

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on June 16, 2014, at 11:00 a.m., Room 241, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from March 5, 2014.

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

ABSENT: Ms. Liz Palmer.

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

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 11:25 a.m. by Chair, Ms. Dittmar.

Agenda Item No. 2. Meeting with Senator Tim Kaine.

Item No. 2a. Welcome and Introductions.

Ms. Dittmar welcomed Senator Tim Kaine and introduced County staff.

She mentioned that she had attended the defense industry reception the previous evening and asked if things were going well at UVA.

Senator Kaine stated that they were. He added that Congressman Randy Forbes had spoken first and played a critical role on the Seapower subcommittee in the House of Representatives. Senator Kaine said that they had a great turnout at the event, and he felt that it was smart to hold that type of meeting. He then introduced Ms. Tyee Davenport, his Richmond regional office director. This region does include Charlottesville. In addition, Mr. John Knapp, from the same office, leads all of his state operations.

Item No. 2b. Brief Overview of Albemarle County.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant to the County Executive for Community and Business Partnerships, presented an overview of Albemarle County. She stated that the County is 723 square miles and the 6th largest county in the state – and 5% of that is located in development areas, where growth is encouraged to happen, and 95% is in rural areas. Ms. Catlin said that in 2012, about 56% of dwelling units were located in development areas, with the remainder in the rural areas. She stated that the last Census showed the population to be about 98,900, with 52% females. She stated that Charlottesville's 2013 projected population of 46,600 makes the combined metro area at about 150,000. Ms. Catlin said that the average growth rate, according to the Weldon Cooper Center, is 1.6-1.8% per year, with about 70% of that being in-migration.

Ms. Catlin presented demographic information on racial and ethnic composition, noting that 5.5% of population growth has come from the Hispanic/Latino population. She reported that the largest population group in the County is between 15-19, with a large segment between 24-29, and the fastest growing age group being those 65+ as a lot of local amenities such as good climate and healthcare make the area appealing to retirees. Ms. Catlin said that there are approximately 38,100 households with an average household size of 2.4 people, and 10,000 of those homes having children under 18, with almost 10,000 having people over 65.

She reported that the unemployment rate locally was 2.3% in 2007, with a high of 5.5% in 2010, and as of April 2014 the rate was 3.6%. Ms. Catlin presented a chart showing the number of jobs in the County, noting that the number of jobs has decreased from a high of 50,300 in 2007-08, but is building back up again. She stated that per-capita income averages \$47,000, and median family income is \$88,000. There are about 60 enterprises that employ more than 100 employees in Albemarle, and about 3,000 enterprises that employ less than 100 employees. Small businesses are the County's strength and diversity. Almost 2,000 of those enterprises are four or less employees. Ms. Catlin noted that partners such as UVA are building the entrepreneurial climate reflected in a lot of small start-up businesses. She reported that the largest area employers include UVA, Albemarle County, the UVA Health Services Foundation, State Farm, Northrup Grumman, and the Department of Defense.

Senator Kaine stated that types of defense assets found here are very valuable and are less likely to see reductions, but every community that has military assets will have to grapple with changes – and Albemarle is well-positioned for growing investments.

Ms. Catlin said that the emerging sectors locally include defense, cyber-security, biomedical research and development, specialty advanced manufacturing, agribusiness, adult beverages – wineries, breweries, distilleries, cideries, and value-added farming. She added that the County also is seeing promising signs of economic recovery. She reminded Senator Kaine that in July 2008 as Governor, he had been present to acknowledge the County's milestone of protecting more than 5,000 acres of land through the ACE Program. During subsequent, very challenging times, Albemarle has managed to maintain progress in the area of conservation easements. The County's most recent numbers over the

first ten rounds of the ACE Program has over 7,555 acres of protected lands, 41 easements and 459 development lots eliminated.

Ms. Dittmar commented that the County was impacted by the recession, but not as badly as some areas of the state. Jobs as well as sales tax income have returned to their 2006-07 levels. Part of that is that Albemarle has a large public sector presence.

Senator Kaine asked how real estate revenues had recovered. Ms. Mallek said they are about halfway back, having lost about 10% and gained about 4%. Mr. Foley said that the County had its first positive reassessment the past year, with a 1% gain.

Senator Kaine said that at the national level, they would like to see steady sustainable growth as opposed to big booms that eventually go bust.

Ms. Mallek said that she would be very happy if it never returned to the 20% per year gains, because that was disastrous.

Item No. 6c. Discussion: Federal Legislative Issues:

- Federal Transportation Funding
- Workforce Investment Act, and FLSA issue regarding firemen
- Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)

Ms. Dittmar said that the first topic of discussion would be the federal transportation funding.

Mr. Sheffield said that the Highway Trust Fund is “headed downhill,” and asked Senator Kaine for his insights on that. He understands that it is not always about more money; it is about more flexibility. He commented that there are separate pots of money used to put a transportation plan together, and sometimes reducing barriers helps localities with flexibility to move money from one project to another.

Senator Kaine said that he advocates for letting states and localities have a lot more discretion and flexibility as to how to use those funds. He suggested that the County keep an eye on transportation bills as they move through the Senate and communicate with him so he knows their thoughts on how funds are allocated. He stated that at the federal level, they will make sure that the Trust Fund does not go bankrupt in the short term, but that may be another patch job of the kind that Congress has been doing with it for a long time. Senator Kaine said there is genuine interest in looking at the funding question with the realization that a revenue source needs to be identified as construction costs go up, and he hopes to work more in the future on how to get that funding and how to keep it flexible for localities.

Ms. Mallek said that the Board passed a resolution several years earlier in opposition to allowing longer trucks and heavier trucks on roads, and they have found that they have no enforcement ability to keep tandem trucks off of rural roads – which are being destroyed by these big vehicles. She stated that many of the independent truckers are against this, because they are challenged to drive safely as it is.

Senator Kaine said that the state is responsible for designating “no through-truck routes.” Ms. Mallek said that is a little different than banning them based on class of vehicles.

Ms. Mallek asked if the Workforce Investment Act had already passed. Senator Kaine said that it has not yet passed. He explained that the WIA has been stymied for the past four or five years. The House and Senate Committees have been working on a compromise but it still needs to go through the conference stage. He stated that there is a lot of excitement surrounding the progress that has been made with it, and it is hoped that sometime this July it will move forward.

Ms. Mallek said the County has a lot at stake. She reminded Senator Kaine that he was responsible for setting up the One-Stops and the County was a pilot. It took several years to get the agencies to work together, and now it is successful, and is making progress. Senator Kaine suggested that the Board continue to watch this and pay attention to the details. Ms. Mallek said that keeping the localities involved was very important.

Ms. Mallek reported that there is also an issue related to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and paid firefighters. There is a huge risk to the local government for paid personnel to go back and volunteer at their firehouses. She said that the Crozet Volunteer Fire Department sent a request to the Department of Labor six times over the last 10 years but has not yet received an answer, and that station in particular would like to have paid firefighters be able to volunteer at that station. She stated that this is made worse by the fact that there is a wonderful cooperative system of having paid staff work side by side with volunteers, and the volunteer agencies are independently chartered as their own nonprofits with their own governing boards.

Mr. Davis said that in other volunteer fire companies, there are paid staff that work along with volunteers. The issue related to the FLSA boils down to whether paid personnel are volunteering for their employer or volunteering for a separate agency. He said that the law has shifted back and forth on this issue over the years, but since 1985 the FLSA stipulated that a person cannot volunteer to do the same work they get paid to do within the system. This issue revolves around the factual complications of whether they are volunteering to do the same work they are paid to do for the benefit of the locality.

Senator Kaine asked for some background information so that he could further review it and take it forward.

Ms. Dittmar noted that the combined paid/volunteer system is considered a desirable model, as most start out as volunteers and then move into paid positions. She said that Botetourt County has expressed a strong interest in having this changed also. She said that she believes that volunteer stations in urbanizing counties would be grateful to have this looked at.

Mr. Boyd mentioned that the reason Albemarle has not allowed this to happen, as some other localities have, is the risk factor and the possibility of someone saying they were forced to work for free, which would violate the FLSA.

Ms. Mallek said that is what a ruling would hopefully address.

Senator Kaine agreed to follow up on the issue.

Ms. Dittmar stated that their final topic relates to BRAC. The first time a commission might happen is 2015. She said that the Charlottesville-Albemarle area has only 60 employers of over 100 people, so the impact on this community would be huge were there to be a decommissioning of the Rivanna Station or any part of the Belvoir system. They would like to be on the leading edge of knowing if something were to happen.

Ms. Mallek said that one concern is to make sure that Rivanna Station and its borders are protected now, if possible, to make sure they can expand if needed.

Mr. Boyd noted that the site is located in his district, and they have been trying to get an appropriation to purchase some additional land surrounding the Rivanna Station for potential future expansion and also for security reasons.

Senator Kaine said that the ability for future expansion can become a factor. BRAC's role is to recommend significant changes to domestic facilities after thorough review. He stated that the idea behind BRAC is to try to take some of the politics out of the decision-making process and to employ a panel of experts to help determine what is needed and what is not. Senator Kaine said that every time a BRAC round is announced, every community hires lawyers and lobbyists to justify themselves – even those localities that are not in danger of losing facilities. He stated that the BRAC process has proven to not be that successful in reducing spending, but the DOD has argued that further analysis shows it is successful. Senator Kaine said that his suggestion has been to set aside the whole notion of BRAC and just make recommendations to Congress about bases in the same way that weapons systems are debated, so that they make some of the decisions and do not do everything the Pentagon says. He stated that while there may be some changes following the demilitarization in Iraq and Afghanistan, intelligence and cyber-security will likely remain intact. He also recommended that they speak with Karen Courington, who is his expert on military affairs and knows the budget very well, and share any concerns they might have about things they have heard. Senator Kaine said that the symposium they just held is a good first step in better overall planning and information sharing, and Fredericksburg, Richmond, Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads have them – so it would be beneficial to have a basic infrastructure in place by which Charlottesville-Albemarle can at least inventory the public sector players and assets, including researchers.

Ms. Dittmar said that it would also provide a better handle on the technology transfer going on. Senator Kaine stated that companies that start without a particular focus on defense and military might develop a technology that ends up having application in that industry.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the federal transportation funding was only "patchwork" for the time being. Senator Kaine said that the Grow America Act is the federal Department of Transportation version, but there is a general commitment to maintaining the Trust Fund for the short term. He said that the challenge with transportation is that there are long lead times, and the short-term funding only allows for quick projects and does not help with planning.

Ms. Dittmar asked for confirmation that they were close to finalizing legislation for the Workforce Investment Act. Senator Kaine said that they are, and he feels quite confident that it will go through the Senate – with bipartisan support.

Ms. Dittmar confirmed that staff would provide information on the firefighter/volunteer issue and the FLSA.

Senator Kaine said that it would be helpful to get the background on the most recent request from Crozet; he thinks that there are national examples where personnel volunteer all the time. He asked if there are other volunteer fire departments in the County.

Mr. Foley stated that there were 10 volunteer organizations – seven fire stations and three rescue squads, and some of those are combined with fire/EMT.

Ms. Mallek noted that there are 600 active volunteers currently in the system.

Ms. Dittmar noted that the Board will also follow up with Ms. Courington as needed on the BRAC issue. Senator Kaine suggested that they contact Fredericksburg about the symposium they created through the Chamber of Commerce, as that would be a better comparative community than Hampton Roads, which is extremely massive.

Ms. Dittmar said that the Board has spoken at length about how the General Assembly loses its sensitivity to local needs. She added that they are lucky to have Senator Kaine's perspectives, as he has served at the local, state and federal levels.

Senator Kaine said that a lot of the issues transcend every level of government – even foreign relations, because it relates to trade. He noted that Virginia probably has a higher percentage of Foreign Service/State Department people than any other state. He stated that most of his work tends to be in the armed services and foreign relations budget, and his colleague Mark Warner focuses on the finance, banking and commerce side – and they are both on the budget committee. Senator Kaine encouraged the Board to work with his staff on any issues they might have, and to visit his office if they are in the area.

Mr. Boyd said that he had to leave the meeting and thanked Senator Kaine for attending.

(Recess. The Board recessed at 12:13 p.m. and reconvened at 12:22 p.m. Mr. Boyd did not return.)

Agenda Item No. 3. **For Action:** Special School Appropriation.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that Virginia Code § 15.2-2507 provides that any locality may amend its budget to adjust the aggregate amount to be appropriated during the fiscal year as shown in the currently adopted budget; provided, however, any such amendment which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures shown in the currently adopted budget must be accomplished by first publishing a notice of a meeting and holding a public hearing before amending the budget. The Code section applies to all County funds, i.e., General Fund, Capital Funds, E911, School Self-Sustaining, etc.

The total increase to the FY 14 budget due to the appropriation itemized below is \$1,014,064.79. A budget amendment public hearing is not required because the amount of the cumulative appropriations does not exceed one percent of the currently adopted budget.

This request involves the approval of two (2) appropriations as follows:

- One (1) appropriation (#2014109) of \$747,028.57 from three School Division self-sustaining funds to assist the School Division to offset a significant reduction in state funding from what was initially projected for FY 14; and
- One (1) appropriation (#2014110) of \$267,036.22 in General Fund fund balance monies to the School Division to offset unanticipated employee health care costs associated with a change in Health Care coverage.

Staff recommends approval of appropriations #2014109 and #2014110 for School Division programs as described in Attachment A.

Appropriation #2014109		\$747,028.57
Sources:	School Division Building Services Reserve fund balance	\$ 300,000.00
	School Division Fuel Contingency Reserve fund balance	\$ 300,000.00
	School Division E-Rate fund balance	\$ 147,028.57

This appropriation request was approved by the School Board on June 12, 2014.

The School Division has been deliberatively and actively addressing their financial situation throughout the year with reductions in expenditures, hiring freezes, and holdbacks, however at this time, the School Division has found it to be necessary to undertake additional measures to ensure that overall expenditures do not exceed revenues for the fiscal year.

Funding from these Self-Sustaining Fund fund balances will be moved to the School Division's Operating Fund to assist the School Division address reductions in state revenues in FY 14.

Appropriation #2014110		\$267,036.22
Source:	General Fund fund balance	\$ 267,036.22

This appropriation request was approved by the School Board on June 12, 2014.

This request is to appropriate General Fund fund balance monies to the School Division to support unanticipated medical plan contributions that are associated with UVA's recent decision to not insure

employee spouses who have access to other Health Care programs through their own employers. While this mid-year change has some impact on other participants in the County's Health Care Fund, the School Division was affected most severely by this unanticipated change. The School Division was required to enroll over 60 additional employees as a result of this action, which required the School Division to provide additional unanticipated contributions to the Health Care fund in the amount of \$267,036.22.

Mr. Bill Letteri, Assistant County Executive, addressed the Board and apologized for the lateness of the request he would be presenting on behalf of the schools. He explained that the schools have been aware that State revenues would be coming in short and have been taking a number of measures throughout the year – including rollbacks, salary freezes and expenditure reductions – in the hope that by the end of the year they would not be in the situation of needing additional revenues. He stated that the schools were not aware that an appropriation would be required, and had hoped that by the conclusion of the year they could come to the Board and make adjustments at that time – but the actual appropriation does need to happen before the end of the fiscal year. Mr. Letteri said that the source of this funding is coming from “sustainable funds,” and in working with Dean Tistadt, the schools have acknowledged that they probably should have been more transparent about the existence of these funds. He stated that there are quite a number of sustaining funds, some of which are nonrestrictive, and it would have been useful for the County to know about them. Mr. Letteri emphasized that as they work toward future solutions, those funds will be designated.

Ms. McKeel asked for an explanation to the public as to what “self-sustaining funds” are, because it is a term that may not be familiar. Mr. Letteri explained that there are 60 or 70 funds that fall into this category, many or most of which are considered restricted funds – such as grant funds from the state – that are restricted in their use. At the end of the year if there are funds remaining they will remain on their financial statements and be available for the subsequent year. He stated that some of the funds are true contingencies, such as the fuel contingency, the e-rate funds, and building services – and while they are designated for those uses, they can be repurposed by Board action for other things.

Mr. Foley said that those contingencies should probably be moved out of the category of “self-sustaining” because they are not really the same.

Mr. Letteri stated that frequently the source of the funds is important, whether they are state or federal, or restricted. He said that going forward with the schools it makes sense to clarify which of the funds are truly restrictive and which are designated for use but could be repurposed. Mr. Letteri said that over the last several days, school staff has been working very collaboratively with County budget staff, and they have acknowledged where improvements need to be made. He said that the reason for having to do this now is a matter of State Code. It is possible the schools do not believe they will have enough funds to stay within their allowable appropriations.

Ms. Dittmar said that what staff seems to want to convey is that this has been a year-long dilemma faced by the School Division, and they have employed a number of different strategies to address revenue that was not coming in from the state – which is similar to what other localities have had to address.

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, said that the school funding for this particular item that got reduced was based on items related to enrollment, taxes, and other factors.

Mr. Foley confirmed that this situation is common around the state at this point.

Ms. Dittmar asked at what point they realized there was not enough funding to cover items as projected. Mr. Foley suggested that school staff answer that question.

Albemarle County Schools Chief Operating Officer, Mr. Dean Tistadt addressed the Board, adding his apologies to Mr. Letteri for putting the Board in this last-minute situation. Mr. Tistadt said that the schools started realizing in the fall that they had a problem – an initial revenue issue whereby they did not qualify for state funding for pay raises, at approximately \$500,000; and salary projections that showed they would not achieve the salary lapse being built into this year's budget. He stated that the combination of those was a fairly significant amount of money, so the schools started forewarning the School Board and took actions to address it deliberately, such as freezing positions and having schools hold back the 10% reserve – which totaled \$900,000. He said that they were also able to get another 4-5% voluntarily from schools and departments by asking them to contribute more. They have also been running salary projections each month to see if they would come in closer to the salary lapse, but they did not realize as much savings as they had hoped. Mr. Tistadt said that they wanted to wait as long as possible before taking any action, since there are three pay periods left, and they were aware of the self-sustaining and contingency funds. He stated that while that was communicated within the schools, it was not sufficiently communicated to the County Executive's office or the Board of Supervisors, and had they not been facing the circumstances this year, the School Board could have considered these monies against next year's budget challenges.

Ms. Dittmar clarified that the last strategy was to go to these contingency funds. Mr. Tistadt responded “yes”.

Ms. Dittmar asked about the contingencies that were not restricted and were available for other use. Mr. Letteri pointed out that some of them were restricted but some have criteria to allow broader use. Ms. Dittmar asked for confirmation that these funds were already in the County's coffers and do not require new revenues or pressure on tax rates. Mr. Foley confirmed that was the case.

Ms. Mallek pointed out that the \$267,000 was going to be coming out of fund balance. Mr. Foley agreed that was the case. He also stated that County staff feels there is a need to take a look at all of these funds and report back as to whether there are balances in the others.

Mr. Tistadt agreed that clarifying how they are classified is important, as not all of the funds are truly self-sustaining.

Ms. Mallek said that the total was \$676,000 and what has been identified here is \$747,000, and asked if some of that difference could go into the insurance side to help offset other costs. Ms. Allshouse said that her understanding is that the schools want to be good stewards of the funding and make sure there is an adequate amount. They will not use it if it is not needed, and it will go into the schools' fund balance.

Ms. Mallek stated that there is an extra \$75,000 in there. Mr. Tistadt said that in all likelihood, the appropriation is in excess of what they will need, but they would rather have a bit more in it then have it fall short and be in violation of State Code.

Ms. Dittmar asked if there were other things under "self-sustaining" that should not be there. Ms. Allshouse said that the schools have the fund balance of about \$200,000 at the end of the year, but \$212,000 has been appropriated into the FY15 budget so it cannot be used at this point. The only other place she is aware of would be the General Fund fund balance.

Mr. Letteri emphasized that there are many sustaining fund balances, most of which – as the schools reported to staff the previous Friday – are restricted in use. He said that his understanding is that these are the only funds available for repurpose.

Mr. Tistadt said that technically there are some funds that could be repurposed, such as the after-school program, but that would leave them no margin of error. He said that they did not really see other areas that should be used, but it would be prudent to fully evaluate all funds and report back to both boards.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the two combined appropriation total a little over \$1 million. The first one in the amount of \$747,028.57 entails moving Fund fund balance monies from three funds over to the school operating fund. She said that staff felt that the best approach for full transparency would be to move the money from those small funds into the school operating fund, which would be an amendment to what they had originally shared with the Board. Staff recommends the Board approve this request as revised.

Mr. Foley noted that with this scenario, tracking of the expenditures in the school fund is clear from year to year.

Ms. Dittmar asked what expenses are driving the need for the appropriation, since they are not yet addressing healthcare for spouses. Mr. Tistadt said that they were not achieving the salary savings that were built into the budget, which is on the expense side, and there was also a revenue shortfall on the revenue side – with the combination of those two things totaling about \$1.5 million.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that the larger portion was budgeting for something that they did not qualify for from the state, which was \$500,000. She said that she also does not understand why the lapse factor was around \$800,000, and last year it was budgeted for \$2 million – so it is not surprising to her that it did not come in as anticipated and is now leaving an enormous hole.

Mr. Tistadt said that the schools had been achieving over \$2 million in savings every year until the last two, and then they budgeted it at that level but it was not achieved. He said that when the economy turned, employees stopped leaving.

Ms. Mallek said that it had been talked about for four years at both School Board and Board meetings, and they had increased the VERIP fund significantly to get people to retire. Mr. Tistadt said that they lowered that number in next year's budget.

Mr. Foley said that the VERIP program changed in such a way that it almost encouraged people to stay longer, because over time it will phase out.

Ms. Allshouse said the next request is for \$267,036.22. She said that UVA changed its policy mid-year, which affected the County. She explained that if you were a spouse of a UVA employee receiving benefits and had access to another healthcare fund, you were asked to leave that and transition to another opportunity through employment. She said that when that occurred, it affected the School Division much more significantly than the General Government side or any other partners in the healthcare fund. Ms. Allshouse reported that about 60 individuals chose to go on the County's healthcare fund about mid-year, and that was paid for through the policy set up by both boards.

Ms. Mallek clarified that this is for the portion of school employees who used to be insured with UVA through their spouses. Ms. Allshouse said that is correct. The recommendation is that this come from the audited FY13 General Fund fund balance.

Ms. Dittmar asked when UVA made that announcement. Mr. Sheffield said that it was about eight months ago, and he specifically asked in their budget work sessions what the impact of this would be – and the response was that there was no impact, which frustrates him. He added that he personally was impacted by that decision.

Mr. Letteri stated that it was difficult to predict. Human Resources analyzed the two policies – UVA's and the County's – and it was assumed that this would not be an issue, but it did not work out as expected.

Ms. Dittmar said that they had had the time since January 1 to know it was coming. Other organizations in town faced the same thing, and they went immediately to their employees who were eligible for their insurance but were not being insured, to find out whether they were on UVA's plan and what they were thinking about doing. She said that they need to talk about why there is a problem with two major areas in terms of projections, so that it is not repeated. This could have been dealt with a lot earlier.

Mr. Foley explained that staff thought the healthcare fund might be able to bear the cost of that unexpected event, but the problem is that it would charge an expense to the healthcare fund instead of the School system where those people are actually employed. He said that staff had said early on that they would support the schools, but even if they had they would have still had a problem, and the result of that is using fund balance to support it.

Ms. McKeel said that this would have been worked out through Human Resources. Mr. Foley said that the follow-up is what staff could have done better to predict this change, its impact and the numbers. He stated that with all the changes going on with healthcare, staff will need to stay on top of this going forward.

Ms. Mallek said that last year and the one before they reduced the size of their reserves because it was recommended by a consultant that they were too large – so there was no increase in rates because they were shrinking those down. She asked if that was the same reserve pot that would have been accessed. Mr. Foley responded “yes”. He added that one year they actually gave money back to employees because the pot became large, as claims were far less than projected. He stated that the reality of it is that it needs to be charged back to the School fund, and that is why staff is before them.

Ms. Dittmar noted that having to make decisions very quickly, up against a deadline with a lot of information to be digested, is a prescription for bad decision-making, so having this come up at the very end after all of the business was done was unfortunate. She said that there was a lot of scrambling done at the end by everyone, and asked fellow Board members what they wanted to do with this.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that there is not much of an alternative, and they have to support it.

Ms. McKeel said that the question is whether to have one or two motions.

Mr. Davis pointed out that in order to make an appropriation of more than \$500 requires a majority vote of the elected members of the Board, so that would mean all four present must vote in favor of it for the appropriation to be approved.

Ms. McKeel **moved** to approve Appropriation #2014109 for School Division programs. Mr. Sheffield **seconded** the motion.

Ms. Dittmar said that it is important that staff follow through on analyzing these funds and making sure they are all where they should be. They should also separate out the restricted funds and those funds that are available for other uses.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Boyd and Ms. Palmer.

Ms. Dittmar said the second request involves going into the General Fund balance. This is why Ms. Allshouse counseled the Board during its budget process to be careful to not draw its General Fund balance down because things come up and they need to be nimble. This request then takes funds away from the County CIP.

Ms. Allshouse said this request would not affected FY13 audited number of \$2.5 million. If Board members will recall, there was about \$500,000 that was not allocated. She added that it would eventually have gone to capital.

Ms. McKeel then **moved** to approve Appropriation #2014110. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Sheffield, Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek and Ms. McKeel.
 NAYS: None.
 ABSENT: Mr. Boyd and Ms. Palmer.

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE				
APP#	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION	SOTRAMOUNT
2014109	3-3906-63906-351000-510100-6505		Building Services Contingency Reserve	300000
2014109	4-3906-63906-493010-939999-6599		Transfer to School Fund	300000
2014109	3-3908-63905-351000-510100-6504		Fuel Contingency Reserve	300000
2014109	4-3908-63908-493010-939999-6599		Vehicle & Equipment Fuel	300000
2014109	3-3223-63223-351000-510100-6503		E-Rate Fund Balance	147028.57
2014109	4-3223-63223-493010-939999-6599		Technology Equipment	147028.57
2014109	3-2000-62000-351000-510110-6599		Transfer in from SSF	747028.57
2014109	4-2000-62432-462310-301210-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	14000
2014109	4-2000-62432-462310-311009-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	40000
2014109	4-2000-62432-462310-580000-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	15000
2014109	4-2000-62432-462310-580500-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	11000
2014109	4-2000-62432-462310-800700-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	5000
2014109	4-2000-62432-462320-127200-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	14000
2014109	4-2000-62432-462320-127300-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	16000
2014109	4-2000-62432-462320-127600-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	31000
2014109	4-2000-62432-462320-127605-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	15000
2014109	4-2000-62432-462320-157100-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	40000
2014109	4-2000-62432-462320-210000-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	8874
2014109	4-2000-62432-462320-580505-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	20000
2014109	4-2000-62432-462340-331500-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	16500
2014109	4-2000-62432-462340-600000-6504		Transportation Appropriation Category	3626
2014109	4-2000-62433-462340-600900-6505		Transportation Appropriation Category	50000
2014109	4-2000-62115-468200-332115-6503		Technology Appropriation Category	10000
2014109	4-2000-62115-468200-540305-6503		Technology Appropriation Category	100228.57
2014109	4-2000-62115-468200-550100-6503		Technology Appropriation Category	2000
2014109	4-2000-62115-468200-550305-6503		Technology Appropriation Category	7500
2014109	4-2000-62115-468200-600100-6503		Technology Appropriation Category	1000
2014109	4-2000-62115-468200-600202-6503		Technology Appropriation Category	500
2014109	4-2000-62115-468200-601100-6503		Technology Appropriation Category	500
2014109	4-2000-62115-468300-540305-6503		Technology Appropriation Category	300
2014109	4-2000-62115-468300-600710-6503		Technology Appropriation Category	25000
2014109	4-2000-62433-462420-510121-6505		Building Services Appropriation Category	163000
2014109	4-2000-62433-462420-510200-6505		Building Services Appropriation Category	117000
2014109	4-2000-62433-462420-600000-6505		Building Services Appropriation Category	20000
2014110	3-2000-62000-351000-512004-9999		Transfer from General Fund	267036.22
2014110	4-2000-62100-461349-231000-6501		UVA Qualifying Event	1775.38
2014110	4-2000-62100-461350-231000-6501		UVA Qualifying Event	2554.82
2014110	4-2000-62100-461565-231000-6102		UVA Qualifying Event	8660.4
2014110	4-2000-62100-461565-231000-6104		UVA Qualifying Event	8227.38
2014110	4-2000-62100-461565-231000-6113		UVA Qualifying Event	4193.08
2014110	4-2000-62100-461565-231000-6116		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461565-231000-6117		UVA Qualifying Event	8660.4
2014110	4-2000-62100-461570-231000-6105		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461570-231000-6114		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461570-231000-6115		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461575-231000-6105		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461575-231000-6107		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461605-231000-6254		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461610-231000-6251		UVA Qualifying Event	8660.4
2014110	4-2000-62100-461610-231000-6252		UVA Qualifying Event	8660.4
2014110	4-2000-62100-461620-231000-6253		UVA Qualifying Event	1428.97
2014110	4-2000-62100-461620-231000-6255		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461705-231000-6301		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461710-231000-6303		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461715-231000-6301		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461715-231000-6302		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461720-231000-6253		UVA Qualifying Event	2901.23
2014110	4-2000-62100-461720-231000-6301		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461725-231000-6301		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461725-231000-6304		UVA Qualifying Event	8660.4
2014110	4-2000-62100-461730-231000-6304		UVA Qualifying Event	7231.43
2014110	4-2000-62100-461735-231000-6302		UVA Qualifying Event	3594.07
2014110	4-2000-62100-461740-231000-6302		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461760-231000-6301		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461760-231000-6302		UVA Qualifying Event	736.13
2014110	4-2000-62100-461802-231000-6115		UVA Qualifying Event	6134.45
2014110	4-2000-62100-461802-231000-6116		UVA Qualifying Event	3594.07
2014110	4-2000-62100-461805-231000-6251		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461805-231000-6253		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461805-231000-6254		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461814-231000-6102		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461814-231000-6114		UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2

2014110	4-2000-62100-461855-231000-6599	UVA Qualifying Event	2901.23
2014110	4-2000-62100-461878-231000-6251	UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461882-231000-6116	UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461882-231000-6117	UVA Qualifying Event	3897.18
2014110	4-2000-62100-461898-231000-6304	UVA Qualifying Event	10103.8
2014110	4-2000-62100-461912-231000-6113	UVA Qualifying Event	3825.01
2014110	4-2000-62100-461912-231000-6114	UVA Qualifying Event	8660.4
2014110	4-2000-62100-461918-231000-6301	UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-461918-231000-6302	UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-462221-231000-6107	UVA Qualifying Event	3594.07
2014110	4-2000-62100-462225-231000-6251	UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-462225-231000-6255	UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62100-462228-231000-6599	UVA Qualifying Event	4597.23
2014110	4-2000-62112-462230-231000-6105	UVA Qualifying Event	2598.12
2014110	4-2000-62430-462150-231000-6501	UVA Qualifying Event	5773.6
2014110	4-2000-62430-462220-231000-6501	UVA Qualifying Event	454.67
2014110	4-2000-62432-462320-231000-6504	UVA Qualifying Event	9382.1
2014110	4-2000-62433-462420-231000-6104	UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	4-2000-62433-462420-231000-6111	UVA Qualifying Event	4330.2
2014110	3-1000-51000-351000-510100-9999	Use of Fund Balance	267036.22
2014110	4-1000-93010-493010-930014-9999	Transfer to School Division - Health Insurance Costs	267036.22
	TOTAL	4,056,259.16	

Agenda Item. No. 4. Adjourn.

At 1:00 p.m., Mr. Sheffield **moved** to adjourn the meeting to July 1, 2014.12:00 p.m. at Piedmont Virginia Community College, Charlottesville, VA. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Boyd and Ms. Palmer.

 Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 10/01/2014
Initials: EWJ