

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on February 28, 2014, at 9:00 a.m., Room 241, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from February 26, 2014.

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

ABSENT: None.

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

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m., by the Chair, Ms. Dittmar.

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** FY 2014/2015 Operating and Capital Budgets.

Overview

Ms. Lori Allshouse introduced County staff.

Mr. Bill Letteri reported that, at the last work session, the Board covered overall revenues and expenditures for the general fund and capital across departmental categories, stating that, in this work session, the focus would be on operating expenses in individual department areas, and what the changes are with this year's recommended budget.

Ms. Lori Allshouse addressed the Board, stating that she would discuss cross-departmental items which would affect all department budgets, with concentration on general government departments. Ms. Allshouse reported that there is a 2% increase in all salaries which will affect all department budgets, totaling \$824,000 on the County government side.

Ms. Palmer said she had heard from teachers that their salaries were capped at the end of 30 years, and asked if the same cap applied to County employees.

Ms. Laura Vinzant, Senior Budget Analyst, explained that there is a top of the range for each pay grade so, in a sense, they are also capped – if an employee hits the highest pay grade.

Ms. Mallek asked if that existed for administrative staff also. Ms. Vinzant said the position itself would have to be reclassified, and Human Resources would have to go through an exercise of proving that duties were of a higher grade level.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the operating budget also reflects an 8% increase in health insurance costs, which includes the contribution from the County as well as the individual, so each employee will also have an 8% increase in healthcare costs on their side. She stated that this totals about \$250,000 across the organization. Ms. Allshouse said there is a slight decrease in VRS retirement rates on the local government side, as County government is in a different trust fund than the schools whose rates increased, but there is a slight increase in the VRS group life insurance rate.

Mr. Boyd asked what the dollar amounts were for those items. Ms. Allshouse said the dollar amount for retirement had a savings of \$56,500, and the VRS group life increase was \$51,400.

Ms. Allshouse stated that they have a budgeted salary lapse, or attrition, totaling \$512,000 across departments and is considered as a savings in the budget.

Ms. Allshouse reported that, in the category of computer maintenance and replacement, every department is charged a fee based on the amount of computer equipment they have in their departments, and there is a small decrease in that category across departments. She stated that they also have a vehicle replacement program, which is funded using the per-gallon fuel dollar cost that departments are charged. Ms. Allshouse explained that requests from departments come in, and they are considered based on the age of the vehicle and number of repairs, with a ranking that the General Services Department does to replace vehicles from the internal services fund. She stated that vehicle fuel is budgeted at \$2.82 per gallon, and some departments use more vehicles than others, so there's a fuel charge budgeted – with no state or federal gasoline taxes levied, saving about .40 per gallon over what people pay at the pump.

Ms. Allshouse said she would also briefly discuss the General Fund fund balance and the policy for that fund. She stated that, at the close of each year, the Board's policy is to retain 10% of the fund balance – based on both the school fund and general fund – for cash liquidity purposes and to address unforeseen emergencies. Ms. Allshouse said this fund is designed only for true emergencies and as sound budgetary practice and should be used for one-time items, not operations. She stated that their goal was to contribute as much as possible to the CIP, with capital items considered one-time purchases. Ms. Allshouse said there is also a school operating fund fund balance policy, approved by the Board in March 2013, and this policy transfers anything in excess of 2% of the school reserve over to the CIP.

Ms. Allshouse reviewed how they work through the fund balance and where they end up, stating that the County always starts with an audited amount and, for 2013, the audited fund balance was \$35.6 million. She stated that the first thing they do is ensure they have the 10% unassigned fund balance reserve. Ms. Allshouse said, for FY14 or the current year, the Board has approved appropriations of about \$2.8 million for things such as carry-forwards from the previous fiscal year and the closeout of the fire contract. She stated that staff also recommends a revenue contingency and the County's is about \$500,000 which isn't very large when considering the levels of revenue they have. Ms. Allshouse said they have budgeted \$2.5 million to be transferred from the General Fund balance to capital, and staff is recommending use of \$1 million in one-time money in this budget.

Ms. Allshouse reviewed the math of the fund balance, explaining that they start with \$35.6 million on June 30, 2014; \$28 million is subtracted as what they want to keep on hand based on Board policy; actual and planned use of fund balance is \$6.9 million; so the remainder is \$600,000. She noted that staff isn't projecting any excess fund balance to be carried over from 2013, but they haven't had the audit yet so the number is left blank.

Ms. Palmer asked if the "anticipated use of fund balance" was the amount used for extra things that come up. Ms. Allshouse said it is actually anticipated use already put in the budget before them today, and the \$2.5 million was already earmarked to be moved to capital once the Board approves the budget. She stated that, by policy, any excess is shifted to capital.

Ms. Mallek said they aren't certain of the \$636,000 until after the audit. Ms. Allshouse clarified that they had the 2013 audit, but they want to make sure the Board approves the \$1 million when they approve its FY15 budget.

Mr. Letteri said staff would provide quarterly financial updates on the status of operations funding as they go through the year and, in that report, they will provide at least a projection based on revenues and expenditures.

Ms. McKeel stated that it's a long time to have to wait for firm numbers.

Ms. Allshouse said it is important to wait until the year ends to see how revenues over expenditures turn out, however, those are projected quarterly.

Mr. Letteri stated that it's more difficult in their environment because the revenues and expenditures don't occur very evenly.

Ms. Mallek said it also depends on what the legislature does between now and June.

Ms. McKeel asked if the revenue contingency of \$500,000 was adding to another number, or is the total being added to another amount. Ms. Allshouse said that was the total amount, as is.

Ms. McKeel asked what contingency funds they have in addition to that one, what they are for, and what their balances are. Ms. Allshouse said she would be covering some of those in her presentation, and could provide a list of all of them to the Board.

Ms. McKeel said the \$2.5 million and \$636,000 that were listed as "anticipated" were not in the CIP document as it is now. Ms. Allshouse said the \$2.5 million is built into the CIP budget, but the other number is not.

Mr. Foley stated that it would show up as a source of revenue into the CIP, and staff confirmed that the \$636K would go in later.

Ms. Allshouse reported on the recommended use of General Fund fund balance in FY15, stating that there was a \$1 million use of fund balance in the FY15 recommended budget. She said approximately \$300K is for position startup costs and one-time costs in the budget, for example, funding equipment for newly hired police officers.

Mr. Foley noted that this also includes their vehicles.

Ms. Allshouse reported that there is an economic development fund that is used to help pull down matching funds for business support and other initiatives, and those projects must be approved by the County Executive's Office.

Mr. Foley said, if the state has a project that is looking to locate here and the Governor's Opportunity Fund is in play, this allows them to put in a local share to match it.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the Fellowship Program fund is used to bring in temporary employees who are students with master's degrees, and staff would like to continue the program.

Ms. Allshouse said there is an additional amount for vehicle replacement, as that fund was run down really low during the recession, with vehicles not replaced as much as needed.

Ms. Dittmar asked how long it would be before they got to where they needed. Mr. Andy Bowman said the total vehicle replacement fund is approximately \$1 million and, of that amount, about \$115,000 is being funded through one-time money. He said, as part of last year's budget, they came up with a three-

year plan to get back to funding vehicle replacement with recurring money and, in FY14, they used \$200,000, \$115,000 in FY15, with the plan to use \$0 in the future.

Ms. Palmer asked how much the County normally spends from the economic development fund, and how much they spent the previous year.

Mr. Foley said they didn't spend any funds last year, nor the previous year, but several years before that, it was used to match the Governor's Opportunity Fund with some job training credits to help a company which located here.

Ms. Allshouse reported on the fuel contingency fund, stating that gas prices can be volatile so this fund is set aside for that purpose. She noted that the fund was not used in FY14, but it is still important to have it.

Ms. Allshouse stated that there is \$50,000 in an Innovation Fund, with the goal of saving more money than is put into it, and that is a total amount as opposed to an addition to other monies.

Ms. Allshouse said they also have a grants matching fund, which leverages additional revenue for the County.

Administration

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

Mr. Letteri stated that staff's recommended total FY15 budget for Administration is \$12,265,397, an increase of 6.2% over FY14 – with the largest departments in this category being Finance and Information Technology, which comprise about 64% of the total. He said that category also includes the Board of Supervisors, the County Executive, Human Resources, the County Attorney, Finance, Management and Budget, Information Technology, and Voter Registration. He said a lot of these internal departments provide services to the school division as well as local government, which is an important efficiency and structure different from many other localities.

Mr. Letteri stated that the Board of Supervisors category covers all BOS expenses including the Clerk's office – and the FY15 budget recommends total expenditures of \$648,083, an increase of about 8% or \$48,000. He said the majority of expenses go toward salaries and benefits for both the Clerk and the Office of the Board of Supervisors, including their travel and training, dues/memberships and their component of the annual audit – which will cost about \$163,000 in FY15. Mr. Letteri stated that other expenses in this category include legal advertisements for public hearings and special meetings. He said the category of memberships and dues includes participation in the Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development and the Chamber of Commerce, and those are recovered entirely through Economic Development Authority fees which are transferred in as revenue.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was an increase in a particular product that CVPED is doing that is causing this increase, as their membership fee has increased substantially. Mr. Foley said last year was the first year they moved from an equal amount fee for all jurisdictions to a population-based formula, and this is the second year of the implementation of that. He stated that the amount by comparison to other regions is about 50-60% of what most regions are paying, so it's a gradual way of getting to a reasonable level of funding.

Mr. Letteri stated that, in the County Executive Office and Executive Services category, the County Executive's Office is responsible for implementing the policies and goals of the Board and directing the day-to-day operations of the County. He said this category totals \$1,152,266 and the proposed budget recommends a decrease over FY14 of about \$37,535. Mr. Letteri stated that staff is proposing the creation of an Economic Development Office, and this budget proposes that they move the Economic Development Facilitator position from the Executive budget to the Office of Economic Development. He said they have also included in this year's budget a \$50,000 allocation for a half-time position, which will also be moved to the Economic Development Office. Mr. Letteri reported that the additions to this budget include the Community Engagement position previously discussed, and Ms. Catlin would provide more details about what that involves.

In addition to the cross-departmental changes mentioned by Ms. Allshouse earlier, Mr. Letteri said there were relatively few changes and adjustments to this budget in total. He said there are eight people in the Executive Office now, five of whom are on the executive management team – the County Executive, the two assistants, one office administrator and an organizational development person who helps with strategic planning and similar broad initiatives. Mr. Letteri stated that the other group in that office is the community and strategic partnerships staff, and they are involved with community relations and public engagement – and this group would include the new person. He said they have recently hired a

Communications Specialist so, in addition to Ms. Catlin, the new person would make that team a total of three.

Ms. Catlin addressed the Board, stating that if the Board decides to establish an economic development office, it is staff's anticipation that those responsibilities of marketing, communications, tourism and community partnerships would still remain in this office, while the new economic development office would focus on those core economic functions not currently being addressed. She said one of the responsibilities of her office has been community engagement, and they had a position for several years – but it was eliminated in 2009 when they were at the most severe of cost reduction strategies. At that point in time, she said they had two community advisory councils at a time when the capital budget was at just a maintenance level with no new projects being done – so the position was eliminated, but there was an understanding at that point to revisit that decision when activity levels started to change.

Ms. Catlin stated that they currently have four community advisory councils and hopefully will soon have six when the Comp Plan update is adopted and two new councils come on board. She said there will be approximately 90 council members in place, and tasks associated with the advisory councils include application, appointment and orientation processes, website and agenda posting, minutes, FOIA compliance, the communications piece, and meeting support. Ms. Catlin stated that most of these groups meet monthly and have expectations about what will happen before, during and after their meetings. She said these groups hold an annual joint town hall meeting each March; the councils are also very engaged in the master plan updates, with each plan updated every five years. She said Pantops would be updated as soon as the Comp Plan is adopted and, while the councils have been self-sufficient to some degree, in order for them to be effective, engaged and informed liaisons and advisors for the County, they need some level of staff support.

Ms. Catlin reported that they are in the position now of having some active capital projects moving forward – the Crozet streetscape, the Northside Library, the police firing range – and that will continue in the years ahead. She said the Board has a goal of “citizen ownership of community challenges” and, as they look into the near future, there are issues such as broadband, courts, solid waste, and water resources protection, staff realizes that there are major policy issues going forward that will require informed and engaged citizens to help the County arrive at the right conclusions on these projects. Ms. Catlin concluded that these are the issues driving the need for this particular position.

Ms. Mallek suggested putting the community engagement position on the list for discussion when they have more time to talk about what its focus will be.

Mr. Letteri reported that even with the new position, the Executive Office is still not back to pre-2009 levels. He said they have one office assistant for the entire group and, with the level of activity and complexity of the office, it's a challenge to keep up with all the various tasks. Mr. Letteri stated that another challenge they have is the lack of management analysts and, currently, they use existing departments to do whatever special research or analysis that needs to be done – but the departments themselves are already challenged to deal with their own level of work. He said there was a requested half-time position that came from that office which is not included in the recommended budget.

Ms. Palmer said it sounds like an internship kind of job.

Ms. Mallek stated that it's a highly skilled type of position.

Mr. Foley said Mr. Andy Bowman used to serve as Management Analyst, but the demand in OMB required him to shift to that area. He stated that, at the end of each departmental presentation, the Board would hear the top two challenges for the future that are unfunded – and, in this case, it is those two positions.

Mr. Letteri stated that Human Resources serves both local government and schools, and it is formally a school department to which the County contributes each year, and the transfer to the schools is about \$543,000 for that department. He said HR is a large department with a broad area of responsibilities, covering employee recruitment, selection and retention, classification and compensation – which has been a challenging area this year, and administration of benefits and leave, which has also been challenging given the changes in VRS, hybrid plans, etc. Mr. Letteri said HR also deals with employee relations, workplace safety and wellness, teacher licensure, certifications and training. He stated that the department serves approximately 3,800 employees total – including 2,400 school employees, 630 local government employees, 180 regional jail employees, and 600 substitute and temporary employees. Mr. Letteri said the total budget is approximately \$2.3 million, with \$543,000 coming from local government. He stated that the primary changes in this category relate to the cross-departmental changes as highlighted earlier, and said that they've also reallocated costs which were previously absorbed by this department for certain benefits for part-time workers, which have now distributed back to departments. Mr. Letteri clarified that those benefits included an annuity and group life insurance policy for part-time employees, and the cost of those policies was previously accounted for in HR but now will be distributed to the departments where those employees are placed.

Ms. Mallek asked if reclassification was an option in order to provide raises to employees. Ms. Vinzant said, when “reclassifications” are referenced in department descriptions, those are to fund reclassifications which have already occurred; there is a pool for new reclassifications in the non-departmental section, which is budgeted at \$120,000 for FY15.

Ms. Lorna Gerome, Director of Human Resources, stated that, as the organization has adapted to changing needs, many employees have had to take on more responsibilities and assume broader roles – and their work has become more complex with new technology systems. She said a lot of the reclassifications have been done to accurately compensate for that broad expansion of duties; if they don't compensate those employees accordingly, they risk losing them and, if the long-term classification plan isn't funded, they get behind as they did with public safety and then have to end up digging out of a hole.

Mr. Foley noted that there is an amount for individual reclassifications and also an amount set aside for a specific group which has fallen behind, and it is a lot of money if the Board wanted to reallocate it – but staff has already identified some departments which are in need of that, based on HR's recommendations.

Mr. Boyd said the amount allocated is not an unusual amount for an organization of Albemarle's size, and all companies must deal with that.

Mr. Foley mentioned that the police reclassifications cost about \$400,000.

Ms. McKeel said different groups cycle through, and HR determines that there is a need to look at a particular sector based on the market – which happens in County government as well as schools and is just part of doing business.

Mr. Sheffield asked how many additional employees have enrolled in the County's health insurance plan as a result of efforts like UVA's where they've disallowed spouses to be on health insurance plans. Ms. Gerome said they have had an increase in enrollment in both spouses and dependents, with about 40 directly related to the UVA change and an additional 10 from other employers which have made that same change. She stated that the County doesn't increase the employer contribution for dependent coverage because they are self-insured, and it's not a direct cost as it was for City of Charlottesville Schools – but there may be increased cost realized with claims in the future. Ms. Gerome said the number of new individual enrollees coming onto the County's plan is less than 10, because it is advantageous for an employee to take the health plan and they typically have 90% enrollment.

Ms. Palmer asked her to explain the 30-year salary cap. Ms. Gerome stated that teachers and classified staff are treated the same way and, with teachers, the top of the scale goes up to T-31, so there's a maximum; classified employees also have a maximum in their pay grade and, once they hit that maximum, any salary increase no longer goes into their base but they do receive a lump sum for that maximum. She said 2% is an average over the teacher's scale and, whatever the teacher's scale moves, they would get that amount – not a fixed 2%. Ms. Gerome noted that positions such as the Superintendent of Schools and County Executive are not classified, so they are not on those pay grades.

Ms. McKeel asked her to explain the longevity stipend. Ms. Gerome said a classified employee would get whatever amount was over the 2% and it's called a lump sum; the teachers would get an amount based on their years above the T-30 and it's called a longevity stipend.

Mr. Letteri reported that the County Attorney's Office is an organizational area which provides services to more than just local government, as the office provides legal counsel and advice on all civil matters to the Board of Supervisors, the School Board, and all other boards, agencies and officials of the County – in areas such as land use, zoning, taxation, finance, law enforcement, social services contracts, real estate, employment, legislation and litigation. He said there are eight individuals in this department, including five attorneys and three support staff functioning as paralegals or office assistants. Mr. Letteri stated that the total budget is \$1,040,897, and the proposed budget recommends an increase of \$23,942 or 2.4% – primarily related to cross-departmental needs.

Mr. Letteri said the County's Finance Department is divided into six major areas or divisions, including administration, revenue and taxation, accounting, real estate, purchasing, and payroll. He stated that Finance Director, Betty Burrell, provided him with information on scope and volume explaining that 224,000 tax bills were issued in 2013 and accounting has issued about 45,000 checks. Mr. Letteri said the department is moving toward a P-Card system, which has been a great efficiency with invoicing and billing – and thus far, have had about 5,600 transactions through the system. He stated that Purchasing is a very stressed department, providing all the procurement and purchase orders for both schools and local government and, last year, about 3,300 different POs were processed at a total of \$65 million in volume. Mr. Letteri said payroll each month totals about \$13 million, with about 3,800 checks issued each month; and that department has a staff of three.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would encourage staff to fully explore the P-card system, as it can really improve efficiencies.

Ms. Betty Burrell, Director of Finance, addressed the Board, stating that the County is now at 99% direct deposit for employees and having that capability is a condition of all new hires. Regarding the purchase order volume, she said they can't totally eliminate those even though P-cards improve those efficiencies. Ms. Burrell said the threshold for P-Cards is currently \$1,000, and staff will be coming to the Board in the near future to ask for that amount to be raised.

Mr. Letteri summarized that this total category is just over \$5 million in expenditures, with the proposed budget recommending an increase of \$349,000 or 7.5%. He said highlights of those changes

include funding a full year of the risk manager position, with recruitment currently underway. Mr. Letteri said other operating expenses are increasing by \$80,000, including a \$30,000 increase in professional services to provide assistance with the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) preparation – currently handled in-house – and they are hoping this is the last year outside expertise will be sought for assistance. He stated that there's a \$22,000 increase in special litigation based on prior year trends, and an \$18,000 increase in training to fund the department's essential training needs. Mr. Letteri said the last item is conversion of a contract employee who's been with the County for three years into a full-time position in the area of financial systems and business operations manager, and this has come about as a result of the Access Albemarle program.

Mr. Boyd asked about the risk management position and what they expect to save as a result of that. Mr. Letteri said the County's risk in all areas of operation involves employee safety, financial risk, operational risk, etc. – and it is difficult to quantify.

Mr. Boyd asked if there was any way to measure it through reduced insurance premiums and the like. Ms. Burrell said they can't anticipate exact dollar amounts of what will be saved, but the position should provide better safety and property protection because there are things that will be put in place to help protect County properties. She stated that, in five years, they will see tremendous benefit in having a risk manager because, at some point, they will be able to self-insure or at least raise their deductible so they're not paying an insurance carrier and will begin to assume some of their own risk.

Mr. Boyd stated that he was thinking more of things like workmen's compensation, as they should be able to save on insurance through a reduction in claims because of improved workplace safety. Ms. Burrell said they already have a wellness and safety person, but they need a risk manager to evaluate data and claims so they can get people back to work quicker and reduce the number of people who are out for long-term disability.

Mr. Boyd said he was looking for some way to measure the success of that, since it was an added position and, to the extent they can quantify a position in any area, they should do that.

Mr. Foley said staff could work on some metrics for that.

Mr. Letteri reported on the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), stating that the four functional areas include the annual budgeting process, long-range planning, performance management, and grants including pursuit and compliance. He stated that the OMB budget is currently at \$353,992, with the recommended budget increasing by 3.4% or \$11,476 – primarily associated with cross-departmental issues.

Mr. Boyd asked if they were adding a part-time person to assist during budget time. Mr. Letteri stated that the office was very lean in terms of the number of employees, and there are times during the year, such as budget season, when they are focused entirely on the budget and can't keep up with their level of regular work.

Mr. Boyd said this is in addition to the fellows in the program.

Ms. Allshouse said they increased it slightly for some part-time assistance during peak times, as overtime and comp time both tend to increase during this period.

Judicial

- **Clerk of Circuit Court**
- **Commonwealth's Attorney**
- **Office of the Sheriff**
- **Circuit Court**
- **General District Court**
- **Magistrate**
- **Juvenile Court**

Mr. Letteri stated that his final category of discussion was the Judicial category, which totals \$4.4 million and involves the Clerk of the Circuit Court, the Commonwealth's Attorney, the Sheriff's Office, and contributions to the courts. He said the budget for the office of the Clerk of Court is \$841,000 – of which \$539,000 is supported by the state or the Compensation Board, which supports salaries and expenditures of the courts. He said most jurisdictions supplement these operations to some degree so they can perform their operations efficiently. Mr. Letteri said this budget recommends an increase of \$58,675 for the Clerk's Office, or a 24% increase, and involves the changes mentioned by Ms. Allshouse as they are on the County's pay plan. He reported that the other major change is to fund the other half of a full-time chief deputy position for the Clerk, which has been identified both in operational audits and the evaluations HR has done of the operation, as well as supported by the state supreme court as a necessary and essential role for their operation. Mr. Letteri said the Commonwealth Attorney is the second category, and that position is also a constitutional officer which provides various services for all three courts in the system. He stated that their operation totals \$1,070,231, and they are requesting an operational increase of 2.7% or \$28,000, all related to cross-departmental adjustments. He said this operation is also subsidized by the County, and the transfer to the operation is about \$501,000 per year. Mr. Letteri said the third area involves the Office of the Sheriff, which includes 23 FTEs and totals \$2.2 million; the request is for an additional \$74,000 or 3.4% primarily for required cross-departmental adjustments. He noted that

there are some increases for vehicle replacement and fuel costs, which are a major component of this office's work.

Ms. Palmer asked if that would be in capital outlay, and Mr. Letteri confirmed that it would be.

Ms. Palmer asked about the funding for the public defender and said that, at some point, she'd like to hear the reasons for not funding that position.

Ms. McKeel agreed that she would also like to have that discussion.

Ms. Dittmar suggested that it be put on the list of items for further discussion.

Mr. Foley pointed out that they didn't get a budget request from the public defender's office through the process, but said they could still discuss it.

Mr. Letteri said the last category of Judicial is courts, with support provided for General District Court, Circuit Court and the Magistrate's Office, as well as the Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court. He stated that there were minor increases in this category totaling \$263,644, and the County supports one position for the court, a clerk, and the increase is \$9,316 or 3.7% for cross-departmental adjustments and a minor increase for expenditures in lease contracts.

Public Safety

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

Mr. Doug Walker addressed the Board, stating that the functional areas within Community Services include public safety, social services, the health department, parks and recreation, community development, and a number of agencies which are tied to those functional areas. Mr. Walker said, under public safety, the total budget is \$36,883,704, with the majority divided between the police and fire department, and other portions going to the Albemarle/Charlottesville Regional Jail (ACRJ), Emergency Communications Center, (ECC), inspections and other fire and rescue services.

Mr. Walker reported that the Police Department budget reflects an increase of \$714,000 or 4.7%, and 3% of that increase is for overtime based on previous trends; there is a \$44,000 operational increase due to increased fuel and telecommunications costs; there are also some decreases due to grants for selective enforcement for overtime, and an increase in state support for HB-599 funds for local governments with their own police departments. He stated that the budget includes funding for three additional police officer positions and the related operating and one-time costs associated with those new positions. Mr. Walker said the Comp Plan identifies an officer per thousand population ratio of 1.5 to 1,000, and the FY15 budget would achieve a population ratio of 1.23 officers per 1,000 population. He noted that it would require 28 additional police officers to actually achieve the goal. Mr. Walker said there are two specific aspects to this ratio as mentioned in the five-year financial planning process, and the five-year financial plan includes 12 additional patrol officers which would maintain the current officer/population ratio. He stated that the Board has been talking about a shift to geo-policing and, while that would require additional staffing to keep up with population, it would be a shift towards 10-hour shifts. Mr. Walker said the phase two – geo-policing – is addressed, in part, through the addition of three additional police officers.

Mr. Ron Lantz, Deputy Chief of Police for Operations, addressed the Board on behalf of Col. Steve Sellers. Chief Lantz explained that the department has asked for a total of six officers in the five-year plan plus one school resource officer. He explained that having five officers for the next three years would get them to the 10-hour shift which they need, and the 10-hour shift would be the squad-based system they are trying to achieve. Chief Lantz said the bare minimum they would need would be five officers a year for the next three years.

Mr. Sheffield said he would like to add this item to the Board's list for further discussion, stating that he would like to get a better understanding of how the three positions recommended in the budget would be used – because it would really mean one officer on the road per shift.

Chief Lantz agreed, stating that, currently for evening shift, they are down three positions due to attrition from retirements or career changes. He stated that they have three officers who have confirmed they are going to retire, and there are 14 who have 20 years or more who can retire if they choose. He said those three officers would be plugged into evening shift, and any new positions would be plugged into "patrol engine" positions which are the boots on the ground. Chief Lantz said he and Colonel Sellers developed a pilot for a 10-hour shift which began November 16, and they've already seen success with that – even without all the positions filled. He said they've built in a larger overlap during peak calls for service time, and that has helped reduce response times for priority one calls – going from 66% to 72% in responding within five minutes or less. Chief Lantz said that they are struggling in the rural areas to get there within 10 minutes or less, going from 31% to 42% when they started the pilot program.

Ms. Palmer asked if the Board was looking to change the Comp Plan to reflect geo-policing. Mr. Walker said staff recognizes this as a transition between the Board directive to maintain the officer/population revenue as reflected in the five-year plan and a new initiative for geo-policing and what resources that requires. He stated that there is a blending of goals here to try to maintain staffing and staffing levels as well as implement a new community-based policing model, and they would need to continue to have that conversation with the Board.

Ms. Palmer commented that there might be a different target with geo-policing rather than straight population levels, and asked if that would need to be reflected in the Comp Plan.

Mr. Foley stated that they're seeing a transition here, and staff is looking for that direction from the Board.

Ms. Mallek said she would classify geo-policing as a far enhanced model compared to the Comp Plan model.

Chief Lantz stated that school resource officers (SROs) are also part of the geo-policing package, it's just not a patrol function and, last year in Albemarle County, middle schools alone generated 410 calls for service – with Walton Middle School having 132 calls. He said the reason why that school's volume is high is because that school has an SRO and he recognized crime and reported it, so they anticipate that to happen especially in the beginning as people get more comfortable with reporting crime.

Mr. Walker reported that, with the Fire Rescue Department, the budget reflects an increase of \$584,000 or 6.1%. He explained that the "battalion chief staffing" item is not additional personnel, but is enabling the department to appoint an acting battalion chief. He said the Rescue 8 building next to Seminole Trail will house career rescue staff after the project is completed. Mr. Walker said the County is on a program of replacing approximately 1/9 of turnout gear every year, and that item in the budget is tied to the replacement program – which was originally purchased with grant funding.

Mr. Sheffield asked why that wasn't considered a capital item. Mr. Bowman said that turnout gear combined would reach the dollar threshold for capital criteria but, most years, there are individual pieces and Finance classifies that as an operating expense.

Mr. Walker stated that there is \$20,000 in the budget for two additional rescue training classes as requested by Western Albemarle Rescue Squad, and it's included in the training budget on the Fire Rescue side which is typically how they handle training.

Ms. Mallek asked Chief Eggleston to explain the battalion chief element in a little more detail.

Chief Dan Eggleston addressed the Board, stating that several years ago they added battalion chiefs, which provides a supervisor for each 24-hour shift. He said, when they made that switch, they hired just three people to fill three slots – so when one battalion chief is off, Fire Rescue has to backfill that slot with someone from administration. Chief Eggleston said their desire is to pull a captain up into an acting position to fill that role, and that will require additional funding to pay the overtime.

Ms. Mallek asked what the battalion chiefs would do during the day, because there are independent fire companies that are working during the day. Chief Eggleston said their main responsibility would be to manage resources, to make sure that equipment is moved around to provide supervision on significant calls, and to help manage the system on a daily basis. He stated they are rather busy, and there has been an increase in the amount of time they spend on major calls, so those positions are again backfilled from administration. Chief Eggleston emphasized that these chiefs are on the street providing supervision on a daily basis, and they may move ambulances around based on activity or may supervise an event as it unfolds. He stated that, just the previous day, there was a major accident and a large brush fire going on at the same time, and that's becoming a weekly occurrence.

Mr. Walker reported that there are nine firefighters that were hired as part of a FEMA grant two years earlier, with five dedicated to expand rescue services in the Route 29 corridor, and four for the Ivy Fire Station. He stated that two of the nine will very likely be eligible for continued funding, and the FY15 budget for Fire Rescue picks up the cost of seven of those nine when the grant expires in May 2015, which would mean one month of funding for the FY15 budget year. Mr. Walker said there is also a fire training instructor position with a focus on volunteer training, and that grant expires at the end of FY14, so the budget provides for local funding for that position as an FTE beginning in July.

Ms. Mallek asked if this was Chief Scott Lambert's position, because he's been here for a decade or more, or whether it was another person to help increase the number of classes offered. Chief Eggleston said, in 2009, the state increased the number of training hours required for Firefighter I, and they were only able to provide one class per year – which was not adequate for volunteer numbers. He said, through a grant, they were able to increase the FTE by one person – which allowed them to go from one to three classes and institute a blended learning training program that has been very successful. Chief Eggleston said this position would allow them to continue the one additional person in training so they can provide three programs a year.

Mr. Walker said the EMS cost recovery program also reflects some changes, specifically the increase of a full FTE to serve as a cost recovery analyst to improve quality control for the significant increase in the amount of transactions processed with the increase in their billing program. He stated that this is anticipated to be offset 2/3 by an increase in related revenue, and an anticipated increase in

revenue tied to the EMS cost recovery program – with the expectation that Western Albemarle Rescue Squad will participate and will execute the memorandum of understanding with the County, and that the money for their participation will start coming into the budget in October. Mr. Walker said this also assumes that the Board will make program changes consistent with the recent Office of Inspector General opinion to change the way the County does billing – so that they're only billing for insurance for bona fide County residents. He stated that it does include an anticipated reduction in revenue. Mr. Walker said the County has been paying 5.5% of collections to an outside third-party vendor, but is also using current staff time – particularly Wendy Roberman – to provide what quality control she can, and that has taken her away from other responsibilities in support of ACFR.

Chief Eggleston noted that, when they began this program, they had three transport units billing – the two County-owned units and Scottsville Rescue; since then, they've tripled the number of transport units and are up to 7,000 calls for EMS. He stated that they've done that without any staff increase at all, and it's very important to keep the paperwork and patient care reporting accurate in terms of what goes to the billing contractor, so they can interface with insurance companies and Medicare to get reimbursement. Chief Eggleston said the \$40,000 is a good estimate of efficiencies, but it would be important to improve paperwork methods for the billing contractor, which cannot be done with existing staff.

Mr. Walker said it's difficult to quantify the value of the work that's not getting done because of the time being spent by existing staff to manage the quality control aspects of the billing, but staff could work on a way to pinpoint it to help them understand those demands.

Chief Eggleston said it's important to get the patient care form documented well, and billing has to be even more accurate. He stated that they want to make sure not to shift that burden to providers, so they can focus on taking care of the patient. Chief Eggleston said the electronic record is done in the ambulance, but there are conditions and coding which must be done correctly before that information gets sent to the billing contractor. He stated that the EMS forms are very complicated to look at it, and they don't have the capacity to review those properly – adding that Albemarle is the only locality among its peers that doesn't have someone assigned to this process.

Ms. Mallek said some localities do it all in-house, and don't pay the 5% to an outside vendor.

Mr. Walker reported that there is an increase of \$217,000 in the Fire Rescue budget, much of which is tied to increase in support for volunteer fire and rescue partners, the 10 volunteer stations, and there is a volunteer funding policy used by OMB in evaluating those requests and communicating with them about their requests. He stated that the volunteer fire rescue tax credit program reflects an increase, and there have been some changes in the program to make it more automated – which is anticipated to lead to more participation.

Ms. Mallek commented that it's just the vehicle sticker.

Mr. Davis said there is a personal property stipend and a vehicle tax stipend.

Mr. Walker reported that the City fire contract increase reflects a difference in what was assumed last year as part of the budget process, prior to completion of the operational conversations about the terms of the contract. He said there is also a decrease in the contingency because there is better information now about actuals.

Ms. Mallek asked if the turnout gear request was for volunteer equipment. Mr. Bowman said they do provide turnout gear replacements for volunteers, but it is listed separately from the Fire Rescue Department budget as "other fire rescue services."

Chief Eggleston pointed out that the \$31,000 in replacement gear for paid staff was to catch up from years when budgets were extremely tight, and the nine-year replacement cycle is really at the far end of what's acceptable in the industry.

Ms. Mallek said volunteers have been doing that out of their home budgets. Chief Eggleston said that's true in some cases, but ACFR has always had a very healthy fund to replace that gear on the volunteer side.

Mr. Walker said inspections and building codes would be discussed under Community Development because that's where they are managed but, for budgeting and accounting purposes, this is viewed as a public safety function. He stated that the County's contributions for ECC, regional jail and juvenile detention have decreased. Mr. Walker said the ECC contribution had dropped because the call volume for the County has decreased; the regional jail costs are assessed on a per-bed basis, and they have experienced a decrease in overall inmate population; the juvenile detention contribution uses a three-year rolling average, which should level out to what could be some dramatic increases. He stated that the SPCA increase is driven purely by a per-capita formula.

Ms. Mallek asked if Offender Aid and Restoration and Drug Court were "under the gun" again this year legislatively.

Mr. Davis said he assumes they are going to be funded, because he hasn't heard anything to the contrary and would have if they were threatened.

Mr. Walker stated that there are other support components that are a part of the police department budget, including the records clerk, the animal control supervisor, a civilian component to geo-

policing to take care of more routine functions, and their career development program. On the Fire Rescue side, he said there is an interest in enhancing prevention specifically with public education. Mr. Walker stated that plan review is keeping pace with development, but inspections often falls secondary to plan review and that capacity issue needs to be addressed. He said there isn't a dedicated fleet maintenance person with Fire Rescue, using existing staff instead, and there is a very large and expensive fleet for both career and volunteer firefighters.

Ms. Mallek said each volunteer station has a person to manage the fleets – usually not a driver or firefighter, but someone who is good with machines.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarification on what “inspections” entailed. Chief Eggleston explained that the inspections component of fire rescue is to ensure there is compliance with the state fire prevention code, so staff goes into schools and businesses to ensure state codes are met. He said it's a form of fire prevention, and some inspections are mandatory more frequently than others.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was a fee that businesses paid to be inspected and whether it covered the cost of the inspection. Chief Eggleston said there is a fee but it doesn't fully cover the cost, and ACFR staff is planning to come before the Board to review those charges.

Ms. McKeel stated that she is interested in discussing inspections and their ability to maintain safe communities given staffing levels, because her sense is that some of this goes back to 2008 when positions may have been cut.

Ms. Dittmar said she would like to add that issue to the list for further discussion.

Ms. Mallek said that it currently included Fire Marshal Howard Lagomarsino and two other inspectors, and that has expanded along with their roles.

Chief Eggleston stated that Fire/Rescue is multi-functional and takes care of everything from public education to plans review to engineering to investigations.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would like to know more about inspections to include who is responsible for inspecting roads and other critical safety infrastructure.

Mr. Foley said some are mandatory and some are preventative, but staff could bring that information forward in more detail.

Public Works

- **General Services**
- **Stormwater**
- **Facilities Development**
- **RSWA**

Mr. Letteri reported that the category of Public Works includes four areas: General Services; stormwater - which is separated out this year; Facilities Development; and contributions to the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA). He stated that this category totals \$4.49 million, and the proposed budget recommends an increase of \$468,448 or an 11.6% increase. Under General Services, he said there are 20 staff members working on the maintenance and operations of various county facilities and grounds as well as utility costs, and the total budget is \$3.49 million, with the proposed budget recommending an increase \$219,000 or 6.7%. In addition to cross-departmental adjustments, he said the primary increase is related to operations of the new Northside Library and warehouse – an addition of \$187,000 to include buildings, grounds maintenance, custodial services and associated utilities. Mr. Letteri reported that an additional \$10,327 relates to the Rescue 8 building as mentioned by Mr. Walker.

Mr. Letteri stated that other impacts to the budget include an addition of \$20,964 related to overall building maintenance costs and \$28,578 related to grounds maintenance, with a particular focus on increasing level of service for median mowing and general aesthetics in the community.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the \$187,000 for Northside Library was an additional annual cost for operations maintenance. Mr. Letteri said that it was.

Mr. Foley noted that it's a three-quarters year cost because the facility is opening in October.

Mr. Letteri confirmed that was the case.

Ms. McKeel asked if the custodial services were contracted out. Mr. George Shadman, Director of General Services, said they were contracting for those services, adding that there are two custodians on the County payroll that address needs for all County buildings – but other than that, the daily cleaning of buildings and trash removal/disposal is all contracted out.

Ms. McKeel said she would like to have a discussion in the future about combining services with the school system, which has a huge custodial department.

Mr. Shadman stated that every few years they take the in-house services and compare them with private-sector contracting to see which is most cost-effective.

Ms. McKeel said she was actually referring to looking at the school system's existing custodial service to see if there may be some efficiencies for the County.

Ms. Palmer said she would like to ask about having four more hours of custodial service at Yancey Elementary School on a temporary basis on Saturdays to support on-going efforts to make that a community facility, because it seems to be a barrier in jumpstarting that program.

Mr. Walker said it would be talked about as part of the report coming back to the Board in April during the discussion of establishing that facility.

Staff said that they would put it on the list for further Board discussion.

In conclusion, Mr. Letteri said the priorities in this category are maintenance mechanics for the new facilities being brought online, grounds and facilities maintenance issues, custodial services, additional median mowing and environmental management. He mentioned that stormwater is now a separate expenditure in the Public Works category, totaling \$360,770 and recommended to increase \$94,325 or 35%. He said the primary increases in this category are related to the additional engineer and inspector positions, which will begin in January, so the cost reflects two full-time positions which are funded for just half the year. Mr. Letteri stated that the other additional funds are the \$95,125 or 10% operating increases for maintenance, contract costs associated with permit requirements; the entire operation of \$360,770 will be funded from the 0.7-cent tax increase that would be dedicated to this operation, with the balance going into capital.

Mr. Letteri presented a slide showing the Virginia Stormwater Management fees which will be generated through inspections and Community Development fees to cover those areas and support the engineer and inspector positions, adding that the other part of the 0.7 cents is going into operating for TMDL expenditures with the remainder going into capital to support the Hollymead Dam project.

Ms. Dittmar asked if staff could move to the economic development office discussion, as she had an obligation which would require her to leave.

Mr. Foley said staff was aware that some Board members might have to leave, so they would cover as much as possible and move the remainder to the meeting to the following Monday – adding that the Board would also be setting a tax rate that day.

Ms. McKeel stated that she was concerned about all that is on Monday's agenda in addition to the tax rate discussion and decision.

Mr. Foley said one option would be for the Board to identify the items it would like to have on the list for consideration as they contemplate the tax rate, with the idea there would still be some general review done later as they finalize the budget. He stated that the challenge was the timing of getting the ad out because of a new state law, but the way staff had the schedule set up includes a final work session if needed – which it seems that they will.

Ms. Mallek stated that they could break in the middle of the day on Monday, then reconvene in the afternoon.

Board members discussed their respective schedules, and agreed to meet on Monday in a split session with a lunch break in between.

Mr. Letteri reported that the first of the last two categories in the Public Works area is Facilities Development – which is an internal services fund which is funded through the capital fund based on hourly rates established each year. He said the minor increase in that budget this year reflects cross-departmental adjustments and an increase of the rate from \$75 to \$80 per hour. He said the last category is Public Works contributions, which represent contributions to Rivanna Solid Waste Authority in connection with the Ivy Material Utilization Center and Transfer Station – explaining that the County has requested an extension of that contract for one year, with those additional costs of \$150,000 reflected in this budget for a total of \$450,000.

Mr. Letteri briefly reviewed the priority items in the Public Works category.

Health and Welfare

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

Mr. Walker reported on the Health and Welfare category, with a total budget of more than \$19.5 million, nearly 75% of which is attributable to the Department of Social Services (DSS) and the County's transfer to the Comprehensive Services Act (CSA). He stated that the DSS budget reflects an increase of 4.7% or \$521,000, with an additional full-time position – a foster care adoption senior eligibility worker – which is a high priority to address significant caseload issues, and .25 FTE part-time hours to address caseload support for the Comprehensive Services Act. Mr. Walker said there is a net local cost decrease of \$25,000 for the department as a whole as there are some off-setting revenues tied to direct services. He stated that there is a proposed additional eligibility worker for Family Access to Medical Insurance Security (FAMIS), a federal and state program which provides low-cost health insurance for children and

families that earn too much for Medicaid but do not have private insurance. He said, in 2014, these cases will be transferred from state to local government – and the concern is not only the management of 625 active cases, but the fact that a 75% denial rate means a total of 2,300 applications which needs to be processed by local staff. Mr. Walker stated that the General Assembly has approved funding for a new position to support local government, and the Board would see in its upcoming budget a request to use existing department funding to cover the local share of that cost. He said this budget does not include but will have on the list approximately \$10,000 of new local money for an additional position to deal with that caseload.

Ms. McKeel said her impression has been that DSS has received less money from the state for many years, with a lot of pushback to localities.

Mr. Walker said that is the case, and Kathy Ralston of DSS reported to him earlier in the day that, based on staffing ratios put out by the state, they are about 40 positions low.

Ms. McKeel stated that they need to have a bigger discussion about this in the future, after this budget session.

Mr. Foley said those are strategic issues similar to geo-policing which will be discussed in a future Board priority-setting meeting.

Mr. Walker reported that the Bright Stars Program, a jointly funded preschool program, shows an increase of 3.5%.

Mr. Walker stated that the Comprehensive Services Act includes state and local money, as well as federal money and money from the schools, and this budget reflects a decrease in the cost per case but an increase in the number of cases overall. Mr. Walker said the County is experiencing a 5% increase in local costs to support the program and, in the past, have used the fund balance in CSA to offset increases in local support, however, the balance is at a level which is not recommended but they continue to use. He emphasized that the variance in this cost can be significant, depending on the cases.

Mr. Walker said the Jefferson Area Board for Aging (JABA) has been moving away from County subsidy of Mountainside Senior Living and instead has been using that funding for some part-time capacity in other higher priority areas.

Mr. Foley mentioned that JAUNT funding indicates “level funding,” but there were some route changes which means they are actually expanding service.

Mr. Walker said it was Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) which had increased.

Mr. Foley confirmed that it was CAT.

Mr. Walker reported that Region Ten Community Services Board is a quasi-state agency providing mental health and substance abuse services, which is funded by formula, and the County is a member of that board. He said there is a budget increase based on that formula, and a decrease in the Healthy Transitions program tied to a decrease in the number of County participants that are receiving benefits.

Mr. Walker said there is a significant increase in Health Department funding, based on the County's share of rent for the building – and Dr. Lilian Peake was able to get additional rent support from the state, so the increase is intended to pull down the state share of \$197,000.

Mr. Walker reported that many of the Health and Welfare agencies are considered a part of the Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT) process, and Gretchen Ellis coordinates that process whereby the programs are evaluated with a fairly large group comprised of City and County representatives. Mr. Walker said each agency is rated as part of that process as exemplary, solid, fair or weak – and determinations about funding are generally left to local governments based on that rating.

Mr. Foley said the County looks at agencies through three different processes including ABRT, and he could provide that explanation to the Board via email.

Ms. McKeel stated that one of the groups that she had questions about was the Municipal Band, as they have been cut significantly. Mr. Walker said he would address that item separately.

Mr. Walker reported that, also under Health and Welfare, is the County's tax relief program, and eligible applicants may qualify for 20-100% of relief – with criteria being residents who are 65 years or older, or who are permanently or totally disabled with incomes of less than \$69,452 and a net worth cap of less than \$200,000. Mr. Walker said the tax relief program is budgeted as an expense within the Health and Welfare category.

Ms. Palmer asked if this was something the Board had established in the past, and whether there were state guidelines for it.

Mr. Walker said there is enabling legislation which allows localities to establish those, and there are parameters set for the programs.

Ms. Palmer said she would like to see those parameters.

Ms. Mallek noted that the \$200,000 is exclusive of the house and 10 acres, so it really has a wide-ranging ability for people to apply – and suggested to fellow Board members that they take some of the blue application forms to their town hall meetings. She said renewals are due April 1st and new applications are due October 1st, with forms available through the Finance Department.

Mr. Walker said all of the Health and Welfare agencies are listed and he could provide further clarification on the acronyms as necessary. He mentioned that the Parks and Recreation Department budget has an \$8,000 line item for utility costs at the Scottsville Community Center, with the anticipation that the Boys & Girls Club will be successful in moving forward with their use of that building. He said they have also identified an in-kind amount for the lease using fair market value rates. Mr. Walker reported that the Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless (TJACH) had a contingency which the Board set aside to deal with the homelessness initiative in partnership with the City, and that effort has now transitioned to TJACH's work – so what looks like a new agency is really just the implementation of decisions made by the Board the previous year in conjunction with the City.

Ms. Mallek said the effort operates within the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission.

Mr. Walker confirmed that was the case, and said TJACH had re-formed with both County and City representation and a positive sense of what that work will provide in terms of a continuum of care, a housing navigator, and other best practices innovations.

Ms. Mallek asked if the United Way funding is only for scholarship funding for families to participate in direct-fee subsidies for childcare which, in turn, enables parents to work.

Mr. Walker said United Way is recommended for level funding, and there have been recent conversations with schools, local government and United Way as to how to better work together on that initiative.

Mr. Walker reported that compelling needs going forward in the Health and Welfare category are mostly related to the Social Services arena with regard to caseloads, and they would further address these issues in a strategic fashion as they talk about the five-year financial planning process in the fall. He said, on the agency side, the County in the past has provided additional funding for those agencies which have come through the ABRT process and are rated exemplary or solid – but there is no funding in this budget to recognize those levels of achievement.

Ms. Dittmar said she would like to look at the foster care and adoption caseworker item more closely, and requested it be put on the list for discussion.

Mr. Foley stated that staff would get an agenda to the Board in advance of the meeting the following Monday.

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

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adjourn to March 3, 2014, 9:00 a.m., Room 241.

At 12:10 p.m., Ms. McKeel **moved** to adjourn the Board meeting to March 3, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

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

NAYS: None.

(Note: Due to inclement weather, the March 3rd meeting was cancelled and a special meeting called for March 4, 2014, 9:00 a.m.)

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 09/03/2014
Initials: EWJ