

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on November 5, 2014, at 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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 (arrived at 1:12 p.m.).

ABSENT: None.

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. The meeting was called to order at 1:11 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. Dittmar.

Agenda Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance.
Agenda Item No. 3. Moment of Silence.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Ms. Dittmar introduced staff present.

Ms. Dittmar stated that the Board received a request from staff that Item 8.7 from the Consent Agenda be pulled.

Mr. Boyd said that the North Charlottesville Business Council has requested the addition of an item to the County's legislative agenda this year, and he would like to include that item in the discussion.

Ms. Palmer **moved** to adopt the agenda, as amended. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 5. Brief Announcements by Board Members.

Ms. Mallek referenced a press release issued by the Warrior Healing Campaign, a group in the Central Virginia area that raises funds for existing organizations that are working with injured soldiers and returning veterans, as well as older veterans. She said that to celebrate the launch of their organization, they will be holding a community kickoff event on Sunday, November 9, 2014, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at King Family Vineyards. Secretary John Harvey, Secretary of Veterans and Defense Affairs, Commonwealth of Virginia, retired U.S. Admiral, is the keynote speaker for the evening.

Ms. Mallek reported that last weekend the Journey Through Hallowed Ground held a dedication on the Somerset Plantation for the first 180 trees for the Living Legacy project in this area, representing the 180 fallen soldiers who were involved in the Liberty Mills skirmish in Orange County. She said that they have done some plantings in Gettysburg and a large planting at Oatlands in Fauquier County, and are working on more along the entire Journey corridor.

Ms. Mallek stated that members of the VACO Agricultural and Environment Committee took a boat trip on the James River, sponsored by the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, with a focus on cleaning up the Chesapeake. She said that the Rivanna River Basin Commission is organizing a presentation event in early winter that will include the economists who developed the report. Board members will receive an invitation for the event.

Ms. Palmer reported that the Supervisors will be out in the community in November and December to solicit feedback on the five-year financial plan, and she will be holding a town hall meeting at Red Hill Elementary School on November 17, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. She added that she will be holding a joint meeting with Ms. Mallek at Henley Middle School, on November 18, 2014, 7:00 p.m.

Ms. Dittmar reiterated that Board members will be holding town hall meetings in November and December. The City is also holding its version of town halls and she recommended that those Board members who share borders with the City read their neighborhood reports.

She reported that she recently visited Pine Knot, a retreat used by President Theodore Roosevelt in the Scottsville District. She encouraged anyone who had not been there to visit. Ms. Dittmar stated that her family and the Malleks attended the twilight tour in Scottsville, which was quite interesting and a very enjoyable event.

Ms. Dittmar said that the Board had three opportunities to gather in between its last official meeting; including a gathering with General Assembly members and citizens to talk about the legislative environment for this upcoming session.

Ms. Dittmar said that CATEC held a briefing attended by several Board members in which they shared the status of their strategic planning efforts. She added that the Board will be considering a CATEC item under Agenda Item 13.

She noted that for the second time only this year, they held a roundtable meeting for businesses on or near Rio Road, and she hopes to expound on that under Agenda Item 24.

Agenda Item No. 6. Recognitions.

Item No. 6a. Larry Davis, County Attorney, Local Government Attorney's (LGA's) Edward J. Finnegan Distinguished Service Award.

Ms. Dittmar congratulated County Attorney, Larry Davis, for being awarded the Edward J. Finnegan Award for Distinguished Service at the fall Local Government Attorneys of Virginia conference in Richmond, which is a professional association of more than 650 public and private attorneys who provide legal services to local government across the state. She said that Mr. Davis received the award because of his significant and sustained contributions to Virginia local government law and the LGA Association.

Ms. Dittmar said that in bestowing the award, the organization congratulated Mr. Davis for his remarkable depth and breadth of knowledge of local government law, his positive ethical influence on others in County government, and his advice on policy issues in addition to legal issues. She stated that when she attends meetings where there are people in attendance from other counties, they often mention Mr. Davis as one of the leading – or the leading – attorney in the Commonwealth.

Ms. Dittmar said that Mr. Davis was appointed as Albemarle's first in-house attorney in 1994 and has served in that position for more than 20 years. She noted that she calls and emails him frequently for advice. She said that Mr. Davis has over 30 years in local government service, and also served as a member of the Board of Directors of the LGA and served as its president in 1995. Mr. Davis served on the Board of Governors for Local Government Law for the Virginia Bar Association and served as Chairman in 1998. Ms. Dittmar noted that besides other accolades, Mr. Davis has represented the County a number of times before the Virginia Supreme Court.

Mr. Davis thanked the Board for taking time to recognize his receipt of this award. He stated that receiving this award from his peers in the LGA was a very significant and meaningful award for him. He said that the distinguished service award is a particularly good honor for a local government attorney to have. He stated that he has had a long career in local government law and public service because of the support from his wife and kids. He said that having a special team of support staff and attorneys in Albemarle, and in other places that he has worked, has made it possible for him to serve local governments and the state.

Item No. 6b. House Joint Resolution 363 (2014 Session) to honor Dennis Rooker for his service on the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. McKeel said that beginning in 1998, Dennis Rooker represented the Jack Jouett Magisterial District as a Planning Commissioner and then as a Supervisor. She said that through his hard work and attention to detail, Mr. Rooker earned the respect of those who worked with him and those who he represented. Ms. McKeel thanked Mr. Rooker for his support of public education and for working closely with her during her years on the School Board. She said that she learned quickly to appreciate Mr. Rooker's opinion and to seek his counsel. She said that she always felt they could work together and find common ground. She then asked Delegate Steve Landes, who represents the 25th House District, to come forward with Mr. Rooker. She noted that Delegate Landes voting precincts are Belfield, Brownsville, Crozet, East Ivy, Ivy, Jack Jouett and Yellow Mountain.

Delegate Steve Landes addressed the Board and thanked Mr. Davis for his work in local government. He added that Mr. Davis has been a great resource for those who serve in the General Assembly. Delegate Landes said that he is before the Board to recognize Dennis Rooker, who served on the Board for many years as the representative of the Jack Jouett District in Albemarle County. He said that he himself never served at the local government level but always appreciate those that serve at that level because it is the most difficult level of government, because that is where the rubber meets the road. The Board sees people on a daily basis. Delegate Landes stated that he is before the Board to present a copy of House Joint Resolution 363, which recognizes public servants for the service they provide to the Commonwealth – and particularly in this instance, Albemarle County.

Delegate Landes then read and presented the following:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 363
Commending Dennis S. Rooker.

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, February 28, 2014
Agreed to by the Senate, March 5, 2014

WHEREAS, Dennis S. Rooker admirably served the citizens of Albemarle County as a member of the Board of Supervisors from 2002 to 2013, representing the Jack Jouett District; and

WHEREAS, during his 12 years as a member of the Board of Supervisors, including two years as chairman, Dennis Rooker sought to protect the environment and the quality of life in Albemarle County, ensure a fiscally sound government, establish reasonable tax rates, and promote regional cooperation; and

WHEREAS, Dennis Rooker first arrived in Charlottesville to attend the University of Virginia, where he earned bachelor's and law degrees; he then settled in the area, established a law practice, and has owned several small businesses; and

WHEREAS, public service is a hallmark of Dennis Rooker's life; he was a member of the Albemarle County Planning Commission for four years and was the chairman for two years, and he also was a member of the Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization for nine years, serving as chairman for two years; and

WHEREAS, Dennis Rooker was the County representative to the Planning and Coordination Council for Albemarle County, Charlottesville, and the University of Virginia for 12 years; he served on the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir Stewardship Task Force and the Meadowcreek Parkway Design Planning Advisory Committee; and

WHEREAS, some of the accomplishments that took place in Albemarle County while Dennis Rooker served on the Board of Supervisors include development of master plans for the growth areas of the county, passage of an ordinance regarding the aesthetics of cell phone towers, and construction of Meadow Creek Parkway;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, that the General Assembly hereby commend Dennis S. Rooker, a dedicated public servant, for his 12 years of service as a member of the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, representing the Jack Jouett District; and

BE IT RESOLVED FURTHER, that the Clerk of the House of Delegates prepares a copy of this resolution for presentation to Dennis S. Rooker as an expression of the General Assembly's appreciation and admiration for his work on behalf of the people of Albemarle County and the Commonwealth.

Delegate Landes added that the resolution was patroned by himself, Delegate Farris, Delegate, Toscano and Senator Deeds. On a person note, Delegate Landes said it was an honor to work with Mr. Rooker in representing the interests of Albemarle County. He again thanked Mr. Rooker for his service.

Mr. Dennis Rooker addressed the Board and commended Larry Davis for the recognition he received, noting that it was well deserved and commenting that Mr. Davis was a consummate professional. Mr. Rooker thanked Ms. McKeel for her kind words and Delegate Landes for the recognition, for which he feels grateful and humbled. He said that for the four years he served on the Planning Commission and the 12 years on the Board of Supervisors, those years gave him an enhanced love of Albemarle County and its citizens, of staff of the County that works hard every day to bring services to those citizens, and of Board members – who dedicate huge amounts of time to try to get policy decisions right and to guide staff in a way that provides terrific services to County citizens. Mr. Rooker said that he is pleased to be with them at the meeting, and while he is not among the Board members anymore he follows them closely and takes great interest in what they are doing. He encouraged the Board members to never doubt that what they are doing is extremely important and touches the lives of many citizens. He also thanked his wife for her support as she attended almost as many meetings as he did.

Ms. Dittmar thanked Delegate Landes for attending and for personally presenting the recognition. Ms. Dittmar added that she had attended the Central Virginia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects awards ceremony in October, where Dennis and Ann Rooker were recognized together with a citizens service award. This award was for a non-architect citizen or member of an allied profession who has made or fostered significant contributions to improving the built environment in the community served by the AIA chapter. She thanked them for their service.

Agenda Item No. 7. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

Dr. Charles Battig, a resident of the White Hall District, said that this is the 18th consecutive year of no global warming according to the official federal record. Dr. Battig said that the International Red Cross reported that last year there was a record low of 337 natural catastrophes, one-half as many as the

peak in 2005, and 22,000 deaths versus 97,000. He presented data on severe storms, stating that there was no upward trend of Category 3 or stronger storms and noted that it was rather random. Dr. Battig said that several sources including Bloomberg report that there are bumper crops of soybeans, corn and grain in almost every country, and perhaps this is the result of fertilization due to CO₂. He reported that 2020 is the target year for energy independence, and gas prices are dropping 20% below June levels in a short period of time. Dr. Battig also mentioned that there is no evidence that low saturated-fat diets decrease heart attacks, and going on higher amounts of unsaturated fats have not proven to be a benefit to cardiovascular illness. Science is always in movement and everyone needs to recognize that change is normal.

Mr. John Zug, a resident of the Rio District said he is before the Board as an Assistant Commonwealth Attorney and Co-Chair, with Robin Hoover, of the Madison Area Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team. Mr. Zug stated that the team is an organization comprised of professionals from local law enforcement, the court system, healthcare, mental health, advocacy, school and university communities. He said that per the Board's authorization in late 2007, they formed a diverse team that since 2009 has been looking into intimate partner homicides that have occurred in both Charlottesville and Albemarle from 1999 to 2007 – and in the past year they have been working specifically to generate a report, which he has distributed to the Board. Mr. Zug said that the report has a group of findings and recommendations that they are hopeful, if adopted, can help reduce further intimate partner fatality in Charlottesville and Albemarle.

He stated that everyone in the community has a role to play in preventing or curbing domestic violence – from the employer to the neighbor to the family member. One of the goals of the fatality review team is to get more people engaged in stopping abuse, because addressing intimate partner violence and the issues that cause it starts with public awareness. Mr. Zug said that putting an end to domestic violence and homicides can have broad implication on the community and society as a whole. The Centers for Disease control estimate that the economic impact of domestic violence exceeds \$8 billion per year in 2003. He said that domestic violence is the most common cause of injury for women between 18 and 44, and substantially raises the risk of chronic disease in women. Mr. Zug said that abused women are 70% more likely to suffer from heart disease, 80% more likely to suffer from stroke, and 60% more likely to develop asthma. He stated that the Violence Against Women Act was signed into law in 1994. Significant progress has been made in combating intimate partner violence, but there is still a long way to go.

Mr. Zug said that in his report, identities are protected and confidentiality is honored. The report does not rank in any priority order in terms of steps that can be taken. He asked the Board to take particular note in the findings: awareness of resources. He said that all of the members on the team are aware of the Shelter for Help in Emergency, but none of the fatalities sought access from the Shelter – so it is important to raise awareness of its existence and the services it provides.

Mr. Robert Humphris addressed the Board, stating that he is a resident of the Jack Jouett District and was speaking on behalf of the Charlottesville-Albemarle Transportation Coalition (CATCO), formed in 1988 to research transportation projects in this area. He said that in the past 25 years, CATCO has advocated publicly for and against various transportation projects, and they want to reiterate their strong support for the Route 29 Solutions projects, including construction of the grade-separated intersection at Rio Road and Route 29. Mr. Humphris said they believe it is critical that the construction schedule for these projects, which puts this grade-separated interchange first, is maintained. He stated that all of the traffic studies analyzed and researched for the past 25 years shows that the grade separation of this intersection is vital to improving mobility and safety as well as decreasing congestion in the Route 29 North corridor. Mr. Humphris stated that while there may be some inconveniences during the short construction period of the intersection, all users of the corridor will benefit greatly from the expeditious completion of these projects. CATCO appreciates the Board's continued support of these projects.

Mr. Jeff Werner, of the Piedmont Environmental Council, addressed the Board and restated the PEC's support for the Route 29 Solutions package, and for the proposed sequencing of those improvements. Mr. Werner said that PEC supports Route 29's businesses as well. PEC's correspondence with VDOT and to the community has always stressed the need to minimize construction-related disruptions. He stated that the PEC also must express extreme disappointment in the misinformation and factual distortions being circulated by local businesses, particularly in an effort to derail the work at Rio Road. Mr. Werner said that in responding to this deliberate obfuscation, PEC appreciates everything that the Board and VDOT have done in trying to get the facts out to the community. He stated that these projects are necessary investments in the long-term viability of the local economy. Route 29 Solutions will bring reduced congestion and improved traffic safety - \$230 million in long-overdue investment in projects taken directly from local and regional plans, which the County has been trying for years if not decades to advance. Mr. Werner said that the Board has done a lot already in its commitment to working with the community and local residents, but it can also use its public position to challenge these false and misleading allegations about VDOT's plans. He said that this is a great opportunity for the community, and the PEC asks that the Board does all it can to make sure it is not lost.

Mr. Werner said that the Chamber of Commerce's Free Enterprise Forum in 2011 stated, "Based on this data, the Free Enterprise Forum extrapolates that the US 29 Western Bypass could serve at least 49% of the traffic on US 29." He stated that back when the bypass was being talked about, the Chamber was enthusiastic about diverting almost one-half of the traffic away from the businesses on Route 29 –

yet today, making improvements that will increase mobility and will keep traffic moving on Route 29 will somehow be catastrophic. Mr. Werner said that this does not make sense, and is why the community is a bit confused about what is going on. Clearly, there is an attempt to derail these improvements, and he hopes the Board will do all it can to get the facts out.

Mr. Neil Williamson, on behalf of the Free Enterprise Forum, said that he appreciates Mr. Werner's comments and citing correctly what was posted on the blog. Mr. Williamson said that he shares Mr. Werner's concern with misinformation, but he does not share his view that the improvements will be beneficial to the businesses located right there. He stated that if you own one of those businesses, it is "economic destruction," and he believes that businesses located in the direct area of Rio Road will be dramatically impacted by this construction – and he takes offense to the misinformation out there. Mr. Williamson said that he has been very forthright about the numbers he is using, and his opinion is that they are "putting a four-inch pipe on a two-inch line," and this is not going to fix the problem. He stated that the Free Enterprise Forum recognizes the speed of this process and has not been pushing forward against moving forward, although they have questioned the sequencing.

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

Ms. Dittmar said that the Board has already pulled Item 8.7 to consider at a later date.

Mr. Boyd said that he needs to pull the minutes assigned him. He said that he has questions on a few other items. Item 8.3, which allocates \$30,000 for establishment of the Economic Development office; he said that it seems a bit high for reorganization of the fourth floor. Mr. Foley said that those are design costs for renovation of offices in the Finance Department to create space for the new Economic Development office. He stated that Trevor Henry was present to explain that in more detail.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Director of Office of Facilities Development, said that the design fee is to cover about 3,200 square feet of renovation on the first floor of the County Office Building. He explained that it would entail moving seven or eight people out of the current space and relocating them into the Finance office, and creating the ultimate location for the Economic Development office. Mr. Henry stated that based on construction numbers, the fees are estimated appropriately for that level of work.

Mr. Boyd asked what the Facilities Management Team did, and whether there are engineers or architects in that department who could do that type of work – because in the rendering, it says that they had done a preliminary design. Mr. Henry said that Mr. Monty Breeden, of Facilities Development, is a licensed architect, and they will often do the conceptual-level work in order to help take a department's request to put it into at least a conceptual level plan, so they can take a dollar per square foot cost and assign it to that work – but that is really the limit of what they do internally. He said that at that point, they bring on engineers and architects from the outside to complete that work. The department's role is really more construction management/owner's rep, but not internal design work.

Ms. Mallek asked if this would provide enough details to get valid bids back. Mr. Henry said that it is enough to scope the work and anticipate the costs so they can budget for it appropriately.

Mr. Boyd noted that the County is behind on design of the Northside Library (Item 8.5) and will sign an extension of that lease. There is an adjustment of \$60,000 – and he does not understand how they will get that back at a later time.

Mr. Henry clarified that that's the total cost of the project for what is an overall five-month extension. When bids came in on the project they were approximately \$300,000 above budget, so staff spent five or six weeks working with the contractor to get the scope defined to allow them to start. With that, he said that they lost time on the front end. The first extension was part of the contract signed; it brought the phasing of the project together, and it extended it. Mr. Henry said that the latest request is to allow the work to finish. There were some structural issues identified over the summer, with a claim of 79 days delay that was compressed to just under 40 days. He stated that they are now looking at early February 2015 for completion of work, which provides ample time to move the library in and renovate where they are leaving. Mr. Henry added that they have already extended the lease three months and they are asking for two months more. The total five-month delay will impact the project by \$60,000, which the project itself will ultimately fund. He said that the language of the request states that the funds will come out of operating funds currently, but the project will reconcile at the end as actual project costs.

Mr. Boyd said that this leads him to the next item of concern: the CIP report (Item 9.1) in which almost every single project is currently over budget, and some of them considerably – by as much as 100%. Mr. Henry said that he does not think Mr. Boyd is reading the report correctly.

Mr. Boyd said that if it costs twice as much as the original proposal, then it is 100% over budget.

Ms. Mallek said that the VDOT issues impact this particularly, because of the rules changes and the requirements that are made.

Ms. McKeel suggested that Mr. Boyd sit down with Mr. Henry outside of the meeting.

Ms. Dittmar said that it may be a concern enough to impact voting for it though.

Ms. McKeel asked if Mr. Boyd wanted to pull the item for a separate vote.

Mr. Boyd said that he does not want to delay the vote on it because he trusts what Mr. Henry says, but he does want to go on record as noting that this report seems to indicate that most of the County projects go over budget.

Mr. Foley said that staff will follow up and clarify this, and make sure there is public information on this. The issue may be in the way it is communicated.

Mr. Henry said that it could be in the interpretation of the report. He said that the other piece of the report for which he wants feedback is the history of a project, which shows when a budget first appears. Staff made an attempt to show that in the report on the firing range. He said that if that meets expectations, staff can apply that to the other projects in the report.

Mr. Boyd said that it did meet his expectations, but his question has been whether a project should be reconsidered when its actual costs are expected to greatly exceed the original budget.

Mr. Foley stated that the Board should talk about this in depth in its discussion of the CIP during the budget process – when a number gets out there, and it looks like the County has exceeded the budget, when some of the origins of the projects are not scoped out but get discussed in public. He said that he wants to be sure the public understand that projects may start out very differently, then changes are made so the costs escalate.

Mr. Boyd acknowledged that the firing range was exactly like that, because the Board changed the design and scope of the project all along.

Mr. Foley said that staff will do some follow up and make sure the public is also informed.

Ms. Mallek noted that Mr. Henry has held several meetings with Crozet residents, because the process changes that VDOT or another layer has applied, such as legislative changes with easement laws, are what have caused a lot of delays and extra expenses.

Ms. Dittmar commented that she is still trying to get a handle on public projects whereby you allocate money and then put it out for bid. She said that she realizes there is a difference between how public projects are handled in comparison to private projects – and said this would be a really good topic to discuss in depth as it serves to educate other people in the process.

Ms. Dittmar said that she needs to pull her assigned minutes.

Motion was then offered by Ms. McKeel, **seconded** by Ms. Mallek to approve Item 8.1, as read, through 8.11, and to remove Item 8.7. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Item No. 8.1. Approval of Minutes: November 13, 2013; February 24, May 7, May 14 and June 11, 2014.

Ms. Dittmar pulled the minutes of November 13, 2013 and carried them forward to the next meeting.

Ms. Palmer had read the minutes of February 24, 2014 and found them to be in order.

Ms. McKeel had read the minutes of May 7, 2014, pages 1-36, and found them to be in order.

Mr. Sheffield had read the minutes of May 7, 2014, pages 94-end, and found them to in order.

Mr. Boyd pulled the minutes of May 14, 2014 and carried them forward to the next meeting.

Ms. Mallek had read the minutes of June 11, 2014 and found them to be in order.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved the minutes as read and carried the remaining minutes to the next meeting.

Item No. 8.2. FY 2014 Budget Amendment and Appropriations.

The executive summary 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 \$251.05. 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 one (1) appropriation as follows:

- One (1) Appropriation (#2014121) totaling \$ 251.05 for reconciliation of the Capital Improvement Program projects.

Staff recommends approval of appropriations #2014121 for general government and school division programs and projects as described in Attachment A.

| Appropriation #2014121 | | \$ 251.05 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| Source: | Borrowed Proceeds | \$(60,895.28)* |
| | General Gov't CIP Fund fund balance | \$60,895.28* |
| | School CIP Fund fund balance | \$ 251.05 |
| | School CIP Maintenance Program | \$(45,660.24)* |

**These portions of the appropriation do not increase the total County budget.*

This appropriation request is to reconcile FY 14 revenues and expenditures of the Capital Improvement Program as follows.

- Reconcile FY 14 revenues and expenditures by appropriating \$45,660.24 from the School CIP Maintenance Program for the Agnor Hurt Elementary School Addition/Renovation Capital Project to support the startup expenses of the construction phase that occurred in FY 14. The construction phase of the project was approved and included in the Adopted FY 15 Capital Budget, however, the project experienced expenditures in FY 14, as it was necessary for School construction work to start in mid-June to ensure that work would be completed before the start of school in late August. This does not increase the total County Budget.

There is an appropriation request included in the November 5, 2014 FY 15 Budget Amendment and Appropriations Executive Summary (Appropriation #2015047) which equally reduces the FY 15 project budget of the Agnor Hurt Elementary School Addition/Renovation Capital Project and increases the FY 15 project budget of the School CIP Maintenance Program project.

- Reconcile FY 14 revenues and expenditures by appropriating \$251.05 in School CIP fund balance to support Murray High School Phase I Capital Project. The project was completed in FY 14. The FY 14 project costs were \$251.05 more than budgeted.
- Reconcile FY 14 revenues and expenditures by appropriating \$60,644.23 in General Government CIP fund balance to the Regional Firearms Training Center Capital project and to equally reduce the amount of borrowed proceeds that were budgeted for the Regional Firearms Training Center in FY 14. The project budget was established as its own separate Fund by Appropriation 2014-089 approved May 7, 2014. The project revenues that were included as part of the FY 14 budget for this project were not received in FY 14 and the project requires the use of CIP fund balance for costs incurred in FY 14. Upon final closeout of the project, the County's share of the remaining fund balance will be returned to the General Government CIP fund. This does not increase the total County Budget.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved appropriation #2014121 for general government and school division programs and projects.

| COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|--|
| APPROPRIATION SUMMARY | | | |
| APP# | ACCOUNT | AMOUNT | DESCRIPTION |
| 2014121 | 4-9000-69980-464600-800949-6599 | -45660.24 | SA2014121 Reconcile Multiple Projects |
| 2014121 | 4-9000-69985-466730-800605-6116 | 45660.24 | SA2014121 Reconcile: Agnor Hurt E S Addition/Renov |
| 2014121 | 4-9000-69985-466730-800605-6303 | 251.05 | SA2014121 Reconcile: Murray H S Phase I |
| 2014121 | 3-9000-69000-351000-510100-6599 | 251.05 | SA2014121 Reconcile: Murray H S Phase I |
| 2014121 | 4-9010-93010-493010-939999-3125 | 60644.23 | SA2014121 Reconcile: Regional Firearms Training Center |
| 2014121 | 3-9010-51000-351000-510100-9999 | 60644.23 | SA2014121 Reconcile: Regional Firearms Training Center |
| 2014121 | 3-9050-41000-341000-410500-9999 | -60644.23 | SA2014121 Reconcile: Regional Firearms Training Center |

| | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 2014121 | 3-9050-51000-351000-512031-9999 | 60644.23 | SA2014121 Reconcile: Regional Firearms Training Center |
| TOTAL | | 121,790.56 | |

Item No. 8.3. FY 2015 Budget Amendment and Appropriations.

The executive summary states that the 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 15 budget due to the appropriation itemized below is \$452,198.92. 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 nine (9) appropriations as follows:

- Two (2) appropriations (#2015047 and #2015053) to appropriate \$113,513.24 for various Capital Improvement Program projects; of which \$83,513.24 will not increase the total County budget;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015048) to appropriate \$365,806.43 for various school division programs and projects;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015049) to appropriate \$2,000.00 in donations to the Fire Rescue Department;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015050) to appropriate \$25,452.00 in Federal revenue to the Emergency Communications Center;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015051) to appropriate \$10,000.00 in State revenue and \$6,745.00 in Federal revenue to the Sheriff's Office;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015052) to re-appropriate \$7,351.49 in Federal revenue to Fire Rescue Department;
- One (1) appropriation (#2015054) to appropriate \$2,309.00 in Federal revenue to the Department of Social Services; and
- One (1) appropriation (#2015055) to appropriate \$2,535.00 in State revenue to the Police Department.

On additional appropriation (#2015057) will be considered separately today as part of the Board's regular agenda as part of action item "Appropriation of funds received from VDOT for the condemnation of a portion of CATEC Property used for the Meadowcreek Parkway."

Staff recommends approval of appropriation Appropriations #2015047, #2015048, #2015049, #2015050, #2015051, #2015052, #2015053, #2015054, and #2015055 for general government and school division programs and projects as described in Attachment A.

Appropriation #2015047 **\$0.00**

This does not increase the total County budget.

Source: Agnor Hurt E. S. Addition/Renovation \$45,660.24

As the counterpart of the November 5, 2014 FY 14 Appropriation Request #2014121, this request is required to reconcile FY 14 revenues and expenditures and FY 15 revenues and expenditures by appropriating \$45,660.24 from the FY 15 Agnor Hurt Elementary School Addition/Renovation Capital Project for the FY 15 project budget of the School CIP Maintenance Program project to FY14 for the expenses that were incurred in FY 14. This does not increase the total County Budget.

Appropriation #2015048 **\$365,806.43**

Source: Donations \$26,340.00
 Federal Revenue \$339,466.43

This request is to appropriate the following School Division request approved by the School Board on September 11, 2014:

- **21st Century Community Learning Center grant:** This request is to appropriate \$141,984.00 for a 21st Century Community Learning Center Grant received by Benjamin F. Yancey Elementary School. These funds will be used to expand student participation in the Club Yancey Program, which provides after-school academic and fitness enrichment programs for students.

This request is to appropriate the following School Division requests approved by the School Board on September 25, 2014:

- **Title I:** This request is to appropriate \$197,482.43 in Title I funding. The Virginia Department of Education increased funding for FY15 by \$43,355.75 over the original budget amount of \$1,400,000.00. In addition, there is \$154,126.68 of State funds unused in FY14, which may be re-appropriated for FY15. Title I funding is used to support reading and language arts instruction for students with achievement levels that do not meet expected standards in the eight elementary schools with free- and reduced-lunch program participation percentages that are above the County average.
- **Community Public Charter School:** This request is to appropriate \$26,430.00 in donations received for the Community Public Charter School. The mission of the Community Public Charter School is to provide an alternative and innovative learning environment, using the arts, to help children in grades six through eight learn in ways that match their learning styles; developing the whole child intellectually, emotionally, physically, and socially.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------------|
| Appropriation #2015049 | | | \$2,000.00 |
| Source: | Donations | \$2,000.00 | |

This request is to appropriate \$2,000.00 from the Fire Rescue Donations Fund to the Department of Fire Rescue. These donations support various efforts including the car safety seat program, public education and one-time equipment or station furnishing purchases.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|
| Appropriation #2015050 | | | \$25,452.00 |
| Source: | Federal Revenue | \$25,452.00 | |

This request is to appropriate \$25,452.00 from the Virginia Department of Emergency Management Local Emergency Management Performance grant to the Emergency Communication Center. The funds will be used to support operating costs.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|
| Appropriation #2015051 | | | \$16,745.00 |
| Source: | State Revenue | \$10,000.00 | |
| | Federal Revenue | \$6,745.00 | |

This request is to appropriate two Sheriff's Office grants:

- Appropriate \$10,000.00 from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Speed Reduction grant. This grant will be used to fund overtime hours in the Sheriff's Office to provide speed enforcement.
- Appropriate \$6,745.00 from the Virginia Department of Emergency Management State Homeland Security Program Grant to the Sheriff's Office to provide funds for the purchase of equipment.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------|-------------------|
| Appropriation #2015052 | | | \$7,351.49 |
| Source: | Federal Revenue | \$7,351.49 | |

This request is to re-appropriate \$7,351.49 in FY14 Fire Rescue Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Fire Training grant funding to provide funds for overtime salary costs incurred to send Fire Rescue firefighters to required HAZMAT training.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| Appropriation #2015053 | | | \$30,000.00 |
| Source: | North Garden Engine 32* | \$37,853.00 | |
| | General Gov't CIP Fund fund balance | \$30,000.00 | |

**This does not increase the total County budget.*

This request is to appropriate the following General Government Capital Projects:

- **Apparatus Replacement Program:** This appropriation request is to appropriate \$37,853.00 to refurbish Monticello Engine 112 by reallocating currently appropriated funds budgeted for the refurbishment of North Garden Engine 32. Originally, Hollymead Engine 121 was to be moved to North Garden. Under the new fleet plan approved by the Albemarle County Fire and EMS (FEMS) Board in June 2014, Hollymead Engine 121 will be moved to Monticello Station 11 as Engine 112 and will serve as a County reserve. The refurbishment will be completed and the Engine ready for use in June 2015. This does not increase the total County Budget.
- **Economic Development Office:** This request is to appropriate \$30,000.00 from the CIP fund balance to support the architectural/engineering design services for the creation of the Economic Development Office and required Finance Department office modifications to accommodate displaced staff. The proposed work will include the design and reconfiguration of existing spaces at COB-McIntire to accommodate the needs of the newly created office. The Office of Facilities Department staff created a conceptual plan that requires further professional development. An appropriation request will be submitted for funds supporting the cost of construction upon completion of the design phase when the scope and schedule are better defined.

Appropriation #2015054 \$2,309.00

Source: Federal Revenue \$2,309.00

This request is to appropriate \$2,309.00 of Federal Revenue for the Department of Social Services (DSS) to assist in addressing the increased Foster Care/Adoption Program workload. The local share will be provided from DSS's current appropriated budget. DSS requests to change a current position from part-time to full-time status. Additional information about this request is included in a separate executive summary on the Board's November 5, 2014 agenda.

Appropriation #2015055 \$2,535.00

Source: Federal \$(42,253.00)
 State Revenue \$44,788.00

This request is to appropriate a net increase of \$2,535.00 in revenue from the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services Police Department's Victim Witness grant. This appropriation also reconciles the difference between budgeted and actual revenues received from the Federal and State governments to support this effort. The increased funds will be used for operational expenses to the program.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved appropriations #2015047, #2015048, #2015049, #2015050, #2015051, #2015052, #2015053, #2015054, and #2015055 for general government and school division programs and projects.

| COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE APPROPRIATION SUMMARY | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------|--|
| APP# | ACCOUNT | AMOUNT | DESCRIPTION |
| 2015047 | 4-9000-69985-466730-800605-6116 | -45660.24 | SA2015047 Reconcile: Agnor Hurt E S Addition/Renov |
| 2015047 | 4-9000-69980-464600-800949-6599 | 45660.24 | SA2015047 Reconcile Multiple Projects |
| 2015048 | 3-3219-63219-333000-384284-6599 | 141984.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-111400-6113 | 22880.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-119400-6113 | 88289.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-210000-6113 | 8505.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-221000-6113 | 2991.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-231000-6113 | 2500.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-232000-6113 | 600.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-241000-6113 | 500.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-312500-6113 | 1000.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-420100-6113 | 7894.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-520100-6113 | 175.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-550100-6113 | 350.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-580500-6113 | 500.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-600100-6113 | 400.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3219-63219-460000-601300-6113 | 5400.00 | SA2015048 September 11, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 3-3101-63101-333000-384010-6599 | 197482.43 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-111400-6501 | 79601.06 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-132100-6530 | 12041.00 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-154100-6530 | 1323.00 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-210000-6501 | 5460.65 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-210000-6530 | 1022.35 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-221000-6501 | 12455.44 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-231000-6501 | 7000.29 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-232000-6501 | 90.40 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-241000-6501 | 1022.57 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-312700-6530 | 43355.75 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-115000-6501 | 24208.88 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-210000-6501 | 1801.50 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-221000-6501 | 4166.87 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-231000-6501 | 3500.16 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-232000-6501 | 90.40 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3101-63101-461101-241000-6501 | 342.11 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 3-3380-63380-318100-181080-6599 | 26340.00 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3380-63380-461101-132100-6280 | 24421.73 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3380-63380-461101-210000-6280 | 1868.27 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015048 | 4-3380-63380-461101-601300-6280 | 50.00 | SA2015048 September 25, 2014 School Board Meeting |
| 2015049 | 4-1000-32015-432010-600000-1003 | 2000.00 | SA2015049 Materials and Supplies |
| 2015049 | 3-1000-51000-351000-512008-9999 | 2000.00 | SA2015049 Trs. From Contribution Fund |
| 2015049 | 4-8405-93010-493010-930009-9999 | 2000.00 | SA2015049 Trs to General Fund |
| 2015049 | 3-8405-18000-318000-181114-9999 | 2000.00 | SA2015049 Donations-Fire Rescue |
| 2015050 | 3-4100-24000-324000-240548-9999 | 25452.00 | SA2015050 Local Emergency Management Grant |
| 2015050 | 4-4100-31045-435600-331800-1003 | 600.00 | SA2015050 R&M Buildings |
| 2015050 | 4-4100-31045-435600-520300-1003 | 1700.00 | SA2015050 Telecommunications |
| 2015050 | 4-4100-31045-435600-550100-1003 | 1132.00 | SA2015050 Travel/Training/Education |
| 2015050 | 4-4100-31045-435600-600000-1003 | 3000.00 | SA2015050 Materials & Supplies |
| 2015050 | 4-4100-31045-435600-600100-1003 | 3000.00 | SA2015050 Office Supplies |
| 2015050 | 4-4100-31045-435600-600900-1003 | 5000.00 | SA2015050 Vehicle & Equip |
| 2015050 | 4-4100-31045-435600-601100-1003 | 500.00 | SA2015050 Uniforms & Apparel |
| 2015050 | 4-4100-31045-435600-601700-1003 | 1520.00 | SA2015050 Copy Expenses |
| 2015050 | 4-4100-31045-435600-800700-1003 | 9000.00 | SA2015050 Technology Equip |
| 2015051 | 3-1000-24000-324000-240500-1003 | 10000.00 | SA2015051 State Revenue |
| 2015051 | 4-1000-21070-421070-120000-1002 | 10000.00 | SA2015051 Overtime Wages |
| 2015051 | 3-1000-33000-333000-330001-1003 | 6745.00 | SA2015051 Federal Revenue |
| 2015051 | 4-1000-21070-421070-601000-1002 | 6745.00 | SA2015051 Police Supplies |
| 2015052 | 3-1598-33000-332000-330042-1003 | 7351.49 | SA2015052 Reappropriation of fund balance |

| | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| 2015052 | 4-1598-32015-432010-301210-1003 | 7351.49 | SA2015052 FEMA Training Grant balance |
| 2015053 | 4-9010-32020-432020-810306-3140 | -37853.00 | SA2015053 From North Garden Engine 32 |
| 2015053 | 4-9010-32010-432010-811105-3140 | 37853.00 | SA2015053 To Monticello Engine 112 |
| 2015053 | 3-9010-51000-351000-510100-9999 | 30000.00 | SA2015053 Economic Development Office |
| 2015053 | 4-9010-81050-481050-312350-1008 | 30000.00 | SA2015053 Economic Development Office |
| 2015054 | 3-1000-33000-333000-330020-1005 | 2309.00 | SA2015054 Federal Revenue- Social Services |
| 2015054 | 4-1000-99900-499000-999990-9999 | -5651.40 | SA2015054 Contingency Budget Adjustments |
| 2015054 | 4-1000-53010-453010-110000-1005 | 5888.40 | SA2015054 Salary |
| 2015054 | 4-1000-53010-453010-210000-1005 | 450.00 | SA2015054 FICA |
| 2015054 | 4-1000-53010-453010-221000-1005 | 3307.50 | SA2015054 VRS |
| 2015054 | 4-1000-53010-453010-241000-1005 | 323.50 | SA2015054 VRS Group Life |
| 2015054 | 4-1000-53010-453010-270000-1005 | 40.50 | SA2015054 Workers Comp |
| 2015054 | 4-1000-53010-453010-222100-1005 | -2049.50 | SA2015054 Annuity Part-time |
| 2015055 | 3-1225-33000-330001-330001-9999 | -42253.00 | SA2015055 Federal Revenue |
| 2015055 | 3-1225-24000-324000-240500-9999 | 44788.00 | SA2015055 State Revenue |
| 2015055 | 4-1225-51000-351000-512004-9999 | 2535.00 | SA2015055 Transfer to General Fund |
| 2015055 | 4-1000-99900-499000-999990-9999 | 1844.00 | SA2015055 Contingency Budget Amendments |
| 2015055 | 3-1000-51000-351000-512000-9999 | 2535.00 | SA2015055 Transfer from 1225 |
| 2015055 | 4-1225-31012-431010-350000-1003 | 208.00 | SA2015055 Print & Bind External |
| 2015055 | 4-1225-31012-431010-550400-1003 | 60.00 | SA2015055 Travel Education |
| 2015055 | 4-1225-31012-431010-550600-1003 | 198.00 | SA2015055 Travel Subsistence |
| 2015055 | 4-1225-31012-431010-580100-1003 | 225.00 | SA2015055 Dues & Memberships |
| 2015057 | 3-9000-69000-324000-410210-6305 | 144700.00 | SA2015057 State Revenue |
| 2015057 | 4-9000-60000-496010-999999-6305 | 144700.00 | SA2015057 CATEC Contingency |
| TOTAL | | 1,202,867.84 | |

Item No. 8.4. FY 13/14 ACE Easement Appraisals and Purchases.

The executive summary states that on November 13, 2013, the Board approved the Acquisition of Conservation Easement (ACE) Committee's request to have the top five ranked properties from the FY 2013-14 applicant pool appraised. The properties were the Henley Forest, Inc., Caldwell, Campbell, Woodson, and Stargell properties (see Attachment A). Based on estimated easement values for these properties prior to the official appraisals, the ACE Committee believed that the ACE Program fund balance would be enough to purchase some or all of the easements. Even if it were not, the Committee believed it was prudent to obtain appraisals on lower ranked properties in the event that higher ranked application(s) were withdrawn.

On September 3, 2014, the Board approved the recommendation of the ACE Committee and staff to: 1) approve the Henley Forest, Inc. and Campbell appraisals from the FY 2013-14 applicant pool; and 2) authorize staff to invite Henley Forest, Inc. and Campbell to make written offers to sell conservation easements to the County for the amounts approved by the ACE Appraisal Review Committee (ARC). Since then, Henley Forest, Inc. submitted its offer to sell a conservation easement to the County and has accepted the County's offer to purchase the easement for \$363,780. The Caldwell application has been withdrawn.

The ARC did not initially approve the appraisals of the remaining two properties, Stargell and Woodson, due to questions regarding development potential and the comparables used. The ARC has met again and has approved these remaining appraisals based on the detailed responses provided by the appraiser.

Through the first ten rounds of the ACE program, the County has acquired easements on 41 properties and protected 7,555 acres and other open space resources at a 23% discount to net easement value because of grants, donations and adjusted values from the income grid (see Attachment D).

Currently, the County has \$751,454.60 of reappropriated funds from FY 2013-14 for acquiring easements plus another \$310,394.11 in grants from the Office of Farmland Preservation (OFP): \$149,678.46 was awarded in March, 2014 and \$160,715.64 was awarded in February, 2013. These grant funds must be used within two years of the award date and are held by OFP in a restricted account until the County submits a Reimbursement Claim Form for 50% of the total acquisition costs. Therefore, the total funds available for the acquisition of all easements in this class of applicants is \$1,061,848.70. With the County's purchase of Henley Forest, Inc.'s easement for \$363,780, a balance of almost \$700,000 remains in the budget for the acquisitions of the Woodson and Stargell easements at a total cost of \$329,000.

Funding for the purchase of these conservation easements would be paid for from existing funds in the CIP-Planning-Conservation budget (line-item 9010-81010-580409) and grants from the Office of Farmland Preservation (OFP).

The ACE Committee and staff recommend that the Board:

- 1) Accept the Henley Forest, Inc. written offer to sell a conservation easement to the County for the amount of \$363,780;
- 2) Approve the Stargell and Woodson appraisals from the FY 2013-14 applicant pool (see Attachment A); and

- 3) Authorize staff to invite the Stargell and Woodson property owners to make written offers to sell conservation easements to the County for the amounts approved by the ARC (see Attachment C).

By the above-recorded vote, the Board accepted the Henley Forest, Inc. written offer to sell a conservation easement to the County for the amount of \$363,780; approved the Stargell and Woodson appraisals from the FY2013-14 applicant pool; and authorized staff to invite the Stargell and Woodson property owners to make written offers to sell conservation easements to the County for the amounts approved by the ARC.

Item No. 8.5. Northside Library Lease Extension.

The executive summary states that the County currently leases 15,572 square feet of space from Rio Associates Limited Partnership at 300 Albemarle Square for use as the Northside Library. The original 1991 lease was extended by a First Lease Modification and Extension Agreement entered into on November 1, 2004, a Second Lease Modification and Extension Agreement entered into on October 1, 2009, and a Third Lease Modification and Extension Agreement entered into on June 1, 2014. The current lease term expires January 31, 2015.

The new Northside Library and Storage Facility is currently under construction at 705 Rio Road (former Phillips Building Supply building) and will provide a permanent location for the library. A construction schedule extension of 40 calendar days is necessary due to delays in construction over the summer from unexpected site, building, and structural issues related to existing conditions. The County is planning on substantial completion of the new library in late February 2015 and occupancy in March 2015 based on the extended schedule.

Because the new library will not be ready for occupancy by January 31, 2015, when the current library lease at the Albemarle Square location expires, a lease extension through March 31, 2015 is necessary. The landlord, Rio Associates Limited Partnership, has agreed to a two-month extension, from February 1, 2015 to March 31, 2015, at the current monthly rental amount of \$25,953.33, subject to the same terms and conditions as set forth in the previously modified and extended lease.

The County Attorney's office has prepared a "Fourth Lease Modification and Extension Agreement" (Attachment A) to extend the lease for two months, which has been forwarded to the landlord for review and execution.

The FY15 Adopted Budget anticipated a new Northside library opening date of November 2014. A revised opening date of April 2015 will have an approximate \$60,000 impact to the General Fund, primarily due to 1) the additional expense for the County's share of the lease at the current library location; and 2) the County's reduced revenue from delaying the beginning of the lease at the new library location, where the County will lease space to Jefferson Madison Regional Library. Staff recommends \$60,000 be set aside in reserve from the year-end FY14 unaudited revenue over expenditures to address these one-time impacts. The Northside Library project budget includes sufficient contingency funds to cover these costs; therefore, year-end adjustments will be made to effectively restore the use of these reserve funds once the project is complete.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached resolution (Attachment B) authorizing the County Executive to sign, in a form approved by the County Attorney, the Fourth Lease Modification and Extension Agreement between the County of Albemarle and Rio Associates Limited Partnership to extend the Northside Library lease through March 31, 2015.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution to authorize the County Executive to sign, in a form approved by the County Attorney, the Fourth Lease Modification and Extension Agreement between the County of Albemarle and Rio Associates Limited Partnership to extend the Northside Library lease through March 31, 2015:

RESOLUTION APPROVING THE FOURTH LEASE MODIFICATION
AND EXTENSION AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE AND RIO ASSOCIATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
FOR THE NORTHSIDE LIBRARY

WHEREAS, the County of Albemarle leases from Rio Associates Limited Partnership 15,572 square feet located at 300 Albemarle Square for use as the Northside Library; and

WHEREAS, the original lease for the Northside Library was first dated January 31, 1991, and was extended by a First Lease Modification and Extension Agreement entered into on November 1, 2004, by a Second Lease Modification and Extension Agreement entered into on October 1, 2009, and by a Third Lease Modification and Extension Agreement entered into on June 1, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the current lease term expires January 31, 2015, and the replacement facility will not be available for occupancy until March 2015; and

WHEREAS, the attached Fourth Lease Modification and Extension Agreement extends the lease of the Northside Library through March 31, 2015.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby authorizes the County Executive to sign, in a form approved by the County Attorney, the Fourth Lease Modification and Extension Agreement between the County of Albemarle and Rio Associates Limited Partnership to extend the Northside Library lease through March 31, 2015.

**FOURTH LEASE MODIFICATION AND
EXTENSION AGREEMENT**

This **FOURTH LEASE MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION AGREEMENT** entered into this 8th day of October, 2014, by and between **RIO ASSOCIATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**, hereinafter referred to as "Landlord", party of the first part, and the **COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE, VIRGINIA**, hereinafter referred to as "Tenant," party of the second part,

WITNESSETH:

THAT WHEREAS, by LEASE dated the 31st day of January, 1991, commencing on the 1st day of July, 1991, and originally scheduled to end on the 30th day of June, 2001 (hereinafter referred to as "said Lease"), which Lease was held over by prior written consent of Landlord on a month-to-month basis at the same rental rate as the rate that prevailed for the 10th year of said Lease, Landlord leased to Tenant a portion of certain real property situated in the County of Albemarle said property being more particularly described in said Lease as 15,572 square feet located at 300 Albemarle Square, in Charlottesville, Virginia, which Lease was further extended between the parties by the **FIRST LEASE MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION AGREEMENT** entered into on the 1st day of November, 2004, commencing November 1, 2004 and expiring October 31, 2009, which Lease was further extended between the parties by the **SECOND LEASE MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION AGREEMENT** entered into on the 1st day of October, 2009, commencing November 1, 2009 and expiring October 31, 2014, and which Lease was further extended between the parties by the **THIRD LEASE MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION AGREEMENT** entered into on the 1st day of June, 2014, commencing November 1, 2014 and expiring January 31, 2015;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements herein contained, the parties hereto do hereby covenant and agree to and with each other as follows:

FIRST: Said Lease, as previously modified and extended, shall be extended for an additional 4th extended term (hereinafter "the Fourth Extended Term") of two (2) months commencing February 1, 2015 and expiring March 31, 2015 on the same terms and conditions as set forth in said previously modified and extended Lease, except as follows:

SECOND: The fixed minimum monthly rental for the Fourth Extended Term, under Provision 2(a) herein shall be twenty-five thousand, nine hundred fifty-three and 33/100 Dollars (\$25,953.33).

THIRD: Except as herein modified, all of the terms and conditions of said Lease shall remain in full force and effect.

FOURTH: The signatories whose names are herein below affixed are authorized to bind their respective parties to the terms and conditions of this **FOURTH LEASE MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION AGREEMENT**.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this **FOURTH LEASE MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION AGREEMENT** as of the day and year first above written:

TENANT:

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE, VIRGINIA

By: _____
Thomas C. Foley, County Executive

LANDLORD:

RIO ASSOCIATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

By: Dumbarton Properties, Inc., its Agent

By: _____
James N. Plotkin, President

Item No. 8.6. SDP-2014-00060. Farmington Country Club.

The executive summary states that critical slopes are slopes of 25% or greater. County Code § 18-4.2.3 prohibits a structure, improvement, or land disturbing activity to establish a structure or improvement from being located on critical slopes unless a special exception is approved by the Board.

The applicant, Farmington Country Club, is requesting approval of a Minor Site Plan amendment to construct additional parking to serve the country club. This would include the

expansion of the lower parking lot south of Tennis Road and adjacent to the existing driving range, and the construction of a new bio-filter in the same general area. See Attachments A and B for the request and the site plan. In order to construct these improvements as proposed, Farmington County Club is requesting a special exception to authorize the disturbance of a small area of man-made critical slopes.

County Code §§ 18-4.2.5 and 18-33.5 authorize the Board to approve a special exception to waive the requirements of County Code § 18-4.2.3 to permit the disturbance of critical slopes. The area of the proposed improvements in Farmington is approximately 2.63 acres, of which 0.21 acres is comprised of critical slopes (0.08% of the project area). The critical slopes appear to be man-made and created pursuant to the construction of the existing lower parking lot and driving range. Engineering and Planning staff have no concerns with the critical slopes disturbance request. See Attachment C for staff's analysis of the relevant factors for the critical slopes waiver request.

No budget impact will result from authorizing this special exception.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment D) to approve this special exception to allow the critical slopes to be disturbed.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution to approve the special exception to allow the critical slopes to be disturbed:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Farmington County Club ("Farmington") is the owner of Tax Map and Parcel Number 060E2-00-00-00100 (the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, Farmington filed a request for a special exception in conjunction with SDP 2014-00060, Farmington County Club, to waive the requirements that prohibit the disturbance of critical slopes, as the Property is depicted on the pending site plan amendment under review by the County's Department of Community Development.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, upon consideration of the foregoing, the executive summary prepared in conjunction with the application, and its supporting analysis included as Attachment C thereto, and all of the factors relevant to the special exception in Albemarle County Code § 18-4.2.3, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves the special exception to authorize the disturbance of critical slopes in Farmington's expansion of its lower parking lot south of Tennis Road and adjacent to the existing driving range and the construction of a new biofilter necessary to construct additional parking to serve Farmington.

Item No. 8.7. FY16 VDOT Revenue Sharing Program Participation. *(pulled from Consent Agenda)*

Item No. 8.8. SDP-2014-00056. Regional Firearms Training Center.

The executive summary states that the County, on behalf of the County, the City of Charlottesville and the University of Virginia, proposes to construct a 19,861 square foot indoor firearms training facility and associated parking at 2300 Milton Road (Attachment A). The proposed parking area includes thirty (30) spaces as required by the Zoning Ordinance for classroom assembly areas. County Code § 18-4.12.15(g) requires curbs to be established at the edges of parking areas or access aisles in commercial and institutional development parking areas of eight (8) or more spaces. The parking spaces for the indoor firearms training facility are proposed to be flanked by wheel stops rather than the required curbing. Therefore, the applicant has requested a special exception to waive the curb requirement for the parking area and access isles.

County Code § 18-4.12.2(c) allows design requirements of parking areas to be waived by special exception upon considering whether the proposed waiver would equally or better serve the public health, safety or welfare. The applicant's justification for the waiver request is to maximize the capabilities of the site's proposed bioretention facility while still providing an adequate and safe parking area for vehicular and pedestrian traffic (Attachment B). According to the applicant, using wheel stops rather than curbing will allow runoff to flow from the parking area to the bioretention facility, which will evenly disperse flow.

The indoor firearms training facility will be used by local law enforcement agencies and will not be open to the general public. Therefore, there is not expected to be a high volume of traffic using the facility and parking area. The County Engineer and Zoning Administrator have reviewed the plan and the request for the special exception and have no objections. Staff opinion is that the design of the parking area would equally or better serve the public health, safety and welfare.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment C) to approve this special exception to waive the requirement for curbing in the parking area as required by County Code § 18-4.12.15(g).

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution to approve the special exception to waive the requirement for curbing in the parking area as required by County Code § 18-4.12.15(g):

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Rector & Visitors of the University of Virginia (“UVA”) is the owner of Tax Map and Parcel Number 09300-00-00-00700 (the “Property”); and

WHEREAS, the County, acting as the agent for the County, the City of Charlottesville, and UVA, is the applicant for a site plan for a regional firearms training facility to be located on the property; and

WHEREAS, the County filed a request for a special exception in conjunction with SDP 2014-00056, Regional Firearms Training Facility, to waive the requirement that curbs be established at the edges of parking areas or access aisles in commercial and institutional development parking areas of eight or more spaces within the proposed parking area of the to-be-constructed regional firearms training facility as depicted on the pending site plan for the Property under review by the County’s Department of Community Development.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, upon consideration of the foregoing, the executive summary prepared in conjunction with the application, and its supporting analysis, and all of the factors relevant to the special exception in Albemarle County Code § 18-4.12.2(c), the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves the special exception to authorize the use of wheel stops rather than the required curbing at the edges of the parking areas of the to-be-constructed regional firearms training facility.

Item No. 8.9. SUB-2014-00116. John C. Fisher Rural Subdivision.

The executive summary states that the applicant proposes to divide a 8.549 acre lot (Parcel X) off of an existing 77.877 acre parcel (See Attachment A). The parcel, Tax Map 96 Parcel 13, is zoned Rural Areas and currently contains one dwelling that accesses the property from Spring Valley Road (Rt. 634). The property is mostly covered in critical slopes (See Attachment B) and the proposed division would result in Parcel X not having a building site that meets the requirements of County Code § 18-4.2.2(a).

County Code § 18-4.2.2(a) requires that each parcel have a building site of 30,000 square feet or more and have such dimensions that no one dimension exceeds any other by a ratio of more than five (5) to one (1) as described by a rectangle inscribed within the building site. The building site may not contain, among other things, land within critical slopes. The applicant is requesting a special exception to waive the requirement of the rectangular five (5) to one (1) building site.

The proposed Parcel X has a contiguous area of over 30,000 square feet outside of critical slopes, but this area fails to meet the requirement that the building site be rectangular with a ratio of no more than 5:1. The residue parcel that would result after the proposed subdivision does have a building site that meets the requirements of § 18-4.2.2(a). Because Parcel X already contains a dwelling, the division would not result in any *new* dwellings being added to the building site that does not meet the requirements of § 18-4.2.2(a).

County Code § 18-4.2.2(a)(3) authorizes the Board to waive or modify the rectangular shape requirement by special exception upon consideration of the recommendation from the Virginia Department of Health and consideration of three factors: i) The parcel has an unusual size, topography, shape, location or other unusual physical condition; ii) No reasonable alternative building site exists; and iii) Modifying or waiving the rectangular shape would result in less degradation of the parcel or adjacent parcels than if those dimensions were adhered to. The applicant has provided justification for the special exception (Attachment C), and staff’s analysis of the three factors are found in the Staff Report (Attachment D). Staff concluded that two of the three factors are satisfied. Staff also concluded that the third factor – that the modification would result in *less* degradation than if the rectangular dimensions were adhered to – was not satisfied. However, staff concluded that the modification would not create any more degradation. The Virginia Department of Health has provided approval for this subdivision (Attachment E).

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment F) to approve this special exception to waive the building site requirement of County Code § 18-4.2.2(a).

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution to approve this special exception to waive the building site requirement of County Code § 18-4.2.2(a):

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, John C. Fisher (“Fisher”) is the owner of Tax Map and Parcel Number 09600-00-00-01300 (the “Property”); and

WHEREAS, Fisher filed a request for a special exception in conjunction with SUB 2014-00116, John C. Fisher Rural Subdivision, to waive the requirement that no one dimension of a building site exceed any other by a ratio of more than five to one on Parcel X, which will consist of 8.549 acres and currently contains one dwelling, as the Property is depicted on the pending subdivision plat for the Property under review by the County's Department of Community Development.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, upon consideration of the foregoing, the executive summary prepared in conjunction with the application, and its supporting analysis included as Attachment D thereto, and all of the factors relevant to the special exception in Albemarle County Code § 18-4.2.2(a)(3), the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves the special exception to waive the rectangular five to one building site requirement on Parcel X.

Item No. 8.10. VACo 2014 Annual Meeting Voting Credentials.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board authorized Ann Mallek to serve as the Board representative, and Jane Dittmar as the alternate, to cast votes at the VACo Annual Business meeting.

Item No. 8.11. Adoption Worker Position.

The executive summary states that During the Kaine administration, First Lady Anne Holton developed an increased focus on permanency for foster children and led the statewide Children's Transformation project that, among other positive changes, pushed adoption to the forefront. As a result of that and other policy changes, the adoption caseload exploded statewide. Two years ago Governor McDonnell led a campaign to increase adoptions of foster children and the caseload increased again. Both of these initiatives were done without additional resources being provided to the local departments of social services (LDSS). The Department now finds itself with an opportunity to address the overwhelming adoption caseload (that continues to grow) and is the reason for this request at this time outside of the normal budget process.

The Foster Care/Adoption Program of the Albemarle County Department of Social Services (ACDSS) currently has two part-time workers, one of which is a Senior Worker. The Senior Worker has recently announced her intent to retire on February 1, 2015, and ACDSS is requesting to increase this position to a full-time worker. We are not requesting that it remain a Senior Worker. At this point, the team has more need of worker time to manage the increasing caseloads and demands rather than a senior position.

There are several key factors in support of this request including significant prevailing state mandates related to adoption services, changes in policies governing adoption services, increased adoption caseloads and projected continued growth in caseloads, and worker caseload measures beyond the reasonable capacity of the two part-time positions. A more detailed justification of the need for the conversion of a part time senior worker to a full time worker position is provided in Attachment A

This request is for consideration of an additional appropriation of \$7,961 for additional salary and benefits for the January through June 2015 timeframe to address the opportunity presented by the retirement of a long- time employee and the need for additional staff support by increasing the part-time senior position to a full-time position. The required ongoing additional annual funding of \$15,921 would be included in the annual budget process beginning in FY 16. The additional position time and associated costs would generate new federal revenue of \$2,309 in FY 15 and \$4,617 in FY16 for a *net local dollar impact* of \$5,652 in FY 15 and \$11,304 in FY 16. Appropriation #2015054 in the amount of \$7,961 is included as part of the FY 15 Budget Amendment and Appropriations Executive Summary, also being presented to the Board for consideration on November 5.

Staff recommends that the Board approve the request to change one part-time senior adoption worker position to a full-time adoption worker position and approve Appropriation #2015054 on the November 5, 2014 FY15 Appropriation Request.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved the request to change one part-time senior adoption worker position to a full-time adoption worker position and approve Appropriation #2015054 on the November 5, 2014 FY15 Appropriation Request.

Item No. 9.1 Quarterly Capital Report, ***was received for information.***

Item No. 9.2. County Grant Application/Award Report, ***was received for information.***

The executive summary states that pursuant to the County's Grant Policy and associated procedures, staff provides periodic reports to the Board on the County's application for and use of grants.

Grant awards provide funding to support a variety of projects supporting the Board's Aspirations statements and the County's Mission to enhance the well-being and quality of life for all citizens through the provision of the highest level of public service consistent with the prudent use of public funds.

The attached Grants Report provides a brief description of three grant awards received during the time period of September 13, 2014 through October 17, 2014.

The budget impact is noted in the summary of each grant.

This report is for information only.

GRANT REPORT ACTIVITY - September 13, 2014 through October 17, 2014

Applications were made for the following grants:

No grant applications were made during this time period.

Awards were received for the following grants:

| Granting Entity | Grant | Type | Amount Received | Match Required | Match Source | Department | Purpose |
|--|---|---------|-----------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration | Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Speed Reduction | State | \$10,000.00 | \$5,000.00 | Budgeted within Sheriff's Office Department's Budget | Sheriff | This grant will be used for overtime hours for the Albemarle County Sheriff's Office to provide speed enforcement. |
| Virginia Department of Emergency Management | FY15 Local Emergency Management Performance Grant (LEMPG) | Federal | \$25,452.00 | \$8,484 each from County, City, and UVA | Budgeted within ECC Department's Budget | Emergency Communications Center (ECC) | This grant will be used to support the development and maintenance of a Comprehensive Emergency Management Program. The funding will be used to support the ECC by augmenting salary, website support, training and education, materials and supplies, and technology equipment. |
| Virginia Department of Emergency Management | FY14 State Homeland Security Program Grant | Federal | \$6,745.00 | 0 | None | Sheriff | This grant will be used to provide funds for the purchase of one Thermal Imaging Camera for use by the Sheriff's Office Search and Rescue Team to aid in the detection of evidence, suspects and missing persons. |

Item No. 9.3. School Board to Board Report, ***was received for information.***

Item No. 9.4. FY 2015 1st Quarter Cash Proffer Report, ***was received for information.***

The executive summary states that in 2007, the Board directed staff to provide a quarterly report on the status of cash proffers. Since that time, the report has been expanded to also include updates on non-cash proffers. The Board received the last quarterly proffer report on August 6, 2014, which included information on cash proffer revenue and expenditures and non-cash proffers for April through June, 2014. This report includes all proffer activity (both cash and non-cash) for the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2014 (July-September). The next quarterly report will be on the Board's February 4, 2015 agenda.

Critical Infrastructure: Prioritize, plan and invest in critical infrastructure that responds to past and future changes and improves the capacity to serve community needs.

Proffer Activity for Fiscal Year 2015 First Quarter (July-September)

- A. New Proffered Revenue:** There were no rezoning requests approved this quarter that provided new cash proffers.
- B. Total Proffered Revenue:** Total proffered revenue is \$46,136,985.90. This reflects new proffered revenue (described above) in addition to 2013 annual adjustments to anticipated proffer revenue (not received yet obligated) from proffers in which annual adjustments were proffered.
- C. 1st Quarter Cash Revenue:** The County received a total of **\$196,910.94** from existing cash proffers during this quarter from the following developments:

| DEVELOPMENT | TOTAL | INTENDED PURPOSE |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---|
| Belvedere | \$5,000.00 | Historical Markers |
| Belvedere | \$7,500.00 | Affordable Housing |
| Estes Park | \$20,986.71 | CIP |
| Grayrock West (f.k.a. Patterson) | \$40,922.68 | CIP |
| Livengood (Glenmore S5) | \$23,652.20 | CIP/Affordable Housing |
| Leake (Glenmore K2) | \$22,349.35 | CIP/Affordable Housing |
| Old Trail | \$24,000.00 | Crozet Parks/Schools |
| Riverside Village | \$30,000.00 | Park Master Plan or Darden Towe Park Improvements |

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|------------|
| Wickham Pond II | \$22,500.00 | CIP-Crozet |
| TOTAL | \$196,910.94 | |

D. 1st Quarter Expenditures and Appropriations: A total of \$375,000 in proffer funds from Stonefield were expended during this quarter on the Seminole Trail Volunteer Fire Department renovation and addition.

Current Available Funds: As of September 30, 2014, the available proffered cash on-hand is \$4,302,335.00 (including interest earnings on proffer revenue received). Some of these funds were proffered for specific projects while others may be used for general projects within the CIP. Of the available proffered cash on-hand, \$2,318,209.16 (including interest earned), is currently appropriated (Attachment A). The net cash balance is \$1,984,125.84 and Attachment B provides information on how the net cash balance may be used for future appropriations to CIP projects.

FY 2014 Survey of Cash Proffers for Commission on Local Government

The State requires that localities accepting cash proffers report to the Commission on Local Government annually. The County's report for FY 2014 is attached (Attachment C). During FY 2014, the County collected \$880,318 in cash proffers. The amount expended in FY 2014 is \$302,199. Appropriations, including interest that accrued in FY 2014, totaled \$550,000 and are reflected on Attachment A.

Cash proffers are a source of revenue to address impacts from development and they support the funding of important County projects which would otherwise be funded through general tax revenue. Using cash proffer funding for current or planned FY14–FY17 CIP projects builds capacity in the CIP by freeing up funding for other projects. In addition, non-cash proffers provide improvements that might otherwise need to be funded by general tax revenue.

The Community Development Department and Office of Management and Budget staff monitor proffer funds on an ongoing basis to ensure that associated projects not currently in the CIP move forward and to ensure that funding is appropriated to projects before any proffer deadlines.

Item No. 9.5. Domestic Violence Fatality Review Program Report, ***was received for information.***

Item No. 9.6. VDOT Culpeper District, Albemarle County Monthly Report, October 2014, ***was received for information.***

Item No. 9.7. Strategic Prevention Framework-State Incentive Grant (SPF-SIG), ***was received for information.***

The executive summary states that The Strategic Prevention Framework – State Incentive Grant (SPF-SIG) originates through the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Agency (SAMHSA). The prime recipient for the grant in the Commonwealth is the Virginia Commonwealth University. Albemarle County is a sub-recipient. The yearly funding amount for Albemarle County is \$145,150.00.

Prior to the SPF-SIG intervention project:

- Albemarle County had the sixth highest rate of alcohol-related motor vehicle crash (A-MVC) mortalities across all ages in the State of Virginia.
- 195 of the A-MVCs that occurred from 2009 to 2011 involved 15-24 year olds.
- Of the 15-24 year olds involved in A-MVCs, the average age of the driver involved was 21 years.
- A majority of the 195 A-MVCs involved:
 - 21-24 year olds (59%)
 - males (78%)
- 118 of the 195 A-MVCs involved Albemarle County residents (61%)
- At least 26 students were involved in A-MVCs from 2009-2011, including
 - 15 college/university students
 - 10 high school students (and one unknown)
 - 15 were residents of Albemarle County (58%).

The following results of the survey of 18 to 24 year olds conducted as part of a needs assessment prior to interventions provided information on alcohol-related behaviors and perceptions of young adults in Albemarle County:

- 55% felt that it was only somewhat likely that someone driving under the influence would be stopped by law enforcement
- 87% do not drive after drinking two or more alcoholic beverages
- 78% do not ride in a car with someone who has been drinking

- Young adults in our area do not understand the relationship between the amount of alcohol that is consumed and the level of impairment.

Additionally, the survey asked participants to report the number of alcoholic drinks they consumed in the past 30 days and to predict the number of alcoholic drinks their peers had consumed in the past 30 days. Responses to these questions revealed that the perception of the amount of alcohol that is consumed by one's peers is greater than the amount of alcohol people report they personally consume.

The goal of the County's SPF-SIG campaign is to reduce the number of A-MVCs in Albemarle County among people ages 18-24 years. This is achieved by implementing strategies that will lower the number of A-MVCs and that will target behavioral change (i.e., perception of risk, perception of consumption patterns, knowledge regarding the effects of alcohol). The County's SPF-SIG project implemented three main strategies:

1. Collaboration with the Albemarle County Police Department (ACPD) to increase sobriety checkpoints and saturation patrols to increase the perception of risk associated with drinking and driving.
2. Social norming campaign paired with media coverage to increase the reach of the normative information regarding drinking behaviors of young adults in our community, including increasing awareness that most young adults in our community are not regularly drinking alcohol and most young adults are not driving after drinking alcohol.
3. Mass media advocacy campaign promoting the efforts of the police and bringing awareness regarding the problem of alcohol-impaired drivers in Albemarle County.

These strategies were implemented in 2013 (Year 2) of the SPF-SIG project. The ACPD conducted three sobriety checkpoints and 20 saturation patrols. The ACPD reported that it would have been unable to conduct any sobriety checkpoints in 2013 without the SPF-SIG grant funding and that it was also able to expand the locations of sobriety checkpoints due to the funding. Social norms materials were developed and disseminated and the mass media campaign included press coverage of sobriety checkpoints, news reports on the risks of driving after drinking, specifically being caught by the police, and social media advocacy. Results of data collected indicate that in 2013:

- A-MVCs in Albemarle County decreased 40.7% among people ages 18-24 years old.
- The perception of risk associated with drinking and driving increased (1%).
- The community's perception that drinking behaviors are viewed as wrong increased:
 - 5%: 18-20 years old
 - 4%: 21-24 years old

It should be noted that full implementation of strategies did not begin until the fourth month of the year (April). Although research indicates that strategies that are in practice for more than one year are more successful than strategies that are in practice for less than one year, the County's SPF-SIG project has seen significant success in under one year. With continued application of the Program's most successful strategies, the SPF-SIG team predicts continued success with the SPF-SIG project. A full Year End Report for 2013 is attached and provides more detailed information regarding the background, strategies, and results of the SPF-SIG project.

The implementation of SPF-SIG is grant funded with federal monies with no direct budget impact to the County.

No action is required by the Board. The information provided in this report is for information only.

Agenda Item No. 10. 2015 Legislative Priorities.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that each year the Board considers and approves its legislative priorities and coordinates its priorities with the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC), the Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) and the Virginia Municipal League (VML). On August 6, 2014 the Board reviewed the Board's 2014 Legislative Priorities and the Board reviewed and approved its initial 2015 Legislative priorities. On October 1, 2014, the Board approved the TJPDC Legislative Priorities. Generally, the TJPDC's legislative program incorporates many of the County's legislative priorities. The Board attended a regional forum with area legislators organized by the TJPDC on October 29, 2014 to discuss further possible legislative initiatives relating to taxation authority. Other initiatives are sometimes added prior to the final adoption of the Board's Legislative Priorities to address issues arising since August.

Following approval by the Board of the preliminary 2015 Legislative Priorities, several new or expanded priorities have been identified and are set out below for the Board's consideration:

Local Government Administration and Finance

Virginia Retirement System

The County supports restoration of funds to the Virginia Retirement System to maintain the long-term solvency of the plan without further devolving the funding responsibility to localities. The addition of this priority is in alignment with the School Board priorities.

Full Funding of State Mandates

The County requests the state provide full funding for its mandates in all areas of local government including the Standards of Quality and other mandates imposed on local school divisions, positions approved by the Compensation Board, costs related to jails and juvenile detention centers and human services positions. The addition of the underlined provision aligns this priority with the School Board priorities.

Stormwater Utility Fee Waiver

Request the General Assembly to amend Virginia Code § 15.2-2114 to provide that a public entity is eligible for a waiver under Virginia Code § 15.2-2114(C) from the imposition of stormwater utility charges where the public entity's real property is covered by a municipal separate storm sewer system permit ("MS4"), even though the public entity is not the MS4 permit holder. Background information regarding this item is provided in Attachment A.

School Bus Video-Monitoring Systems

Request the General Assembly to amend Virginia Code Section § 46.2-844 to allow for service of summonses by mail for violations of passing stopped school buses recorded by school bus video monitoring systems similar to the authority in Virginia Code Section § 15.2-968.1, for the service of summonses for running red lights recorded by a traffic signal enforcement system. Background information regarding this item is provided in Attachment B.

Business Personal Property Tax

The Charlottesville Regional Chamber of Commerce is asking the General Assembly to enable a \$500 minimum value reporting requirement for business personal property tax. County staff does not oppose such legislation, so long as it is not a mandate on localities and local officers administering local taxes. If an amendment is supported by the Board, County staff would suggest an amendment to Virginia Code Section § 58.1-3518 by adding the underlined additional authority regarding personal property taxes that would allow that "the commissioner of the revenue [or Finance Director] may elect not to require such a return from any taxpayer who owns such property which does not have sufficient value to generate a tax assessment and may also elect not to require the reporting on such a return of property with an original cost of less than two hundred fifty dollars." The \$250 threshold would be consistent with a prior reporting practice of the Finance Department that was determined not to be enabled. Existing Virginia Code § 58.1-3518 is attached (Attachment C).

Bottle and Can Deposit

A request has been suggested that the Board consider supporting legislation to require a deposit on returnable beverage containers. With the exception of a study resolution introduced during the 2008 session, it has been about 14 years since the General Assembly has considered such legislation, including introduction of HB 659 (which subsequently died in committee) by Senator Deeds as a member of the House of Delegates in 2000. This request has not been included as a proposed legislative priority.

Taxation Initiative

The final position of the County related to County taxing authority may be influenced by the outcome of the October 29, 2014 regional legislative forum.

The County supports the TJPDC's top priority and legislative request urging the governor and legislature to equalize the revenue-raising authority of counties with that of cities (Attachment D).

If general taxing authority equal to cities and towns is deemed not attainable, the County could request specific legislative authority for targeted additional taxing authority related to the food and beverage tax, the transient occupancy tax, a cigarette tax, or a local option sales and use tax.

After the Board's review, input and approval of the proposed Final 2015 Legislative Priorities, staff will submit the Board's 2015 Legislative Priorities to the TJPDC, VACo and VML for their information and to the legislators representing the County.

The County's legislative priorities seek to ensure that the state adequately funds its mandated responsibilities and does not jeopardize the County's ability to effectively and efficiently implement the policies and programs that it deems necessary. New taxing authority could provide alternative revenue sources to reduce the County's dependence on real estate taxes.

Staff recommends that the Board approve the proposed Final 2015 Legislative Priorities (Attachment E), with any deletions and additions it deems appropriate.

Mr. Davis stated that the Board previously reviewed the preliminary legislative priorities in August and gave approval to those. Since August, he said, there have been a few modifications and additions that have been proposed. Mr. Davis said that the first two items proposed for addition are the result of meetings between the School Board and the Board committee on legislative priorities. Staff is suggesting that to conform to school priorities that the Board add a priority regarding VRS. In addition, to align the full funding of state mandates priority, he said, staff recommends adding "and other mandates imposed on local school divisions." Mr. Davis said that there is also a proposed legislative initiative regarding storm water utility fees. There is currently legislation that requires an exemption of local storm water utility fees for public property that holds an MS4 permit for storm water. Mr. Davis said that has been

interpreted locally to not include two County schools located in the City, because they are not owned by the County, who is the holder of the MS4 permit. He explained that the County has had discussions with the patron of the original storm water utility bill, Delegate Bulova, who said that his intent was that properties like the school be covered – so staff is suggesting having a legislative amendment to clarify that those properties covered by an MS4 permit should be exempt from local storm water utility fees.

Mr. Davis said that the second item regards school bus video monitoring systems. A couple of months ago the Board adopted an ordinance to authorize systems to be installed on County school buses. He said that very few localities have adopted these systems thus far, primarily because there is a flaw in the legislation that relates to how summonses have to be served. Currently they must be served as traffic infractions are served, which require a police officer to serve a summons if the fine is not paid. Mr. Davis said that this is a very difficult and impractical approach. Under the red light camera legislation, it is specifically allowed for summonses to be served by first-class mail, and the County would ask that the General Assembly amend this legislation to allow these summonses to also be served by first-class mail. He noted that this would eliminate the impracticality of having the Police Department serve local summonses, and the possibility of them having to serve summonses for out of state and out of area drivers that may violate the ordinance.

He stated that the next item is an item that has been proposed by the Charlottesville Regional Chamber of Commerce regarding business personal property tax, which became an issue last year when the Finance Department changed its processes to specifically recognize that all business personal property needs to be reported. Mr. Davis explained that there has been a practice that property with an original purchase price of less than \$250 would not necessarily be required to be reported, which was not enabled by State law. The Chamber is asking for legislation that would allow such a process to be established at a locality's discretion at a \$500 level. He said that the County would not object to this type of discretionary enabling authority up to a \$250 level, as it is not known what the fiscal impact would be to localities for a \$500 exemption – but a \$250 practice might be considered if there were enabling legislation available for it. Mr. Davis said that staff is not requesting this per se, but in the priorities it would be stated as the County not opposing this type of legislation.

Mr. Davis said that the next item was raised by Ms. Mallek – a bottle and can deposit. Staff did not add it to the legislative agenda because there was not a lot of Board support for the item. He said that staff did research it; and Senator Creigh Deeds introduced a bill in 2000 to address Ms. Mallek's issue, but it died in subcommittee very quickly and he is not sure there is a lot of legislative interest in reintroducing that bill – so unless there is further Board direction, it has not been added to the agenda at this time.

Ms. Mallek said that since she raised this at their meeting, she met with Delegate David Toscano and Senator Creigh Deeds, who said that this would require a significant grassroots effort across the state, given the inertia on the issue and the way the legislature has functioned recently. Ms. Mallek said that she is taking this as a long-term challenge to work on the grassroots effort, and hopefully out of the ongoing solid waste effort, something will evolve in the next year that they can push forward through the Agriculture Committee and other places as well. She agrees with Mr. Davis's conclusion to leave it off the proposed list. Mr. Davis said that staff did not add it to their proposed list, but he did want to recognize the topic.

Mr. Davis stated that the next item is the taxation initiative, and the top priority of both the County and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District is to have the same taxing authority for counties and cities for the excise taxes that cities can levy. They held a legislative session the previous week with some General Assembly members in the Planning District but did not find a lot of support for it in the County's local delegation. He said that staff needs some additional direction from the Board at this point as to how to advance this priority or a different priority related to local taxing authority. Some ideas have been floated around that staff has discussed internally, but nothing has been specifically identified other than perhaps some discussion related to a meals or cigarette tax, or transient occupancy tax that could have a targeted dedicated revenue purpose – either subject or not subject to referendum.

Ms. Dittmar said that the parity issue between cities and counties is one that the Board is asking for statewide through the Virginia Association of Counties, and apparently the regional delegation comprised of surrounding counties and cities support this. She stated that the reason that cities care is because they cannot take full advantage of some of their user taxes if the counties nearby cannot meet them at the same level as it causes a competitive disadvantage. Ms. Dittmar said that parity would be something like a cigarette tax, a no limit on lodging tax, changes in meals tax or admissions tax – which is currently also prohibited through a three-party agreement with the City and the University unless they decide to change it unilaterally. She said that legislators were particularly concerned about the meals tax, and she wondered if the parity was a problem because of that one element and if the County may want to ask them about a specific tax – which may be more attractive to citizens than property tax.

Ms. Mallek said that in discussions after their presentations last week, she heard that the referendum issue might solve it, and at least that might get somewhere.

Ms. Palmer said that her impression was the Board needs to be a lot more specific about what they ask for, and some of the legislators reacted to how vague the County's proposals were.

Mr. Boyd said that he would have a difficult time voting to eliminate the referendum to increase the tax. He added that he did not realize there was a variance there.

Ms. Mallek said that the County does not even have the enabling authority to increase it, as it is at its limit. Mr. Davis confirmed that was the case.

Ms. Dittmar said that only the meals tax requires a referendum, and if the County is given permission it does not need it for lodging or cigarettes. She stated that when the Chamber of Commerce supported the meals tax in the 1990s, they were relatively sure that 50% of the meals purchased were by tourists – which also means that 50% were purchased by local residents. Ms. Dittmar said that cigarettes and lodging seem to be the least onerous taxes, which asks visitors to help with services, and asks smokers to pay 30 cents on a pack.

Mr. Davis noted that Arlington and Fairfax, the only two counties that have the enabling authority, are capped at five cents or the rate of the state cigarette tax – which is currently 30 cents per pack.

Mr. Boyd asked if it would make sense before the Board proposes this to have some idea of revenue.

Ms. Dittmar said that they have done those calculations, and they need to figure out what they would be putting it towards – specific support for certain things that the community wants or has a vision for but cannot afford.

Ms. Mallek commented that it could be any of the things on Item 18.

Mr. Davis mentioned that there are a few instances where there are restricted fund requirements. In the instance of the transient occupancy tax (TOT), three cents of the five-cent tax allowed must be dedicated to tourism or tourism-related expenses. He said that in the history of that tax, there have been a number of special additions to that tax, but all of them have been targeted to something related to tourism, convention centers, or some very specific improvement. Mr. Davis said that has been a basis for General Assembly approval of those taxes in some jurisdictions, including Albemarle. If the Board wants to target it for some other specific purpose such as education, that is a strategic decision the Board would need to make in trying to convince the General Assembly that this type of tax would serve a public purpose. He stated that it is a challenging environment this year to get additional taxing authority from the state. The Board's legislative timeline is such that its meeting with local legislators is planned for December 4 – and the deadline for having bills drafted for introduction is December 8, which is a very small window in which to develop a change in strategy.

Ms. Dittmar said that one thing that the Supervisors did hear from legislators in the earlier meeting was that this is a short session in an election year, and they do not want to consider too many new things.

Ms. Mallek said that is the same story the Board has heard for eight years straight, which is frustrating.

Ms. Dittmar suggested that the Board move forward with the parity item that includes the elements they have been talking about, then further delineate fallback requests to narrow it and better define it, and that would satisfy their process issue.

Ms. Mallek said that they could have an umbrella effort going forward that would be refined through Mr. Blount's help going forward, and Mr. Davis's redrafting would be what makes it happen quickly.

Mr. Davis said that they could have some discussions with legislators to see if there is any interest in sponsoring or carrying bills, but that will be the real challenge in the process for this year. He said that this is a process, and the Board may not achieve everything in this regard this year, but it could be the start of a discussion for next year.

Ms. Mallek said that even though they might fall flat a few times, if they do not ever start they are never going to get to year three when it passes.

Mr. Davis said that the remaining item on his list was a late request received the week before from the Registrar made to the School Board and the Board. He explained that next year there is a primary scheduled for the second Tuesday in June. There is a legislative initiative being sponsored by the Registrars Association to move the primary date to the third Tuesday in June, primarily to avoid conflicts with school schedules because many school systems are still in session that date in June, which is a very significant conflict for localities. Mr. Davis noted that the request is just to move the primary date from the second to the third Tuesday in June.

Ms. Mallek said that from a candidate's perspective it is a bad consequence, because the days are so short already if you have a primary situation, but she can understand why they want to take this approach.

Ms. Dittmar asked what primaries would be held then. Mr. Davis said that next year's elections, there will potentially be a state Senate primary, three Board of Supervisors races, and the House seats are also up next year.

Ms. Palmer said that she supports the change of one week.

Ms. McKeel agreed, noting that there are often snow days and make up days anyway.

Mr. Boyd said he does not have a problem either, but traditionally the party will back off of a primary if there is only one candidate.

Mr. Davis said that is the legislative proposal as established. All the items except for the primary date were included in the attachment to the Board's executive summary. He said that staff is recommending that the Board approve the final 2015 legislative priorities with the inclusion of the primary issue, unless the Board has any additional deletions or additions to propose.

Mr. Boyd asked if they are going to refine the equalization of taxes issue before the Board votes on it. Mr. Davis said that what he heard was that the Board was still going to advance the regional position of asking for equalized taxing authorities with cities, and that would be the County's priority as well. The Board added that item in its initial priorities which was then adopted by the region, so staff recommends leaving it in.

Ms. Dittmar said that does not constrain the Board from asking for something smaller.

Ms. Mallek agreed, stating that all the drafting will happen later.

Ms. Palmer asked if the Board needs to do anything about the business personal property tax. Mr. Davis said that staff's recommendation was to not oppose legislation if it was discretionary for the local government and limited to a \$250 cap.

Ms. Palmer said that she wonders about the chance of the \$500 getting through, and if it was better to oppose it or to say they do not mind as long as the County is not required to do it. Mr. Davis said that the County would like to have its support contingent on that cap, but when a bill is introduced it could go in lots of different directions – so introducing a bill that limits local government's taxing authority, even if it is discretionary, has the potential for going bad. He emphasized that this is not something he would ask for because the position of VACO and the County has often been to not take away any legislative authority on their taxing authority, and while this does not currently do that it does have that potential.

Mr. Boyd said that he thought they were asking for a local option to make that decision. Mr. Davis said that is where it is going to start.

Ms. Palmer said that it seems better to oppose it than to leave it hanging with, "We do not care, as long as you do not make us do it."

Ms. Mallek said that it does not say that, it says that as long as it is \$250 or less they support it.

Ms. Palmer asked if they would have a chance to oppose it if it went to \$500.

Ms. Mallek said that Mr. Blount would be there to oppose it for the County.

Mr. Davis explained that if a bill was introduced with \$500, David Blount or staff would appear and request that it be limited to \$250; if the bill was introduced that said it would be mandated on localities, the County would oppose it. He said that the legislative process is something they do not control.

Mr. Boyd asked if the \$500 was requested because it aligned with some sort of federal guidelines. Mr. Davis said that staff has looked into that but was not able to clarify it, and they do not think that it is applicable.

Ms. Palmer said that the state of North Carolina has an economic development office devoted to recycling and green energy initiatives, and the way they get the money to run it is through a tax on the tipping charge in the landfills. She said that they collect a significant amount of money to stimulate economic development in manufacturing in reuse and recycled goods. The way to keep recycling costs down is to find a place for them to go.

Mr. Davis said that the only other item under this discussion is Mr. Boyd's request for the North Charlottesville Business Council's proposal.

Mr. Boyd said that he just wants to gauge the interest of the Board in adding this to the agenda.

Ms. Dittmar said that they have added it to the list for consideration for the business assistance package. The next step is for Ms. Catlin to come back to the Board in December for the Board to look at all of the options and provide some detail on what that would mean. She said that since construction is not imminent until 2016 and there is an extended General Assembly session in the future, the Board should be well in time to discuss that.

Mr. Boyd said that he does not have a problem with that approach, because one thing they would have to flesh out with staff would be the financial impact of tax deferral.

Mr. Sheffield said that there are other local legal issues that would need to be determined, because if the Board is making this kind of decision, there is a question about businesses further away that may be claiming an impact.

Ms. Dittmar said that she would like to leave every single idea on the table until they have the report back in December.

Mr. Sheffield asked how many local legislators have been briefed on the letter from the Chamber, and how much they are aware of its contents.

Ms. Mallek said she knows the legislators have received it, but have not talked to anyone about it.

Ms. Dittmar said they are aware of it, and if it makes it through the Board's scrutiny they will be discussing it further.

Mr. Sheffield said that he would prefer to educate state legislators sooner rather than later so that they are prepared, and can even provide some input.

Mr. Foley said that there are a lot of important questions about the proposal that need to be evaluated more closely. The next General Assembly session may be the most opportune time, prior to the beginning of construction in May 2016 – so it will provide an opportunity to do some good research on something that could be of significant cost and needs to be thought through very carefully.

Mr. Boyd stated that it is possible to get that analysis for this year, and it helps to put it in a year in advance.

Ms. Mallek agreed, stating that she still has a learning curve about what the criteria would be and how they would get the information needed to decide, so there is a lot to be discussed in the future.

Mr. Foley said there is some initial information that could be brought back at the Board's first meeting in December regarding some basic questions that may have some influence on how they want to proceed, although it will not assess the entire impact.

Ms. Dittmar said that she heard loud and clear that this General Assembly does not want to add a lot of things to their plate, and this would be a watershed issue for the entire Commonwealth. She added that she cannot imagine that the Board would be able to disseminate enough information to others who will be making those decisions. She said that the one thing she has heard is that the legislators would want to look at this if it makes it all the way through the Board's consideration as to what it might mean for projects all over the state, so it is a significant ask, but a good one to evaluate.

Mr. Davis then asked the Board to approve the final 2015 legislative priorities as set out in Attachment E with the addition of the primary date issue.

Motion was then offered by Ms. Mallek to approve the final 2015 Legislative Priorities with the addition of the primary voting issue. Mr. Sheffield **seconded** the motion.

Ms. Palmer clarified that the parity issue between the City and County would come later.

Ms. Mallek said that this is the umbrella topic, not the details.

Mr. Boyd stated that he still has some real problems with the equalization taxation issue without tweaking that, but he will vote in favor of the priorities overall.

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

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

NAYS: None.

Albemarle County's 2015 Legislative Priorities

Growth Management, Land Use and Transportation

Stormwater Utility Waiver - request the General Assembly to amend Virginia Code § 15.2-2114 to provide that a public entity is eligible for a waiver under Virginia Code § 15.2-2114(C) from the imposition of stormwater utility charges where the public entity's real property is covered by a municipal separate storm sewer system permit ("MS4"), even though the public entity is not the MS4 permit holder.

Transportation Funding - Support legislation to 1) establish a new dedicated funding source for a Charlottesville-Albemarle Regional Transit Authority; 2) establish stable and consistent state revenues for Virginia's long-term transportation infrastructure needs; 3) direct funding efforts to expand transportation choices and engage in multimodal transportation planning; and 4) fund maintenance of rural road systems. The County also strongly opposes any legislation or regulations that would require the transfer of responsibility to counties for construction, maintenance or operation of new and existing secondary roads.

Biosolids - Support legislation enabling localities, as part of their zoning ordinances, to designate and/or reasonably restrict the land application of biosolids to specific areas within the locality based on criteria related to the public safety and welfare of its citizens and the environment. In addition, support legislation regarding land application of biosolids that protect the environment, public health and safety.

Local Authority - Support legislation to strengthen localities' authority by enabling them to utilize adequate public facilities ordinances, and encourage the General Assembly to refrain from passing legislation that preempts or circumvents existing local authority to regulate land use.

Impact Fee Authority - Support impact fee legislation that allows for 1) effective implementation through simple locally-based formulae and reasonable administrative requirements; 2) does not cap or limit localities' impact fee updates; and 3) does not diminish the existing proffer system.

Conservation Easements - Support legislation that augments local efforts in natural resource protection through 1) continued funding of the Virginia Land Conservation Foundation (VLCF) for locally established and funded Purchase of Development Rights programs (e.g. ACE Program in Albemarle County); 2) continued provision of matching funds to localities for their Purchase of Development Rights programs through the Office of Farmland Preservation; 3) retaining provisions in transient occupancy tax legislation so that funds can continue to be used to protect open-space and resources of historical, cultural, ecological and scenic value that attract tourism; and 4) increased incentives for citizens to create conservation easements.

Scenic Protection and Tourist Enhancement - Support enabling legislation for Albemarle County to provide for a scenic protection and tourist enhancement overlay district. Such legislation would provide a method to ensure full consideration of visual resources and scenic areas when the County or state make land use decisions in designated areas.

Health and Human Services

Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) - Request that the legislature assist localities' implementation of CSA in a consistent, financially stable manner by: 1) fully funding the state pool for CSA with allocations based on realistic anticipated levels of need and a cap on local expenditures for serving a child through CSA, and 2) encouraging the state to be proactive in making service providers available and to support local and regional efforts to address areas of cost sharing among localities by procuring services through group negotiation.

Child Care for Low Income Working Families - Request the legislature provide additional funds to local governments to assist low-income working families with childcare costs. Funding helps working-class parents pay for supervised day care facilities and supports efforts for families to become self-sufficient.

Local Department of Social Services (LDSS) - Request the legislature increase funds for LDSS to match all available federal dollars to assist LDSS staffing needs in order to meet state mandated services and workloads.

Local Government Administration and Finance

Taxation - Support legislation granting counties taxing powers equal to those granted cities and towns, without decreasing, limiting or changing city and town taxing authority.

Personal Property Tax - Support legislation to amend Virginia Code § 58.1-3518 to provide that the commissioner of the revenue or Finance Director may elect not to require the reporting of property with an original cost of less than two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) on a business personal property tax return.

Virginia Retirement System - The County supports restoration of funds to the Virginia Retirement System to maintain the long-term solvency of the plan without further devolving the funding responsibility to localities.

School Bus Video-Monitoring Systems - Request the General Assembly to amend Virginia Code Section § 45.2-844 to allow for service of summonses by mail for violations of passing stopped school buses recorded by school bus video monitoring systems similar to the authority in Virginia Code Section § 15.2-968.1, for the service of summonses for running red lights recorded by a traffic signal enforcement program.

June Primary Elections – Support legislation to move the annual date for June primary elections in the Commonwealth from the second Tuesday in June to the third Tuesday in June to avoid conflicts between local election administration and local school systems, where schools serve as voting precinct polling places.

Composite Index - Support legislation to amend the Composite Index Funding Formula by re-defining the local true value of real property component of the formula to include the land use taxation value of real property rather than the fair market assessed value for those properties that have qualified and are being taxed under a land use value taxation program

Community College Capital Costs - Request the state to fund 100% of public funding required for community college costs. Currently, localities are required to fund a portion of operating and capital costs.

Public Defender funding - Request the state to adequately fund compensation for public defenders in Commonwealth jurisdictions.

Full Funding of State Mandates - Request full funding for state mandates in all areas of local government including the Standards of Quality (SOQs) and other mandates imposed on local school divisions, positions approved by the Compensation Board, costs related to jails and juvenile detention centers and human services positions.

Voting Precincts - Eliminate split Virginia Senate precincts to the extent possible. The Virginia Senate redistricting plan has created split precincts in the Jack Jouett, Rio and Rivanna Magisterial Districts. The Jack Jouett precinct is split between the 17th and 25th Senate Districts in two places. The Woodbrook precinct is split between the 17th and the 25th Senate Districts and the Stony Point precinct is split between the 17th and 25th Senate Districts.

Drug Court Funding - Request full funding for the Drug Court Program, which provides effective treatment and intensive supervision to drug offenders through the Circuit Courts of several Virginia localities.

Agenda Item No. 11. Transportation Planner Position.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that on June 10, 2014, the Board held its annual retreat to consider and clarify its top priorities to ensure that staff's work is aligned with Board priorities. At its August 6th meeting, the Board formally endorsed the draft aspirations discussed at the retreat, as well as the draft Year One priorities recommended by staff. On October 1, 2014, the Board approved a FY 15-17 Strategic Plan (Attachment A), which included the following priority for addressing Operational Capacity:

By January 2015, identify and propose staffing resources needed to meet the Board's transportation priorities.

Planned/Possible Action(s):

- Clarify needs and expectations for additional staffing.
- Evaluate and identify organizational alternatives to address transportation needs.
- Evaluate staffing and funding alternatives to address identified needs.

Resource Consideration(s):

- Possible mid-year addition of 1.0 FTE.

This executive summary is provided for the Board's consideration in addressing this priority.

Attachment B is a Memorandum from the Director of the Community Development Department to the County Executives outlining CDD staff's understanding of this priority and the factors it considers to be important to assure that the County's transportation program is successful. In summary, staff understands the following to be important factors for considering the level of experience and expertise needed for this position:

1. Evolving nature of the transportation program. Staff sees this position as the first step in an ongoing evolution towards a more comprehensive transportation program for the County. For example, it is noted that the City of Charlottesville's Neighborhood Services Department has transportation engineers and planners providing a broad array of transportation services, from supervising the construction of improvements to neighborhood sidewalk priorities and traffic calming. While staff believes the County has not yet reached that level of need, continued growth in the Development Areas will result in the County evolving to that point. It is expected that this position, if approved, will provide important leadership as the County transitions to a higher, more comprehensive level of service in the transportation arena.
2. Program urgency. A mid-year addition indicates the Board considers this initiative a high priority that cannot wait for the normal budget cycle and that the Board has an expectation that this program should begin producing results very quickly. Understanding this priority, staff believes a senior level position with meaningful relevant experience is required to meet this interest in achieving immediate positive results.
3. Current management capacity. The Community Development Department is limited in its capacity to provide effective leadership and management for a new program that requires extensive daily oversight and supervision. Accordingly, the opportunity to attract and hire a skilled, seasoned transportation planning professional will alleviate much of the need for day-to-day supervision and will continue to enable current CDD management staff to provide broader leadership support to the overall transportation function in conjunction with the new professional transportation planner.

When staff considered all of these factors together, it determined the need to hire a professional who is already experienced in working with VDOT, MPOs, elected officials, and neighborhoods. It is also believed that the individual needs to be skilled at budgeting and grant writing, and be able to identify possible funding sources for projects and to actively seek that funding. Therefore, staff recommends that the program be started with a Principal Planner position. A Principal Planner position is a Grade 18 on the County's scale. As set forth in the Memorandum (Attachment B), staff has outlined the primary functions as being planning, implementation, and community relations, with a lesser role in development

review. The role in development review is seen as being limited to what may be associated with multi-modal issues and transportation impacts in existing neighborhoods.

Staff estimates that the cost of a Transportation Planner (Principal Planner), including salary and benefits, for one-half year will be approximately \$53,894 and that the ongoing annual cost is expected to be \$103,000 in FY16. If the Board approves the position, staff will present a FY15 appropriation request to the Board on December 3, 2014. The ongoing annual costs will be included in the annual budget process beginning in FY16.

Staff recommends that the Board provide feedback regarding the proposed position and, if satisfied, approve the position to be filled in FY15. If approved, staff will begin the recruitment process immediately.

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, said that he does not have a formal presentation on this topic. This is in response to a priority in the FY15-17 Strategic Plan. He said that staff has tried to outline the interest in the position. Today they are trying to clarify the Board's needs and expectations as well as alternatives as to how to move forward. Mr. Graham said that staff has outlined a position that focuses on planning, implementation and reinforcement of community relations; they are not looking to establish a position that would have much to do with the development review process as that is viewed as separate of what they are trying to do.

Ms. Dittmar asked if this position would provide the capacity to serve citizens with all the questions that are asked about roads, which most of the Supervisors do not have the expertise to answer adequately. Mr. Graham said that is certainly the intent, with this person doing a lot of coordination and front-end planning work asked of staff. He said that they have asked for a fairly senior position because they need someone who can pick up these issues and quickly move with them, and does not have a large learning curve to get up to speed.

Ms. McKeel stated that Mr. Graham's report was very informative and helpful. She commented that the chart he provided was pretty sobering. Mr. Graham noted that this has been staff's informed look at this, and it is not a comprehensive detailed study of every locality in Virginia.

Ms. McKeel said that at the voting booth the day before, several people came up to her and expressed frustration over transportation issues.

Ms. Palmer said that the staff report includes a list of all the things the County used to do and talks about restoration of that position, and she would like to know over what period of time those services were lost, and where they are getting the money to pay for the position now. Mr. Graham said that most of those happened during the recession, with a number of Community Development positions lost. One of the things viewed as an enhanced service was a transportation planning position. He stated that they used to do a lot more work to support neighborhood services and traffic calming, which is an enhanced service rather than a core service; as a result, that was stopped. Mr. Graham said that VDOT provides traffic calming, although not at the level people expect, so staff directs them to VDOT. He said that some of the other services, staff just absorbed, such as the Six-Year Secondary Road Improvement Program. Mr. Graham said that it has been a strain, but the downturn really came in the 2008-09 time period.

Ms. Palmer asked if this position is needed to provide core services, or if it is needed to do the enhanced. Mr. Graham responded that staff's understanding is that the Board was looking for core services that the County is not currently providing, and most of those are a restoration of services that were provided at one time.

Mr. Foley said that they do see it as an enhanced level, because it is proposed as a Principal Planner rather than just the Planner it was before, so there is a higher level of oversight and initiative that can be taken given the increased demands on transportation.

Ms. Mallek asked if this person would be able to help with some of the procedural things that Mr. Jack Kelsey was trying to do while he was also serving as an Engineer. Mr. Graham said that is a good segue way into what they see as the division of work with the Office of Facilities Development. He explained that Community Development would take over all the front end – the planning and trying to get the initial implementation going; Jack Kelsey's role and OFD's role would pick up when they got to the point of estimating the construction costs and developing this into a project that can move forward. Mr. Graham stated that staff has really struggled to have enough resource to be able to take the time to develop really good project understanding and cost estimates on the front end, so they are hopeful that this position can do that.

Ms. Mallek asked if this person would also have a role in the pre-project phase of CIP items. Mr. Graham confirmed that this person would be responsible for getting projects into the CIP, making sure they are properly estimated, etc. He said that Board members have had to spend significant time with VDOT representatives trying to coordinate and get improvements in their districts, and staff sees this position as assuming some of that role and acting as liaison with VDOT so they do not have to devote that much time to working with VDOT.

Ms. McKeel said that it is also critical to her to have someone with experience.

Regarding funding of the position, Mr. Foley said that there was no “magical place” for this money to come from, but the Board does have a reserve for contingencies of approximately \$250,000 when they started the budget. Staff suggests that funds for this position come out of this contingency. Other than that, he said, funds would have to come from the fund balance.

Ms. Dittmar said that they are in the middle of a budget year currently, so if they hired the person before the end of this year, they would need that portion of salary and benefits. After that, it would go into the regular budget. Mr. Foley said that for the current fiscal year, it would go in the budget as \$53,000, and afterward would automatically go into the operating budget.

Mr. Graham said that the \$53,000 in the current fiscal year is probably on the high end, so it would probably be in the first part of the year before they would hire this person due to the holidays and recruitment challenges during that time.

Ms. McKeel said that it is really important to hire someone experienced. Her understanding is that the County recently lost two people who were applying for another position based on the salaries the County was offering. Mr. Foley said that current staff cannot take on the responsibility of this without an experienced person who can hit the ground running, so they will take a look at the salary range and make sure they are in the right place.

Ms. Mallek said that she heartily supports this, and is grateful for David Benish and Jack Kelsey for taking on the extra work that is not in their realm, as all the staff has over the last five years. Mr. Foley said that he appreciates her comments, because staff has really worked hard over this difficult time.

Motion was then offered by Mr. Sheffield to approve the position to be filled in FY15. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion.

Mr. Boyd said that he will not support this because he does not like the out of cycle FTE personnel decisions, because this takes away the ability to weigh this position against a teacher and a half, or a new police officer, etc. He thinks it is the wrong time to be doing this although he is not necessarily opposed to the idea. He thinks new positions should be part of the Board’s overall budget discussion or otherwise they will talk about adding FTE positions all during the year.

Ms. Mallek agreed, but added that during budget discussions last year the Board talked about this position and said they were going to bring it back mid-year, so she feels very comfortable approving it.

Ms. Dittmar said there are relative merits to what Mr. Boyd said, but they also spent time at the Board’s retreat prioritizing this so it is part of their strategic plan.

Mr. Boyd said that discussion at the retreat is not a vote.

Ms. Dittmar said it was a commitment in terms of the Board’s vision and strategies to be able to meet their goals, and this is a priority for the Board.

Mr. Foley said that staff always thinks about what Mr. Boyd has said, but in this case, because of the reasons Board members gave coupled with the challenge in transportation impacts that the County really has no choice in. They want to move forward at this time.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 12. Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee – Public Engagement Plan.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that on April 2, 2014, the Board established the Albemarle County Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee. The Committee’s charge included submitting for the Board’s consideration a public engagement plan to accompany its work.

The Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee has prepared a draft public engagement plan for the Board’s consideration. This plan will guide all public involvement, engagement and interaction in support of the Committee’s work.

No specific budget impact related to the public engagement plan has been identified. Work will be performed by Committee members and County staff. A separate but related initiative to retain technical expertise to support the work of the Committee will be forthcoming in the near future. That initiative, if approved by the Board, will have a specific budget impact.

Staff recommends that the Board approve the Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee’s public engagement plan as presented or as modified by the Board.

Mr. Leo Mallek, Chairman of the Albemarle County Long-Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee, addressed the Board and stated that he was before the Board to discuss a public engagement plan, which the Committee approved on October 1, 2014. Mr. Mallek mentioned that when the Board was discussing support for a bottle bill, the consensus of the Committee, for some time in the future, is that one element of that will be encouragement of the Board to support a bottle bill, which is inclusive not only of glass bottles but also other recyclable materials that do have a value in the marketplace. Mr. Mallek reported that the Solid Waste Advisory Committee has come forward with a public engagement plan that works quite well with the policy that came from the Committee charge. One of the parts of this was that the policy would include public engagement in determining the goals and strategies based on best currently available data. He said that the Committee has identified a number of critical issues, including the preponderance of inconsistent terminology in the whole waste stream – which makes it very difficult to obtain consistent information across the Board about the items that will be of importance in the development of a sustainable materials management policy. Mr. Mallek said that the Committee will be looking at that as one issue, as well as the effectiveness of different recycling and diversion methods – and the committee is hoping to get strong input from community organizations and from industry as well as haulers regarding the best management practices in this particular area.

He said that the Committee is looking to keep the process as transparent and open as possible by trying to get good information from the public and disseminating information from the Committee and from other professionals in the field, so there is an exchange that makes the process much more acceptable to the community. Mr. Mallek said that the Committee is trying to meet the mandate, which they perceived from a report done by GBB in 2008, to help achieve higher rates of recycling in the community. He said that this has been demonstrated through various other surveys that a large proportion of community members are interested in being able to recycle, and in getting the people who collect, haul and manage the waste to be more responsible about the recycling process. Mr. Mallek said that goes back to terminology, because several of the groups involved in that process have inconsistent terminology that has been confusing to the public they seek to serve. He said that as the Committee tries to identify public participation goals, it will try to identify stakeholders and what the public considers to be their issues, aspirations and concerns and to try to make sure those are understood and considered. Mr. Mallek said that the Committee understands that the process will not be the last word, and looks forward to advising the Board on a policy that will be open-ended, agile, economically feasible, and as acceptable to as large a group as possible. He noted that the Committee will use all available resources to establish a glossary of terms, as many other agencies have.

Mr. Mallek said that as part of community activities, they will plan to hold roundtable discussions with stakeholders that would be facilitated by staff and advisory committee members who are knowledgeable in this area. They would like to have surveys of various homeowners associations, which seem to be the largest groups of individuals contracting for waste management services in the County. He said that the advisory committees are prepared to do presentations at community events to move this into the realm of PTAs, meetings of rotary organizations and various other community organizations, to make sure the public is informed and to solicit feedback. Mr. Mallek said that one idea that has surfaced is to come up with a branding program, such as using a mascot, which could be used countywide in schools and elsewhere. He stated that the first few items on the schedule are already out of date, so the Committee would like to start running fairly quickly with the stakeholder roundtable meetings and information-gathering phase. Mr. Mallek said that the Planning Commission public hearing will be held in December, and the Committee is looking to develop focus groups and social media outreach through the use of County staff along with information from members of the committee and the general public. He stated that they have set out roles and responsibilities for staff, committee members and Board of Supervisors members that seem to be approachable goals. Mr. Mallek said that the final steps would be to gather and disseminate input, which would be aided by use of the consultant – and there are already programs in place to get the information out to a large number of people very quickly. He stated that the last step is to set an end goal, which is to ensure that the charge of the advisory committee is successfully completed, including development of a recommendation for a policy, which they would make to the Board regarding solid waste. Mr. Mallek noted that the committee is trying to remain open to all options available to them, so that they can be as informative as possible.

Mr. Sheffield asked who was meant by “staff” in terms of the work to be done with this. Mr. Foley said that Doug Walker, Lee Catlin, and Matt Regis – the fellow, worked with the Committee.

Mr. Sheffield said that this seems like a lot of work. Mr. Foley said that it has been.

Mr. Mallek asked Mr. Foley to comment on consultancy and where a consultant might come in to relieve staff of some of this. Mr. Foley said that when they originally made a recommendation about forming a committee, they talked about the need for some consultant assistance. Getting a good scope of work for what they are going to do to help the committee and engage with the public is really important. He said that staff had intended to come back in December with a proposed scope of work. The other big committee formed – the Water Resources Funding Committee – used a consultant from the very beginning to help with that process. Mr. Foley said that given the magnitude of this issue, staff feels it is really important as citizens start to engage with the Board about alternatives. He said that they need good data that they can rely on, and having a consultant is essential in staff’s opinion.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there was a way they could incorporate some sort of education to the homeowners associations, because most HOAs have no idea what single stream means versus other options.

Ms. Palmer said that she attended the DEQ's solid waste meeting the previous two days on the future of solid waste in Virginia. A woman from the paper industry stood up and said that they are having a difficult time getting paper that is not contaminated and she encouraged communities to look farther afield for sources to sell paper scrap to. Ms. Palmer emphasized that the more trash is comingled, the less they will be able to use for recycling. She said that if they are going to have a successful solid waste and recycling plan, they will need to look very carefully and the community will need to understand the contamination issue.

Mr. Boyd said that on page one of the proposal, "critical issues," Item #2 states that there is a lack of accurate information concerning the effectiveness of different recycling techniques, but in his observation, there is a difference of opinion currently on this, as there are people who state they can sell their contaminated paper just as easily. He asked how the Committee is going to determine what the accurate science is.

Mr. Mallek said that part of that is addressed when they talk about inconsistent terminology. The Committee wants to develop a glossary of terms, with a set definition, to establish consistency – and that should address Mr. Boyd's issue, at least as a starting point.

Mr. Boyd said that he appreciates that as a starting point, but he received an email from one of the Committee members about what true "single-stream recycling" is and sent it to Van der Linde, who responded by stating that his method was better.

Ms. Palmer commented that the email did not come from the Committee, it came from an individual.

Ms. Dittmar said that in looking at the community engagement plan, the last part of it was to come with a plan, and she hopes if the committee can find itself in a place to recommend one direction, they would also give at least some briefing on the direction they decided not to take and why. She said that this would help establish what the facts are, and the assumptions drawn from the facts in order to make a recommendation.

Mr. Foley said that is why a consultant is critical, because the Board really need some of that research.

Mr. Boyd said that he appreciates the source Ms. Palmer cited who actually buys the paper, and he wants to see that kind of science in the report – something the Board can put its finger on, and not just someone's opinion.

Mr. Mallek said that the Committee would like to see that as well.

Ms. Mallek said that there will probably be a dissertation with it, because without the background it is hard to understand the conclusion fully.

Ms. Palmer said that the email Mr. Boyd was referring to was from one person on the Committee.

Ms. Dittmar said that a stakeholder in the Scottsville area stepped up and said they would be interested in setting up recycling for Southern Albemarle but did not want a convenience center, and she would like the Committee to at least have a discussion with residents in that area. She then asked when the Board would begin to discuss the content of the biannual survey that the County does.

Mr. Foley said that typically the survey does not go out until April or May, and then the results would be compiled – so the Committee will need to find another way to reach out.

Ms. Dittmar noted that electronic surveys are not a great outreach tool for surveying the rural areas.

Ms. Mallek said that is true in White Hall, where about 25% or more of the residents do not work on computers at all, so having the paper surveys in the grocery stores will be an important element. She stated that using the HOAs is a really good way to share information and raise the standards, and some of them are eager to be involved as some of them are contracting for an entire neighborhood.

Mr. Mallek said that one of the members of the committee is Terri Kent of Better World Betty, who has strong connections in the community such as schools, so she will be helpful in this process.

Ms. Palmer commented that schools are very important in this.

Ms. Mallek said that they should ask the School Board to change its policy back to separation of recyclables so that the children are aware of the different nature of those items.

Ms. Palmer said that is also necessary in the County Office Building.

Ms. Palmer **moved** to approve the Long-Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee Public Engagement Plan, with the modification of Scottsville on the list. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

Ms. Mallek commented that Crozet should also be added because in 2008 there was \$250,000 in the budget for a recycling center in Crozet, and a few times per year someone will ask her about the status.

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

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

**Public Engagement Plan
Albemarle County Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee
Approved by the Committee October 21, 2014**

STEP 1: Project Description:

The Albemarle County Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee is an advisory committee formed by the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors to study solid waste management as a public policy issue and to identify best practices for the management of solid waste in the County and how solid waste will be handled in the future including the possibility of regional cooperation. The committee will recommend a thoughtful, deliberate, and comprehensive process for developing solid waste policy for the County based on consensus, cooperation, and economic analysis. This policy will include public engagement in determining goals and strategies based on the best currently available data.

This public engagement plan is focused on ensuring an effective method for involving the community in the development of a sustainable materials management policy. Once a policy is adopted, a second phase of public engagement will involve education about implementing the identified strategies.

Critical Issues:

- The information available to the public contains certain contradictions and inconsistent terminology which make clear dialogue and engagement more difficult.
- Currently there is a lack of accurate information concerning the effectiveness of different recycling and diversion methods. This has led many to believe that our area landfill diversion rate is higher than it actually is.
- Solid waste management is complex and often confusing from a resident's point of view, even without the complicated local waste and recycling history.
- Consolidation of the waste industry here and around the country is reducing competition and leaves fewer options for both waste hauling and disposal.
- Currently there is a lack of choices among convenient locations for do-it-yourself trash disposal and recycling. Facilities are hard to locate near neighborhoods.
- Given the large amount of current confusion about what is actually recycled or diverted, County staff and the advisory committee need a fresh approach to inform the public in a deliberate, consistent, and effective manner without being divisive. This process will require a strong spirit of transparency and engagement.
- County staff and the advisory committee should address the perceived need as referenced in the GBB report from 2008 for the community to achieve higher rates of recycling and diversion.

STEP 2: Assess Level of Public Concern and Interest

Low – Level 2 on a scale of 1 (very low) to 5 (very high)

The level of public concern and interest could rise before the advisory committee completes its charge. This public engagement plan will be adaptable and scalable to respond to a changing level of concern and interest.

STEP 3: Identify Public Participation Goals

County staff and the advisory committee seek to involve multiple stakeholders and residents in this process. The level of public participation may be considered to range on a spectrum. A level three involvement, appears appropriate for this issue.

| | | | | |
|--------|---------------|---------|-------------|---------|
| Inform | Consult/Input | Involve | Collaborate | Empower |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- a. County staff and advisory committee members seek to work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that issues, aspirations and concerns are consistently understood and considered. This process should include elements of public information, but also solicit two-way communication.
- b. All stakeholders should be included in the process to ensure that their concerns, aspirations, and issues are directly considered in the alternatives developed and that they are allowed to provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.
- c. This process will not be the last word in public participation related to sustainable materials management in the County. To the extent that the committee will deliver not a final policy but rather “recommend a thoughtful, deliberate, and comprehensive process for developing solid waste policy,” further public participation will occur in that process.

Specific action items will also have public participation components. This plan, then, is focused on understanding the values of diverse stakeholders.

Part 1 (pre-implementation of solutions/practices)

- Survey the public to inform ongoing engagement activities
- Provide the public with accurate information about current practices vs best practices in solid waste management
- Engage the public in the process of long range planning
- Provide transparency in making solid waste management decisions
- Gather and disseminate community input to ultimate decision-makers (Board of Supervisors) for their consideration
- Keep public and stakeholders informed about any changes throughout the process

Part 2 (post-implementation of solutions/practices)

- Provide timely and accurate information to residents about changes to solid waste management.
- Engage residents in raising awareness about the importance (the why) but also the practical logistics (the how) of getting household waste to the proper processing facility and where their waste ends up

STEP 4: Identify Stakeholders

Albemarle County HOAs

Albemarle County residents in urban ring

Albemarle County residents in the rural area

Regional entities like: RSWA, TJPDC, City of Charlottesville, and UVA

Private Haulers and Transfer Stations

Environmental Groups

Local industry

Large- and small-scale employers

Local Chamber of Commerce

Town of Scottsville

Others to be determined

STEP 5: Select Tools:

Open House

Stakeholder Roundtables

Stakeholder Focus Groups

Social Media forums and quick polls (MindMixer, Facebook)

Tools/ Activities (Public Activities will include)

- Information on website. The Long-Range Solid Waste site should be enhanced in style. There is no additional cost for this. The site should have a map and photos of facilities, an FAQ page, a calendar, and links to partners.
- Glossary of terms for use online and at public events.
- Notice when public meetings are occurring, through County website
- Public hearing at relevant Planning Commission meetings
- Roundtable discussions with stakeholders, facilitated by staff and advisory committee members. These can replace certain regular committee meetings or be held in addition to them, perhaps during evening hours at locations out in the community.
- Survey of HOA contract managers.
- Additional focus groups with smaller numbers of stakeholders, facilitated by staff and advisory committee members. These can provide a more detailed understanding of values and perspectives.
- Press releases to local media
- Advisory committee attendance and presentations at community events such as neighborhood meetings, HOA meetings, festivals, and others to be determined.
- Use of a "branding" program for identifying the new focus on "Sustainable Materials Management". This may include the use of a new logo or adoption of a pre-existing program from some other jurisdiction.
- Social media outreach
 - Twitter engagement from County and from committee members
 - Facebook engagement from County and from committee members
 - Cville Tomorrow edits and information from County and from committee members, on wikis related to the committee's topics
 - "Engage Albemarle" discussion topics on the County website

Our overall goal is to strengthen public trust, to involve citizens and stakeholders in a meaningful dialogue, and to benefit the entire community through development of a successful long term sustainable materials management policy.

STEP 6: Create a Schedule

- October 2014: publicity of topic
- October 23, 2014: pilot community meeting at Yancey

- October 14: Planning Commission discussion for public hearing in December
- November 5: Deliver Public Engagement Plan to Board of Supervisors
- November: preliminary public information using web and social media tools
- December: 1st Stakeholder Roundtable meeting
- December: Open House held
- December: Planning Commission public hearing
- January: 2nd Stakeholder Roundtable meeting
- Q1 2015: focus groups and increased social media outreach
- Q2 2015: finalize recommendations, public comment period for draft
- July-August: Deliver complete report to Board of Supervisors (final public comment)

STEP 7: Roles and Responsibilities

Staff: Staff will work with the advisory committee and the community to prepare a recommended policy approach to present to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration, ensure the effectiveness of the public participation process, provide review and recommendations to the Board of Supervisors in accordance with established county policies and plans, and keep community informed about progress of the plan through the legal review process.

Committee: The Advisory Committee will work directly with County staff and the community to identify, research and evaluate options, provide leadership for the public engagement process and develop recommendations a comprehensive solid waste management policy based on sustainable materials management for consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

Board of Supervisors: The Board of Supervisors has the final decision making authority for approving the long term solid waste and sustainable materials management policy direction.

STEP 8: Gather and Disseminate Input and Results (Feedback loop)

- Dissemination of public input to decision-makers and back to public
- A-Mail topic as email list. Staff sends, advisory committee can help with content.
- A website kept up-to-date by staff
- Collect all comments and make available on public website and to committee and decision-makers
- Public meeting/roundtables posted
- Press releases and other materials will be sent out as appropriate to keep the community informed about the progress

STEP 9: Evaluate Effectiveness

End goal: The charge of the advisory committee is successfully completed, with the community aware of process, feeling heard and valued, given multiple opportunities for engagement, part of a feedback loop. The process helped Albemarle County to develop an improved and durable solid waste policy based on Sustainable Materials Management.

- Formal and informal feedback from stakeholders.
- Survey of citizens participating. Email should be logged as much as possible through the participation process. A simple SurveyMonkey poll can be sent at the end of the process.

Agenda Item No. 13. Appropriation of funds received from VDOT for the condemnation of a portion of CATEC Property used for the Meadowcreek Parkway.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that Albemarle County Public Schools (ACPS) and Charlottesville City Public Schools (CCPS) have each received a check in the amount of \$144,700.00 from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) as part of the compensation for the condemnation of 2.75 acres of the 15 acre Charlottesville Albemarle Technical Education Center (CATEC) property. The 2.75 acres was required for the Meadowcreek Parkway. The CATEC property is jointly owned by the County and the City School Boards. These funds are required to be placed in the localities' General Funds and the County funds can be appropriated at the Board's discretion. This payment represents the balance due from the total settlement of \$621,250 paid by VDOT for the condemnation. ACPS and CCPS had each received \$167,312.71 in October, 2010, while the matter was pending in the Circuit Court. The Board previously appropriated those County funds to the School Board to be used for CATEC site projects outside of the CIP priority process.

The funds received by ACPS are General Revenue funds. If the Board supports using these funds for CATEC purposes, the funds could be provided to CATEC for its needs as determined by the CATEC Board. Alternatively, the funds could be held in a County special reserve account in the Capital Improvements Fund for future use by CATEC.

Both ACPS and CCPS have agreed to recommend to their Board and Council the appropriation of these condemnation funds to CATEC in support of their needs as determined by the CATEC Board.

Given the source and the one-time nature of these funds, prudent fiscal practices would suggest that these funds be allocated and used for a capital project or capital maintenance that would not require

ongoing funding for which there is no identified funding source. Use of one-time funds for one-time purposes is consistent with the County's published financial policies and goals.

There is no impact on the current County budget.

Based on previous Board discussion, staff recommends that the Board approve Appropriation #2015057 (Attachment A) to appropriate the \$144,700.00 received from VDOT as compensation for the taking of a portion of the CATEC property to a County special reserve account in the CIP for a future CATEC capital request. Specifically, the Board has previously discussed the possible use of these funds to support a joint CATEC/PVCC project.

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Appropriation #2015057 | \$144,700.00 |
| Source: Sale of Land | \$144,700.00 |

This request is to appropriate \$144,700.00 received from VDOT as compensation for the taking of a portion of the CATEC property to a special reserve account in the CIP for a one-time CATEC capital or capital maintenance project as determined by the joint CATEC Board.

Mr. Bill Letteri, Deputy County Executive, said that this matter involves a request to appropriate funds from VDOT in connection with condemnation of a portion of the CATEC property. He explained that as part of the construction of the Meadow Creek Parkway, VDOT condemned 2.75 acres of the 15-acre parcel. Mr. Letteri said that the CATEC property is owned jointly by the Albemarle County School Board and Charlottesville City School Board, so the funds received from VDOT were actually received by each of the school boards. He stated that the funds are required to be placed in the locality's general fund, and then appropriated by the Board per its discretion. Mr. Letteri said that both school boards have agreed to recommend to the Board and City Council that the appropriation be made directly to CATEC for its use at the discretion of the CATEC Board. He stated that the option that staff is recommending is that the funds be placed in the CIP in a special reserve account for the CATEC facility, given the one-time nature of the funds.

Ms. Mallek asked if there has been a large improvement to the parking lot of the existing school, during the construction of the Parkway, in addition to the cash – so they did get value on their current site for the project. Mr. Letteri said that is correct, and this represents the second part of the funds received for the condemnation.

Mr. Davis explained that the original Meadow Creek Parkway project included replacement of some parking places and the driveway. As part of the construction VDOT also reestablished the equivalent parking area as part of the project. He said that the initial payment by VDOT into the courts was distributed as represented in the executive summary, and that money was appropriated by the Board of Supervisors out of the CIP as a source of funding for one-time site improvements at CATEC. There were also some other site improvements that were funded from the first payment of VDOT money related to this. Mr. Davis said that the position of the Board at that time had been that any additional money received would go into the County's CIP fund, but the request is to divert it to a CATEC special fund. The School Board recommends allotting it to CATEC unrestricted.

Ms. Mallek asked if \$300,000 in cash could be leveraged into \$3 million of future construction. Mr. Letteri confirmed that would be true at a 5% interest rate, and the \$300,000 would be required every year to support a debt of \$3 million.

Ms. Mallek said that it is hard to have \$300,000 at any given time, and her initial thought is that this needs to be a CIP issue so the CATEC Board has even more impetus to move along with their discussions about modernization and changes they make, and to begin to implement some of the things in their strategic plan.

Ms. Dittmar commented that the Board is not restricting their use for capital improvement; the Board would be earmarking it for those improvements. Mr. Davis clarified that the Board is parking the funds in a special reserve account that would be appropriated in the future when they identified an appropriate need for it.

Ms. McKeel said that the Board would be adding a procedural hurdle, and her concern is – according to what Ned Michie said in his recent email – that City staff plans to allocate the money directly to CATEC as long as the County does so. It does not seem to her that putting it into the CIP is what the expectation has been. She said that she would feel a lot more comfortable taking the \$144,700 and sending it back to CATEC, which is what the intent was all along. Ms. McKeel said that she will not support putting it into the CIP, regardless of how it is targeted. She added that the Board is trying to work on better relationships, and they are setting themselves up for a lot of misinterpretation if they restrict this – and it is much better if it just goes back to CATEC.

Ms. Mallek said that it should not just be spent on operating.

Ms. Dittmar asked what the CATEC Board would do if they needed the funds to pay a project manager to look at what is involved in a new building. She asked if it is a big hurdle to get a check from the CIP.

Ms. Mallek said that it would just come to a meeting for an appropriation.

Ms. McKeel said these are decisions the CATEC Center Board needs to be able to make.

Mr. Letteri said that the way this would work is that the Board would appropriate the funds into a special CIP account that is designated for CATEC, and until such time that it is de-appropriated or taken out of the account, it would always be there for their use.

Ms. Dittmar asked how easy it would be for the CATEC Board to get a check. Mr. Davis said that it would simply require a request to the County to appropriate that money to them for their expenditures.

Ms. Dittmar noted that it would be similar to how school appropriations are made.

Ms. Palmer asked why the Board would not just give the funds to CATEC, since they are the ones that know what they need.

Ms. Dittmar and Ms. Mallek said that they do not know what they need based on a recent meeting they attended with the schools.

Ms. Dittmar said that they went to the meeting, and the school boards asked questions that seemed to indicate that they did not know what was in their own strategic plan. She said that City Councilors are trying to figure out their vision for technical training and work with their School Board on that. It is going to depend on whether they stay with the building they have or go with a new building – and they are not anywhere near that right now. Ms. Dittmar said that since this was value based on a capital asset that has now been translated into an easement payment that it will go back into capital assets, and keeping it in the CIP designated for CATEC leaves it there for careful decision-making in the future. She said that she would prefer that it be dedicated for building improvement or new building fund, and if City Council agrees with that, it leaves them \$300,000 in seed money for a new building, or \$300,000 to redesign the current campus to suit the emerging needs they are trying to satisfy.

Ms. Palmer asked who would decide to use this money.

Ms. McKeel said that the CATEC Center Board should be deciding how they use this money.

Ms. Dittmar said that there will be a governance issue that needs to be figured out by the CATEC Board, the school boards, by City Council, and by the Board of Supervisors – if they are moving into a partnership with PVCC and launching new ideas about technical training for students. She said that CATEC is adult education also, so that is partly where this Board needs to be looking out for citizens. Ms. Dittmar said that the decision will come from either the current CATEC Board, constituted the way it is, or some new iteration of a board, but she does not know where they are going with this.

Ms. Mallek said that it is all in flux right now. The suggestions made at the meeting the other day – which were just one person's ideas, including the notion of hiring a consultant to see if they should change the zoning on the site – caused her concern. She said that she sees the money disappearing quickly unless there is more organization about how they are going to be implementing this. All she is trying to do is raise the performance bar and ensure they have a plan organized that is going forward. Ms. Mallek said that she sensed incredible frustration among business people in the audience of the meeting, as the plan has been finished for six months and they now seem to be going backwards.

Mr. Boyd said that he is in favor of putting it in the CIP. He does not look at it as adding a layer of approval, but as being responsible for the Board's appropriation as the body that allocates it. He said that he feels that the Board should put it in the CIP, earmark it, and wait for the CATEC Board to come forward with a proposal for a final decision.

Mr. Sheffield agreed.

Ms. McKeel said that she agrees with Ms. Dittmar about the potential restructuring of the CATEC Board, but at this point she feels it is incumbent upon the Board of Supervisors to send that money back to that board – with \$144,700 coming from the County. She will not support staff's recommendation.

Ms. Dittmar asked Mr. Davis what the motion would be. Mr. Davis said that the motion would be to approve Appropriation 2015-057 as attached in the Board's executive summary, which places the funds into a special reserve account in the CIP for one-time CATEC capital or capital maintenance projects as determined by the joint CATEC Board.

Motion was offered by Ms. Mallek to approve Appropriation #2015057 to appropriate \$144,700.00 received from VDOT as compensation for the taking of the portion of the CATEC property to a County special reserve account in the CIP for a future CATEC capital request. Mr. Sheffield **seconded** the motion.

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

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

NAYS: Ms. Palmer and Ms. McKeel.

Agenda Item No. 14. Broadband Update.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that at the Board's most recent work session on broadband coverage held on September 3, 2014, the Board reviewed the final report of the Broadband Task Force and discussed continued efforts to improve broadband coverage in the County. As a result of that discussion, the Board directed staff to provide details of the known unserved areas, present updates on funding options, provide an update on the Albemarle County Public Schools ("ACPS") networking projects, and provide recommendations for Board consideration.

Since September, staff has continued to explore possible solutions and funding sources to advance the Board's objective to expand broadband in Albemarle County. To date, work has included the Broadband Task Force efforts; engagement with the Center for Innovative Technologies (CIT), the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC), UVA, and potential regional partners; research on various grant and funding opportunities; mapping studies to determine the extent of existing coverage; and an assessment of vertical assets and County-owned real estate that may be employed. In separate, but related efforts, staff has been developing proposed changes to the wireless telecommunications regulations in the Zoning Ordinance and ACPS staff is working on two networking projects for connecting schools and students.

The provision of "broadband" in the context of Albemarle County is multifaceted, multimodal, and requires a set of solutions rather than a single approach. Broadband is available in Albemarle County through several means: Wireless through fixed wireless technology and mobile wireless technology (4G/4G LTE) and wireline through fiber optic cable, coaxial cable, and copper cable (DSL).

Broadband deployment to rural areas is complex because of the County's large geographic area and low population densities in some areas. These factors create unique physical challenges and economic barriers for service providers. Staff has acquired updated information on coverage areas. Strategies to further deploy fiber, DSL, mobile wireless and fixed wireless may include the use of existing assets and regional partnerships, possible collaboration with schools to leverage opportunities related to their investment in the fiber network, and leveraging grant funds. Staff will provide an overview of coverage and "blind spots" throughout the County, as well as a series of possible solutions to help address some of these underserved areas at the November 5th meeting for the Board's consideration. Representatives of Albemarle County Public Schools will also present objectives and opportunities associated with their fiber network project, including extension of fixed wireless networks and opportunities to collaborate with public safety. Attachment A outlines the agenda for staff's November 5th presentation to the Board, Attachment B summarizes the options to be presented and their related budget impacts, Attachment C is a coverage map, and Attachment D is an overview of the ACPS Network initiative.

The budgetary impact will depend upon the nature and extent of County involvement based on Board direction. Immediate steps involving regional/provider discussions and the pursuit of grant opportunities can be accomplished with the use of existing staff time. The "planning grant" through DHCD, if successful, would require a \$25,000 County match. Consultant costs to develop a "Broadband Deployment and Funding Strategy", based on estimates provided by DHCD, are estimated at \$50,000.

Staff recommends that the Board authorize staff to proceed with recommendations outlined in Attachment B, to include:

- 1) Continuation of previously discussed efforts (review of regulatory barriers, grant opportunities, regional discussions that involve the TJPDC and CIT, partnerships with public safety and schools);
- 2) Provide funding for the completion of a grant application for the Community Connectivity Planning Grant through the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development;
- 3) Authorize staff to issue a Request for Proposals to develop a "Broadband Deployment and Funding Strategy".

Mr. Bill Letteri said that staff has been working hard to try to gain an understanding of the challenges associated with expanding broadband in Albemarle County, as well as trying to develop a strategy going forward that is logical and thoughtful. He said that he and IT Director, Mike Culp, attended a work session on broadband about a month ago, presenting a slide that he feels underscores the importance of broadband to the community – affecting the areas of economic development, education, healthcare, public safety, innovation and citizen engagement. Mr. Letteri said that as technology is evolving, it is becoming a critical service and utility for citizens.

Mr. Letteri stated that today Mike Culp and Bill Fritz will talk about updates to the eligibility funding map, which is really about updates to the census data provided by the FCC. He anticipates that there will be a bit more information about where in the County there are coverage issues; it also talks about eligibility as it relates to grants. He said that they will also talk about what is happening locally, regionally with partners and around the state, and what is happening around the country. Mr. Letteri said that this has been a hot topic of discussion and everyone is involved, with many work sessions and conversations with adjoining jurisdictions. He stated that they will also talk about partnerships, and as they consider different options for how to go forward, those will be a critical part of the solution – whether

they are partnerships with the federal government, partnerships with the state, or partnerships directly with private providers. Mr. Letteri said they will also talk about potential partnerships with schools as it relates to their infrastructure projects. Mr. Vincent Scheivert, from the School Division, will discuss that project. After the others present their information, he will come back and outline what they feel are appropriate or recommended steps going forward. He said that staff has done a good deal of work and effort to try to understand this issue and map out a way forward, but at this point engaging a consultant to help with a deployment and funding strategy is among the things needing to be looked at.

Mr. Mike Culp, Director of Information Technology, stated that the map he is presenting does not depict coverage areas. It is very important to look at the map that shows eligible census blocks and not an actual coverage map. He said that the eligible census blocks coincide with rural, low population density, and difficult terrain locations – which makes it hard for existing service providers to offer service to those specific locations. Mr. Culp said that it is important to note that a single parcel without access to broadband service in the census block makes the entire census block eligible, and if they displayed each eligible parcel on the map as a pin, there would be 3,324 pins on the map. He said that while they have asked multiple times to get the exact parcel data, it is proprietary data that neither the FCC nor any local service providers can give to the County. Mr. Culp said that with the data revealed, there is the potential of \$1 million in funding available for Albemarle, and at most, 6% of the County's population lives in the eligible census block areas. They also do not know whether there is a residence on every parcel. He stated that providing a map of each eligible parcel, they would have to do a physical onsite inventory starting with the census blocks that have the highest number of eligible parcels.

Mr. Culp stated that broadband continues to be a very hot topic. Staff has attend numerous workshops including the recent broadband workshop sponsored by the Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission; at this workshop, the Center of Innovative Technology's Broadband Program Manager, Sandy Terry, presented a strategy for broadband deployment, and that strategy is consistent with the recommendations on the final slide. Mr. Culp said that also at the workshop, local citizens discussed their challenges obtaining and their future needs for broadband. The head of the Rockbridge Area Network Authority discussed their network and operations, and representatives from the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) discussed the two funding opportunities available through their agency. He said that there are also broadband events in November: on November 7, there is a public safety-focus meeting in Orange to discuss how they can continue efforts to develop a regional approach to public safety communication systems. Among the items to be discussed are ways to develop viable public-private partnerships which may solve the "last mile" broadband challenge. He noted that most of the rural counties in Virginia have that last-mile challenge, and being able to get to the remote locations in the rural areas is a constant challenge for all the rural counties in Virginia. Mr. Culp said that on November 13, there is a meeting of the Charlottesville Chamber of Commerce's agri-business roundtable, where broadband needs and advantages will be discussed. On November 14, the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission is hosting a broadband workshop similar to the Central Shenandoah meeting. During this workshop, he said, they plan to further discuss the DHCD process for applying for and working with DHCD grant funds. He stated that they continue to monitor and express interest in the FCC funding through "Connect America" funds, phase two – in particular their broadband experiments. Carriers in localities that have existing authorities are submitting for those funds now. Mr. Culp said that there is at least one service provider who has committed to submitting for those funds. He said that they continue to explore all partnerships, and can partner with new as well as established telecommunications carriers through public-private partnerships, and there are example ideas in the broadband task force report. Mr. Culp stated that one example is the use of public land for siting wireless towers, or the use of vertical assets for private sector equipment. He said that they also have access to a detailed report from the New York School of Law that provides examples of successful and unsuccessful broadband public-private partnerships. Mr. Culp said that they can also partner with public safety, other municipalities, the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission and others. To help better understand all of these options there is a new initiative through their fellows program, with UVA interns working with the fellow groups to produce a comprehensive report on the establishment of broadband authorities throughout the country and state. He said that within the state section of that draft report, there is more detail around several of the existing and established authorities. The report also includes an analysis of other options used extensively in the past – public-private partnerships, crowd sourcing, private donations, tax incentives, and co-ops. Mr. Culp said that there are many creative strategies, but at this meeting they would focus on the partnership with the schools. He said that at the last meeting, the Board asked them to provide an update on the Albemarle County Schools networking projects, and stated that school CIO, Vince Scheivert, would provide an update on those.

Mr. Vince Scheivert, Chief Information Officer for School System, said that the schools have several projects in process, and what is before the Board is the proposed fiber optic plan that would bring fiber optic cabling and interconnections to all school sites. He presented a map showing work that has been completed, work that will be completed or started this year – including the western expansion. Mr. Scheivert said that there are roughly 15 different sites for the School Division, so it is a very small amount of fiber with a large capacity of sites attached to it, representing Western Albemarle High School, Henley Middle School, Brownsville Elementary, Monticello High School, Cale, Jack Jouett, Agnor-Hurt and Woodbrook elementary schools, Albemarle High School, the building services and transportation buildings, Sutherland Elementary, and also provides fiber optic connectivity for their northern library and the fire station across from Monticello High School. He said that is the shortest run with the largest number of schools. The second run that will pick up an additional six schools is the western run. They are also in discussions with the ECC about attaching directly to them; the locations would be Meriwether Lewis, Murray High School, Western Albemarle campus, Crozet Elementary, and any current open ground project locations such as the streetscape that allow them to put in conduit. He stated that at that

point, they will have about 21 out of 30 sites connected through fiber optic cabling, which then gives them the capability and speeds to be able to conduct school business as necessary. Mr. Scheivert said that they will continue to look at the offshoot schools and noted the location of alternative runs, explaining that they have approval for all VDOT right of way but there are certain spots where they will have to pass through the City. He pointed out the designation of fiber optic cable that would be dedicated for local government use. The School Division would not have a purpose to run there without tying into a local government facility such as fire, police stations, etc. Mr. Scheivert said at this point they will be two-thirds of the way through interconnecting sites, with the other sites being long runs that are less cost effective. He noted that this project will allow them to eliminate the digital divide in the School Division, and their goal is to eliminate the chasm that some students experience when they leave school and subsequently leave behind education and instruction. Mr. Scheivert said that in tandem with this project, they are beginning to build out the countywide LTE wireless program, and will begin early implementation over December and the winter months, and are partnering with public safety – Albemarle County Fire, Police, the ECC and independent bodies. He stated that they are looking at all of their other opportunities and capabilities to be able to provide a privatized network for schools, as well as public safety. Mr. Scheivert said that the major plan for that is to be able to do a large-scale field test using the ECC tower and Carter's Mountain in the spring, concluding in the summer. He stated that all of the schools are now wireless inside the buildings in all locations. The "Connect America" dollars come from the same fund as E-Rate.

Ms. Palmer said that his report indicated that the 2011 estimate provided that annual charges would increase from \$200,000 to \$1.2 million, and asked what time period he was talking about. Mr. Scheivert explained that in 2011 the School Division's contract was coming up, so they looked at the capability of expanding services – and that \$1.2 million was the yearly quote for interconnecting the County's 26 schools. He said that the \$200,000 was the current cost for WAN services that connect the schools, and the quote would have increased it to \$1.2 million.

Ms. Palmer asked when they would have paid that. Mr. Scheivert said it would have been that year. This provides the ability to scale in and ramp up as the School Division desires. He added that there are incremental steps that can be taken with network connectivity depending on level of service, ranging from 100MB, 1G, 10G. He said that the next step is a big jump.

Mr. Boyd asked if it would have been a possibility to piggyback onto existing cable as opposed to the School Division building its own network, and asked if they priced it out as part of the procurement process. Mr. Scheivert said that the School Division was contracting with the largest provider in the area at the lowest cost provided nationally, and those were the lowest costs they have seen anywhere.

Mr. Boyd clarified that what he was asking is whether they could have piggybacked onto an existing pipe and used 1Gig. Mr. Scheivert said that the difficulty the School Division encountered was the same one that residents have: the infrastructure is not there; so the single largest provider is the current provider for the County. He said that they pursued wireless and regional networks, but most vendors said they were not interested and said it would be too much work for them to do something other than what they have always done, which is just selling a service – and he was not going to switch one service for another.

Mr. Boyd said that Mr. Scheivert was saying if he had upgraded to connect all 26 schools at 10 Gig each, it would have gone from \$200,000 to \$1.2 million a year – which is how he assessed the payback for putting his own cable down. Mr. Boyd asked if there is not an operating cost for the cable. Ms. Scheivert said that his operating costs for the fiber will go from \$200,000 to \$10,000, if that. He said that a cheaper alternative would be running aerial, which he has done for other divisions, but those operating costs would jump to \$70,000, and accidents that cause poles to go down will cause loss of service. By going underground, he said that he essentially eliminates operational costs.

Ms. Mallek said that the schools' expansion line seems to be close to the fiber line from Ashburn going to Staunton, and asked if they are working together because there were ports every 1,500 feet. Mr. Scheivert responded that they are in the process of finalizing the RFP that will allow them to bid. There is a lot more competition with the number of people traveling down Route 250.

Ms. McKeel said that the capability of the school system seems to allow the County to close some of the gaps in service.

Mr. Scheivert asked if she meant for residents or for students and staff. Ms. McKeel said she meant for families. Mr. Scheivert said this may provide the opportunity for them to have a continued discussion about that.

Ms. Mallek said that the schools came before the Board a few years ago to ask them to join in and get the bigger pipe, and asked if they went with the middle-size pipe. Mr. Scheivert said that there are some capacities they could look at to see if there might be excess above the needs of the School Division, but he cannot say right now exactly what that would be.

Ms. Dittmar mentioned that there had been a NACO webinar on Connect America and the next evolution of FCC thinking, and currently it is limited to the School Division, and asked if adult education students and PVCC students could participate.

Ms. Palmer asked if Ms. McKeel had meant families of students. Mr. Scheivert said that he would describe the LTE issue in slightly greater detail. He explained that it would work the same way as a major

carrier like Verizon or AT&T: you would get a device like a MiFi that you would have at your house – unless you lived in a densely populated area, in which case they would just broadcast actual wireless instead of providing individual devices. He noted that the student device that the schools are providing would be the only ones capable of connecting at this point.

Ms. McKeel asked what future possibilities might be. Mr. Scheivert said that a student – whether in school or out of school – could be connected to the school and would have access to all the resources and capabilities needed to continue their learning. It would not be tied to a building or location, but instead would align with when they are interested and engaged. He said that they could collaborate with other students as well, and it really eliminates all the barriers of 19th Century education that they are still fighting to get out of – and it provides options for kids that are not comfortable with the social aspects of school, enabling them to interact with peers in a way that gives them the capability of being successful.

Ms. Dittmar asked if this was something the County could explore as part of its initiatives. Mr. Foley said the County has had discussions of expanding it beyond the school's use and what the capacity would be to do that, the total cost of the project and how the County might even be able to support the front end of the project to get to the second phase sooner. He said that this was based upon antennas on existing towers that have a broader range, and putting smaller antennas in areas where there is prohibitive terrain for signals in an effort to cover smaller areas. Mr. Foley emphasized that figuring out the whole network – how many of those would be needed and what the cost would be – is where they are currently, but the first part of this is the partnership with the ECC to put a device on Carter's Mountain so it can be tested out to see what kind of coverage is possible. He said that the partnership to increase the County's capacity seems to have potential in the next phase, and Mr. Scheivert is still working on laying cable for the first phase. Mr. Foley said that staff is also recommending that the County pursue grants for other options, which may have implications for the schools' work also.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Scheivert what his anticipated timeframe is for the project. Mr. Scheivert responded that he will know more in the spring. He added that access to vertical real estate is the single greatest barrier currently – with private entities having expressed an interest in partnering, but nothing on record yet. He said that the schools have internalized what the cost would be to be able to provide a large swath. There are six to nine strategic locations throughout the County that the School Division would like to be able to see access to, to be able to provide a 75-80% coverage rate, and from there they would start to look at how to close the "shadowed" areas that are affected by mountain blinds and hollows, etc. Mr. Scheivert said the School Division has a conceptual model, but he would feel more comfortable sharing that after he had true data. He said that they have the capability to handle all the back end part of it, which will be done by January, and from there it will involve hanging equipment on towers – and it is the smaller locations to fill in gap that are his barrier.

Mr. Boyd asked at what point they would start monitoring capacity in the lines. Mr. Scheivert said they do that now, and he sent the charts in his last communication to the Board.

Ms. Palmer said that when she and Ms. Dittmar had met with Mr. Scheivert many months ago and asked how families who do not have children in the schools could participate, he explained that there were barriers to going outside the school system – perhaps because their grant was specific to education. Mr. Scheivert said that the problem is that they are a school division that provides services to schools and students, and some of the solutions that local government is looking into help to address that piece.

Ms. Palmer asked about the Heard's Mountain tower location. Mr. Scheivert said they will not go on that mountain but instead will do micro-cell technology in that area, which means they will go low instead of high to get around.

Ms. Mallek asked if the School Division is looking for existing cell companies who need to be donating location space on their tower or buildings or silos. Mr. Scheivert said they are looking at any potential partnerships that are mutually beneficial, as long as the County Attorney's office approves them.

Mr. Letteri said that this is a great example of how using existing assets and infrastructure can make a difference in some of this. There are legal issues in providing the service to general citizens – which is why staff is looking into establishing an authority, as has been done in other regions. He said that the school infrastructure does get into some of the difficult rural areas, but there are still some areas for the County to address.

Mr. Letteri said that as they evaluate the role of local government, they need to evaluate whether they are looking at the whole County, focus areas such as businesses, and other factors – and those would be further explored once they get the connectivity reports back from the consultant. He said that the same is true with speed of service, so the question becomes how much capacity they need to provide, and whether this would be a partnership, direct County investment, grant-funded, etc. Regarding recommendations going forward, Mr. Letteri said that the staff will continue to move forward with networking, researching the authorities issue, researching grants, and hopefully engaging a consultant that will allow the County to do a connectivity study – possibly funded by an FCC grant – to help understand where exactly they would need to go to get all citizens connected to the service. He said that the second level of this work would be a more thorough deployment plan and funding strategy that looks at the structure of the organization, what kind of investment would be required, and how long it would take.

Ms. Dittmar commented that Ms. Pat Groot from the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission was present at this meeting. She said that she hopes the County can take advantage of the

same type of planning grants of neighboring localities. She then asked when the Board might hear back about the next steps.

Mr. Foley noted that putting in a planning grant would require a \$25,000 match, and staff needs to know if there is disagreement about pursuing that. Broadband deployment and funding strategy evaluation by a consultant would require some funding, and would involve issuing an RFP that the Board would need to approve. He said that staff would like to start the process and come back to the Board for a future decision.

Mr. Letteri said that the immediate decision is to make application for the grant, to try to bring down the funds and match them so they can do the connectivity study; with that, they would be in a position to do more with a consultant.

Ms. Mallek asked if the GIS capability exists to rule out parcels that do not have residences on them, because many of the western areas are very remote. Mr. Culp said that it does.

Mr. Letteri said that some of the parcels are very large with only one residence, so it covers a lot of geographic area but is not representative of the area's population.

Mr. Foley said that staff is seeking the Board's approval to proceed with pursuing the planning grant, as well as defining the scope of work for a consultant to be brought back to the Board, which would involve some costs.

Mr. Letteri said that staff will make application for the grant, but if they are not successful that would change the scope of the consultant's work to do the first part of the connectivity study.

Ms. Dittmar said that she would like the recommendations to emphasize that they are working with the School Division on how to interface and partner to make this happen.

Mr. Foley said there is no question that the staff is pursuing that, and they have had some good conversation in that regard, so they will continue to coordinate and ensure they are not duplicating efforts.

Agenda Item No. 15. Closed Meeting.

At 4:12 p.m., **motion** was offered by Mr. Sheffield that the Board to go into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3.711(A) of the Code of Virginia under Subsection (1) to consider appointments to boards, committees and commissions in which there are pending vacancies or requests for reappointments; under Subsection (1) to discuss the annual performance reviews of specific County employees appointed by the Board; and under Subsection (7) to consult with and be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice relating to the negotiation of easements on the County Office Building property. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 16. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 5:18 p.m., Mr. Sheffield **moved** that the Board certify by a recorded vote that to the best of each Board member's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 17. Boards and Commissions: Vacancies/Appointments.

Ms. McKeel offered **motion** to make the following appointments/reappointments:

- **appoint** Mr. J. Timothy Keller to the Agricultural and Forestal District Advisory Committee with said term to expire April 17, 2018.
- **reappoint** Mr. Charles Lebo and Ms. Marcia Joseph to the Architectural Review Board with said terms to expire November 14, 2018.
- **reappoint** Mr. Doug Lowe to the Fire Prevention Board of Appeals with said term to expire November 21, 2019.

- **appoint** Ms. Eden Brown to the Historic Preservation Committee to fill an unexpired term ending June 4, 2015.
- **reappoint** Mr. Doug Lowe to the Local Board of Building Code Appeals with said term to expire November 21, 2019.
- **appoint** Mr. Mark Hahn to the Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee with said term to expire November 30, 2015.

Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 18. Five Year Financial Plan.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that beginning in 2008, the County has annually approved a balanced Five-Year Financial Plan for the County. This process is not designed to be an approval of the next fiscal year's operating budget, but both clarifies the most important longer term priorities of the Board and helps create a framework within which the next fiscal year's budget development will take place. The first work session to discuss the County's FY16 – FY20 Five-Year Financial Plan is scheduled for November 5, 2014. A Board/School Board joint work session is scheduled for November 12, 2014 for the School Board to present the School Division's information related to the Five-Year Financial Plan. Additional Five-Year Financial Plan Board work sessions are scheduled for December 3 and December 10, 2014. The purpose of these work sessions is for the Board to provide direction on future funding priorities considering the financial projections over the next five years.

At the November 5th work session, staff will present information on revenues and expenditure assumptions and will present scenarios for the Board's review and discussion.

The five-year financial planning process provides guidance on future fiscal year planning and the priorities of the Board and provides a framework for the annual budget process.

Staff recommends that the Board provide direction to staff during the work sessions regarding what changes, if any, it determines should be made to the proposed Five-Year Financial Plan. Adoption of a final Plan will be requested at a future work session.

Mr. Foley stated that Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, would do the bulk of the presentation on this, but he wanted to take the opportunity to thank staff and said that it's hard to appreciate the work that goes into putting this five-year plan together. He said that the entire budget staff, led by Ms. Allshouse, put a lot of work into this, and department heads put a lot of time into looking at their five-year needs as well and justifying what they do. Mr. Foley said that the County Executive's staff spends a tremendous amount of time looking through options and thinking hard about the five-year outlook, and there was a leadership team as well as a cross-departmental team that looks at assumptions and things that are going into the five-year plan. He stated that this year, the school division staff under Dr. Pam Moran's leadership worked hand in hand with County staff to look at assumptions together, helping to understand each other's needs so that they could put a plan together for the very first time that doesn't give the local government side first and then the schools – but instead combines them together and provides a bottom line that they can rely on in terms of things that are important critical issues.

Mr. Foley said that last year when they were talking about the budget, they addressed the challenges the County was faced with and the changing reality for the future, and the five-year plan is an opportunity to continue that conversation. He stated that it was frustrating for them last year to look at the one-year issues and not be able to put them in a broad context. Mr. Foley said that last year they discussed the significant realities about the status of the community and some of the challenges the recession had created for the County as an organization, but they remained hopeful that this modest recovery would move them in a positive direction, even if it was a slow climb. He stated that they talked at that time about modest growth and challenging needs in the community, and in looking at this year, those challenges and unmet needs are only growing because of population growth and student enrollment growth, but the picture on revenues has changed from a modest pace to a very slow pace. Mr. Foley said that most of the Board was in attendance at the legislative meeting where they heard about state revenue projections, on top of the budget crisis they were already in, and they are faced with a difficult environment for revenues. He stated that their community conversation over the next several weeks would need to acknowledge a gap between the reality of available revenues and what they've said they want to be as a community, and to identify with the Board and the community preferences for resolving that gap.

Mr. Foley expounded on the revenue picture, stating that they are seeing a struggling economy and are much more sluggish in revenue projections and estimates as they were last year. He stated that they had projected real estate values to increase about 2.5% each year, but they had to scale that back by about .5% in terms of existing values, which equates to a fairly significant amount of money. Mr. Foley said that while all other major sources of revenue are still growing, they are showing a much slower pace

of growth, which has changed the revenue picture. He said that the state is continuing to redefine its relationship with localities, and continues to come to the County with new mandates and reductions in revenues. Mr. Foley said that the combination of those on things that must get done is very significant, with flat or declining revenues for local government and schools over the past several years. He noted that the Virginia Retirement System, Comprehensive Services Act, and TMDL legislation have driven the need to raise taxes in the past. Mr. Foley presented a graph showing how funding has changed on a per-pupil basis for K-12 funding, noting the amount of revenue lost for support of the local school system, and referenced a slide from the legislative meeting from Jim Reginbaugh that talked about taxable sales growth in Virginia – and how it's approaching zero in 2014. He stated that defense spending is declining across the U.S., a 7.2% decrease in 2013 and 4.9% in 2014; Department of Defense spending in Virginia is down from \$54.8 billion in 2012 to \$41.4 billion in 2014. Mr. Foley said that the state had already identified a \$1.55 billion shortfall from 2014-16, and the new revenue forecast prepared in September after that shortfall was identified has indicated that there would be an additional general fund revenue reduction of \$882 million over FY15 and 16, and the state has identified that they need to cut another \$272 million in 2016. He emphasized that there were challenges at the local level that were confirmed at the legislative meeting, and the state was clearly going to be making some additional cuts, with a structural imbalance experienced at the state level that would have some impact on local revenues.

Mr. Foley said that this difficult environment and message comes at a time when the County continues to grow and urbanize, and from 2009 through the five-year planning period ending with 2020, they are projecting to have over 18,000 new residents in the County – and fortunately, most new homes are being built in the development areas, but this is creating an urban area that is more like a city. He stated that the urban ring is growing and changing and declining in a lot of circumstances, which is driving the need for fire and rescue services and police services at a different kind of level, and is driving some socio-economic issues that the school system is experiencing. Mr. Foley said that in the school system, projected enrollment growth and changing demographics are the biggest drivers for their challenges, and they are projecting over that some period over 2,000 new students in the system – with many of them economically disadvantaged. He stated that these changes coupled with the growth and urbanization that impact general government services are having a real impact on the expenditure picture.

Mr. Foley said that as the Board reviews what's before them, the bottom line represents natural growth and where revenues are expected to grow under current projections, and they've made sure that expenditures don't exceed that revenue growth. He said that there are clearly impacts to that, and without any change with new positions in the school system, class sizes would have to increase. He stated that the top line represents school and local government's best efforts to give them a scenario that reflects catching up on all the things they've been unable to do during the recession but for which they have a standard they've established as a goal, such as the number of police officers per 1,000 population and keeping up with enrollment growth. Mr. Foley said that they would also talk about the things that aren't included in either of these two scenarios, which are items the Board has identified as important, and staff's goal is to get grounded in where they really stand so they can have a broader conversation about the value of these things and the potential for filling this gap. Mr. Foley said that the second thing besides catching up is keeping up.

Mr. Boyd asked if staff could add in a line as to what it would take in pennies on the tax rate to make up that gap, and said that he assumed these were adjusted for the schools and local government given the 60/40 split. Mr. Foley responded that the gap shown is actual numbers – so the first year is \$8.1 million, which they cut put into tax rate terms, or a combination of tax rates and reductions in services. He said that staff would get to that momentarily in his presentation.

Mr. Boyd said that it would be helpful for them to have information for their town hall meetings regarding what it would take to meet the gap in terms of tax rate.

Mr. Foley said that for the first year, to fill the gap would take five cents – which is a number just for operations, and to fill the capital side, staff doesn't see the need for an increase until the second year, but that would be another penny and a half. He stated that the end game on capital and operational by the end of the five years is 19.5 cents.

Ms. Palmer asked if that was with property values remaining constant. Mr. Foley said that property values are projected to grow at 2% per year, and the Board can address whether this gap is realistic or not and whether they feel there are assumptions that don't make sense – but staff feels pretty confident that these are realistic numbers to catch up and keep pace.

Mr. Foley presented information on measures they took during the recession, stating that current staffing levels are now back to 2006 levels, net staffing losses are in all functional areas with the exception of public safety and human services – so they haven't made up any ground in those other areas since the recession started. He said that there has been a total of 4% increase in salaries over the last five years, with a 15% increase in employee premiums.

Ms. McKeel asked what was meant by "human services." Mr. Foley said that it was primarily the Department of Social Services, which provides for foster care and other social services.

Ms. Palmer asked if the 15% increase in employee premiums coupled with the 4% increase in salaries meant that staff was really experiencing an 11% decrease in take-home pay. Mr. Foley responded that staff would provide real numbers on take-home pay.

Mr. Foley reported that there had been a lot of work done by the school system and local government to find efficiencies and reduce staffing, and they had originally reduced local government staffing by 75 positions – and the ones that have come back have gone solely to public safety and human services. He said that they have worked on partnerships and have adapted to some other things, including privatizing of some services, and have worked through five years of doing a lot of that adaptation – and thought they were coming out of it, but are now faced with this again. Mr. Foley said that this doesn't mean they don't need to still look at those efficiencies, and stated that the tax bill for the average homeowner has declined for four years, and even with last year's rate increase it is still below the 2009 level.

Mr. Foley said that as they look to the future and engage the public as they strategize on solving this gap, there are some ideas that have already emerged – the Board has already taken some initiative on trying to get the state to give localities more authority on revenue sources; they could consider reductions in services; scaling back expenditures in various ways, some of which they've already done; they have established an economic development program that will help address revenues, but that's not a quick fix. He stated that they've also considered going out to voters on the capital program for things that aren't essential, such as parks and recreation. He said that the tax rate is an option, with consolidation and partnerships also considered previously.

Mr. Foley said that the purpose of this agenda item today is to start this conversation with the Board, and staff feels that they can justify why this gap exists but they need for the Board to ask them questions to make sure they're comfortable with the assumptions – and at the end of the day, either expectations need to be scaled back or they need to come up with other ways to fill the gap to achieve those things. He said that Ms. Allshouse would also talk to them about aspirations that are not included in that gap for things that are probably important to the Board.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarification of the term "consolidation." Mr. Foley said that it might include consolidating a school HR department with a local government department, or a city-county consolidation, and staff doesn't have any specific ideas yet, but they would have to do this kind of thinking to address the funding gap.

Mr. Boyd asked if the average homeowner tax bill would also hold true for "median" tax bills.

Ms. Palmer said that she would like to know the same thing, because high-end home prices have gone down, but middle-class housing has gone up.

Mr. Foley said that staff could look at that.

Mr. Sheffield suggested that they break it into low, median and high.

Mr. Boyd said that he would like to see the general median.

Mr. Sheffield agreed, but said that he would like to see the difference in prices within tiers to see if higher-value homes are dropping as much as lower-value homes.

Ms. Dittmar asked if they had dropped the rate in the last four years.

Mr. Boyd said that they had dropped it in prior years.

Ms. Mallek said that in 2007, they dropped it six cents.

Ms. Palmer said that in the next years, it declined.

Ms. Mallek said that the first year she was on the Board, they raised it one-half penny, but not after that.

Mr. Foley said that staff would bring all of that information back to the Board, and would like to find out from them what all the important information is that they need to take out to their town halls.

Ms. Lori Allshouse addressed the Board, stating that she feels the County is best in class in how they do five-year planning, based on her conversations with budget directors in other jurisdictions. She said that the budget office, finance department and others work hard on this, but this isn't a budget and sometimes they even get caught up in thinking they're doing a budget – and a plan is different than doing a budget. Ms. Allshouse said that the plan is done in December, and the budget is put together in January. She stated that the planning does bring together three components of their budget – general government, schools and capital – and doesn't include things like their self-sustaining funds, so it just brings those main components together. Ms. Allshouse said that the approach has been a bit different this year because they work so closely with the school leadership and school department, whereas last year they had two separate efforts. She said that five-year planning is a critical part of their AAA-bond rating, and in some jurisdictions they just do them in the budget office and put them out as a publication, but she feels that working on it together is a healthy way to look at this. Ms. Allshouse stated that the plan projects out to 2020 and is based on the best assumptions known today, so in the case of real-estate assessments they are about 25% done and by the time their budget comes out they know. She said that the aid to localities amount that the state would make them pay back would be revealed in more detail in November, but currently she has an assumption built in. Ms. Allshouse said that the schools would bring

forth their information on November 12, so the details she mentions here are general government. She stated that they would also have a CIP meeting on November 12, which is a five-year plan as well.

Mr. Boyd said that she might want to mention for the sake of the new Board members that staff doesn't do this in a vacuum, and goes out into the community to talk with realtors and others about what's happening economically.

Ms. Allshouse said that the revenue forecasting was very thorough, but they also do some other quantitative work, and this is a great framework for the budget, which is very important to them because it offers a pretty good indication of how to start building the annual budget. She stated that the Comp Plan informs this, the CIP informs it, etc., so there is a lot of information that is coming through the five-year plan into the annual budget process. Ms. Allshouse said that last year, general government and schools provided separate five-year plans, although they did them during the same time period – and this year they are guided by the new strategic plan. She said that last year, individual departments didn't put a lot of effort into identifying what they needed over five years because they were coming out of the recession and thus didn't get very thorough. Ms. Allshouse said that in the Board's strategic plan, they mentioned organizational capacity as a goal, so staff has asked the departments to show their basic needs over five years. She reported that last year, staff asked them to adopt a five-year financial plan – which was tenuous because they were adopting a plan based on assumptions, but this year, staff would like the Board to come together on a general consensus for a preferred scenario or approach in context of their priorities and the economic situation, to help inform the FY16 budget. Ms. Allshouse said that their information and guidance over the next four work sessions would really help staff when they start putting the annual budget together, and staff would not ask for a formal adoption unless that's something they would prefer to do.

Ms. Allshouse said that the goals for the plan were developed by staff, and guiding principles were developed by the Board and School Board. She presented the guiding principles, including a shared understanding of facts, mandates and obligations that come first; staff capacity over all functional areas; compensation and benefits they would strive to maintain according to the identified market; physical infrastructure; the strategic plans of both the Board and the School Board; public engagement; a focus on prevention, based on a proactive approach to addressing demographic and community trends; and fiscal responsibility with an emphasis on quality services within a reasonable tax obligation for residents and aggressive pursuit of additional resources through alternative revenue sources.

She reported that their agenda for this meeting will include a discussion of revenues and expenditure assumptions, with her focus being on general government. Ms. Allshouse said that she is presenting only two scenarios, and while there can be a lot of scenarios staff felt that these were a good starting point for them. She recognized the Finance Department, with Betty Burrell and Steve Allshouse, stating that they have a revenue team and consult with the Community Development, Bob Willingham with real estate assessments, and others. Ms. Allshouse said that they have a proven track record, and for the last two years have been within 1% of the budget – which is really close and really top notch for this large of a budget. She stated that the forecasting methodologies, led by Steve Allshouse, are consistent with GFOA best practices and are both qualitative and quantitative. Ms. Allshouse said that they really added a lot of the quantitative work over the last several years, and if something's known to be changing then they work it into assumptions – and Mr. Allshouse plays the models against each other for a thorough approach that hones in on revenues. She stated that a few reasons why revenues are less than anticipated are that they're five years out from the great recession, and the leveling out didn't really occur. She said that based on historic trends, if there are long recoveries after recession, it can lead to a slowdown or downturn. Ms. Allshouse said that the state's reduction of funding to the County is reflected in these numbers, and the assumed rates of growth appear consistent with Fiscal Analytics' projections as well as recent post-recession and multi-year trends. She presented data from Fiscal Analytics and their projections for fiscal years 14, 15 and 16 – with projections for a 2.9% growth rate at the state level over the next two years.

Ms. Dittmar noted that there is a lot of defense spending here, and sequestration hit Virginia a lot harder than other parts of the country.

Ms. Allshouse stated that revenue growth is assumed to be more moderate than anticipated this time last year, but it is growing and they are not in a recession – with a projected 2.1% growth rate for FY16, and 2.5% and 2.6% in the out years. She presented revenue data by category, noting that real estate taxes reflect new construction, new land divisions, tax collection rates and land use, and noted that they were projecting a 3-3.5% increase. Ms. Allshouse said that other property and local taxes were hovering around 2%, and other local revenues were a bit lower.

Ms. Palmer said that Mr. Foley had projected a 2% increase in assessments, and asked if this was worked into the data she was presenting and whether it included all of the additional real estate taxes that come in through growth, building, etc. Ms. Allshouse confirmed that was the case, and said that there were two calendar years affecting the fiscal year.

Mr. Foley said that the figures reflect dollar differences rather than value differences, in terms of percentages.

Mr. Sheffield asked how they captured a decline in home values in the older neighborhoods due to neighborhood desirability. Mr. Foley said they use actual sales to see how those are fluctuating, and that's the basis on which the figures are projected – so if a neighborhood is declining and values are declining, they would be picked up as sales are considered for those areas.

Ms. Dittmar asked if they were going beyond the simple formula of property value increase, and if they were adding in the complication of numbers of units and projecting that out. Ms. Allshouse said that was the case, and they were including land divisions as well as changes in land use – so there were a lot of factors to it.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he was an advocate for improving the infrastructure in the neighborhoods, not just because they deserve it but because it helps raise their property values in the long run.

Ms. Mallek said that over the past seven years, it's been fascinating for her to see how the values shift from one district to another, and sometimes a district will go up one year and down the next.

Ms. Allshouse said that state revenues are projected to decline, with last year's assumption being a 1% growth rate each year, now dropped down to a .3% rate; federal revenues are pretty much the same. She noted that the federal revenue dealt with a lot of pass-through money to social services. Ms. Allshouse presented a slide on real estate revenues, noting that they comprise about 51% of the County's budget and referencing changes that have occurred in 2005, with the growth line just being a little bit flatter. She mentioned the information that Mr. Foley had presented, with taxable assessed values being a little bit lower than projected last year at this time. Ms. Allshouse presented revenue information from FY05-FY20, and pointed out the projections for personal property tax revenues.

Mr. Sheffield asked if they had ever tried to figure out what would be required in businesses revenues in order to close that gap, such as sales revenues, types of businesses, etc. Mr. Foley said that they hadn't done that type of analysis before, but they could make an assumption on a certain kind of business that came in and what kind of revenues it would generate.

Mr. Sheffield said that it might be something for the new economic development office to take on, because that's what is making some other communities not have to raise property taxes. Mr. Foley said that they would get sophisticated about that analysis as the program starts up.

Ms. Allshouse pointed out the history of BPOL tax income and the projection included in this plan's assumptions.

She presented two scenarios compiled for the Board's consideration and discussion. She said that scenario poses staying within the current tax rate – 79.9 cents – every year of the plan, which ties directly with revenues. Ms. Allshouse said that this is school revenues and general fund revenues together, minus the transfer between. She stated that this scenario provides funding for mandates and obligations, provides for the increased costs associated with healthcare for employees; provides a full year of funding for any positions funded in this fiscal year – included those expiring with the FEMA grant for firefighters, which cost about \$400,000-\$500,000; provides for operational increases of about 2% and those associated with the capital program. Ms. Allshouse said that with this scenario, that was as far as they could go, and while there was a little bit of money for agencies, there weren't any increases at all for ABRT or cultural agencies.

Ms. Palmer asked if this includes the 3% increase for staff salaries. Ms. Allshouse said that this includes no substantial raises, so they wouldn't be able to keep up with market. She stated that they tried to get a few small ones in the out years – zero in the first year, 1% in FY17, 1.2% in FY18, a 0.4% in FY19, and a 0.65% in FY20, and they knew it was important to the Board's guiding principles, in working in commonality with the schools' classified positions. Ms. Allshouse said that the increase in the deductible for health insurance dollar amount is \$300,000-\$400,000 in the first year. She said that this scenario fails to provide any additional staffing to meet current needs, nor those associated with population growth – so there isn't one new police officer nor one new teacher for five years. Ms. Allshouse said that with the current tax rate, it wouldn't support the capital program as currently approved, and they would have to go in and make adjustments in the current capital plan. She stated that they tried for a little bit of increase for some of the core agencies like the jail, but they wouldn't have been able to pull off what they needed – and they didn't cut ABRT or cultural, but they didn't add anything over the five years for those two categories.

Ms. McKeel asked if this scenario projected what they would normally assume in natural growth. Ms. Allshouse said that it does, they just didn't change the tax rate or make any other adjustments.

Ms. Allshouse stated that she wanted to respond to a question she had received about the \$5 million in the first year, then the \$6.5 million – and most of that went to the revenue-sharing, school transfer, CIP transfer, and CSA, by their formula and guidelines. She said that they reduced the reserves and contingencies for the first year from what they have currently, and they didn't increase those in the out years. Ms. Allshouse said they have \$250,000 every year in reserves, and this still protects the 10%.

Mr. Foley stated that the personnel line item is important to understand, with \$500,000 of the \$900,000 representing seven positions funded through a FEMA grant that goes away, to maintain a current level of EMS. He said that the transportation planner approved tonight is in this line, along with the additional social services workers previously authorized.

Ms. Allshouse commented that they didn't want to lay off anyone they had just picked up, such as the economic development department.

She presented information on the revenue-sharing payment with the City of Charlottesville, which is based on a contract and formula, and said that there is a break in 2016 by about \$200,000, but then it would start picking up. Regarding increased healthcare and benefit cost increases, Ms. Allshouse said that there is a VRS trust fund separate from the schools – and they may see a decrease, then stay flat, and then see a slight increase.

Ms. McKeel commented that the education piece is much more underfunded, so they were harder hit. Ms. Allshouse confirmed that the educator funding is entirely different with the state.

She explained that the health insurance increases reflected plan changes that would be more costly for employees, plus the spousal change.

Ms. McKeel noted that the schools get the information on VRS every year in December of what they owe, so projections could be all over the place.

Ms. Allshouse presented information on the increase for the schools per their sharing formula, with an effort for commonality, and stated that their increases are about \$2.5 million and \$2.8 million. She said that under scenario one, the Comprehensive Services Act – which every jurisdiction is mandated to do, with costs shared with the state – includes clear mandates, and is a program that provides for child-centered, family-focused, community-based services for at-risk children and families. Ms. Allshouse said that this is a shared program and in looking at FY15, there is \$4.8 million currently in the budget from the state, with schools putting in \$1.4 million and local government putting in \$2.7 million, for a total of \$8.9 million. She explained that they transfer these monies into a separate CSA fund, and they try to keep a healthy fund balance for unexpected expenses. Ms. Allshouse said that in the first quarter of this year, there was a 36% increase in costs – which is huge – and the County will probably have to make an adjustment in their current budget to accommodate that. She stated that if they think about that increase as something that might continue, if that was happening for a full year, they'd have to increase the money from \$8.9 million to \$12.3 million next year; that would mean that state funding would increase to \$7.4 million, schools to \$2.1 million, and the general fund increasing as well. Ms. Allshouse said that the funding is done in a shared way based on the services children get, so IEP services are schools costs; DSS placements are a general government cost. She said that not all jurisdictions share it that way, but the County has done it this way for years. Ms. Allshouse said that looking at it on an annual basis, the schools would have to pick up about \$700,000 next year just for CSA; local government would be less – but for planning purposes, the overall hit is about \$3/4 million. She said that they are talking among staff about whether there may be another way to fund this, because it could hit schools one year and local government another year.

Ms. McKeel said that this is a good example of how schools and local government work together, because in many localities county governments pay this entirely on their own. Ms. Allshouse agreed, stating that it's nice that they at least program it together, but the funding can be a bit tricky. She noted that they built in the large increase in the first year of the plan, but the years after that just set a 5% assumption in the out years.

She presented a brief summary of scenario one, stating that they covered their mandates and obligations including the CSA increases, the healthcare increases, the full year of funding of any position for this year so there would be no layoffs, and covered operational increases associated with capital programs. Ms. Allshouse said that the scenario didn't enable them to do market salary increases in any years, with no new teachers and no new police officers or any other positions, reconsideration of the capital program as currently adopted, and while it covered the contractual obligations for agencies like the SPCA, they only built in about 2%, which may not pull it all off.

Ms. Allshouse reported that scenario two aligns with most of the Board-adopted principles, funding all mandates and obligations as shown in scenario one including CSA, and provides salary increases for employees that are within the range of HR's recommendation, assumes dedication of three pennies of tax increases, provides more adequate funding for agencies at 3% rather than 2%, provides funding to begin addressing current service level needs and staffing shortages, and addresses keeping up with population growth on both the school and general government sides. She said that they've been calling this "catching up and keeping up" in-house. Ms. Allshouse stated that staff could add the tax rate information into what they want to present to the public, noting the \$8.1 million funding gap in the first year up to \$26 million in the out year. She noted that the salaries in this scenario include a 2.3% plus pay for performance in the first year that averages about 3% overall, with 2% in each year of the out years – to keep pace with inflation, which is growing at about 2% per year. Ms. Allshouse mentioned that this supports employee training throughout the plan on the general government side. She stated that the "catch up and keep up" concept basically addresses catching up with some staffing shortages and pressing community needs, and addresses keeping up with some of the pressing new obligations.

Ms. Allshouse reported that Albemarle County's police staffing ranks about 127 out of 134 Virginia localities in staffing ratio, which was originally presented in a newspaper article – but staff followed up in April of the previous year to confirm the staffing ratios per capita. She said that this scenario includes full fire engine service for the Pantops area, which is the second busiest area in the development area – with more than 27% of the population over age 65, with major thoroughfare areas, and lots of different engine companies come to support Pantops. Ms. Allshouse said that they are not meeting their response times, and the thought here is to put a full engine in within the five years.

Mr. Foley pointed out that catching up with the police staffing ratios doesn't bring them to number one, it just addresses the gap in terms of the needs, and it impacts police officer safety to have that few officers. He said that there aren't a lot of big reach items in this scenario, these are very basic things.

Ms. Mallek noted that it impacts citizen safety also.

Ms. McKeel asked if staff used the County's self-imposed ratio of number of officers. Ms. Allshouse said they didn't really fund everything as set in the Comp Plan.

Mr. Foley said that they used it as a basis to develop the scenario.

Ms. Palmer asked where scenario two was in the presentation to show the gap. Ms. Allshouse explained that in scenario one she hit the revenue line as the bottom line, and the \$8 million gap in the first year is filled in the second scenario.

Ms. Palmer asked if they filled that entire gap with three cents. Mr. Foley said that the three cents was just capital and wasn't even about that line.

Ms. Allshouse said that when staff created scenario two, they put the tax rates in for capital – but it was dedicated, so the gap stayed the same because the increase goes right over to capital. She reported that staff also built some positions back into social services, as they are understaffed for some of their mandated programs. She presented a slide showing general government positions per 1,000 population and stated that the ratio of positions to population was still the same as 2006. Ms. Allshouse noted the total staffing for functional areas in 2009 and where they are now in 2015 – and pointed out increases in the areas of health and welfare, public safety and judicial, just by one position. She stated that in administration, they had 107 positions in 2009, and are now at 104; they are at 33 positions for public works; parks, recreation and culture staffing levels are below where they were in 2009 even though they've added parks; Community Development took a strong hit during the recession – with 92 positions and 73 today. Ms. Allshouse stated that with catch up and keep up over the five-year period, if they added some positions to health and welfare it would bring those levels to 137; public safety would go from 265 to 288; judicial stays the same; administration increases by 3; public works by 2; Parks & Rec by 1; and Community Development by 3. Ms. Allshouse said that in looking at the positions to "keep up" with the population growth, health and welfare would go to 150; public safety to 316; judicial unchanged; administration would go to 112; public works would increase to 39; Parks & Rec would stay the same; Community Development would increase to 77.

Ms. Mallek asked if public safety was police except for the full fire station at Pantops. Ms. Allshouse said that was correct.

Ms. Mallek said that when staff presents again, she would like details on the public safety calls, specifically rescue, as the fire calls seem to be decreasing given their strong prevention efforts – so a rescue station might be an option instead of a fire station, which would have different staffing.

Mr. Boyd said that there's already an ambulance out there.

Ms. Allshouse said that with scenario one, they kept the ambulance in and didn't make any changes in personnel, so they would just move it to its new home.

Ms. Mallek said that the difference in staffing for fire versus rescue would be a huge amount of money. Ms. Allshouse agreed.

Mr. Foley noted that the plan does add 20 firefighters over its span.

Mr. Sheffield said that he wasn't sure he understood the two different columns: catch up and keep up, and asked if the timeframe for adding those positions would be by FY20.

Ms. Allshouse said that it's the same timeframe, it just has two parts to it, so the scenario is one that would catch you up and keep you up on the general government side, and then the schools would share their information on November 12 when they present to the Board. She emphasized that with catch up and keep up, they're really catching up with their current situation – the heavy workloads, the staff shortages, etc. – and in considering population growth, the keep up items address that.

Ms. McKeel said that she didn't understand the Community Development piece at all, knowing the struggle of getting the workload done now, only increasing the staffing from 73 to 77 by FY20.

Mr. Foley said that they would go over that in more detail in future presentations.

Ms. Allshouse said that they ranked all of these through a scoring system, and when the resource requests came in, they were very oriented toward health and safety.

Ms. McKeel said that there seems to be a real disconnect here, and she would want to have a good explanation. Mr. Foley said that's what staff wants to hear, and they would explain more as to why they did that and what Community Development, and what their focus would be. He said that the reason the numbers in that department were high in earlier years is because there was lots of building activity going on, and Mark Graham would present to them on December 3.

Ms. Palmer said that there were a lot of parks they need to open, and she wasn't sure if it was a staffing issue or a money issue in general to get them open, but she would like that explained.

Mr. Foley said that there is a third scenario that is more of an aspirational scenario, and that's where they would see several other positions that didn't get into this scenario that still has a huge gap to it.

Ms. Allshouse summarized that scenario two lines up with the Board's guiding principles, funds all mandates and obligations, provides some salary increases for employees within the recommended range, provides more adequate funding levels for agencies, assumes a three-cent tax rate increase in the out years to support the CIP.

Ms. Palmer asked if this reflects what they've already counted on for the courts. Ms. Allshouse said that it does, and this moves the courts out a few years.

Mr. Foley said that staff tries to be realistic in this plan as well, so things like the courts are moved into the out years of the CIP – but more pressing things like modernization of schools took up some of the tax increase.

Ms. Mallek asked if the revenue-sharing investment was included. Ms. Allshouse said that it is in here.

Mr. Foley said that the revenue-sharing and ACE money is in this plan.

Ms. Mallek said that's giving them just the diminimus of what they could get from the state. Mr. Foley said that Ms. Allshouse would get into a further discussion as to how some of the roads could be funded, perhaps financing instead of using cash.

Ms. Allshouse said that it provides funding to address staffing shortages and staffing to keep pace with anticipated enrollment growth on the school side and population growth on the general government side. She stated that scenario two didn't have a lot of extra parks, greenways, master plan implementation, regional transit, ecosystem protection, solid waste recycling services, rural area planners, school division initiatives such as world languages; learning space modernization is included in the first two years but not in the out years; it didn't bring in the Western Albemarle High School environmental science academy; it didn't bring in renovation of the Berkmar Rescue Squad building, which was a high priority; and it did not fund any unfunded mandates.

Ms. Palmer asked if it even considered the concept of the convenience center. Ms. Allshouse said that there's still some money in the CIP.

Mr. Foley said that it maintains an operating cost of \$450,000 for solid waste, but doesn't project that it's going to go up or double or anything close.

Ms. Allshouse thanked the Board for their attention, and thanked staff for all their work, stating that on November 12 they would hold a joint CIP work session with the schools, at which time the schools would also present the details of their part of the five-year plan. She said that there was another work session scheduled for December 3, at which time they could get further into details about the Pantops station and other projects; on December 10, staff would like to wrap up and get the Board's direction and thoughts on the budget process.

Mr. Foley said that it would be great if the Board could share any of their specific questions with staff so that they can provide responses at that time.

Ms. Dittmar stated that her town hall meetings are scheduled for December, and asked if there were other items the Board wanted from Ms. Allshouse and other staff before their December 10 meeting.

Ms. Palmer said that for her town hall, she would like to get some of the slides they had last time with the tax rates and dividing lines for the different scenarios. She said that for their other town halls, staff had slides that compared with other localities, and she'd like to have that again. Ms. Palmer said that she would like to have something similar to last time, with updated information as to what this means to residents and homeowners.

Ms. Dittmar asked if those slides could be emailed to the Board.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive, said that those slides were available, but those were pertaining to the budget so there was some different detail and different information being put forth – and what would be important for staff to know is what kind of conversation they want to have with constituents.

Ms. Palmer stated that in order to get citizens engaged, they need to tell them what it means to them – what they're going to get and what they're not going to get – and she loved the chart that gave the pennies on the tax rate and what it meant to an individual homeowner.

Ms. Mallek expressed concern that this might shift the public's focus onto those things instead of the kinds of questions they're trying to address with the five-year plan.

Ms. McKeel said that she thought the presentation they all watched with delegates and representatives had some really good slides as to where they are with state funding, and she'd like to include those because that frames everything as far as the issues going forward and the lack of state funding. Ms. Allshouse clarified that those were presented at the TJPDC event the previous week.

Ms. McKeel said that the schools would probably have some slides they would want to use as well.

Ms. Dittmar said that she would still like to delve into the "pain threshold" issues such as where the unemployment rate is, what the free and reduced lunch trajectory is, the BPOL tax income, etc. She also mentioned staff's strategies presented to address the gap – reducing services, scaling back expectations, and increasing the tax rate – and said that they were beginning to address those, but would like to hear more about the bond referendum and consolidation and partnership strategies, as well as the borrowing structure for AAAs. She said that her final area of interest was the special tax districts that have been considered by other localities.

Mr. Sheffield said that he would also like to explore that, as transit and storm water funding tax districts could help define how the funds were used instead of just going into the general fund pot.

Ms. Palmer said that the water authority has one for Northpointe whereby they put in an extra amount of money on connection fees to pay for the water and sewer there.

Ms. Dittmar asked how they would need to get back to Ms. Catlin on what kind of conversation the Board wants to have with the public at their town hall meetings.

Ms. Catlin said that as they work the slides together, that would start to emerge – and staff will make sure they've given the Board what they need. She noted that there would be School Board reps present, staff support if necessary, and a senior staffer from the County Executive's office.

Recess. The Board recessed their meeting at 6:52 p.m. and reconvened at 7:06 p.m.

The Chair called the meeting back to order.

Agenda Item No. 19. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 20. **Public Hearing: Ordinance to amend County Code Chapter 2, Administration, Article XI, Personnel, Division 3, Deferred Compensation**, Section 2-1108, Establishment, execution and amendment of plan, to remove the provision that designates the National Association of County's Deferred Compensation Program as the County's deferred compensation program. The proposed amendment would also re-adopt and re-establish the County's plan of deferred compensation for its employees, and would update the applicable section of the Virginia Code referenced in the County's ordinance. (*Advertised in the Daily Progress on October 20 and October 27, 2014*)

The executive summary forwarded to the Board states that as a benefit to employees, the County offers a voluntary Deferred Compensation Program by which employees can contribute portions of their earnings into 457(b) retirement savings accounts. Unlike the mandatory Virginia Retirement System (VRS) defined benefit program, to which both the County and the employee are required to contribute, the Deferred Compensation Program is funded solely by employees' voluntary pre-tax contributions. The 457(b) retirement savings accounts held by County employees are similar to 401(k) accounts available to private sector employees.

The County first established a Deferred Compensation Program in 1983, and by ordinance, adopted the National Association of Counties (NACo) Deferred Compensation Program. The 1983 ordinance also created a deferred compensation committee appointed by the county executive. The ordinance granted the committee the power to do all things by way of supervision, administration and implementation of a plan of deferred compensation.

When the County's Deferred Compensation program was first established in 1983, deferred compensation programs were in their infancy. At that time, it made sense for the County to pool its resources with other localities in offering this benefit. However, over time, the County's Deferred Compensation Program has grown to over \$26 million in employee retirement contributions and earnings. Many more options now exist to serve these growing savings, possibly with lower fees and expenses. Very few Virginia localities of Albemarle's size still use the NACo Deferred Compensation Program. While many smaller localities still do, most larger localities have moved on to high quality programs with lower expenses that allow employees to keep more of their retirement savings.

The County's Deferred Compensation provider is specifically designated in *County Code* § 2-1108 as the NACo Deferred Compensation Program and can be changed only by amending this 1983 ordinance. Regardless of whether the County ultimately chooses to remain with NACo's Program, the Deferred Compensation Committee believes that opening the County's Program to competition from other

investment providers would have a positive effect on Program costs, again allowing County employees to keep more of their retirement savings.

The proposed ordinance would re-adopt and re-establish the County's plan of deferred compensation for its employees and would remove the exclusive designation of the National Association of Counties Deferred Compensation Program from *County Code* § 2-1108, and allow the County to consider other investment providers, either in addition to or instead of the existing NACo program. The rest of the *County Code* provisions regarding deferred compensation would remain the same.

Because the County's Deferred Compensation Program is funded by voluntary employee contributions, no impact is expected on the County's budget.

Staff recommends that, after the public hearing, the Board adopt the attached proposed ordinance (Attachment A).

Mr. Bill Letteri, Deputy County Executive, stated that this was a public hearing to consider adoption of an ordinance to amend County Code Section 2-1108 regarding the deferred compensation program. As a benefit to employees, he explained, the County offers a voluntary deferred compensation program by which employees can contribute portions of their earnings into a 457-B plan. He said that unlike the mandatory VRS defined benefit program, to which both the County and employees are required to contribute, the deferred compensation program is funded solely by employees' voluntary pre-tax contributions. Mr. Letteri said that the 457-B retirement savings accounts held by County employees are quite similar to the 401K accounts that you find in the private sector. He stated that the County first established a defined compensation program in 1983 and at that time, by ordinance, adopted a National Association of Counties deferred compensation program. Mr. Letteri said this was at a time when these types of programs were in their infancy, and as such it made sense for the County to pool its resources with other localities offering this similar type of benefit. He stated that over time the County's deferred benefit has gotten quite large – now over \$26 million in investments and savings, and there are many more options available now to serve these growing savings – possibly lower fees and lower expenses. Mr. Letteri said that the County's deferred compensation provider is specifically designated in County Code Section 2-1108 as the "NACO Deferred Compensation Program." He said that this ordinance would readopt and reestablish the County's plan of deferred compensation for its employees, and would remove the exclusive designation title from the section and allow the County to consider other investment providers, either in addition to or instead of the existing NACO program. Mr. Letteri said that the rest of the County Code provisions regarding deferred compensation would remain intact, and staff is recommending that the Board adopt the proposed ordinance after the public hearing. He acknowledged Assistant County Attorney Andy Herrick's good work in researching this and looking at various programs and options.

Mr. Davis stated that Mr. Herrick had done some great work on this that had proven to be very valuable in providing this analysis.

Ms. Dittmar opened the public comment period.

There were no speakers to come forward, so the Chair closed the public hearing.

Mr. Boyd stated that he is very familiar with this product and would highly recommend that they move forward with it.

Motion was then offered by Mr. Boyd to adopt the proposed ordinance. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ORDINANCE NO. 14-2(2)

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN CHAPTER 2, ADMINISTRATION, ARTICLE XI, PERSONNEL, OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE, VIRGINIA.

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, that Chapter 2, Administration, Article XI, Personnel, Division 3, Deferred Compensation, of the Code of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, is hereby amended and reordained by amending Section 2-1108, Establishment, Execution and Amendment of Plan, as follows:

CHAPTER 2. ADMINISTRATION

ARTICLE XI. PERSONNEL

DIVISION 3. DEFERRED COMPENSATION

Sec. 2-1108 Establishment, execution and amendment of plan.

Pursuant to the Government Employees Deferred Compensation Act (Virginia Code §§ 51.1-600 et seq.), the county hereby re-adopts and re-establishes a plan of deferred compensation for its employees. The purpose of the plan shall be to provide for the deferral of compensation to the participants. The plan shall exist in addition to all other retirement, pension or other benefit systems available to the participants and shall not supersede, make inoperative or reduce any benefits provided by any other retirement, pension or benefit program established by law. It is understood that, other than the incidental expenses of collecting and disbursing of the employees' deferrals and other minor administrative matters, there is to be no cost or contribution by the county to the program. On behalf of the employer, the county executive is hereby authorized and directed to execute and deliver the plan to the plan administrator. He is further hereby authorized to execute for the county individual participation agreements with each employee requesting the same, to act as the "administrator" of the plan representing the county and to execute such agreements and contracts as are necessary to implement the program. The plan shall contain such terms and amendments as the county executive may, from time to time, approve, such approval to be conclusively evidenced by his execution thereof.

(9-14-83, art. I, § 1; 5-13-87; Ord. 1988, § 15-6; Ord. 98-A(1), 8-5-98)

Agenda Item No. 21. **Public Hearing: CPA-2014-00001. Route 29-Hydraulic Road Official Map.** Ordinance Re-Adopting and Modifying U.S. Route 29 and Hydraulic Road Official Map – Ordinance to re-adopt and modify an official map originally adopted December 2, 2009 under Virginia Code § 15.2-2233 et seq., depicting, within the vicinity of the northwest quadrant of the U.S. Route 29 and Hydraulic Road intersection, the location, centerlines, and existing and future right-of-way widths of the legally established segments of U.S. Route 29 and Hydraulic Road abutting and on County Tax Map and Parcel Numbers 61W-03-19A and 61W-03-25. The ordinance and map would be amended to identify the current tax map and parcel numbers, but the location, centerlines, and existing and future right-of-way widths would be the same as adopted on December 2, 2009, except as modified to remove rights-of-way dedicated to public use and improvements constructed since December 2, 2009. (*Advertised in the Daily Progress on October 20 and October 27, 2014*)

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that an "official map" is a map showing the location of legally established and future or proposed streets, alleys, walkways, waterways, and public areas. The official map identifies the limits of lands that a locality may acquire for these public purposes and allows the locality time to acquire those lands when a building permit application is pending within the limits of the lands shown on the map as a future or proposed right-of-way.

Proffer 10 of the Albemarle Place (now Stonefield) rezoning required the owner to reserve and ultimately dedicate additional lands needed for the U.S. Route 29/Hydraulic Road intersection improvements. The proffer required the owner to reserve the right-of-way area until an official map or transportation improvement plan was adopted by the County that identified the specific land required for right-of-way for the intersection improvements. Thus, the official map in this case serves to identify the specific land that the owner of Stonefield will dedicate to the County for right-of-way for the U.S. Route 29/Hydraulic Road intersection improvements.

The official map for the U.S. Route 29/Hydraulic Road intersection was originally adopted by the Board on December 2, 2009. By statute, an official map must be re-adopted every 5 years. The Planning Commission considered the official map's re-adoption on October 14, 2014 and recommended that the official map be re-adopted. The proposed ordinance and official map are included as Attachments A and B.

Since the original official map was adopted by the Board on December 2, 2009, Stonefield has dedicated much of the right-of-way shown on the original official map. In addition, the parcel configurations within Stonefield have changed.

The revised official map modifies the original map by removing the "future" rights-of-way already dedicated to public use by the owner and identifies the new tax map and parcel numbers of the lands abutting and on the mapped rights-of-way. The remaining future rights-of-way still to be dedicated are shown on the official map as two parcels – Parcel 1 (793 square feet) and Parcel 2 (1,095 square feet).

There is no budget impact from the re-adoption of the official map and the ordinance. However, the dedication of land resulting from this official map will be in lieu of expending funds to purchase the right-of-way.

After the public hearing, staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached ordinance (Attachment A), which by reference re-adopts the official map as modified (Attachment B).

Mr. Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney, addressed the Board, stating that this was a public hearing on an ordinance to readopt a modified official map for the Route 29/Hydraulic Road intersection. He said that official maps were a creature of statute under Virginia law and were typically used by localities that wish to identify existing or future right of way in the event of receipt of a building permit, and it puts a hold on the building approval process so that the locality has time to purchase the property. In this case, he said, the official map was being used as the device by which the right of way proffered in

conjunction with the original Albemarle Place rezoning to identify the limits of the right of way. Mr. Kamptner said that the original official map was adopted in 2009, but by state law they have only a five-year life and have to be readopted within a five-year period. He stated that since that time, much of the right of way has already been dedicated to the County or to VDOT as part of the frontage improvements along Route 29 and Hydraulic Road, and the map included in their packets shows that they have about 1,800 square feet of right of way still to be dedicated – so that is the area being reserved for future dedication upon demand by the County. Mr. Kamptner said that staff has included a proposed ordinance for adoption, which incorporates the map as included as Attachment D by reference.

Mr. Sheffield asked what would happen if they didn't adopt the official map. Mr. Kamptner said that this particular land would be released from the reserved dedication, so if further improvements were needed, the state would have to pay for that land.

The Chair opened the public comment period.

There were no speakers, and the Chair closed the public hearing.

Ms. Mallek asked if it would be in the County's best interest to just ask for the dedication. Mr. Kamptner stated that they can do that at any time, but staff's practice has been to request it when it's actually needed, and he spoke with Jack Kelsey in Facilities Development today about why the entire right of way wasn't requested at the time Stonefield was developed. He said that Mr. Kelsey indicated that it wasn't needed at that time and the County only demanded the right of way needed for the frontage improvements at that time.

Mr. Davis said that the land would likely be necessary if there's an interchange developed at Hydraulic, and otherwise it may not be necessary. He said that Mark Graham is familiar with a sketch of the interchange that was proposed at the time that this official map was wrapped around, and at some point after the intersection design is studied they may have a better idea about what land would be necessary.

Ms. Palmer commented that they could not ask for any more, and this was the most that could be used at that intersection. Mr. Kamptner said that this was the remaining land that the applicant proffered to dedicate upon demand, and anything else was needed they could always gift additional land or the County or the state would pursue it.

Ms. Mallek said that the building is already there, so their development in that spot has already occurred.

Motion was then offered by Ms. McKeel to adopt the proposed ordinance and map. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ORDINANCE NO. 14-A(5)

AN ORDINANCE TO RE-ADOPT AND MODIFY AN OFFICIAL MAP PURSUANT TO VIRGINIA CODE § 15.2-2233 *ET SEQ.* FOR A SEGMENT OF U.S. ROUTE 29 ABUTTING COUNTY TAX MAP AND PARCEL NUMBERS 61W-03-19A and 61W-03-25, AND A SEGMENT OF HYDRAULIC ROAD ABUTTING COUNTY TAX MAP AND PARCEL NUMBERS 61W-03-19A and 61W-03-25

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, that, pursuant to the authority in Virginia Code § 15.2-2233 *et seq.*, the attached map entitled "Plat Showing Parcels One and Two Being Future Right of Way for a Single Point Urban Interchange Across TMP 61W-03-19A and TMP 61W-03-25 as Shown Hereon, Jack Jouett Magisterial District, Albemarle Co., Virginia," last revised September 23, 2014, prepared by Kirk Hughes & Associates, Land Surveyors & Planners, which depicts, within the vicinity of the northwest quadrant of the U.S. Route 29 and Hydraulic Road intersection, the respective locations, centerlines, existing right-of-way widths, and future right-of-way widths of the legally established segment of U.S. Route 29 abutting County Tax Map and Parcel Numbers 61W-03-19A and 61W-03-25, and the legally established segment of Hydraulic Road abutting County Tax Map and Parcel Numbers 61W-03-19A and 61W-03-25, originally adopted on December 2, 2009, is hereby re-adopted and modified as an official map. The existing and future right-of-way widths would be the same as adopted on December 2, 2009, except as modified to remove as "future" rights-of-way those lands dedicated to public use and improvements constructed since December 2, 2009, and to identify the new tax map and parcel numbers of the parcels abutting and on the mapped rights-of-way.

This ordinance shall be effective immediately.

Agenda Item No. 22. Natural Heritage Committee Annual Report.

Mr. Tom Olivier addressed the Board and stated that he is member of the committee and would present the first part of their report. Mr. Olivier said that the Natural Heritage Committee has three main purposes: to develop and maintain data on Albemarle County's biological resources; to recommend policies and actions aimed at protecting County biodiversity; and to educate the public regarding the importance of native plants and animals, and the steps public can take to support native biodiversity. He noted that the purpose of the committee was stated more formally and fully on page two of the annual report the Board has received. Mr. Olivier said that in 1997, Citizens for Albemarle, a local volunteer organization, proposed that the County's Comp Plan include a commitment to protect local biological resources, and asked that the commitment include creation of a standing biodiversity committee. He said that the Natural Resources and Cultural Assets chapter of the Comp Plan, which was adopted in 1999, included the requested "strong commitment to biodiversity protection" and called for creation of a standing citizen committee focused on biodiversity protection issues. Mr. Olivier said that the commitment was virtually unique in the country. He reported that in 2002, planning staff created an all-scientist biodiversity workgroup, with volunteer scientists working until 2004 to assess locations and states of County biological resources, and developed a recommendation for their protection. Mr. Olivier said that the report of the workgroup provided a scientific foundation for work of the succeeding biodiversity committee, and referenced a link to their report online, which covers three volumes but also includes a ten-page summary.

He stated that in 2005, the Board created the Natural Heritage Committee, which is the standing biodiversity committee called for in the Comp Plan and one that has worked continuously for the last nine years. Mr. Olivier presented a few of the accomplishments of the committee, stating that in 2007 they identified six areas in the County totaling about 20,000 acres as near-term, high priority conservation areas. He said that the committee spearheaded collaboration between local natural resource oriented organizations to fund and create a high-resolution land cover overlay for the County, many visits to field sites to collect and update data for the biological resource inventory were conducted, pages on the County website with information for the public about biodiversity were created, and the committee collaborated with park designers to integrate native biodiversity into park designs. Mr. Olivier said that at the present time, the committee is working to create a GIS layer with important small-scale biological resources identified, and the work name is the "flag layer." He stated that this layer would be consulted by planning staff in review of rezonings and special use permits, and they are also working on a countywide GIS analysis of biological resources, which would provide a solid basis for a countywide biodiversity protection action plan that's been called for in their Comp Plan since 1999. Mr. Olivier said that they were also visiting more biodiversity sites, and continuing their parks collaboration. He stated that they recently participated in the "Go Native" plants campaign, which was a collaboration among the committee, County business development staff – Susan Stimart, the Virginia Native Plant Society, and others.

Committee Chair, Lonnie Murray addressed the Board, thanking Anne Mallek, Liz Palmer and Ken Boyd for being included in their biodiversity surveys this year. Mr. Murray stated that he wanted to address what makes a special site, stating that one of the determining factors is the presence of locally rare species or habitat – or a large, unfragmented block of habitat. He said that before something gets on a state rare list, it is rare locally, and they really don't want it to get on the state list. Mr. Murray said that it takes a lot of effort to go and survey the sites, and there are 39 historical sites as well as new sites that are reported to them by the public or by local botanists. He stated that for new sites, they will go out and survey them, and if they are of significant merit they will be included in their official list. Mr. Murray commented that he'd like to see more Board presence on some of their trips to sites within their districts. He stated that some of their significant discoveries have included confirmation of a paper birch habitat originally discovered by area naturalist Mo Stevens, an ecosystem that dates back to the last ice age 12,000 years ago containing species that would normally be found in Canada; a G1S1 Piedmont May Fig barren, classified by the Department of Conservation and Recreation as a globally rare habitat, with less than 20 occurrences in the world. Mr. Murray reported that there have also been some losses – along Polo Grounds Road, a site along the Rivanna River, and the quarries on 29 – due to paving for the Meadowcreek Parkway, a forestry site that didn't use best management practices, and traffic increases coupled with logging and development activity.

Mr. Murray said that one of their long-term goals has always been to develop a biodiversity action plan for the County, and they'd also like to take some of the data that's been collected and put it into a more searchable database to make it more useful by the committee and by staff. He stated that they'd also like to restart their education efforts, working more closely with local educators, and would like to get to more site visits. In the past year, he said, there have been a lot more volunteers from Master Naturalists and other community partners to come out on site visits, so the committee doesn't have to constantly revisit the sites. Mr. Murray said that biodiversity is what gives us a sense of place and is also important for history and culture, with Thomas Jefferson being a big fan of native plants and local flora and fauna. He stated that there are two native species of hazelnuts, three native plums, two passion fruits, persimmons, paw paws, and a whole lot of other native and edible crops. He said that as local food becomes a bigger thing, those economic resources are very important. Mr. Murray said that biodiversity is also a measure of human health, and Albemarle County is among the top four healthiest counties in the state; he noted that one of the reasons they maintain that health is biodiversity. He mentioned that stream health has long been considered the gold standard for the health of water, and the same holds true for terrestrial biodiversity.

Mr. Boyd said that Mr. Murray had come out to his homeowner's association and was very well received – with lots of questions asked of him – and he suggested to fellow Board members that they have someone from the committee come and speak to their groups.

Ms. McKeel and Ms. Mallek said that was an excellent idea.

Ms. Palmer mentioned that she and Ms. Mallek both went out on a trip arranged by the natural heritage committee to see the native swamp rose, which was a lovely trip.

Ms. Mallek said that they saw many other native species as well.

Ms. Palmer stated that she was very happy that the Natural Heritage Committee is up and running, and that they've been able to help them get staff to help identify these places – because if they don't know where they are, they can't protect them.

Ms. Mallek asked if the GIS layer project was underway now. Mr. Murray said that it's underway, and they've made lots of progress in the Special Sites layer, so staff can be aware of where these sites are, so when there are new parks proposed or new County projects staff they can factor that into their planning process. He said that the landscape level planning was also underway in terms of looking at where the largest areas of forest blocks are, and the key areas of the County for which they want to prioritize protection.

Ms. Mallek said that over the years they've had some discussions about incorporating evaluation points in the ACE Program for features, and they would need to get together with the Natural Heritage Committee on that.

Mr. Murray said that while he can't speak for the committee as a whole, he's long thought that they should consider two different scoring systems and shouldn't penalize farms for not having enough biodiversity, or penalize biodiversity for not having enough agriculture. He said that currently, the way the scoring system is set up, that's the way the points go.

Ms. Mallek said that it's all additive in points, but there is a certain built-in disadvantage to a piece of property that has only one or two features. She asked about the reaction of the DCR people when they came to see the Arrowhead rocks.

Mr. Murray said that DCR was blown away that Albemarle had this kind of biodiversity, and said that the Piedmont is often overlooked for the amazing features that are here – and people tend to think they need to go way out into the mountains or remote areas. He stated that it really speaks well to the good stewardship of landowners that such habitats still exist in the County.

Ms. Mallek stated that she receives the journal for the Coastal Zone Management organization, and the last chapter talked about the growth of the native plant industry and the economy of that in Virginia. She said that Albemarle County was listed at the top of the partners on the list.

Ms. Palmer asked where they were with incorporating native plants into landscaping in urban areas. Mr. Murray responded that if you drive through Crozet, the streetscape there is almost 100% native plants, and County staff has been working closely with members of the committee to incorporate more native species in landscaping.

Ms. Mallek commented that the ARB does that as well.

Ms. McKeel thanked Mr. Murray for his report and suggested that the committee collaborate with schools. She stated that Sutherland Middle School recently did an entire report for their community on native plants, and went out in the community to give presentations on what people should be planting – and were horrified to find out some of the plants being sold to plant here.

Ms. Palmer said that all of the schools were starting community gardens and wondered why they were not putting in Pawpaw trees.

Mr. Olivier said that in the 1990s, there was a local organization called the "Environmental Education Center" that John Hermsmeier ran, and one of their programs was a schoolyard habitat program – and some of the schools in the County are situated on 40 and 50-acre properties with extensive woods, and in at least one case, abutting a river. He said that Mr. Hermsmeier was able to go in and work with some of the environmental education faculty, and there were projects started in the schools whereby students would go out and identify native plants and animals on the grounds, and start putting protection measures in place. Mr. Olivier said that the buildings and grounds division of the schools was very supportive and helpful, and they provided aerial photos to do layouts the students could work from. He said that the center was no longer there, but there have been efforts like this in the past, and very possibly all of this could be restarted.

Mr. Murray said that when people talk about "endangered species," they seem far away – but the last passenger pigeons were reportedly seen in Albemarle County.

Ms. Dittmar commented that it was at Pine Knob, by Teddy Roosevelt.

Mr. Murray said that it's important to note that endangered species are not an abstraction, and familiarizing students with rare County species while they're still here and accessible is important.

Ms. Dittmar thanked him for their committee's work, which she said was valuable and significant and would hopefully protect natural resources for future generations.

Mr. Olivier noted that the slides in the presentation were taken by Scott Clark, Lonnie Murray, or others on the committee.

Ms. Mallek said that the previous spring, she and Dan Mahon had walked along the old mills trail from State Farm down to the old lochs.

Agenda Item. No. 23. Local Ebola Preparation Update.

Ms. Dittmar stated that Dr. Charles Devine, Interim Health Director of the Thomas Jefferson Health Department, and Ryan McKay, emergency planner, were present.

Dr. Charles Devine addressed the Board to provide an overview of the Health Department's work, and said that he would talk about the Virginia Department of Health's traveler monitoring program and how they're preparing to implement the program locally so they can protect themselves from Ebola virus disease. He stated that there are no cases of Ebola virus disease in the community or in Virginia, and while they recognize the fear arising from the disease, they want to assure everyone that the risk of exposure in the community is extremely low. Dr. Devine reported that the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and the customs and border protection officials were conducting enhanced entry screenings at five U.S. airports including Dulles, and were screening all U.S.-bound air travelers that have been in any of the three countries of concern in West Africa: Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea. He said that early recognition of illness was critical to controlling the spread of Ebola virus disease, and the purpose of active monitoring was to ensure early identification of patients developing the disease so they may be immediately isolated to protect others and quickly receive state of the art care to improve their likelihood of survival. With this in mind, he said, on October 27, the Virginia Department of Health in coordination with the CDC implemented a post-arrival active monitoring program to follow each of these travelers for 21 days after their last possible contact with Ebola.

He said that the Virginia Department of Health had retroactively identified individuals traveling from the affected countries who arrived on or after CDC airport screening began on October 16; for those who arrived on October 16, their 21-day period of active monitoring ended today, and none of them had developed Ebola viral disease. Dr. Devine said that the 21-day monitoring persists for 21 days after the date of last possible exposure because this was the maximum incubation period for the disease, and once a person has moved beyond that, they were no longer at risk of developing the disease. He stated that the active monitoring program requires the Health Department to establish regular communication with potentially exposed individuals and includes daily checks to assess for the presence of symptoms such as fever, rather than relying solely on individuals to self-monitor and report symptoms should they develop. Dr. Devine said that the active monitoring program is not limited to travelers, but would also include any contacts of Ebola viral disease should there be a case here. He stated that the active monitoring program assesses a traveler's risk of developing Ebola based on exposure history and current health status. He said that traveler's exposure risk determines the appropriate level of care or appropriate active monitoring necessary to protect the community, and stated that all ill travelers who are arriving from the three affected countries who had direct contact with the person who was sick with the Ebola viral disease are taken from Dulles to a local hospital for evaluation. Dr. Devine said that in general, the asymptomatic people who are traveling from the affected countries – those who are not ill and have no symptoms – would continue to their destination, but on arrival would be actively monitored by the local health department for the 21 days. He stated that asymptomatic travelers are assigned to one of three groups based on their degree of risk of developing exposure based on their exposure history in country. Dr. Devine said that a person with a needle stick while working in country would be placed in a high-risk category and would be seen visually once per day and communicated with a second time during the day to ensure that they were free of symptoms and remained no threat to anyone. He stated that the monitoring includes daily temperature checks for fever, which is typically the first symptom, and as a reminder, people who have no symptoms pose no risk to anyone. Dr. Devine stated that the symptoms combined with the travel history and exposure risk aid in determining the type of care a sick individual would receive and the course of action taken to monitor and protect the community.

Dr. Devine said that the Health Department is prepared to implement the monitoring program, but doesn't have anyone currently that they are monitoring – although there are approximately 140 people being monitored across the state. He said that the health district has a robust and long-established infectious disease control program and plans to control diseases such as tuberculosis, and they've reviewed the programs, enhanced and upgraded them to meet the specific requirements associated with Ebola viral disease. Dr. Devine stated that the Health Department is also leveraging partnerships built over many years, and is establishing new relationships in the community to help respond effectively should the need arise. He said that they're working with human services agencies including DSS, the Red Cross, and Region Ten to provide non-medical support should any be necessary for those going through the 21-day monitoring program. Dr. Devine said that the Health Department was also working with the Thomas Jefferson Emergency Medical Services Council to ensure appropriate protocols are in place should first responders encounter or need to transport a patient with suspected Ebola viral disease, and dispatchers at ECC and emergency personnel are actively asking questions about the individual's travel history, and that effectively excludes risk.

Dr. Costi Sifri of the University of Virginia addressed the Board, stating that he would present UVA Health System's preparedness planning for Ebola viral disease over the last eight to nine months. Dr. Sifri said that UVA has a long history of expertise in having to deal with international contagious diseases – tuberculosis, measles, mumps, and some unique infections that they've been first in the country to identify. He stated that they've had to stand up emergency responses to these contagions when they've occurred over the last five or six years, even a decade, and in the early spring of this year the Health System team decided that they needed to develop a standing system to respond to these international contagions. Dr. Sifri said that this started with a disease that they wouldn't be talking about today – MERS co V – which is a SARS-like virus that can cause respiratory illness, currently an issue on the Arabian Peninsula. He stated that they started that planning in May, which was a multi-disciplinary group planning effort that included the Health Department, with active planning occurring for MERS co V in June, and a tabletop exercise in July – which was about the time that the extent of the Ebola virus problem became known in West Africa. He said in July and August, they folded in the Ebola virus planning into preparedness planning, and much of what's been discussed is now occurring at a regional and national level in terms of patient identification and preparedness planning.

Dr. Sifri said that in September, they had their first case of a rule-out patient with Ebola – a nurse who had come from West Nigeria, which at that time was on an active surveillance list, and she had criteria to be a person who could potentially have the disease. He said that she was identified during an emergency room screening visit, and they had at that time worked very diligently to develop a travel screening protocol for the different conduits into the health system that identified that patient, and they were able to place her into a safe location and do an assessment. Dr. Sifri said that because of the nuances of the Ebola viral disease, the patient was admitted into their medical intensive care unit, which they have identified as the place to take care of patients who have Ebola virus disease for further evaluation. He stated that she had a second test after her third day of illness that ruled out Ebola viral disease, and she received additional patient care and was discharged from the system. Dr. Sifri said that this was a very important dry run to see that the systems worked, and the national response to the Ebola virus disease has evolved, CDC recommendations have changed, and the Health System has been updating its preparedness planning in concert with that. He noted that they've always had a conservative stance on how to deal with the potential of Ebola virus disease as a health system, including monitoring for exposure as part of the CDC recommendation and follow-up, including those who care for patients. Dr. Sifri said that there's been a significant amount of education for Health System employees involved in this, and there's currently screening throughout the system, with the most likely portals of entry being the emergency room or patient transfer center – but as a precaution, they are screening throughout the entire health system including any doctor's sick visit or procedural area. He said that the Virginia Hospital and Healthcare Association has been looking at statewide preparedness planning, both regionally and throughout the Commonwealth, and if a person is found to have Ebola virus disease at a healthcare facility in the state, the Health Department would first see if they can help transfer that patient to a bio-containment unit facility such as Emory University or the National Institutes of Health. Dr. Sifri noted that if the transfer couldn't be made, the state public health medical schools – VCU and UVA – would take care of that patient on an alternating basis until they reach capacity, which is two Ebola patients.

Ms. Dittmar suggested that the Board ask any questions they might have.

Ms. Palmer said that she's received questions such as, "Is UVA ready?" and "What happens if?" so it's good for her to be able to answer "Yes." She said that soon after the Dallas situation, they didn't have a place to put the family members who were exposed, and she asked if this had been worked through locally.

Ms. Mallek said that they just keep them home.

Dr. Devine said that the Code of Virginia requires that the "least restrictive restraints" be placed on people under quarantine, which refers to people who are not sick but who have been exposed and are in the incubation period or isolation – which refers to the sick patient who's in hospital in this case. He stated that there are procedures in place to obtain an order of quarantine or an order of isolation if necessary, but in general the finding is that they can work with people who need to be monitored, in a way that is less restrictive and less onerous than an order.

Mr. Boyd asked if the risk in the community was extremely low. Dr. Sifri and Dr. Devine confirmed that it was.

Ms. McKeel asked if Martha Jefferson Hospital was working closely as part of the preparation. Dr. Devine said that they had been working with MJH since early October, and they are able to take a patient who arrives at their facility and perform the appropriate initial evaluations; should they rule in for Ebola, they would be transferred as mentioned.

Ms. Dittmar said that she has been asked about a situation whereby someone showed up at a Prompt Care facility, and asked if the health district had reached out to them. Dr. Devine said that they have, but emphasized that it was unlikely that someone would just "pop in" someplace, because the Health Department is aware of all of the travelers coming back from the affected countries and is interacting with them once or twice per day – and part of that interaction is to establish a plan should symptoms develop so that the patient can be in a controlled and appropriate way, removed to appropriate treatment.

Ms. Mallek said that it is the great unknown that is alarming to people, and one of the concerns has been the constant evolution of standards from the CDC. She asked how convinced the medical

community was that this non-contagion until symptoms appear is really true, because it would be a major issue if they found out in a year that they were wrong about that.

Dr. Devine said that it really does appear that that's true, and the nurse who was ruled out for Ebola had to be tested twice because early in the symptomatic phase there are so few viruses present in the system, that the most sensitive tests that exist may not be able to detect them – and it's not until 72 hours after symptoms are established that the test becomes reliable when you're looking for a negative. He stated that it's not until several days after that when vomiting and diarrhea develop that there's any substantial real danger because the body fluids contain the virus, but until then the risk is very low – and before symptoms develop, there is no risk.

Ms. Mallek asked if rubbing up against a person can transfer the virus through sweat. Dr. Devine said it can't be passed before symptoms appear.

Ms. Palmer said that there is no virus shed in sweat. Dr. Devine said there is no virus shed because there's no virus present at that point in numbers of present to be shed.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was a fellow travelers list compiled when people are traveling together on airport buses, etc., because it seems that it would be difficult to find these people. Dr. Devine said that contact investigation is a big part of their work, but the personal traveling from the airport to a destination in Virginia will be limited depending on their level of risk and how they've been assigned as far as risk goes – and those in the top two categories will not be using public transportation.

Dr. Sifri said that what they've seen in West Africa with the Nigerian experience is that the traditional tracing that the health department would do should work. He stated that in Nigeria, there was a person who traveled to Lagos, Nigeria, and he was recognized to have Ebola late and did give it to other people in Lagos, but through traditional contact tracing they were able to stop the transmission after there had been 20 transmission events – and now that country is Ebola-free. He stated that the tracing works for this virus, and has worked for this virus with 24 previous epidemics. Dr. Sifri said that the UVA Health System has always maintained a higher standard than what the CDC recommended, and this has evolved in a number of ways, such as net covering as part of their personal protective equipment (PPE), which eventually became a CDC recommendation. Dr. Sifri said that it is still unclear how the nurses in Dallas acquired Ebola, and the health system has learned the value of practice and how to put on and take off the equipment carefully, because the risk of self-contamination is extremely high with this. He stated that not doing this correctly is the highest risk for potential inoculation to a healthcare worker, and this wasn't rigorously practiced in Dallas, given the time and understanding before they had their first patient.

Mr. Boyd said that he had recently flown back from being out of the country and wanted to see his granddaughter, who was born prematurely, and the hospital staff told him that he couldn't come up and see her before he had gone through an Ebola screening – even though he had been to China. He stated that the nurses indicated that they couldn't even test him for any disease because he didn't have any symptoms.

Dr. Sifri said that his six-year-old daughter was in the emergency room with the entero-virus, and she was asked whether she had been to West Africa in the last 21 days.

Ms. Palmer asked for an update on pets and dogs. Dr. Devine said that pets and dogs in particular were not thought to get sick from Ebola – they don't become ill and there are not dead dogs lying in the street in West Africa – but out of caution, a pet who is exposed to a family member with Ebola should be isolated and quarantined and monitored out of an abundance of caution. He said that there is not firm science behind that recommendation, and the thought is that they probably don't get sick from the virus.

Ms. Mallek said that she felt reassured and thanked them for coming.

Ms. Dittmar thanked them also.

Ms. Palmer said that now the Board had something they could say to constituents.

Mr. Foley said there was lots of information on the Board's website, so staff might also put a link to the health department information on the main County website.

Dr. Devine said that there was information on the public Virginia Department of Health website.

Dr. Sifri stated that if they were to have an Ebola patient here, he would ask for public health officials to help facilitate a helpful conversation, with the healthcare workers who may be helping to take care of patients and not ostracize them. He said that they also need to be sensitive to the immigrant population in the community, as there is an immigrant population here from West Africa but they are not traveling back and forth.

Agenda Item. No. 24. Route 29 Solutions Project.

Item No. 24a. Project Update.

Item No. 24b. Communications.

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, addressed the Board, stating that it had been a busy month as far as this project went with them – and they have held their business and stakeholder meetings, with Ms. Catlin coming back in December with comments and ideas as far as how to move forward. Mr. Graham said that the design public hearing was also held in the last month, and the comment period has been closed for a little over a week. He noted that the addendum for their RFP with the three contractors would go out the following day, and staff does not know what additional information is in that RFP, but they hope to find that out and have been assured that they will get a summary of comments. Mr. Graham said that on November 10, the advertisement would go out for bids for the 29/250 Best Buy project, and they should be coming back in mid-December with those bids with construction starting in the first quarter of calendar year 2015. He stated that they completed all of the utility relocation more quickly than anticipated. Mr. Graham said that the Commonwealth Transportation Board had approved Alignment A for Berkmar Avenue, so that's moving forward. He confirmed that there was a meeting to be held the following afternoon at 2:00 p.m.

Ms. Mallek said that she appreciated all of the emails the Board was receiving to help them stay informed.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive, addressed the Board, stating that Communications Specialist Jody Lewis and Community Engagement Specialist Emily Kilroy had been working hard on the communications efforts related to the project. Ms. Catlin reported that they had held an open house on October 23 for business assistance and outreach, and on October 30 the Board had the stakeholders meeting. She said that Susan Stimart had done four business drop-in meetings this week – at Hardee's, Jimmy John's, Sultan Kabob, and Kurt's Homemade Ice Cream, and staff would come back to them on December 3 with a preliminary conversation about some of the ideas and which have the most merit to move forward on. Ms. Catlin said that they hope to get back out with some business stakeholders in February with some of the ideas that will be brought forward in more final form, will get feedback and come back to them in March with some recommendations. She stated that staff recognizes that this will be a work in progress, as they want to be adaptable to situations as they occur, but they want to have a good, robust package of assistance by then. Ms. Catlin said that they are also moving forward with neighborhood outreach and communication efforts, and VDOT is completing a comprehensive communication plan that they would be reviewing with the advisory panel. She stated that they are coordinating the plan to synch up with key milestones in the project, when it's important to ensure dialogue with the neighborhoods. Ms. Catlin said that they also want to hold a planning roundtable with representatives from neighborhood associations in the affected areas so that they have a chance on the front end of the communication plan to give ideas, thoughts and reactions in the same way they did with business roundtables. She said that staff is currently striving to get the County's communication network as up to date and comprehensive as possible, and while they had a pretty good neighborhood association database for a while, when the community engagement resource went away it wasn't kept as up to date as it needs to be. Ms. Catlin stated that this is a good time to move forward with the effort, because the Best Buy ramp construction would be visible for people and the contract award for the three design-build projects would be happening in the February/March timeframe.

Ms. Palmer commented that with the Best Buy ramp projects there are neighborhoods right around that area, so they would need to move quickly with some of those areas. Ms. Catlin agreed, stating that those neighborhoods would need to be at the top of the list.

Ms. Catlin introduced Mr. Chip Boyles, Executive Director of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, stating that the MPO has been spending some time putting a structure in place to ensure that all the involved parties – the County, the City, VDOT and the advisory panel – are all communicating and working effectively together.

Mr. Chip Boyles addressed the Board, stating that a lot of neighborhood and business contact was already underway, but the TJPDC had been working toward an organized process that would continue through construction and afterward, to make sure that all stakeholders – especially the public – were all talking constantly with information exchanging in all directions. Mr. Boyles said they'd already begin with two the following day and more right after that, with a number of committees and subcommittees that would work to make sure everyone was at the table, meeting and talking on a regular basis. He stated that what they were proposing was to have a very small and concentrated oversight committee that will work with and exchange the information with three subcommittees comprised of members from all partners – communications and engagement, which would also work with VDOT's communications plan; business assistance, to streamline all of the efforts to help businesses; and a neighborhood subcommittee. Mr. Boyles said that each of the subcommittees would be charged with creating working groups so if something specific needs to take place, they can be tasked to do just that. He stated that each of these would then bring information to the subcommittees, to the oversight committee, and to the decision-making bodies as quickly and easily as possible. Mr. Boyles emphasized that there would be a lot of discussion between the groups to keep them in constant communication.

Ms. Dittmar stated that the business roundtable had excellent attendance, and only one business was unable to attend. She said that there was a variety of different thoughts from this group, and some of them wanted to use the group as a conduit to get information to the panel and to VDOT. Ms. Dittmar said

that she felt they got some good feedback as far as potential assistance, and asked fellow Board members if they felt that way.

Ms. Palmer said she'd heard a few new things and felt the meeting was very valuable, and was very impressed with the turnout.

Ms. Dittmar commented that there was an element of fear in the group, and she tried to empathize with the businesses along Rio in addition to using the lens of what this means to Albemarle County. She asked when the insert flyers would be mailed with the utility bills.

Ms. McKeel said that it may be in her mailbox when she gets home.

Ms. Dittmar said that she picked up a flyer that had about 11 bullet points on it, seven of which contained very inaccurate information – so they need to be vigilant in the communications program; two items made the situation seem a lot worse than it really is.

Ms. Palmer said that it's the unknown that concerns people most, and if she owned a business there she would be very actively trying to plan for it and figure out what she was going to do – but she doesn't blame anyone from being concerned about their bottom line during the construction period.

Ms. McKeel asked if Ms. Dittmar had any strategies as to how to address the misinformation.

Ms. Dittmar said she welcomed ideas, but her plan was to go business to business and talk to the owner/managers of this particular business to address some of the bullet points.

Ms. Palmer said that there are always constituents approaching Board members with misconceptions, which they are tasked with correcting, and asked if the information was already on the County's Facebook page.

Ms. Catlin said that they already have the publications as well as links to VDOT on the County's website, and it would be helpful to make the "FAQ" a living document, so if the Board is hearing things that they are frequently having to answer or correct, they should let staff know. She said that Mr. Shucet was doing a good job with the anticipated closure situation with the intersection and the lane access, and staff distributed it to everyone who attended the panel meeting and everyone who came to the open house. Ms. Catlin said that Lou Hatter of VDOT was contacting the media every time an item came out to ensure accurate information was being disseminated, and once they get into the neighborhood conversation phase that will provide a good opportunity to get at some of the issues.

Ms. McKeel noted that VDOT and Mr. Shucet have offered to come to the neighborhood meetings and answer questions, and asked Ms. Dittmar to provide a copy of the flyer she mentioned to Ms. Catlin so that staff can cross-check it with the FAQ. Ms. Catlin said that was a very good suggestion.

Ms. Palmer said that what she hears the most is the rationale for the sequencing, and why they weren't doing the parallel roads.

Ms. McKeel said she is often asked why they aren't addressing Hydraulic before Rio, as Hydraulic is very congested.

Ms. Catlin said that those answers are on the FAQ, but if they don't feel it's adequate staff could adjust it.

Ms. Dittmar said that the answer on Hydraulic on the FAQ page seems sufficient to her, but the sequencing question might need slight enhancement.

Ms. Palmer agreed, stating that Mr. Sheffield had done an excellent job in explaining the regional traffic patterns to her, and she has repeated what he's told her about the interchange at 250 and the Meadowcreek Parkway, etc.

Mr. Sheffield said that the two things he tells people are: there is no sequence, they're actually starting at the same time but some projects are able to finish faster than others; and the parallel road network needed to get around the Rio intersection already exists – and building the extensions only exacerbates the issues at that intersection.

Ms. Mallek said that she always thought that the parallels would be the way around, but if they're up first then it brings a lot more traffic into where you're trying to do the work.

Mr. Sheffield said that the Hillsdale Drive extension is well out of the County's hands – it's all the City's, and there's no timeframe for that as they are still pulling that together. He said that he saw an email a few weeks ago trying to reactivate the old Hillsdale committee, but they were using the same email addresses from years earlier.

Ms. Palmer said that once the Meadow Creek Parkway/Route 250 bypass interchange gets finished, there would be a lot more people coming south on 29 making the left-hand turn there, and if they don't improve that intersection soon, they're going to get tremendous backup.

Mr. Sheffield said that they now have current traffic counts for what's happening, and construction at that intersection won't begin until 2016, which means that when the interchange opens they will see the real-time impacts of that.

Ms. Mallek said that it would be great to find a way to change the conversation away from how awful it's going to be, which has the possibility of becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy if that's all the businesses talk about – but instead say that it's going to be difficult for a few months, but there would be some special things going on that would make the extra time it took to get there worth it. She said that she has been disappointed in the negative tenure of what she's heard thus far, and she hoped they could get through that and make the best of it.

Mr. Sheffield said that this is an opportunity for businesses to make changes to some of the access issues that have bothered them in the past, such as better turning radii for delivery trucks – because once the project starts, they won't be able to change those details.

Ms. Dittmar asked how they might connect the dots on all of that. Ms. Catlin said that there was a conversation that came from their stakeholders meeting on that topic, and one of the people who was most concerned caught up with a VDOT representative afterwards, and they will end up with an improved entrance as part of this. She said that this is what Ms. Stimart was working on, and staff would continue working with VDOT on that also.

Ms. Dittmar asked how soon the window would close for that.

Mr. Sheffield said that they still had about a year to provide input on the design, but it's better to get it sooner rather than later, because getting an idea into an engineering drawing does take time. He stated that the bicycle and pedestrian aspect of this is getting lost in the noise of the project in general, even up in the Hollymead town center area, and he wasn't confident that VDOT was going to provide clarity on that. Mr. Sheffield said that they have an opportunity here to include multi-use bicycle and pedestrian amenities, and he doesn't want it to get lost but isn't sure how to pull it out.

Ms. Dittmar commented that the neighborhoods would be really interested in that.

Mr. Sheffield said they would be interested in it, but how it comes to fruition is another matter, and people looking at the renderings feel frustrated because they don't see any bike lanes.

Ms. Dittmar said that she had attended the land use education program in October, which was co-sponsored by the Virginia Cooperative extension and the office of planning and policy at Virginia Tech, and two experts on the panel were Lee Catlin and Elaine Echols – who were teaching planners from around the state about communications and public engagement.

Agenda Item. No. 25. Peer Market Survey Review.

Ms. Dittmar said that Ms. Palmer had brought up an item early in the year about possible support from interns and others for elected officials to do their jobs more effectively. She said that they spent some time looking at peer localities and what they wanted to ask them, and UVA interns did a first round of calls with Clerks of the Board to ask questions about tech support, mileage, office space, administrative support, postage and email support, web and social media, research, professional development, etc. Ms. Dittmar stated that they were pretty much on par with comparison localities, but one area that was all over the map was compensation for elected officials – with some counties such as Arlington paying the equivalent of a full-time salary; Fauquier, Stafford and Hanover had more compensation than Albemarle but not enough to survive on; and some similar to Albemarle, which pays in the teens; and James City County, which pays about half of that. Ms. Dittmar said that when she was in Scottsville for their founder's day event, all of the past Supervisors minus one were in attendance, and they were kidding her about the amount of time it takes to be a Supervisor – and they told her that only retired people or those with completely flexible jobs should be doing this. She said that with that as the case, that excludes a whole bunch of people from being able to serve and represent a viewpoint on a Board. Ms. Dittmar said that in looking into the counties that pay more, she wants to be certain that they give some scrutiny to this issue for millennials and others who may wish to serve in the future.

Ms. Palmer said that Ms. Dittmar stated this well and she didn't know what else she could add other than the fact that sustainability on the Board is important, and they want a variety of people to be able to serve. She stated that it was very difficult for her to find people who wanted to serve because many of them have to take a significant cut in income depending on what they do for a living, although she felt it was an honor to serve. Ms. Palmer said that she would like to see if there is interest on this Board to increase the salary in order to encourage a variety of people to serve. She said that they have a great Board now, and it's good to have a young person like Mr. Sheffield who works full time but is able to serve. Ms. Palmer emphasized that they all have things they must do and it's very difficult, so it's important for them to look at this. She said that prior to having an outside person look at this, she would like for Mr. Davis to weigh in on the timing needed to increase the salary.

Mr. Davis said that the method where they can raise their salary more than the cost of living is an alternative to what they've done in the past, but what it would require is that in an odd year – one in which half of the Board is running for reelection – prior to July 1, they can adopt an ordinance setting the salary at whatever they deem appropriate, that would be effective January 1 of the following year. Mr. Davis said that half of the Board would have to run for reelection after they've approved a salary increase under

that methodology, so if they were to consider this measure for next year, prior to July 1, 2015 they would adopt a new salary structure that would be effective January 1, 2016.

Ms. Dittmar said that the question is whether they are limiting, because of the way they compensate, groups of people who would be viable to serve on the Board – and it seems that they would run it by local political parties to get their input and other counties to find out why their salaries are what they are.

Mr. Boyd said that this has been discussed many times before and comes up every few years, but the Board has never decided to take this step forward.

Ms. Dittmar said that the difference here would be that they wouldn't be the ones looking at it.

Mr. Boyd said that he wasn't sure the law would allow them to do that.

Ms. Mallek said that what Mr. Davis is saying is if this were decided next year, the three of them running next November would be running on that raise.

Mr. Boyd said that they couldn't say, "I'm not going to run next year, so I'm going to propose that we raise the salaries." Mr. Davis said that it didn't require three people running for reelection, it just requires that there be an election for at least three members of the Board in the election cycle before the raise becomes effective.

Ms. Palmer said that she wasn't suggesting that they raise the level to Loudoun County's at \$50,000 a year, but to consider this as something that could augment someone's regular income so there can be more diversity on the Board. She said that as a citizen, she stood before the Board years ago and asked them to raise their salaries.

Ms. McKeel said that it was important to have a broad representation from the community, and it was very difficult to get people to run for the Board of Supervisors and the School Board – and she would like for any outside analysis to include both boards.

Ms. Mallek said that a \$5,000-\$10,000 difference isn't going to do it, and to address the questions everyone has raised isn't going to happen with a small increase – because without a spouse or other part-time jobs, it's not going to be feasible.

Mr. Boyd suggested that they give this some further thought, and if anyone wants to put it forth as a motion in the future, they can do that.

Mr. Sheffield said that he has no interest in talking about this until they can solve their compensation issues for County and school staff.

Ms. Dittmar said they aren't talking about it for themselves.

Mr. Sheffield said that it is for these positions though, and that rubs him the wrong way.

Ms. Dittmar said that she would like to run it by the political parties, because all she hears from them is that they can't talk people into running – and if they don't have good people serving on the Board, they're going to have a County compensation and budget problem for years to come, with no creative, dynamic or energetic people. She said that boomers were aging, and they were going to see retirees in these positions because they are active and available.

Mr. Sheffield said that was fine, adding that he didn't know until halfway through the election that they even got paid.

Mr. Boyd asked Mr. Davis to see if there was any way to vote in a sizable change in pay for the Board, but not have it impact anybody currently sitting on the Board.

Mr. Davis said that wouldn't be until the entire Board faced reelection.

Ms. McKeel said that there are expectations for new technology for the Board members to use, and when they are oriented it would be helpful to have institutionalized technology – cell phones, laptops, etc.

Mr. Foley said that there were differences among individual Board members as to what they wanted to use.

Agenda Item. No. 26. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Sheffield reported that the Governor's Transportation Conference in Roanoke on November 13 would be covering House Bill 2, and this Board needed to become familiar with the potential outcomes of the bill and how it impacts transportation decisions.

Ms. Mallek said that he could let them know if it was different from the other three times they've heard it, because the state keeps emphasizing that they would be figuring out over the next year how this might work.

Mr. Sheffield said that their approach to the development area could actually benefit the County in terms of how they're positioning themselves for future transportation money.

Ms. Mallek said that this has been the focus for a number of years – allocating funding to get the most bang for the buck.

Ms. Palmer reported that she had attended the solid waste DEQ meeting on the previous Monday and Tuesday, and Ms. Mallek had also attended on Monday. She said that she'd learned a tremendous amount, and would really like to pursue the economic development portion of this and learn more about it to ensure that the new economic development person was aware that this was a potential industry. Ms. Palmer said that she'd received some additional information from a consultant in the field who's worked in the Charlottesville area quite a bit and has worked with the City, having attended a number of Rivanna Solid Waste Authority meetings over the years. She said that he mentioned a number of federal grants that were available for smaller industries that could be developed locally, and she agreed to pass his contact information onto staff. Ms. Palmer said that he had a number of contacts in the state that he would share with them, including a contact in the City of Norfolk who had some ideas.

Ms. Mallek asked if they could recognize Mo Stevens at the Board's November 12 meeting, because she wasn't notified that he wouldn't be recognized until January – and because he was old and frail, she wanted to make sure they got it done.

Ms. Dittmar said that her understanding was that the Natural Heritage Committee had wanted to present that, and suggested that Ms. Mallek work with Travis Morris to get it on the agenda.

Ms. Dittmar stated that in a related matter, there are all of these volunteers on committees who should be recognized – and there are other ideas that counties are implementing that she would like to further explore.

Mr. Sheffield said that he'd be more than happy to show his appreciation with something like cooking pancakes for them.

Ms. Mallek said that she would really like for all of them to participate in County Palooza, and said that it was a great day with a lot of fun activities from individual departments.

Ms. Dittmar said that the Board had received from Clerk Ella Carey a list of all of the commissions, committees and authorities from which they get information, and their charge was to decide how they want to get information from them in the future. Ms. Dittmar said that they would also need to review some of their procedures, to be reaffirmed in January.

Agenda Item. No. 27. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Foley said that he would be providing a comprehensive update to his report on projects and major things underway as a part of their transition into next year, including updates from the committee work with schools and the City. He stated that one of the things he would be adding to his report was the Community Safety Advisory Committee, a cooperative effort with the City and University, and they have identified three primary focus areas: engagement and education, which includes a community outreach and communications subcommittee; prevention and awareness, with the University looking at whether the lighting needs to be improved and the City looking at their neighborhoods in the same regard. He said that there is "prevention through environmental design," which is something planners and police officers have been trained in, and there is also a transportation component to that effort. Mr. Foley said that the final piece was enforcement, with a public safety subcommittee doing a lot of work on that. He stated that he, the police and fire chiefs, and Lee Catlin were involved with that effort. He stated that the University visited the University of Pennsylvania recently to try to learn what they do, with UPA being located in the center of a city, with a much higher crime rate. Mr. Foley said there would be some contact with local neighborhoods before UVA announces any change, and a lot of good progress and good engagement was underway, with the subcommittees reaching out to the community. He stated that the next PAC meeting was on November 21, and there would be an update on the safety committee and their progress.

Mr. Sheffield said that he had a conflict with the PAC meeting because of the US 29 panel meeting, and Mr. Boyd had indicated that it was customary for the Chair or Vice-Chair to step in, and Ms. McKeel would already be there.

Ms. Dittmar said that she would look into who else could attend.

November 5, 2014 (Regular Day Meeting)
(Page 64)

Agenda Item. No. 28. Adjourn.

The Board adjourned their meeting at 9:08 p.m.

Chairman

| |
|-------------------|
| Approved by Board |
| Date: 07/08/2015 |
| Initials: EWJ |