An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 4, 2013, at 9:00 a.m., Room 241, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from February 25, 2013.

PRESENT: Mr. Kenneth C. Boyd, Mr. Christopher Dumler, Ms. Ann Mallek, Mr. Dennis S. Rooker, Mr. Duane E. Snow and Mr. Rodney S. Thomas.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Thomas C. Foley, County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Clerk, Ella W. Jordan, Assistant County Executive, William Letteri, and Director of Budget and Performance Management, Lori S. Allshouse

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

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** FY 2013/2014 Operating and Capital Budgets.

Overview

Mr. Boyd stated that, every year, the Board goes through this process where the departmental information does not follow the same sequence as the book of material given to the Board. He asked if staff could change it for next year so that it is in the same sequence. He also said that the comparisons are done "budget to budget" instead of "actuals to budget". By doing this, it changes what is presented, noting that on page 31 in the budget summary, there is a $7 million increase in the referenced budget when, in fact, there is a decrease of $12 million in actual to budget. He said there is quite a bit of difference in how it is presented to everyone. Mr. Boyd added that he does not know how to fix the issue, but did want to bring it to staff's attention as it changes the way one looks at the budget.

Ms. Allshouse pointed out that the actuals in the budget include re-appropriation items too, so it does get confusing when comparing it to the actual.

Mr. Foley commented that it would be simple to give an actual to proposed budget in a separate sheet by summary.

Mr. Boyd said that it could also be included in the summary section.

Ms. Mallek commented that the actual for FY 2013 would not be included because the year has not been completed. Mr. Foley said that was correct; staff would only have mid-year numbers.

Mr. Boyd commented that projections would be available.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that, in the budgets for the departments under the "Overview of Changes" section, there are a number of items that do not contain explanations of things like increases in salaries – as much as 8% or 9% in some cases.

Ms. Laura Vinzant, Senior Budget Analyst, said there was an anomaly this year, particularly regarding salaries that Board members typically would not see. When the budget was adopted last year, it was adopted with a one percent increase in salaries. After that, the Board added another 5% to salaries – and that is reflected in every department. They are looking at the adopted budget not the revised budget that included the 5%. She said that every section in the FY12-13 projected has an explanation of the 5% salary change, but that is not shown in the adopted to recommended change number and percentage. Ms. Vinzant added that, for the salaries in every department, there is closer to a 7% increase in salaries. She emphasized that this is an unusual year because of the timing of those salary adjustments. All other changes, whether the addition of a position or reclassification, should be included.

Mr. Boyd also commented that the tabs do not match the budget book. For example, there is no section for "Community Services" or for all the categories listed under "Safety".

In terms of Community Services, Mr. Foley explained that the reason for that is the way the County is structured under the Assistant County Executives. One is "Operations" and the other is "Community Services." That is an organizational thing based on internal services versus external services, which staff felt was a good way to organize. He added that staff will take this feedback and look at continuous improvements as it moves forward.

Mr. Foley also pointed out that Mr. Letteri and Ms. Allshouse have done double work to cover both sections.

Mr. Letteri said that this is an opportunity to get more into the detail of the components of revenues and expenditures, and to allow Board members the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback. Mr. Letteri explained that staff will keep track of all suggestions and come back to the Board with a summary of what the changes might involve, and the affect on the final recommended budget.

Mr. Letteri then recognized the OMB staff: Ms. Lori Allshouse, Mr. Andy Bowman, Ms. Laura Vinzant, and Ms. Lindsay Harris for their extremely hard work on the budget.

Ms. Mallek commented that when she takes the proposed budget to meetings with other counties, they are amazed by the detail. She said that she really appreciates all of staff's hard work.

Mr. Letteri also recognized the department heads and staff in attendance.

Mr. Letteri reported that this year's budget remains focused on One Organization committed excellence. Even as times are changing, staff is focused on high performance and organizational excellence. The staff is also focused on making capital strategic investments to ensure that even modest steps help advance the County's strategic priorities. He also said that the budget focuses on the future, by repositioning to meet tomorrow's challenges. Mr. Letteri stated that there is a sense that the County is coming out of the recession, with economic activities beginning to pick up and evidence that there are better times ahead – but this only assumes modest steps, while keeping the tax bills relatively flat.

Mr. Letteri said that, in contrast to last year's initial cautious steps of progress through catch up and recovery, this year's focus is on "build, invest and advance" with the idea of building resilience and supporting the County's ability to respond to change while sustaining core operations. Examples include stepping up fire and rescue positions and the ability to respond to emergency medical services. He said they are also shoring up some operational departments, including support of the new parks, fire stations and libraries.

Mr. Letteri said that the budget invests in creating organizational capacity that yields a positive return, improving ability to perform and produce over the long term. Examples include investing in economic development and creating jobs through capital investments that help generate economic activity. The budget invests in an Information Technology (IT) position to further leverage sophisticated tools and take advantage of additional opportunities that enable the staff to do a more efficient and effective job.

Mr. Letteri said that the last goal is to advance strategies that the Board has developed, with seven principal goals established in the last year. Staff believes that this budget takes modest but meaningful steps forward in advancing those goals. He said that examples include adding safety officers at schools and putting more resources in libraries.

Mr. Letteri then reviewed the budget calendar, stating that later in the week staff will discuss the capital fund and conclude with any additional discussion on operations. On March 11th, the School Division will be presenting its operating budget.

Mr. Rooker asked if the Board will be receiving a copy of the School Board's budget in a book. Ms. Mallek responded that Board members did receive the proposed budget, and another copy would only be necessary if there were changes.

Mr. Snow asked if the School Division received any additional money from the State. Ms. Allshouse responded that she does not think anything has been changed from the proposed budget.

Mr. Boyd asked if the School Board has approved the Superintendent's budget. Ms. Mallek responded that it had.

Mr. Letteri said that if there were changes in federal revenues, it would impact that budget.

Mr. Foley said staff would try to get more information for the March 11th meeting.

Mr. Letteri commented that, at the conclusion of the discussion on March 11th, the Board can make any adjustments and changes to the proposed budget. Staff will then come back to the Board so it can reach a consensus on any changes. Staff has also set aside March 13th as another date for discussion, if needed. The public hearing on the Board's recommended budget is scheduled for March 27th with final adoption slated for April 3, 2013.

_____

General Fund Revenues and Expenditures

Ms. Allshouse addressed the Board, stating that she would concentrate on the General Fund for today's meeting. She said 86% of the General Fund comes from local revenues. She reported that general property taxes – including vehicles, machinery and tools – comprise about 63%; other local taxes are at about 20.5% which is where one would find economic improvements in sales tax and includes food and beverage taxes, BPOL, etc.; state revenues comprise about 10%, which has remained fairly flat; and federal revenues are less than 2%. Ms. Allshouse noted that staff will be talking about transfers and use of fund balance also.

Ms. Allshouse presented General Fund revenues in dollar amounts, including the increases and changes, and pointed out the local revenues and FY13 adopted budget as well as the recommended budget for FY14. She stated that the general property taxes have increased by about $2.6 million, a 1.9% increase, and other local taxes have increased 3.5%. Ms. Allshouse noted that there was a slight decrease in other local revenues, due to the Office of Facilities Development moving out of the General Fund area and the resulting net change. She confirmed that Parks & Recreation fees, EMS fees, and other fees such as inspections are all in that category. Ms. Allshouse said that state revenues remain flat in FY14, and the 9.8% increase in federal revenues is due to a formula change in how the County is funded for Social Services. She noted that grant funding goes into a special revenue fund, but there are a few renewable, yearly grants that go in the General Fund.

Mr. Boyd commented that when the County is awarded grants, those funds are applied to the expense side but thought those funds should be put into the budget somewhere even if it's just called "grants."

Mr. Foley pointed out that when one looks at the total budget amounting to $321 million, that includes all of the funds.

Ms. Allshouse reiterated that grant monies transfer in if it is an on-going grant, but some of the newer discretionary grants – and even the FEMA grant – don't go into the fund.

Ms. Mallek said that method keeps the Board from thinking there is more money than they really do, and she likes it to remain in a separate fund until the time comes to spend it, because then it's not elevating the rest of the revenue pot.

Mr. Rooker said the only difference is grant monies are not under the General Fund, as that fund anticipates recurring revenue sources. Mr. Foley said that is correct.

Mr. Boyd noted that he had that complaint with the School's budget for years, as grant money didn't show up on the expense side and implied a self-sustaining source.

Mr. Foley said that staff has discussed this at length this year and, in their presentation, staff has added special revenue funds so that the full picture is realized, i.e., the $1 million federal grant for firefighters. He emphasized that the $321 million proposed budget includes everything the County is going to spend this year.

Mr. Boyd commented that the school budget may not reflect the potential impact of sequestration, but there will definitely be an impact on the revenues the Schools will receive.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the FY 14 budget is based on the current real estate tax rate, noting that there was a 2.3% decline overall in 2013 total taxable assessed values. She stated that the County has two calendar years in each fiscal year, so staff looked at the FY13 assessment and have also made a projection on how FY14 is going to go. Ms. Allshouse noted that staff is still anticipating a slight decrease in 2014, but believes that will be the bottoming out of the market. Since the recession, she said, real estate revenues decreased 12% over about five years.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Rio District had an increase in 2013, and is the only district that actually increased.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the decline in reassessments were offset by a slight increase in real estate revenues because of new taxable land divisions, developments, and construction as well as a change in land use deferral. She explained that one cent on the real estate tax rate equals $1.5 million, and the assessor has indicated that an equalized effective tax rate would be 78 cents.

Ms. Allshouse said that changes in assessment were very uneven across categories, with residential declining 2.66% overall, multi-family (apartments) increasing 3.65%, commercial and industrial increasing 2.41%, and rural and agricultural property decreasing 5.24% on average.

On the expenditure side, Ms. Allshouse reported, the General Fund has about $228 million with 41% as transfer to Schools, 8% transferring to Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and debt, and 71% of the CIP and debt number going to Schools as well. She noted that, overall; the amount going to Schools is about 51% of the General Fund. Ms. Allshouse reported that Public Safety comprises about 16% of the budget, revenue sharing is 7%, and the others are smaller percentages.

Ms. Allshouse presented a chart showing the revenue side, based on the changes that occurred from the adopted FY13 budget, with Public Safety increasing by $1.79 million which is the largest increase on the General Government operations side. Ms. Allshouse said there was a slight decrease in Public Works, mostly due to moving the Office of Facilities Development (OFD) off of the General Fund to an internal services category.

Mr. Letteri noted that figure also reflects a change with stormwater coming out of the General Fund.

Ms. Allshouse said the subtotal for General Government operations increase is $2.81 million, and City revenue-sharing is decreasing almost $600,000 in FY14 with the transfer to Schools increasing $2.62 million, or 2.6%. She said that the bottom line was an increase of about $6 million, and about $5 million of that represents increases in Public Safety, increases to Schools, and increases to capital.

Mr. Foley added that the 'entire pie' is up 2.3% or $7.2 million, so this is a large percentage of that with some of the special revenue funds increasing as mentioned earlier.

_____

Non-Departmental

- **Transfers, Reserves**

Ms. Allshouse reported that the Non-Departmental category is where most of the expenditures actually occur in this budget, representing $141 million, and this is where a lot of money moves from the General Fund to some other areas. She said City revenue-sharing is decreasing by $600,000, as the formula has a lag factor of several years based on the County's revenues. Ms. Allshouse reiterated that the School Division increases 2.6% or $2.6 million, based on the County's 60/40 transfer policy. She also noted that the School Board request is still unfunded by $1.4 million. She stated that the transfer to debt and capital has increased by almost $500,000, or 2.7%, in the FY14 budget.

Mr. Boyd said he was reminded in reading a book the previous evening about vehicle and equipment replacements and, as the County considers the issue of bus replacements, he asked about adding the $3.50 fee to the School System's budget to create those reserves.

Ms. Allshouse said that the $3.50 fee is designated for those larger public service vehicles and apparatus which would be in capital and has to do with the dollar amount.

Mr. Foley said the County could add a fee, however, it would essentially be shifting that cost back to the School operating budget. He emphasized that the County does replace some major apparatus in the CIP without a charge on the fuel, but the typical operating ongoing replacements come out of the vehicle replacement fund. Mr. Foley explained that there are two matters – capital and large items, and the operating formula – so since the Board perceived the school buses as a large item, it approved moving those to the CIP. He said that fire engines are not replaced with a fuel charge; they are in the CIP because the cost is so large; whereas a police vehicle every year replaced at $26,000 would come out of the fuel charge and is in the department budget as an expense.

Mr. Boyd commented that, even if it wasn't charged back to the School System, it seems like a very good way of accounting for it, because then there would be some operating cost involved with replacing the vehicles. Mr. Foley responded that there is a certain amount of the tax rate every year that automatically goes to Capital, so it is an ongoing expense and is charged off to Capital every year before new projects are assumed.

Mr. Rooker said that police vehicles are not in the CIP. Ms. Allshouse confirmed that most police cars and smaller vehicles under $30,000 are in the General Fund. Mr. Rooker said that is the difference; that is the distinction.

Mr. Boyd asked if the transfer for vehicle replacement was a transfer to a special fund and not to the CIP. Mr. Foley replied that those vehicles are considered non-capital expenses.

Ms. Allshouse said staff has increased the use of one-time funding in the Non-departmental category, and includes $250,000 for the Economic Development fund and $100,000 for the Grants Leveraging Fund which is just about depleted now but noted that grants have brought in about $2 million overall. She stated that the Innovation Fund and Intern Fund are two new ideas for the FY14 budget, and are funded at $166,500. She explained that staff was, at one time, able to put aside a salary increase in the budget for one-time performance bonus monies for three years in the five-year plan; but since staff was able to move to a market merit increase in the FY14 budget, the one-time money could be used for the Intern Fund and an Innovation Fund. Ms. Allshouse explained that the Innovation Fund would be used to support organizational innovation, but projects would be carefully managed prior to funding. For the Intern Fund, she said the County uses a lot of interns in the organization and a lot come from the University of Virginia through the UIP program but the Intern Fund is a little different and be used for recent college graduates who are interested in learning about government work full-time for one year.

Mr. Boyd wondered how much new money would be used for the Intern Fund stating his calculations show there would only need to be about $5,750 because of the $74,250 left over in salary reserves.

Ms. Allshouse reported that, for the first time, staff recommends putting $100,000 into a fuel contingency to account for fluctuations in gas prices.

Mr. Snow asked what fuel rate the County builds its budget on. Ms. Allshouse responded that the County doesn't pay state and federal taxes on the fuel so, if taxes were added in, the amount would be $3.25 but without those taxes it's about $2.80, which is what the County pays.

Mr. Foley stated that staff could build in contingencies in every department or pull that out separately and estimate, but what staff has done in this budget is put it into one separate place which is a good management practice.

Ms. Allshouse explained that there is $50,000 in the Non-departmental budget and is recommended for employee training. She stated that, while there is training in each department, this covers organization-wide training or County training for transition. She also said that the $80,000 salary reserve is for employees who are working at a higher level and might get reclassified.

Mr. Boyd asked if salary reserve has been the same amount every year. Ms. Allshouse responded that those funds have fluctuated and are slightly higher than last year's amount.

Mr. Boyd asked if the County was doing a major adjustment on police salaries this year. Mr. Foley confirmed that was done last year, with that reserve at about $200,000, but the FY14 number is more of a typical department reclassification number.

Ms. Allshouse reported that there is a very small increase, comparatively to others, of 4.5% in early retirement and that amount is based on estimates from the Human Resources Department as to what will be needed in FY14.

Mr. Boyd asked when that item is to be phased out. Mr. Foley responded that the County is going into the second year of a five-year phase-out.

Ms. Allshouse stated that the other contingency for Board consideration is for the Mountainside facility in Crozet and, in the past, the County has been able to provide this funding to ensure that lower-income people can remain at the facility.

Ms. Mallek commented that this is the auxiliary grant money that pays to allow people who were employed in Albemarle County to have a place to live.

Mr. Rooker responded that it's not just former County employees.

Ms. Mallek said that it's people who worked here in the County, and it's moved out of where it used to be into this fund. She stated that this share is not paid for people from outside of the County, such as former City residents.

Mr. Foley said that there had been a thorough evaluation between the City and the County, so there was a joint community effort on Mountainside. He added that Mountainside is not the only facility that provides these services and, because of the interpretation by Social Services, there is a change that had to be brought forth. Staff set this matter aside so the Board could consider it.

Mr. Boyd asked why this particular request for funds is being considered in a special category. Mr. Foley responded that there is a change in interpretation in the use of auxiliary grants.

Ms. Mallek added that it doesn't fit in the Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT) process, and is a federal matter.

Mr. Rooker clarified that it's analogous to what has been spent in prior years, and is being pulled out to be considered separately.

Mr. Foley reiterated that staff felt it important enough to have Ms. Ralston and other County staff speak to it as a separate discussion item.

Ms. Allshouse said the last item is $250,000 in reserve for contingencies, which is the same amount in the current County budget, and is set aside for unexpected things that occur throughout the year.

_____

Cross Departmental

Regarding changes in items across departments, Ms. Allshouse stated that the change in Virginia Retirement Services (VRS) was done mid-year and, therefore, not reflected in the FY13 budget when they started out; 2% of salary increase is in each department's budget, and the other portion of the performance increase is held elsewhere and will be spread as the performance reviews are done. This amount is determined by where raises are that are higher than 2%. She also said that staff is budgeting for salary lapse at about $500,000 which is essentially budgeting for attrition.

Mr. Boyd noted that the Schools do not seem to account for attrition as much as Local Government, even though that area has about three times the number of employees.

Mr. Foley said the School Division increased it in their proposed budget for the first time, and that would be a good question to ask them as far as what percentage it is of their payroll.

Ms. Allshouse reported that, across all departments, there is an increase of health insurance costs of 7%, a slight decrease in the VRS group life insurance rate, and funding for the mandated Line of Duty Act (LODA) obligation which is approximately $200,000 and is spread between the affected departments.

Mr. Boyd said he thought the LODA expense was about $500,000. Ms. Allshouse responded that the cost is about $200,000 in the current year, and that cost is being held in FY14 but this is an area that would likely increase.

Mr. Foley said that what Mr. Boyd may be remembering was the estimated cost of doing self-insurance, and staff felt the VaCorp plan was the better option, with most Virginia localities choosing the same.

Mr. Rooker asked about the Innovation Fund process and how that would work. Mr. Foley explained that a proposal would either come back for full approval, or a Board member would sit on the approval committee for recommendation.

Ms. Allshouse reported that there is also an increase in departments for core training, as this is an area that was significantly decreased during the recession, and it is staff's desire to at least get employees back to their core training levels. She said that computer maintenance and replacements increased 7.9%, or $19,000. Ms. Allshouse stated that insurance was decreasing $109,968 across departments, and this insurance savings was realized by using VaCorp for workman's compensation. She said some of these savings could be used to fund the Risk Manager position which will be discussed a little later in the budget.

Ms. Allshouse stated that the vehicle replacement surcharge has been increased from $3.00 to $3.50, and staff is also recommending the addition of one-time funding of about $200,000 for vehicle replacements. She said the surcharge will help replace 38 of the 58 vehicles requested for replacement, adding that the County is still not back to the replacement level pre-recession. She stated that 30 of the 38 vehicles are public safety vehicles.

Mr. Rooker asked what the mileage criteria is for replacement vehicles. Mr. Andy Bowman responded that staff looked through a host of objective criteria including age, mileage, condition, maintenance cost, etc., with public safety vehicles getting more use than Social Services vehicles. He said that the standard the County has used, based on what other localities typically plan for, is about 120,000 miles or 10 years, whichever comes first, and is used as a planning guide over the long term, with individual vehicle decisions made on a year-to-year basis based on those criteria.

Mr. Boyd commented that he thought the emergency services and volunteer firemen were looking at revising their mileage and vehicle replacement schedule last year. Mr. Bowman responded that their schedule only applies to large apparatus.

Chief Dan Eggleston explained that their adjustments were based on large apparatus in terms of what goes into the CIP, and the lifespan is extended out to 20 years on most large apparatus. He added that didn't apply to small apparatus, although staff uses the same criteria in looking at replacing smaller apparatus such as trucks and SUVs.

Ms. Allshouse stated that this budget also provides details on vehicle fuel budgeted at $2.89 per gallon, with state and federal gas taxes waived, and would normally total 47 cents a gallon.

Mr. Dumler asked if that was primarily reimbursements for onsite fill-ups, and if there is a set-price contract. Ms. Allshouse replied that staff would have to bring that answer back to him.

Mr. Letteri reported that the cross-departmental expenditures already discussed would apply to a lot of the subject areas he would be talking about, with the first category being internal operations which are those departments that run the business of the County. He stated those departments include the County Executive's Office, the County Attorney's Office, Finance, the Office of Management and Budget, Information Technology, and Human Resources. Collectively, he said, the category totals $11.5 million in the budget and represents an increase of $308,000 or about 2.7% overall. Mr. Letteri reported that the Board of Supervisors category increases $23,000 overall in FY14, or about 4%, but there is one decrease in this department of $10,000 associated with the audit, because the County is now producing its own Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) in-house. He noted that staff is in the process of going out with an RFP for audit services and he hopes to see that change reflected in future pricing.

Ms. Mallek asked if the audit cost would move from the Board of Supervisors to the Finance Department.

Mr. Letteri explained that there are some additional costs in Finance whereby staff would engage a professional to help establish the audit process, but those expenses will eventually go away.

Mr. Rooker said that this had been looked at by the Audit Committee.

Mr. Foley said staff is budgeting based on the assumption that the audit cost would go down, and would shift over for staff to do the CAFR.

Mr. Boyd asked if part of that cost decrease is because of technology associated with Access Albemarle, adding that he has mentioned to Farmer, Robinson & Cox that there should be a reduction because of the new system taking over the fixed asset system. Mr. Letteri responded that the quality of the records and the ability to summarize data and move it into a CAFR report is so much improved.

Mr. Rooker added that the County is able to produce reports in a much more timely manner now, adding that the County did not receive a management letter for the first time ever with the last audit. He said that the process, in the past has been a bit of a 'fire drill' to try to get everything done in time, and now he is seeing that 'fire drill' approach disappearing which is a good thing. Mr. Boyd said he likes receiving quarterly reports in the CAFR now and the format is very helpful.

Mr. Letteri stated that there have been increases associated with travel, training, and education based on policy changes there; an increase in Thomas Jefferson Partnership for Economic Development (TJPED) membership fees which are based on the new cost allocation; and increases in revenues from Economic Development Authority (EDA) which will more than offset those additional costs. He said that, overall, net additions to the Supervisors category total about $22,000 or 4%.

Mr. Boyd mentioned that there is a banking term called 'asset matching,' which tries to relate cost with revenues, and this seems to be an area that staff ought to be looking at through the lens of return on investment. He added that it may not all be monetary, but there should be some indication of a return on the County's investment.

Mr. Foley stated that the 'return on investment' principle is something staff is always looking for in the budget, and particularly with TJPED, Albemarle is trying to catch up with the other regions in terms of what they put into it. He said that TJPED is doing some real tracking now on inquiries that have come in, how much more activity they're doing because of what they're doing and what's being invested. He emphasized that some of this may not be as quantifiable, but there is certainly some benefit that can be shown.

Ms. Mallek said that agencies should be tasked with providing that type of information, and staff doesn't need to spend its time doing that.

Mr. Boyd said that's one example, but there are others that have brought great returns such as improved tax collection, stating that was a small investment with a big return.

Administration

- **Board of Supervisors**
- **County Executive**
- **Human Resources**
- **County Attorney**
- **Finance**
- **Office of Management and Budget**
- **Information Technology**
- **Voter Registration & Elections**

Mr. Letteri reported that the County Executive section of the budget includes management oversight of staff, and some of the goals include implementation of a comprehensive communications strategy, increased staff development and capacity, and providing exceptional leadership. He said, overall, this category increases in FY14 by $188,000 primarily due to staff salary increases and the reallocation of an Organizational Development Manager from the Department of Human Resources.

Ms. Mallek said that's basically adding someone in communications.

Mr. Foley stated that they moved the Organizational Development Manager, who handled the training program in Human Resources (HR), to the County Executive's Office in an effort to focus on a much broader array of responsibilities such as training and engaging the workforce as well as generating ideas. He said all the 'commitment to excellence' efforts which have been identified in the organization include the training and professional development of County staff. He added that succession management has become a greater focus, for example, so that position was moved from an expense in HR to an expense in County Executive and will broaden the scope and responsibility that will move the County forward with Baldridge efforts and other types of performance improvements.

Mr. Boyd commented that the 7% increase in health insurance costs seems a bit misleading to him, and it would be good to know how much that represents in dollars. Mr. Letteri responded that it's a 7% increase in premium costs, and Ms. Allshouse said staff would provide a dollar figure to the Board.

Mr. Foley said employees had some questions about that as well but, essentially, a single-coverage premium went from $38 to $43, with family coverage running more and a larger share on the employer side.

Mr. Letteri stated he would be talking briefly about that issue in the Human Resources section of the budget with a more in depth discussion at the School Board joint session on Wednesday. He said that economic development is also a function that exists in the Executive's Office, and they have proposed a $50,000 placeholder in the FY14 budget to engage someone to assist with the economic development efforts in that area.

Mr. Snow asked if that position would help implement the plan that was just developed. Mr. Foley responded that the next phase of the Action Plan has not been developed yet; it will be developed through engagement with the Board and the community. He added that, in August, the County would be coming to the end of the three-year Economic Vitality Action Plan.

Mr. Snow asked if the $50,000 would go toward someone hired to help implement the plan. Mr. Foley said he thinks that's what makes the most sense, but the County has a roundtable scheduled with the business community and the environmental community and would come back to the Board with those results to determine if a new position is the answer or whether another investment makes sense. He confirmed that it would be for a half a year in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that, right now, it's a placeholder.

Mr. Letteri reported that the Department of Human Resources budget actually decreases by $29,000 or 4.3%, and this budget item is the General Fund's contribution to the department which is really a School department and reflects General Government's share of the work that goes on there. He said that this Department has developed a client-based model that allows more focus on the different areas of government, both on the Local Government and School side, to allow a team of people who are much more responsive to needs. Mr. Letteri said that the decrease is due largely to the reallocation of the position that moved over to the County Executive's Office.

Mr. Boyd commented that this item is a little misleading to the public, because it shows one position and a $205,000 expenditure. Ms. Mallek said that's why she asked about the other costs of the program.

Mr. Letteri said that some of the HR initiatives reflect increasing tuition assistance to employees, and there is an increase of $13,500 for that program. He reported that the health care area and adjustments to the health insurance program would be discussed at length on Wednesday with the School Board. He said the Healthcare Executive Committee has met and has made some recommendations and there are some options in terms of premiums when compared to market, and whether or not the notion of incorporating deductibles should be introduced. He said Ms. Gerome will discuss this with the Board and will include comments and feedback from focus groups regarding this issue.

_____

Mr. Letteri reported on the County Attorney's Office category stating that the only real changes in this area result from the 5% VRS change and the 2% merit increase. He said that the Office represents both Local Government and Schools, and has quite a workload for their eight member staff. He said County Attorney staff have developed a level of expertise that allows them to handle a lot of litigation in-house.

Mr. Rooker asked how the School contribution is reflected. Mr. Davis responded that there is no allocation to Schools and, when they looked at that issue a few years ago, it was determined that the cost benefit to the Schools was in excess of $200,000 if they were to establish their own in-house attorney and staff it, so there are great efficiencies in the way this is done.

Mr. Boyd commented that there are times when outside counsel must be used, and there is no expense in this budget for that. Mr. Davis responded that his office does not budget for outside counsel because they are used so rarely and, over the last three years, the County has only used it once for a very minor issue. He said that outside counsel is only needed when there is a conflict, or for a very specialized area of law.

Mr. Boyd said that, in a lot of cases the Board sees, the insurance company brings in outside counsel to handle it. Mr. Foley said the County's premiums cover the cost.

Mr. Rooker asked how often a conflict occurs. Mr. Davis said those instances are very rare. Mr. Foley added that there is no charge to Schools for services provided by the County Attorney's Office or by the Finance Department.

Ms. Mallek commented that having someone like Chris Brown from that office is a huge benefit for the County and the families, because sometimes Schools get caught in the middle of family disagreements, and it's very important to have someone who can deal with the attorneys on both sides and sort things out for the benefit of the kids.

_____

Mr. Letteri reported that the Department of Finance also serves both Schools and Local Government and, overall, the department is increasing by $88,000 or 1.9%. He said this increase reflects the addition of a half-year Risk Management position, which is a critical function. Currently, these issues are managed in a somewhat decentralized manner. This position will enable the County, in a much more comprehensive and methodical way, manage its risk hopefully toward the notion of mitigation and decreasing insurance premiums. He said he sees this as a good investment in the future.

Mr. Rooker said that it makes sense, specifically in areas such as the Line of Duty Act and workman's compensation insurance, as savings could likely be realized in the future.

Mr. Boyd asked if this position will deal with health issues also, or is that a separate function. Mr. Letteri said that, because the County is self-insured, the health program is a very large part of the financial risk. He said he sees this as a partner in that area which would promote wellness and safety and, in turn, would have a direct impact on claims.

Mr. Boyd noted that there are 14 real estate assessors and asked how many that department had before the County made the decision from bi-annual to annual assessing. He said he had assumed there wouldn't be that many people added when that change was made.

Mr. Foley said he would check about staffing levels at that point.

Ms. Mallek recalled that the Board had asked the department to take on a whole new role regarding revalidation to ensure that people were compliant and that was a huge savings. Ms. Allshouse confirmed that there has been no staff increase in the Real Estate Office.

Mr. Letteri said the Finance Department is a large department and, as such, they have allocated the salary lapse, so this includes a $66,000 reduction in the salary line to account for the notion of the salary lapse. He said that staff would be monitoring the lapse on a monthly basis to ensure that they are achieving those goals as they go through the year.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that he wants to ensure that there is aggregate stop-loss insurance as opposed to just individual because, at the end of the day, the liability is in aggregate.

Mr. Letteri said that staff did look at that issue in detail and would share that with Mr. Rooker at some point. Mr. Foley noted that that matter would be brought up in the work session.

Mr. Boyd said that he had asked early on about the actual lapse factor and was hopeful, with Access Albemarle, there would be some accounting. He said that is something staff should be able to track using the new system.

Mr. Foley replied that staff can get that figure right away and said that, in budgeting lapse, there is a total number that's projected and a portion of that is carved out which staff feels is still appropriate.

Mr. Letteri reported that this department budget also includes a $50,000 increase in professional services related to ongoing implementations of the County's system. He said that most of the Access Albemarle program is about the financial systems, and staff recognizes that there's more work to be done in changing the processes and procedures around this software. Mr. Letteri stated that there is also $10,000 included for a bond referendum study which will allow the County to have its financial advisers analyze the pros and cons on how the County should proceed and this issue has been discussed previously. He mentioned that the CAFR preparation would continue to engage an individual to help staff with the program and procedures for developing the CAFR internally. He said, once those procedures are in place, he doesn't anticipate the costs to be continued. Mr. Letteri stated that it also includes a $14,500 net increase to purchase a program called Costar, which is a database system that allows staff to look at information about property values, market conditions and current commercial real estate information which helps the County avoid litigation costs.

Mr. Letteri said there is also a $24,000 increase to fund essential training needs, adding that Betty Burrell has been able to bring on more professional, certified staff, however, it does require ongoing training to keep up licensures. Mr. Letteri said that the budget also includes $46,000 to fund a risk management position beginning January 2014.

Mr. Boyd said that is something staff should be able to track the benefit of easily adding that the Finance Department has a good track record.

Mr. Letteri noted that there are a number of strategic objectives and initiatives that the Finance Department is focused on, such as the revenue and tax implemented this year and new banking services, as well as formalizing the County's investment policy in an effort to determine how the County can make the best use of its funds. He said that Finance staff is rolling out the 'purchasing card' program, which is a much more efficient way of procuring small items and keeping track of them. Mr. Letteri said Finance staff is also looking at online auctioning to try to reduce the level of storage in various facilities. He stated that Computerized Aided Mass Appraisal (CAMA) and the land use revalidation efforts are also underway along with a continued focus on delinquency collections, and are projecting that overall collection rates will increase by at least a percent based on these efforts.

_____

Mr. Letteri reported that, with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), there has been an overall increase of $45,000 – or 15.5% – and much of this is driven by the need for a part-time grants manager, which is viewed as a strategic investment to monitor grant activities and ensure compliance as well as seeking grants.

Mr. Boyd asked how this had been dealt with in the past. Ms. Allshouse responded that the Director of Housing, Ron White, has been helping out, but his workload is picking up in Housing so he may not be as available.

_____

Mr. Letteri reported that the Department of Information Technology (IT) is one of the largest departments with a broad spectrum of responsibilities throughout the organization, and there is an overall decrease of $58,000 largely because the County is no longer carrying the $250,000 cost of maintaining the mainframe. He said that there would be additional costs going forward as they transition the tax and revenue system, but those costs were included in the appropriations done to support that effort. He said that this budget includes the initiative discussed this year of adding an IT position, as there are quite a number of sophisticated technology tools and programs the County uses and there are others that will be needed to continue to monitor activities and allow the County to be more effective. He said that there is a particular need in the public safety area, given the uniqueness of how their time and overtime is tracked and that will require a good deal of programmatic help.

Mr. Letteri said that there is also a $17,000 increase for data processing consultants to address a multi-year list of projects, and the County is continuing its efforts with laser fiche which is an important records management component of the system used largely in the area of Social Services. He said this budget item supports maintenance costs of that system.

Mr. Boyd asked if this would eventually save money in the area of needed storage space that is being used now for records retention. Mr. Letteri responded that it would be an essential tool used, and they have also formed a Records Management Team that is looking broadly at all record management needs throughout the County including courts, schools, etc. He said those efforts are focused now on Community Development and the internal departments of the government, but is expected to have application elsewhere. Mr. Letteri said that the Schools have had significant storage needs, and the Finance Department is looking into online auctioning as a method of disposing items before those items would have to go into storage.

Mr. Rooker commented that it is better financially to turn those things into cash as soon as possible, rather than paying to have them stored. Mr. Letteri said that the concept has become quite popular in other localities.

Mr. Letteri reported that there have been major IT upgrades in the financial system and HR payroll system, and that department has also been instrumental in the PCI tax and revenue installation, working on all the data conversions to perform them in the most cost-effective manner.

_____

Mr. Letteri stated that, in the Voter Registration Department, there has been an overall decrease of $12,000, or 2.2%, largely due to the expected activity in voting.

Mr. Boyd asked why it would cost more for the four split precincts in 2013 than it did in 2011. Ms. Mallek said ballot production.

Mr. Boyd said $10,000 of the expense was for the more complicated ballot and the four split precincts. Mr. Foley said that the Presidential Election had an impact.

Ms. Mallek asked for confirmation that the budget does accommodate the possibility of new voting machines, because this will take place as soon as the state decides which machines can be used to replace the old crank ones. Mr. Letteri replied that this would be acknowledged in the CIP, as it would likely be a liability for capital in the future but still as of yet unidentified, and it may possibly cost less than the current equipment.

Mr. Letteri indicated that this concluded the internal operations budgets items, and he would move on to external.

_____

Public Works

- General Services
- Facilities Development

The category of Public Works, Mr. Letteri said, includes the areas of General Services, stormwater, Facilities Development, and the County's contribution to Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA).

Mr. Letteri said that, in total, Public Works represents $4 million of the overall General Fund budget, and has a $441,000 or 9.9% decrease over FY12-13.

Mr. Letteri reported that General Services provides buildings and grounds maintenance and repairs and oversees the operations and mechanical systems for county-owned and operated facilities. Mr. Letteri said there are 11 buildings that are maintained by General Services, totaling 382,000 square feet and five acres of lawn. He stated that the department also oversees the County's environmental compliance mandates and energy conservation programs, Entrance Corridor beautification, and operates the internal mail and Copy Center. Mr. Letteri said that the other component of General Services has been the stormwater management issue, and that has been set up in a separate cost center.

Mr. Letteri stated that an additional $186,000 is provided in FY14 for buildings and grounds maintenance, and one of the key additions to General Services this year has been support of public libraries with the 23,000 square foot Crozet facility becoming the County's responsibility to maintain as well. He said staff felt these costs were better directed to General Services than to the Jefferson Madison Regional Library (JMRL) budget due to the fact that the County has better rates for utilities because of the ability to negotiate collectively with other localities. Mr. Letteri said there was another $50,000 or so that has to do with cleaning the building, and this would be a contract to have someone clean the building 7 days a week.

Mr. Dumler asked what percentage of this amount was offset in the agreement signed with Jefferson-Madison Regional Library (JMRL). Mr. Letteri responded that little of it was offset with the Crozet Library because it was such a small facility. He added that the same is true of Scottsville, but they did reflect reductions in electrical costs in their requested budget.

Mr. Rooker asked how much of that $162,000 would be utilities and janitorial services. Mr. Letteri responded that each of those costs would be $50,000, and the other components would be maintaining the parking area and grounds of the Crozet Library as well as maintaining the landscaping.

Mr. Rooker commented that, if one factors out utilities and janitorial services, it comes to about $3.00 per square foot.

Ms. Mallek asked if not enough would be saved by the change to Northside than it was worth just doing the cheaper utilities and then dividing the bill with this City.

Mr. Boyd said Northside is a leased facility. Mr. Letteri said that he didn't know if there was a utility component to the lease payment.

Mr. Davis stated that the difference with Northside is it operates as a library operational cost the way the contract is set up so that the City and County costs are shared; it's more difficult to do an allocation with either party taking over responsibility. He added that issue is something staff is still looking at though.

Ms. Mallek said she would like to get a report about the safer chemicals being used by General Services, and what the County is still doing versus not still doing, as there were some estimates that there would be greater costs associated with that.

Mr. Boyd said that the environmental management position is another one that should be able to demonstrate savings particularly in the area of fuel and energy cost reductions and he'd like to get a report back on that at some point in the future.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that the budget anticipates a significant increase in utilities – an 11% increase or $81,000 – and the Crozet Library and Scottsville Library have been broken out as separate expense items. Mr. Letteri noted that $24,000 is the total increase strictly due to utility rate increases.

Mr. Rooker asked if the window replacements are expected to save money with utilities. Mr. Letteri responded that the Oversight Committee had recommended doing an ROI (return on investment) on the project to look at savings versus costs, but the windows have been put off for many years now. He said that this would be discussed when capital items are brought up later in the week.

Mr. Letteri reported that the total increase in the stormwater category is $23,000, and the cost center that now exists in General Services will be separated out. Staff is shifting that item to a separate cost center, and this is about taking a step forward to begin the work that's necessary to create a stormwater utility, if that is the direction the Board chooses to go. That will enable staff to track these costs separately going forward.

Mr. Dumler asked what percentage does the $266,000 stormwater CIP fund represent.

Mr. Letteri replied that there is a separate stormwater line item, but couldn't recall the precise numbers. He said it may be around $700,000-$800,000 in that account but some of that has been earmarked for programs and projects.

Mr. Foley said staff could check the balance on that fund, and share it with the Board at the next meeting. He stated that there is an assumption built in which assumes the funding of an operational expense out of the money set aside in anticipation of where things are headed toward the establishment of a utility. Mr. Foley noted that the Board could also decide to use general tax revenue to pay for the stormwater program, however, that is the decision the Board will have to make.

Mr. Boyd asked if the $122,000 for solid waste and recycling is what the County is reimbursing to Rivanna. Mr. Bowman explained that the $122,000 is to cover costs associated with recycling and disposal for the County Office Buildings and facilities, and does not include Schools.

_____

Mr. Letteri reported that the Office of Facilities Development (OFD) is an internal services fund that derives its resources from the capital program based upon billable hours to the actual projects, and part of it is supported by the General Fund, which has to do with their administration of the operation, the director and the assistant. He said that the total increases in this category are $73,000, due to the 5% and 2% merit increases as discussed earlier. Mr. Letteri noted that it also reflects an increase in billable hours, going from $71 to $75 under this program in part to support those salary increases. He stated that staff has looked at comparable market rates, and determined that Albemarle is well within being competitive, and is almost an order of magnitude better than what they're finding in the private market.

Mr. Foley pointed out that, in the General Fund expenditures, there is a $689,000 decrease in the Office of Facilities Development.

Mr. Letteri said that OFD continues to do a great job, and has added some good staff through replacements this year with a high level of expertise and their performance is monitored throughout the year, both through schedule and through bringing projects in at budget. He said OFD also serves the Schools and oversees all of its big capital projects, which is a major component of OFD's workload. Beyond the major projects, OFD helps the Schools with large maintenance projects. Mr. Letteri said that, through the Schools' maintenance budget, if they're funding things like mechanical replacements and roof replacements, OFD staff would have involvement.

Mr. Boyd asked if there was a reduction in the Schools' budget since they don't really perform that function any longer, like they did when Al Reaser ran Facilities Management. Mr. Letteri responded that they have made adjustments over the years in the department and they don't now have the staff to deal with any of these large projects. The School Division is relying on OFD much more heavily than ever.

Mr. Boyd said that he just wants to make sure there are no duplication costs.

Mr. Letteri commented that they meet routinely together to look for ways to avoid duplication, and the County now has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Schools for this. He compared the Schools' Building Facilities Department with the County's General Services Department.

Mr. Rooker asked if the $75 per hour fee, which gets charged to projects, ultimately becomes a part of the CIP and not an operational expense. Mr. Letteri said that is correct. He added that it is not unlike architectural or engineering fees that are borne by the client and then ultimately financed over time and built in as a capital item.

Mr. Foley emphasized that it is a component of the total project cost.

Mr. Rooker said that the Schools do not pay it out of their operating cost, it is charged to the project cost.

_____

Mr. Letteri stated that the last category is Public Works, and this is the contribution to the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) for both the McIntire Recycling Center and the waste transfer facility. He said the budget reflects a $50,000 decrease in that contribution.

Mr. Foley explained that this is basically the worst case scenario. He said the County got a proposal from Tom Frederick that said if RSWA operates it themselves and it's not put out to bid to the private sector, where some savings were anticipated, it would be about $300,000. He said that, if the whole process of putting an RFP together for someone to run the operation, oversee the contract, etc., the fallback would be for Mr. Frederick to run the whole operation for about $290,000. He added that this is a safe place from the budgeting perspective, and it could be a potential savings if we're successful with the RFP process.

Mr. Rooker said that one of the things that has been discussed in the past was the problem of leasing the facility. He said, if there is to be a private operator and the County has to be the intermediary lessee, then it becomes a liability issue for the County. He stated that this issue needs to be settled before an RFP goes out because, if the County doesn't want to be the lessee that will change the nature of an RFP.

Mr. Foley responded that there is a special work session on Thursday of this week, and that's one of the primary issues to be discussed because Rivanna will want to protect themselves from any liabilities also.

Mr. Rooker said, to save $50,000 but increase the County's liability that may actually be no savings at all.

Mr. Foley said there's also a risk of overseeing the contract, but all of those things, pros and cons, will be laid out in the work session.

_____

(Note: At 11:00 a.m., the Board recessed, and then reconvened at 11:09 a.m.)

_____

Community Services
- **Public Safety**
  - **Police**
  - **Fire Rescue**
  - **Other Public Safety**

Mr. Letteri reported that the category of Public Safety represents the largest category in General Government operations, and includes the areas of Police, Fire/Rescue, Inspections, the Emergency Operations Center (ECC), the Albemarle/Charlottesville Regional Jail (ACRJ), other fire and rescue services (volunteer), and public safety agencies. He said that, overall, increases in this department total just over $1 million, including the addition of two police officers, one school resource officer, and one traffic safety officer which recovers some of the revenue through the Photo Safe program. Mr. Letteri stated that $48,000 of this increase is based on overtime, largely due to salary changes as well He stated that operational increases total $35,000 due to the training and firearm qualifications and the impact of patrol video cameras and this category is also partially offset in fuel decrease costs. He said that capital outlay increases total $118,000, and a large part of their budget is replacing police vehicles. Mr. Letteri noted that staff is anticipating revenue increases of $284,000 due to the increase in local and state revenues and the School's share of the safety officer.

Mr. Dumler said that the Police Department is proposing two additional officers based on the policy change implemented to index that number to inflation, and asked how far behind Albemarle County is as far as total allocated FTEs and total hired FTEs.

Ms. Allshouse said that the number was actually indexed to population, and she confirmed with Chief Sellers that the Police Department is at 122 officers. If that department were to use the old Comp Plan goal, it would be 1.5 officers per thousand, or about 28 officers below that old standard.

Mr. Foley said Chief Sellers has been trying to get up to full staffing, but there is always some turnover; however, he feels they will be up to 122 officers shortly.

Mr. Dumler also asked how the public safety reclassification is impacting hiring. Chief Sellers stated that the force is about 117 officers currently, with the cap at 122 and, based on what he has in the pipeline now, he expects to be fully staffed by April 1. He said that, in terms of the reclassification process that occurred last year, it didn't have a significant effect on recruiting but what did have a positive effect on recruiting was the $125,000 the Board set aside for career development. Those funds allowed his department to offer some small salary enhancements for officers who have college degrees as well as compensating those who are working diligently toward their college degrees which, in turn, helped with retention and recruitment.

Mr. Rooker asked if that enhancement included the second language category. Chief Sellers responded that it did not.

Ms. Mallek noted that it needed to be added somehow.

Mr. Foley said that, once the second language category is added, there's another cost, and Chief Sellers wanted to focus on what he felt was most important.

_____

Mr. Letteri reported that the Fire and Rescue budget for FY14 increases $1.3 million or 16.9%, and this is the first full year of impact for the eight firefighters for the Ivy Fire Station. He said there is a $231,000 increase associated with overtime costs due to the Ivy Fire Station, the FEMA-SAFER grant expiring mid-2015, and salary changes as well as historical experience. Mr. Letteri said that operational budget increases total $104,378 primarily due to the opening of Ivy Fire Station and the FEMA-SAFER grant and training issues.

Mr. Foley stated that this is one of those areas with special revenue funds, and Fire and Rescue is actually going up about 24% total when the special revenue funds are added to General Funds but that's the effect of having federal monies coming in.

Mr. Snow asked if the grants were affected by sequestration. Mr. Foley responded that this particular FEMA grant would not be affected.

Mr. Rooker said it is a little difficult to understand the net and asked how much of that $965,000 is being covered by the FEMA grant this year. Ms. Mallek said none. Mr. Rooker said that would then make it a net increase.

Mr. Letteri said that the budget includes a Division Chief for volunteer services, which has been an area of focus, and it is felt that the County will be well-served by having a person to help with communications and coordination between the 10 different stations. He stated that EMS service delivery changes include $402,000 related to a number of items, including the Ivy ambulance, three firefighters on Rt. 29 North, a Rt. 29 North ambulance full time, the jump crews associated with these, and costs directly related to revenue collections.

Mr. Boyd asked if a jump crew was planned for Stony Point. Chief Eggleston responded that Stony Point has made the decision not to support an ambulance there, adding that the County will be working with them over time as staff still sees it as a great advantage to that community. He said staff will try to work through some of the issues over time with the folks at Stony Point but, at this point right now, Stony Point does not support it. He added that those minor operational changes for the ambulance at Stony Point – fuel and maintenance – are not reflected in this budget.

Ms. Mallek asked Chief Eggleston about staffing changes at Ivy. Chief Eggleston confirmed that there will be three people for the daytime ambulance Monday through Friday, 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. He said that the three additional people at Ivy are for the ambulance, and there are eight people budgeted for Ivy in addition to the volunteers and some amount of the SAFER funding to be incorporated and staff that engine 24/7.

Mr. Boyd asked if staffing figures weren't showing up here because those will be coming out of the SAFER funding. Chief Eggleston responded that the nine people for the SAFER grant are in the special revenue fund.

Ms. Mallek said that she didn't recall approving the hire of more than the original six, and now it's nine. Chief Eggleston explained that what's new here is the ambulance, as that was not planned for when talks began about staffing for the Ivy Station – there was to only be an engine; and that staffing for the engine included eight people out of this year's budget, in addition to the volunteers. He said that the SAFER grant allowed for a little more flexibility in case the target on the volunteer end wasn't reached. He said there are about 18 volunteers right now which will allow the County to staff that engine on nights and weekends with one volunteer, and then some of the staffing from the FEMA grant will help round that out to make sure that there is enough staffing for the engine 24/7.

Ms. Mallek said that would change the design as a volunteer station to have staff there 24 hours a day. Chief Eggleston stated that there's still a volunteer that will be part of that three-person crew, and that person would serve nights and weekends.

Mr. Foley explained that the original request for was 12 people, but the Board didn't approve that so staff budgeted for eight, and has been recruiting for volunteers. He said that the SAFER grant has allowed them to extend that recruitment period and, in the meantime, staff has been able to fill the gap with FEMA money to help run that. He added that there are 12 people to run that station around the clock. He said they would have had to make the decision this year and add people if they didn't have enough volunteers.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that it wasn't approved to be another paid station, it had approval to be a volunteer station with paid staff during the daytime, and we're sliding away from that. Mr. Foley responded that this is not where they're going in terms of planning, and what they're doing is including the eight people the Board had approved hiring as the only people in the budget. He explained that staff is continuing the volunteer recruitment effort, which would have ended by now, because the station is going to open in July, however, the grant has allowed for the extension of the recruitment. He stated that those efforts are still underway, but the County now has a little bit more time to recruit because of this grant which is helping fill the gap.

Ms. Mallek said that her second question is why the paid staff is not operating as a jump crew for Ivy as they do in Earlysville, which has very similar call numbers, so there will not be a doubling up on staff. Chief Eggleston responded that staff looked at that issue but, since the County is transitioning away from the current City contract, there is now a need to replace what that contract provided in terms of an engine company with Ivy. He said that if Ivy uses a jump crew, that station would cover portions of 29 South and, based on that call volume, they would lose the capacity to have a staffed engine crew – which would help make up the loss of the City contract. He said staff didn't think that was a good strategy going forward.

Mr. Foley emphasized that the added cost of this budget is large, and a big part of that is because the County had only budgeted for the eight firefighters for half a year, so now there is a full year and that's a big piece of the increase which staff had anticipated would hit in the second year of this initiative.

Mr. Snow stated that some of the money is offsetting through the cancellation of part of the City contract and the new EMS recovery fees.

Mr. Foley responded that that's absolutely the case, and if they had shown expenditures offset in the bottom line, the Board would see a savings of $738,000.

Mr. Rooker said that's why he wanted to see a net on this. He said that the cost increase is not entirely Ivy, as it also includes some operational expense increases in addition to the volunteer coordinator. Mr. Rooker said that it's the $966,000 and the $84,000 in benefits that you can look at as a true expense and, from that, you offset whatever revenue recovery there is from that unit and the City contract cuts. He said the net difference between those two is not huge. He added that, when the FEMA grant expires and if volunteers have not been recruited to fill in those positions, then there would be a big net increase.

Ms. Mallek stated that is why she is making the point that they can't allow the new station to evolve the way Station11 and Station 12 did, where they started out with volunteers who eventually went away because they were never allowed to be in charge and to have a shift that was all their own.

Mr. Rooker commented that her point is well taken, and this year's not bad; it's when the FEMA grant expires that there will potentially be a big increase.

Chief Eggleston emphasized that their strategy for volunteer recruitment at Ivy has not changed, and staff is working very hard to get the volunteers they have now in the academy trained after the fact to ensure that, when they open the station in July, there will be enough staff to maintain service around the clock. He said they were working very closely with Bob Larsen, the Chief at Ivy, and he is doing a wonderful job. Chief Eggleston said that Ivy should end up on July 1 with about 18 trained firefighters which is a huge achievement, and they will want to continue that, which is why they will request some additional advertising money to continue the recruitment effort long past the opening of the station.

Mr. Boyd said that there is, in this budget, an additional position to help with recruitment of volunteers.

Ms. Mallek stated that the new hire is supposed to be working with communication, and when Jason had the position, he got sucked into recruitment, administration, etc., and never got out to do the things he was supposed to do.

Mr. Foley said staff is in a challenging place of having set a very ambitious goal of getting volunteers to staff a station, and that's not happening anywhere in the country although there has been some successes locally. He said that the alternative to what's before them is to not use the FEMA positions, open the Ivy Station in July, abandon the volunteer recruitment effort, and then the County would have to fund some more positions. Mr. Foley said the County is utilizing the grants to extend that recruitment period to provide a better opportunity at being more successful, and that may mean there are career people in a station that staff is trying to recruit volunteers for and it changes the atmosphere. He stated that the alternative is to ask for more staff, adding that staff is really doing the best they can with this scenario. He pointed out that recruiting volunteers to staff a station is tough.

Mr. Rooker said that is particularly true when it's a new station to add or to perpetuate something that has been volunteer for, i.e., 50 years.

Ms. Mallek said what brings people into the station is having training for volunteers.

Mr. Foley said that most localities don't do volunteer training at stations because of the cost, and there is a good investment to do that in this budget, with future requests pending to do even more such as extending it in Earlysville. He stated that the process staff is following is also important with a volunteer chief helping with recruitment in addition to having Mr. Snow participate in TV ads which is encouraging volunteers. Mr. Foley said there were also signs posted around the County and recruitment events held, but, if there are efforts the Board would like to add, they should make those suggestions. Right now, these efforts have allowed staff to avoid coming to the Board sooner in terms of career staff, because of the FEMA grant which, in turn, has helped staff extend that recruitment period. He added that there is a lot of new service in here and a lot of expense. Mr. Foley said he would like to provide some follow-up to the Board with expenditure offsets in this particular calculation, because the $996,000 drops down to under $200,000 with offsets which is not a bad deal when considering what's being added, including the assistant chief position.

Mr. Snow said the follow-up discussion should include the EMS recovery offset.

Mr. Foley said staff has also done a separate breakdown of the net costs of adding ambulances that generate revenue but there is a cost associated with those, and that will be pulled out for discussion as well.

Ms. Mallek commented that there's a lot of good work going on, especially with Mr. Foley's effort and the help with Western Albemarle Rescue Squad, adding that has been a huge step forward.

Mr. Foley said that the Fire and Rescue staff has worked really hard on this too, and the position proposed can make a big difference because of the time allowed for working on communications and interaction with volunteers.

Regarding Fire & Rescue services, Mr. Letteri said a major part of the decrease in this budget is driven by the change in the City contract which was reduced by $786,000, netting an overall decrease in this department by $559,000. He said that the category itself is $2.2 million total and provides funding support and assistance to volunteer fire companies and volunteer rescue squads that is vital in the combination system. Mr. Letteri said that other changes include increases of $181,000 or 9.9%, which involves $148,000 due to reported expenditures for items in accordance with the funding policy. He stated that budget staff looked in detail at the history of expenditures at all the different fire stations, and this funding proposal is based on that information.

Ms. Mallek said this is the first time the County has been able to meet policy in about five years, which is huge.

Mr. Foley said it's the first time since the policy was implemented and it's a big step forward.

Mr. Letteri reported that there were increases to Western Albemarle Rescue Squad (WARS) and reductions in Charlottesville/Albemarle Rescue Squad (CARS) funding based upon changes in the contract, and $32,000 or 6.7% in increases for supplies associated with these operations.

Ms. Mallek asked for an explanation of accident/sickness insurance, adding that she would be happy if volunteers were allowed to join in on County insurance. Mr. Bowman said that this is just referring to the County's liability.

Chief Eggleston explained that this is the Provident policy that Fire & Rescue has for volunteers which includes a vehicle, accident and injury policy and it's a very lucrative policy that's been compared with what the County could provide in terms of worker's comp for volunteers. He added that the FEMS Board Executive Committee felt it was a good policy to stay with and there was no cost benefit to move forward with worker's comp. He said that the policy covers injury or illness related to something that happens from the moment a volunteer is notified of a call to the time they get back home after responding, and even covers lost wages. He added that this is a very good policy.

Mr. Foley suggested removing the word 'sickness' and replacing it with 'injury.'

_____

Ms. Mallek asked about the amount in the budget for overtime during hunting season, as she noticed there was $13,000 included. Mr. Foley said that's a special appropriation in the budget, and he would explain that item when they come back to that topic.

Ms. Allshouse reported on Public Safety contributions, stating that contributions to some agencies come through contracts or through Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT) review. She explained that agencies are in every category, as the state requires that funding must be put in a category to which it is assigned. Ms. Allshouse stated that the regional jail expense has decreased by about $200,000; the Emergency Communications Center (ECC) has decreased by $6,000 based on the new contract; the Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention Center increased 8%, or $63,000. She said that the SPCA will increase about $20,000 or about 3.7%, based on the contract formula.

Ms. Mallek said that Foothills Child Advocacy Center received an exemplary rating, and she would like to submit that as a candidate for full funding instead of cutting them back again. When an agency receives an exemplary rating and is working with children, their request should receive full funding.

Ms. Allshouse explained that basically they increase what the County has funded them in the previous year, not necessarily based on their request.

Mr. Rooker said they received $885 more than last year, however, that is not a big increase.

Mr. Foley said that's a 3% increase which was what all of the agencies received if an exemplary rating was achieved.

Ms. Allshouse stated that the key is the increase on what was provided to those agencies in the current year versus what was requested.

Mr. Foley said staff will add that item to the list for further discussion.

Ms. Allshouse reported that inspections and building codes is an item that will be discussed in Community Development. She said those were included in the Public Safety area as part of the categorization requirements.

_____

- **Human Services**
  - **Social Services**
  - **Bright Stars Fund/CSA Fund**
  - **Human Services Agencies**

Mr. Letteri reported that Health and Welfare comprises a large portion of the general operating budget at $18.5 million, and the recommended budget represents an increase of $477,000 or 2.7% over last year's budget. He said that the category includes the Department of Social Services (DSS), which is the largest component at 59%; Bright Stars, Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) funding, the Health Department, Region Ten, JAUNT, other health and welfare agencies, and Tax Relief for the Elderly and Disabled.

Mr. Letteri said that the allocation for DSS increases by $543,000 or about 5.2% in the FY14 budget, adding four positions to this department including an eligibility worker and an eligibility supervisor, an adult services worker, and a Bright Stars family coordinator. He said the budget provides for increases of $18,300 in overtime wages based on overall workloads in the department. He added that there is an operating cost increase of $67,000 or 2.2% primarily to change programs that are fully or partially reimbursed; and related revenue increases of $315,407 of 4.7%.

Mr. Rooker stated that there was a transfer to Bright Stars reduction of $88,000 and asked for an explanation, given that a person has been added to that area. Ms. Allshouse responded that it's due to a change in the composite index, which resulted in more state money.

Mr. Bowman explained that the state has capped the composite index for this program at .5, and the actual composite index is .635.

Mr. Rooker stated that the County essentially makes up the difference in what they don't get from the state. Mr. Bowman said that was the case, and the FY13 budget assumed the entire composite index.

Mr. Rooker said that, including this increase then, the net was a reduction of $88,000 in general County expense. Mr. Bowman said that was correct, and $43,000 refers to the entire fund.

Mr. Snow asked if these additional four people would help alleviate the workload stress on the DSS staff. Ms. Kathy Ralston addressed the Board, stating that it is a huge shot in the arm, and the request to the County Executive was for 15.5 positions which is why there is an increase in overtime, as DSS staff is still not able to keep up, even with the addition of these positions. She said the extra positions will definitely take some of the pressure off current staff.

Mr. Snow asked if the workload had peaked at this point. Ms. Ralston said that the benefit program load is still going up, but not at quite the rapid rate it was going. She stated that where they're seeing an increase now is in foster care, where there has been a fairly sizeable increase with children 0-5. Ms. Ralston said that they are sitting down with community partners who work with that early intervention group, such as the CHIP program and the Healthy Families program and Family Partners at Children, Youth & Family Services (CYFS), to try to figure out what's going on and why there are such noticeable increases.

Mr. Boyd noted that those numbers were going down before. Ms. Ralston said it was going down, and what was going up is teenage children – but that's starting to level off. She said that the good news is the younger children are much easier to adopt, so there may be increases in adoptions as a result of that.

Mr. Dumler asked if they had objective caseload criteria for those positions so the Board can see which initiatives are being hurt by the Board's inability to fund those. Ms. Ralston responded that they do, and those are provided in the strategic initiatives but could be pulled out from the narrative.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that her report would be presented on Wednesday.

Ms. Ralston said that information would be for FY12, so it wouldn't capture the increase in foster care that is being seen now.

Mr. Rooker asked if Ms. Ralston had any advanced information on how sequestration might affect their programs. Ms. Ralston responded that the state DSS office has indicated that, for the current federal fiscal year, they were in good standing, as they have been able to set aside funds to blunt any cuts from sequestration; however, for federal FY14 and FY15, unless they come up with a different plan, we likely will be hit. She said that the largest reductions will be made in the Social Services Block Grant, which is the only federal source that funds adult protective services and is the primary one for Child Protective Services and foster care. Ms. Ralston added that they would also lose some minor programs, which would likely see increases in CSA.

Ms. Mallek said there are zero dollars for CHIP in the budget on the agency list, and asked if the County needed to be paying attention to that because that program works with young babies. Ms. Ralston explained that they don't have universal access for young parents in this community. She explained that universal access is a program whereby everyone who had a baby at UVA or Martha Jefferson would get a visit from a home visitor and a nurse that checks in with the new mother to see if she needs help. She said that CHIP and Healthy Families are the two primary programs they can refer to for early intervention, and they really get the kids who are at risk but a lot of people are missed because of the lack of universal access. Ms. Ralston said that one of the things Social Services is doing is tracking those cases that have had CHIP or Healthy Families intervention, but the families don't always reveal that information. She stated that the concern is that there are kids taken into CPS that have never had access to CHIP or healthy families and that is one thing that's really hurting the community.

Mr. Foley mentioned that CHIP is level funded in this budget. He asked Ms. Ralston to take a moment to explain the situation with Mountainside.

Ms. Ralston explained that the County and City had a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Jefferson Area Board for Aging (JABA) and JEC, Inc. to provide some funding for Mountainside Senior Living, which is one of several adult care facilities but one of the largest and one of the only ones that provides a substantial number of auxiliary grant bed spaces in the community which is for low income people. Ms. Ralston said that contract was due to be up March 2012, but the City and County discussed with JABA how to deal with the MOU in the coming years and set about to do some analysis. She stated that, during that analysis, it was discovered that, according to the administrative process code in Virginia, no one can provide additional supplement for auxiliary grant beds. Ms. Ralston said that general operations can be supplemented for a facility like Mountainside, but it can't be tied to auxiliary grant beds because it's technically subsidizing those beds. She stated that they can subsidize Mountainside in general, and Mountainside is a very valuable resource in the community as it provides a lot of bed space but you can't hold the facility as to whom they provide those services.

Ms. Ralston said that Mountainside, JEC Inc. and JABA have made some conscious decisions over the last few years to make some changes as to how they decide supplements for their beds that have not been communicated to the County during the course of the MOU. She said that Mountainside decided to supplement some private-pay people coming into Mountainside, made some changes in how they would allocate beds and reduced the number of licensed beds which decreased revenues, and some other changes that have all impacted revenue. She added that the one issue that is most concerning is that the County can no longer tie the allocation to the auxiliary grant bed.

Mr. Rooker said that the County can tie next year's contribution to their performance in the prior year.

Ms. Mallek clarified that the auxiliary grant money covers 50% of the cost for the person per month, so they've been raising privately the $20,000 annually for those beds which, in the past, was supplemented by the County to offset that the gap.

Ms. Ralston said that the other thing to keep in mind that supplementing Mountainside for general operations does open the Board up for other adult care facilities to ask for the same thing. Mr. Boyd said that's been his concern all along when they extended the MOU, as to whether they really want to get the County involved in the assisted living facility business.

Ms. Mallek said that Windham was about to go bankrupt, and the County came to JABA and asked for help, and that's how all this started. Mr. Davis explained that the County was in the process of getting out of the regional home in Staunton, and sold that property, and there was a savings to the County for a service they had been providing on a regional level. The County then entered into this agreement with Windham at that time for a one-time payment of $177,000 which was going to be used to open and operate this home, without requiring any additional supplement from the County after that first year. He said Windham had a business plan and agreed to gain-share with the County to return the $177,000, but that didn't work out so they came back over the years asking for additional supplemental appropriations from the County but that agreement never changed, and the only compensation that was required under the agreement by the County was the $177,000 to provide those beds for a 10-year period, which has just now expired. He pointed out that, now the County has no agreement with them going forward stating that the County has no obligation to fund them and there has not been any obligation to fund them for the last nine years.

Mr. Rooker asked if Mountainside has any obligation to provide a certain number of beds to the County. Mr. Davis responded no and added that obligation has now been completed. He said they didn't comply with that agreement because they didn't have any gain to share and, over the last 10 years, the County has provided them an additional $585,000 in appropriations that weren't required to be provided under that agreement.

Ms. Mallek commented that that was money well spent for people who needed it, and Mountainside has increased the number of private-pay clients to put towards the auxiliary beds. She stated that she desperately hopes that the County will not turn its back on these folks, because these are people who have worked their lives and have tried to be independent and contribute, and they're just out of money.

Mr. Rooker said he is sympathetic, however, there are also a lot of people that are out there that are not staying at Mountainside who have similar needs, some whom I know firsthand, that don't receive any kind of housing subsidy. He said that there is an aging population in general, and JABA does a terrific job of providing services in this community that other communities don't have, and they do a lot of it with private fundraising. He said he was not averse to increasing the amount they give to JABA, and hopefully they find a way to keep Mountainside open and keep providing some auxiliary beds but he is somewhat averse to the idea of picking out one assisted living facility to subsidize that one and not subsidize others.

He stated that it's a bit of a philosophical issue to him, and they need to improve services to seniors in general in the community, and JABA is focused on those who have the least resources. Mr. Rooker said he would continue the contribution directly to JABA, with a request that they try to provide auxiliary beds as best they can at Mountainside.

Mr. Snow said the contribution should be tied into next year's funding.

Mr. Boyd said the difference is that Mountainside shouldn't be singled out as one particular agency, adding that there is a formula that's nonpolitical and a group that rates them on performance basis. He said the County should not put any others ahead of other people nor just pick winners and losers in that nonprofit community.

Mr. Rooker stated that the County contributed $50,000 last year to JABA in the form of auxiliary beds at Mountainside, so no one is talking about increasing that amount, but just re-categorizing that money and not necessarily tying it to Mountainside.

Mr. Boyd asked if Mr. Rooker felt the County should change its formula for nonprofits and rate seniors higher than youth, for example.

Mr. Rooker said he is saying that the $50,000 that was categorized last year would now be uncategorized; stating that does not increase the amount that the agency receives.

Mr. Boyd said he agreed with that.

Mr. Foley emphasized that JABA doesn't go through the ABRT process, because they have been designated as an agency, not a nonprofit. He said that there is $55,000 set aside and previously it was designated for Mountainside services but Mr. Rooker is suggesting not tying the contribution to any particular facility.

Mr. Rooker said that Board members have expressed a desire that Mountainside continue to provide auxiliary beds there, but he doesn't think it is wise for the County to be taking the approach that it will be subsidizing one assisted living facility and not another.

Mr. Boyd said he agreed. He said giving the contribution to JABA in general allows them to make its own priority decisions as to the most important programs to continue.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Boys & Girls Club requested $45,000 but the recommendation is for $20,000; he also noticed that First Tee had asked for $34,452, but got funded at $0.

Ms. Mallek said that Boys & Girls Club is getting a $7,600 increase based upon what they got last year and they, indeed, did ask for more.

Mr. Thomas said that First Tee has been struggling, and he wondered why they were not getting any money.

Ms. Gretchen Ellis addressed the Board, stating that the Boys & Girls Club submitted a very strong application that showed meaningful outcomes for the children they're serving, and they've also doubled the number of kids they're serving at Southwood. She said they had asked for a separate pot of money for Southwood, but the County couldn't quite assess how that was different from their general youth development operations, so the increase was recommended combining those two programs and it was rated exemplary. She said that the First Tee application was extremely weak, due to the fact they didn't provide any information about need, didn't describe any outcomes, didn't show any benefit to the community or the children they're serving in their application. She said a member of the Agency Budget Review Team made a site visit and was unable to get much more information, therefore, they were not recommended to receive any funding.

Mr. Thomas said the City has abandoned it, and he is trying to salvage it.

Ms. Ellis said that the City did not recommend funding either.

Mr. Rooker said that the Boys & Girls Club and First Tee are night and day, as the Boys & Girls Club runs after-school programs with a strong educational component for many, many children after school.

Mr. Thomas said that he is very familiar with Boys & Girls Club and was one of their original board members, and First Tee is moving in that direction.

Ms. Mallek asked if the summer expanded hours were recommended in the ABRT official number. Ms. Ellis explained that there was a recommendation for funding, and most of that came from the City last year so the funding for the summer expansion is coming from the City this year because those programs are in the City at Cherry Avenue. She noted that James Pierce has said they are beginning to serve more kids from Jack Jouett and are running buses to Cherry Ave.

Mr. Rooker said they are negotiating with the County right now to increase the service in the Jouett area. He added that First Tee is a good organization, and there is a similar program for tennis called Quick Start which is not funded by the County, nor do they fund little league sports. He said he doesn't think they're in the same category as the kinds of things that the Boys & Girls Club do.

Mr. Thomas said that First Tee has enough money currently to go through October right now.

Mr. Foley stated that the criteria the Board has established for funding agencies doesn't lend itself well to tennis and these other programs that were mentioned, not that it's not a valuable thing.

Mr. Snow said that a constituent had asked him if any effort is made when someone on tax relief sells their home to someone who doesn't qualify.

Ms. Mallek stated that it's not a deferral, it's a waiver. Mr. Davis said that it's not like the land use program, where it's multiple years.

Ms. Mallek said that the waiver is for the person, not on the land.

_____

Mr. Letteri reported that Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) is an $8.6-million expense providing primarily mandated services for at-risk children, and revenue sources include the state at $4.7 million and the Schools at $1.2 million through transfer. He said the County's portion of this is $2.3 million, which will actually decrease this year.

Mr. Rooker said that the overall cost of CSA mandated services went up by $2 million, and asked what was done in the program to have the costs increase by 31%. He said that the entire increase was covered by the state at $1.5 million and school fund transfer at $500,000, and asked what the changes were to increase the cost that much. He also asked if the school amount was a new expense for them, and whether they have a revenue item to cover that. He also asked if the benefit increases would be a situation where the state starts increasing benefits, but then starts bleeding that increase over to the localities.

Ms. Ralston responded that the increase is largely on the School side, as there has been a pretty significant increase in special education services costs, and the $500,000 from the Schools is an increase in expenses for them. She said, when this was first set up in 1992, Schools made the conscious decision that it would fund their portion out of their budget and DSS would fund its portion out of Local Government, and it's been that way ever since. She said, otherwise, the County would start to see these increases on the Local Government side pretty significantly. Ms. Ralston added that funding for special education for day operations and day placements for students comes from the School's budget and the funding has stayed fairly constant for the last three or four years.

Mr. Rooker said it all goes into the fund, from which benefits are paid, regardless of the source.

Mr. Boyd said the Board has been trying to get the CSA field leveled for years legislatively.

Ms. Ralston stated that it's not benefits that people get; it is paying for services. She said students who can't be served in the school system have to be put into placements and that's a big cost with some of them being residential, even out of state. She stated it is really based on the IEP that the Schools do, and are mandated to provide services for these children by the federal government. She said that the formula has stayed constant but what is changing is the state's emphasis on the need for more local-only dollars. Ms. Ralston said localities are responding that this is a matching program for children who are essentially wards of the state. Ms. Ralston noted that there's an administrative policy change underway that could have a significant impact on local dollars from a service standpoint.

Mr. Boyd asked if it would be possible to get information on how many individuals are being served under CSA at an annual cost of $50,000 or more. Ms. Ralston said that the state DSS is moving toward a transformation of children's services, and the idea is to serve children in their home community more than ever, to avoid placing them in a residential facility, and serve them with wrap-around services so they can stay with their natural families. She said staff is putting extraordinary efforts into doing that with families now with 'Family Partnership Meetings' that go on with these families at certain decision points along the way. She said that some of these meetings take hours and hours and include extended family in an effort to help establish what can help contribute to making the child safe and keeping the families together. She added that they are bringing kids back, but the wrap-around services sometimes are just as expensive as a placement far away.

Mr. Snow asked if there was any redundancy in the system in terms of the different agencies that also support these types of services. Ms. Ralston said that was one of the reasons why CSA was set up, and there is a Community Policy and Management Team (CPMT) that oversees those funds and, within that, is a structure of teams such as FAPT that reviews all the cases that come into the system so that there is not any overlap, and resources are maximized. She said only core agencies (Health Department, Region Ten, Community Services Board, Court Services Unit, Schools, DSS and Local Government) are involved in the CPMT process.

Mr. Rooker commented that the children usually handled under CSA would not be covered by other agencies such as the Boys & Girls Club, as they can't provide the special services needed and as the law mandates.

Mr. Boyd asked which DSS clients are served through CSA money. Ms. Ralston responded that those funds are expended on foster care children, and also foster care prevention with children designated as a 'Child in Need of Services' by the court, or a child that has come to DSS's attention through abuse and neglect cases. DSS also provides counseling to the adults in order to maintain the child in the home. She also indicated to Mr. Rooker that a lot of those agencies do provide services to some of these children, such as Boys & Girls Club, but it is all part of a service plan that is put together by a team of people for a particular child or family.

Mr. Rooker asked about the administrative expense of CSA and how that is being handled.

Ms. Ralston said DSS receives about $12,000 for administration, and spends about $300,000.

The Board decided to wrap up its discussion for the day.

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

The Board discussed the possibility of postponing the meeting due to snow. Mr. Davis explained that, by statute, if the Chair declares the Board cannot assemble on Wednesday because of weather, everything on that agenda, by law, gets heard at the next regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors, including those items advertised for public hearing, without no additional advertisement required. He said that the complicating factor is that the Board has scheduled an adjourned meeting for Thursday and, if the Board is going hold that budget work session, then it would have to call a special meeting which could then be adjourned to the following Monday, if necessary.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adjourn.

There being no further business, the Board adjourned their meeting at 12:28 p.m.

____
Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 05/01/2013
Initials: EWJ