

A special meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 11, 2013, at 9:00 a.m., Room 241, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. (This meeting was adjourned from a special meeting held on March 7, 2013. The purpose of this meeting was to allow the Board to hold a previously planned budget work session. The March 6, 2013 meeting was cancelled due to hazardous weather conditions.)

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.

### **School Division Budget.**

Mr. Steve Koleszar, Chairman of the School Board, said schools and local government are partners working together to improve the community, the quality of life, and the economic vitality. He presented facts about the school system, stating that the special education numbers are at 10.1% currently – compared with over 18% ten years ago – due to implementation of various academic programs that help students who were marginally classified as special education and are now progressing on grade level. Mr. Koleszar said that does not help reduce special education costs because it is the very severe disability cases that drive the cost of special Ed upward significantly. He stated that the free and reduced lunch program continues to increase, now up to 27% of all students; it used to be about 20%.

Mr. Koleszar stated that the charge of County schools is to prepare every student in Albemarle to graduate citizenship, workforce, and college-ready with a set of skills that will positively impact the economy and the community. For every graduate there is from high school, he said, 70% is saved in the cost of social services compared to a non-high school graduate. Mr. Koleszar said that a college graduate's lifetime earnings will be \$1 million more than a non-college graduate, so the investment in education has a tremendous impact on overall quality of life.

Mr. Ned Galloway, Vice-Chairman, said that the School Division is very pleased that its Advanced Placement Program is ranked in the top 3% of all school divisions in the U.S. and Canada. With over 970 total graduates, 560 students took one or more AP course by the time they graduated. The Division also has many talented musicians, thespians and vocalists who earned high honors. Enrollment in those areas has increased over 30% during the last three years.

Mr. Koleszar noted that 71% of graduating students took one or more college-bearing courses.

Mr. Galloway reported that they have some STEM and STEM-H academies in the County. The Health & Medical Sciences Academy, housed at Monticello, was recently named a Governor's Health Sciences Academy. He said that they also began a successful CoderDojo Academy this past year which is expected to expand to a four-week long program beginning this summer. Mr. Galloway said that the Division believes it is getting an incredible return on investment. He then presented a comparison of private schools, City of Charlottesville schools, and Albemarle's schools in terms of per-pupil expenditures versus the education provided.

Mr. Thomas asked where the figure (\$22,750) for private schools was derived. Mr. Galloway said that figure came from St. Anne's-Belfield. The cost is anywhere from \$14,000 to the \$22,750, depending on the grade and school.

Mr. Koleszar said that the state continues to be behind in funding for local education and other local things which has put a lot more pressure on local revenue to meet the needs of a growing enrollment. He stated that instructional challenges include increasing graduation requirements, with the newest being that all graduates must have a virtual course to graduate, beginning with this year's freshmen class. Mr. Koleszar said that there are staffing challenges at large schools. When staffing standards were developed they were developed when the largest elementary school was 600 and the largest middle school was 750. Currently the elementary schools are increasing in size to 750 pupils and one of the middle schools is close to 900 students which are requiring these revisions.

Mr. Rooker said that on the state revenue side, the Governor and House and Senate budget representatives have said that they are providing for a teacher pay raise of as much as 3%.

Mr. Koleszar said that the schools are receiving about \$400,000 for something that will cost over \$2 million. A slide later in his presentation will show that the Division is spending less per student than five years ago which is consistent with state revenue. He also noted that he would address sequestration later in his presentation.

Regarding professional development needs, Mr. Koleszar said that research is fairly consistent in showing that the most important investment to improve the quality of education is improving the quality of

instruction in the classroom. Supporting teachers through staff development is the most critical piece to do that. He mentioned that one future challenge for the schools is funding of a foreign language program at the elementary school level.

Mr. Koleszar reported that the numbers in this presentation are based on what the School Board's budget request with a funding gap of \$1.37 million. There have been some technical adjustments since they sent the funding request. The current funding gap is \$1.2 million. He said that per-pupil revenue is nearly \$1,000 less than it was in 2008-09, when adjusted for inflation.

Mr. Koleszar then presented information on the breakdown of revenues. He noted that the local money that the Division controls includes an increase in facility rental fees and charging students for athletics in an effort to bring in additional revenues. He pointed out that the state has had strong revenue growth in the second year of the biennium, but very little of that has come to education. Mr. Koleszar said that local transfers have been strongly supported, and the schools appreciate local government's efforts in that regard.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that the \$2.61 million (in local transfers) does not include the decision to take over the buses, so in effect that amount is additional revenue. Mr. Koleszar responded that that is correct.

Mr. Koleszar reported that sequestration is a very confusing issue for the schools in terms of how it will actually affect them. It could impact entitlement program income by as much as \$100,000-\$300,000, but it is not anticipated to have much effect in FY13-14 because the federal budget year goes to October, 2013, and a lot of the money has been front-end funded for the entitlement programs. The Division will probably be in a good place for one year. He said that he is not as sure about child nutrition. A few things they can do if the cuts come in are reallocate other staff to do the programs required by the feds even if they do not provide the money, or perhaps increase meal prices for the program. Mr. Koleszar said that the number of free and reduced lunches has meant increased revenues for that program because there is greater participation.

Mr. Galloway said that for the fourth consecutive year maintenance of effort drives the School Division's budget. He said that student enrollment projections continue to trend upward, with the coming school year projected to have 182 additional students. In addition free and reduced lunch numbers continue to trend upward.

Mr. Koleszar noted that the Division has almost as many free and reduced lunch participants as the City of Charlottesville has students.

Mr. Rooker pointed that Agnor-Hurt has 49% free and reduced lunch; Greer has 67%; Red Hill has 51%; and Yancey has 67%.

Mr. Koleszar mentioned that Cale has about 50% ESL students now as well. The Division is seeing a lot of demographic changes in the community.

Mr. Dumler asked if those numbers were due to demographic changes or the overall economy. Mr. Koleszar responded that the numbers may go down as the economy improves, but they have not really analyzed it thoroughly. These numbers are a three-year rolling average, so the full impact of the recession is now being shown.

Mr. Rooker said that enrollment growth averages about 145 students per year. He divided the enrollment increase for the last 23 years by 23 – so that is probably a pretty good bogey for going forward.

Mr. Koleszar said that like students, enrollment jumps do not come in even packets so it is always hard making those predictions. He emphasized that they staff to actual number, not to projected numbers. If a school comes up short, the Division will not hire a staff person which adds to the rift list issues, but is budgetarily prudent.

In terms of maintenance of effort, Mr. Galloway said that they had to maintain commonality with the 2% teacher and classified staff pay increase costs. The Division budgeted \$2.44 million with the state offsetting \$440,000. In terms of reductions, He said that the biggest chunk is in lapse factor, and Division is trying to appropriately budget staff turnover. He then highlighted the reduction where bus replacement was moved over to Capital.

Mr. Koleszar said that the retirements of baby boomers are starting to take place, which is helping the salary picture because the Division is able to hire people with less years of experience. He stated that even though the scale is the same, the average salary goes down to a certain extent because there are less experienced teachers.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Division is losing any quality of educators in that process. Mr. Koleszar responded that they are losing some high quality educators, but also gaining some as younger teachers can be more adaptable and less rigid. It is good to have some turnover.

Ms. Mallek asked what "eliminate transfer to adult education grant" means. Dr. Pam Moran, Superintendent, explained that that's a grant the schools have received in the past that it is no longer receiving from the state, therefore the local match is being reduced.

Mr. Galloway presented the breakdown of instructional needs, reiterating that by the time all current 9<sup>th</sup> graders graduate they must take a virtual course, at a projected cost of \$248,135.

Mr. Koleszar said that is somewhat of a "threat" because the Governor has been trying to pass legislation that would require local funding to go with local students to other school divisions that offer virtual courses. He stated that the Division is trying to develop a much more robust virtual curriculum, including a combination of virtual and actual – as the push today is toward virtual schools. It is important for students to learn how to learn in the digital age. There are a lot of virtual courses out there that are cheap, that are garbage, and if Albemarle is going to do virtual courses it wants to do them right.

Mr. Galloway said that the virtual course piece can also help address space issues.

Ms. Mallek commented that she has been told the County is still lacking the wires needed to get the high schools connected. Mr. Koleszar commented that the County's bandwidth is adequate, and could be enhanced with money in the CIP. He said that increased bandwidth allows for many students to be online at the same time, but at this point the Division is adequate.

Mr. Galloway reported that the response to intervention (\$187,564) piece gets the Division whole to where it needs to be. This addresses students who may no longer be identified as special education, but as at-risk, and can succeed with the right intervention.

Mr. Koleszar presented a chart of expenses as broken out by state categories. There are some technical adjustments from the funding provided in the School Board's adopted budget. The adjustments include elimination of the JROTC program. He said that the County's enrollment never quite got to the 100 that is the standard, so the feds cut the funding this year for Monticello ROTC.

Ms. Mallek asked if the ROTC program had an active duty component as opposed to a reserve or retiree component. Mr. Koleszar said the program had active duty components. The feds were providing \$72,000 for staffing to teach the course with the County augmenting it. He said that the Defense Department is under pressure to cut its budget even without sequestration, and it considered this to be one of the weakest in terms of enrollment.

Mr. Galloway said that the feds have become very rigid in its guidelines in terms of criteria that must be met.

Mr. Koleszar stated that it is unfortunate because the enrollment in ROTC is the highest it has been, at around 70, and with a few more years Monticello may have reached 100.

Mr. Billy Haun, Assistant Superintendent for Student Learning, said that the feds used to allow the students to be counted once for the regular ROTC class and once for the drill team, but they ceased those two years ago and it really hurt the numbers. In the 10 years that the Division has had the program, it never reached the \$100 mark.

Mr. Thomas asked if there it mattered that the student was male or female. Mr. Haun responded "no".

Mr. Koleszar noted that the School Board had to do a correction in its group life insurance rates because it did not include in the budget the employee share of VRS life. That cost will be covered out of the Division's fund balance. In terms of adjustment for state revenues, the \$70,598 is the lowest amount of money in the second year of a biennium that the Division has seen increased from the state.

Mr. Rooker asked if that amount from the state includes salary adjustment money. Mr. Koleszar said this amount is the difference between the Governor's proposed budget and what actually came out of the legislature.

Mr. Koleszar stated that School Board is asking the Board to help it close their \$1.2 million funding gap. Some suggestions are to partially equalize the tax rate, allocate one-time money from General Government's fund balance, update current year revenue forecast and allocate additional revenues to the School Division, or increase the School Division's share of revenue. If the Division does not get the additional money, it may have to increase class size, cut programs, or reduce personnel. He added that just like the Board's budget, the School Division does not have any fat that it can cut.

Mr. Rooker asked if the School Board has looked specifically at what would be cut, such as a priority list.

Mr. Koleszar explained that the RTI is an initiative, something the School Board wants to add so that would be the last thing to get cut. He said that the Board felt it should wait until it has the final revenue numbers and then make those decisions. Mr. Koleszar stated that his feeling would be to increase class size because the quality of instruction is much more important in his opinion than class size in terms of bang for your buck.

Ms. Mallek said that if there is a way to do that so it is "less broad brush," then it might not be as bad. Mr. Koleszar said that is correct, but it will have a direct impact on the classroom.

Mr. Rooker said that the requirement for virtual classes is viewed by the state long term as a cost reducer, but the School Board is showing a cost increase of approximately \$250,000. Mr. Koleszar

responded that ultimately it will reduce costs, but until there are teachers who know how to teach in that environment, they are probably going to need to be teaching about the same number of students. He added that once they become more comfortable in their ability to teach that way, they will be able to teach more students as effectively so class size can be increased without having a negative effect on the quality of instruction.

Mr. Rooker said that the City of Charlottesville is also going through this same process. At a prior group meeting discussion virtual learning was an area contemplated with the possibility of combining effort and thus saving money. Mr. Koleszar said that the County is working together closely with the City, so that can possibly reflect some savings if they can work together and offer a broader scope of courses.

Mr. Snow stated that the School Board's budget reflects a \$1.5 million budget shortfall, but it also states that the Division may not know the budget gap due with government funding for several months and that may affect the disparity. Mr. Koleszar said that the numbers with the budget adjustment are now somewhat firm even though the Governor has not signed the budget. When the School Board sent the request to the Board, it had not received a budget from the state, but there is one now and no indication that it will change between now and when the Governor signs it. He reiterated that the adjusted figure is \$1.2 million.

Mr. Thomas asked about the impact of the composite index on the budget. Mr. Koleszar responded that this is the second year of the biennium so the composite index does not change, but next year it will and the impact is uncertain.

Mr. Galloway commented that there are new members on the City School Board who have come on beyond that point, so there is a new spirit.

Mr. Snow noted that nationally there has been a drop in the birth rate, and asked if they were aware of anything predictive of fewer students in the future. Mr. Koleszar responded that the projections they use are based on live birth rates. They also use projections from the Weldon Cooper Center. They never know is the impact of the economy on in-migration and out-migration which can change fairly dramatically. He added that he would not be surprised to see parents moving into the area to avoid some of the problems they are experiencing in Fluvanna County schools. Traditionally younger families who cannot afford to live in Albemarle are living in outlying counties but changes in home prices can make a pretty dramatic difference in that dynamic.

Mr. Galloway said that the Schools Long Range Planning Committee does take the live birth rate statistics into account, but also factor in the arrival of first graders who might be in private preschool.

Mr. Dumler asked them to comment on the CIP projects that did not make the cut this year. Mr. Koleszar replied that the School Board put maintenance projects as their highest priority, which includes the critical septic infrastructure at Yancey. He said that the highest priority new projects are: 1) the expansion at Agnor Hurt, 2) the Enterprise Center to get students out of trailers, and 3) the Crozet expansion to meet critical seat needs. Mr. Koleszar stated that based on what he has heard from the Redistricting Committee for the western feeder pattern, expanding Crozet makes the most financial sense.

Mr. Rooker said there is an expense for Murray expansion as well. Mr. Koleszar clarified that the Murray expansion is the Enterprise Center item, since they are both on the same campus. He said that the critical need there is driven by the number of students in trailers, which is why it rose to the top of the priority list.

Ms. Mallek asked about the MESA funding and the expansion to 238. She said that she has been hearing that there are a lot of applications for that program. Mr. Koleszar said they would get to that item momentarily.

Mr. Koleszar then reported that the next area is educational excellence. Educational excellence is more than just maintenance of effort; it is meeting students at the leading edge of their potential. That is the reason the School Board is going to a strategic plan review. His feeling is that the worst thing you can do in an excellent school system is to get complacent and say "we are there". If you are not continuing pushing to improve and struggle to get better, you will go downhill.

Mr. Koleszar thanked Board members for participating in the schools' strategic planning process.

He then presented a list of what the Division thinks educational excellence looks like going into the future: transformation of classrooms into innovative learning environments; development and implementation of a full one-to-one technology initiative; development and implementation of a world languages program in elementary schools; adopting world languages; and implementation of a fully staffed instructional coaching model – which has generated requests from all over the country to come here and observe that system. Mr. Koleszar noted that the coaching model may be an entrepreneurial opportunity to add some revenue that will in turn support staff development.

Mr. Rooker asked what is meant by transformation of classrooms and innovative learning environments, and whether there is a price tag on them. Mr. Koleszar responded that there is a small price tag. The School Board has redirected existing monies to do them. The best example is a chemistry classroom at Western Albemarle where the teacher set up workstations instead of rows of desks. He said that this teacher does not do any lecturing, but instead lays out the curriculum and goes from student to student. When the students pass one module, they go onto the next module. It is very individualized and

“student-directed” learning, which are the skills students need for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Mr. Koleszar stated that the costs included buying furniture, but most of the investment was the teacher’s time in redeveloping her curriculum. He said that the School Board has implemented “Design 2015,” whereby every school and division has submitted an internal grant to do this school by school to have a broader impact on instruction.

Mr. Snow asked how this is different than the “pod-style” open classrooms of the late 1970s. Ms. Mallek responded that that was 300 kids in a pod, and this is 30.

Mr. Galloway said that this is still in a contained room, but gives the teacher the flexibility of the space. He said that they are incorporating this same flexibility into spaces like the library, where a room can be changed around from week to week.

Mr. Snow commented that the open-style classroom was deemed to be ineffective by the 1980s, so schools returned to the traditional classroom.

Dr. Moran explained that she began her teaching career in an open-space middle school, and this is nothing like that. She stated that they are looking at setting up a more “21<sup>st</sup> Century” learning environment, whereby students are able to use technologies in ways that allow teachers to individualize and personalize learning. It will take the ceiling off for kids, as well as also help kids get to the bar, so that technologies are a part of it and space is a part of it so that they have opportunities for teachers to teach in multiple ways – that do include lecture, but also collaborative work as well as individual work. Desks lend themselves less to that than some version of tables that can be reconfigured. The most important thing is pedagogy which is how the teachers make sure that the system has the strategies in place. Dr. Moran said that one of the failures of the 70s was they spent a lot of time focusing on building those spaces, but did not teach teachers how to teach kids in the more individualized ways. In her opinion, that approach created “the zoo on the hill” that came out of the pod environment of the 70s. Dr. Moran invited Board members to come visit the chemistry classroom at Western Albemarle and the library at Monticello, as well as some elementary schools that are “redesigning up.” She added that the Division is trying to prepare the students to go to work in an environment that is much more going to be like the world of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, in terms of work spaces. She said that students have gotten away from the concept of being able to actually “do things with what they learn,” so they are looking at CTE (Career and Technical Education) programs as a way to strengthen this kind of work as well.

Mr. Snow said he has been in the classroom at Western to observe, and was just curious about the difference in approach. Dr. Moran said that the Division is not looking to turn back the clock to those facilities of the 1970s and make those mistakes.

Mr. Koleszar mentioned that this really goes back to the importance of staff development. They are finding that some of the largest amounts in these grants are not for furniture – they are for teachers to learn how to teach in this kind of environment. He pointed out that one of the reasons the eight-period day failed is that they did not invest the time and the effort needed in staff development to adapt to this changed environment.

Mr. Snow commented that he sees how this will help students with critical thinking, rather than regurgitating facts learned through a lecture.

Mr. Rooker noted that some companies are doing away with assigned workspaces, and employees can come in and set up anywhere they can find space in the building. This is a little bit more along those lines.

Dr. Moran said that this is “flexible spacing,” whereby students can work independently as well as together in small groups.

Mr. Thomas stated that Murray has that at the grammar school level, which is exercising students’ minds better.

Mr. Rooker asked if there is a cost estimated for shifting to this. Mr. Koleszar responded that this will be a multi-year process.

Ms. Mallek said that there is money in the CIP fund currently for fairly small structural changes.

Mr. Rooker said he is trying to understand the long-term expense.

Mr. Koleszar clarified that it is more of an operational expense, and that is why the Division has been able to fund it through existing funds. They have a staff development budget, some of which has been moved over to these grants.

Ms. Mallek asked if professional development is mostly in house. Mr. Koleszar responded, “Yes”.

Mr. Rooker also asked about the world languages program in elementary schools – how many different languages, etc. Mr. Koleszar explained that they will try to focus on just one. About ten years ago they tried to implement a program of tapes – and it was effective for K-1, but was appalling for anything higher than that. He said that if they are going to do that, they need foreign language instructors, and that is going to be a pretty sizable cost, similar to the cost of art and music.

Mr. Thomas commented that he heard from several school principals about the need for more language teachers. Mr. Koleszar said that is due to the increase in enrollment of English as a Second Language students (ESL). For schools like Cale where they have over 50% of students who are ESL, they are experimenting with having several hours a day of instruction in Spanish for all kids. He also said they were doing some strategic hiring, with a preference given to bilingual teachers if they are equal in skill set to competitive applicants.

Mr. Koleszar reported that they increased the number of slots in math from 50 to 75. The Division had 154 applications from 9<sup>th</sup> graders for the MESA Academy – which is double the number of slots. He said 26 students applied who were Albemarle County residents who did not go to County schools as 8<sup>th</sup> graders, but only 11 of those were accepted. The acceptance rate from private schools is lower than the acceptance rate from County schools.

Ms. Mallek said she thinks that is part of the problem in that students who have gone through the County's middle schools, with the limitations they are given, are not being accepted. Mr. Koleszar reiterated that private school applicants are not being accepted at a higher rate.

Dr. Moran noted that when the Division started this program, it did not anticipate having the significant interest in this academy that has developed, and they are seeing the same trend at the health and medical sciences academy. They are finding that parents want those customized options as well as the students. She is concerned about how to balance such a program within their facilities. The programs are open to all residents within the County, not just to the students within the school district. She said that Western Albemarle will probably present a proposal for an academy next year as well.

Ms. Mallek commented that there is a strong perception that there is a huge difference between the regular high school experience and the MESA experience, which has exacerbated the demand for honors students to get those spots.

Mr. Koleszar said that they are trying to use MESA as a model of great instruction with the Design 2015 so there will not be that significant a difference. For example, the transformation of the chemistry classroom at Western is the same kind of instruction going on at MESA. That is the type of goal the Division is trying to achieve. These academies are designed to be models of great instruction. He said that in the work session the School Board had a year or two ago on 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning spaces, he learned that when you want to transform a system, "you cannot just cookie cutter it; you have to let it grow organically." It takes time to let the program grow; it cannot just be forced. The pressure for an academy at Western is coming from the students rather than the faculty.

Mr. Rooker said that for a number of years people have been moving to the area and buying a house so their kids can go to a school in the western school system. It is a good thing that the Division is achieving some kind of reasonable equity in other schools now in terms of results.

Mr. Koleszar stated that they are also contemplating building a "high school of the future" as part of this effort. Delegate Landes put through a budget amendment in this year's General Assembly session for research money for the high school of the future, taking into account the kinds of things the County is trying to do. He added that as this project develops, it will allow students who could not get into MESA to have a program of equal stature. They are partnering in this process with the University of Virginia. Mr. Koleszar said that Albemarle is a leader in the state and is becoming a leader in the nation. They have a request for a high school in the CIP that will actually cost much less than a traditional high school.

Mr. Boyd asked if the new high school they are thinking of would be a specialty type high school. Mr. Koleszar responded that it would be along the lines of the concept of a magnet high school, with improved instruction, and would probably save the County in capital costs. The focus is to shift away from rote learning, memorization and passing standardized tests to project-based learning and what kids can do right away.

Mr. Koleszar concluded his presentation by thanking everyone who worked on the budget. He stated that they encourage lots of input from constituents on the budget and appreciate all the thoughts. Mr. Koleszar said that he hears "lots of horror stories" from schools around the state who struggle with funding, and he can say with confidence that the Board of Supervisors supports Albemarle Schools. The School Board continues to appreciate all of the Board's support, and hopes that the Board will be able to help the School Board with its current shortfall.

Ms. Mallek asked about the activity buses at the end of the day being cut. Mr. Josh Davis, Chief Operating Office, responded that the activity buses have not changed in the four years he has been working here. There are two or three buses at each of the high schools.

Mr. Rooker stated that the schools' expense breakdown proposes that it will spend 3.72% on administration, which is less than one-half of what it spends on building maintenance services, and quite a bit less than it spends on transportation services. He said that his impression is that at the administrative level the schools are running a pretty lean operation.

Mr. Koleszar said that before the recession hit, the Division had the Resource Utilization Study – which turned out to be really good timing – and it forced the Division to look at ways to be more efficient. The Division's priority is always to keep its' resources as close to the classroom as possible.

Mr. Snow thanked everyone for helping with his town hall meetings.

Mr. Koleszar commented that he is aware the Board has some concerns about the CIP. If they get to the point where there are additional revenues, the School Board will be glad to speak on what are priorities for funding. Not speaking for the School Board, but he thinks that it would probably choose Crozet as the piece to accelerate because that will address enrollment needs in the western part of the County.

Mr. Rooker said that the schools are short operationally right now by \$1.2 million, so the more that is put into operations, the less there is available for the CIP.

Ms. Mallek said that at some point it would be good to know what would be needed to get real elementary school foreign language as well as musical instruments, like so many benchmark communities have.

Mr. Koleszar stated the School Board had a work session in which it discussed one to one computing and elementary foreign languages, and he, personally, does not believe that Albemarle has the capacity to do the staff development, planning, and strategy work to do one-to-one computing at the same time as a foreign language. He thinks that the one-to-one is less expensive and thus will be tackled first, and in the following year will have the resources to tackle the elementary foreign language. The Division cannot do both at the same time; it does not have the resources.

Mr. Snow asked for an update on the internet connectivity program. Mr. Koleszar responded that Mr. Vince Shievert, Chief Information Officer, could do a presentation for the Board, but would need to know what kind of information is desired, or he could sit down with Mr. Snow individually to go over all of that.

Ms. Mallek said that the Board asked questions at the Board-to-Board presentation several months ago, at which time he said it was in process to hardwire schools.

Mr. Snow said that he noticed there is money in the budget for it.

Mr. Shievert addressed the Board, stating that there are two projects happening concurrently – the interconnection between locations to circulate data in and around school buildings, and the other is the wireless project. He stated that the schools are at the point now where they will do a large-scale pilot. They have a current pilot operation at Albemarle High School that includes an eight-mile radius with wireless connectivity. Mr. Shievert said they will be moving that to a cellular tower, which will provide up to a 30-mile radius of coverage from the cellular tower on which they locate the equipment which will allow the ability to test out the equipment that they would look for a full-scale deployment. He stated that they have done a wireless analysis to see where coverage rates would be and where they would need to put equipment to provide coverage throughout the entire County, and at that point they will be able to figure out what the build out would be. Cost, need, etc., will then be factored in. Mr. Shievert said that until they have a final solution on the equipment, it is difficult to be able to put that out.

Mr. Koleszar asked where that tower will be located. Mr. Shievert responded that the least expensive is Carter's Mountain because of the infrastructure that is already there. The schools are still investigating other cellular providers, both local and nationally, that might be interested in partnering.

Mr. Dumler asked what he means by "different technologies." Mr. Shievert replied that technology is referring to the wireless connectivity, so whether it will be an LTE or WiMax solution – and whatever direction they choose, they want to ensure that it is sustainable for the future.

Ms. Mallek asked if the schools are also taking into consideration the overlay of where services are currently being provided so as not to replicate in areas where the service already exists. Mr. Shievert said that even though they may have coverage, some families may not have the capability of taking on a monthly expense. The schools are taking into consideration the whole package.

Mr. Rooker asked if residents who live within an eight-mile radius of Albemarle High School can receive service. Mr. Shievert said the schools have not gone out and put equipment at a house, but theoretically, it could exist.

Mr. Rooker asked if a similar tower or a series of towers would be used in taking this out to a 30 mile radius. Mr. Shievert replied, "Yes", and it would be a single tower. He added that Carter's Mountain would give the schools that geographic reach.

Mr. Snow asked if this system will help reach the 10% of the County that is still not covered with internet service. Mr. Shievert responded that they will not have that 10%; their goal is to fill in the gaps. He said that the schools do not currently have the return on investment requirements that AT&T or Verizon would have to be able to put equipment in locations, and they have physical and land assets throughout the County whereas AT&T and Verizon do not. Mr. Shievert said that the ability to use sites such as fire stations as cellular sites are all things that they are taking into consideration as they develop their plan.

Mr. Boyd asked what the end result is here that the schools are going for, and if they are trying to compete with the wireless community. Mr. Shievert responded, "Absolutely not". Mr. Koleszar responded that this attempts to help those who do not have wireless access at home – either students, teachers, or other staff – be able to access it.

Mr. Shievert added that the individual would actually be connected to the school's network. The individual would have access to the same abilities and resources despite where he or she lives.

Mr. Boyd said that he has access to those systems now.

Mr. Shievert said that option one would be to require students to subscribe to a service to give them access at home, as well as other technologies and infrastructures to be able to allow them remote connectivity. VPN access is not the solution, unless they are going to look at a much different model for bandwidth and connectivity to deliver the type of instructional materials that they deliver over a network. He offered to provide more information to the Board at a later date.

Mr. Rooker said that this Board has enough interest in the matter to put it on a future agenda.

Dr. Moran said that the schools have been working with local government tech staff to work at some collaborative aspects of this, and have reached out to the University as well, so perhaps this could be more of a joint discussion.

Mr. Boyd recalled that the School Division did a survey a number of years ago as to how many students had internet connection, and it seemed like a very high number.

Mr. Shievert said that one of the issues is bandwidth – the speeds at which end users can connect – and only about 40% of households in the County currently have the capability of receiving landline cable. He noted that only people in the urban ring or an established development will have access to high-bandwidth fiber connectivity. They are starting to see differences between those who have the capability and accessing all resources or those who have the ability to access limited resources.

Mr. Boyd asked if the trend is to telecommute students. He reiterated his question about what the long-range plan is. This seems to talk about an awful lot of money.

Mr. Koleszar asked how much has been spent on the pilot. Mr. Shievert responded that the equipment cost between \$5,000-\$10,000, and the connectivity is the Division leasing the bandwidth from the mountain back to the data center.

Mr. Koleszar said so far this is a relatively low dollar project.

Mr. Boyd asked about the \$900,000 figure. Mr. Shievert responded that the \$900,000 is for the basic upkeep of the connectivity that they currently have in the schools.

Mr. Dumler commented that that's the LAN/WAN program.

Mr. Boyd asked how much the schools have spent on bandwidth over the last five years because it seems like it's a million dollar entry every year. Mr. Shievert responded that in previous years the \$900,000 was broken up between "LAN" and "WAN" in the CIP. He explained that LAN – local area network – is the connectivity inside schools. There is a series of equipment in each school called "switches," which interconnects all the network inside. He said that the WAN – wide area network – connectivity is the connection between individual sites. Mr. Shievert explained that the LAN cost is a repetitive cost every four to five years, which is reflected in this CIP. Over the last two years there was also the wireless build out – which increased wireless connectivity inside schools to support 21<sup>st</sup> Century instruction. He emphasized that these are not future demands, they are current demands that the schools are struggling to keep up with. Mr. Shievert said that the CIP request he has put forward is actually a reduction in the cost, if you added up the previous years in the past. The \$900,000 is a consolidation of LAN, WAN, and wireless moving forward. If he does it altogether, he has the ability to reduce ongoing cost.

Mr. Boyd asked if Mr. Shievert could provide a breakdown of those numbers. Mr. Shievert responded, "Yes". Mr. Koleszar suggested that Mr. Shievert share with the Board the things that the schools are doing either at a Board meeting or a joint meeting of the two boards.

Mr. Foley stated that staff has tentatively scheduled an April or May review of getting to the 10% of lack of coverage and how these plans help to meet that. There are some bigger issues beyond the School CIP approaches associated with this as well.

Ms. Mallek commented that she looks forward to having upper-level language with 10 kids at each of the four schools participating. Mr. Koleszar responded that they have the technical capability to do that now, but do not necessarily have the staff development and preparation to make that happen. He said that there are a lot of advantages to having asynchronous courses too, where students are collaborating but may be doing different things at different times. Mr. Koleszar emphasized that the School Board wants to make sure that all its virtual courses are more of a "hybrid course," with a teacher working with the class as well as the virtual element. He emphasized that the Division has a commitment to excellence and do not want to put the students into any kind of courses that are not excellent.

Ms. Mallek commented that she is glad the Division has this technological ability to do what it is doing.

Mr. Koleszar thanked the Board for its continued support in the County School Division.

**Note: At 10:22 a.m., the Board took a recess and reconvened at 10:34 a.m.**

**Continuing issues from Prior Work Session.**

Ms. Allshouse addressed the Board, stating that they would be discussing items Board members identified at prior work sessions. Staff's goal is to have the Board approve the proposed budget for public hearing and then set the 2013 tax rate for public hearing. Ms. Allshouse then reviewed the following list of items for discussion:

**Operating Budget**

• JABA-Mountainside Operations	\$53,821
• Adult Care Facility Reserve	(53,821)
• Foothills Child Advocacy Center	\$ 2,065
• Public Defenders	69,482
• CAT Option A	47,294
• Municipal Band	8,000
• Historical Society	29,000
• Discovery Museum	9,400
• Earlysville EMT training	11,000

**Total \$176,241**

**Capital Budget**

- Additional **\$500,000** in CIP funding for Transportation Revenue Sharing Match

Beginning with the adult care facility reserve, which was placed in a non-departmental reserve, Ms. Allshouse said that her understanding is that the Board recommended moving those funds to JABA for Mountainside operations, in a broader way as the Board could not identify it for auxiliary grant beds.

Mr. Rooker stated that he has no preference as to whether it is designated to JABA in general, or for Mountainside operations. Mr. Davis responded that the County does not have a specific agreement with JABA regarding those funds, nor has there been an agreement with JABA for money provided over the last eight years used to fund Mountainside.

Mr. Rooker stated that the \$1.2 million shortfall in the school budget should be added to the list for discussion.

Mr. Boyd asked where staff would come up with the \$176,000 if the Board decided to fund everything on the list. Ms. Allshouse responded that the Board would have to reduce expenditures elsewhere, or come up with additional revenues. She said that staff worked hard to identify all revenues and were careful with expenditures. It will be extremely challenging to take that any further areas to reduce or revenues to increase funding. Ms. Allshouse said that staff is looking at potential state increases in revenues for the constitutional officers – which may bring in an additional \$30,000. However, Mr. Ron White, from the Housing Department, has also said that he may lose \$40,000 in revenues for the housing voucher program. She said there is also potentially an opportunity for revenue related to state-funded local employees in the Department of Social Services, which is formula-driven.

Mr. Dumler asked if the \$250,000 set aside in the reserve contingency would be maintained throughout the year. Mr. Foley responded that it would be maintained. During the current year, the Board used that reserve for things it deemed essential. Ms. Allshouse said that last year the Board had the reserve for discussion, but that is not available this year.

Ms. Mallek suggested that the Board talk about different levels of equalization that might get support.

Mr. Rooker asked what the equalized rate would be. Ms. Allshouse responded that the Assessor's Office indicated that it is estimated at .78 cents.

Ms. Mallek asked what the money equivalent of that would be. Ms. Laura Vinzant said that the equalized rate would be a 1.8-cent increase, and that would provide about \$980,000 for the local share and \$1.47 million for the schools, and \$279,000 additional to the CIP for a total of \$2.7 million.

Mr. Foley commented that the Earlysville item is one-time money because it is a start-up effort.

Mr. Rooker said he believes that item should be funded. Ms. Mallek agreed.

Ms. Mallek asked about the Discovery Museum item. Mr. Dumler stated that the Discovery Museum is the only item other than Municipal Band that seems to fall into the non-ABRT category.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the item was reviewed by the ABRT. The application was ranked as "weak." She said that last year the County provided \$2,500 to the Discovery Museum and received a state matching grant in that amount.

Mr. Dumler asked if that ranking was because of the criteria that were set out. Ms. Allshouse explained that ABRT said in its review of the application stated that “no projected or actual outcomes were identified; strategies for achieving outcomes or indicators were not described.”

Mr. Thomas commented that ABRT made the same comments about the First Tee Program.

Ms. Mallek said that the Discovery Museum is different from the band, because it is mostly a “Charlottesville” item. Hearing no other comments from Board members, Ms. Mallek suggested removing that item from the list.

Ms. Mallek then mentioned the addition of the Historical Society to the list.

Mr. Snow explained that he has received a letter from Stephen Meeks; the request is not for \$29,000. The request is for \$13,000 for funding Rio Hill (\$8,000), as it is the only Civil War battle site in the area and to fund some exhibits (\$5,000). The Historical Society is also interested in proceeding with the purchase of the old jail to turn it into a historical site. He would like the County to meet with Mr. Meeks to discuss his plans for the old jail and their available funding sources.

Mr. Rooker said he questions whether this is the way to fund historic preservation. For years, the Historic Preservation Committee wanted some staff support so they could move forward with a number of the projects that have been assigned to them – and the County has not provided that financial support. He stated that his question is whether the best way to do this is to give money to the Historical Society, or to fund a staff person to carry this out.

Mr. Thomas commented that education is one of their primary objectives.

Mr. Dumler said that cataloging of historical assets is one of the things that staff used to do, but that was eliminated.

Ms. Mallek said it would be hard to match the volunteer efforts brought in for \$13,000-\$20,000 with a paid staff person.

Mr. Dumler stated that there are also many matching grant opportunities.

Mr. Foley clarified that there are two different objectives here. Anything that County staff is doing toward historic preservation is very minimal.

Mr. Rooker said that the first step is deciding whether the Board wants to put money into historic preservation beyond the current minimal staff time and, if the Board makes the decision to do so, then it needs to decide the best way to do so. The Board could provide some funds to the Historical Society because it could leverage the funds better than the County could internally or the County could provide one-third of a staff person dedicated to historic preservation. He added that he is not sure the Board could make that decision today.

Mr. Snow commented that those are good points, and they should be asked prior to making a decision on the matter.

Mr. Dumler asked if it is something to be discussed at a later time.

Ms. Mallek said that some amount of funding could be added in the budget as a placeholder while they are trying to decide.

Mr. Boyd said he is having trouble with the whole discussion, because the Board would have to take money from somewhere else or raise the tax rate – which he is not inclined to do again this year. He said that the Board needs to get past that conversation before deciding what it is going to put in there or not put in there.

Ms. Mallek stated that the Board could keep a \$13,000 placeholder for historic preservation.

Mr. Boyd commented that the public defender’s office has made a good case for some funds. Ms. Mallek agreed.

Ms. Allshouse said that the Municipal Band has requested \$8,000 from the County and \$72,885 from the City. The County provided \$8,000 in FY13, but the ABRT ranked the FY14 application as “poor” and recommended no funding. The City recommended \$36,443 for FY14, or 50% less than the prior year.

Ms. Mallek said that she supports the Municipal Band’s request because they bring people in from all over the region, it is free to everyone, and there are lots of musicianship opportunities for people of all ages. She said that she hopes the Board can find \$8,000 for them.

Mr. Snow said that he has received quite a few e-mails and would support that also.

Mr. Rooker said that he would support the Municipal Band’s request too. He added that the Board received some information that the Band has had more performances in the County than in the City during the year.

Ms. Mallek said the Band is trying its hardest to take what was an arts activity and make it conform to the County's expectations and needs.

Mr. Boyd commented that all of the items on the list are worthwhile, but there is a process set up for vetting them.

Ms. Mallek said that the ABRT process is a recommendation, and noted that some things just do not fit in that evaluation.

Ms. Allshouse reported that Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) Option A is called "Rio Road or Fashion Square to Downtown," and that route is not currently included in the City's budget although the City would have to fund it along with the County.

Mr. Thomas asked if the \$47,000 was a joint amount, but staff and Board members confirmed that each entity would need to pay that amount. Ms. Mallek said City Council is waiting to see what the Board does before going ahead with that bus route.

Mr. Thomas said that people who live in the Rio Road area are begging for a bus route.

Ms. Mallek stated that it would help everybody because it would provide a very important link to all other bus routes in addition to being a huge improvement over option B.

Mr. Thomas noted that it would accommodate Stonehenge, Treesdale, and the new Lochland development.

Mr. Rooker said the County has added a lot of density in that area, it's close to the City and to not have bus service come through that area is a mistake.

Mr. Boyd asked what the ridership numbers are, as predicted by the consultant. Mr. Rooker stated that there are about 250 riders per day.

Mr. Snow said that he would also support option A.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the public defender's request does not have City funding at this point.

Mr. Rooker said he agrees with all the emails that say public defenders should be paid on a comparable pay scale as the prosecutors, because that is a "laudable goal." He pointed out that public defenders are state employees, are not on the County's pay plan and have no agreement with the County. He stated that this would be taking on a continuing obligation to enhance the pay of state employees to handle cases 50/50 between the City and the County. Mr. Rooker said that he would be open to talking with the City about whether this is an undertaking that the City and County should jointly move into but, because the City is not including this in its budget, it doesn't make sense for the County to fund the differential.

Mr. Dumler asked if the County could pursue a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the public defender's office and, at the same time, make any appropriation contingent upon a similar appropriation from the City. Mr. Foley responded that Albemarle County would be the first in the state to undertake this, if the Board were to choose this route.

Mr. Rooker said he is not supportive of making this decision today to include this in the budget, but he would support discussing this with the City in the future. He emphasized that the Commonwealth Attorney's Office is an Albemarle County office, not a joint City/County office, and they handle cases in the County only.

Board members agreed that they would like to move forward on having a discussion with the City on the matter, but could not support funding it in the FY 14 budget.

Ms. Allshouse stated that the Foothills Child Advocacy Center was rated very highly by the ABRT, and they requested \$32,450 from the County and \$28,875 from the City – and the current recommended budget includes \$30,385 which is a 3% increase over the FY13 funding. She noted that an additional \$2,066 would fully fund their request.

Mr. Foley pointed out that all of the agencies that scored well received a 3% increase.

Mr. Rooker said he didn't see a basis for distinguishing this organization over other agencies that had very high rankings from the ABRT committee.

Ms. Mallek said her concern is lumping everyone into the same category – the band and children for example – those who are greatly in need. She added that the broad-brush approach is not necessarily the very best thing the County can be doing.

Mr. Boyd said the Board might need to change the ABRT criteria.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that the Board supports arts in the community, supports child advocacy organizations, and it's always difficult to decide whether it should give anything to the arts or give it to organizations that do work which might be considered more compelling in the community.

Ms. Allshouse said that the Board has discussed increasing the amount of money put toward revenue-sharing with the state in order to pull down the match for transportation, and the Board has asked the question on whether there are categories of funding currently in place prior to FY14 that could be used for that match. She said staff members from OFD, OMB and Community Development have identified approximately \$450,000 in current money that could be designated toward the match for FY15 state funding; adding that, in FY14, there is already a \$1 million match. She said the cycle is tied to the application year.

Mr. Benish explained that, this past fall, the Board agreed on four sidewalk projects and the lighting synchronization program and the County has made that submittal, although he has not yet heard whether or not there's going to be an award. He said that, in last year's budget, the Board set aside \$1 million to match that request, so what's already in place has a match and staff hasn't yet discussed with the Board which projects would be under next year's requests.

Ms. Mallek confirmed with staff that there would be \$500,000 in cash, as discussed at the Board's last meeting, plus \$450,000 identified in equivalent projects which is a great idea.

Mr. Foley stated that, this year, staff reallocated funds based upon the ability to submit a request.

Mr. Rooker said that it would be wise to use that pot of money and leverage it for those projects the Board would expect to do anyway in the CIP, and asked if there was a need for the current year.

Ms. Allshouse explained that the County develops the FY14 budget with a thought toward the state's FY15 match because of the application process, so the County has the money in place for the FY14 state application.

Mr. Foley said that, if the Board would like to make a stronger commitment, it would be easy to reallocate the money into revenue sharing and then, when it comes before the Board in the fiscal year, there would be money set aside moving forward.

Ms. Mallek asked if that would mean delaying projects, and staff confirmed that it would not. Mr. David Benish stated that the only potential delay is that some of the reserved money could be in contingencies if staff sees unforeseen costs, which is always the case.

Mr. Rooker said if the County predicts, as the year goes on, that there will be General Fund surplus going into capital, then the Board would have a preference to use the first slice of that money for revenue-sharing projects so matching money could be obtained.

Mr. Foley noted that the County has shifted from revenue sharing to pay for priority transportation projects to dedicate all of revenue sharing for sidewalk and crosswalk improvements, because those projects are so large it is difficult to make much of a difference. He stated that, at some point, they are taking revenue-sharing money and supporting sidewalk and pedestrian improvements rather than building it up for large road projects. Mr. Foley said that it did make a difference in terms of getting the John Warner Parkway done, Jarman's Gap Road done, and Georgetown Road done. He pointed out that they took a few million for sidewalks rather than setting it aside for the next major project, but there is a lot of turmoil going on as to how transportation projects will be funded.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that it took 15 years to get just those three road projects done, adding that when they find out if there really is going to be any local dribble-down funding from the new transportation bill that is supposed to be a big component for secondary roads, then that may change the Board's thinking.

Mr. Boyd mentioned that the County does not have to make application until November.

Mr. Foley said the County should have the transportation numbers, including the change at the state level, and could incorporate that into their work session information over the summer.

Mr. Rooker asked if revenue sharing monies could be banked over time. Mr. Benish responded that one of the things that has changed over time with the revenue-sharing program is the ability to do that, because now, the state wants everything under construction within two years.

Mr. Davis said the state has raised the limit to \$10 million, so the County could potentially wait and accumulate money to apply towards a \$10 million match at that level.

Mr. Rooker noted that one could potentially save up for five years and then find out that the program had changed.

Mr. Benish said the County is now doing more locally-administered projects, which is a lot more work for staff, but you have to be moving towards that project fairly rapidly.

Ms. Allshouse said that the Board could come up with another \$50,000 from the CIP fund balance to add to the \$450,000 to make it an even half million dollars to add to the other half million for revenue sharing.

Mr. Rooker stated that he's comfortable leaving it at the \$450,000 and, if the identified projects end up costing more, they could draw down the fund balance at that time.

Mr. Boyd agreed that they could always draw down the fund balance.

Mr. Snow asked when that decision would have to be made about adding the additional \$50,000. Ms. Allshouse responded that the application is due in November.

Mr. Benish said that is when the County agrees on projects, and then the state makes their decision in the spring.

Mr. Snow said he is fine with having the \$950,000 now and, if necessary, accessing the additional \$50,000 at a later date.

Ms. Allshouse stated that Ms. Laura Vinzant would present an updated spreadsheet for the balancing process, whereby the Board can make changes to the budget.

Ms. Vinzant stated that those items for consideration that have been removed from the General Fund by the Board include the Foothills item, the public defender's office, and Earlysville EMT training.

Ms. Allshouse said that the total expenditure adjustments would be \$79,294, leaving a negative of \$68,294 – with the school piece being separate at \$1.2 million for a total gap of just under \$1.3 million.

Ms. Mallek commented that she was comfortable keeping it in capital for the time being.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that these are projections and, while the Board can control things on the expenditure side, there are uncertainties on the revenue side. He stated that the Board's policy has been to move surplus to capital at the end of the fiscal year anyway, so it doesn't need to be spelled out.

Mr. Foley said it's a question of whether the Board would want to allocate that on an ongoing basis for future projects, or just have it be one-time money to help the CIP in the next fiscal year.

Ms. Mallek said that this would be a small step in getting the Board closer to the old routine of putting several pennies off the top into the capital fund which would allow us to build up the fund to get some of these projects done.

Mr. Foley said that the additional allocation of \$1.47 million to Schools would go automatically, so really they're just offsetting it.

Ms. Vinzant clarified that the Schools would get the entire \$1.4 million.

Mr. Davis stated that Schools wouldn't need the \$1.2 million from Local Government, as it would come out of this split.

Mr. Foley said Schools would get \$272,000 more than this gap.

Ms. Mallek noted that the Schools could put that money toward buses since the amount is more than they requested.

Mr. Dumler asked about pulling the Charlottesville/Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau (CACVB) items out.

Ms. Mallek said there would be a presentation at the Board's next meeting on that.

Mr. Foley said staff had provided information to the Board on the funding going from the CACVB to different organizations.

Mr. Dumler stated that the Festival of the Book is on there at half funding, and the Piedmont Council of the Arts (PCA) is unfunded.

Mr. Foley said those two agencies went through an application and review process, and the Board received the scoring criteria in a hand-out.

Mr. Rooker commented that he wasn't sure what happened with the PCA, and he would like some clarification.

Ms. Catlin explained that the PCA is receiving \$10,000 from the CACVB, and they are being funded directly for the cultural plan that is being developed so they did not go through the ABRT process. She said that the Economic Development Authority is committing \$5,000 to the PCA also, based on direction from the Board at last year's work session.

Mr. Rooker asked how that is compared to prior years of funding. Ms. Allshouse said that, in FY13, PCA received \$5,000 through the ABRT process.

Ms. Mallek noted that the County is essentially level funding PCA for operations; however, \$10,000 is being provided to them through the CACVB's cultural plan.

Mr. Dumler asked about the Festival of the Book and their funding from last year. Ms. Allshouse stated that the Festival of the Book was funded by the CACVB last year.

Ms. Catlin confirmed that CACVB funded Festival of the Book to the full extent of the request at \$10,000. She said that, because of the timing of the requests, the Festival was fully funded without a review process and, this year, they went through the review process and received \$5,000 in funding. Ms. Catlin explained that ABRT decided which agencies were appropriate for tourism-related funds, and they were sent to CACVB which had a five-person team, including people from the community, who put together criteria and evaluated applications.

Mr. Rooker said he understood that the Board would determine a reasonable level of funding for these agencies, and the CACVB would pay it recognizing that there was some limit to that. He stated that what is actually happening is that the Board is identifying an agency, and the CACVB is deciding what amount they will pay.

Ms. Catlin stated that part of the reality is that the CACVB is managed by an agreement set up with the City with an 11-person board of directors, including three County employees including herself. She said when the responsibility for providing funding was given to CACVB, so was the ability to make decisions about what that funding level would be. She said that she strongly advocates on the Board's behalf, however, it is still not a situation where the County is able to dictate exactly what amount goes to which agency unless there's something of which she is not aware.

Mr. Foley stated that the Board looked in detail at establishing appropriate criteria, and approved that as the basis on which they ought to evaluate ABRT agencies. He said perhaps there are some criteria that should be added, or the County could send a letter indicating what should be funded; however, it is still going to be a joint City-County decision.

Mr. Rooker said the total contribution that the CACVB is giving to the Festival of the Book is \$2,500 whereas the County used to contribute \$10,000.

Mr. Foley said that the County's contribution went from \$10,000 to \$5,000.

Mr. Rooker stated that it was his opinion this process is not working the way it was expected. He said the County should allocate its own money and look at amending the agreement so that the CACVB is not just being handed money that they're expected to give to agencies. He added that the County would be better off making the agency decisions on its own and keeping more of the money ourselves.

Mr. Foley said that the Board can certainly go about it however they choose, adding that there's a charge for this jointly appointed group and includes revenue that automatically goes to them. He said that, when those agencies were passed along to CACVB, no money was sent over; it was the money they were already giving them.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that it was \$500,000 that was being handed over to the CACVB without any decent agreement as to what should be done for these cultural items, adding that their receipts showed an extra \$35,000. She asked what the CACVB is doing with the \$600,000 that the County has given to them.

Mr. Thomas asked how the PCA and the CACVB collaborate. Ms. Catlin responded that the CACVB is on the steering committee of the PCA cultural plan, a PCA representative is on the CACVB marketing committee, and they collaborate significantly in a number of different ways. She said that, two years ago, the Board had the discussion about the fund balance, and there was a decision to allow the marketing plan to go forward and a commitment of a very substantial amount of that fund balance would be used to support that marketing plan, i.e., the branding, the advertising. She said the CACVB has assumed, with the amount for Journey Through Hallowed Ground, about \$66,000 in funding this year without any increase from the County, although the amount did increase in terms of revenues. She said the question is at what point do the agencies get capped without realizing the impact that has on the CACVB budget. She said, as the Board has seen, the CACVB has a budget that allocates the money that they have available.

Mr. Thomas said that he sees the CACVB as a big part of the Economic Vitality Action Plan and, in his mind, CACVB is performing. He added that the CACVB made a good decision in supporting the PCA.

Mr. Rooker said that the process didn't break down over the PCA; it broke down over some of the other agencies such as the Festival of the Book, which is only getting about \$5,000 in combined City/County contributions, whereas the County alone used to give them \$10,000. He said that is an important festival for this community, and that's just one example. He pointed out that there's a policy issue here beyond looking at what the CACVB did for this particular agency this year. He said the Board had felt that the CACVB was being overfunded, that they were building up big reserves, and the CACVB came back to the Board with a plan for spending some of those reserves on a marketing plan that the Board somewhat approved, however, the question going forward, in his mind, is whether or not the Board needs to renegotiate the agreement with the City in terms of the amount of funds that go to the CACVB. Mr. Rooker said that the Board could have taken back the surplus, but instead came up with a plan for the CACVB to pay the agencies that had particular tourism attributes, and it looks like that's not exactly working the way the Board might have envisioned it working.

Mr. Foley said the CACVB is not funding to the exact amounts the Board had anticipated, adding that the agreement should be renegotiated as the revenues are going to outstrip the operating expenses, and the County shouldn't just keep sending it over. He stated that the issue related to level of funding to

certain agencies relates to what criteria the CACVB is using, whether that is appropriate, whether they are providing adequate support, all of which will impact their fund balance. Mr. Foley said that deciding what level of funding is provided to a certain agency does put them in a little bit of a bind as to how to fund them, as it's coming from money the County already allocates to them.

Mr. Snow asked what is the Board able to do at this point. Mr. Foley responded that, if the majority of the Board wanted to express a concern, or indicate it would take funding back, the Board could then make those decisions.

Mr. Rooker said that, having seen how the process operates this year, he would be in favor of renegotiating the funding formula so the County is adequately funding the tourism bureau, determine their actual expenses plus reasonable reserves and request that the County take back the funding of the agency requirements. He commented that what the County is effectively saying to the CACVB under the present structure is, "Here's our money, you decide how you want to distribute it among these agencies," and he does not believe that is working very well.

Ms. Mallek said, in her opinion, the current process is not working.

Mr. Boyd asked if it would be possible for the CACVB to use the ABRT process for reviewing applications in order to make those recommendations and, if so, incorporate that into the agreement. Mr. Rooker responded that it still comes down to money, and the CACVB would have the latitude to put a fixed smaller amount in for agencies and divide that up. He added that it may have no relationship to the amount of funding that the Board thinks those agencies should get – high or low.

Mr. Foley noted that there is a very focused set of criteria – the tourism benefit and value back to the community versus ABRT, which uses health and safety criteria and a number of other things.

Ms. Mallek said that these particular agencies don't really belong in the ABRT, and that's the problem.

Ms. Allshouse said that the CACVB said that it would only fund marketing parts of their budget, not operations, so there is a difference as to what components the CACVB would fund.

Ms. Catlin stated that if the Board wants to control exactly how much funding goes to what agency, this is not a mechanism that allows the Board to do that.

Ms. Mallek said this was a way to share some expense because that pot of money was there and it has definitely not come about in the way she was hoping it would.

Mr. Snow said he believes the Board has agreed to re-look at the agreement, and asked for suggestions as to how to move forward.

Mr. Foley said that what he's hearing from the Board is it would like to take back these agencies as a County Board decision in terms of how much the agencies would receive, but, in order to do that, the County would need to renegotiate the agreement and determine how much revenue is actually going to them. He said that the question becomes how staff should deal with what's before the Board today, because this year the CACVB has the money and we don't.

Ms. Catlin stated that, by agreement, the County is not able to do anything at this point in time.

Mr. Foley said that, by the end of the calendar year, the Board would need to make changes for next year's funding and, with the direction staff has received today, they will move toward that goal.

Mr. Rooker stated that the Board should accept what CACVB has done, look at renegotiating the contract, and look at the needs of the agencies over the current year – such as the Festival of the Book – to see if supplemental funding is needed.

Mr. Snow commented that this year is already funded so, if the Board reviews the policy this year, it can make the changes and then take some funding to augment next year as well.

Mr. Foley mentioned that City Council may be having the same discussions too, as it is a new process for both entities.

Mr. Boyd commented that if the Board feels more funding for the agencies is necessary, then it can always make that request.

Ms. Catlin said that the funding level has been shared with all of these agencies, and the CACVB has not heard anything back from the agencies yet.

Mr. Rooker stated that the CACVB criteria that they would only fund marketing expenses of agencies is not the kind of criteria the Board would be looking at. He added that the mismatch of criteria is the problem in his opinion.

Mr. Foley said that one approach would be to give the CACVB that feedback and let them keep it, and the other would be funding it from the County side.

Mr. Rooker stated that, this year, the CACVB can be told that some of this funding is inappropriate.

Mr. Foley said that if the Board feels that level funding for the Festival of the Book is appropriate, staff could communicate that to the CACVB. He reported that the Festival of Photography was level funded, the Virginia Film Festival was level funded, the Festival of the Book was reduced from \$10,000 to \$5,000, and the Paramount Theatre went from \$34,000 to \$4,300.

Ms. Allshouse said that the ABRT knew that the CACVB would only fund marketing costs, not the operational.

Mr. Foley stated that the process itself was challenging, and the "only marketing" criteria might have driven some of the confusion.

Ms. Catlin explained that the CACVB review board felt that taking on a lot of administrative and operating costs for a lot of different agencies would start to impact their ability to stay focused on marketing, so they focused mostly on those activities of the tourism-related agencies that were about bringing people into the community through marketing, outreach, publicity, advertising, those types of things.

Mr. Foley said there's some good logic there, but it's kind of a mismatch in terms of funding agencies and, on this list is the question of whether there are other items that should be kicked back.

Mr. Foley reported that the Festival of Photography was level funded at \$10,000; the Festival of the Book was reduced from \$10,000 to \$5,000; the Paramount Theatre went from \$34,000 to \$4,300; the Charlottesville Vegetarian Festival was funded at \$3,000 although their request was for \$6,000; the Jefferson School African-American Heritage Center was funded at \$2,700 although the request was \$10,000; the Piedmont Council of the Arts was unfunded with a request of \$5,000; however, there was other funding provided for specific projects; and the Downtown Business Association (DBA) of Charlottesville requested \$53,888 but received no funding.

Ms. Mallek said that the DBA is strictly a Charlottesville thing, so it shouldn't be funded with County funds.

Mr. Rooker noted that the same is true for the Paramount Theatre, and they didn't apply for County funds.

Ms. Allshouse reiterated that only the marketing pieces were sent over.

Mr. Foley said that the information before the Board should show whether ABRT recommended the operating piece of that agency.

Ms. Mallek said that universally, they were zeroed by ABRT if any part of it was sent to the CACVB which was the missing link of which the Board was not aware.

Mr. Rooker stated that some of these agencies were funded with just City funding, and the only one he would like to have communicated over to the CACVB was the Festival of the Book as there doesn't appear to be a substantial County contribution that was there before. He said that the policy itself would also need to be reexamined.

Ms. Catlin said that staff would certainly communicate that particular agency to the CACVB. She said, if they are looking at criteria beyond what they were looking at in their mission, that gives them more ability to fund those things which are important to the County.

Ms. Mallek expressed surprise that there are three CACVB board members representing the County, when the County pays much more than 50% of the money.

Ms. Catlin stated that that's all done by agreement.

Mr. Foley said that issue would be discussed when staff revisits the MOU.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that the CACVB has to create a new administrative expense in order to evaluate proposals, so it's inefficient and he shares in the blame for allowing it to go forward in this manner.

Mr. Foley said that this approach made sense at the time, but now everyone has the benefit of seeing it actually implemented. He said it will not have any impact on the sheet, but staff will let CACVB know that the Board thinks Festival of the Book should be considered for more funding.

Ms. Mallek stated that, with that in mind, they were back to the total as discussed. She asked fellow Board members if they would join her in supporting an equalized tax rate, in order to fund the things on their list, including the School increase and the small items on the list, as well as putting extra money into capital.

Mr. Snow said that he wouldn't support the equalized tax rate and explained that, last year, he did support the partial tax increase because the Schools said they really needed it at that point, the VRS costs

shifted, they had to renovate a fire station and build a new fire station, and had a library to get off the ground. He stated that, this year, property taxes have decreased for some, but commercial properties have gone up and a lot of the financial burden would be placed on those developments for stormwater management. Mr. Snow noted that the residents at Mosby Mountain have indicated to him that their property taxes went up by 4% to 5% again this year. He said that the Schools have received a million dollar break by moving the buses into the CIP and, last year, most of the tax increase revenue went to the Schools to help them cover their shortfall. He said, "If we can find money for these additional things, that's great, and if we can't – then we can't afford them."

Mr. Rooker said that there's an "in between" view here also. He stated that property values have declined generally and, if someone's went up by 3%, that means someone else's must have gone down by 6% to balance it. He stated that you can only look at it in the aggregate; in the aggregate, property values are down. He said that the School amount is \$1.2 million, and that's a substantial amount of money. Mr. Rooker stated that, for the first time, Schools are budgeting their lapse, as is the County, so that won't be in the surplus at the end of the year. He said Schools have created a tight budget, and one that does not take on a lot of new initiatives, and he thinks the Board should try to find a way to fund some of what the Schools need in order to close their budget gap.

Mr. Rooker said that he would be willing to consider a 0.8% increase, which would put the rate at 77 cents and that would still leave taxes lower than they were last year for the average property owner. He said they simply would not reduce as much as they're currently projected to be reduced. He pointed out that this would raise a total of \$1.2 million, which would provide about \$654,000 for Schools and would allow the Board to fund the small list of items which were reviewed today as well as providing some additional money to go into capital. He stated that the Board needs to build up reserves in capital to handle some very large projects that are coming and are on the list. Mr. Rooker stated that to not start setting aside some funds in capital for those projects isn't wise. He emphasized that his proposal would still reduce the tax burden on the average property owner but would deal with some of the more significant needs.

Mr. Boyd stated that he is not in favor of raising taxes at this point, and he has confidence that, by keeping taxes level, staff will figure out a way to get by without creating a crisis situation.

Mr. Rooker said that he doesn't think there will be a crisis, but the capital needs are significant with the court project alone being \$40 million, and no provision for it today. He said to suggest that not dealing with the Schools' \$1.2 million deficit isn't going to impact the in-the-classroom experience is kidding ourselves, adding that the per-pupil expenditure has actually gone down over the years. Mr. Rooker stated that Albemarle County spends less per student than many, many systems around the state and still dramatically out-performs on standardized tests.

Mr. Boyd claimed there are still school systems that are spending less than Albemarle and outperforming it.

Mr. Rooker said that's not really the case, and Albemarle is in the top 3%.

Ms. Mallek noted that Hanover County may be spending less on schools, but they receive so much support from local industry into schools that doesn't show up in the tax rate, and they have a much greater amount that's available to them.

Mr. Rooker **moved** to approve a real estate tax rate of 77 cents per \$100 of assessed value, which would be a .8 cent increase, which is less than the equalized rate, to help provide some funds for the schools to bridge their gap. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

Mr. Thomas asked whether they had forgotten about the fund balance.

Mr. Snow said that was already reflected here.

Mr. Thomas asked if Schools have already used the fund balance in here, and still need \$1.2 [million] more?

Mr. Foley stated that the Schools are using a good portion of their 2% fund balance, and their original budget had \$1.8 million in it with the \$617,000 added to correct the group life insurance issue. He added that \$3 million is roughly what the total would be, so there is still a bit of a gap in their fund balance available, but some of that is on-going.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that the Board significantly cut their fund balance by stating that everything over the 2% would be shifted over to capital, not operations, which is a good portion. He said he does not see that they have a good internal way to deal with their significant deficit and felt the Board should contribute to solving part of that problem.

Ms. Mallek stated that, when times were lean, people said "we can't do that now because things are going down," but now things are stable and they need to try to change their view from not running away and not doing anything substantial to change where we're going in the future.

Mr. Boyd said that he keeps coming back to the fact that, even though the value of property went down last year, the County still brought in more money than expected because it is driven by the economy, and the emphasis the County is putting on economic growth will bring in additional funds next year.

Mr. Rooker said that the Economic Vitality Action Plan has had no impact on Stonefield or on Hollymead Town Centre, and Avon Center was approved before the plan was implemented. He said that, from a School standpoint, they have to budget now and have to decide what personnel will be in the classroom now. He said that they would likely increase class sizes, as that is the easiest method to achieve savings with 84% of their expense being personnel. Mr. Rooker said that, at the same time, they're increasing the number of students in the system by 150 per year.

Mr. Boyd stated that Murray Elementary School has 25-30 kids in a class size even though it was targeted for 18-21, so increasing the target class size by one person is probably going to have very little impact on what the actual number of kids are in a class.

Ms. Mallek said that is what we thought last year, and it turned out to be grievously wrong as far as the middle and high schools. She said it is not the upper level classes that get nailed, it's the basic level classes where there were eight or nine or ten kids more in there which it makes it very difficult. She stated that they tried to reverse that last year and brought in 17 teachers, and if teachers aren't able to give feedback to these students on basic reading and writing skills, we're not going to help ourselves in our workforce.

Mr. Boyd said that if he thought they would really be harming school children, he would vote for it, but he doesn't think that's true and believes they can figure a way around it.

Mr. Snow asked what the assumption is built into the five-year plan for a projected tax increase. Mr. Foley responded that, in year three, there's a .7% increase, which was targeted to try to offset the gap with the projected expenditures with a lot of it going to Social Services staffing to keep up with that level.

Mr. Boyd said that there are increases in the five-year plan for stormwater management, such as setting up districts.

Mr. Rooker stated that they took the expense out and said, "We'll find a way to fund it." He emphasized that it's not accounted for, and is out of the expenditure side.

Ms. Allshouse said it's an addition.

Mr. Foley indicated that they assumed it would have to be funded, but they haven't generated the revenue to offset it yet.

Mr. Rooker stated that the current tax rate does not cover that expenditure which we need to understand.

Mr. Boyd said that the five-year plan is all just hypothetical, and they're "talking real" now with budget items.

Mr. Rooker stated that they are talking real and he has spent a lot of time going through the school budget and, in hearing the presentation today, he thinks it would be a mistake not to help meet some of that deficit that will most likely have an impact in the classroom. Mr. Rooker emphasized that, in looking at economic vitality, one of the first things employers look at is the quality of the schools and how communities provide for their students.

Ms. Mallek said that many people came to the Board budget hearings last year and said that very thing, that they brought their employees here because they wanted to live here and have their children go to school here.

Mr. Rooker said it seems that Mr. Boyd says, year after year, that funding doesn't make a difference in the classroom.

Mr. Boyd stated that the current rate does increase school funding, by 2% or \$2 million.

Mr. Rooker said that's about equal to the amount in the five-year plan for year three and, if the Board does it now, the revenue would be there.

Mr. Snow said that they increased it last year, took care of the bus expense through the CIP budget, and absorbed the VRS transfer. He added that the Board has already given a significant amount of additional money to the schools this year and, if I felt for one split second that we were hurting our children, I would vote for this. He stated that he has spoken with several people who have said they would be fine with the budget the way it is and that is what he is basing his decision on which are the conversations that he has had and what is already done in this budget.

Mr. Rooker said that, last year, the Board did not raise the tax rate to the equalized amount.

Mr. Snow stated that what they gave the Schools is what they would have given them had they raised it to the equalized rate and divided it with local government as always.

Mr. Rooker said that Schools got 60% as usual, Local Government got 40%.

Mr. Thomas said that the rate went up to 76.2 cents last year.

Ms. Mallek said that what's on the table now is less than 50% of the equalized rate, at .8%. She said that another option would be to not do the raise that's in the budget.

Roll was then called and the motion **failed** by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Mallek, Mr. Rooker and Mr. Dumler.

NAYS: Mr. Thomas, Mr. Snow and Mr. Boyd.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that, in the past, they have made a decision before the public hearing that allows nowhere to go and no feedback on proposals, and that's been very poorly received by the citizenry. She said that, last year, they took a higher rate to public hearing in order to have a valid point to which people could respond.

Mr. Rooker reminded the Board that the advertised rate can go down, but it can't go up. He emphasized that his motion was proposing the rate they would take to public hearing, which would allow the Board to get additional information and allow people to comment on both sides of the issue.

Mr. Thomas said that, with the votes the way they are now, the rate would stay the same.

Mr. Dumler stated that this rate provides an opportunity to hear from the public.

Mr. Boyd said that if you advertise the rate and it's a split Board, that rate stands.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that you must have an affirmative vote on the tax rate.

Mr. Davis confirmed that the Board must set an annual tax rate by majority vote.

Ms. Mallek said that nobody is conceding anything by advertising a rate slightly higher than where it may end up.

Mr. Rooker said that, if the comments come in that indicate that education is going to suffer, which the Board has all said it doesn't want to happen, the Board won't be able to respond to that.

Mr. Boyd stated that no matter what's decided here, if the Board doesn't give them the full \$1.2 million, the School Board's position is going to be that the Schools will suffer.

Mr. Rooker said his proposal is to give them about half of what Schools have requested.

Mr. Snow then **moved** to increase the tax rate .4 cents, with 100% of it going to the Schools if the main issue is making sure the Schools have what they need.

Mr. Rooker said that he would support that.

Mr. Snow stated that what the Schools are doing is great for our kids, and agrees that they have done a lot more with less, with their average cost down per student. Mr. Snow said that he supports their focus on critical thinking, rather than just memorizing facts and figures so they can pass some test down the road, and if they have to raise the rate, he wants it to be enough just to pay for schools.

Mr. Dumler commented that this would wipe out the Board's ability to pay for the \$176,000 in items previously discussed.

Mr. Foley said that the number is \$68,000, and it wouldn't fund any of those additional items.

Mr. Rooker stated that there is some Board reserve, and Mr. Foley confirmed that there is a \$250,000 reserve for contingencies.

Mr. Rooker reiterated that he would support Mr. Snow's motion.

Mr. Dumler asked what the rate would be to keep the .4 cents for the schools as well as the additional items totaling \$68,000. Mr. Foley and Ms. Vinzant said it would be a three-digit number and would change the formula.

Mr. Boyd said that those items could be covered with the contingency funds.

Mr. Rooker **seconded** the motion, dedicating the .4 cents to schools, so the rate would be 76.6 cents per \$100.

Mr. Foley said if the Board makes that decision, then staff would just change the base for Schools.

Roll was then called and the motion **failed** by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Rooker and Mr. Snow.

NAYS: Ms. Mallek, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Boyd and Mr. Dumler.

Ms. Mallek said she was voting "no" because she felt the Board should be doing more.

Ms. Mallek then **moved** to support a .5% increase just for the Schools. Mr. Snow said he felt Schools could find the additional money, and would not vote for the .5% increase.

Mr. Rooker said that .5% increase isn't going to get approved, and asked Ms. Mallek and Mr. Dumler to consider supporting the .4 cent increase, as it deals with half of the school budget deficit.

Mr. Snow then **moved** to increase the tax rate .4 cents, with 100% of it dedicated to schools. Mr. Rooker **seconded** the motion.

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

AYES: Ms. Mallek, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Snow and Mr. Dumler.

NAYS: Mr. Thomas and Mr. Boyd.

Mr. Dumler then **moved** to advertise the 2013 fiscal year tax rates for public hearing as follows: the real estate tax rate at 76.6 cents per \$100 of assessed value of real estate; and at \$4.28 per \$100 of assessed value of personal property tax. Mr. Rooker **seconded** the motion.

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

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

NAYS: None.

Mr. Foley mentioned that the \$11,000 Earlysville item is a one-time expense from the General Fund balance that will be offset with other items that were not funded.

Mr. Rooker commented that, if there is additional surplus or another source of funding that arises, other items on the list may be funded and noted that he thought everyone wanted to fund the CAT bus route.

Ms. Mallek stated that City Council is going to vote on the bus route in a few weeks and, if the County money is not there, the bus route will not be funded.

Mr. Foley said that, if there's no funding for those after the hearing, staff could come back and see if additional revenues had been found.

Mr. Rooker said that they had indicated the possibility of funding through contingencies, and additional surplus funds as they come in would be used to revamp the contingency.

Mr. Foley clarified that the Board wanted to reduce the reserve contingency by the \$68,000.

Mr. Boyd stated that the Board wanted to send the right message to the City.

Mr. Foley reiterated that the total was \$68,000 after the Board made decisions on funding.

Mr. Rooker said that this is with the understanding that the first surplus revenues that come in would go back to that contingency.

Mr. Boyd asked if they had voted to set the real estate tax rate at the higher level. Mr. Davis said that the rate voted on earlier was only the rate that would be advertised for public hearing.

Mr. Boyd stated that, for the record, he is not in favor of advertising the higher rate.

Mr. Thomas noted that the screen had said 76.2 cents, and the vote was actually for "76.6 cents."

Mr. Foley said that the record will show that the vote to set the real estate tax rate reflects where the Board stands, and there was a majority vote to advertise those rates.

Mr. Rooker clarified that another way to look at the second vote was that they had already voted on the real estate tax rate, and the second motion essentially incorporated both rates that would go to public hearing.

Mr. Boyd said that was not the way he felt, really.

Mr. Davis stated that a majority of the Board has voted to set the tax rate for public hearing, but that it doesn't commit the Board to adopting that rate, and the record will reflect that Mr. Boyd is not in favor of that advertised rate.

Mr. Boyd affirmed that the record will reflect his intentions.

Mr. Rooker asked if the Board needed a vote to take the budget to final public hearing. Mr. Foley responded that the Board's vote on the rate has done that, with clarification about adjustments to the reserve contingency to fund the other items and he assumed there is consensus on that.

Mr. Foley reminded the Board that the public hearing is scheduled for March 27, 2013 at 6:00 p.m.

---

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

There were none.

---

Agenda Item No. 4. Adjourn.

At 12:19 p.m., **motion** was offered by Ms. Mallek to adjourn the Board meeting to March 13, 2012, 9:00 a.m. Lane Auditorium. Mr. Dumler **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

---

Chairman

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

Date: 08/14/2013
------------------

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