

An afternoon adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 3, 2015, at 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from February 26, 2015.

PRESENT: Mr. Kenneth C. Boyd, Ms. Jane D. Dittmar, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer and Mr. Brad L. Sheffield.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Thomas C. Foley, County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Clerk, Ella W. Jordan, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 1:02 p.m. by the Chair, Ms. Dittmar.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session: FY2016 Operating and Capital Budgets.

- **General Government - Cross Departmental and Non-Departmental Expenditures**

Mr. Bill Letteri, Deputy County Executive, reported that he would provide a brief follow-up on the School Board discussion of salaries and the timing of salaries, with the bulk of the meeting to be a continuation or review of various departments. He stated that Mr. Walker will review public safety, health and welfare, parks and recreation, and community development. Mr. Letteri said that at the end of their discussion, they will talk about the advertised tax rate.

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, addressed the Board, stating that the discussion will begin with a follow-up from the last work session on the direction from the Board to the Superintendent and County Executive to start with a salary increase beginning in January 2016, and there has been conversations as to whether that can be moved forward to October 1. Ms. Allshouse said that if they are to initiate the salary increase beginning on October 1, this will adjust the salaries to market sooner, and it will be consistent with the County's compensation policies. She stated that it supports commonality with the schools, and Mr. Foley has been working closely with the Schools to ensure parity between the two systems.

Ms. Allshouse said that funding availability is an important consideration, and the County has been watching the state budget to monitor changes, and one positive change for local government was the state's desire to not implement the reduction in aid to localities. She stated that this will assist the local budget by having revenues come in higher than estimated, and there has also been some positive changes related to the jail's budget, with the combination of those two changes providing enough available funding to implement the October salary increase for general government. Ms. Allshouse noted that the school division has identified one-time money for their additional quarter, and the total estimated cost for local government would be \$337,500.

Ms. Mallek stated that the school department has provided a figure of \$690,000 for their side, and people have been concerned about their health costs going up – which would equate to \$170,000 to the School Board, and \$76,000 to local government.

Ms. Palmer asked how much the County has received from the state in unexpected revenue. Ms. Allshouse explained that it was \$196,000 coming directly into the general fund.

Mr. Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive, addressed the Board, stating that he will review the other operational departments, sometimes called the "community services portfolio" and referred to as the "outward-facing agencies." He said that this included County departments as well as agencies and organizations it supports as part of its services to citizens and the region.

- 
- **Public Safety**
    - Police
    - Fire Rescue
    - Other – Fire Rescue Services
    - Inspections
    - Public Safety Contributions

Mr. Walker stated that Public Safety is the single largest change in this budget over last year's, and is comprised of the Police Department at 45%, Fire Rescue at 31% - now transferred to the Fire Rescue Services Fund, Building Inspections, the Regional Jail, ECC and other public safety agencies. He said that the Police Department increase represents just over \$1 million, or 6.4%, attributable to a 4.8% increase in overtime based on trends as well as an increase in overtime wages that are reimbursable that will appear as an offset from increased costs to increased revenue. Mr. Walker said that operational increases totaled \$56,000, with an almost \$53,000 increase in vehicle replacement; and a net revenue decrease of \$253,000 or 7.1% attributable to a decline in fees as well as a decline in state-supported 599 funds that come to the County for the police department. He stated that the fee decline is not an actual decline, it is a decline over the current year based on actual trend data and changes to the false alarm ordinance and the Photo Safe program.

Ms. Mallek asked what the difference is between the traffic safety person and the five new police officer positions, as she assumed they will be officers on the street. Mr. Walker explained that the traffic safety position is not funded, and the five patrol officers constitute what will be a "squad," and said that Ron Lantz from the police department is present and can talk more about the positions requested that are not recommended for funding.

Ms. Palmer said that she would also like to ask about the five positions funded last year, and how many of them were filled.

Mr. Walker stated that he cannot speak to the turnover rate but he knows that it is an ongoing issue for the police department, so they will expect to be filling all of those positions, and there is a constant movement of positions through the organization. He said that there is a career development program, a specific initiative to address recruitment and retention within the patrol officer ranks of the department, in order to address issues related to turnover.

Albemarle County Deputy Chief of Police Ron Lantz addressed the Board and stated that the department currently has 129 staff members, down from 130 with someone from the academy let go the previous week. Deputy Chief Lantz said that the attrition rate for the department is three to five members per year on average, and they will definitely be able to fill the five positions.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the traffic safety officer is an enforcement position.

Mr. Lantz said that it is, and stated that the department's five-year plan was to build on the traffic safety/traffic enforcement team, so it would be up to eight officers total – with four assigned to the Jefferson District and four assigned to the Blue Ridge District. He noted that currently there are six – five officers and one sergeant.

Mr. Sheffield stated that this is a priority for him, especially in the development area where there is a traffic enforcement issue, as they have been shifting their resources more to safety and patrolling.

Ms. Allshouse asked if he would like to have that added to the list of discussion items.

Mr. Sheffield responded that he would like information on what one traffic safety position would cost, and he has planned to send an email as to his position on wanting that filled.

Ms. Mallek said that it would include a vehicle also, and stated that speeding is a major concern for people in the rural areas as well.

Ms. Dittmar stated that they are at 124 or 125 last year, and are now close to 130.

Mr. Lantz said that they are authorized for one more position, so that will take them to 131.

Ms. Dittmar noted that the 131 was what they were trying to get to with the additional five positions from last year.

Ms. Mallek commented that with retirements every year, there are even more people to replace. Mr. Lantz agreed, stating that there are several officers currently looking to retire.

Mr. Walker stated that the staffing ratio of authorized versus filled is far better than it was when he started.

Ms. Mallek said that the level was 115 when she joined the Board, so this is much better than it had been.

Ms. Dittmar stated that retirement and people leaving the system is a recruitment and retention issue, not an issue of how many slots have been paid for – and she wants to ensure that the five allocated from 2014-15 are close to being filled since they are looking to add another five. Mr. Lantz said that it is a daily battle trying to find qualified people, and they have increased their testing dates to bring people in to fill the void.

Ms. Mallek said that she recalled comments about the department having interviewed a hundred candidates and only three being qualified to go onto the next step.

Mr. Foley noted that the over hire is basically to keep the department as filled as possible.

Ms. McKeel asked how compression impacted the salaries in the police department, as this can be a problem with recruitment and retention. Mr. Lantz said that the career development program will instantly help 12-14 officers who would not have qualified for the old program and the associated salary enhancement, and under the new career development program their pay will increase – so they get separation instead of the compression experienced.

Ms. McKeel asked for an explanation of how the career development program addressed compression. Mr. Lantz said that it is a retention tool as well as a recruiting tool, so those 12-14 officers who qualify for the program will have to meet certain standards – such as being a field training instructor – and will receive a stipend in return for that training. He explained that Police Officer I would be entry level, so this will define a career path for them and develop future leaders for the department.

Mr. Walker said that not every police officer will move up within the hierarchy of officers, but the department still needs experienced, qualified patrol officers. This is a value-added program that they have been working on for two years, in order to provide pathways for these officers who might not be moving into sergeant positions.

Ms. Mallek noted that this was the next step to the reclassification that was done a few years earlier. Mr. Walker confirmed that it was.

Ms. McKeel said that she would like additional information on compression within the police and fire rescue departments. Mr. Foley stated that the study of that is funded in the coming budget so they can clearly document where those issues are.

Mr. Walker said that the target ratio in the Comprehensive Plan is 1.5 officers per thousand population, and the addition of these five officers will bring that to 1.31. He noted that it is difficult to keep up with the pace of population growth, with the level in 2009 at 1.9 officers.

Ms. Palmer asked where the standard of 1.5 came from. Mr. Walker said that it was set in the Comp Plan, but it was set before he was in his position.

Ms. Mallek said that she was not on the Board yet either.

Mr. Boyd said that he was.

Mr. Foley said that he was in his position as well. There had been a study done nationally on the standards used, and Albemarle actually came down on a pretty low standard by comparison, although it was a big goal to reach locally. He stated that this was done prior to Chief Steve Sellers' arrival.

Ms. Palmer asked if the study would still be viable if they were to do it today. Mr. Lantz responded that it would be, and said that he had pulled some numbers that day that confirmed this. He stated that the national standard from the Department of Justice was 2.51 officers per 1,000 population for all police departments. He said that the Virginia county standard is currently 1.6, and Albemarle is at 1.29 – which is last among county police departments statewide.

Ms. Palmer said that there are counties like Arlington that will skew the average, and asked what the median is. Mr. Lantz responded that the median is derived by putting all of the departments together and factoring in population, and 2.51 is decided upon as the proper number for the population ratio nationally.

Ms. Palmer asked if there is anything comparing Albemarle to like counties, since this is just an average. Mr. Lantz said that the department does have that comparison, so he can share that with the Board to give an idea of what Albemarle looks like in the context of its peers.

Mr. Walker noted that there are counties with police departments, and counties with law enforcement agencies, and they are not the same.

Ms. Mallek said that the ranking of 129 out of 131 jurisdictions reflected all of the localities in Virginia.

Ms. Palmer said that the average does not always mean a lot. Mr. Foley emphasized that the comparison is not an average.

Mr. Sheffield said that he recalled them having a fully funded crime analyst position. Mr. Walker said that it has been fully grant funded, and this budget represents the incremental increase in local share to pick up the positions. He stated that the County will have to fund 50% this year, 75% the following year, and 100% by FY18.

Ms. Dittmar asked if grant funding of positions is a practice used during the recession that will end soon, or if this is something they will typically do. She stated that they had lots of conversations about avoiding use of one-time money for ongoing expenses, and they are now facing shortfalls for departments because there are grants expiring for ongoing expenses. Mr. Walker said that if they know there are staffing needs and can identify a grant that can help address that, they would want to at least consider using that money to get it started – such as they have with the SAFER funding through FEMA, and the COPS program accessible sometimes to police. He stated that it really is based on what they anticipate their needs to be, but also recognizing that in a few years they will need to pay that out of local funds.

Ms. Mallek said that the important thing to remember is that the Board has a decision to make about whether they will pay it or not. Mr. Walker said that he does not think they would be authorizing a grant if they were not expecting to pick up the cost of those positions.

Ms. Mallek said that is not always the case.

Ms. Dittmar stated that there is nothing to track the impact of these decisions and the expectations being placed on future decision-makers.

Mr. Foley suggested having Ms. Allshouse answer that from a financial planning perspective.

Ms. Allshouse said that a staff person hired 15 months ago to get a handle on the County's grants and help manage them. In the grant report provided to the Board, they are informed that an application is being considered by staff, so the Board can pull that for further discussion. She stated that comprehensively, staff wants to provide a great report that does exactly what they are talking about. Ms. Allshouse said that in their five-year planning, they think about the grants and put them out there as they are expiring, but staff can also find a way to segregate it out and make it clearer.

Mr. Sheffield stated that it will be helpful to have a list of grant-funded positions and the timeline for them, to at least set some expectations that the County will have to pick up the tab.

Mr. Boyd clarified that the previous Board's plan had been to backfill the SAFER positions with volunteers, but that did not happen. He emphasized that there is a plan, and it did not intend to fund additional firefighters this year.

Mr. Foley said that the five-year plan discussion may be a good time to address grant-funded positions, so that the Board would know the timeline for funding running out.

Ms. Dittmar stated that sometimes the grants appeared on the Consent Agenda, and she does not feel that these items carrying a tax implication should be there going forward, because they are obligating future Boards to tax increases. She asked why the SAFER positions were not filled by volunteers, and whether they had forgotten that they needed to find them, or were not able to find them.

Mr. Foley said that the County Executive's monthly report had been providing them with an update on the recruitment and retention efforts.

Ms. Dittmar commented that there must have been a really big reason why they were not able to accomplish that.

Mr. Foley stated that Fire Chief Dan Eggleston is present and can discuss the process they had been through.

Mr. Eggleston explained that when they were planning for the Ivy station, there was a desire to recruit volunteers for that station primarily because at the time they could not afford to hire the 12 firefighters. He said that there was a lot of discussion and planning at that time, and the County put together an Ivy recruitment and retention plan that was all vetted through the Fire EMS Board as to how they would achieve this – including timelines and strategies for public engagement to get those volunteers. Mr. Eggleston stated that they had a minimum target of 25 trained released volunteers, but as they approached the opening of the Ivy station they knew they would not reach that target. He said that they had applied for a SAFER grant and were awarded the grant, which allowed them to push the strategy out to the end of the grant period and continue to recruit volunteers. Mr. Eggleston stated that it is difficult, and they continue to look for volunteers that can come in, go through the extensive training process, and be released and become active volunteers. He said that out of 20 volunteers now in Ivy, only 11 have been released, and they have not met their target. Mr. Eggleston stated that they have not failed – they have done a wonderful job and the volunteers are used throughout the system, often to put the ambulance in service on nights and weekends at Ivy. He emphasized that they just do not have enough to let the SAFER grant personnel to expire, as they are needed to maintain operations 24/7. Mr. Eggleston said that they will continue to recruit volunteers, but they are fighting an uphill battle, and he and Chief Larsen are both out in the community trying to encourage people to join – but they did not make the 25 mark.

Mr. Boyd said that they also hired someone – a recruitment officer – to come in and concentrate on the recruitment effort and bolster the initiative. Mr. Eggleston said that the system has become healthier because of that, and they are seeing numbers of volunteers at other stations increase a lot, but the Ivy station levels are just not there to staff the engine nights and weekends with volunteers.

Ms. Mallek asked if the staffing would be six days only with one overnight, as opposed to 24/7. Mr. Eggleston explained that the purpose of the recruitment plan was to have one volunteer to staff nights and weekends, and that one person would equate to the four extra needed at Ivy.

Mr. Foley stated that the County received the grant two years ago, and each year in the five-year plan have tracked this issue and monitored the success of the effort in monthly reports – and last year in the five-year planning process, one of staff's slides had identified this as part of the challenges in the plan. He said that recruiting volunteers is a tough business now, losing some and gaining some more.

Ms. McKeel asked what the biggest challenge is in recruitment. Mr. Eggleston responded that time commitment is the primary issue, in terms of training hours required; when he started there were 40 hours of training required, and now there are 250 hours required. He said that ACFR have done some fantastic work in delivering that in a blended learning environment to accommodate different schedules, but at the end of the day you still have to go through 250 hours of training for firefighting, another 200 hours to be an EMT, and then have to be released to practice. Mr. Eggleston stated that they are trying to make it much easier, and the County is actually ahead of most localities in terms of what they are providing to volunteers.

Mr. Boyd recalled that ACFR had increased the number of classes to try to make them more available, as part of the plan to backfill the grant.

Ms. McKeel asked for confirmation that the number of hours is not determined by the Board, but at the state level. Mr. Eggleston confirmed that it is determined at state and national level.

Ms. McKeel asked if there is anything built into the grants that said if the grant was accepted, they would fill the positions on their own. Ms. Allshouse said that some do and some do not, and sometimes there is an expectation in a grant application for future local funding.

Ms. Mallek asked if that is the case with the SAFER grant, because that was never explained to the Board. Mr. Eggleston said that this grant did not require that.

Ms. Mallek said that part of the discussion in planning to open the Ivy station was that the costs were going to be covered by the shrinkage in costs for the City contract, and this would be the next layer – to add more staff. She stated that she kept saying that in order to encourage the community to step up and volunteer, there needed to be an incentive that stipulates there will not be 24-hour coverage at Ivy. Ms. Mallek said that this is all the rural area stations have anyway, and there will be a tremendous effort to provide that service, but if people always know the County will step in and fill the gap, they are less likely to volunteer. She stated that she does not know if having rescue volunteers separate from fire volunteers would help, but in Earlysville they have picked up 10 rescue-only people that do not have the interest to run into burning buildings but are able to be trained to run the ambulance.

Mr. Eggleston said that ACFR has that option for people who wish to join Ivy, Monticello or Hollymead, and the system actually has a lot of EMS-only volunteers.

Ms. Dittmar asked if they can use the City contract to get them to the point where they have a full complement of volunteers. Mr. Eggleston responded that one of the main purposes of building the Ivy station is because the City relocated their station from Ivy Road down to Fontaine. If they were to shut Ivy down at night and just let the City run calls, there would be a significant increase in response times. He stated that the way the current agreement is written with the City, they have a \$400 per-call annual budget used to ensure that the City responds to the fringe areas in the quickest time possible, and this would likely exceed the \$400 cap.

Ms. Dittmar said that she would like more information on this from staff.

Ms. Mallek stated that she has asked for information previously on the call volume – rescue versus fire, day versus night – and that will be helpful.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the Ivy station responds to a large portion of the County and backs up other stations, so it is a system to respond to emergencies, which they have on a daily basis, and if they remove a component it will be felt. He said that the station runs roughly 1,000 calls per year, and that will be a huge impact to the community.

Ms. Dittmar said that what she is referring to is the City contract filling in while the County builds more capacity, and asked if this will mean laying off people. Mr. Eggleston said that they are employed by ACFR.

Ms. Mallek stated that they can be moved to other stations, and what they discussed when they were talking about taking the grant, with the idea of having more rescue ability at Pantops and shifting throughout the County as coverage was expanded. She said that this has gone ahead of that decision because more people have already been hired.

Ms. Dittmar said that if it is just a matter of time to get more volunteer capacity, it might be worth considering incremental payments to the City for specific calls to help get the County through for at least some of these positions. She stated that she does not know the difference in terms of the new fire station and the distance, but it is right around the bypass and does not seem that far away. Ms. Dittmar commented that it is more of an employment issue than a safety issue.

Mr. Eggleston clarified that it is a response time issue, and that is a big component when they moved forward with the Ivy Station. It is not just response time for that station, as they provide backup for Crozet, Earlysville, Seminole Trail, Hollymead, and down to North Garden. He said that all of those factors need to be considered.

Mr. Foley said that staff can provide an analysis on this to show how they ended up with this model, and emphasized that this is not about saving jobs, it is about service issues. After that analysis, he said, if the Board were to decide to do something different, staff can put a plan in place to reduce staffing, but it will impact service.

Ms. Dittmar stated that she has done a tour of CATEC since Mr. Eggleston's last visit to the Board, and the acting director said that CATEC students want Firefighter I, but ACFR has not supplied anyone to do the training.

Mr. Eggleston said that ACFR would love to continue to support CATEC, but it is a matter of staffing. The department has to either support two or three volunteer academies at night or CATEC but not both, so it is a matter of choice. He stated that they are getting about 15-20 volunteers through an academy at night, and that is a bigger return on investment.

Ms. Mallek asked if this is what the four training officers are doing all the time. Mr. Eggleston responded that the training included a full-time academy as well as blending learning and coordinating the EMT classes, and those officers are quite busy with no additional capacity. He said he would love to do more training, but they do not have the capacity to do it.

Ms. Mallek said that PVCC has some trainers, so perhaps they can be tapped into.

Mr. Boyd stated that the County had been dealing with this issue for the 12 years he has served on the Board, and while Ms. Dittmar's ideas are good, the Board has been through this process, including task forces that looked at merging the fire departments, and contracts on and off. This is not something new in terms of trying to strike a balance between County and City coverage. He said that he would hate for staff to have to go back through everything they have done for the last 10 years.

Ms. Mallek said that just sending links to the previous reports would be helpful.

Mr. Boyd agreed.

Mr. Foley asked if the Board wants an analysis of the reduction in staffing in Ivy and how the City response times would fill it, because that is not something they have done specifically on Fontaine since it was changed.

Ms. Mallek said that it was done in preparation for the Ivy discussion, so they can at least start there.

Ms. Palmer said that she is interested in knowing the City's capacity and how much they can be used anywhere, whether it is Ivy, Pantops or some other station. Mr. Eggleston said that it is not a capacity issue, it is an issue of workload and the County's ability to move towards a situation where it is mutual aid where both localities are providing service. He stated that what has made the City nervous previously was an imbalance in service, and the County is currently paying approximately \$185,000 for 400 calls per year, and if they are to exceed that, the cost is close to \$1,000 per call. Mr. Eggleston said that they are obligated to protect the City and be careful about the resources they use outside of their boundaries, and the County has been through a year of discussions and negotiations with them, and then settled on the agreement. He stated that while the City has the capacity, the County will find a big expense if they go back to the system they used years ago.

Mr. Davis stated that the contract used to cost about \$800,000-\$900,000 per year when they were running a larger service area, and there is a savings of approximately \$700,000 from the status quo to the current expense. He said that one of the provisions of the City contract is that they will respond to County calls if they are available, but there is no guarantee that they would run the call, and sometimes the calls had to come from other system components. Mr. Davis noted that it will be a significant service downgrade if they are to return back to the City contract.

Ms. Dittmar said that it seems to her that there is only an issue with the Ivy station, and it seems that they can establish a bridge to use the City for certain calls at that fixed cost, but it will be used into perpetuity, and will allow the County time to get volunteers where they need to be. She stated that they are not talking about sending these people to other areas, and rather than abandoning a strategy that made financial sense, it seems that there will be a way to get to that by staying the course and focusing on getting volunteers there.

Mr. Eggleston stated that ACFR will continue to work very hard to recruit volunteers, as there are empty seats across the system, and what they are talking about is browning the station out and having the City come out. He said that he feels this is a bad move that will result in a decrease in service and leave a big hole in an area they have committed to the community that they will find fire and EMS protection.

Ms. Mallek commented that the community needs to step up.

Mr. Boyd said that this was the plan three years ago – to ratchet down support from the City over time – and he finds it hard to believe that it will be any different now than it was then.

Ms. Dittmar stated that they are not talking about a new agreement, as they have one in place.

Mr. Foley said that staff could do a high-level analysis of this by looking at what the contract will cost, and the City has put a high premium on calls beyond the 400 level, so staff can bring that information back to the Board. He stated that Mr. Boyd's point is a good one, as the system has been trying for 15 years to get enough volunteers to fill the seats, which is a challenge across the entire country. Mr. Foley said that they might be putting off the inevitable, which is to provide an adequate level of service after building a station, they have to be at that level. He stated that they were fortunate to get nine people on grants for some period of time, but the reality is that the volunteers will supplement their service but it is hard for them to do the core, basic stuff.

Mr. Boyd stated that in his observation it is going in the other direction, with places like Stony Point and Seminole Trail are coming to the County and indicating that they are having trouble finding coverage during the days. He emphasized that there has been a loss of volunteers happening for some time now, and gone are the days when Barnes Lumber Company would ring the fire bell and everyone dropped what they were doing to go to the fire station.

Ms. Mallek said that the tire plant is the same way.

Mr. Foley said that some of the Board members had been through this before, but perhaps this conversation helps them to conclude the inevitable piece and how to deal with it going forward.

Mr. Walker stated that they will also be discussing the staffing of the Pantops station in the near future.

Ms. Allshouse asked Ms. Dittmar if she would like to have this information before the March 11 worksession, or if it is something more long term.

Ms. Mallek said that it will be needed before the April 1 public hearing.

Ms. Dittmar said that as much as could be gathered by March 11 will be helpful, but this is a thought in process.

Mr. Walker reported that there is a significant element in the FY16 budget to create a fire rescue services fund, moving revenues and expenses out of the general fund and into the new fund. He stated the budget establishes that fund and dedicates 6.6 cents of the current tax rate to fund the cost associated with fire rescue services, and there is also a proposed one-cent increase in the tax rate, with 100% going to fund the cost of those services. He stated the fire rescue services operations increase is almost \$1.7 million, or 16.7%, and includes the full-year funding of the nine firefighters previously funded with the FEMA grant, four of which will fill the third seat at the Ivy fire station, and the other five supporting 24-hour rescue service out of Rescue 8 for the southern Route 29 corridor. Mr. Walker said that the operating costs have changed by \$986,000, and the \$706,000 reallocation from volunteer to fire rescue services operations is specifically funding for fuel, line of duty act insurance, health services, turnout gear, and other operating costs that are managed by the fire rescue department on behalf of the volunteer agencies. Mr. Walker stated that he has spoken with the FEMS Board about this change, and they are fine with it, as it provides a way for the department to be more transparent and service-oriented – absorbing costs that are system costs, not departmental costs.

Mr. Foley said that through the County's innovation fund, they invested some money to keep volunteer agencies from going out and buying gas and paying taxes on it by investing it in some central locations for fuel.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the dedicated one penny tax and the allocation of 6.6 cents means that fire rescue is solely funded by property taxes. Mr. Walker said that it is offset by a little bit of state money and fee collection.

Mr. Sheffield said that currently, fire rescue is partially funded by things like sales tax revenue. Mr. Foley said that EMS cost recovery comprised \$1.6 million of the funding, with permits and fees and some other local taxes providing some support.

Mr. Walker stated that in this budget there is also a \$135,000 increase in this budget for system-wide turnout gear, which is necessary to pay for something that has been covered by grant proceeds 10 years ago. He said that there is a \$38,000 cost increase in volunteer accident insurance, attributable to the use of that insurance and actuarial adjustments; fuel rates and consumption have also increased; there is \$20,000 in the budget for advertising focusing on volunteer recruitment and retention; and funding for continuation of the Project Risk grant.

Ms. Mallek asked if the personnel going out to house visits as part of Risk are being paid overtime, as they are not going out during work time. Mr. Walker said that on the career side, it is non-exempt employees.

Mr. Eggleston clarified that it is partial overtime, and also partnership with community agencies such as Habitat for Humanity and CERT volunteers, to help install smoke alarms in homes throughout the community and educate the public.

Mr. Walker stated that there is also approximately \$37,000 in the fire rescue budget for system-wide fitness equipment replacement for facilities throughout the County, which had originally been funded through a grant in 2004.

Ms. Mallek asked if this is just for the three County stations. Mr. Walker said that it is for all stations that have fitness equipment, so it is used by career and volunteer firefighters, and some elements need replacement.

Ms. Mallek said that in the past, there was a donation effort to fund that equipment at Station 4. Mr. Walker said that in the budget was a \$220,000 increase in direct contributions to the 10 volunteer fire rescue agencies, which is consistent with the County's policy and practice to fund 100% of the reasonable cost of their operations – for utilities, building maintenance, telecommunications, fire and EMS supplies, vehicle repair and maintenance, training, uniforms and administrative costs. He stated that there are some individual one-time requests outside of the policy, but they are not recommended for funding.

Ms. Mallek said that she would like staff to email her a list of the requests that are considered to be outside of the policy.

Mr. Walker said that the budget included a 1.8% increase in the City's fire contract agreement, and a \$20,000 increase for support for the volunteer fire rescue tax credit program, which was recently made into an automated program so that volunteers find it easier to participate.

Mr. Davis said that the tax credit can be used to offset a volunteer's personal property taxes.

Ms. Mallek asked what EAP is. Mr. Walker explained that it is the Employee Assistance Program, which is part of the overall wellness program and to provide things like counseling services, in an effort to avoid other costs associated with a member's service.

Mr. Walker reported that other public safety contributions include the County's share of the cost for the jail, which is a significant part of the increase in this part of the budget. He stated that there has been an interest in changing the way the amount contributed by member jurisdictions is budgeted, and last year the juvenile detention center shifted to a three-year average of number of bed days instead of being based on one year. Mr. Walker said that the \$600,000 increase for Albemarle County this year is a significant increase from the past two years, but is not that far off of where they were three years ago, and other member jurisdictions have similar challenges. He stated that the budget committee has agreed to a five-year average to present to the jail board, and if that change is made it will affect the County's share of the FY16 budget. He said that the increase is estimated to be almost \$271,000. Mr. Walker said that there is also elimination of the aid to localities reduction, resulting in a net positive, and he is not sure if that reflected money from the Comp Board.

Ms. Allshouse said that she will check on it, but she thought that it did.

Mr. Boyd mentioned that he has met with the jail superintendent and asked him about this and he explained that it will be the policy going forward, not prorated back five years. He stated that the County only pays 20% of the salaries from the Comp Board, so even though there is a big increase for that, the County's percentage will not decrease significantly. Mr. Boyd said that the Risk grant allowed for non-violent inmates to go through a particular program rather than be incarcerated, and the jail received a \$300,000 grant the first year – but the first year's cost was \$560,000, so they will be coming back to the County with a request for some additional funds. He stated that he would like for Colonel Kumer, from the jail, to come to the Board's March 11 meeting to explain the program, and while there will be some costs the first year there are also some benefits, as the recidivism rate is low among participants. Mr. Boyd said that this has been tried in other communities and found to reduce the number of people who are incarcerated.

Ms. Palmer asked if they are seeking another \$500,000 in this budget.

Mr. Boyd explained that they have received a \$300,000 grant, but that is just a one-year grant, so this year there will be a cost split among participating counties. He said that the County will be asked for approximately \$100,000, but after that it will be their share of the \$560,000 cost. Mr. Boyd said that the program would be operated by an independent company, and one way they have cut costs is by reducing the program from seven to five days.

Mr. Walker said that the jail superintendent had presented this idea to the jail board before applying for the grant and said that the cost tended to be a wash – with the cost of the program being somewhat level with the cost of incarceration. He stated that their costs for the program are more than the actual grant they are getting, and this will be an opportunity for the Board to talk more about the cost/benefit.

Mr. Boyd said that after the first year the cost will go up, because it is only a one-time grant.

Mr. Walker said that the superintendent will be presenting it to the jail board the following week.

Mr. Boyd said that the jail is going to have the vendor come in and talk to the Board under "other matters," but he will suggest having the Superintendent of the Jail, Colonel Kumer, come in and make a presentation so the Board can ask questions.

Ms. Mallek asked how this relates to what Offender Aid and Restoration had been doing, and why the OAR money is down from what they had requested – because that is keeping people out of jail through a very structured activity schedule, testing, drug court, etc. She said that it is proven to be greatly effective in reducing recidivism and that program is already going, so she is not sure why they would fund a separate private effort, which she knows nothing about.

Ms. Gretchen Ellis addressed the Board, stating that she is a human services planner with the City of Charlottesville, which manages the Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT) process for both the County and the City. Ms. Ellis said that the reduction in funding recommended for the ABRT for OAR relates to one program – the Restorative Practices Program, which is a juvenile program. She stated that the four main programs – re-entry, drug court, pre-trial, and probation – are all recommended for a 3% increase in funding; the planner program is recommended for level funding; the restorative practices program is rated at the "fair" level for the second year in a row, largely because of underutilization, and the cost/benefit was not viewed by the team as being strong. Ms. Ellis said that most of the core programs for OAR were recommended for an increase or level funding, except for the defunding of restorative practices.

Mr. Walker said that there were discussions between the jail and OAR about providing the services associated with the Center for Risk Reduction, and they did not make a proposal when the RFP was put out for them to do so.

Mr. Boyd stated that it will be helpful to have Colonel Kumer come in and explain the benefits, as there are some intangible benefits to this program.

Mr. Foley said that staff can have him come in for the March 11 meeting.

Ms. McKeel commented that what Mr. Walker has presented for the regional jail may not be counted on as the final number. Mr. Walker explained that the budget going forward from the budget committee to the jail board reflected this change, although the Board has not approved it yet.

Mr. Foley stated that staff will get some information to the Board in advance so that they can review it for the March 11 meeting, and will schedule it as a 15-minute item on the agenda.

Mr. Walker reported that the Juvenile Detention Center decrease of almost \$55,000 is due in large part to an increase in revenue from a program they have implemented which is pulling down significant state money, and the cost of the program is actually less than the revenue to run the program – so this is a very positive initiative from juvenile detention.

Mr. Walker stated that the ECC increase of 4% represented the County's share and does include some salary increases and adjustments to health insurance, as well as a new web-based emergency operations center software platform in conjunction with the City and the University to replace the current system, which is largely non-functional, as well as budgeting appropriately for the overtime being expended.

- 
- **Health and Welfare**
    - Department of Social Services
    - Bright Stars Fund/CSA Fund
    - Human Services Agencies

Mr. Walker reported that the Health and Welfare category in the budget is a large functional area comprised of several different components, the largest being the Department of Social Services but also including the Bright Stars program and CSA, both of which are managed by DSS. He stated that the Health Department, Region Ten, JAUNT, the Tax Relief for the Elderly and Disabled program, and other health and welfare agencies are in this category. Mr. Walker said that the increase overall for FY15 is approximately \$19,000 or .1% from the current year. He stated that DSS has an overall budget increase of \$93,000, reflecting the addition of two full-time positions – a family preservation worker and eligibility worker – and is consistent with the positions determined to be most critical for that agency. He noted that it also includes some additional overtime and about \$20,000 for what was previously provided to MACAA for administration of the CARES Emergency Utility Assistance Program, which that agency did not apply to manage this year. Mr. Walker stated that there are related revenue increases, so the net increase overall for that department is approximately \$167,000.

Ms. Mallek stated that DSS is still down in positions according to state standards, and while adding two is better than none, they still need more.

Mr. Boyd asked if the County is managing the overtime situation to make sure that at some point in time they will need to hire people instead of paying overtime.

Ms. Mallek said that the overtime burns people out, so then they have to start with a new person and training.

Mr. Boyd stated that if the existing caseload is such that it requires someone to work overtime to maintain an individual that cannot be solved by putting another person in there.

Mr. Walker said that turnover is also a factor, and turnover and overtime together can be indicative of overworked employees, and while staff acknowledges the need for additional personnel, they are also mindful of choices that need to be made, so they are only bringing forth the most critical. He stated that other budget items that do not cost as much but are important to the workers are funding for smart phones, so they can be more productive and safer in the field.

Mr. Boyd said that overtime is not broken down in this assessment, and it might be helpful to know what percentage of salaries is being paid in overtime.

Mr. Foley said that they will also provide information on what is driving that overtime.

Mr. Boyd said that there are places such as emergency services, the police department and social services that require a high percentage of overtime – and he is just looking for more information.

Mr. Walker stated that the Board had inquired about what it would take to provide funding to fill all of the eligible positions for Bright Stars, and while there is additional money that can be pulled down from the state, it will require additional County investment.

Ms. McKeel said that as she is interpreting it, an investment of \$400,000 will allow Bright Stars to pull down a grant to fill a total of 175 slots, which will take care of current students as well as the waiting list. Mr. Walker said that is what they are allowed by the state, but not the County's entire need.

Ms. Mallek asked for confirmation as to how many slots the County currently offers. Mr. Walker said that they are 38 slots shy of 175. Ms. Allshouse said that is what would cost \$400,000.

Ms. Palmer asked if they will also need more space in which to put these children. Mr. Walker said that it will equate to two additional classrooms, although there are some current classrooms that might have capacity – and it will also depend on where the children live. He noted that the Bright Stars final report will be completed later in the week, and Ms. Dittmar and Ms. Mallek have participated in some conversations with the schools about the program.

Ms. Dittmar stated that it depends on where the students are feeding from.

Ms. Mallek said that it is more of a "classroom equivalent."

Ms. Palmer asked if it makes sense for them to put more money in the budget to draw down more from the state, since they do not know where the kids are coming from.

Ms. Mallek said that they will by July, and suggests that they put it on the Board's list for items to discuss at the end of the budget season.

Department of Social Services Director, Kathy Ralston, addressed the Board, stating that they do already know where most of those students will be coming from, with a lot of the waiting list being in the Cale district and the 29 North area, so that will mean Greer and Agnor-Hurt. She stated that she feels confident they can put another classroom at Cale and somewhere on 29, and they know that there is a sizable number of children in the Cale and 29 North areas that will really benefit from Bright Stars. Ms. Ralston stated that the County has funds available to them at the state level to serve 175 children, and they are currently serving 134 – so they can go to that maximum number and get state dollars, and anything beyond that will be local-only dollars.

Ms. McKeel asked how many children are currently on the waiting list. Ms. Ralston responded that the waiting list is very fluid, but at last check it was approximately 80-90 students. She explained that the list reflects areas that they serve, so the schools that do not have a preschool program have a very large waiting list because there is no preschool there. The kindergarten data is probably a better source for target demographics of kids who could be served by Bright Stars.

Ms. Allshouse clarified that the actual figure is \$301,000, and they will pull down \$99,000 in grant funds for a total of \$400,000.

Ms. Mallek said that the Bright Stars funding from the state has been ongoing in the past. Ms. Ralston confirmed that it has, and said that the only differences coming out of the General Assembly may be the requirement to serve more low-income children. Currently the County serves 80-90% low-income children with the other children having much higher risk factors.

Ms. McKeel suggested putting Bright Stars on the Board's list of items for future discussion.

Ms. Mallek asked about the decrease in Medicaid funding, which is noted as a \$10,000 reduction. Ms. Ralston explained that it is the UVA Medicaid program where there are outstation workers housed at the University, and this is just a reduction in cost. She said that the program is fully reimbursed, with 75% federal dollars and the remaining match coming from the University hospital, so there are no local dollars in that program.

Mr. Walker reported that the Comprehensive Services Act has also received a lot of attention over the course of the year, and both school and County staff have worked well to understand what options and opportunities there may be going forward. He said that there are no changes proposed in the current budget year, but they do expect for the conversations to continue in the planning process. Mr. Walker stated that there is a significant increase in costs associated with CCSA mandated services on the school side, primarily education services for residential placements and day placements. He noted that this is being experienced in the current year, and they will be using some of their fund balance to offset that increase, as well as anticipating next year. He said that on the local government side, the cost per case is down, primarily because of the favorable match rate for community-based services, but this is difficult to predict because some of the services these individuals require are enormous. Mr. Walker said that there are also a lot of changes occurring at the state level through the Office of Comprehensive Services, which will soon be the Office of Children's Services through the Children's Services Act.

Mr. Walker reported that the Health Department's annual agreement is up for the Board's consideration in the upcoming budget, and explained that the department paid the County along with the City and the state. He said that the County is anticipating being able to pull down more state money to support their need to maintain the building. That did not occur in this fiscal year, so that money will be carried forward in anticipation of that happening next year. Mr. Walker said that there is not a lot of movement with respect to JABA's funding, and this is the second year of the two-year reallocation of funding from Mountainside Senior Living to other JABA programs.

**Recess.** At 4:34, the Board recessed their meeting, and reconvened at 4:47 p.m.

(Note: At this time, Mr. Sheffield read a Transactional Disclosure Statement in which he stated that he is employed as the Director of JAUNT, a regional public transportation provider owned by the City of Charlottesville and the counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Louisa, Nelson, Buckingham, and Amherst located at 104 Keystone Place, Charlottesville, Virginia, 22902, and has a personal interest in JAUNT because he receives an annual salary from JAUNT that exceeds \$5,000 annually. He then recused himself from the portion of the budget discussion that covered JAUNT, and left the room.)

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Walker reported that the JAUNT request for funding represented an increase of \$165,000 or 14.3%, and this increase does not expand services but is associated with maintaining existing services, largely because state and federal revenues are not increasing as much as expenditures. He said that this represented the County's share of JAUNT services, and the service hours required to provide the JAUNT services in the County itself. Mr. Walker said that there is \$9,300 for the County's share of a previously grant-funded mobility analyst position recommended for support within the budget, and another position requested – an operations supervisor position – is not recommended for funding, and the County's share would have been about \$11,500.

Ms. Mallek asked if the difference between the request and recommendation is that one position. Mr. Walker responded that it is the only new or expanded thing they asked for.

Mr. Boyd said that he recalled from last year some contributing communities cutting back on their routes, and asked if that is something that might be considered by Albemarle as well.

Ms. Karen Davis, Assistant Executive Director of JAUNT addressed the Board, stating that this is always something they looked to do – so if they do not get what is needed in order to operate the current service level in a community, they look at raising fares, cutting back services and trimming back staff. Ms. Davis said that for Albemarle, they budgeted what is needed to provide the service as currently offered, and did not look to raise fares as they are one of the highest levels of JAUNT's service area.

Ms. Palmer asked if this is all because the state and federal government have cut back on support. Ms. Davis explained that two years earlier, the state had some additional transit dollars – which they distributed around the state – and as a result, JAUNT added back service areas in all of its service areas including Albemarle County. She said that in Albemarle, they provided transportation for Head Start, Boys & Girls Club after-school transportation, and a new route for the International Rescue Committee to get their workers from Charlottesville and Albemarle out to Boar's Head for work.

Mr. Boyd said that he sees JAUNT buses all over town all the time, and asked if they coordinated with Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT). Ms. Davis stated that they do, and said that JAUNT provides Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) service in relationship to CAT's routes and service, and above and beyond that provides some additional urban trips to Hollymead and rural Albemarle.

Ms. Palmer asked if JAUNT has asked the Boar's Head to contribute some money toward getting their workers there. Ms. Davis said that is something they could do, as they often partner with community groups.

Mr. Boyd asked if they are doing that for Wintergreen also. Ms. Davis said that they are.

Ms. Mallek noted that in the past when the Board had considered curtailing JAUNT service in Albemarle, many people came to the meetings and expressed that they are able workers but just could not drive a car, so they needed the service to be able to live independently. She said this is a very compelling argument, and she hopes the Board will stay strong on this.

Ms. McKeel said that in the past she has been concerned about the County reducing the funding for JAUNT, resulting in fare increases and fewer people being able to afford the service, then the public says the service is not needed to begin with. Ms. Davis acknowledged that it is a terrible cycle, and has seen that happen in other communities, whereby the fares inch up just enough so that people cannot afford them.

Mr. Boyd said that last year, Louisa had dropped a lot of their services because of budget cutbacks. Ms. Davis said that it was Fluvanna.

Ms. Mallek said that they came back two months later and put it back in, realizing that it was a mistake. Ms. Davis explained that Fluvanna had a terrible budget crisis, so they cut all of JAUNT's funding and JABA's funding from the County, and there was an outpouring of community support, so half the funding was put back in. She said that since then, it has been inching forward and Fluvanna had been trying to grow JAUNT's services back to where they were.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that Albemarle is near the core of jobs, so the busses that pick up people in Buckingham, Fluvanna and Nelson pick up the rest of the riders as they come through Albemarle.

**(Note: Mr. Sheffield returned to the meeting at 4:56 p.m.)**

Mr. Walker stated that he would address the United Way and childcare scholarship contingency, and explained that in the past the United Way has gone through the ABRT process – and consistent with that process, the childcare scholarship program has been rated “fair” two years in a row, which means by policy an elimination of funding. He explained that staff is not comfortable eliminating this valuable contribution to support that needed program, so it created a contingency, which yielded a reduction in support for United Way but funding of the same service through a contingency. Mr. Walker said that Gretchen Ellis has met with Kathy Train and her staff at United Way about this service and its appropriateness within the context of the ABRT process

Ms. Ellis stated that the childcare scholarship program has always been a bit of an outlier in the ABRT process because it is not a direct service program, but a program that supports workforce development by allowing low-income parents to have reliable childcare for their children. She said that it also supports child development, as they are moving toward strongly encouraging parents to use high-quality childcare. Ms. Ellis stated that it has been very difficult to evaluate as a program because they are not able to track long-term outcomes, so the recommendation from City staff after meeting with Ms. Train and her staff was that the funding should remain with United Way – as they are administering it with virtually no overhead costs, and it is unlikely that anyone else will be able to do that. She said that this is also more of an economic development and workforce development type program, and recommends that in the future it be reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget as such, rather than as a human services direct-service program.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarification about the funding itself. Mr. Walker explained that the amount is the same as the previous year, and the choice will be to restore the funding to United Way or to look at some other way to provide that service. He said that staff is respecting the ABRT process but also valuing the service, so staff hedged at the prospect of not funding this service, which totaled \$104,000.

Ms. Ellis said that it is still in their budget but at this point is not a line item for the United Way, and staff is recommending that it continues to be funded within the United Way – which had just been decided the day before this meeting.

Ms. Mallek stated that this should be considered a pass-through to the clients who are using this directly. Ms. Ellis clarified that the United Way is paying the childcare provider, not the clients themselves, so the money is going from the County to the United Way to the childcare provider on behalf of the child.

Ms. Barbara Hutchinson, Vice-President of Community Impact Programs for the United Way, addressed the Board and stated that she administered the program. Ms. Hutchinson explained that years ago this had started out as a self-sufficiency program, similar to the childcare subsidy through DSS. Over the past year they have transitioned the program to focus on quality of care – and much like the rationale for the Bright Stars program, it is recognized that children start kindergarten ready for school if they have experienced a high quality early learning environment or preschool. She stated that they have transitioned the program such that they require a minimum of a licensed provider, and beyond that have established a category of preferred providers that are centers or home providers who are working with local agency-ready kids to improve the quality, and then rated centers who go through the Virginia Star Quality Initiative (VSQI). Ms. Hutchinson said that the rate of reimbursement is based on the quality, so a parent choosing a licensed provider will receive a scholarship equivalent to 65% of the cost of care, whereas a parent choosing a VSQI-rated provider will receive a scholarship equivalent to 85% of the cost of care.

She stated that encouraging parents to choose higher quality childcare go above and beyond the self-sufficiency part of the childcare assistance program, and this has been a transition year, so they did not quite meet all of the benchmarks established for FY14, which is what the funding decision was based upon. Ms. Hutchinson said that they would have addressed this, but there is not an opportunity in the ABRT process to answer those types of questions – and the only way to perform a long-term evaluation would be to get results from the schools and track these children in the school system. She stated that the United Way has been negotiating with Albemarle County Schools Superintendent Dr. Pam Moran, and it looked as though there will be an MOU forthcoming whereby they will be able to track these children as well as Head Start students, similar to how Bright Stars students are currently tracked. Ms. Hutchinson said that this will allow them to produce a report on an annual basis that would show the results of the children who participate in these early childhood programs and where they are in school performance. She stated that the data has to meet certain criteria, so they have to have sufficient years of data for it to be qualitative, and it will likely be three to five years before they will be able to provide those measurements. Ms. Hutchinson noted that they know from regional, state and national research that this is the right thing to do, but until such time the data is available, they only have anecdotal information.

Ms. Mallek said that the 17 years of the Bright Stars program will at least provide a corollary to this. Ms. Hutchinson agreed, adding that with the new program they have been able to engage with community partners – the United Way, DSS, etc. – who are all investing in other programs in the community. She said they decided that it made sense to support those investments, so if a family is already receiving home visiting services, for example, it would make sense to invest a scholarship in that family to make their opportunity for success greater. Ms. Hutchinson said that United Way has partnered with City of Promise in Charlottesville, as one example, and she spoke frequently with County DSS, which referred people to United Way who cannot be served through VIEW or the childcare subsidy. She stated that they also partner with Ready Kids, the SHE shelter, and Teen Places – and United Way also offers the only scholarship available for teen mothers. Ms. Hutchinson said they currently have five teen

mothers, two of which were in the County, and all five had quit high school until they received the scholarship for childcare providers – which enables them to go back to school. She emphasized that the United Way is trying to look holistically at families and the community and what the needs are, so they do not always fit in a box as a result. Ms. Hutchinson said that they are working with the City of Roanoke and their school system to gather their information, as it has already been through legal review.

Board members thanked her for the information.

Ms. Mallek asked if the reduction in the budget for tax relief for elderly and disabled is based upon usage. Ms. Allshouse said that it is based on trends, and the best estimate from the Finance Department.

Mr. Walker said that the criteria for the program is still the same.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there is a cap on the program. Mr. Walker responded that all those who are eligible may apply, and will receive the relief.

Mr. Foley emphasized that no one will be turned away.

Ms. McKeel asked staff if they have an idea of how the program is actually utilized for those who are eligible.

Mr. Sheffield said that last year there was very small participation.

Ms. Allshouse said that staff can provide exact information.

Ms. McKeel said that she would like to know the cause of that small participation rate. Ms. Allshouse stated that she will provide the information she has on hand, and try to get additional background as soon as possible.

Mr. Foley said that staff can also provide information on what the County does to promote awareness of the program.

Ms. McKeel said that residents have shared with her that they do not feel comfortable with the paperwork for the program, and she wondered if there would be a way to make it simpler.

Ms. Mallek said that what she has found to be most successful is to have the forms available to share with neighbors and people in church, etc., and she encourages them to take forms home with them to give to friends – rather than having some stranger come door to door. She stated that the budget in 2008 was \$400,000, and it has been increasing substantially over that time – so she would be disappointed to know the use is declining.

Mr. Foley said that he does not think the numbers are sliding, but the question is whether more people would do it if there were additional advertising.

Ms. Mallek said that it must be personal in order to succeed.

Ms. McKeel asked if organizations like JABA and AHIP might have relationships with some of these potential clients.

Mr. Sheffield said that from his understanding, JABA does provide that information.

Mr. Foley stated that staff will look into all of the information around this program, to see if it is leading to people not being as aware as they can be – although it may be that the agencies are doing all they can do.

Ms. McKeel said that it is possible that the agencies' staffs might have known at one point, but now do not.

Ms. Mallek commented that the change in the economy in recent years has certainly impacted the people who need the relief. She also requested additional information via email on the decrease for the Legal Aid Justice Center.

- **Parks, Recreation and Culture**
  - Parks and Recreation Department
  - Darden Towe Park Fund
  - Libraries
  - Recreation and Cultural Agencies

Mr. Walker reported that there are few changes in the parks, recreation and cultural assets portion of the budget, with no increase in staffing and a modest increase in operating costs. He said that there is a net cost decrease of \$177,000 due to increased revenue from the tourism fund, a portion of which goes directly to support the cost of parks and recreation. Mr. Walker said that there is also an increase in support for the Darden Towe Park, which is a partnership with the City.

Ms. Palmer said that she would not characterize the activity with parks and recreation as “nothing going on,” as they are all working very hard.

Mr. Walker said that he meant with respect to changes in the budget, and agreed that there is lots of activity.

Ms. Palmer said that she had brought up Hedgerow at a recent meeting and the potential for matching money, and Bob Crickenberger has assured her that they do have the capability to get started on that now. She said that she will make some additional comments at their meeting the following day, when Hedgerow is officially accepted into the parks system. The only other item for which she sought additional discussion is Yancey Elementary School, which wants to stay open for use of the gym and the computers, which offers WiFi. Ms. Palmer said that Mr. Crickenberger will be talking with the Yancey principal that Friday to assess additional needs, and said that Yancey is looking to provide some additional service since the JMRL Board has decided not to keep the Scottsville Library open for two additional nights.

Ms. Dittmar clarified that the Library Board has asked for an additional \$8,592 to keep it open those nights, as requested by Scottsville Elementary and Walton Middle School so that parents will not have to drive their kids up to Charlottesville or forego having them bring a laptop home altogether. She said that she is very distressed that this was not recommended in the budget.

Ms. Mallek said that it can go on the list, and they can talk about it when they get to that page.

Ms. McKeel noted that Yancey and Walton are six miles apart, and she wondered if one of those facilities could be utilized instead of both.

Ms. Palmer said they are asking for one or the other to remain open, and there are families all the way to the Nelson County line who do not have service.

Ms. Mallek said a year ago, they had talked about the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) going back into ACE, and the discussion then was that when new revenue came in, it would be discussed again. She stated that she supported getting more staff in Parks and Rec, but she also looks at this as a good source to boost the ACE program because of the properties that qualify on the scenic side of it. Ms. Mallek said that someone had reminded her recently that the reason there was a lot of business support for the ACE program historically has been because of the tourism values it provided, so she would like this item to be on their list for discussion.

Mr. Walker reported that the proposed library increase was \$207,000 or 5.4%, attributable largely to an increase in the County's share of a full year of Northside Library operations, as well as an increase of almost \$143,000 for the County's share of existing system-wide operational costs. He said that this is year two of a three-year planned implementation of salary improvements, so next year there will be a similar request, as well as significant increases in support for the library system's retirement system, which they get through the City of Charlottesville. Mr. Walker stated that there is also a one-time credit of nearly \$121,000, a savings realized by not opening the library when anticipated, and some of that was applied toward complementing support for computers, and what was not needed will be carried over into next year to help offset those costs.

Mr. Walker said that there is one position requested as well as a request for increased hours, and the first was the County's \$15,000 share of a requested half-time computer support position, and almost \$8,600 for four hours additional time per week at the Scottsville Library. He noted that the County provides approximately \$200,000 to support the library systems at Crozet and Scottsville, which are outside of the JMRL agreements.

Ms. Mallek said that the reason for that is because the buildings for those facilities are wholly owned and operated by the County.

Ms. Palmer asked why the hours were cut out of Scottsville. Mr. Walker said that they were not cut out, but throughout the budget there was a consistent intent to not expand services, and in order to expand and provide those services it would require additional funding – so staff made the judgment not to increase the funding.

Ms. Dittmar stated that it came as a surprise to her, because she and another Supervisor had sent a letter to the library board prior to the budget process asking for this, as a special request. She said that the mayor of Scottsville had also sent a letter requesting this item, which was less than \$9,000, and she did not consider this to be a vague increase in services.

Ms. McKeel asked what exactly she is surprised about.

Ms. Dittmar said that if County staff had responded to the request by saying that they were going with a firm policy of no increases due to it setting a precedent, she might not have liked it but she would have accepted it, but there was no such communication from staff.

Ms. Palmer stated they did increase the hours for Crozet, which she completely agreed with, and that was an expansion of services.

Ms. Mallek said that she would also support it for Scottsville and Northside.

Mr. Walker reported that the budget reflected an increase for the Charlottesville Area Convention and Visitors Bureau of \$48,000 or 6.6%, consistent with the contract and use of TOT revenue. He said that the other recreation and cultural agencies are funded based on a review coordinated by County staff utilizing the criteria relative to cultural agencies, and funding is recommended for the African-American Cultural Arts Festival, Ash Lawn Opera, Municipal Band, Piedmont Council for the Arts, Virginia Festival of the Book, and Virginia Film Festival. Mr. Walker stated that these are all agencies funded previously, and there is no recommended funding for those not funded previously, and no funding increase for the agencies currently supported.

Ms. Palmer asked if the reduced funding last year for the agencies will be their current funding levels this year. Mr. Walker said that the Municipal Band in particular is funded at \$5,000.

Ms. Mallek said that it was \$8,000 last year, and had been \$16,000 a few years ago.

Mr. Foley stated that the Board had put it on the list for discussion, but there was not majority support to bump it back up to \$8,000.

Ms. Mallek said that she will be glad to put it on the list.

Ms. McKeel said that one of the applicants for funding, the African-American Teaching Fellows, does not seem to accurately describe what they are doing as an organization, and she wants to know who she would speak with about the application. She asked Ms. Ellis about the justification for not funding the organization, part of which is that the students are not from this area – and while that is accurate, the students have agreed to teach in this area for five years, so this does not make sense to her.

Ms. Ellis said that the City has funded the program for the past few years, so ABRT was looking at the projected outcomes, and the fellows made the argument for funding this program as being a workforce development program – but it was not developing the local workforce. She stated that the second issue is that the group did not place any teachers in the City school system last year, so it was hard to justify a benefit to the City. Ms. Ellis confirmed that the group is placing a lot more teachers in the County than they have in the City.

Ms. McKeel stated that it met what the County is trying to achieve in terms of diversity in classroom employees, but she understands that it did not meet criteria because it is new funding. She said that what confused her was the statement that the “students were not from this area,” but they might not be, as the goal is to have them agree to teach in this area.

Ms. Ellis said the way that the application was framed was that it was a workforce development effort to improve the local workforce.

- 
- **Community Development**
    - Community Development Department
    - Economic Development
    - Office of Housing
    - Community Development Agencies

Mr. Walker stated that the Community Development department is the largest share of the community development service area within the budget, which also includes the Office of Housing, the Office of Economic Development, and community development agencies. He said that there is a combined increase of \$326,000 or 5.9% in this area of the budget, and it includes some new positions including full-year funding of a transportation planner position, a zoning enforcement position, and an inspector related to the mandatory Virginia Stormwater Management Program implementation begun the previous year – which was offset by fees.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the transportation planner had already been included the previous year. Ms. Allshouse said that it is a full year of funding for the position, whereas last year it was only partial, and it increased in cost because of 12 months versus six.

Mr. Walker said that the Commonwealth’s Attorney positions will also fall into that category, as they will have a full year of funding in FY16, and there is an increase in the number of hours in the Office of Management and Budget grant position.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive, addressed the Board, stating that she will provide an overview of the Office of Economic Development and noting that it is the same operation as funded this year – with two full-time positions and a half-time administrative assistant. Ms. Catlin said that there is a small increase in this budget due to several factors, due primarily to the compensation and health benefits increases across the board through all departments, along with the transfer of approximately \$4,000 in marketing funds that had been in the County Executive’s budget that are more appropriately allocated to the Economic Development department. She stated that there is a minor adjustment in the budget because of the shift of CVPED funds into this area, and the cost of the new Economic Development Director.

Ms. Dittmar asked if Ms. Catlin’s office is still going to keep the tourism piece of economic development, and asked if there are other areas that will stay with her department. Ms. Catlin responded

that the County is breaking it down into a “three-legged stool” of sorts, with Community Development having a big piece of economic development, and marketing and partnerships and community engagement staying in her office, with the new Economic Development office focusing on enhanced actual economic development.

Ms. Palmer asked if they still have the \$20,000 for the Natural Heritage Committee to use for the intern to finish their map. Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, responded that they are carrying forward one more year with that.

Ms. Palmer asked where the rural area planner ranked on the Community Development priority list. Mr. Graham responded that it is pretty far down on the list, and is really an expansion and restoration of things that have not been done for a number of years, so it is effectively a new service.

Ms. Palmer asked what the department did not get funded that it wanted. Mr. Graham stated that they had asked for an imaging technician for records management, as they are going through all of the old records to turn them into digital format so that the public can get access to them as well as staff. He said that it is hoped that this will save them some money, because they currently get about 300 FOIA requests per year, so reducing that number by a half or two thirds will relieve staff of that burden – but they have to get past the hump of getting records into the system.

Ms. Palmer asked who is doing that now and what the cost will be for the individual. Mr. Graham said that they are doing some of this with one-time CIP funding, but it is not getting done as quickly as hoped, so this will hopefully help and will free up other staff's time to help other customers.

Ms. McKeel asked what the cost for the technician position will be. Mr. Graham responded that it will be \$70,000, including benefits.

Ms. Mallek said that there had been a lot of discussion the previous year about the natural resources overlay work that needed to be done in order to complete projects, and while the interns have good intentions, if they are funded in July and do not show up until September, then gone by vacation – with staff having spent a lot of time getting them up to speed – she does not think it is the most efficient way to do this. Ms. Mallek said that she hopes they will have an ongoing discussion about a new staff person that will become part of the team and help out with other things, such as the natural heritage work at Arrowhead, as these departments are already running far below adequate staffing levels.

Mr. Graham said that they have not been using interns with the Natural Heritage Committee, which have indicated a strong preference to keep the planner who has been working with the committee and allow him to do the work. Mr. Graham said that staff has been taking some of his other assignments, redistributing them, and getting interns to backfill all of that work, which has allowed them to take administrative tasks off of other planners and keep the senior planner focused on doing the natural heritage work with the committee.

Ms. Mallek said that is really different from what she has been hearing, and they have been talking about an important way to implement growth management – so if they are understaffed and unable to make decisions with good information on development projects that come forward, they end up with a lot of rural development that ends up costing them more in the long run. She stated that they will end up paying a lot more in the end if they are hiring enough staff to be able to focus on this in different ways, beyond just the GIS overlay.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Graham if there would be staff freed up to do that kind of work, such as master planning in the rural area, if there is a records management position as described. Mr. Graham responded that there would obviously be more resources, but unless they can define what the goal is for that, he could not say whether it would be sufficient to accomplish what the Board is trying to do.

Ms. Mallek said that what she had in mind is what Joan McDowell did for 15 years. Mr. Graham said that a lot of what Ms. McDowell did was dealing with rural area planning, but they were also seeing a lot more development occurring in the rural areas at that time. He stated that the County is not seeing that number of applications in the rural areas anymore, so there is not a need for additional rural area staff in terms of processing applications, but if they are seeking other initiatives such as better support for the farm community and ways to grow agri-tourism, those positions will need to be considered.

Ms. Allshouse asked what the Board would like to have on the list for discussion.

Ms. Mallek stated that a natural resources or rural area planner would be the way to describe it.

Ms. Palmer said that she would like to put Mr. Graham's most wanted position on there.

Ms. Mallek said that perhaps that can be outsourced, but she would like to know from staff.

Mr. Foley said that it seems that the Board has identified objectives they want more effort put into, and staff can come back with some strategies as to how to accomplish them, and provide some clarity on what roles will make a difference.

Ms. Mallek said that staff already has emails from Karen Firehock, Tom Olivier and Lonny Murray, which provides great detail as to this perception.

Mr. Foley said that Mr. Graham does an analysis of everything, with three or four months of budget process, and while he might identify certain priorities for the department, the Board also identifies their own priorities.

Ms. McKeel said that she will also want to know what will not be funded if they allocate money to that.

Mr. Foley stated that staff can come back on March 11 with a holistic review of this.

Mr. Walker reported that the major change in the Office of Housing was an increase in revenue because they assumed an additional housing choice voucher program and absorbed the administrative costs and associated revenue. He stated that with agency contributions, there is an increase of \$36,500 or 4.2% for CAT, and this increase funded the County's share of current routes they supported. Mr. Walker said that for the third consecutive year, CAT has asked the County to pay a portion of the cost of Route 7, but this is not supported in the proposed budget.

Ms. McKeel asked for the specifics of what Route 7 covers. Mr. Walker said that it goes from Barracks Road to Fashion Square Mall.

Mr. Sheffield noted that CAT has pulled out of Albemarle Square with the moving of the Northside Library, but they are now asking the County to put a bus stop in front of SunTrust bank. He said that he will ask staff to look into it, but he does not think they need a bus stopping in the far right lane that is already backing up to turn right onto 29 North.

Ms. McKeel stated that it would be helpful to have CAT Transit Manager John Jones come in and talk about the agency's priorities, because there are routes that are not getting any upgrades or bus stops, to have a discussion about how to make the routes more equitable.

Ms. Dittmar asked if that is a conversation to happen outside of the budget cycle.

Ms. McKeel responded that it probably will be, and said that because CAT is managed by the City, the County is not always made aware of those priorities.

Mr. Walker said that Mr. Jones is aware of those issues and has been asked to provide in writing some comments related to those concerns.

Ms. Mallek said that in the past when this has come up, CAT has said that the County will need to supply the easements for the places to put the shelters, and she is glad they are pushing forward with it.

Ms. Mallek stated that she would also like to put the 4-H person on the list, because if the County is interested in supporting agriculture going forward, that element is very important and less expensive than lots of other things.

---

- **Board sets tax rate for advertising**

Ms. Allshouse reported that the next part of the budget process is for the Board to set a tax rate for advertising, which means they cannot go above the amount but can go below it.

Ms. Dittmar said that setting the tax rate for advertising is intended to continue the budget process with some room to evaluate initiatives and priorities among Board members, and while it may ultimately be the tax rate they adopt it does not mean the County has set the tax rate at that level. She stated that at the end of their vote, they will advertise a tax rate to continue the discussion among Board members and with citizens as they come to the public hearings, and they will not officially vote in a tax rate until April.

Ms. Allshouse said that the Board can make their decision on tax rate at the end of their April 8 public hearing, but if not they will have to make it on April 14.

Ms. Palmer stated that the Board has put a lot of things on their list and still has discussion left to do, so she would suggest a tax rate that was higher than what the County Executive has suggested – adding two pennies to the rate instead of just one. She said that they have not discussed the school CIP, and if they are going to include everything that they have talked about, they will need about a penny and a half on top of what they have estimated.

Ms. McKeel said that they do not really know what the state's budget total will be, given state uncertainties, so it will be good to build in some flexibility.

Ms. Palmer agreed, stating that she has spoken with two School Board members and Dean Tistadt, and Ned Gallaway have told her that the schools may consider a discussion at their next meeting – because they do not know until the County Executive presented his budget that there is a major element removed from their priority list, which had totaled \$1 million out of their CIP. She said that the County has taken money out of the CIP and put it into operating, which is a major move, with a backlog of CIP projects that may depend on a possible referendum. Ms. Palmer stated that Mr. Tistadt had said to her that if the County were to do a referendum to do modernization on the schools, it might be wise to have some money this year and spread that out over several different schools to do modernization

projects to show citizens who are using the schools what those modernization projects would look like, in preparation for a referendum. She said that she is very concerned about the Red Hill issue, and the budget does not even include the \$250,000 to do the library.

Mr. Letteri clarified that the proposed CIP as it now stands includes \$1 million in the first year for modernization, and that is intended to begin implementation of modernization so that the value and nature of those investments can be demonstrated.

Ms. Palmer said that this differed from what she has heard, and she was told that the School Board had a priority for the Red Hill money going into renovation. She stated that the Red Hill renovations had been characterized as a modernization, and according to the School Board member she had spoken with, that was something they were not expecting. Ms. Palmer said that if they put the library on a referendum and are not even going to do the design for that this year, the school renovation will be put off another three to four years.

Mr. Foley said that staff's understanding was that Red Hill was part of modernization, and the proposal had been put together in consultation with the school staff. He stated that there would be \$1 million put in for modernization, and he was not sure if \$97,000 for Red Hill modernization as design money can move forward to start that project. Mr. Foley said that even if it is approved, that is what they were going to do in the first year.

Ms. Palmer said that in setting the tax rate, she would like to hear back from the School Board on this.

Mr. Sheffield said that her question indicates that there are more discussions that need to happen regarding what projects need to be funded that are currently unfunded.

Ms. McKeel stated that the school division still has a gap that needs to be addressed, and there may be more information from the state coming forward prior to the Board's meeting the following week.

Ms. Allshouse said that her understanding from Dean Tistadt is that the schools have worked into their current budget everything they know from the state.

Mr. Foley said that even with the school's best estimating, that has gotten them to the \$880,000 gap.

Ms. McKeel stated that Mr. Sheffield's point is good in that there should be some flexibility in the advertised rate. Ms. Allshouse said that some of these things are not fully developed.

Mr. Foley said that if the Board wanted to get a sense of what their list will look like, staff will need a few minutes to try to pull it together, and he assumes that the penny on the tax rate would be split 60/40.

Ms. Mallek said that she does not have a firm number, but she knows that she does not want to make a prejudicial decision that will mean anything going forward is not real. She stated that she wants people to be able to come to the public hearing and have a real discussion on these items, so getting the data for tonight is not crucial but it will be helpful to get it as soon as possible. Ms. Mallek stated that the current tax rate is 79.9 cents, and the County Executive's proposal is to make it 80.9, with the extra penny dedicated to the fire rescue fund – which means the County is at status quo for operating, except they will be taking a penny from what they were originally going to put in capital and bring it back into operating.

Mr. Foley said that there has been growth in revenues at the current tax rate because property values have gone up, and that has generated the dollars that helped move them beyond status quo.

Ms. Dittmar asked what the increase in that value is. Mr. Foley said that it is the value of the reassessments and new construction.

Ms. Allshouse said that on page 49 of their budget documents, there is information on the revenues coming into the County.

Mr. Sheffield said that in doing the math, he calculated a 3% increase in operating if the Board supported the County Executive's budget.

Ms. Allshouse said that is definitely close, and the bottom line is a \$7.5 million increase – although \$1.6 million of it is due to the penny for fire rescue, and some of it is due to transfers and uses of fund balance. She said that the local revenue total represents what they often call "natural growth," but the extra penny is in there, so the resulting increase will be approximately \$5.8 million.

Mr. Foley said that on page 51, staff has broken down the real estate taxes, and the increases were \$4.3 million in real estate reassessments, with dedicated funds for water resources and the penny for fire rescue.

Mr. Sheffield said that the 3% he had mentioned pertained to residential property tax versus commercial increases. Mr. Davis said that the lowered tax rate necessary to offset the increased assessment, which would appear in the ad, would be 75.6 cents.

Mr. Boyd said that what will show up in the paper will be the difference between the 75.6 cents and what rate the Board determined as an advertised rate.

Ms. Dittmar asked for clarification of what the increased revenue will amount to. Ms. Allshouse said that the increase in new revenue would total about \$5.8 million.

Mr. Sheffield said that would be excluding the added penny. Mr. Davis said that the difference in the tax rate to create the same amount of revenue had the assessment not changed would be 4.3 cents.

Ms. Mallek said that is the equivalent tax rate for equalization.

Ms. Dittmar said that she wants to be able to communicate to constituents what the increases will fund, as there are things taken out for funding as well.

Mr. Foley suggested that he create a sheet the Board can use that will show where all the increases are.

Ms. Allshouse said that Andy Bowman is working on something in that regard, and she is not sure if it will include some of the school shared funding.

Mr. Sheffield said that Ms. Dittmar is only referring to what they are spending the \$5.8 million, and part of that is the increase in personnel costs and benefits, which has increased 9.8%.

Ms. Dittmar said that the cost of doing business has gone up, and that takes away some of the money, but she would like to know what new things the County is buying for its citizens with the money received.

Ms. Allshouse said that the public safety category totaled \$3 million in additional general fund expenditures.

Ms. Dittmar said that includes the extra penny, and she is talking about addressing the new initiatives provided by the additional revenue before they get into what the extra pennies will provide.

Mr. Foley said if the Board needs this information to make the decision about what tax rate to set, which is a different discussion.

Mr. Sheffield stated that there are a lot of discussions that need to happen regarding what an extra penny might fund.

Mr. Foley said that their March 11 meeting will focus on that, so that staff will know what their spending plan is to go along with that rate.

Ms. Palmer said they will also have to think about the 60/40 split.

Mr. Foley said that a very quick snapshot would be that \$1.6 million split 60/40 gives about \$900,000 and the remainder to local government.

Ms. Allshouse noted that 10% went to capital first, prior to the split.

Mr. Foley said that would fill the schools' gap, with about \$400,000 going to local government to pay for the things on their list.

Ms. Dittmar stated that last year they had increased the property tax by more than three cents, to 79.9 cents, and they are now talking about some aspirational initiatives that will possibly be funded through service districts for the urban area, bond referendums, or a specific capital program whereby certain initiatives will be direct-funded. She said that if they end up voting in April for a penny increase on the tax rate, she is worried that they might get into a tax increase fatigue with citizens – and last year, the message was that there are things totally out of the County's control that necessitated the increase. Ms. Dittmar said that the message is not quite the same this year, and she wonders if they want to set an increase this year and possibly forego the ability to draw a big picture of where they want to go with the County and what the price tag will be.

Mr. Sheffield said that they need to create a foundation for where they are going, and he does not think they are fully there yet, although this budget gets them closer to that. He stated that they do not have solid footing to move forward with other initiatives such as those with economic development, and they are still trying to catch up – and his concern is whether they will still be catching up over the next year, or starting to build on a foundation.

Ms. Dittmar stated that she wonders if they want to play catch-up immediately by small increases in tax rates and marginal cuts, or look at new strategies and see what kind of county they can become and what it will cost to get there.

Ms. Palmer said that it was wonderfully aspirational to look at it that way and she feels they should pursue that, but the problem is that the County is not trying to catch up right away – they have gotten way behind over a long period of time. She stated what they need is a target for the CIP and what will get done every year, and that way when the County Executive comes before them in the fall with a

preliminary proposal, the Board can evaluate it based on how it affects their target. Ms. Palmer emphasized that in her mind, this is a basic asset management plan with a certain number of projects and certain amount of money, and if they do nothing this year they are only falling further behind.

Ms. Dittmar said that there has been an effective tax increase by virtue of the increase in assessments, so the County has received additional revenue to continue to catch up – and maybe they want to catch up more or catch up faster.

Ms. Palmer said that tonight they need to figure out what they will advertise, without knowing a lot, and they will need some flexibility.

Ms. Mallek said that as much as she admires the brand new approach, and the direction to the County Executive to be innovative, she is very concerned about taking money out of capital for operating when they are so far behind on capital already. She stated that she recalled a comment from a Board member in 2008 who stated that they could not willingly give up the three cents going to capital because it will be so hard to get it back, and that is the truest statement ever made. Ms. Mallek said that she would be interested in the extra penny for advertisement as a start for going forward.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarification that the additional penny is beyond the dedicated fire and rescue penny.

Ms. Palmer said she would suggest 2.5 cents above the current rate as an advertised rate for discussion.

Mr. Davis clarified that this will mean an advertised rate of 82.4.

Ms. Palmer **moved** that the Board advertise for public hearing for the 2015 tax year: \$.824/\$100 of assessed value for real estate, public service property, and manufactured homes; \$.428/\$100 of assessed value for personal property; and \$.428/\$100 of assessed value for machinery and tools.

Mr. Davis clarified that this is 1 cent as recommended by the County Executive, plus an additional 1.5 cent.

Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion.

Mr. Davis noted that there are three components that have to be advertised: the real estate tax rate, which has to be advertised in the special 30-day noticed ad, containing the lowered rate and the effective rate; the rate for personal property taxes and the rate for machinery and tools, which are not recommended for change but are still reflected in the advertisement for tax rates that would be in their budget advertisement.

Mr. Sheffield said that the public should understand that the Board had only had two weeks to review the County Executive's proposed budget, so while they might be setting this at 82.4 cents, there is clearly a lot of discussion that needs to happen with citizens as well as among themselves as to direction going forward.

Mr. Foley said that part of that is because of the delay in getting information from the state.

Mr. Sheffield said that he does not blame staff, he just wants the public to know that there is still some distance to go before reaching a conclusion.

Ms. Mallek stated that with six Board members and six different perspectives, they worked hard to find middle ground and needs to be listening carefully to citizens to find out what their priorities are.

Mr. Boyd said that putting this much money on the table will invite controversy.

Ms. Palmer said it did last year.

Mr. Sheffield said that it will invite discussion.

Ms. Mallek said that she is glad there is something to talk about, and she is sorry if that upset some people – but to her it is better to have a discussion than to have a decision made pre-emptively without discussion. She said that in looking back, the years in which people were most unhappy were those in which they were not able to say anything valid about what was proposed.

Mr. Foley asked if the extra 1.5 cents was subject to the 60/40 split or dedicated, because the press will likely ask the County about it, or if that is a decision to be made on March 11.

Board members indicated that it does not need to be decided now.

Ms. Mallek said that she does not want it to come back that she voted for something where a penny could not be sequestered for capital.

Ms. Palmer said that her motion does not include the stipulation of the 60/40 split, and her intention is capital.

Ms. Dittmar asked why that has to be decided the following week. Mr. Foley explained that the County has to advertise the budget and the expenditures, and the Board will need to stipulate how it is spent so that the public can react to it.

Mr. Boyd said that it does not necessarily have to be the final budget.

Mr. Foley said that the public needs to know what is proposed so they can comment on it.

Ms. Mallek said that the Board does not need to have every detail identified.

Mr. Foley clarified that the County will advertise a budget that will have an amount of money in every functional area, and behind that will be the information as to what they added – such as more police officers – or that it went to capital, etc. He emphasized that they need to know that by March 11 so that staff knows what to advertise, so the public will have something on which to react.

Mr. Sheffield asked what the agenda is for March 11. Mr. Foley said that other than Colonel Kumer from the Jail, it is whatever the Board directed.

Mr. Boyd asked if staff can come back with the things on the list and the amounts associated with them. Mr. Foley said that is exactly what staff will do, to start with the list for the Board with information about the bottom-line totals and the revenues it will generate.

Roll was called, and the motion **passed** by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer and Mr. Sheffield.

NAYS: Ms. Dittmar and Mr. Boyd.

Mr. Foley said that Mr. Davis has clarified with him that technically, by law, seven days in advance of the public hearing is when the ad has to appear.

Mr. Davis confirmed that the budget ad will need to be displayed at least seven days in advance of the public hearing. He said that typically, the ad would appear in the paper two Sundays before the date of the public hearing, which is held on a Wednesday.

Mr. Foley said that staff will follow up and let the Board know the last date on which expenditures need to be finalized, even though that March 11 is the calendar they have adopted, as it seems there is a bit more flexibility.

Ms. Allshouse asked Ms. Dittmar to review the list compiled based on the Board's discussions, which she will provide by email.

Ms. McKeel stated that it is important to provide clarity on the additional revenue and whether the million will be allocated to capital.

Mr. Foley said that the school division will speak to it, and they will come to the Board meeting to address it.

Ms. Dittmar thanked staff for all of their work.

---

#### Agenda Item No. 3. Closed Meeting.

At 6:26 p.m., Mr. Sheffield **moved** that the Board go into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3.711(A) of the Code of Virginia under Subsection (1) to consider appointments to boards, committees and commissions in which there are pending vacancies or requests for reappointments. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Boyd and Ms. Dittmar.

NAYS: None.

---

#### Agenda Item. No. 4. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 8:41 p.m., Mr. Sheffield **moved** that the Board certify by a recorded vote that to the best of each Board member's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Boyd and Ms. Dittmar.

NAYS: None.

---

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

There were none.

---

Agenda Item. No. 6. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There was no report.

---

Agenda Item. No. 7. Adjourn.

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

---

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 09/02/2015
Initials: EWJ