

An adjourned meeting and a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on April 10, 2013, Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from April 3, 2013.

PRESENT: Mr. Kenneth C. Boyd, Mr. Christopher J. 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, and Clerk, Ella W. Jordan.

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

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** Solid Waste Options RFP.

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, said that this work session is a continuation of the previous month's meeting when he presented a draft RFP for the Board's consideration. In January, he said, the Board directed staff to prepare a draft RFP, to work with the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority to develop a potential lease agreement for Ivy MUC, a short-term agreement to cover the period between July 1st and the County start-up at Ivy MUC and to look at amending the agreement for continued operation of the McIntire Recycling for an indeterminate length of time. In March, staff reviewed the draft RFP and the Board directed staff consult with potential bidders to determine if there was interest in bidding on the proposal and to identify any concerns with the draft RFP. Mr. Graham said they have done that.

Mr. Graham said there are three options in the key points of the RFP: 1) to continue the existing transfer station as a privately-operated facility by a contractor; 2) to operate a new, scaled-down convenience center at Ivy; or 3) to operate a new, more efficient transfer station at Ivy. He noted that within the RFP, the contractor's responsibilities are: 1) operation and disposal, 2) insurance for the facility, 3) maintenance of equipment, 4) utilities, and customer complaints, and 4) assumption of the financial risk for the operation. Mr. Graham said that the County's responsibilities are: 1) permit holder, 2) establish fees, 3) oversight, and 4) facility risks.

In terms of RFP comments, the first related to operating the existing transfer station, and was viewed as not a viable long-term solution. It is a very manpower intensive operation and it was felt that it could not ever be efficiently run there to come even close to break even. With respect to building a new transfer station, Mr. Graham said there was some interest but only if the County was going to support a much larger facility there. He said that he was very cautious to say he had no reason to believe there was community support for that. The existing RSWA permit at 150 tons per month was somewhat controversial when it was permitted with the State, and he thinks it would be a long, hard battle to go through a permit that would greatly extend the capacity of that facility.

Ms. Mallek asked if the 150 tons was perceived as a maximum limit, and if the suggestion to staff was that more flow was needed to make it viable. Mr. Graham responded that volume solves all the problems as far as making it financially break even. He said that the contractors were not very committal regarding exact size, but his assumption was that it would take 250-300 tons per day to make it work as far as a permit limit.

Mr. Rooker commented that the contractor would have to get its own permit. Mr. Graham responded, "no", the County would actually have to obtain the permit, even if it were operated by a third party. Mr. Graham stated that the zoning is not set up for a private operation at Ivy; it must be operated as a County facility. Mr. Rooker asked if the contractor would operate under the County's permit. Mr. Graham responded, "yes".

Mr. Graham said the third option was the convenience center, and contractors were supportive of that idea as it is something most of them do in other communities. The contractors did anticipate that Rivanna lease conditions would make it much more expensive than what they have seen with other facilities. He stated that there is an industrial discharge permit that Rivanna has written into the lease agreement, and there was concern with the cost of that permit. Mr. Graham said that he came away with the sense that the private contractors did not feel that the Ivy operation could be self-supported and felt the fees would never cover the cost of the facility.

Ms. Mallek asked if that was specific to the Ivy location. Mr. Graham responded, "yes". He added that this did raise questions about County convenience centers at other locations. The contractors said service and convenience centers were something they provided in their normal services, although most preferred to do the transportation and disposal. The contractors thought it could be more cost effective than providing the same type facility at Ivy.

Mr. Graham noted that there were questions as to whether fees would be collected by the County, and whether they would be enough to support the operation. Mr. Graham said that contractors pointed out that most localities support the facilities through their own tax revenue rather than charging fees. Typically fees are not charged at the facilities, but there are others such as Goochland that charge a bag fee, ton fee, per-appliance fee, and per-tire fee.

Mr. Foley mentioned that it is very common to charge for tires and white goods such as appliances, even if you do not charge for bags.

Mr. Graham said that staff came out of the meetings with contractors feeling that there were three viable options: 1) continue with RSWA, which would require ongoing County support; 2) have a County-operated convenience center at Ivy, which will require some ongoing County support; and 3) open a County-operated convenience center on some other property not yet identified, and the supports needed there are not yet known.

Mr. Foley asked what he meant by County-operated facility. Mr. Graham responded that the County would own the property and lease the facility.

Mr. Graham said that assuming a preference that County support be reduced and the County exercises control over costs, staff prefers two options: 1) County operated convenience center at Ivy MUC and 2) County operated convenience center on County property.

Mr. Graham stated that there are also some service questions that have arisen. How would household hazardous waste disposal be provided? He explained that HHW could be offered at a convenience center the same way it is currently provided. He explained that Rivanna doesn't actually take title or control of the material. Rivanna has a contractor that comes in and loads materials directly onto his truck – which is a routine service provided for many communities. Mr. Graham said that there are some localities that have drop-offs for HHW, but this must be permitted and is a potentially expensive operation because of the permit and the controls required for taking title to the material. Another issue is vegetative debris. Convenience centers can handle the typical, small residential loads, but bigger commercial loads would need to be directed to other facilities. The question with RSWA is whether they would want to continue its mulching operation even if the County is not there, as that has been a self-supporting operation that helps defray other costs.

Mr. Graham stated that bulky waste such as sofas and appliances, as well as small construction debris from people remodeling their houses, can easily be handled at a convenience center as part of the residential loads. He noted that bigger loads from things like house construction would need to be treated as commercial waste and go to one of the permitted transfer stations in the area.

Mr. Graham then presented photos of typical convenience center operations, noting one as a great example of a facility having roll-off containers with built-in compactors and another with a top-load unit without a compactor, which would be good for things such as furniture and vegetative waste. He pointed out the grade separation between where the user drives and where the container is, to make it a little easier to get over the top. Mr. Graham said that the issue of household hazardous waste keeps surfacing, and showed a photo of a large convenience center where they actually stored the HHW in an enclosed facility. He also mentioned a neighboring county that used a three-sided shed whereby a person just pulls up and puts the material in, adding that the same facility had a "vegetative waste pile" with the contractor coming in and hauling it off when it reached a certain level.

Mr. Rooker asked how these facilities are staffed. Mr. Graham responded that in the past they had been unmanned, but there were lots of issues at the facilities, so now they are typically manned and have various hours of operation. He noted that Nelson County operates its site six days per week, 12 hours per day. Typically most facilities have one person onsite – with fencing to control the material. Mr. Graham said that the biggest costs are finding a pad-ready site, with about an acre of flat land needed, and getting three-phase electricity run to the site. He noted that even though open-top is less efficient, it is cheaper when factoring in the cost of running electricity to the site.

Mr. Foley said that in his previous locality, Caroline County, they had three facilities located each on about one-half acre. They included drive-in facilities with an open-top unit almost level to the ground that could accommodate brush or bulky waste, and even tires.

Ms. Mallek commented that it seems inefficient to have brush, tires and couches going into the same pile to be sorted out later.

Mr. Foley said it might be more efficient not to have brush put in the open top.

Mr. Graham emphasized that it would depend on the contractor and their equipment sorting capabilities. That clarification is part of what staff would seek with the RFP, leaving the flexibility for the way they see it working best.

Mr. Foley noted that typically these facilities also accommodate recycling as a separate function on the same site.

Mr. Boyd said that his concerns have always been cost and service levels. It seems that operating a full-blown transfer station at Ivy would not be a viable option. He asked if household waste would accommodate someone like a local plumber who might be disposing a hot water heater, or whether he would be considered "commercial." Mr. Graham responded that they have to be careful, because there is a line where the contractor is providing a service for a homeowner versus collecting and hauling material. He said that the plumber could bring a water heater to the convenience center as long as the property owner verifies that it is coming from one location – not a collection of material and hauling.

Mr. Boyd asked if a small contractor redoing a kitchen counter or similar would have some facility to use. Mr. Graham replied that it appears so, but it is an undecided question and no one has ever

challenged it or pushed on where the exact limit is where it crosses over to commercial waste that must go to a permitted transfer station.

Mr. Foley said that the position up to now has been that they are not providing these convenience centers to small contractors on a regular basis. It becomes more of a transfer, and typically the alternative is to rent a dumpster on the site during the construction project.

Mr. Graham explained that there was some recognition that the rules "just get in the way" if the contractor is taking out old appliances but cannot drop them off – yet the homeowner can. It is just a question of keeping clean with DEQ as far as making sure it is a convenience center and not considered to be operating as a transfer station.

Mr. Foley said that if the Board were asked what the County is providing there, it would respond that it is not a level of service to accommodate all the small contractors in the County. If something comes there occasionally, it is probably not an issue at the site. If the contractor continues to bring loads of stuff, they would probably have a problem.

Mr. Boyd pointed out that staff has already identified the important issues, and it is not a matter of choice, it's a matter of how it gets permitted and what is legal to do there.

Mr. Graham said that in going forward with an RFP, staff recommends eliminating the options of the transfer station as it just does not seem viable. He added that if someone wanted to operate a transfer station while setting up a convenience center at Ivy that would be fine. Mr. Graham said that the second question is whether the convenience centers are preferred to the ongoing Rivanna operations. If the convenience centers look attractive the question becomes going forward with an RFP to see how they look.

Mr. Snow stated that he is more in favor of the convenience centers, moving them to the perimeter out of a central location, similar to what they did with fire and rescue squads – thus making the services more accessible to citizens. He mentioned that at his town hall meeting at Yancey Elementary School, citizens said they have been asking for this for a number of years and were ready to go with a site. In his opinion, the Board could offer better service to most of the County citizens by going with three or four convenience centers scattered throughout the perimeter of the County. Mr. Snow suggested having one in the southern area of the County, one out towards Stony Point, and one in the west.

Mr. Rooker commented that the centers would need to be in locations between the urban area and the far reaches of the rural area, so they are fairly central.

Mr. Boyd said that he wants to ensure they are not setting up a center that becomes a competing operation to curbside pickup.

Mr. Rooker said that if you put a convenience center in a location, some people living nearby will stop paying for pickup and will use the center. Mr. Boyd responded that that is what concerns him a little bit. Ms. Mallek said that's life.

Mr. Rooker said that is just reality, unless there is a bag fee at the convenience center.

Mr. Boyd asked if it would be possible to get an idea of where there is coverage from private haulers. Mr. Graham responded that they are private businesses, so they are understandably protective of their customer base.

Mr. Foley said that if the Board is looking at the option of convenience centers, the question then is whether to maintain one at Ivy or whether to have multiple locations in the County. He said that he is not sure that they would have a center at Ivy under the Rivanna agreement and then do centers around the County. That is some of the direction staff needs. Staff could put out an RFP, then look at the cost of doing the centers, and then later there would be a decision about where to actually site the centers.

Mr. Snow said that he is more inclined to go with centers around the County and close Ivy.

Mr. Rooker added that it would depend on cost.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that this is the next step for information-gathering, not the final decision.

Mr. Foley said that in the RFP staff could ask contractors for the cost of running a center at Ivy, if they do a lease, versus the cost of running one elsewhere with the County providing the site.

Mr. Graham stated that if the convenience centers are preferred, staff could advertise an RFP and give contractors options – either providing a convenience center at Ivy and other locations, or either one if they prefer – and then provide the Board with the best data possible to make a decision.

Mr. Rooker commented that there would need to be at least three locations for convenience centers, and there may be reduced costs if they operate more than one site.

Mr. Snow said that there's a lot of difference between a convenience center that is staffed versus having a site that's left unmanned. Mr. Graham responded that staff is not considering the latter option, as they have heard numerous times that unmanned convenience centers are a lot of problems.

Mr. Boyd asked if it would also be possible to eliminate non-single stream recycling.

Mr. Rooker suggested that they ask in the RFP to specify whether there would be an increased cost for doing that.

Mr. Graham said it is a good point to make in the RFP, as far as "what not to include."

Ms. Mallek said she thinks that is too extreme and would not suggest it.

Mr. Boyd said he wants to leave it open so they could put it in the option. Mr. Graham agreed, adding that staff wants to give as much flexibility as possible to the contractor to design the operation they think is the most effective.

Mr. Rooker said he would stipulate in the RFP something like "please quote both ways."

Ms. Mallek stated that it is important to her that the materials collected be recycled to the maximum possible, rather than having it go to a dump. Mr. Graham responded that that's what staff is thinking too.

Mr. Graham said that in order to meet the December time frame, it is important to determine quickly the location of the perimeter facilities, and if that direction is chosen, what the fees will be for most items at the convenience centers. It is also important to know how much County support the Board is willing to provide and how much will be self-supporting.

Mr. Foley said that the bidders are going to try to get a low-cost option, so they will likely propose charging fees in order to get some revenue back, and that will be reflected in the RFP.

Mr. Graham stated that the RFP is currently written to give a preference to "lower County support."

Mr. Boyd said that he would prefer that, as it would shift it to the free market to establish. The contractors know how much they can charge for a convenience center. Mr. Graham said that is one of the questions Board members will have to look at. The Board will have some flexibility in setting a fee structure.

Mr. Rooker commented that when the Board had the consulting firm come in a few years ago, one of the things that they said was that the County could bring one or two haulers in and divide up the County – and it could be done on a lower per-capita basis. When you get to the level where you're telling people you can either buy private pickup or go to a convenience center and pay a fee there, would you also be better off looking at a potential bid from a bidder to come in, or two bidders to come in and say "we would do all of the County, or half of the County, for this price?"

Ms. Mallek said that she is not willing to go there, and she is not interested in cutting out the company that has been hauling her trash for the last 35 years in favor of a new company chosen to handle that quadrant.

Mr. Foley clarified that staff is focused on the more narrow issue of this RFP. Staff now has some direction on multiple sites. The revenue issue is addressed by asking the contractor "to give us their best business model to give us the least cost." He added that staff will give the contractors the ability to propose some different ways of approaching this, and then staff will look at the bids when they come in.

Ms. Mallek said she does not want the County being in the position of making up fees that are impossible. Mr. Foley noted that the companies are assuming some financial risk here, so if they price themselves out of the market, the fee issue will work out. In the bidding process he said that he thinks the County wants to give that opportunity.

Mr. Rooker said the County has to provide an incentive for people to use their system, and if people can do it as cheaply by using a private hauler, they are not going to get anybody coming there, so they know that.

Mr. Foley noted that the most "convenient" convenience center is on the curb, but it is the gap in the market they are trying to fill.

Ms. Mallek added that she would also like to have the option of people being able to bring HHW any day for a fee – not storing it for months and then bringing it to the dump site – as well as the disposal of brush and vegetative waste staying at Ivy. She also asked about the feedback staff received from potential bidders stating that "most prefer the transportation and disposal rather than the management" and asked if that meant that they did not want to hire the staff for the facilities. Mr. Graham responded that they are not averse to running it, but most are in the business of taking trash and processing it or disposing of it. The Board will have to set the fees, ultimately.

Mr. Foley explained that if the trash is stored on site, the County would have to get a permit for the convenience center – but otherwise could bring a truck out once a week or so, and pay for that level of service.

Mr. Boyd commented that he is not ready to take Rivanna and Ivy off the table yet, but would want the cost estimates first. He added that there are some close-down costs involved with Rivanna that could be considerable, and those numbers need to be factored in too.

Ms. Mallek said that she is also ready to see some numbers, but is not willing to have somebody hold a lease over their heads and a whole lot of other \$150,000 costs the County might be able to get rid of.

Mr. Snow commented that if Rivanna is closed, there are also costs to the City.

Mr. Foley stated that “the answer to this is there’s no answer today,” but when staff comes back to the Board with the private sector’s estimate they will also have to factor in the impact of pulling out of Rivanna, balanced against what they are already paying including the \$300,000 a year option. He said that Rivanna is currently debating the cost-shifting, if they continue to operate, so those would have to be brought back as separate cost components.

Mr. Rooker mentioned that there are some costs Rivanna will have on an ongoing basis that will get allocated to other things. While costs are being lowered on one side the costs are increasing by a percentage of that on the other side.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that there’s a reason for that.

Mr. Rooker acknowledged that, adding that some of the people involved in the environmental work there do other things.

Ms. Mallek said that she has been trying to get an answer from them for several years as to what exactly those people do.

Mr. Boyd added that the Board needs to factor in those costs too.

Mr. Rooker agreed that Rivanna has provided a pretty good option, and, in his opinion, that is the bogey against which everything else is going to be judged.

Ms. Mallek commented that she looks at the current RFP process as a “short-term approach,” and she hopes that the Board will be stepping up to a new level. She said that she does not perceive that the County should be continuing to do this for 50 years. There are a lot of other places doing a lot more creative and cost-effective things than what the County is looking at doing. She added that solid waste disposal is a County government service that is really important like many other things, and should not only be decided upon by the bottom line.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that under several of the scenarios, the County will still be involved in providing services. If the County hires employees to be out there, then in effect it will be the face of the facility to the public, not the party that comes out to haul waste away once a week.

Mr. Foley added that no matter what the County ends up with, it is still going to have to manage the operation – even if it’s just overseeing a contract.

Agenda Item No. 3. Discussion: Proposed Police Firing Range.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Director of the Office of Facilities Development, addressed the Board, stating that he, Colonel Steve Sellers, Chief of Police, and Ms. Lee Catlin, will provide an update of work done since the Board considered this item in February. They will provide a cost analysis of an indoor range, and some of the potential sites as well as a process to come up with a recommendation. He stated that they are not yet ready to recommend a site.

Mr. Henry reported that on February 6, 2013, the Board voted to stop work on the outdoor range and focus efforts on locating an indoor range. Based on that action, he said, staff pulled the site plan from the review process and took a step back to look at overall needs – both at the executive level and with key stakeholders. He said that out of those discussions, staff is focusing on a firearms training center, classrooms to support training as well as joint training with municipalities and fire/rescue, including a possible low speed track. Mr. Henry stated that staff has also established a set of criteria and priorities for the site evaluation, developed a list of potential locations – with the first tier for consideration being properties that are under control by the County or the City and UVA as potential joint partners. He reported that they have conducted some due diligence internally on a few of those sites, and that work is still in progress. Mr. Henry said that he and Chief Sellers met with some of his staff along with officials from Scottsville and a developer on the potential use of the tire plant, as well as a joint meeting with the City and UVA on a project site with a follow-up meeting planned next week. Staff has done a lot of analysis in trying to put the list of sites together.

Mr. Henry presented a schematic of the proposed range which reflects a 12-lane indoor range model. In working with police, it has been determined that the size of the range needed to support joint training needs in an indoor training facility needs to be 20-24 lanes. He said that the construction cost of a facility like this would be \$3.6 - \$4 million, which would essentially be “a building within a building” with a shell, classrooms, life safety elements, and storage – with the range being a contained cinder block ballistics, acoustic, structure with heavy HVAC requirements as well as noise buffering provisions. Mr. Henry added that he has listed the site development costs as “to be determined” because it will vary depending on what the site looks like and its location. He said that regardless of establishing an indoor facility, there will still be some outdoor training required – specifically rifle training.

Mr. Rooker asked Police Chief Steve Sellers how frequently the outdoor rifle training might occur and how many shots might be fired in a typical training session. Chief Sellers responded that some rifle training can take place in an indoor facility, with some modifications. He said that he would foresee SWAT training with rifles – which takes place twice per month, significantly less than handguns.

Mr. Rooker said that the biggest concern people have would be noise and wondered if there might be a place to fulfill the outdoor training needs that is not necessarily directly associated with the site. Chief Sellers replied that in working through the issues on the outdoor range at Keene, one of the suggestions was to put silencers on rifles, and that could certainly mitigate some of the noise. He added that they do not have a specific location now within the County to do that kind of training, so they do some of it now at Rivanna but frequently travel to Harrisonburg.

Mr. Foley said that once staff comes back and gets the final definition in the site, they will identify what the rifle range issue is about – whether silencers are used, how often it would happen, indoor/outdoor facilities, etc.

Mr. Boyd asked if incorporating the silencers affects the quality of the training. Chief Sellers responded that it is not significant, “not a deal breaker,” and while silencers muffle the sound they do not eliminate it.

Ms. Mallek asked if the proposed site was all unidirectional, or if the long access of the building could also be used. Mr. Henry responded that the long side is about 50 yards, and each lane is approximately four feet. A range that would hold 24 lanes could be built in a 26,000 square foot footprint. He said that their engineering firm is out of Richmond and is working with an architect who has designed ranges before, with this concept having been presented to staff in November.

Chief Sellers reported that the chiefs in the region all agree that joint training and multi-disciplinary training is the way of the future to best protect the community. Part of the long-term vision for public safety is to combine training efforts. He stated that the Police Department is minimally staffed now, falling 25 short of the County’s goal for staffing, and still remains the lowest staffed County police department in the state when comparing officer to population ratio. Chief Sellers added that for 2012, response times actually worsened. He said that the minimum staffing levels for the department for patrol is nine officers on day shift, 10 officers on evening, and seven on the midnight shift. In a perfectly staffed situation he would have nine officers plus three more during day shift – two in training, and one on leave. Chief Sellers noted that in 2012, they met minimum staffing requirements 64% of the time.

Chief Sellers reported that the officers currently travel out of the County for training, with the academy being in Weyer’s Cave and specialized training held in other academies throughout the state.

Mr. Rooker asked if the numbers he presented included people who were taken out for training. Chief Sellers replied that it did not.

Chief Sellers stated that in terms of officer and community safety they have increasing response times. In the Albemarle County Police Department they have 19 specialized teams, which are highly trained officers with specific skills to provide services for law enforcement. He deems seven of those teams are “critical,” meaning they are time sensitive and need to arrive swiftly to a major incident. He said that the teams include the accident reconstruction team, the hostage negotiation team, the critical incident stress management team, the dive team, the TAC team (SWAT), canine officers, and the criminal forensic teams.

Mr. Rooker asked if officers are doing training that is specifically geared toward circumstances that might occur at schools. Chief Sellers responded that they are, adding that for the first time ever the County, the City and UVA are collaborating on a scenario-based response to active shooter training in four quarterly training allotments throughout 2013. He emphasized that they are trying to do that training locally.

Mr. Rooker commented that it seems to present some unique circumstances. Chief Sellers agreed, adding that it is imperative to him that the officers who have those highly skilled specialties are in or near the County as much as possible. He mentioned a situation from December 26, 2012 that took place on Rio Mills Road, whereby there was an active shooter incident that developed into hostage barricade situation and ended up as a homicide/suicide. Chief Sellers said that he needed 54 officers to manage that scene, including forensics experts that had to come in and process the various crime scenes. He added that without the specialized teams’ assistance and outfitted cars that allows officers to respond from home, that scene would have gone on for days. Chief Sellers said that it is important to understand that they need to bring the resources back quickly, which is impacted by traveling out of the County for firearms training. He stated that his goal is to have three trainings per year, as well as some time to practice on duty, and in the future two of those days may be scenario-based – all simulated within the context of a range. Chief Sellers said that that type of training is intended to raise the stress level to close to what would be experienced in a real situation, and it is not unusual to have an officer’s heart rate to soar to 200 per minute. He stated that after a day of that kind of training officers are exhausted, and adding an hour or hour and a half drive adds to that exhaustion and is putting them at risk. Chief Sellers mentioned that they have had an incident in the County where an officer was traveling out for training and fell asleep at the wheel and crashed.

Regarding the challenge of scheduling, Chief Sellers stated that it severely impacts operations of the Police Department. Citing an example of an officer who failed his firearms recertification training because he did not get enough range time, Chief Sellers explained that he must temporarily relieve that

officer of duty and put him on restricted duty, because they cannot function as a police officer until they successfully pass their state-mandated firearms training. He said that if an officer goes to an existing range and fails due to lack of practice time or other reasons, he must make arrangements to find another range in order to get the officer rescheduled. Chief Sellers said that can take weeks because they have two days scheduled at the current arrangement and cannot reschedule until the next month. That is a great impact and it takes a police officer off the street for however long it takes to reschedule him.

Mr. Rooker asked who the instructors would be for training that officer. Chief Sellers responded that Albemarle would need to send an instructor, and they are internal employees of the Police Department. He added that it is imperative that it be a County instructor. The County has a way that it trains and it's consistent, and endorsed in terms of risk and liability. He said that when they go to someone else's range, they have different ways of training and different ways of approaching things. Chief Sellers stated that sometimes those things are in conflict with Albemarle's training methods, which can cause great confusion, and that's another complication with switching venues.

Chief Sellers said that to get 126 officers trained three times per year, which is 28 or 29 training days, they send about 14 officers out with three to four trainers. Typically every trip outside of the County for training takes 17 or 18 officers. Chief Sellers mentioned that the cost for traveling out of the County including overtime, fuel, and fees to use ranges, is \$25,524 – \$76,800 per year. He said that beefing up one critical team in terms of capacity would be about \$2.2 million for five officers over five years, including the addition of new officers to make up for the loss of officers who are traveling.

Mr. Rooker said that most of the time people are training and not driving. He asked if the overtime is reflected in the driving time. Chief Sellers responded that it did.

Mr. Rooker asked what percentage of training is taking place now at Harrisonburg, Augusta, Henrico, etc., versus Rivanna. Chief Sellers responded that they are currently in the gentlemen's agreement stage of working through a schedule through 2013. He added that before summertime one-half of the training would likely be local with the other one-half out of the area.

Mr. Rooker asked if the training is based on one training session per officer per year or what. Chief Sellers said that he is incrementally trying to raise the department's level of firearms and handgun proficiency, and his budget includes two training opportunities per officer annually.

Mr. Henry reported that staff has laid out five key areas for site criteria. The primary focus or first tier is those sites within the control of joint partners – County, City, UVA. He added that as Chief Sellers mentioned, multi-disciplinary training with partners is a priority. He also stated that costs play into the equation, as is finding a location that fits appropriately within a development area/zoning, and public concerns. Mr. Henry said that the highest criteria in site location now is the property and the control of it, with the other factors being weighted fairly equally.

In terms of site alternatives, Mr. Henry said that the Keene option is still on the table. A lot of work was done on the site when it was evaluated for an open range. The cost estimate is pretty significant from a site development standpoint. In order to get the indoor range in a similar location to where the open range was envisioned is \$1 million or more of site work. There is some question as to whether they can complete the vision for the facility on that particular site. Mr. Henry stated that he feels that the site would be viable for an indoor range. There have been some concerns raised publicly about environmental impacts but he does believe it could be done without impact to the cap, and could be engineered properly. He said that the Keene location does support their joint police/fire-rescue training goals, and would support their joint partnership with the City, so there are still some positives from that perspective. Mr. Henry noted that this would be a Tier I option, as it is controlled by the County.

Mr. Henry stated that use of the Scottsville Tire Plant would be a Tier II option. Staff did meet with the developer a few weeks ago and were provided with initial proposals on what the terms would be. He said that it would be privately owned. The scope would be limited to the firing range and associated classrooms. The terms would be an annual operational agreement or lease, proposed to be 20 years, along with the cost to improve the facility. Mr. Henry stated that the police had an exercise at the site in March, and although the structure exists the range itself would basically be built inside of it so the cost of the construction is still significant. He emphasized that it is a viable option. The representatives from Scottsville were very favorable in support of it and felt that the community would embrace that location. Mr. Henry said that negative factors include that it would be limited to police. Staff thinks that the City is still interested in the site, but it is pushing their limit of acceptance. He noted that it would not support any interaction with UVA because of the distance, and the fire/rescue community is doubtful for the same reason.

Mr. Snow said that he has visited both sites, and the Scottsville site is a lot more accessible than Keene – which has narrow, small roads. He stated that Scottsville is a straight shot down Route 20 with one turn getting to the plant. The roads are wide and the site itself has a lot of open area with outbuildings that seem great for scenario training. Mr. Snow said that there are also berms around to protect the buildings from the river, and it might be a good area for a rifle range. To him it looks like it is a far superior site than what they were talking about at Keene should they want to include more areas. Mr. Snow added that it took about the same amount of time to drive from town to either location. Mr. Snow stated that the only downside to the Scottsville site is that the County does not own it, but the building is already there.

Mr. Henry responded that the building is already there but the construction of the range is essentially a brand new building within the facility. If the site was dropped into an industrial zone on the

perimeter of the City it would be pretty attractive from a location standpoint, but, again, he thinks the distance is the most problematic component.

Mr. Rooker said that every site he showed on the map is on the periphery of the County – the Byrum site, the Preddy Creek site, etc. Mr. Henry replied that those sites were from the original study and are no longer under evaluation.

Mr. Foley stated Mr. Snow's point that the difference between the sites at Keene and Scottsville is not much different is well taken. The difference is that Keene was on the outskirts originally but the County could do everything there, and the Scottsville site may have some restrictions on training. He explained that the County has other sites that it owns that won't cost another dime. The County would like to avoid paying at all, if it has a partnership with the City and University, which would not be the case with the tire plant. Mr. Foley added that staff envisions not getting into a protracted negotiation on this between now and July when they come back to the Board, until they determine that the other sites aren't going to work. He said that staff wants the Board to endorse that, as the tire plant is a second tier option.

Mr. Rooker emphasized looking at the top tier sites first. Other board members agreed.

Mr. Henry reported that staff has several other sites under investigation, but at this point is not ready to talk about them in detail as their viability is still being explored with the County's partners. He said that one suggestion has been to form an advisory committee to the County Executive to help vet the other sites and locations.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant to the County Executive for Community and Business Partnerships, stated that the public participation piece of this process is very critical. Several years ago the Board endorsed County-adopted administrative guidelines for public participation that lay out a very systematic approach for meaningful community engagement. She said that the policy outlines a process for developing public participation plans for projects that staff feels will have significant community impact and involvement. Ms. Catlin stated that the purpose of these plans is to provide a clear description to stakeholders of why, when and how they can participate. Having a clear plan at the beginning of the process helps to set expectations in the right place for everyone involved, and helps to alleviate misunderstandings as to how the input was gathered and how it was going to be used in the decision making.

She said that there has been good effort thus far in keeping the public involved in the project, but staff would recommend in going forward that they organize the outreach efforts into the structure of the administrative guidelines. Ms. Catlin said that this type of plan identifies goals, identifies stakeholders and the tools to be used, creates the schedule, clarifies roles and responsibilities for all parties involved, and establishes how the input will be gathered and used and how feedback will be provided. She stated that for the Crozet Library project staff used this public participation plan, and it was shared with everyone so people saw where they fit in and how their input would be fed into the decision-making process. Ms. Catlin said that as they get closer to narrowing down a site and a plan for the firing range, staff recommends working through the guidelines with stakeholders, and coming back to the Board with a proposal for exactly how that is going to happen.

Mr. Foley noted that staff does not want to throw out 10 different options in different communities at this point, but felt it was important to get some feedback from citizens as they look at alternatives. He said that staff would like to pull some citizens in to give some initial feedback, and Mr. Rooker had suggested that the Police Citizens Advisory Committee sit with staff and look at the preliminary alternatives. When they are ready to be narrowed down, citizens will be fully informed and will have participated in the preliminary selection process. He said that after it is narrowed down to one or two sites, there would be a public engagement process. Mr. Foley said that the advisory committee could involve someone previously involved in the CIP process as well as someone sensitive to environmental concerns that might help with those aspects. Staff thinks that these are two very critical components that they will definitely be implementing as they go forward.

Mr. Rooker commented that that's an excellent way to proceed. He added that there are four interested members of the Citizens Advisory Committee at this meeting – and perhaps John Springer or his designee could be involved.

Mr. Boyd said that there is a Police Advisory Committee already set up, and that's where this should go. He said that he is not really in favor – particularly in the site selection phase of this thing – of setting up another committee.

Mr. Rooker said that's not what Mr. Foley is talking about. He was suggesting having a few people with specific skill sets that would be helpful in this process to help evaluate.

Mr. Boyd said that's what the Police Advisory Committee is for.

Mr. Rooker said that his thought was just having somebody like Chris Lee from the CIP committee to help out.

Mr. Boyd stated that reaching out to some stakeholders is a good idea at this stage.

Mr. Foley said if the Board is comfortable with that approach, staff will initiate it as part of the process to get more citizen input.

Ms. Mallek said she is relieved to know that the entire committee process Ms. Catlin was talking about is not starting right now.

Mr. Foley commented that that is the second piece after this initial process has been narrowed down.

Mr. Rooker said that it is helpful to say there were some citizens involved earlier in the process so that when things are weeded out and two or three viable options are selected, they then start the full participation process. Mr. Foley agreed.

Mr. Henry stated that staff recommends moving forward. Staff has a meeting set up for next week with the City and UVA, continuing the vetting of a potential site and a partnership. Staff will continue to evaluate some of the other sites. He said that within a few weeks staff should have enough due diligence done internally to have a productive review with the advisory council or select members coming in to work through the site process – with the idea that by the July timeframe they could come back with some specific site recommendations.

Mr. Rooker noted that the Scottsville Tire Plant might require a Phase 2 environmental report, and asked if there was asbestos in the building. Mr. Henry responded that there is, and there was a Phase 1 done under a prior acquisition. He said that if the County were looking to purchase the property, they would absolutely have to do a Phase 2, but the public-private partnership model would necessitate that the developer assume the risk and liability.

Mr. Foley said that even if the County just leases the building, there is a question as to whether the County could be brought into the liability if there was ever an issue, and that's something that would need to be considered.

Mr. Rooker commented that it is an aspect of that site that may not be an aspect of other sites.

Mr. Boyd stated that this is the second time Chief Sellers has been before the Board with the contention that going out of the County for a training facility is a bad idea. He said that he is even convinced more that it is a bad idea. Mr. Boyd said that he is ready to make a motion to take the option of training outside of the County off the table. He believes that they need to build a site in Albemarle County or in the surrounding area close here, and not fool with that option anymore.

Ms. Mallek said she would support that also, as the goal is to do as much as possible locally.

Mr. Rooker said he would not support it until he sees the costs. One option is to staff up the Police Department better to deal with accommodating the training travel time. He agrees that the best option – assuming the County can afford it – is to do something local, and as close to the urban area as possible. He supports what Mr. Boyd is saying, but would ask that the Board not take it off the table until it has some idea of the cost comparison with respect to a local facility.

Mr. Boyd stated that it is not all dollars and cents, but there are human costs also and that's what is bothering him. He reiterated that he is ready to make a motion that the Board take that option off the table.

Mr. Rooker responded that there are police stations all around Richmond and all over the country that train outside of where they are, and they find a way to do it and get good training. It's not something that cannot be done. Is it the best option here? He said that he does not think it is the best option here, but to say you are taking it off the table is to say that regardless of knowing what the costs of these other options are and what the viability of them is, the Board does not know if they are all viable.

Ms. Mallek said that they are looking at \$600,000-\$700,000 annually to go outside of the County, so that is something they can use to compare with the other sites. She said that she has said for a long time that the moral obligation is that the County needs to have its folks be able to train in the most convenient and at-home place that it can. To that extent, she is willing to go ahead and support that.

Mr. Boyd stated that he does not want any more time and effort to be spent on that. Mr. Rooker agreed, but said that he would not want to vote not to explore that option in the future. It may end up being the only option. He added that he does not want to see them in a situation where the estimate is \$10 to \$12 million, and the City won't go along with one-half of it. There are a lot of things that can happen here as the Board goes down this road. He added that he thinks what they are talking about studying and looking into, and hopefully finding a good option for, is something that is close by that will provide convenient training and it will become affordable, and that all three jurisdictions can participate in.

Mr. Snow said he agrees with Mr. Boyd and Ms. Mallek that going out of the County is not a viable option, but enough work has been done by staff to move forward as they plan.

Mr. Boyd said that he's agreeable with not having a motion, but he wants to implore staff not to spend any more time in looking at going out of the County. Mr. Foley responded that he hears a very strong consensus as to how to make it work in the County, and the questions Board members asked have been answered.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that there is no money in the CIP for a vastly more expensive project. Mr. Boyd responded that he knows that.

Mr. Foley commented that there are many other alternatives staff is looking into regarding the cost and financing, such as partnerships, fundraising, etc. He added that staff will bring back an update in July that will aid in getting closer to a decision.

Mr. Rooker thanked the members of the Police Advisory Committee for attending the meeting today.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adjourn.

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

Chairman

Approved by Board

Date: 08/14/2013

Initials: EWJ
