stated that the actual transfers will decrease as there is a two-year lag. She also presented information on the transfer to schools, and said that in four of the last five years the actuals were less than projections. Ms. Allshouse presented information on the transfer to CIP debt over the five-year model, under scenario one), noting that in FY11-12 the $18.8 million included some one-time money for revenue sharing with VDOT. Regarding the fund balance issue raised earlier, she said there were funds set aside from FY10-11 for a debt payment that would be put in the CIP this year, so that is why FY11-12 is 6% higher.

Ms. Allshouse presented information from the Technical Review Committee, which is the staff group that looks at CIP projects identified and brought to them; they did send their recommendations to the Oversight Committee yesterday. Under scenario one, she noted the amount of money under the current tax rate that would go to school debt service, general government debt service and capital projects – and said that in FY17 almost all the transfer under this scenario would go to pay debt.

Ms. Allshouse summarized that scenario one funds basic obligations and commitments, including the VRS rate increase, continues the formulas for the school transfer and the CIP transfer according to Board policy, increases the general fund balance from 8% to 10% to ensure continued strong financial position, minimally addresses support for the evolving workforce, minimally addresses core public safety goals, provides funding for support the results of the safety classification study, unfreezes three police officer positions by FY16, and achieves the opening of the Ivy Fire Station.

Ms. Mallek asked if that only covered the engine. Mr. Foley responded that it is the operating cost for eight firefighters at that station.

Mr. Boyd asked if they would be able to find volunteers for the night shift. Mr. Foley responded that they are in the process of doing that now. He added that the budget assumes the dissolution of the City/County contract in FY14.

Ms. Allshouse stated that the average residential parcel assessment in 2009 was $2,300 in taxes for the average homeowner, and with the current tax rate through 2017 the taxes would not even reach the 2007 levels.

Mr. Rooker commented that the projections may be optimistic for valuation, noting that there are many constituents in his district who are waiting to pounce on their assessments based upon the impact of the bypass. He said that this would be a reality, and even with other areas the indexes predict continued declines until values are down about 25%-30% from when the boom ended.

Mr. Foley stated that it is a tough game to predict, but Steve Allshouse and Mark Graham and others have studied it very, very carefully and continue to monitor information and trends.

Mr. Rooker also noted that in the City, there is a gigantic differential between where sales are occurring and assessed value – as much as 30% – and in the County the sales are about 12%-15% below assessed value. He said that he thinks the County staff may be optimistic about what they are projecting as far as valuations.

Mr. Foley said that staff is predicting a 3% decline in the upcoming round of assessments, and another 1.5% decline after that.

Mr. Rooker stated that the point here is that the contingencies that provide $250,000 aren't going to make a dent if the declines are in the millions, and that needs to be considered.

Ms. Allshouse reported that scenario two is a five-year financial plan that is based on an equalized 76.5 cent tax rate, and if this approach were taken it would provide an additional $7.2 million over five years to the School Division, with the first year being an additional $1.4 million. She said that this scenario would provide an additional $5.4 million for community facilities over five years for capital, and based on the formula in the first year it would be an additional $313,000 for capital – with staff recommending that .5 of the tax rate go to capital also, resulting in $736,000 annually for each year of the plan. Ms. Allshouse stated that the equalized rate could fund the Crozet Library, including the operational expense. Regarding public safety investment, she said that in addition to the three police officers and the staffing for Ivy station, this plan would provide for the needed apparatus for Ivy, an EMS service in the Pantops area – which would be a net cost of $85,000, and a firing range.

Mr. Foley pointed out that the ambulance revenues would offset the EMS costs. Mr. Rooker said the Board needs to look at the ordinance again.

Ms. Allshouse commented that the Oversight Committee has just begun to address capital projects, so the five-year plan informs that process and vice-versa.

Mr. Foley stated that staff has used the TRC recommendations in developing these recommendations.

Ms. Allshouse said that there would be some additional support also for the evolving workforce.

Ms. Allshouse reported that under the second scenario, the same general trend applies with assessment income, and staff is expecting it to increase in the out years. Ms. Allshouse said that in 2009, the assessments were $2,289 but by 2017 the assessments still do not reach that level even at the equalized tax rate.

Ms. Allshouse reported that neither scenario fully address the core service needs such as Comp Plans, police staffing, or funding for the long-term capital needs beyond what's been mentioned here – nor do they address the "watch list items," such as devolution of responsibility of secondary roads, TMDL, funding of long-term solid waste management, expansion of Medicaid, and ongoing reductions in state and federal funds. She said that staff set aside money for the Board to have if that becomes a reality, but there is nothing built into either plan for long-term changes. Ms. Allshouse said that longer-term issues such as community policing, water protection efforts, capital needs such as court facilities, school renovations, library upgrades and ACE, greenways, and master plan implementation items such as sidewalks are also not included in these scenarios.

Mr. Foley noted that the dedicated .5 cent to capital also fully funds the maintenance program, but staff has not allocated the total results of the extra .5 cent. He stated that schools have pulled out all of their requests this year except for maintenance, but would be coming back next year to talk about redistricting and anticipated school impacts. Mr. Foley said that staff has left the .5 cent unallocated so it could be placed where it was needed, but in the plans presented there is nothing included beyond the library, the firing range and opening the Ivy station. Mr. Foley stated that the two scenarios are based on how much tax reduction the Board wants to provide over the five-year period, adding that it meets the basics – with $7.2 million more for schools and $5.4 million more for capital over the time span. He added that it is important to note that staff worked really hard in the first model to get the fire station opened and the library in, but the VRS obligations skewed that. Mr. Foley said that under the first model there is not enough money to build the Crozet Library let alone fund its operating costs, but scenario two moves them closer towards some of their strategic objectives. He added that the Board needs to keep in mind that in the Pantops area, when that contract goes away, the bypass station will have one less engine to cover that area. He added that this is not the annual budget, but an opportunity to give the Board some scenarios in which to think about. He emphasized that the reality is the Board could go with the second scenario and raise the tax rate by .3 cents, and then just do the library.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the renovations to Greer School had been completed. Mr. Foley responded that that project is currently underway.

Mr. Boyd asked for clarification about an engine at the Ivy Fire Station. Ms. Allshouse explained that the second scenario would provide an additional engine.

Mr. Foley said that it is a good question, as staff had considered getting an engine to provide some efficiencies – but the process of making any change would likely be lengthy and controversial. He commented that the County is not necessarily replacing the second-due pieces the same way it is the first-due.

Mr. Snow asked why it would be controversial. Mr. Thomas responded that the volunteers wouldn't like it.

Ms. Mallek said that the fleet plan has been established through the process and would need to be redone that way.

Mr. Foley commented that it has happened with the County vehicle fleet and with the school bus fleet, and it needs to happen with this.

Mr. Boyd asked if it was his understanding that the station could be opened but a truck would have to come from somewhere else, or they would have to buy a new one.

Mr. Foley confirmed that one of the two would need to happen in order for it to be opened.

Mr. Thomas said staff has done a very good job in putting this together, and asked if wages had leveled off in the private sector.

Mr. Foley responded that there is no data as to where that stands for the future.

Mr. Rooker said that in looking backward every year for the 30 comparative markets in the survey area, the County observes trends and can make compensation decisions based on that information in estimating what it should be in the future.

Mr. Thomas commented that people's property values going down would have an impact on the private sector.

Ms. Mallek responded that under one plan, their bill would be the same. She said it would be difficult if people were selling their homes and having an inventory that is just huge compared to what the County should have had is holding it all down.

Mr. Foley stated that the heart of the issue is that the current tax rate won't allow the County to add services, so the question is whether the County is raising taxes on people to pay for services, and on a year-to-year basis it never goes back to previous revenues over the life of the model.

Mr. Boyd asked if there were a mechanism by which to look back and see if bills would have actually gone up or down, based on an equalized rate versus a stabilized rate.

Ms. Allshouse said that staff does have the capability to do that.

Ms. Mallek stated that there is some variety in assessments, and the Board knew beforehand what would have been accomplished with an equalized rate.

Mr. Foley said the question was how equalizing would change these graphs.

Mr. Rooker stated that if they changed the tax rate to equalize it, they would be able to figure out the impact.

Mr. Foley also noted that the fiscal year is split on two different assessments, which would have to be factored in, but it is something that could be calculated.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that the County grows by about 1,000 people per year, and it is very difficult to say that you would forever operate on the same revenue. He said that schools would have the same revenue they had four years ago for next year, and other services such as police and fire and rescue are impacted by a growing population. He thinks the Board needs to consider that. Mr. Rooker also stated that the staff's projections regarding values may be optimistic and there may be significantly less revenue. He said that in 2017 under either scenario, taxes paid on an average parcel would be less than they were 10 years prior.

Mr. Rooker stated that he would like to look at more money going into capital if they go with an equalized rate, perhaps one cent, because those allocations would be available as necessary as a reserve; whereas, once money is allocated to operations it is much more difficult to recapture it if actuals turn out to be worse than projections. He said that taking additional revenue and putting it on the capital side provides a cushion that is not there when you put it into operations. Mr. Rooker stated that the Board has virtually eliminated its capital plan, and realistically you cannot go on forever that way in a growing county. He added that as the County is finishing up previously budgeted projects, there is no capital for new projects.

Mr. Boyd said that is a good idea as long as it can be managed properly because once there are limits to capital projects, it becomes much easier to separate "wants" from "needs," and the process over the last few years has not been altogether bad.

Mr. Rooker said he agreed, but also said you cannot plan on no new facilities as the population grows by 1,000 each year.

Mr. Boyd stated that the biggest expense is the number of children coming into schools. It is his understanding that enrollment was over-projected each year. He also said that there are 180+ new homes that are behind the Rite Aid at Pantops, and they would be building out to over 300 homes – and he does not know what they would be contributing to tax rolls versus expense rolls.

Mr. Rooker said that very few townhouses are net positive, and with Mr. Boyd being on the Fiscal Impact Committee he is aware of that.

Ms. Mallek also said there is a cost of delay, and the 40% cost reduction window is gone. She stated that the Crozet Library, which is at about a 20% cost reduction, has been on the books since 1998, and there are thousands and thousands more people who moved in that area – at the Board's direction. She emphasized that the County needs to take advantage of opportune times so it doesn't end up having to borrow more money. She said that she appreciates all the work staff has done in giving the Board these two scenarios. She added that she has had many discussions with people in the White Hall District at town hall meetings about the tax rate.

Mr. Thomas encouraged Supervisors to visit the Crozet Library, noting how overcrowded it is and how inadequate the lot is. He said that he wishes they had the money and if there is any way they can get the library done, he would like to see it happen.

Mr. Boyd asked if any thought had been given to a temporary location for the library.

Ms. Mallek responded that a committee did evaluate that, and found it would be about $50,000 per year in rental expense plus a six-figure amount for upfitting.

Mr. Boyd asked about using the Crozet School.

Ms. Mallek responded that the school is being used by two schools and they have a multi-year lease. She said it was not suggested last year because there was uncertainty as to whether the Board would go forward with construction of the new facility.

Mr. Foley said that staff hadn't planned to do a full presentation on this, but the estimates most recently obtained show about a $1 million savings as the market stands now. He stated that it is unusual in a five-year planning process to move towards making a decision on the library, but because the Board pushed to get the construction documents done and to make the project "shovel-ready," it would be useful in this process to get some direction.

Ms. Mallek stated that the cost increase is expected to be 3%-5% over the next year.

Mr. Boyd said that the same principle could be applied to anything, including the fire station at Pantops – so this needs to be considered by the CIP Committee.

Ms. Mallek responded that the previous CIP Committee has had this as its number one project for the last two years. She thinks that process is still valid. She also stated that there have been drastic reductions in the number of people who are allowed to be in there.

Mr. Dorrier said the CIP Committee would have a recommendation within a week or two.

Mr. Rooker stated that when the County master planned Crozet, from that point forward there was a commitment as the County planned for a substantial increase in population in the area, that the library would be a central element of the investment made in the community. While the economic times have not been the best, he thinks the County made a commitment to deal with that situation. He said they have looked at other options, including the school, but they were rejected for good reasons.

Mr. Boyd said the school was rejected by the community.

Mr. Rooker said the community was about 50/50 on putting it there.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that the community would have been happy with it in either place, and it was local government's suggestion to put it downtown because of its' potential impact on the economy. She emphasized that there would have to be a substantial investment in that building to get it strong enough to hold the books – millions more.

Mr. Rooker said they went through this whole process before, and he believes it was unanimous by this Board to build a new library.

Mr. Foley pointed out that less than a year ago, this Board approved spending another $300,000 to get the documents ready. There have been a series of decisions all the way through. He said that the library could not be funded at the current tax rate without dipping into cutting back on maintenance, so that would likely not come forward as a recommendation from the Oversight Committee. Getting the library done would require more revenue. He also said that operating costs would be about $200,000, and even if salaries were cut back to nothing there still would not be capital money to get the building done.

Mr. Dorrier said the Friends of the Library are willing to cooperate with the County in raising money.

Mr. Foley responded that they are already counting on $1.6 million from them and that is a concern to staff because it is a lot of money to raise. He added that if the County goes forward it would probably have to borrow that money and then wait for the reimbursements as it will take them some time to get that money.

Ms. Mallek said they have several hundred thousand in the bank or pledged, but they really need to see the commitment from the County that it will do this project in order for the big checks to start coming in. Donors have said that. She stated that because the project has been on the books for so long, people are skeptical, and as soon as there is a commitment to get it going, they can proceed. Ms.

Mallek also said it would help boost the confidence among local bankers, who have expressed concern that the County is not committed to downtown – and business people have said the same thing. She emphasized that the idea here is to get the project moving and help increase revenues from a thriving downtown going forward.

Mr. Foley stated that staff had concluded their presentation. There are some followup items that staff will bring back. He added that the School Board will be making its presentation to the Board tomorrow on its near and long term challenges.

Ms. Mallek asked for comments from Board members on the two scenarios.

Ms. Mallek commented that the Library Board needs to be able to start working on how to change its operation out there and deal with the new reports from the consultant on the structure there.

Mr. Thomas asked when the limitations on attendance there would take effect. Ms. Mallek responded that the Fire Marshal limitations to 50 people are effective immediately. She added that liability is important and the County needs to recognize its responsibility.

Mr. Rooker said that there is also no significant funding in the capital plan for master plan amendments, and as people move into the urban areas there are service area impacts. He stated that there are many new residents in the Pantops area, Arden Place, Fontana, etc., and the idea was to invest in those communities so there would be services that make them attractive to live. They are seeing virtual elimination of a budget for investing in infrastructure to support the master plan.

Mr. Boyd stated that his constituents have no interest in a library in Crozet, as it does not do a whole lot for the Rivanna District, so that is the struggle. He emphasized that the County has invested a huge amount of money in Crozet, a lot more than any other district in the County.

Ms. Mallek responded that they have been at it for 10 years, and that affects the total.

Mr. Rooker said that the Board needs to be aware of its obligations to the other districts, in addition to those they represent. He stated that he wants to fulfill their obligation to Crozet, but also does not want to neglect the other master planned areas.

Mr. Snow stated that with the scenario of an equalized tax rate, there would be an additional $7.2 million over five years for schools that is needed, additional money for public safety items, and the Crozet Library. It is more than just the library they are talking about.

Ms. Mallek said the library is ready to go, but the other items are also important.

Mr. Rooker reiterated that if they go to an equalization rate, he thinks they need to consider devoting more than one-half cent to capital because it is needed and because it provides a cushion that is not there for operating.

Mr. Snow stated that he does not think the Board is ready to decide on which scenario today. The information provided is a good starting point and he thinks the Board needs to adjourn.

Mr. Foley said if the Board would like to see what dedicating a whole penny versus half a penny would do to the list, staff could provide information as to what it would take away from operations.

____

Agenda Item No. 5. From the Board: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Thomas said that the developers of Belvedere Subdivision have asked that he look into getting a traffic light beside Covenant Church at their entrance. VDOT previously looked at the request, but turned it down because they said one was not warranted. He is hopeful the new traffic county on Meadow Creek Parkway will help. In order for a light to be installed a recommendation will have to come from the Board.

____

Mr. Thomas said that he has had a conversation with Ms. Karen Keener from Fashion Square Mall. They are in the process of scheduling a meeting, tentatively set for November 15th, with Fashion Square Mall executives and representatives of the County. Ms. Catlin is helping to coordinate the meeting.

____

Agenda Item No. 6. Adjourn to November 10, 2011, 4:00 p.m., Room 241.

At 6:11 p.m., Mr. Boyd **moved** to adjourn to November 10, 2011 at 4:00 p.m., Room 241, for a joint meeting with the School Board. Mr. Thomas **seconded** the motion.

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

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

____
Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 03/07/2012 Initials: EWJ