

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on October 7, 2015, at 1:00 p.m., Room 241, Second Floor, 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.

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 1:00 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 County staff members.

Ms. Palmer stated the Ivy MUC transfer station (Item #14) and the Long-Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee (Item #21) items are currently separated on the agenda – one in the afternoon and the other during the evening. She said she would like to switch Item #21 and Item #20 so that the Committee's report is heard before the Water Resources Program discussion.

Ms. Jordan asked if Ms. Palmer also wanted to move the Transportation Planner report (Item #9) to be part of the transportation discussion.

Ms. Mallek said she thought Ms. Palmer had intended to switch items #20 and #21 to after 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Palmer responded that was her intent, but they are also going to put the Transportation Planner quarterly update with Transportation Matters, so that Item #9 will become Item #12C.

Board members agreed with the recommended changes.

Motion was offered by Ms. McKeel to adopt the final agenda as amended. Ms. Palmer **seconded** motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

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

Ms. Mallek stated the International Bicycle Festival in Richmond went very well. The exposure for Richmond and Henrico was spectacular, and she found herself wishing that more had been done in Albemarle, since the teams were training here for 10 days before the races. She said there was active engagement with the bicycling community and they had tried to put forth a public effort regarding ways to share the road with drivers, which had been a great step forward especially in terms of bicyclists moving to the side to let drivers pass.

Ms. Mallek reported she had presented the Charlotte Yancey Humphris Community Service Award to Julia Vranches, Miss Teen Charlottesville. She stated that Charlotte Humphris, former Jack Jouett District Supervisor, had been the first Miss Teen Charlottesville in 1950.

Ms. McKeel thanked Ms. Mallek for filling in for her at the event, since she was out of town.

Agenda Item No. 6. Proclamations and Recognitions:

Item No. 6a. Dan Eggleston as Career Fire Chief of the Year by the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC).

Ms. Dittmar reported that Albemarle County Fire Chief Dan Eggleston had been named Career Fire Chief of the Year by the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC), which represents leadership of firefighters and emergency responders worldwide. She stated their members are the world's leading experts in firefighting, emergency medical services, terrorism response, hazardous material spills, natural disasters, search and rescue, and public safety policy. Ms. Dittmar commented that public safety is something that keeps Supervisors up at night, but they feel assured under the current leadership. She stated that Chief Eggleston has headed the Albemarle County Fire Department for 13 years and has been a fire chief since 1998. Ms. Dittmar said Albemarle County Fire & Rescue serves a population of nearly 105,000 in an area of 720 square miles, with a combination volunteer/career staff of more than 600

personnel. She stated that under Chief Eggleston's leadership, the organization has become a combination system unifying volunteer and paid firefighting functions, and during his tenure the department has reduced response times, enhanced the daytime staffing of volunteer stations, launched an innovative community risk reduction program, invested more than \$25 million in fleet modernization, and reduced the County's public protection classification to a Class Three rating, reflecting improved citizen safety and lowering insurance rates for businesses and homeowners.

Ms. Dittmar quoted Tim Wall, Chair of the Volunteer and Combination Officers section of the IAFC as saying: "Dan is an innovative man who leads with integrity and demonstrated skill in his local, state and national level activities. He has had a significant impact on the fire service through teaching and mentoring others, facilitating associations and departments through difficult national issues, and writing on a number of key topics for the fire service."

Chief Eggleston stated he appreciates the Board's recognition of his award, and expressed his gratitude to his parents, family including his sister and brother-in-law, the best staff a person could hope for, a great boss in Doug Walker, and excellent mentorship from Tom Foley. He said he looks forward to working with everyone in the County to make this the best community they can hope for.

Item No. 6b. Introduction of Chan Gianniny, Chief Deputy Sheriff.

Ms. Mallek stated that Sheriff Chip Harding has promoted Sgt. Chan Giannini to the position of Chief Deputy in the Sheriff's Office. She said that Sgt. Giannini has led the office through an accreditation process this year with a perfect score, achieved by just 1% of the agencies in Virginia, and has also written a number of grants. Ms. Mallek said that before being hired by the Sheriff's Office, Sgt. Giannini had served as the volunteer reserve officer and was very committed to the success of the reserve division, which has 60 sworn officers, the largest in Virginia. She stated that Sgt. Giannini has a B.A. from James Madison University and has been with the department since 2006. Ms. Mallek noted that Sgt. Giannini had been the first female deputy in the history of the Madison County Sheriff's Office, the first female police officer supervisor in Scottsville, and the only female ever promoted to a supervisory position in the Albemarle County Sheriff's Office, which was established in 1745.

Sheriff Chip Harding introduced Sgt. Chan Giannini Bryant, and mentioned that she planned to run for Sheriff in four years.

Sgt. Chan Giannini Bryant addressed the Board and stated that she is honored to be recognized, and stated that she is planning to run for Sheriff in four years but first would complete her duties as Chief Deputy.

Ms. Dittmar stated that while the Sheriff is an elected position by the people, that office plays a significant role in County public safety.

Item No. 6c. Digital Government Award.

Ms. Palmer reported that for the 13th year in a row, Albemarle County has been named among the top ten most technologically advanced county governments of its size in the U.S. by the Center for Digital Government and the National Association of Counties, in their 2015 Digital Counties Survey. She stated that Albemarle ranks seventh in the nation in utilizing information technology to deliver high-quality service to its customers and its citizens in the population category of 150,000 or less, and among the 400 counties that competed in the survey. Ms. Palmer said the annual survey evaluates counties on their ability to demonstrate successful outcomes through the strategic use of technology, and recognize counties using the technology to improve services and boost efficiencies. She stated that successful programs also showed progress over the previous year, utilized innovative solutions, and revealed a commitment to collaboration within and outside of their organization. Ms. Palmer said that Albemarle was recognized for successfully using technology for citizen engagement, policy, data and operations, and providing efficient and effective services to citizens. On behalf of the Board, she thanked Albemarle County employees for their continued dedication to innovation and accessibility, and specifically recognized staff members from the IT department.

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

Mr. Neil Williamson of the Free Enterprise Forum, stated he is before them to present the 2015 Local Government Spending Index (LGSI) report, which is the fourth such report and was compiled using data from the auditor of public accounts reports. He stated the LGSI was designed on the concept of "self-comparison," with spending deduced per capita in an index of 100, and Albemarle County ranks #1, with a 130% increase in spending from 1991 to FY2014, while population increased 52% and school population increased 35%. Mr. Williamson said Albemarle is second in per-capita spending, after Charlottesville, but is #1 when compared to other localities due perhaps to urban requirements.

Mr. Sheffield asked if staff could do some analysis and provide some feedback on the report. Mr. Foley stated they have done so in the past and will again, adding that there are some specific considerations for context such as the addition of a County Fire Department in 1991, as they had reached a tipping point with urbanization. He said in an urbanizing community, the changes are more dramatic because of a population threshold that pushes it into more urban services.

Ms. Mallek stated when she first started using the auditor of accounts yellow book, she did not realize the revenues shown were often supplemented by extra service districts and other income sources that are not reflected in the chart. She asked Mr. Williamson how they take that into account.

Mr. Williamson responded the report reflects all spending, regardless of where the revenue comes from.

Mr. Gary O'Connell addressed the Board and stated he is before them to promote the event, "Imagine a Day without Water," a partnership between the ACSA, RWSA, and the City of Charlottesville to remind residents of the value of water and the investments that have been made in good quality, safe drinking water in the community. He stated the major promotion through early November is a school contest involving all of the school art programs to generate a poster or piece of artwork, with prizes offered for the contest. Mr. O'Connell said there is more information on the ACSA website, and read a resolution proclaiming October 7, 2015 as "Imagine a Day without Water," for proposed Board adoption.

Ms. Mallek **moved** to adopt the proposed resolution for Imagine a Day without Water. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion.

Ms. Dittmar noted the Board does not typically accept motions from the floor.

Mr. O'Connell offered to leave the resolution with the Board for adoption at a later time.

Ms. Mallek said it had been circulated the previous week.

Mr. Davis stated if there is unanimous Board consent, they can move it forward.

Mr. O'Connell apologized, as he thought it had been given to the Board previously.

Ms. Palmer asked if the School Board has already adopted this resolution. Mr. O'Connell responded that he wants to get their support, and has talked to school staff about it.

Ms. Palmer asked if this will be an annual event. Mr. O'Connell responded there is some kind of event every year that focuses on the value of water, with this year having "Imagine a Day without Water" as the theme, and the art contest will probably not be annual.

Ms. Palmer asked that in the future they recognize the importance of clean water in the community's rivers that supply clean water for drinking.

Ms. Dittmar asked if they needed a Board vote to consider the item. Mr. Davis responded if there is no objection, he would construe that to mean unanimous consent of the Board.

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

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

(Note: The adopted resolution is set out below:)

**RESOLUTION PROCLAIMING
IMAGINE A DAY WITHOUT WATER
OCTOBER 7, 2015**

WHEREAS, water is essential for everything we do in life; and

WHEREAS, we need water to make a cup of coffee, fight fires, or consume a glass of water, or even take a bath; and

WHEREAS, most sectors of our economy rely on water, and without water our economy would grind to a halt; and

WHEREAS, while nature provides water, it takes pipes, pumps, treatment plants, and people working 24/7 to deliver clean, safe water to our homes and businesses, and then remove and treat wastewater so it can safely be returned to the environment; and

WHEREAS, water infrastructure is largely invisible, because it is out of sight, and out of the minds of most people, and needs our attention and continuing investment; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby proclaims

**October 7, 2015
as
"Imagine a Day Without Water"**

to help Albemarle County residents and Albemarle County Service Authority customers recognize the value of safe, clean water to our community.

Signed and sealed this 7th day of October 2015.

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

(Discussion: Mr. Boyd stated he needs to pull his minutes of May 6, 2015.

Referring to the appropriations, Mr. Boyd stated there had also been a small return of about \$600, and asked if there was an effort to see if they still need to spend that money. Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of Management and Budget, addressed the Board and asked Mr. Boyd if he is referring to the money to be reappropriated in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Boyd responded that it was for an item already budgeted, but there was nothing to indicate whether the department had come in under budget or over budget. He added that there is no indication as to how an item being reappropriated is reviewed to determine if it is still necessary.

Ms. Allshouse explained that at the end of a fiscal year if funds are not completely spent, staff looks at purchase orders and projects that are not completed, or items that had bills come in after the end of a fiscal year, so things do not necessarily fall cleanly in one year. She stated the second thing they look at is departments that have unspent funds. Budget staff will then have a conversation with the department and with the County Executive's office prior to bringing those items forward to the Board.

Mr. Boyd commented there are items throughout the year that might need reconsideration, as in the case of those that have more budgeted than what is actually needed. Ms. Allshouse said staff encourages those items to drop to fund balance. The Director of Finance will be providing the Board with a detailed report on those items. She emphasized there is a clear review process initiated from her office, forms that need to be filled out, and a lot of conversations with analysts.

Mr. Boyd stated he would also like to discuss Item 8.7 with other transportation items.

Ms. Dittmar suggested that it be renumbered as Item 12d.

Ms. Palmer stated she needs to pull April 1 and April 7 minutes.

Motion was then offered by Ms. Palmer to approve Items 8.1 (as amended) through 8.6, and to pull Item 8.7 (for further discussion), on the consent agenda. Ms. McKeel **seconded** motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Item No. 8.1. Approval of Minutes: December 3 and December 10, 2014; February 23, March 4, March 10, March 11, April 1, April 7, April 8, April 14 and May 6, 2015.

Ms. Dittmar had read the minutes of December 3, 2014, and found them to be in order.

Ms. Mallek had read the minutes of December 10, 2014, pages 42 (begin with Item #42) – end, and found them to be in order.

Ms. Mallek had read the minutes of February 23, 2015, and found them to be in order.

Ms. Mallek had read the minutes of March 4, 2015, and found them to be in order.

Ms. Palmer had read the minutes of March 10, 2015, and found them to be in order.

Mr. Sheffield had read the minutes of March 11, 2015, and found them to be in order.

Ms. Palmer pulled the minutes of April 1, 2015, and carried them forward to the next meeting.

Ms. Palmer pulled the minutes of April 7, 2015, and carried them forward to the next meeting.

Ms. McKeel had read the minutes of April 8, 2015, and found them to be in order.

Ms. McKeel had read the minutes of April 14, 2015, and found them to be in order.

Mr. Boyd pulled the minutes of May 6, 2015, and carried them forward to the next meeting.

Item No. 8.2. FY 2016 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 16 budget due to the appropriation itemized below is \$1,727,000.06. 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:

- One (1) appropriation (#2016026) to appropriate a \$2,500.00 donation to the Department of Parks and Recreation;
- One (1) appropriation (#2016027) to re-appropriate \$134,304.04 for various Capital Improvement Program projects;
- One (1) appropriation (#2016028) to re-appropriate \$768,986.05 for various General Fund, Fire Rescue Services Fund, Bright Stars Fund, Computer Maintenance and Replacement Fund, and School Fund projects;
- One (1) appropriation (#2016029) to re-appropriate \$383,896.59 for various Special Revenue Funds;
- One (1) appropriation (#2016030) to appropriate \$22,679.06 for rental income and expenses related to the Old Crozet Elementary School;
- One (1) appropriation (#2016031) to appropriate \$211,685.00 to the Emergency Communications Center;
- One (1) appropriation (#2016032) to appropriate \$34,474.01 to the School Division;
- One (1) appropriation (#2016033) to appropriate \$168,475.31 to the Acquisition Conservation Easement (ACE) program; and
- One (1) appropriation (#2016034) to appropriate \$30,000.00 from the Compression Reserve to the Human Resources Department. This appropriation does not increase the total County budget.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment B) to approve appropriations #2016026, #2016027, #2016028, #2016029, #2016030, #2016031, #2016032, #2016033, and #2016034 for local government and school division projects and programs as described in Attachment A.

Appropriation #2016026		\$2,500.00
Source:	Donations	\$ 2,500.00

This request is to appropriate a \$2,500.00 donation to the Department of Parks and Recreation to establish a rustic educational amphitheater to support music education in honor of Paul McCartney's June 23, 2015 visit to Charlottesville and Albemarle County. The amphitheater will be located at Mint Springs Park.

Appropriation #2016027		\$134,304.04
Source:	Gen. Govt CIP Fund fund balance	\$134,304.04

This request is to re-appropriate FY 15 funds for the following Capital Program projects:

- Sidewalk Contingency: This request is to re-appropriate the remaining FY 15 balance of \$83,735.54 to support project costs of current sidewalk projects or to support sidewalk projects and improvements that may be necessary to address safety issues.
- Fire Department Contingency: This request is to re-appropriate the remaining FY 15 balance of \$50,568.50 for unplanned apparatus maintenance expenses of the career fire and rescue departments.

Appropriation #2016028		\$768,986.05
Source:	General Fund fund balance	\$ 748,312.58
	State revenue	\$ 15,249.47
	Water Resources Fund fund balance	\$ 5,424.00

Computer Maintenance and Replacement [Please note this request will be appropriated from General Fund fund balance and transferred to the Computer Maintenance and Replacement Fund that was created in the FY16 budget.]

- This request is to re-appropriate the remaining FY15 balance of \$224,637.20 from the General Fund to the Computer Maintenance and Replacement Fund. Based on a review by the Finance Department, the County established this Fund in the FY16 Adopted Budget to increase transparency and to streamline management of the function that was previously treated as a suspense account within the General Fund.

The following requests are to re-appropriate FY15 General Fund fund balance funds to complete projects that were started but not completed in FY15, to provide funding for purchase orders initiated in FY15 but

delivered in FY16, and to move FY15 funding forward to meet ongoing or anticipated expenditures in FY16. These \$544,348.85 in requests are planned to be one-time expenditures.

The proposed use of the General Fund fund balance for the following items will not reduce the County's 10% unassigned fund balance reserve, however, it does reduce the amount of FY 15 expenditure savings that would be available for other uses in the future.

Board of Supervisors

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$7,291.00 in funding remaining in the Agenda Management System Innovation Fund Project to help pay for the first year of maintenance of the new agenda maintenance system.

Finance

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$15,576.00 for replacement furniture for the Accounting Division Office.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$5,000.00 for a replacement copier for the Payroll Division.

Human Resources

- Requests the re-appropriation of the \$4,859.03 balance remaining in tuition reimbursement at the end of FY15 to supplement funding for the employee tuition reimbursement program in FY16.

Voter Registration and Elections

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$16,900 to purchase 100 printers for use with the 100 electronic poll book laptop computers. The printers would be used to create voter check-in tickets which will speed up the process of checking in voters and provide additional security during the check-in process.

Commonwealth's Attorney

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$7,157.00 for furniture needed after the renovation of the Commonwealth's Attorney Office.

Sheriff

- Requests the re-appropriation of the \$617.08 balance remaining in collected fingerprinting fees at the end of FY15 to purchase volunteer reserves' uniforms, equipment, and other miscellaneous expenses. The total balance remaining at the end of FY15 was \$1,217.08. Of that amount, \$600 was re-appropriated in July.
- Requests the re-appropriation of the \$717.46 balance remaining in contributions to support reserve division programs. The total balance remaining at the end of FY15 was \$4,717.46. Of that amount, \$4,000.00 was reappropriated in July.

Police

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$53,038.49 for traffic safety programs from the net revenues and expenditures in prior years related to the PhotoSafe Program. These revenues are intended to only fund traffic safety programs/operations and not general operations;
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$36,000.00 to complete an update of the department's policy manual approved in mid-year FY15;
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$23,134.73 for K-9 and ammunition expenditures planned in FY15 and delivered in FY16; and
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$1,348.82 to complete the mentoring program project awarded in mid-year FY15 from the Innovation Fund.

Fire Rescue System [Please note these requests will be appropriated from General Fund fund balance and transferred to the Fire Rescue Services Fund that was created in the FY16 budget.]

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$50,000.00 for a one-time standards of coverage and staffing analysis study for the Fire Rescue system that will be based on nationally recognized guidelines and criteria, including recognized National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards, Insurance Services Office (ISO) schedules, any federal and state mandates relative to emergency services, and generally accepted practices within emergency services.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$35,000.00 for a temporary pilot program to provide office administrative support to volunteer fire rescue stations through June 30, 2016. This request has been reviewed with and is a priority of the Fire and Emergency Medical Services (FEMS) Board.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$34,778.00 for replacement radios and computers planned in FY15 and delivered in FY16;
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$20,000.00 to develop an updated Strategic Plan for the Fire Rescue system;
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$17,650.00 for one-time equipment and supplies to support temporary staffing for the Prevention Division;
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$13,219.58 to complete the personal protective equipment, fuel, and recruitment video projects awarded in mid-year FY15 from the Innovation Fund;

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$7,500.00 to complete the best practices manual to support administrative volunteers approved in mid-year FY15;
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$6,200.00 for incident commander training; and
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$1,084.22 in donations for the Car Seat Safety program.

General Services

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$38,700.00 to complete the Board of Supervisor video streaming project that began in FY15; and
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$10,560.00 for the Scottsville pumping station appropriated in FY15 and delayed to FY16 due to on-going negotiations with vendors.

Water Resources [Please note this will be appropriated from the Water Resources Fund fund balance as transfer to the General Fund.]

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$5,424.00 for the estimated cost to implement a landscape master plan at the two County office buildings, which began in FY 15.

Social Services [Please note the cost of the following expenditures will be offset by a reimbursement of \$15,249.47 in state revenue.]

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$37,300.00 for LEAD training, process improvement training, and adult protective services staff training;
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$8,863.89 to continue the Outreach team's marketing and communication project for the community;
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$3,825.00 for improvements to the Department's observation room to include camera cabling and installation;
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$3,000.00 to the Bright Stars program for furniture and fixtures of a new classroom. Please note these requests will be appropriated from General Fund fund balance and transferred to the Bright Stars Fund: and
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$842.69 to replace children's furniture in the lobby waiting area

Education [Please note this request will be appropriated from General Fund fund balance and transferred to the School Fund.]

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$8,595.24 for one-time expenses related to Yancey Elementary School to support intergenerational programming.

Parks and Recreation

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$7,000.00 to create a Strategic Plan for the department.

Community Development

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$1,330.00 to complete the paperless plan review pilot project awarded in mid-year FY15 from the Innovation Fund; and
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$1,375.00 to complete a consulting services contract that began in mid-year FY15.

Innovation Fund

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$50,680.62 that was undesignated at the end of FY15. In addition, one innovation fund project is returning \$992 in unspent funding to the Innovation Fund. This brings the total reappropriation to \$51,672.62.

Training Pool

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$8,789.00 in balances remaining at the end of FY15. Of this balance, \$4,578.00 will be distributed to the Department of Voter Registration and Elections to allow two staff members to participate in the Certified Elections/Registration Administrator (CERA) Professional Education Program. The remaining \$4,211.00 will be re-appropriated to the Training Pool for use in FY16.

Appropriation #2016029		\$383,896.59
Source:	Federal Revenue	\$ 6,000.00
	Special Revenue Fund fund balances	\$ 377,896.59

This request is to appropriate and re-appropriate funding associated with Special Revenue Funds, including seized asset accounts, grants and donation funds. The funding requested for re-appropriations was not expended in FY15 and is anticipated to occur in FY16.

- This request is to re-appropriate \$366,812.35 of Seized Asset Monies received from State and Federal Agencies for the Commonwealth's Attorney and the Police Department. These monies will be used to fund office supplies, furniture, equipment, training, and temporary help.
- This request is to re-appropriate \$10,000.00 of the Youth Service Award granted from the Charlottesville Area Community Foundation to the Bright Stars program. The funds will pay for a parenting class program for Bright Stars families.
- This request is to re-appropriate \$6,000.00 of the Virginia Department of Transportation grant funding for continuation of the Lewis & Clark project. This appropriates the awarded Lewis & Clark Exploratory Center Grant balance from the Transportation Enhancement Fund Program administered by VDOT to support the finalization and close-out of the

project. The project is substantially complete and the final reimbursement request to VDOT will be processed once VDOT signs off on the project, which is expected to occur in the next couple of months.

- This request is to re-appropriate \$1,084.24 from a private donation to support the work of the Natural Heritage Committee (NHC). This private donation was originally appropriated in July 1, 2009 and was made to specifically support the work of the NHC. The Chair of the NHC has requested the donated funds be reappropriated so the committee can use the funds to support its mission, which is to maintain and restore the County's native biological diversity and provide a healthy environment for the citizens of Albemarle County.

Appropriation #2016030		\$22,679.06
Source:	Rent	\$ 1,836.36
	Old Crozet E S Fund fund bal.	\$ 20,842.70

This request is to appropriate a total of \$22,679.06 for expenses related to the Old Crozet Elementary School by appropriating (a) \$1,836.36 in additional rental income revenues to provide for operational costs such as preventative maintenance contracts and utilities and (b) \$20,842.70 in unexpended rental revenue that was received in prior years to provide for an anticipated increase in maintenance costs in FY 16. The terms of the recently renewed leases with the Field School of Charlottesville and the Old Crozet School Arts (OCSA) will result in an increase in annual total rent revenues over the amount currently budgeted in FY 16.

Appropriation #2016031		\$211,685.00
Source:	ECC fund balance	\$211,685.00

The Emergency Communication Center (ECC) requests that the County, acting as fiscal agent for the ECC, appropriate \$211,685.00 from ECC fund balance for the following expenditures:

- \$165,000.00 to update the ECC's regional oblique mapping imagery for the region. A regional procurement will also allow other County, City of Charlottesville, and University of Virginia departments (e.g. Finance, Assessor, Treasurer, Information Technology) to access to this product for their use, in addition to public safety departments.
- \$35,000.00 to replace the current outdated community notification system with a new hosted system for the region;
- \$6,632.50 to replace and upgrade components of the ECC's Uninterruptible power supply system pursuant to manufacturer recommendations;
- \$2,552.50 to re-appropriate the ECC's share of costs to complete a public safety diversity/recruitment video project awarded in mid-year FY15 from the Innovation Fund; and
- \$2,500.00 for the replacement of handheld unit batteries for the 800 MHz regional radio cache, which is maintained by the ECC.

Appropriation #2016032		\$34,474.01
Source:	Federal Revenue	\$ 34,474.01

This request is to appropriate the School Division's appropriation request approved by the School Board on August 27, 2015:

- Mary Carr Greer Elementary has been awarded an USDA Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program (FFVP) grant in the amount of \$34,474.01 for FY16. The FFVP is a federally assisted program providing free fresh fruits and vegetables to students in participating schools during the school day, outside of breakfast and lunch. The goal is to improve children's overall diet and create healthier eating habits to impact their present and future health. Schools are awarded the FFVP grant through an application process and consideration of the percentage of free and reduced meals student population. The FFVP grant will be used to serve to Greer students through the Child Nutrition Program with an emphasis on local produce.

Appropriation #2016033		\$168,475.31
Source:	CIP Gen. Gov't Fund fund Bal.	\$168,475.31

This request is to appropriate a total of \$168,475.31 in fund balance of state revenues received in late FY 15 to support the Acquisition of Conservation Easements (ACE) program. The state revenue is a reimbursement from the Virginia Department of Agriculture Consumer Services (VDACS) of the Office of Farmland Preservation for fifty percent of the cost incurred for the purchase of agricultural conservation easements, including the cost of obtaining the appraisals and title insurance. The revenue received is for two ACE easements; \$130,612.81 for the purchase of the Stargell property and \$37,862.50 for the purchase of the Woodson property.

Appropriation #2016034		\$0.00
This appropriation does not increase the total County Budget.		
Source:	Compression Reserve	\$ 30,000.00

This request is to appropriate \$30,000.00 in funding from the Compression Reserve to the Human Resources Department to fund a Compression Study. The reserve is established to address Local

Government salary compression issues. Compression occurs when there is only a small difference in pay between new and existing employees in the same job, regardless of their skills or experience.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution to approve appropriations #2016026, #2016027, #2016028, #2016029, #2016030, #2016031, #2016032, #2016033, and #2016034 for local government and school division projects and programs:

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
ADDITIONAL FY 16 APPROPRIATIONS**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors:

- 1) That Appropriations #2016026, #2016027, #2016028, #2016029, #2016030, #2016031, #2016032, #2016033, and #2016034 are approved; and
- 2) That the appropriations referenced in Paragraph #1, above, are subject to the provisions set forth in the Annual Resolution of Appropriations of the County of Albemarle for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2016.

**COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
APPROPRIATION SUMMARY**

APP#	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
2016026	3-1000-18100-318100-181109-1001	2500.00	SA2016026 Parks donation
2016026	4-1000-71012-471010-600700-1007	2500.00	SA2016026 Donation - construction materials
2016027	3-9010-51000-351000-510100-9999	134304.04	SA2016027 FY 15 CIP Re-appropriations
2016027	4-9010-32010-432010-999999-3140	50568.5	SA2016027 Fire Department Contingency
2016027	4-9010-41350-441200-999999-9999	83735.54	SA2016027 Sidewalk Contingency
2016028	3-1000-33000-333000-330020-1005	15249.47	SA2016028 Re-app: State Revenue for DSS
2016028	3-1000-51000-351000-512050-9999	5424	SA2016028 Re-app: Tr. From WRF for COBs Landscaping Master Plan
2016028	3-1000-51000-351000-510100-9999	748312.575	SA2016028 App Fund Balance
2016028	4-1000-12143-412140-800201-1001	15576	SA2016028 Replacement Furniture
2016028	4-1000-12147-412140-800100-1001	5000	SA2016028 Replacement copier
2016028	4-1000-12031-412030-382000-1001	4859.03	SA2016028 Tuition reimbursement
2016028	4-1000-22010-422010-800200-1002	7157	SA2016028 Furniture for renovation
2016028	4-1000-11010-411010-332100-1001	7291	SA2016028 Granicus maintenance
2016028	4-1000-99900-499000-999984-9999	4211	SA2016028 Training Pool Reappropriation
2016028	4-1000-99900-499000-999978-9999	51672.62	SA2016028 Innovation Fund Reappropriation
2016028	4-1000-13020-413020-550100-1001	4578	SA2016028 Training Pool Distribution
2016028	4-1000-21070-421070-301230-1002	717.46	SA2016028 Contributions reappropriation
2016028	4-1000-21070-421070-301235-1002	617.08	SA2016028 Fingerprinting reappropriation
2016028	4-1000-13020-413020-800700-1001	16900	SA2016028 Electronic pollbook printers
2016028	4-1000-31013-431010-310000-1003	36000	SA2016028 Policy Review Consultant
2016028	4-1000-31013-431010-550100-9980	1000	SA2016028 Innovation Funding - Mentoring Team
2016028	4-1000-31013-431010-600000-9980	20.32	SA2016028 Innovation Funding - Mentoring Team
2016028	4-1000-31013-431010-600200-9980	28.5	SA2016028 Innovation Funding - Mentoring Team
2016028	4-1000-31013-431010-601100-9980	300	SA2016028 Innovation Funding - Mentoring Team
2016028	4-1000-31013-431010-601011-1003	8134.73	SA2016028 Undelivered FY15 PO - ammunition
2016028	4-1000-31013-431010-690010-1003	53038.485	SA2016028 Photosafe Program
2016028	4-1000-31013-431010-800100-1003	15000	SA2016028 K9
2016028	4-1000-43202-443200-312210-1004	38700	SA2016028 Re-app: BOS video streaming
2016028	4-1000-43202-443200-332106-1004	10560	SA2016028 Re-app: pumping station.
2016028	4-1000-43205-482040-301210-1004	5424	SA2016028 Re-app: COBs Landscaping Master Plan
2016028	4-1000-53010-453010-550100-1005	37300	SA2016028 Training
2016028	4-1000-53010-453010-800200-1005	4667.69	SA2016028 Lobby children furniture repl and observ room
2016028	4-1000-53010-453010-600100-1005	7363.89	SA2016028 Outreach Team Funding
2016028	4-1000-53010-453010-800700-1005	1500	SA2016028 Outreach Team Funding
2016028	4-1000-71011-471010-392000-1007	7000	SA2016028 Parks and Rec: Strategic Plan Facilitation
2016028	4-1000-81021-481020-312700-1008	1375	SA2016028 consulting services
2016028	4-1000-81021-481020-800700-9980	300	SA2016028 Innovation fund - additional equipment
2016028	4-1000-81021-481020-800710-9980	1030	SA2016028 Innovation fund - additional software
2016028	4-1000-32015-432010-930050-1003	185431.8	SA2016028 Reapp Transfer to FR Fund
2016028	4-1000-53010-453010-930208-1005	3000	SA2016028 Reapp Tranfer to BS Fund
2016028	4-1000-93010-493010-939999-9999	224637.2	SA2016028 Reapp from Comp. Maint. Suspense Acct
2016028	4-1000-93010-493010-930014-9999	8595.24	SA2016028 Re-app: Yancey transfer to Schools
2016028	3-1553-51000-351000-512004-9999	3000	SA2016028 Transfer to Bright Stars
2016028	4-1553-51156-453010-800200-1005	3000	SA2016028 Re-app: Furniture & Fixtures - new Cale classroom
2016028	4-1650-99900-499000-999999-9999	5424	SA2016028 Re-app: COBs Landscaping Master Plan
2016028	3-1650-51000-351000-510100-9999	5424	SA2016028 Re-app: COBs Landscaping Master Plan
2016028	3-1805-51000-351000-512004-9999	185431.8	SA2016028 Transfer from GF
2016028	4-1805-32012-432010-800502-1003	7024.28	SA2016028 Re-app: Replacement radios
2016028	4-1805-32015-432010-360000-9980	5000	SA2016028 Re-app: Recruitment project Innovation Fund
2016028	4-1805-32015-432010-561415-1001	1084.22	SA2016028 Re-app - car seat program donations
2016028	4-1805-32015-432010-800100-9980	8219.58	SA2016028 Re-app: Fuel and PPE Repair Innovation Fund projects
2016028	4-1805-32016-432010-392000-1003	7500	SA2016028 Re-app: Treasurer's manual
2016028	4-1805-32015-432010-392000-1003	50000	SA2016028 Re-app: Standards of coverage/staffing analysis
2016028	4-1805-32011-432010-392000-1003	20000	SA2016028 Re-app: Strategic Plan
2016028	4-1805-32011-432010-130000-1003	24500	SA2016028 Re-app: Volunteer Temp OAs
2016028	4-1805-32011-432010-210000-1003	1850	SA2016028 Re-app: Volunteer Temp OAs
2016028	4-1805-32011-432010-550104-1003	2500	SA2016028 Re-app: Volunteer Temp OAs

2016028	4-1805-32011-432010-550100-1003	350	SA2016028 Re-app: Volunteer Temp OAs
2016028	4-1805-32011-432010-600100-1003	200	SA2016028 Re-app: Volunteer Temp OAs
2016028	4-1805-32011-432010-520300-1003	850	SA2016028 Re-app: Volunteer Temp OAs
2016028	4-1805-32011-432010-601100-1003	200	SA2016028 Re-app: Volunteer Temp OAs
2016028	4-1805-32011-432010-360000-1003	100	SA2016028 Re-app: Volunteer Temp OAs
2016028	4-1805-32011-432010-800200-1003	1700	SA2016028 Re-app: Volunteer Temp OAs
2016028	4-1805-32011-432010-800700-1003	2750	SA2016028 Re-app: Volunteer Temp OAs
2016028	4-1805-32013-432010-800502-1003	13500	SA2016028 Prevention - temp equipment
2016028	4-1805-32013-432010-550104-1003	3500	SA2016028 Prevention - temp mileage
2016028	4-1805-32015-432010-600900-1003	650	SA2016028 Prevention - vehicle r&m
2016028	4-1805-32012-432010-550100-1003	6200	SA2016028 Re-app: Blue Card Training Pilot
2016028	4-1805-32015-432010-800700-1003	27753.72	SA2016028 Re-app: Toughbooks this order came out of the IT Suspense Account for Fire Rescue (FY 15 code - 4-1000-91040-491040-980079-9999)
2016028	4-1935-12200-412200-800700-1001	224637.2	SA2016028 Reapp from Comp. Maint. Suspense Acct
2016028	3-1935-51000-351000-512004-9999	224637.2	SA2016028 Reapp from Comp. Maint. Suspense Acct
2016028	3-3104-62000-351000-512004-6999	8595.24	SA2016028 Re-app: Transfer from GF
2016028	4-3104-63104-460213-132100-6113	7984	SA2016028 Re-app: Yancey
2016028	4-3104-63104-460213-210000-6113	611.24	SA2016028 Re-app: Yancey
2016029	3-8407-51000-351000-510100-9999	1084.24	SA2016029 App fund balance
2016029	4-8407-79000-479000-568755-9999	1084.24	SA2016029 National Heritage Committee private donation
2016029	3-1234-51000-351000-510100-9999	55785.58	SA2016029 Appropriation - Fund Balance
2016029	4-1234-22010-422010-320000-1002	25785.58	SA2016029 Temp. Help
2016029	4-1234-22010-422010-550100-1002	7000.00	SA2016029 Travel/Training
2016029	4-1234-22010-422010-600100-1002	3000.00	SA2016029 Office Supplies
2016029	4-1234-22010-422010-800200-1002	5000.00	SA2016029 Furniture
2016029	4-1234-22010-422010-800700-1002	15000.00	SA2016029 Technology Equipment
2016029	3-1235-51000-351000-510100-9999	3108.82	SA2016029 Appropriation - Fund Balance
2016029	4-1235-39000-439000-580905-1003	3108.82	SA2016029 State Drug Seizures
2016029	3-1236-51000-351000-510100-9999	38726.75	SA2016029 Appropriation - Fund Balance
2016029	4-1236-39000-439000-580905-1003	38726.75	SA2016029 State Drug Seizures
2016029	3-1237-51000-351000-510100-9999	13531.80	SA2016029 Appropriation - Fund Balance
2016029	4-1237-39000-439000-580902-1003	13531.80	SA2016029 Machinery & Equipment
2016029	3-1238-51000-351000-510100-9999	20780.50	SA2016029 Appropriation - Fund Balance
2016029	4-1238-31013-431010-800100-1003	20780.50	SA2016029 Machinery & Equipment
2016029	3-1244-51000-351000-510100-9999	234878.90	SA2016029 Appropriation - Fund Balance
2016029	4-1244-31013-431010-550100-1003	79779.00	SA2016029 Travel/Training
2016029	4-1244-31013-431010-800125-1003	155099.90	SA2016029 Firearms & Equipment
2016029	3-1553-51000-351000-510100-9999	10000.00	SA2016029 Reapp fund balance CACF Grant
2016029	4-1553-51154-453010-280200-1005	5500.00	SA2016029 Honorarium
2016029	4-1553-51154-453010-360000-1005	100.00	SA2016029 Advertising
2016029	4-1553-51154-453010-571110-1005	1000.00	SA2016029 Child Care
2016029	4-1553-51154-453010-600200-1005	2500.00	SA2016029 Food Supplies
2016029	4-1553-51154-453010-601200-1005	500.00	SA2016029 Books & Subscriptions
2016029	4-1553-51154-453010-601305-1005	400.00	SA2016029 Instructional Supplies
2016029	3-1592-33030-333000-330036-1007	6000.00	SA2016029 Federal Revenue -VDOT
2016029	4-1592-72055-472030-568915-1007	6000.00	SA2016029 Lewis & Clark Exploratory Center
2016031	3-4100-51000-351000-510100-9999	211685	SA2016031 App fund balance
2016031	4-4100-31040-435600-312210-1003	200000	SA2016031 ECC October appropriation
2016031	4-4100-31040-435600-360000-1003	2552.5	SA2016031 ECC Innovation Fund Project - Oct Appropriation
2016031	4-4100-31040-435600-800700-1003	9132.5	SA2016031 ECC October appropriation
2016032	3-3010-63010-333000-330001-6599	34474.01	SA2016032 FFVP Grant Revenue
2016032	4-3010-63010-460204-129300-6520	3447.41	SA2016032 OT Wages - Food Services
2016032	4-3010-63010-460204-210000-6520	263.73	SA2016032 FICA
2016032	4-3010-63010-460204-600200-6520	1000	SA2016032 Food Supplies
2016032	4-3010-63010-460204-600220-6520	26315.46	SA2016032 Student Snacks/Meals
2016032	4-3010-63010-460204-800100-6520	3447.41	SA2016032 Machinery/Equipment - ADDL
2016033	3-9010-51000-351000-510100-9999	168475.31	SA2016033 FY 15 ACE
2016033	4-9010-81010-481020-580409-1240	168475.31	SA2016033 FY 15 ACE
2016034	4-2000-62420-462140-312700-6501	30000	SA2016034 Compression Study
2016034	3-2000-62000-319000-190250-6599	30000	SA2016034 Compression Study
2016034	4-1000-99900-499000-999950-9999	-30000	SA2016034 Compression Study
2016034	4-1000-12030-412030-390057-1001	30000	SA2016034 Compression Study
TOTAL		4,322,818.47	

Item No. 8.3. FY 2015 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 \$2,234.36. A budget amendment public hearing is not required because the amount of the cumulative appropriations does not exceed one percent of the currently adopted budget.

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

- One (1) appropriation (#2015114) to appropriate \$2,241.00 from the Reserve for Contingencies to the Volunteer Fire Rescue Tax Credit program and Refunds. This will not increase the total County budget; and

- One (1) appropriation (#2015115) to appropriate \$2,234.36 to reconcile Special Revenue Funds that are no longer active in preparation for the FY15 audit.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment B) to approve appropriation #2015114 and #2015115 as described in Attachment A.

Appropriation #2015114 **\$0.00**
This appropriation will not increase the County Budget.

Source: Reserve for Contingencies \$ 2,241.00

This request is to appropriate \$2,241.00 from the Reserve for Contingencies to the following appropriation categories:

- \$1,581.00 donation from the County to the Volunteer Fire Rescue Tax Credit program, which exceeded the current appropriated budget for this category by 1.3% (Note: funding from the county in support of the Volunteer Fire Rescue Tax Credit program is technically considered a "donation"); and
- \$660.00 to Refunds account. Expenditures exceeded the current appropriated budget for this category by 0.2%

After this appropriation, the FY 15 Reserve for Contingencies balance is \$20,617.60.

Appropriation #2015115 **\$2,234.36**
Source: Special Revenue Fund Balances \$ 2,234.36

This request is to appropriate \$2,234.36 from Special Revenue Funds' balances that are no longer active in order to reconcile these funds in preparation for the FY15 audit.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution to approve appropriations #2015114, and #2015115:

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
ADDITIONAL FY 15 APPROPRIATIONS**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors:

- 1) That Appropriations #2015114 and #2015115 are approved; and
- 2) That the appropriations referenced in Paragraph #1, above, are subject to the provisions set forth in the Annual Resolution of Appropriations of the County of Albemarle for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2015.

**COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
APPROPRIATION SUMMARY**

APP#	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
2015114	4-1000-39000-439000-561405-1003	1581.00	SA2015114 Vol Tax Credit
2015114	4-1000-92010-492010-580301-9999	660.00	SA2015114 Refunds
2015114	4-1000-99900-499000-999990-9999	-2241.00	SA2015114 Reserve for Contingencies
2015115	3-1410-51000-351000-510100-9999	140.19	SA2015115 Special Revenue Reconciliation
2015115	4-1410-82050-482030-580419-1008	140.19	SA2015115 Special Revenue Reconciliation
2015115	3-1579-51000-351000-510100-9999	48.09	SA2015115 Special Revenue Reconciliation
2015115	4-1579-53320-453010-571020-1005	48.09	SA2015115 Special Revenue Reconciliation
2015115	3-4101-51000-351000-510100-9999	2046.08	SA2015115 Special Revenue Reconciliation
2015115	4-4101-81017-435600-580000-1003	2046.08	SA2015115 Special Revenue Reconciliation
TOTAL		4,468.72	

Item No. 8.4. Recommended FY 15 ACE Easement Purchases.

The executive summary states that on April 1, 2015, the Board approved the Acquisition of Conservation Easement (ACE) Committee's recommendation to have the three highest-ranked properties from the FY 2015 applicant pool appraised. Easements on the Sweeney, Clark, and Dollard properties were appraised (see Attachment A). Based on estimated easement values for these properties, the ACE Committee believed that the ACE Program fund balance would be sufficient 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.

The Board of Supervisors determines which easements are to be purchased in the ACE Program. County Code § A.1-111(A) provides in part: "From the list of applications received under section A.1-110(D), the board of supervisors shall designate the initial pool of parcels identified for conservation easements to be purchased. The size of the pool shall be based upon the funds available for easement purchases in the current fiscal year and the purchase price of each conservation easement in the pool established under section A.1-111(B)." Because it is possible that not every invited applicant will submit

an offer to sell, if one or more applicants were to drop out of the pool, other applicants would be substituted until the eligible applicants or available funding were exhausted.

After three new easements were acquired last spring, the County has now acquired easements on 44 properties and protected 8,508 acres and other open space resources. The County's investment has been at a 26% discount below full easement value because of grants, donations, and adjusted values from the income grid.

Currently, the County has \$730,153.61 in multi-year rollover funds from FY2015, plus another \$168,475.31 in revenue received in late June 2015 from the Office of Farmland Preservation, as partial reimbursement for the earlier purchase of the Stargell and Woodson easements. In addition, \$242,948.47 in unused grant funds from the Office of Farmland Preservation (OFP) must be used within two years of the award date. The OFP holds these funds in a restricted account until the County submits a Reimbursement Claim Form for 50% of the total acquisition costs. Because staff expects to expend the remaining balance of these funds with the acquisition of the Sweeney easement, the total funds available for easement acquisitions in this class is **\$1,141,577.30**. Acquisition of the higher ranked Sweeney and Clark easements (at a total of \$985,000) would leave a balance of \$156,577 to acquire the Dollard easement, which is only 35% of that easement's full value. Though staff is uncertain whether the owner of the Dollard property would accept an offer for much less than the full easement value, the County currently has no additional ACE funds available if the Sweeney and Clark property owners offer to sell those higher-ranked easements.

These conservation easements would be purchased 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) Authorize staff to invite the owners of the Sweeney and Clark and Dollard properties to make written offers to sell conservation easements to the County for no more than
 - \$713,000 for the Sweeney easement,
 - \$285,000 for the Clark easement, and
 - Any available ACE funds remaining thereafter (up to \$488,000) for the Dollard easement;
- 1) Accept offers from any of these owners to sell conservation easements for no more than the above amounts; and
- 2) Authorize the County Executive to sign on behalf of the County the Deeds of Easement and related forms for any or all of these three easements once such documents are approved by the County Attorney.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board took the following actions as recommended by staff:

- 1) **Authorize staff to invite the owners of the Sweeney and Clark and Dollard properties to make written offers to sell conservation easements to the County for no more than**
 - **\$713,000 for the Sweeney easement,**
 - **\$285,000 for the Clark easement, and**
 - **Any available ACE funds remaining thereafter (up to \$488,000) for the Dollard easement;**
- 1) **Accept offers from any of these owners to sell conservation easements for no more than the above amounts; and**
- 2) **Authorize the County Executive to sign on behalf of the County the Deeds of Easement and related forms for any or all of these three easements once such documents are approved by the County Attorney.**

Item No. 8.5. ZMA-2004-00024 Special Exception to Vary Old Trail Village Code of Development (*White Hall Magisterial District*).

The executive summary states that a zoning map amendment was approved for Old Trail Village on September 14, 2005 that rezoned the property from Rural Areas, R-1, and R-6 to Neighborhood Model District, inclusive of an Application Plan and Code of Development. An application for a site plan is now under review for this property (SDP 2015-00035). Twenty-seven (27) variations to the Application Plan and/or Code of Development have previously been granted. The Applicant has requested four special exceptions for Block 27: to reduce lot sizes, to increase building height, to reduce setbacks and to allow architectural features such as overhangs/eaves to encroach up to one foot into the required setback. All of these variations are necessary before the site plan can be approved by staff.

County Code § 18-8.5.5.3 allows special exceptions to vary approved Application Plans and Codes of Development upon considering whether the proposed variation: (1) is consistent with the goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan; (2) does not increase the approved development density or intensity of development; (3) does not adversely affect the timing and phasing of development of any other development in the zoning district; (4) does not require a special use permit; and (5) is in general accord with the purpose and intent of the approved application. County Code § 18-33.5(a)(1) requires that any request for a variation be considered and acted upon by the Board of Supervisors as a special

exception. Staff opinion is that the four requested variations meet the five criteria listed. A detailed analysis is provided in the Staff Report (Attachment A).

There is no budget impact.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment D) approving the special exception to permit the requested variations for Block 27, as described in the attached staff report.

By the above-recorded vote the Board adopted the following Resolution approving the special exception to permit the requested variations for Block 27, as described in the staff report:

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE SPECIAL EXCEPTION
FOR ZMA 2004-00024, OLD TRAIL VILLAGE**

WHEREAS, March Mountain Properties, LLC ("March Mountain") is the owner of Tax Map and Parcel Number 055E0-01-00-000A1 (the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, March Mountain filed an application to vary the Code of Development approved in conjunction with ZMA 2004-00024, Old Trail Village (the "Code of Development"):

- to permit lot sizes below 4,000 square feet in Block 27;
- to permit a building height above the maximum 2.5 stories in Block 27;
- to reduce the minimum setbacks in Block 27; and
- to allow roof overhangs and eaves to encroach the building setback in Block 27.

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 A thereto, and all of the factors relevant to the special exception in Albemarle County Code §§ 18-8.5.5.3(c) and 18-33.9, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves the special exceptions to vary the Code of Development as set forth hereinabove, subject to the conditions attached

ZMA 2004-24, Old Trail Village Special Exception Conditions

1. No lot size for a single family attached unit in Block 27 shall be less than one thousand, five hundred (1,500) square feet.
2. No building height in Block 27 shall be greater than 3.5 stories.
3. Lots 1-9 in Block 27 shall have minimum five (5) foot front, side, and rear setbacks.
4. Lots 10-25 in Block 27 shall have minimum five (5) foot front, zero (0) foot side, and five (5) foot rear setbacks.
5. Roof overhangs and eaves in Block 27 may project up to one (1) foot into the building setback.

Item No. 8.6. Resolution to accept road(s) in Old Tail Village Block 29A & 35A Subdivision into the State Secondary System of Highways (White Hall Magisterial District).

At the request of the County Engineer, and by the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution:

The Board of County Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, in regular meeting on the 7th day of October 2015, adopted the following resolution:

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the street(s) in **Old Trail Village Block 29A and Block 35A**, as described on the attached Additions Form AM-4.3 dated **October 7, 2015**, fully incorporated herein by reference, is shown on plats recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Albemarle County, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation has advised the Board that the street(s) meet the requirements established by the Subdivision Street Requirements of the Virginia Department of Transportation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Albemarle Board of County Supervisors requests the Virginia Department of Transportation to add the street(s) in **Old Trail Village Block 29A and Block 35A**, as described on the attached Additions Form AM-4.3 dated **October 7, 2015**, to the secondary system of state highways, pursuant to §33.2-705, Code of Virginia, and the Department's Subdivision Street Requirements; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board guarantees a clear and unrestricted right-of-way, as described, exclusive of any necessary easements for cuts, fills and drainage as described on the recorded plats; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

* * * * *

The road(s) described on Additions Form AM-4.3 is:

- 1) **Golf View Drive (State Route 1835)** from Route 1816 (Golf Drive) to .364 miles north, as shown on plat recorded in the office the Clerk of Circuit Court of Albemarle County in Deed Book 3442, pages 188-194, for a length of 0.36 miles.

Total Mileage – 0.36

Item No. 8.7. FY17 VDOT Revenue Sharing Program Participation, **was received for information.**

(Note: At the request of Mr. Boyd, this item was moved to the regular agenda as Agenda Item 12d for discussion.)

Item No. 8.8. 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.

The attached Grants Report provides a brief description of one grant application made during the time period of August 15, 2015 through September 18, 2015.

This report also includes a comprehensive look at potential Five Year Financial Plan implications if projects and/or programs that are supported by grants are continued with local funding after the grants end. As grant funding ends, recommendations will be included in the County Executive’s proposed annual budgets for the Board’s consideration as to whether local funding should be used to continue those projects and programs. No County funds will be used to fund the continuation of those projects and programs without Board approval.

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

GRANT REPORT ACTIVITY – August 15, 2015 through September 18, 2015

Granting Entity	Grant	Type	Amount Requested	Match Required	Match Source	Department	Purpose
Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment	Urban Development Planning Grant	State	\$65,000 in consultant services	None	None	Community Development	This grant would fund planning consultant assistance for the Small Area Plan originally recommended in the Places29 Master Plan and approved by the Board of Supervisors on June 3, 2015 as a priority objective in the County's FY 15-17 Strategic Plan.*

*If this grant is awarded, County funding currently budgeted in the Capital program for this activity could be used to supplement the consultant services provided under the grant.

Awards were received for the following grants:

No awards were received during this time period.

Item No. 8.9. Biannual Update on FY 15-17 Strategic Plan, **was received for information.**

The executive summary states that the Board of Supervisors has formally engaged in the County’s strategic planning efforts since 2001. The Board provided direction and guidance for the development of the FY15-17 Strategic Plan during a retreat held on June 10, 2014. After additional discussion at subsequent Board meetings, the Board gave final approval of eight goals and associated Year One Priorities at its October 1, 2014 meeting.

The objectives and strategies of the FY15-17 Strategic Plan are being tracked and managed on a regular basis. Reports are provided to the Board on a monthly basis through the County Executive’s Monthly Report, with comprehensive updates presented biannually at a Board meeting. Because the Board has already discussed the strategic plan at several recent meetings, this biannual update is being presented on the consent agenda rather than the regular agenda.

Attachment A highlights the progress that has been made during the first 15 months of the FY15-17 Strategic Plan. As new strategic issues associated with the existing Strategic Plan are identified, staff will bring them to the Board’s attention for discussion.

The Strategic Plan provides direction for the County’s Five-Year Financial Plan and annual budget processes.

This report is being provided for information only.

FY15-17 Strategic Plan Progress Report (as of September 2015)

Goal 1: Citizen Engagement:

Successfully engage citizens so that local government reflects their values and aspirations

- A. *Objective:* By June 2015, increase opportunities for meaningful citizen engagement.

Strategies and Actions

- ✓ Restructured County Executive's Office to improve support for elected official meetings with constituents and coordination of ombudsman activities.
- ✓ Developed and implemented a plan to support Five Year Financial Plan and budget town hall meetings.
- ✓ Conducted a work session on community engagement/communication strategies and solicited input at December 10, 2014 Board meeting.
- ✓ Implemented new Granicus agenda management system in June 2015.
- Engagement plans are being developed for the Pantops fire rescue station and the courts project.

- B. *Objective:* Establish and implement protocols, resources, and technologies that reach and respond to citizens from diverse circumstances.

Strategies and Actions

- Video streaming of regular Board of Supervisors meetings that are held in the Lane Auditorium was approved, equipment installation is underway and launch is scheduled for October 2015.
- Geographic Data Systems staff is working with the existing GIS system to develop a citizen's portal that will make it possible for outside users to interact more easily and more in-depth with the County's GIS data.

- C. *Objective:* Create and implement initiatives that strengthen community leadership capacity.

Strategies and Actions

- ✓ Neighborhood Leadership Summit held in May 2015.
- ✓ Places 29 Council has been reconstituted as three sub councils focused on specific geographical areas, orientation for the new sub councils is being scheduled.
- ✓ New Council – 5th and Avon – has been appointed to represent the southern urban neighborhoods now that that area's master plan has been adopted, orientation is being scheduled.
- Support is being provided to the Board's Citizens Resource Advisory Committee that was charged to review the funding challenges for the Five-year Financial Plan and present a final report to the Board in November 2015.
- Ongoing support is being provided to the Solid Waste and Water Funding citizen committees as they are both engaged in extensive community engagement/outreach efforts.
- Neighborhood Leadership Learning Series scheduled for October 2015.

Goal 2: Critical Infrastructure:

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

- A. *Objective:* By June 2015, establish and implement a 3-5 year plan for the use of the Ivy Material Utilization Center as a waste handling and recycling facility.

Strategies and Actions

- A presentation on Ivy MUC Transfer Station alternatives is scheduled for the October 7, 2015 Board meeting.

- B. *Objective:* By October 2015, establish a long-term solid waste plan, with an emphasis on reducing, reusing, and recycling.

Strategies and Actions

- ✓ On August 5, 2015, the Long Range Solid Waste Committee presented a draft of its final report to the Board to determine a solution for meeting the County's long range solid waste disposal needs, to include recycling.
- The Long Range Solid Waste Final Report is scheduled for the Oct 7, 2015 Board meeting.

- C. *Objective:* By June 2015, establish direction and begin the design process to meet the long-term needs of the Circuit and General District Court operations.

Strategies and Actions

- A courts update is scheduled for the October 7, 2015 Board meeting. At this time, City Council and the Board of Supervisors have tentatively agreed to issue an RFP for design services—this will be confirmed in November.

- D. *Objective:* Develop differentiated funding strategies for core vs. enhanced (e.g., quality of life projects like parks, etc.) projects.

Strategies and Actions

- An update from the Citizen Resource Advisory Committee, which will include possible strategies and actions associated with this objective, is scheduled for the November 4, 2015 Board meeting.

E. *Objective:* Establish and implement strategic direction, including appropriate public engagement, for the following community needs:

- Broadband
- Urban infrastructure
- School space (e.g., preschool, school capacity, modernization of facilities)

Strategies and Actions

- The County has applied for a grant and the Board has committed funding to complete a Community Connectivity Plan for broadband expansion.
- Strategies and actions for urban infrastructure are in part dependent on September 2015 Board retreat and October 2015 CDD work program adoption.
- On June 3, 2015, the Board of Supervisors appropriated funds for the initial phase of school modernization pursuant to the adopted FY 16 CIP Budget. This fall, the School Board will submit a plan for subsequent phases of modernization.

Goal 3: Development Areas:

Attract quality employment, commercial, and high density residential uses into development areas by providing services and infrastructure that encourage redevelopment and private investment while protecting the quality of neighborhoods

A. *Objective:* By June 2015, complete Comprehensive Plan Review and adoption.

Strategies and Actions

- ✓ Comprehensive Plan was adopted at the June 10, 2015 Board meeting.

B. *Objective:* Adopt a work plan and schedule for implementation of Comprehensive Plan strategies related to the Development Areas.

Strategies and Actions

- Pending September 2015 Board retreat and October 2015 CDD work program adoption.

C. *Objective:* Work towards creation of midtown district by completing updated Places 29 Master Plan including Rio/Rt. 29 Small Area Plan.

Strategies and Actions

- Pending September 2015 Board retreat and October 2015 CDD work program adoption.

D. *Objective:* Work to enhance Rivanna river corridor by completing updated Pantops Master Plan including Rivanna River Corridor Small Area Plan.

Strategies and Actions

- Pending September 2015 Board retreat and October 2015 CDD work program adoption.

E. *Objective:* Explore and develop strategies designed to revitalize aging urban areas, focusing on existing neighborhoods and redevelopment possibilities.

Strategies and Actions

- Pending September 2015 Board retreat and October 2015 CDD work program adoption.

F. *Objective:* Determine appropriate levels of service for urban areas and evaluate potential use of Urban Service District to fund those services.

Strategies and Actions

- Pending September 2015 Board retreat and October 2015 CDD work program adoption.

G. *Objective:* Determine alternatives to expand multi-modal transportation options.

Strategies and Actions

- Pending September 2015 Board retreat and October 2015 CDD work program adoption.

Goal 4: Economic Prosperity:

Foster an environment that stimulates diversified job creation, capital investments, and tax revenues that support community goals

A. *Objective:* By June 2015, establish an Economic Development Office to achieve the County's economic development mission and goals.

Strategies and Actions

- ✓ At its February 19, 2015 meeting, the Board appointed an Economic Development Director. Economic Development Office was formed in May following the arrival of the New Economic

Development Director and the relocation of the Economic Development Facilitator from the County Executive's Office to this new functional area.

- B. *Objective:* Establish and begin implementation of a Board-approved work plan (to include workforce development activities with partners such as CATEC) for the County's newly-created Economic Development Office.

Strategies and Actions

- ☐ An Economic Development Office Work Plan is scheduled for presentation at the November 4, 2015 Board meeting.

Goal 5: Educational Opportunities:

Provide lifelong learning opportunities for all our citizens

- A. *Objective:* By June 2015, in partnership with the school system, identify potential improvements in funding strategies for K-12.

Strategies and Actions

- ✓ As part of the Five Year Planning process, General Government and School Division staff worked closely together to provide information and scenarios for the Board's review and consideration.

- B. *Objective:* By June 2015, a collaborative work group, which includes members of the School Division, Local Government and community members, will identify possible short- and long-term solutions to maintain, and possibly increase, the current availability of quality pre-school opportunities.

Strategies and Actions

- ✓ Completed.

- C. *Objective:* Finalize direction and develop a plan to enhance educational opportunities for at-risk preschoolers.

Strategies and Actions

- ☐ At its August 5, 2015 meeting, the Board endorsed a plan drafted by the Charlottesville-Albemarle Early Education Task Force aimed at serving between 250 and 350 of the area's most at-risk 4-year-olds who currently receive no preschool. The task force will continue to hold monthly planning meetings, and will deliver recommendations to the Board at a later date.

Goal 6: Natural Resources:

Thoughtfully protect and manage Albemarle County's ecosystems and natural resources in both the rural and development areas to safeguard the quality of life of current and future generations

- A. *Objective:* By October 2015, establish direction and funding for a program to improve water quality.

Strategies and Actions

- ✓ The Water Resources Funding Advisory Committee is scheduled to provide a final report at the October 7, 2015 Board meeting.

- B. *Objective:* Develop and begin implementation of a comprehensive program to improve water quality.

Strategies and Actions

- ☐ This objective is tied to implementation of the recommendations of the Water Resources Funding Advisory Committee report on October 7, 2015.

- C. *Objective:* Establish and begin implementation of priorities for a natural resource program.

Strategies and Actions

- ☐ Pending hire of Natural Resources Manager and October 2015 CDD work program adoption.

Goal 7: Operational Capacity:

Ensure County government's ability to provide high quality service that achieves community priorities

- A. *Objective:* By December 2014, complete review of staffing needs through consideration of the Five Year Financial Plan.

Strategies and Actions

- ✓ Completed.

- B. *Objective:* By January 2015, identify and propose staffing resources needed to meet the Board's transportation priorities.

Strategies and Actions

- ✓ At its November 5, 2014 meeting, the Board approved a Transportation Planner position that is now filled.

- C. *Objective:* Develop alternate, sustainable funding strategies to address the County's long-term operational and capital funding needs.

Strategies and Actions

- An update from the Citizen Resource Advisory Committee is scheduled for the November 4, 2015 Board meeting.

- D. *Objective:* Develop and begin implementation of pay strategies that address staff recruitment and retention challenges, especially as related to salary compression.

Strategies and Actions

- The Human Resources Department has retained Titan-Gallagher, an experienced compensation and human resources consulting firm, to assist the County in developing solutions for pay compression. Work is beginning and the project results will inform HR's presentation to the Board of Supervisors and the School Board in October 2015.

- E. *Objective:* Develop and implement strategies for addressing imminent retirement of senior County staff.

Strategies and Actions

- Staff is working to identify and track critical imminent retirements.

- F. *Objective:* In partnership with the school system, develop recommendations to enhance joint operations to achieve greater efficiencies and improved service delivery.

Strategies and Actions

- The Local Government/Schools Efficiency Committee is scheduled to present a final report at the November 4, 2015 Board meeting.

Goal 8: Rural Areas:

Preserve the character of rural life with thriving farms and forests, traditional crossroad communities, and protected scenic areas, historic sites, and biodiversity

- A. *Objective:* By June 2015, complete Comprehensive Plan Review and adoption.

Strategies and Actions

- ✓ Comprehensive Plan was adopted at the June 10, 2015 Board meeting.

- B. *Objective:* Adopt a work plan and schedule for implementation of Comprehensive Plan strategies related to the Rural Areas.

Strategies and Actions

- Pending September 2015 Board retreat and October 2015 CDD work program adoption.

- C. *Objective:* Initiate the development of a rural transportation plan.

Strategies and Actions

- Pending September 2015 Board retreat and October 2015 CDD work program adoption.

Item No. 8.10. Planning Commission Comp Plan Priority Objectives and Strategies, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.11. Board-to-Board, September 2015, *A Monthly Report from the Albemarle County School Board to the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors*, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.12. Acquisition of Conservation Easement (ACE) Committee Annual Report, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.13. Historic Preservation Committee Annual Report, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.14. Agricultural and Forestal District Advisory Committee Annual Report, **was received for information.**

Agenda Item No. 9. County Transportation Planner Quarterly Update.

By the above-recorded action taken under the "Consent Agenda", this item was moved to Item No. 12c under Transportation Matters.

Agenda Item No. 10. **Work Session:** Community Development Department Work Plan.

The executive summary presented to the Board stated that the Community Development Department (CDD) last reviewed its work program with the Board in February 2015. That report is provided as Attachment A. Since that time, the Board has adopted the Comprehensive Plan Update and established Strategic Plan Objectives for FY 16-17, both of which require review and consideration of priorities and resource demands on CDD. The purpose of this work session is to review CDD's work program with respect to those initiatives and other Board priorities, including the outcome of the Board's September 25 retreat.

The recommended work program is provided in chart form as Attachment B, with a narrative provided as Attachment C. Staff has attempted to balance resources with its understanding of Board expectations, using the adopted Strategic Plan Objectives as the highest priority. As in prior years, staff first anticipates resources needed for ongoing programs, which are largely mandated by County ordinances, and then allocates the remaining resources to the work program initiatives by first assuring that any state or federal mandates are addressed, then by focusing on the Board's priorities. The Board's Strategic Plan - Year Two and Three Priority Objectives are expected to use available resources for all of CY 2016 and most of CY 2017. This will result in a number of remaining initiatives being deferred to CY 2018 or in the utilization of any additional time that becomes available in 2016-2017 to address some of those initiatives. A number of possible ordinance amendments are listed in the work program as potential new initiatives to be introduced in 2016-2017 if there is available staff time. In considering this work program, staff would appreciate any guidance with respect to staff's understanding of what is needed with each initiative. The narrative provided as Attachment C outlines staff's understanding of what is needed. In reviewing the work program, staff believes the emphasis should be placed on priorities for 2016-2017, recognizing outlying years are harder to predict both in terms of available resource and priorities of future Boards.

The work program was developed based on currently available resources, without any assumption of additional funding.

Staff requests that the Board review the provided information, note any desired changes to the work program, then direct CDD staff to proceed with the implementation of the work program.

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, addressed the Board and stated that he would review current priorities, primarily with the strategic plan objectives; staff availability with respect to workload and expertise needed; assessment of remaining Board and Planning Commission priorities; and establishment of the 2016 work plan and initiatives for 2017-20. He stated with respect to priorities, the June strategic plan update included a number of objectives for which Community Development had the lead: master plans for the Rio/Route 29 interchange area, which will likely get a \$65,000 state urban development grant; the Pantops/Rivanna River corridor master plan, which the Board had discussed with the City at their joint meeting; and the revitalization of the urban areas, which is a relatively new priority but one to be captured in their resource needs. Mr. Graham stated the Board had talked at their September retreat about building maintenance and use of vacant buildings, but staff is hoping to pull that out and discuss it separately as a program that can be done more simply than an expansive building maintenance program for all development.

Ms. Mallek asked if he is referring to a blight ordinance. Mr. Graham responded that building maintenance would be one part of what is referred to as "blight," and this would have to do with the vacant buildings that appear to be in inadequate condition and need attention.

Ms. Mallek commented it would focus on owner's responsibility rather than hiring people to go and fix them up. Mr. Graham confirmed that approach, stating they may also be considering tearing them down if that is something that has some Board interest.

Mr. Graham stated the other priorities are transportation and natural resources, both of which have dedicated funded positions as a result of the Board's recent actions. He stated there were also strategic plan efforts related to community development taking a more minor role: urban service levels, water resources, and the economic development assessment that is moving forward independently.

Mr. Graham stated that Community Development still has fewer positions than it did 10 years ago, and he referenced a slide showing the number of planners available, with strategic plan objectives needing to be done by those staff members. He said in looking at staff availability they look at the programs they have in place, with a number of ordinance programs and mandates, and resources left after those things being dedicated to the work program. Mr. Graham noted that building permits includes permits and inspections; zoning includes zoning enforcement and construction; ministerial actions includes site plans, subdivisions, by-right developments, and so forth; legislative includes zoning changes, special use permits, rezonings, and the ARB certificates; GDS includes GIS and data services; planning includes state mandated functions regarding the Comp Plan; and the work program is what is left after all of those items.

Mr. Graham stated he had developed a pie chart to reflect what is left for the work program, and the hours per week needed. He noted the dedicated staff added for natural resources and transportation are able to handle priorities in those areas, with the remaining items being the Rio small area plan and the Pantops/River corridor master plans, which will be the most resource intensive. Mr. Graham said the revitalization of the urban areas will be the next priority, needing about .25 of an FTE, then water quality resources and urban service district areas, leaving about eight hours per week for a planner being able to work on other issues the Board might have an interest in pursuing.

Mr. Graham said the Planning Commission has also passed on to the Board some recommendations with respect to the Comp Plan, economic development, which is already underway; the ACE Program; and the affordable housing policy. He stated there are a number of other strategies as part of the implementation program, and the Board has also expressed an interest in urban revitalization, crossroads communities, and Rural Areas special events.

Mr. Boyd asked if the goal of the ACE Program is 100% of the Rural Area under conservation easement, and extinguishment of all development rights there. He said he is curious as to what the intention was when the program was first established by the Board.

Mr. Davis explained there was very specific criteria used to evaluate the properties, and his interpretation was that the Board had specific types of properties it wanted to protect. He said his understanding was that ACE projects were intended to fill a gap when property owners were not able to donate easements, and the criteria made it a fairly selective process, made more selective by the amount of available funding. Mr. Davis emphasized it was not intended to capture every property in the rural area, but was intended to find those properties that met the environmental, tourism and scenic qualities outlined in the ACE criteria.

Ms. Mallek stated it also works in partnership with other easement holders such as those for historic properties, and one of the benefits of this is to help establish expanded habitat corridors that are beneficial in the rural areas, especially for water protection.

Mr. Foley stated in previous strategic plans, the Board had set a specific goal for protecting rural lands with easements, such as "protect by 50%."

Mr. Graham said the goal at one point had been 90,000 acres total protected.

Ms. Mallek stated they had a goal of 1,000 acres per year protected, but they had fallen back considerably during the recession with funding cutbacks. She added one of the benefits of the large Clayton property easement in the western part of the County that arose during Governor Kaine's administration, was that the state could share more of its revenue through the Farmland Preservation Act, and the property was surrounded by Beaver Creek Reservoir and the northern boundary of the Crozet growth area, so those are the kinds of benefits that can be realized.

Mr. Wayne Cilimberg, Acting Deputy Director of Community Development, stated there are three priority strategies noted in the Board's Consent Agenda, and the ACE strategy was to fund at the prior levels, which were based on one penny of the tax rate, and the Planning Commission was interested in returning to that level, which had been clearly noted in the Comp Plan.

Ms. Mallek said it would not involve re-evaluating that, as they had already spent significant time on it.

Ms. McKeel stated she is trying to figure out how this will tie into the work plan.

Mr. Graham said that currently there is no place for it in the work plan and it had not been recommended for staff resources, as there is no funding tied to it unless the Board wants to explore other funding strategies.

Mr. Cilimberg stated the more success they have with it, the more resources they will have available to push it beyond the half-time position.

Mr. Graham said another strategy to address their priorities would be to hire consultants, which is already anticipated for the Rio and Pantops master plans, and staff has identified some funding in addition to the CIP funding put forward by the Board for Rio. He stated that consultants are not a magic bullet, as they still need to be directed and managed, along with their contracts. Mr. Graham said staff is better equipped to deal with master plans, and every one that has been drafted by a consultant ends up having staff directed to rewrite it. He stated another option would be to expand staff, and Community Development will make that request next year and align the request with Board strategies. Mr. Graham added there is a lag time with hiring and training, with an estimated six months to one year needed to bring them up to speed.

Mr. Graham stated a number of these objectives require them to look at other resource demands that will be created, such as addressing the blight issue, which will require even more staff resources. He said staff is recommending three options: to maintain the current priorities as outlined and presented, keeping other time available for emergency issues; to maintain current priorities but allocate the remaining time for the Board's top priorities; and deferral of action on items such as the master plans in lieu of other priorities. Mr. Graham noted that staff would not recommend delaying the Route 29 priority given that the road project is currently moving forward.

Mr. Graham concluded his presentation and asked the Board for questions and direction.

Ms. Palmer stated the Dark Skies Ordinance is explained very well in terms of the considerable staff time needed to write the ordinance, and her understanding from the two Planning Commissioners, that are professional planners and mediators, that they have offered to provide language for the ordinance and simply wanted staff to sit in on their meetings so there would be some connection. She asked if that will change staff's assessment as to the amount of time needed to develop the ordinance.

Mr. Graham responded that the Commission is referring to time needed on the front end, and what they have recommended for staff time is fine, but once their recommendation emerges, a process going forward will require more time. He stated when they had talked about lighting in the past it had proven to be controversial, and he expected it would prove controversial again, which is where a lot of staff time is anticipated.

Ms. Palmer stated that one of the Commissioners had told her that they are going to suggest a different approach for the committee, so she will be bringing that back to the Board as an alternative idea.

Mr. Boyd said this is not a new subject and has been studied for years, so they should at least look at what was discussed and studied in the past instead of presenting that a new study should be done.

Ms. Palmer said they will address that.

Ms. Dittmar stated she wants to be sure that staff is present and that various stakeholders are included from the very beginning, and when they went through this process before, Emily Couric would not introduce the bill for enabling legislation without ensuring that police were involved and that the business community was at the table. She said she does not feel that a committee should be formed outside of the County, and that does not follow a process that is very inclusive, because it will likely mean a lot of wasted effort and work, with a firestorm to follow.

Ms. Palmer said she will go back to the Commissioners and ask for alternatives since they have already begun working on it.

Ms. Mallek stated that several years ago there was extensive study with lots of research done by a University department and two local nonprofits on stormwater improvements and ordinance changes, and they brought forth initial drafts that were then taken on by the County Attorney's office. She said they ended up with much stronger stormwater regulations in a fraction of the time versus what they would have had if they had done it themselves, and she feels this is a model to be followed with the river corridor and other planning. Ms. Mallek emphasized that involvement from groups like the Rivanna River Basin Commission and the TJPDC will allow them to get a lot more accomplished, otherwise the County will never get all of these things done, even from the short list.

Mr. Sheffield asked Mr. Graham to go back to the list of priorities, and said the Board had held a retreat at which they had discussed urban redevelopment, which went in tandem with the economic development assessment. He stated he feels this should take a higher priority than things like historic preservation, ARB guidelines, and so forth. Mr. Sheffield commented that urban revitalization seems to be the horse for this, with the other items being the cart.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the items on the list are ranked in order, because they did not intend for urban revitalization to not be a high priority. Mr. Graham responded it will actually be easier and simpler to manage the items that Mr. Sheffield has mentioned, because it will now be narrowed down to the two master plans and urban redevelopment.

Ms. Palmer said they are about to start a citizens advisory committee for the southern neighborhoods, and she wants to understand what kind of staff resources will be needed.

Mr. Graham said staff is kind of "on call" as needed, and Community Development staff does not participate in those although the intent is to have them available by request.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive, addressed the Board, stating that the organizing and logistical support for those meetings rests with Community Engagement Specialist, Emily Kilroy, who is the primary liaison.

Ms. Dittmar stated the citizens have been working ad hoc for at least two years, and one of the questions that will arise is, "When does our small area plan take place?" She wants to establish whether the southern urban area is next after Pantops and Rio. Mr. Graham responded that the southern urban area is not slated to begin until 2020 in terms of a master plan update.

Ms. Dittmar said that as with Pantops and Route 29, they share borders with the City of Charlottesville and are urbanizing quickly, so that work probably cannot wait until 2020. She stated in light of other priorities, the work group there wants to know about crowd-funding a planner or hiring an outside planning group to help get started with neighborhood improvements. Ms. Dittmar asked what the Supervisors should tell them at their meeting, which is the following night.

Mr. Graham stated he would return to the caution he had mentioned earlier regarding the use of consultants, as they are good with helping on the front end, but consultants are not a very good fit in

terms of implementation with the County as an organization. He said in terms of alternative funding sources, he cannot advise the Board and it is something they will need to decide, but if it is funded staff can be put in place.

Ms. Dittmar asked if it is something worth pursuing, if it is brought up at the meeting.

Mr. Foley asked if what she means is that the community is willing to put some money forth to help accomplish the plan.

Ms. Dittmar explained that she and Ms. Palmer had shared with them that they could not form a committee until the County was done with the Comp Plan, and now they are being told that they need a small area plan, realizing they will need to wait in line for implementation.

Ms. Mallek asked if the "front end" to which staff is referring is the public meetings, establishment of priorities, etc. Mr. Graham responded it is referring to the public engagement process with the community.

Ms. Mallek said with the J.B. Barnes project in Crozet, a facilitator spent three or four hours over three meetings during the summer with 150 citizens in public meetings to help identify desired outcomes, and that process can be very successful in gathering that information and reducing the burden on staff. She stated what Mr. Graham has said is also true, as staff had to completely rewrite the plan for the Crozet Downtown zone.

Mr. Foley stated if there is some crowd-funding that can bring some money to the front end of the process with a consultant, the time that it takes can get them further into the work plan to free up time for other things.

Ms. Mallek noted that locals had raised the funding for the Crozet process.

Ms. McKeel said her concern would be that monies raised will draw staff into a process that effectively jumps the line ahead of other priorities, so they need to be careful.

Ms. Dittmar stated the citizens understand that they lag behind Pantops and Rio, just as with CIP projects, but they would probably be uncomfortable with waiting until 2020.

Ms. McKeel emphasized the Board just needs to be clear about that.

Mr. Cilimberg stated they have purposefully tried in the Comp Plan process to establish a base level master plan for the southern and western neighborhoods, and it was adopted as such in the Comp Plan. He said he understands now that there is an interest in small area planning, but that process really focuses on small areas such as Avon or Rio, so what Ms. Dittmar and Ms. Palmer may be referring to is something that is not the same as a full update of the southern and western neighborhood plans. Mr. Cilimberg added that it will still take staff time.

Ms. Catlin said staff hopes the committee will discover in their first few meetings that there are a lot of issues to be involved in, and they exist to be an advisory group to the Board, so even if they are not able to get off the ground immediately with the small area plan, there are many substantive issues for them to work on such as water and solid waste to keep them engaged as an advisory committee.

Mr. Boyd stated he feels the updates are very important, and he is hearing a lot of concern about density, and when the master plans are put together people do not envision having hundreds of condos around their neighborhoods. He emphasized it is important for them to do the five-year updates to take a look at what has emerged from that planning.

Ms. McKeel noted they should look at the ramifications of those efforts.

Ms. Mallek stated that in looking back at the Crozet Master Plan, there ended up being a significant downzoning and removal of a lot of neighborhood centers, so going through the next iteration of a plan will be very important. She commented that the process was much more citizen-driven, with surveys of about 3,000 citizens. Ms. Mallek encouraged staff to give the advisory councils some leeway and freedom to stretch their capabilities, because the important part is that the discussion get started, more so than the process by which it will happen.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that Ms. Echols had spent some time up front with the Crozet Community Advisory Council to help establish the more important focus areas of an update.

Ms. Mallek said that it came after the large community survey, which provided those topics related to priority issues.

Mr. Cilimberg stated they are doing an update of a master plan that is more focused on the things that are true issues, not a total redoing, and that is how they will probably approach all of the master plan updates.

Ms. Mallek commented the river part is certainly a new add-on to Pantops.

Mr. Cilimberg stated it is also a focus area of the plan.

Ms. Mallek said staff should not be trying to do everything when there are people in town that can do some of that work.

Mr. Boyd stated this is not really new, as the river corridor is something they have been looking at for a long time.

Mr. Foley said they need clarity from the Board, especially as it relates to workload, and the spreadsheet offered by Mr. Graham reflects current priorities, so he wants to know what they might want to change. He stated the Planning Commission and the Board's strategic plan session recommended that the economic development assessment get done, and that office is planning to bring something forward to the Board by the end of the calendar year, and it will then go to the Planning Commission. Mr. Foley noted if there is a change, then it will affect some things.

Mr. Graham stated the economic development assessment is anticipated to go forward, so there will need to be some involvement from Community Development and an updating of the Comp Plan, but it is uncertain how big that effort will need to be. He said he is also hearing from Ms. McKeel and Mr. Sheffield that they would like any additional time be put toward urban revitalization.

Ms. McKeel noted that it had come out of the retreat, and perhaps those items could be combined as Mr. Sheffield had suggested.

Ms. Palmer said Ms. McClintic had said at their September 23 meeting that she would not be able to do what the Board had requested without the involvement of planners.

Mr. Graham stated staff has already gathered most of that as part of the Comp Plan update, so Ms. McClintic would need to go through that and assess it, and make recommendations to the Board. He said Community Development's work will come after that assessment and the Board's direction, and additional information will involve the County's GDS/GIS people.

Mr. Foley stated there has been a lot of quick movement over the past few months, so they need to sit down and discuss it as a team, rather than passing it from one office to another. He emphasized that the Board's priorities will be very important in informing the process.

Mr. Sheffield said Mr. Graham's spreadsheet seems to set priorities, but his presentation seems to have the caveat of "as time permits." He stated he would prefer an emphasis on urban redevelopment rather on historic preservation, for example, and he just wants to make sure they are all in consensus.

Ms. Mallek clarified the top item on the list is completion of the economic development assessment, and she had thought that work had been done in 2012, but it needed to be signed, sealed and delivered. She added they need to get on with the process of hiring a half-time assistant for Ms. McClintic.

Mr. Foley stated they can get on with hiring a secretary, but Ms. McClintic is not certain that will help her get the work done so she is working on establishing a framework for that position, and that will raise the question as to who will do the secretarial work.

Ms. Mallek stated she supports the hiring of additional people, because some of the pressing issues, such as the blight ordinance, cannot wait, and they will create more work for staff in the long term. She asked Mr. Davis if there might be a short page that can be added to the ordinance to address the blight issue and talk about landowner responsibilities.

Mr. Davis said the ordinance writing is not very complicated, and figuring out what to include in the ordinance is what Mr. Graham wants to focus on. The Board can adopt all of the Building Maintenance Code or certain portions of it, or adopt other strategies in lieu of it. He stated this is the analysis that Community Development wants to look at, and evaluate what the impact would be from a staffing and resources standpoint. Mr. Davis said adopting the ordinance will be the easy part, with the more difficult task being having the resources to enforce it once it is adopted.

Ms. Mallek stated this is similar to the animal control ordinance, where inspectors are going out all week to places where there are problems, but have no power to do anything. She said her preference would be to get a simple blight ordinance passed, and she does not want to spend five years doing nothing while they figure out whether to study it.

Mr. Foley said he is hearing from them that economic development is the top priority; issues around urban revitalization need to be prioritized and simplified, with the blight ordinance as a component of that; and the small area plan at Rio, which also serves that purpose, already prioritized.

Mr. Sheffield stated what is missing from the spreadsheet is economic development, which is a function of limited resources.

Mr. Foley stated they need to put the Board and Planning Commission into the chart to show that it will happen in the first year.

Mr. Graham said it had been dropped in the printout, but it is designated for work "by others," meaning the Economic Development office will be working on it rather than Community Development, who will be in a supporting position.

Mr. Foley stated this will be done with the Planning Department and will be highly scrutinized, so they will need to work into this how it will be accomplished so the product produced will be something not just from the Economic Development office. He said all of these things will take time, so staff will need to factor this in as a priority and run it back by the Board to ensure that it is fully laid out.

Mr. Sheffield said if the spreadsheet is reflecting economic development, he will support what is presented. Mr. Graham responded that staff has included it, but is not sure how high of a priority it is.

Ms. McKeel stated the "elephant in the room" is the staffing issue, and they have discussed repeatedly over the last several years that Community Development does not have the staffing and ability to do much of this work. She said there is one position being recommended for the next budget cycle, but she would like some clarity as to what is needed in terms of staffing to get some of these items done.

Mr. Foley stated the first step in identifying what staffing needs is to clarify priorities, and Mr. Graham has said that Community Development can do all of what is listed on his spreadsheet in the timeframe presented, but if the Board has other priorities to move up faster, that will likely require additional staffing.

Ms. McKeel said the Board has heard over and over again that there is not sufficient staffing to accomplish some of these objectives, and they need to move out of that hole. She stated in the next budget cycle, they need to see something moving forward, as there are businesses and residents in the community who are constantly trying to get things done.

Ms. Dittmar stated they should focus on the priorities, and then staff can go back and do the metrics to determine what additional staff is needed. Mr. Foley responded this is what staff needs to work with.

Ms. Dittmar asked what other items the Board wants to discuss. Ms. Mallek stated there are some items that have been partway done that she would like to see completed, such as rural churches, which had been worked on in 2009 but apparently not finished; transient lodging, as there are 300 Air B&B locations in the County that have been discovered by staff, with a lot of them under the radar; clarification of the guidelines for events such as wineries, distilleries and other rural area uses; upgrading the open burning regulations, as other localities have; and establishing guidelines for crossroads communities. She said she does not envision that these will take years and years to accomplish because of the high skill level with the County Attorney's office. Ms. Mallek said the Board can do these items without public input, but it would improve the process to have it, and she does not feel that these items can wait until 2020.

Ms. McKeel said they had a similar conversation the previous year.

Mr. Foley stated it is a matter of dollars and cents, which was established through their decisions during the budget process, and staff can come back with the numbers of positions needed to accomplish specific priorities within a year or a year and a half.

Ms. Dittmar said they will sort through this with their budget, which is a statement of values, but when the policies are not in place Board members end up taking up time in dealing with items on a case by case basis.

Ms. Palmer asked if they are asking for a plan to get this done now, or waiting until budget time to do that. Mr. Foley stated from Mr. Graham's original plan, the Board wanted to add three items before even getting to the items that Ms. Mallek has raised: the economic development assessment, a blight ordinance and property maintenance, and urbanization priority issues, some of which have already been identified. He said Mr. Graham had indicated that those items can be accomplished with current staffing, perhaps with a few adjustments.

Mr. Graham said he has them planned to be accomplished, and some of Ms. Mallek's additions are simple such as RA churches; transient lodging has separate priorities in the Comp Plan for the development and rural areas, and will be a fairly significant effort; and rural area special events can be a fairly simple fix or a fairly extensive effort depending on how far they want to go with it.

Ms. Mallek stated she would like an incremental approach, and for RA events she would like them restricted to bona fide agriculture, bona fide farms, and historic properties, so every person with five acres will not be able to have weddings.

Mr. Foley said he has country crossroads, burn regulations, RA small churches, transient lodging, and special events. He stated to address the other items not reflected in the work plan and to be responsive to Ms. McKeel's request, staff will do an assessment as to how to add these in a realistic pace and identify what resources would be necessary.

Ms. McKeel commented they can figure out how to phase it in.

Ms. Mallek said the Board can set up whatever community meetings will be necessary to accomplish some of these objectives, so that burden does not fall on staff.

Mr. Cilimberg noted the Dark Skies ordinance is not in the plan until 2018, and the small area plan for southern neighborhoods is not until 2020, so they will need to factor in those for consideration.

Ms. Palmer said she would like to have two Commissioners, herself, and Mr. Cilimberg and Mr. Graham to discuss what will be necessary, and then staff can provide an idea as to whether or not it can be accomplished.

Mr. Sheffield said as Mr. Foley has said, staff will provide an assessment of what resources are needed, as Mr. Graham's time is being prioritized.

Ms. Dittmar suggested holding off on the discussion of the small area plan until she and Ms. Palmer have attended the citizens meeting the following day.

Mr. Graham mentioned that staff has already proceeded with the supplemental conditions that will apply for some drive-thrus so they can be handled administratively.

Mr. Foley said staff now has a list of things they can cost out and bring back to the Board.

Recess. At 2:50 p.m., the Board recessed, and then reconvened at 3:00 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 11. **Presentation:** FY 15 Unaudited Annual Financial Report (UAFR) and FY 15 Annual Economic Indicators Report.

The executive summary presented to the Board stated that the attached FY 15 *Unaudited* Annual Financial Report (UAFR) (Attachment A) provides preliminary information about the County's General Fund operations and Fund Balance as of June 30, 2015. The attached FY 15 Annual Economic Indicators Report (AEIR) (Attachments B and C) provides an overview of general economic conditions in the County in FY 15, as well as a forecast of these conditions in FY 16.

Unaudited Annual Financial Report

The attached *Unaudited* Annual Financial Report (UAFR) provides preliminary information about the County's General Fund operations and Fund Balance as of June 30, 2015. The attached Annual Economic Indicators Report (AEIR) (Attachments B through D) provides an overview of general economic conditions in the County in FY 15.

The UAFR reflects year-end data through June 30, 2015, the end of FY 15. The revenue information in the attached UAFR is organized in a way that is consistent with the revenue section of the County's budget document. Expenditure data is presented following the format of Exhibit 12 of the County's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). Line item titles in the UAFR match the line item titles in these two documents. The columns in the UAFR show FY 15 Adopted Budget revenues and expenditures, Revised Budget revenues and expenditures, as well as Year End actual revenues and expenditures. Each of these Year End figures subsequently is expressed as a dollar difference from, as well as a percentage of, the amount of the relevant dollar amount in the FY 15 Revised Budget.

Highlights of the attached report include:

FY 2015 Revenues		FY 2015 Expenditures	
Revised Budget	\$ 243,216,193	Revised Budget	\$ 243,216,193
Actual Revenues (including Transfers In)	241,944,619	Actual Expenditures (including Transfers In)	239,044,459
Amount Over (Under Budget)	\$ (1,271,574)	Amount Over (Under Budget)	\$ (4,171,735)
% Difference	-0.52%	% Difference	-1.72%

Details of the significant revenue and expenditure variances are found on pages 2-4 of the UAFR.

FY15 Fund Balance & Use of FY15 Fund Balance

The General Fund estimated FY15 ending fund balance will be approximately \$39,521,031. After reserving the portion of fund balance necessary to maintain the County's 10% fund balance policy and future approved/planned uses of fund balance, the *anticipated* balance of \$3,050,788, which is equal to 1.25% of the FY 15 General Fund budget, will be available for FY 17 budget, capital projects, or other uses.

The Schools Division estimated FY15 ending fund balance will be transferred to the General Fund-School Reserve fund balance in accordance with the County's fund balance reserve policy. The \$2,816,261 estimated fund balance is below the 2% maximum reserve and will be available for School Division purposes subject to appropriation by the Board of Supervisors.

Annual Economic Indicators Report

The FY 15 Annual Economic Indicators Report provides an initial overview of general economic conditions in Albemarle County at the end of the fiscal year, and presents a preliminary glimpse of the

expected state of the economy in FY 16. Table I allows a multiyear comparison of data. Highlights from the report include:

§ General economic activity, as measured by the preliminary tax revenues in six representative streams, appears to have risen overall at a fairly robust rate. Changes in these streams ranged from -3.94% in Inspection Fees to +24.05% in Transient Occupancy Tax. Note that these figures are tentative and subject to revision. The information in Table I suggests that the County's economy grew generally at a relatively strong pace in FY 15.

§ Albemarle County's average monthly unemployment rate declined from 4.65% in FY 14 to 4.26% in FY 15. This 0.39 percentage point (pp) drop in the rate, while encouraging, still did not bring down the County's unemployment rate to the 3.0% rate that staff currently considers to be the "frictional" unemployment rate. In FY 16 the average monthly unemployment rate is expected to be 4.31%. Technically this number would be a slight increase over the FY 14 figure, but the projected rise actually could mask an improvement in the labor market since, as the County's jobs base grows, people who previously dropped out of the market might return to seek employment and, consequently, would be included again in the official unemployment numbers during the time that they look for work.

§ The average monthly total number of jobs in Albemarle County appears to have grown between FY 14 and FY 15. This situation represents a reversal of the net loss that occurred between FY 13 and FY 14. The County is estimated to have experienced a net gain of 544 positions between FY 14 and FY 15, with the number of positions rising from 50,246 to 50,790. Note that the FY 15 total jobs number is an *estimate* because final numbers are not yet available from the VEC, and the nature of the jobs data is such that the total figures do *not* necessarily reflect a rise in *full-time, permanent* positions. The projection for FY 16 is that the County will experience a net gain of 1,264 jobs, resulting in a total jobs base of 52,054. This performance would be the best since FY 12, when the County gained 1,072 positions over the previous fiscal year. Note, also, that jobs data is by place of employment while the unemployment rate, discussed previously, is by place of residence. The two numbers can sometimes move in the same direction.

Revenue and expenditure data contained in the UAFR reflect the state of the County's budget-to-actual performance as of June 30, 2015.

Data shown in the AEIR reflect economic variables that impact the County's current and future revenues and expenditures.

Ms. Betty Burrell, Director of Finance, addressed the Board and presented the unaudited FY15 financial report, and emphasized the numbers are subject to change and are not final. She stated staff will present the audited FY15 CAFR to the Audit Committee in November, and the final audited CAFR will be presented to the Board in December. Ms. Burrell said at this meeting, they will review the expenditures, revenues and change in fund balance from the unaudited report, and focus on the general fund and school fund, with debt services, capital and other funds not included in the executive summary. She stated the general fund completed the fiscal year with a \$2.9 million net revenue over expenditures, with a total revised budget of \$243.2 million including transfers in, and the County has \$242 million of revenue, which is \$1.3 million or .52% short of budget. Ms. Burrell noted that transfers in includes the amount the Board appropriated for use of fund balance, should that become necessary, so in looking at actuals and the line item for "use of fund balance," it looks like a negative number but it is really the opposite because it is not used. She stated in FY15 without transfers in, the year-end sum of actual local, state and federal revenues equaled \$239.5 million compared to \$237.9 million in revised budget figures for those categories, and the difference was \$1.6 million or .67% above budget. Ms. Burrell said with expenditures, the County spent \$239 million, which is 1.72% or \$4.2 million below budget, so expenditures came in less and revenues came in a little more. She stated that year-end actual expenditures comes to \$230.9 million compares to \$234.4 budgeted, and the difference of \$3.5 million is within 1.51% of budget. Ms. Burrell stated both revenues and expenditures are within the 5% as recommended by the Government Finance Officers Association for budgeting forecasting.

Ms. Burrell reported that real estate tax revenues exceeds budget, due in large part to the two-cent tax increase adopted in April as well as increases in property values and new construction; categorical aid, which is reimbursable federal revenue, is higher than budgeted; delinquent tax collections, business licenses and motor vehicle license taxes are all below budget. She said with delinquent tax collections, these accounts remaining uncollected are the most difficult to collect. Ms. Burrell said the County now has a three-year history with what it can expect in terms of collections, and the five-year financial plan reflects a reduced amount expected to be collected from delinquent taxes, but they are collecting them sooner. She stated the County realized savings from salary lapse, in multiple departments throughout the general fund, as well as savings on utilities and fuel, and is able to hold fuel reserve in general contingencies.

Ms. Burrell reported the audited FY14 fund balance was \$36.6 million, and after setting aside \$30.2 million to satisfy the 10% fund balance reserve policy and \$4.4 million of previously approved and appropriated uses of fund balance, it is anticipated that after the audit there may be approximately \$3.1 million for cash funding of capital projects or other one-time uses.

Ms. Burrell stated with an overall school division budget of \$161.5 million, their revenue was .31% or \$504,000 above budget, with the largest variance being revenue from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

She said the schools also had vacancy and other operational savings, and the audited fund balance reserved for the school division at the end of FY14 was \$1.8 million, and of that \$211,000 was appropriated in FY15, with an additional \$1.6 million appropriated for FY16, bringing the anticipated end of year fund balance to \$2.8 million available to the school division by appropriation from the Board. Ms. Burrell said since this amount was below the 2% level set as policy, it would be set aside in the general fund for appropriation by the Board.

Mr. Boyd commented that historically there have been very few adjustments made with the final audited budget version. Ms. Burrell said that is correct, and agreed that what they are looking at is likely lose to the final audited version.

Ms. Dittmar stated she and Ms. Palmer served on the audit committee for the Board, and she is very proud of the way the County handled its budget, which has been recognized by outside agencies.

Ms. Burrell said she would share that with staff in the budget and finance offices.

Agenda Item No. 12. **Presentations:** Transportation Matters:

Item No. 12a. Route 29 Solutions Project Delivery Advisory Panel (PDAP) Monthly Update.

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, addressed the Board and stated that Joel DeNunzio of VDOT will provide an update on Route 29 Solutions construction projects, and said that letters will be going to area homeowners and residents regarding work to be done in the coming month, such as drilling and pile-driving, which can be quite loud. Mr. Graham stated that VDOT has reached the end of the sign-up period for directional signage, and he hopes to be able to provide an update on the exact number of participants. He reported there will also be some more lane closures at night, including the Best Buy ramp project, so the Board will likely hear from constituents about that.

Mr. Boyd said he had attended a party the previous evening and spoke with some people who live near the Rio Road area who said they thought they had heard gunshots because the noise was so loud. Mr. Graham responded that staff is trying to get back to people who had expressed those concerns, and said that slamming tailgates can often sound like gunshots.

Mr. Boyd stated he had shared this with Mr. Sheffield and Philip Shucet, and people along Berkmar Drive are very concerned about the amount of increased traffic there already due to the change in traffic patterns, and it is anticipated to get even worse. He said there are some offices there where employees have to park on the opposite side of the road from where they work, so he wants to bring it to staff's attention.

Mr. Sheffield stated the primary outcome needs to be to remind the motorists that there is pedestrian activity on that section of Berkmar.

Mr. Boyd said people are hoping to get some sort of crossing to get them across Berkmar.

Ms. Palmer asked if the entire ramp at Best Buy is going to be closed. Mr. Graham responded it will be closed a few nights, as they have done in the past, and VDOT will detour traffic down to Barracks Road.

Mr. Sheffield stated they have gotten a lot of the underlayment done there and will soon begin some of the paving work.

Ms. Mallek asked if they have to put concrete underneath where the road eroded out during the rains. Mr. Graham stated they have to take some additional measures there because the soil had washed out, but he is not sure what all of those things are.

Item No. 12b. VDOT Quarterly Report.

Mr. Joel DeNunzio, VDOT Resident Engineer, addressed the Board and stated he wants to discuss safety, adding there had been another fatal accident on Route 20 where a woman heading northbound crossed the center line of the road and hit another car head-on. Mr. DeNunzio stated the police report has not been finalized, but VDOT investigates all crashes to see if there are any immediate maintenance needs such as pavement or shoulder work, but nothing was found and that section of the road had recently been modified. He said in the last week of July, there had been five fatalities in Albemarle County with four of them possibly seatbelt related. He said on the Friday of that week, the first "safety roundtable" meeting had taken place, which included the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the DMV, the state police, and a group called "Drive Safe Virginia," focusing on reducing traffic fatalities and injuries. Mr. DeNunzio said that Drive Safe Virginia has information on the importance of wearing seatbelts and other safety concerns such as text messaging, which increases crash risks by 23 times that of normal drivers. He said that talking on a cell phone, whether hands-free or not, doubles the chance of a fatal accident, and motor vehicle accidents are the leading cause of teen-related deaths in the U.S. Mr. DeNunzio said the risk of fatal crash rates are 40% higher for 16 year olds than 18 year olds, and 30% higher than 19 year olds, and VDOT will be doing more outreach through this program. He noted the three top factors are seatbelt usage, distracted driving, and speed, and stated that the four "Es"

are enforcement, empowerment, education, and engineering, with VDOT responsible for engineering but also trying to do more outreach.

Mr. DeNunzio reported with the Rio Road grade separated intersection, there is a continued relocation of gas and water lines, with the water lines completed and gas line relocation underway. He noted there are detours at night down Hillsdale and Branchlands Boulevard, which made construction go a lot faster, and there is a lot of activity such as median closures on Rio Road as part of "top-down" construction. Mr. DeNunzio said Dave Covington had given a presentation on top-down construction at the recent PDAP meeting, which involves opening a section of road, drilling, putting the piles in, filling them with concrete, and covering it up by 6:00 a.m. He stated they are starting to do that now with the bridge caps, and will start drilling the abutments beginning next week. Mr. DeNunzio said they are about done clearing the median and are doing the southbound lane widening, with the crown taken out of that road where it is draining in both directions, and widening on the inside to have room to place a concrete barrier. He stated they are starting to clear the south side of the bridge at Berkmar, and at the Route 29/250 interchange there is a lot of median work there with the curb, with the curb and sidewalk to be finished in the median between Angus Road and Morton Drive. Mr. DeNunzio said there was a slight failure under the lane at Best Buy, with the heavy rains having an impact, and a designer reviewed the wall and determined that some additional support will take care of it.

Mr. DeNunzio stated the Black Cat Road Bridge is on schedule to finish on October 15, with some guard rail installation and seeding to do, and the Broomley Bridge is about nine days behind so the contractor has asked that his substantial completion date be moved to November 9, with the final completion date still on for November 16.

Ms. Palmer asked when cars will be able to drive across it. Mr. DeNunzio said it will be November 9, and the contractor would have received a bonus for completion between the 15th and 30th, but it does not look like that will happen. Mr. DeNunzio stated he will send an update to the Floridan residents' Homeowners Association for distribution.

Mr. DeNunzio stated a lot of people have complained about the I-64 work, and there was an unexpected closure on the Ivy bridge eastbound on I-64 that caused a seven-mile backup. He explained the contractors are putting down an epoxy sealant on top of the bridge, which is put down like concrete and covered with blankets, and then uncovered early the next morning, which is the time it was expected to be cured. Mr. DeNunzio stated that the epoxy had not cured so traffic could not go on it, and people called and complained because the workers had to sit while it cured, and the lane was expected to be open by 7:00 a.m. on October 8. He reported that Pocket Lane had been resurfaced, and stone was being hauled onto Doctor's Crossing, with about 50% of the road having stone and the surface treatment to be done once the other 50% was put down. Mr. DeNunzio stated that the Route 29 rumble strip project would take place from the north to south border countywide from April to November of 2016, to also include shoulder widening, which was expected to help improve safety off the road crashes. He said that bike and pedestrian improvements in Crozet at Starr Hill Brewery and Music Today, there was about \$800,000 for a crosswalk there as well as \$800,000 for a crosswalk on Rio Road between Fashion Square and Albemarle Square. Mr. DeNunzio stated there will also be a traffic signal put at Route 250 and Route 151, and a possible friction course coming down the hill to address heavy braking.

Mr. DeNunzio reported the deck on Proffit Road Bridge needs to be replaced and that project will begin on October 19, with the detour from Route 20 to 600 at Burnley Station, and the closure lasting about four weeks. He stated the engineers feel it would not make it through the winter without replacement, and confirmed it will probably be wood again. He reported materials are being ordered now for the Carrsbrook culvert, and the contractor feels the materials will be four to five weeks out, and a waterline relocation needs to take place first, with a goal of having the work completed by Thanksgiving. Mr. DeNunzio said that first installation of flashing yellow arrows will take place at 22/250, instead of having a left yield turn on green, and he would like to consider Hydraulic Road and Earlysville Road for another installation, as well as left turns at the Route 250/64 interchange. He stated inmate work crews had been working for the past four weeks, with a signed agreement between the regional jail and one crew working at each headquarters in Albemarle County. Mr. DeNunzio stated they have been used for tree trimming, tree removal, trash, drainage repairs, and debris removal, and the crews have worked on six primary roads and 24 secondary roads.

Mr. Sheffield asked if they have also been working on clearing bike lanes. Mr. DeNunzio responded they had, at least on the John Warner Parkway.

Ms. Palmer asked if they keep track of how many bags of trash the crews collect. Mr. DeNunzio responded they do not for these crews, but do for Adopt-a-Highway crews because VDOT picks up those bags.

Ms. McKeel stated some of the bags are really full and others are not.

Ms. Palmer said she figured there would be a tipping charge, so that might provide an approximation as to what the road crews are picking up.

Ms. McKeel said there have been some letters to the editor recently regarding people throwing trash out the windows and trash in general, and she wonders if there is still a number for people to call if they see littering taking place and if it should be better advertised.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive, stated the program is run through the police department, and they will check against the car's license plate, so she will look into it and get back to the Board.

Ms. McKeel commented she has used it several times herself.

Ms. Mallek stated there are several residents in her area who are very watchful of this, but they are told that unless the officers saw it happening, there was nothing they could do.

Ms. McKeel said the program involved people getting a letter from the department stating they had been seen throwing trash out, and it was often business vehicles that were spotted.

Mr. DeNunzio noted that VDOT has to pick up Stripling Avenue about once per month to remove couches, mattresses, or construction debris, and one of the VDOT operators noticed a paint can and realized he could take it back to Sherwin Williams to track who had purchased it, so the police got that information and visited the offender.

Ms. McKeel said a lot of times when trash is picked up along Barracks Road, there are identifying pieces of information.

Mr. DeNunzio stated when VDOT picks up bags and debris, they go through it to look for identifying information.

Ms. Dittmar asked if they have built weather delays into the Route 29 projects. Mr. DeNunzio responded that most contractors built delays into their schedules, but they may not account for unusual events such as two straight months of snow. He said VDOT has been responding to an average of 25-30 snow events per year for the last few years, and that is something that contractors will anticipate in their schedules.

Mr. Boyd asked if VDOT will put up signs for the closure of Proffit Road Bridge, since it is an eastern connector route. Mr. DeNunzio responded there will be signs beginning on 29 at Burnley Station, down to Proffit, and also along Route 20 and the approaches to Polo Grounds Road.

Mr. Boyd asked if VDOT can notify Ambassador Howe, who handles all of the communications for the Proffit Road Homeowners Association. Mr. DeNunzio stated he will make sure that he is included in the communications that VDOT will be sending out.

Ms. Mallek asked about design changes for Berkmar north of the river and how the runoff water will be captured and slowed down before entering the wetland under the bridge. Mr. DeNunzio responded the information has been passed onto the designers, and he will have to follow up on it.

Ms. Mallek stated they had talked about having legislators making non-wearing of seatbelts a primary offense, as texting has been, and asked if the safety group had discussed this. Mr. DeNunzio responded the group had discussed this and the motorcycle helmet laws, with the state police and DMV taking the lead on those issues.

Agenda Item No. 12c. County Transportation Planner Quarterly Update.

The executive summary presented to the Board stated that staff will begin providing quarterly reports to the Board regarding the County's transportation work items as part of the Transportation Presentations this month. The purpose of this agenda item is to review the Community Development Department's transportation activities each quarter and seek Board guidance on its priorities.

The Transportation Planner's Quarterly Report includes a summary of the transportation items, programs, and projects that the County's transportation planner is working on, as well as a status update on various ongoing transportation initiatives being pursued in collaboration with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). This will allow the Community Development Department to assure its work efforts are aligned with the Board's priorities.

There is no budget impact related to this report.

Staff recommends that the Board receive the Transportation Planner's Quarterly Report and advise staff as to any priority changes or new issues not included in the report. Additionally, recognizing that this is the first quarterly report in an ongoing effort, staff requests that the Board advise if any changes to the report's format are desired.

Mr. Gerald Gatobu, Transportation Planner, addressed the Board, stating this is his first attempt at providing a quarterly update and presenting them with a list of standing committees and workgroups in which he is involved. He stated he is Chair of the MPO committee, and he also deals with the Route 250 West Advisory Committee and attended the Route 29 Solutions meetings, as well as Hillsdale Drive Extended. Mr. Gatobu said he works with the Office of Facilities Development to identify transportation projects related to schools and local government, and is a member of the neighborhood impact mitigation team for Route 29 Solutions to address and manage neighborhood cut-through traffic.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the neighborhood mitigation will involve speed feedback signs. Mr. Gatobu stated that "speeding fine" signs are up on Carrsbrook Drive, so they are trying to assess how well they are working, but they may also need to do a speed study. He said they will need some data to show it has an impact, and also needs to make sure there is some enforcement to go with it.

Mr. Sheffield asked if they are going to explore using the flashing speed impact signs. Mr. Foley responded that it will be part of the analysis to be done.

Mr. Sheffield said he is afraid that by the time this analysis is done, they will be done with the Rio Road work.

Ms. Mallek said they can be used elsewhere in the County, so they should just buy a few.

Mr. Gatobu said the signs cost about \$8,000-\$10,000, and they work better in neighborhoods with some enforcement because word gets around that police are actually in the area.

Mr. Sheffield stated he tries to give people the benefit of doubt that they do not know how fast they are going, and while they might be void in the enforcement side, they should also be looking at it from an education side to help people understand they are picking up speed as they are going downhill. He said he would rather not wait until more studies are done, because it is apparent that speeding is a problem. Mr. Gatobu responded he will work with Mr. DeNunzio on this because it is a public road, and said it is a traffic-calming measure so they will need to make sure there is consensus in the Carrsbrook neighborhood. He said there are some aspects such as maintenance that they will also need to discuss.

Mr. Foley said staff wants to make sure they are covering all the bases, but can come back quickly with a cost estimate so the Board can make a decision.

Mr. Boyd asked where he is considering putting these. Mr. Sheffield responded it can be strategically placed in the Carrsbrook/Northfield area where people are speeding unintentionally, whereas the flat areas are more of an enforcement issue.

Ms. Palmer said there is something to the fact that people are not aware of how fast they are going, and perhaps it is because the road is so wide and straight.

Ms. McKeel stated there is money in the budget for two more officers for enforcement, so that will help as all of the measures fit together.

Mr. Foley stated that staff will put together an executive summary for the Board's November meeting and put together a cost estimate, involving VDOT and the police department in terms of enforcement.

Ms. Mallek said what will really change driver behavior is the prospect of a big fine.

Ms. Palmer asked how much time it takes staff to deal with emails regarding specific road problems and requests.

Ms. Dittmar said she sent them to Mr. DeNunzio.

Ms. Palmer stated that she does too, but was under the impression that some items should go directly to staff.

Mr. Gatobu said he and Mr. DeNunzio liaise a lot, and explained that he spends two or three hours each morning to go through emails.

Ms. Palmer asked if there is a way to differentiate which items should go to staff versus VDOT.

Mr. Gatobu explained he has thought about that because people often do not know where to send an item, but he would rather get the question and send it somewhere. He stated he had held a neighborhood learning series meeting the previous Thursday, and had asked neighborhood leaders how they would like the information to be handled, and they like the idea of putting it on the County website with specific links for things like reducing speed on roads, how to get traffic-calming for their roads, and so forth.

Mr. Foley said in terms of who to send things to, Mr. DeNunzio can also address that.

Mr. DeNunzio stated the Board can send questions to either him or Mr. Gatobu, but items related to traffic-calming, cut-through traffic, truck restrictions, or child at play signs will be initiated by Mr. Gatobu. He said with a VDOT website search for "neighborhood traffic mitigation," those items will be directed to County staff, but maintenance items will go to VDOT.

Mr. Foley suggested that for the ease of the Board, Mr. Gatobu can be the point person for Board communications, and then he can connect with Mr. DeNunzio to form a standing list of needs.

Ms. Mallek said it will work for everything except for immediate items, such as people digging up a road.

Ms. Dittmar commented that what has worked best to respond to citizen requests is to send Mr. DeNunzio specific road maintenance requests and road issues and copy Mr. Gatobu on those communications, because the response from Mr. DeNunzio has been very good.

Mr. Foley asked if she is interested in a master list. Ms. Dittmar responded she is, and said that before she rotates off of the Board she is going to establish a master list so there will be a good handoff for her replacement, and then they can decide who the best point person will be.

Mr. Gatobu said he will discuss specific active projects, and said the County transportation priority list approved by the Board in April will be reviewed again, and that is the list used for the House Bill 2 (HB2) projects. He stated the MPO submitted the Exit 118 interchange project on the County's behalf and he submitted Exit 124 and I-64, both of which are "corridors of statewide significance" and aligned with high-priority state projects. He said Proffit Road and Sunset Avenue improvements that can fall under the district program or the high priority, depending on how they fall, and he recognizes Mr. DeNunzio and Chuck Proctor for their help. Mr. Gatobu said neighborhood transportation projects include Fontana and Earlysville traffic restrictions, which have assessments completed, and he will discuss those with the Board in the coming weeks for possible action. He stated there is also the issue of turning movement counts on the John Warner Parkway, and Mr. Sheffield had held a meeting with residents about that. Mr. Gatobu said there are also questions related to the rural rustic road and unpaved road projects, including Doctor's Crossing and Pocket Lane, and one of his goals is to map those and put them in GIS, which he hopes to start on Thanksgiving. He stated that traffic management will also apply to Carrsbrook and he is working with the neighborhood impact mitigation team in the context of Route 29 Solutions, and he has a meeting with the Office of Facilities Development to establish a scope and cost estimate for the Timberwood Boulevard study.

Ms. Mallek said she does not understand why a feasibility study is needed for Timberwood Boulevard because it is obvious the people are trying to cross there, and she asked if it is a structural study to determine what should be built.

Mr. Gatobu responded it is a study to help determine whether to have on-road or off-road pedestrian crossings and how much they will cost for Route 250 East and Route 29, and Mr. Boyd has asked them to also look at Timberwood Boulevard so they are going to add that to the scope.

Ms. McKeel asked if the Board will be receiving a report in November on the commuter routes, and whether it will be timely for what needs to be done. Mr. Gatobu responded they will have that report, and said the only issue will be funding and whether they will front-end the money and then go after proffer funding.

Ms. Mallek asked if there is a federal grant to be applied to this. Mr. Sheffield offered to step out so they can discuss this.

Ms. McKeel clarified she just wants to make sure that this will be timely, as they had initially expected to get the report in October. Mr. Gatobu confirmed this will be timely for the commuter route plans, and said that Kim Davis from JAUNT is available to answer questions.

Ms. McKeel said she just wants to know if the timing is okay.

Mr. Foley stated that his understanding is that everyone is on the same page with this, and that it will be fine to bring this back in November.

Ms. McKeel said her second question is related to the Nunley Building and the new facility for the food bank on Lambs Road, and said it will be helpful to have a bus going down to that facility given the population that they serve. Mr. Gatobu responded that he will contact JAUNT and CAT about that.

Ms. Mallek asked if he will keep her apprised of the Route 250 West advisory committee, so that she can respond to questions if necessary. Mr. Gatobu responded the only thing that has happened lately was a discussion about the Birdwood golf facility.

Ms. Palmer said she would also like information about that group, because she did not know they were still meeting.

Mr. David Benish, Acting Director of Planning, explained that staff had suspended their work when they lost the transportation planner position, so the committee has not been meeting frequently but staff keeps them apprised of the golf facility community meeting.

Agenda Item No. 12d. FY17 VDOT Revenue Sharing Program Participation.

The executive summary states that applications for VDOT's FY17 Revenue Sharing Program are due October 30, 2015. VDOT requests applications every fall in order to determine the level of state funds needed to maximize local participation in this program. The FY17 Revenue Sharing Program can potentially match dollar-for-dollar a locality's contribution toward transportation projects funding up to \$10.0 Million. This funding is typically used to advance high priority transportation projects, including road, sidewalk and bikeway improvements. The County's Transportation Priorities, approved in April 2015, are attached. Revenue Sharing Program funds have been used previously to help fund the John Warner Parkway, the Georgetown Road improvements, the Jarmans Gap Road improvements, the Crozet

Avenue Streetscape project, and the Broomley Road Bridge replacement project (now under construction), as well as eight (8) sidewalk construction projects.

No funding was budgeted in the County's FY 16 Capital Improvement Program budget for the matching funds required to participate in the program; therefore, no application for Revenue Sharing Funding will be submitted this year. Transportation project requests have been submitted to be considered as part of the FY17-26 Capital Improvements Program and Needs Assessment. Funds budgeted for those projects could be used in future years to leverage additional funds from other funding programs and grant sources, including the Revenue Sharing Program.

Participation in the VDOT Revenue Sharing Program leverages matching funds from VDOT to advance important transportation projects. No matching funds will be received this year.

This is for information only, and no action is required.

Mr. Boyd said he has questions about the VDOT matching fund process. There is a lot of concern with the Pantops Advisory Council about a pedestrian crossing there. They have been working on their own to get some information about that, so they are hopeful there can be matching funds to do that.

Mr. David Benish stated in the CIP request from Community Development, they had a transportation projects and revenue sharing program request, which has typically been used to fund the match for participation in the program. He said for FY17, the cost estimate for the crossings is \$2 million over three years through FY19, and the Board can fund those in the CIP, which can be available for the next round of revenue-sharing projects.

Mr. Boyd said the Pantops Advisory Council is planning to come in for that discussion, but what is confusing is they have to identify projects at this point, but will not be doing the CIP allocations until November. Mr. Benish explained the revenue-sharing funding will be for FY17, so the Board has to make that request a year in advance for funding to be awarded in spring. For the crossings project, the most important step is the feasibility study and they have funding from Kenley Horn to do that. He added the next step will be for construction, so they are on track without the need for revenue-sharing funding for that particular project.

Ms. McKeel stated the reason she wants to discuss this is because she is concerned about not having any matching funds available for revenue sharing and leaving money on the table.

Ms. Palmer noted the reason for that is because staff had been advised by VDOT not to get another project until some of the other revenue-sharing projects were done.

Mr. Benish stated there are currently 10 sidewalk projects in various stages of completion, and staff was advised that VDOT is at capacity in terms of new revenue-sharing projects. There are projects with shortfalls, but the County does not have the match.

Ms. Mallek said she may have misunderstood, but what she took away was they had extra money from Meadowcreek Parkway in the amount of \$2.7 million, to be used for the same type of projects as what the \$1 million would be used for. Mr. Benish explained there were excess funds available that were used to cover other shortfalls, and they covered the needs that would have required additional County funding, to go towards projects already in process. He stated this is the opportunity to bring in new projects or to complete other potential shortfalls or other phases that had not been funded. This year they do not have an infusion of money going into a new project or to work down the list on existing projects.

Ms. McKeel stated she recalled Mr. Foley saying the County has to have the funds to get the match, and very clearly they were not making the match this year.

Mr. Foley said the budget proposed by staff and approved by the Board did not have matching local money to bring down state dollars because they did not have the funding to do that and accomplish other things. What Mr. Benish is saying is they should not put applications into VDOT without having matching funds identified, which they certainly can do.

Mr. Boyd stated the unaudited figures from Ms. Burrell shows a possible \$3 million left in the budget this year, and while it should not be used for recurring expenses, this might be something that could be applied to matching funds. Mr. Foley responded it is a reasonable thing for them to talk about.

Mr. Benish commented that when they discussed the possibility of making an application this year, the projects that seemed to be the highest priorities were those that had shortfalls, the Ivy Road bicycle lane project and State Farm Boulevard, and they have not really looked at new projects. He stated the revenue-sharing program is intended to fund projects that are almost ready to go, and they are a bit ahead of the game in knowing the location and costs of the crossing projects.

Mr. Boyd stated he had told the Pantops Advisory Council to come to the CIP meeting next month, and they are planning to talk about their needs and how they want to have the money allocated. It would be acceptable to him if they have to wait a year because the Board would probably want to go through more consideration, particularly if they were going to use the \$3 million after meeting fund balance requirements. He said those projects are important to both Forest Lakes and Pantops

neighborhoods to make those connections, because currently they are not walkable or cyclable neighborhoods.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the in-kind value of land could be used for matching funds. Mr. Benish responded it is for TAP grants and might be for revenue sharing, and they can talk about it later.

Mr. Sheffield noted the challenge with things like sidewalks is they are already in the right of way, so there would not be an in-kind value.

Mr. Boyd commented that Ms. McKeel was concerned about sidewalks along Hydraulic Road. Ms. McKeel agreed that she is.

Mr. Benish stated with more staff in hand, they will be able to go after more grants like TAP grants, which are an 80/20 match and thus a good deal, but are competitive.

Ms. Mallek noted when they had discussed the Ivy Road project last spring, there was discussion and interest in what the University would be contributing, so they need to have that as a lever to get them to contribute before a lot of money is tied up in it.

Mr. Benish responded the Office of Facilities Development has UVA as part of the stakeholder team working on the design of it, but the University is not sure about their future plans for the Kluge Center, so the County's project has been to emphasize construction of sidewalk to the site but not past it. Mr. Benish said staff is also trying to work with them more on the bike lanes and the right of way or paved shoulder, with the current step being working with UVA on the design, although they have not yet contributed any additional funding

Agenda Item No. 13. **Presentation:** Volunteer Fire Rescue Health and Welfare Report - 2015.

The executive summary presented to the Board stated that Albemarle County Code § 6-107 sets forth certain specific responsibilities of the Fire and Emergency Medical Services (FEMS) Board. One responsibility of the FEMS Board is to “...*report at least annually to the board of supervisors regarding the health and welfare of the volunteer system.*” Accordingly, FEMS Board members and County staff have worked collaboratively to prepare the 2015 Report on the Health and Welfare of the Volunteer Fire and EMS System.

The 2015 report focuses on goals set in the 2014 report. Accordingly, the Fire and EMS (FEMS) Board and the Health and Wellness Report Committee both indicated that previous attempts at recruiting had focused on volunteering for the Albemarle County Fire Rescue (ACFR) System as a whole. The 2014 report outlined two specific strategies; 1- *All volunteerism is local*; and 2- *A focus on pathways*.

All volunteerism is local means that ACFR's marketing efforts moving forward focuses on the branding of individual stations rather than ACFR as a whole. *A focus on pathways* means, as a system, we focus on the “onboarding” of volunteers. This onboarding includes data entry, background checks, ID production, gear/equipment distribution, and physicals. It is recognized that an efficient onboarding process will ensure that those interested don't get lost in the process or what is called “pathway”.

The 2015 report includes letter of introduction signed by both Chief Kostas Alibertis from Western Albemarle Rescue Squad/FEMS Board Chair and Chief Eggleston. Of note in the letter are comments derived from a FEMS Board Recruitment and Retention Committee memo to the FEMS Board. These comments simply pointed out the connection between the cost of living/job opportunities and the existence of volunteers within any given community.

The 2015 report looks again at the station by station numbers. However, we do not include year to year comparison numbers due to a record clean-up project in which 250 individuals were removed from the rolls. This change means that comparing last year's numbers to this year's numbers would have made little sense as there is no true context. The plan is to begin showing comparative numbers in the next report.

The 2015 report also provides interviews of five individuals; all of whom have joined in the last 18 months. These individuals were chosen based on their chiefs participation in the report committee which means that they went through the new on-boarding process. These individuals speak highly of some items, are critical of others.

Finally, the 2015 report includes a discussion of goals established in the 2014 report. The goals are based on two “Pathways” - one is the Pathway to Volunteering (the onboarding process) and the second in the Pathway to Fulfillment.

- Pathway to Volunteering
 - Keep Volunteerism Local
 - In 2014/15 the Recruitment and Retention Committee developed new campaigns focused on local branding
 - Clear and easy process for joining
 - ACFR staff worked behind the scenes and out in the field to help create a streamlined volunteer focused processing
 - Invigorate the Recruitment and Retention Committee

- Committee now meeting regularly and providing overall support. Charter was created for the committee along with new Co-Chairs.
- Increase use/support of Social Media
 - The FEMS board created a Communications Sub Committee as part of the Recruitment and Retention committee to help increase outreach.
- Provide Recruitment Training for R&R members
 - The committee has begun to provide information for members on trainings in Virginia as well as host training within the county
 - Sent team from multiple stations to training via grant funding
- Support local Recruitment programs/efforts
 - Committee and staff participating in local outreach with both material and workforce
- Pathway to Fulfillment
 - Getting the most from your volunteering
 - The committee is now looking at retention efforts to ensure members have a good experience beyond their first years
 - Recruitment and Retention are different
 - There is now a greater focus on differentiating goals at committee and FEMS board levels
 - More than just task level participation
 - Revamping of Officer Development Program, now in session and offered in a modular, volunteer friendly, format
 - Greater support for station boards rather than just focusing on operations
 - Provide training to support all functions
 - Created Treasurers' Manual to provide support to station treasurers
 - Increase Retention benefits- Analysis
 - Brought in national experts to meet with FEMS board and R&R Committee

There is no budget impact.

This executive summary is for information only and no action is required at this time.

Chief Tom LaBelle stated they have kept the format for the report the same as that from 2014. He noted the letter prefacing the report from Chief Dan Eggleston and Chief Kostas Alibertis addresses the economic realities of volunteers, with the average income for a volunteer household being about \$16,000 less than that of the average County resident. He reported the team that compiled the report included Chief Alibertis, Chief Calvin Butler from East Rivanna, Chief George Stephens from North Garden, and Chief Danny Tawney from Seminole Trail. Chief LaBelle noted the vote for the report was not unanimous, as the Stony Point Volunteer Fire Department Chief wanted to provide his own report, but the committee and the FEMS Board voted to move it forward.

Chief LaBelle indicated that starting next year, they want to do annual comparisons, which they did not do this year because it was the first time they had done a census and the numbers dropped by about 250-275 members, so there was no real context to do a side-by-side comparison. He noted there was no real incentive for the volunteer organizations to maintain that database, but the County is moving to an easier, web-based system. Chief LaBelle said the team sat down with five different volunteers within the organization that had joined in the last year and a half to talk about what they like and what they do not, and the volunteer process. He stated that most of those volunteers had good experiences, and in every case they went to the station and talked to people at the station. Chief LaBelle stated there is online advertising and banners for the Firefighter I and EMT courses, but at the end of the day it is personal contact that brought people forward. He reported that last year's goals had been established for the group as a whole, dealing with the pathway to volunteering and ensuring that people had good experience as members. This effort reflects the efforts put in over the last year regarding the pathway to volunteering. Chief LaBelle said the Board had heard concerns and complaints about the length of time that physical exams take, but that process has been condensed to one and half or two hours, with rides offered to those who need to get to and from those exams. He stated ACFR has also expedited the paperwork and staff is doing outreach at individual stations to ensure it is completed.

Ms. Palmer asked for clarification as to what he means by the reporting process being different than in previous years. Chief LaBelle responded this is only the second year the system had done a report, and the highlighted sections represent new additions.

The Board complimented Chief LaBelle on the reporting format, and said it is well written.

Ms. Dittmar stated she had sent the report to the three chiefs who operate the volunteer stations in her district, and Chief Butler had indicated that he had not participated, but someone from East Rivanna had some feedback. She said the ordinance calls for this to come from the FEMS Board, to help address concerns that the stations are losing communication with the Board, which is great. Ms. Dittmar asked if this is a thorough vetting of what individual stations feel about their health, and whether it is achieving the goal of them communicating with the Board. She asked why they are not here doing their own reports.

Chief LaBelle explained that Chief Butler sat on the committee and reviewed the report, so perhaps what he is referring to with "not being involved" is the fact that one of the volunteers interviewed

was from his station. He emphasized that every member of the FEMS Board had reviewed the document and voted on it.

Ms. Dittmar asked if they helped create it, or if it was given to them to vote on. Chief LaBelle stated the four members of the committee created it, with the report based to a large extent on last year's goals, and after the committee reviewed it the document was brought to the FEMS Board. He said it may be the case that members of the FEMS Board wish they were involved, but it is the FEMS Board that created the committee, not ACFR. Chief LaBelle noted they are always open to change, but he would encourage them to keep some of the format the same, because if the format of annual reports changes too dramatically things tend to get lost. He added the Board may get a better presence from volunteer agencies if the report is presented in the evening rather than during the day. Chief LaBelle stated there was significant discussion around the FEMS Board table that this was the report of all of the volunteer chiefs, with the exception of Stony Point. He said over the last year or year and a half, the bylaws and committee charters were being established, and the station chiefs were active participants in that process.

Ms. Mallek commented that Chief LaBelle has brought a wonderful improvement in conversation since arriving here. She appreciates the new focus on volunteerism being local, as branding for individual stations as a "home station" is something she had requested years ago. She also expressed her appreciation for the changes being made in training and classes, to try to provide more accountability for their customers.

Ms. Dittmar asked Chief LaBelle to convey the Board's appreciation back to the system members, both volunteer and career.

Ms. Mallek asked Chief LaBelle what the census has revealed in terms of numbers. Chief LaBelle said the starting number was 750, but the census had showed about 500 actual members, with the new focus starting in 2016 being retention of members. He noted they have trained about 70 individuals in Firefighter I and 50 new EMTs in the EVOC class, with good numbers inbound and the next step to slow down the outbound.

Ms. Dittmar asked if some of that is due to aging of members within the system. Chief LaBelle responded that as the population ages, the organizations also age, but at the same time there are roles they can play to keep the organizations viable.

Ms. Mallek stated the staff report had mentioned the future reconsideration of incentives as part of retention efforts, and she hopes the Board will think about the value and relative investment. She said in the past the Board had contemplated providing health insurance to volunteer members, which would have cost \$120,000, but they decided against it, and she hopes they will think about it again as the year progresses.

Chief LaBelle said at the September FEMS Board meeting, they discussed retention issues in depth, and the Recruitment and Retention Committee is actively involved in this evaluation, with the committee having co-chairs representing Fire and EMS.

Agenda Item No. 14. **Presentation:** Ivy MUC - Transfer Station Upgrade.

The executive summary as presented to the Board states that over the past two years, the Board has considered various options regarding the current transfer station facilities and operation at the Ivy Materials Utilization Center (MUC). In part, the evaluation of alternatives for the continued use of the Ivy MUC has been driven by the need to bring the facility into compliance with applicable Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ) regulations. Those regulations require that the transfer station operation be covered to prevent the waste material from being exposed to precipitation.

The Ivy MUC is owned and operated by the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) pursuant to an operating agreement involving RSWA, the County and the City of Charlottesville. RSWA holds the VDEQ permit governing the transfer station operation and is guided currently by a Letter Agreement with VDEQ to prepare and present by December 31, 2015 a detailed plan for bringing the transfer station into regulatory compliance. The RSWA and the County have been working collaboratively to develop viable alternatives for consideration by the Board and the RSWA that will address the compliance issues and retain its use as a transfer station.

At its meeting on March 11, 2015, the Board received a report from its consultant, Draper Aden Associates (DAA) describing three alternative transfer station upgrade scenarios. The report is attached (Attachment A).

Following a discussion of transfer station options at its meeting on March 11, 2015, the Board reached consensus regarding the need to work closely with RSWA to refine the scope and estimated costs for options that involve the modification of the existing facility, as well as options that require the development of a new facility on a portion of the Ivy MUC property referred to as the "western site." Further, recognizing that the RSWA is the owner of the property and the holder of the VDEQ permit, the Board directed staff to pursue gaining support from RSWA for one or more of these options so that the Board could have that input prior to a final determination. As part of its March 11 discussion, the Board indicated little interest in a larger, 15,000 plus square foot new transfer station facility. Accordingly, staff and RSWA have not evaluated that alternative further.

The most recent report from DAA is attached (Attachment B). This report, prepared in close collaboration with key representatives of RSWA and with Supervisors Palmer and Mallek, provides a comprehensive assessment of four basic options - two of which involve modifications to the existing transfer station facility and two of which involve the construction of a new transfer station facility on the "western site" as previously described. The report includes the identification of key assumptions that inform the assessment of the four options and provides relevant background information regarding the changes in the use of the facility over the last several years. The report also contains summary descriptions of the options under consideration, a comparison of key aspects that may be meaningful in the relative comparison of the options, and detailed cost estimates for each option related to both capital and operating impacts. The report also includes preliminary site plans and building elevations so that the Board can better visualize how the various options will "fit" on Ivy MUC property.

The information was prepared in response to the Board's interest in this issue and is being presented at this time for information purposes only with the understanding that the RSWA will receive the report and provide specific information regarding its estimate on the annual operating costs for each option prior to the Board's November 3, 2015 meeting. At that time, it is reasonably expected that the Board will be in a position to make a final determination regarding the preferred option for an upgraded transfer station at the Ivy MUC, which will then inform the RSWA so that it can prepare and provide the necessary documentation to the VDEQ prior to the December 31, 2015 deadline.

Planning level capital cost estimates for the four options that are being considered range from \$750,650 to \$2,587,200 and have been modified from previous reports to reflect new equipment for the options involving the modification of the existing transfer station facility. The County currently has \$1.2M in the FY16 Capital Budget for use on this project. Preliminary operating cost estimates vary for each option and are based on key assumptions involving multiple factors including, but not limited to, debt service/amortization and depreciation, compaction and associated haul weights, personnel requirements, tonnage received, and the assumed useful life of the facility. The RSWA FY16 budget includes \$351,426.50 in County funding support for the Ivy MUC transfer station operation.

This information is being provided for information only at this time. It is expected that the Board will make a final determination regarding its preferred option for a transfer station upgrade at its meeting on November 3, 2015.

Mr. Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive, addressed the Board, and mentioned that representatives from the project consultants, Draper Aden and Reynolds Architects, are present. Mr. Walker stated that in March the Board had a significant conversation about this issue, with the conclusion being a focus on Ivy as the location for these improvements, and the focus on a transfer station. He said over the last few months, there had been considerable effort put into fleshing out the viable options in greater detail, to enable the Board to make thoughtful choices about the investment to make at Ivy, and to enable the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) to consider these options and provide input as the holder of the permit and owner of the property. Mr. Walker stated there had been work with County and Rivanna staff as well as the consultants, with Board input from Ms. Palmer and Ms. Mallek. He said the Board is not being asked to make a decision now but would be in November, and the RSWA will assess the cost implications for the Board as part of their review. He noted this is being driven in large part by a letter of agreement between the DEQ and Rivanna, with respect to being out of compliance with the current transfer station, and a formal report due no later than December 31, 2015. Mr. Walker emphasized they are within the timeframe, but they need to ensure that they meet the deadline.

Mr. Walker provided a map of the Ivy MUC facility on Dick Woods Road, and pointed out the relatively isolated location and the buffering between the neighbors, who have an interest in what happens at the site. He stated the facility itself consists of a scale and scale house, a tipping area into a hopper, a conveyor that goes into a compactor, with trash compacted and put into a trailer, which is transported to an offsite landfill outside of the County. Mr. Walker said that goals established have evolved as the project has moved along, with the need to address the DEQ agreement, but also recognition of the opportunity to improve customer service, particularly the ability to process more than one vehicle at a time; reducing transportation costs, which is a significant variable in the operating costs as it relates to trailer weights; and enhancing the flexibility of operations, generated by the unusual mix of waste this facility receives, and helping Rivanna position itself in a way that gives them some options.

Mr. Walker stated the operating parameters identified are the operating hours and days of operations will be as they are today. Operations, including clean fill, mulching, and white goods are also remaining the same, with all variables able to be changed in the future, but remaining constant now in order to have a direct comparison for the evaluation. He said tonnage is a variable previously discussed, with the station permitted for 150 tons per day but receiving 27 or 28 tons per day, and modeling these options done at 50 tons per day but 30 tons per day in cost estimates for the evaluation. Mr. Walker stated that because of the nature of the investment, they had considered a 3-5 year short term fix, but for planning purposes this was costed out 20 years for the structural improvements and 10 years for the equipment, which is different from the previously identified 14 years to take them to 2030 when the agreement expires. He said they will talk more about waste composition and density, which impacts trailer weights and haul costs. Mr. Walker said personnel costs will remain the same in Option 1, but there is an additional staff person identified in Option 2. He noted that some advantage can be realized with the sizes of materials pursuant to operations, and he introduced Ms. Lynn Klappich of Draper Aden.

Ms. Lynn Klappich addressed the Board and stated they have been talking about two primary options, Option 1, a load requiring mechanical equipment conveyed into a compactor and then into

trailers; and Option 2, with a passive load of waste coming into a tipping floor then pushed into an open-top trailer that is then pulled out and tarped over. She stated the big difference is related to compaction, with Option 1 compacting directly into trailers and Option 2 pushing it into the floor with the only mechanism for compacting being an attachment to the loader or segregating it on the floor to achieve higher trailer weights. Ms. Klappich pointed out that Option 1 is similar to the existing operation, with 1A being almost identical, and they looked at a canopy structure over it with a size of 2,400 square feet. She said they had first talked about a possible canopy in November 2014 when they were trying to come up with a short-term fix for the transfer station; and Option 1B had a larger structure over it, a building, not really a canopy. Ms. Klappich said that because of the unusual and bulky nature of the waste, Rivanna is only getting about 13 tons per load to reduce the possibility of puncturing the sides of the trailers. She stated with 1B, they looked at taking the waste and pre-compacting it into "logs" then pushing them into the trailer, which allows them to get more than 20 tons per load, and transportation costs would be impacted by how much can be put into a load. Ms. Klappich said in order to build structures and change out equipment in the middle of an operating facility, there must be a mechanism in place for handling the waste during that time, and the RSWA has had to do that before when replacing the conveyor, so they have a procedure in place that has been approved by the DEQ. She stated in talking with Rivanna about the existing equipment they had given it 3-5 years, and they have done an excellent job in making it hold out, but the plan calls for complete equipment replacement.

Ms. Klappich presented a slide showing the structure with the larger equipment and longer conveyor, and said one of the focuses for Option 1B is to go back to the goals of flexibility, as a larger tipping floor will allow for some segregation of waste; and Option 1B also has a longer conveyor so it allows for more than one vehicle to unload at a time. She stated the canopy for Option 1B is about 8,000 square feet, with Option 1A at about 2,400 square feet, very minimum for the operation. Ms. Klappich reported the passive load system will be located on the western parcel, and they have been able to find a parcel where they can utilize the existing infrastructure, the scales, the access road, the signage, and the parcel is just south of the closed landfill, and the existing road and flare system for the landfill are present on the parcel. She stated the transfer station fits on the parcel very well despite some challenges with grades, with only a loader needed in terms of mechanical equipment, and rolling stock equipment versus stationary compaction equipment needed to push the materials in. Ms. Klappich noted the grade break is the challenge with the transfer stations for passive loads, as a 16-foot grade break is needed between the tipping floor and where the trailer rests, which creates a lot of cost in terms of the concrete, the foundation, and the overall construction costs for the building versus the cost of canopies needed for the existing operation.

Ms. Klappich said that either option includes the capability for more than one vehicle to one load, with Option 2B being larger and allowing a bit more flexibility in terms of segregating waste and possibly looking at recycling. Ms. Klappich stated that Rivanna is convinced they will need an additional equipment operator, and currently they allocated their 9.2 FTEs among their various operations, with 3.7 allocated to the existing transfer station. She said this includes the scale house attendants, with only 1.5 actual equipment operators, so with tarping the vehicles they will need an extra operator. Ms. Klappich stated that average trailer weights for these passive load facilities are estimated at about 17 tons per haul, and compared to other transfer stations, they are over 20 tons, but that is MSW, not bulky material such as mattresses and furniture. She noted that 17 tons of average trailer weight is thought to be the best this facility can do, and one of the big differences is that Option 2 will be subject to a major site plan amendment, as well as a little bit more work from DEQ. She said that Option 1 will need a minor site plan amendment by the County, but nothing compares to the requirements of this brand new facility and the storm water zoning requirements.

Ms. Klappich presented a slide showing the facility layout for Option 2B, stating that a vehicle will come across the scales, turn left, and make a loop, with the challenge being difficulty for the trailers to get back across the scales to weigh out, so the costs include scales underneath the loading area for the trailers. She explained that a traditional passive load transfer station is a big, open building, and Option 1B includes a lot of Jersey barriers to illustrate how waste might be segregated, and that can be done with Option 2B as well. She said more than one vehicle can come in and unload, which will be a function of the additional equipment operator, who will help people backing in. Ms. Klappich said that Option 1B has a 6,000 square foot tipping floor with an additional 1,800 square feet assigned to the hall trailer area; Option 2B has a 10,000 square foot tipping floor with an additional 1,800 square feet for the hall area.

Ms. Klappich reported that regarding capital costs, there has been significant discussion with Marathon Equipment on the costs for the stationary compactor units and Carter Machinery on the loader costs; Reynolds Architects and Draper Aden Associates both put together conceptual costs for the architectural and site work components, with scales added in based on other projects. She noted the totals presented and said they are used to establish debt service at a 4% interest rate, with building, site work and engineering amortized over 20 years and equipment amortized over 10 years, and a depreciation fund because it is typically included with RSWA's operations. Ms. Klappich stated that in estimating the facility operating costs, they started with the existing RSWA FY16 budget, with the primary difference between Option 1 and Option 2 being the additional personnel as salary and benefits. She said that trying to incorporate the trailer weight differences is very important in this evaluation, with 13 tons as Option 1A and 21 tons as Option 2B, with as much as 60% cost difference. She noted the evaluation has included both 30 tons and 50 tons per day, as the existing figure and the planning figure, respectively. Ms. Klappich said that 30 tons per day totals about 7,000 tons per year, and they incorporated debt service and operations, with the RSWA assessing the transfer operation and administrative costs, so she took that for the FY16 budget and included both that and depreciation in the table presented. She noted that haul costs are based on tonnage, and disposal costs are flat for all four options.

Ms. Klappich stated she also included an estimate assuming the tonnage is coming across the scales and paying \$66 per ton, with some offsetting revenue sources for the RSWA, and she included a figure based on 30 tons per day times \$66 for purposes of comparison. She said she also illustrated the potential cost to the County, which will be the difference between the total annual cost and the revenues, for all four options. Ms. Klappich stated the driver between the 30 and 50 tons is primarily the hauling costs, and this also illustrates the economies of scale with more tonnage.

Mr. Foley said that just for the solid waste transfer station, the cost is approximately \$400,000, so that is already going towards those costs. He stated they had been budgeting about \$450,000, but they have been coming in under that level.

Ms. Palmer stated that one of the reasons she approved strongly of Option 2B is that it provides more flexibility for what they will do in the future, as they had talked about improving the convenience center aspects of the facility. She said she had learned a lot about the type of material received at the site, with thousands of mattresses brought in every year, which raises questions as to whether they are charging the right level of fees. She stated she appreciates the work of the group.

Mr. Glenn Reynolds of Reynolds Architects said that Option 2B provides 3,000 additional square footage to include recycling, in addition to the 6,000 square feet tipping floor.

Ms. Palmer noted she had also talked with people who do the smaller recycling facilities, like that at UVA, and Jesse Worth from UVA has suggested a minimum of a 2,500 square foot addition for the Ivy facility. Mr. Foley stated this will go next to Tom Frederick, who is signing off on the bottom line as the best estimate for budget purposes, but he would be bringing forward final costs from the RSWA for other costs such as insurance.

Mr. Boyd said they also need to see an average cost for the last few years so that can be netted out.

Mr. Foley mentioned they also have \$1.2 million in the CIP, and will also try to explore the number that can be derived from the depreciation figures.

Ms. Mallek said in a recent discussion there was mention of a better quality compactor, and asked if the cost is reflected in these totals.

Ms. Klappich and Mr. Walker responded that it is reflected in the capital costs in Option 1B, and Option 1A is a different kind of compactor, similar to what they have today.

Mr. Foley said this is why the figures are for 21 tons versus 13, which is why the heavy duty compactor provides a better haul.

Ms. Klappich noted there is also a piece of stationary equipment, the scales, in both Option 2A and 2B.

Agenda Item No. 15. Closed Meeting.

At 5:02 p.m., Mr. Boyd **moved** that the Board go into Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(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 (3) to discuss the possible disposition of County-owned property necessary for road improvements on Route 29 because discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position of the County; and under Subsection (7) to consult with and be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding probable litigation arising from the enforcement of a County ordinance.

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

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

Agenda Item No.16. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 6:10 p.m., Mr. Boyd **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. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

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

- **reappoint** Mr. E.N. Garnett to the Acquisition of Conservation Easement Committee with said term to expire August 1, 2018.
- **appoint** Mr. Stan Binstead to the Architectural Review Board to fill an unexpired term ending November 14, 2018.
- **appoint** Ms. Suzanne Coffey to the Places 29 RIO Community Advisory Committee with said term to expire September 30, 2018.
- **appoint** Mr. Louis Lopez to the Places 29 RIO Community Advisory Committee with said term to expire September 30, 2017.
- **appoint** Ms. Elizabeth Knotts as the Scottsville District representative to the Social Services Advisory Board to fill an unexpired term ending December 31, 2015.

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

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

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 18. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

Ms. Martha Levering addressed the Board, stating she is a City resident and represents the League of Women Voters, Charlottesville area. Ms. Levering said the LWV nationwide has worked on solid waste issues since 1971. Last year during the Comp Plan review they spoke to the Board about the important role in local government in solid waste management and oversight, and supports the objectives of the plan to reduce waste, conserve resources, protect human and environmental health, and decrease greenhouse gas emissions. She said the LWV also studied the report produced by the Albemarle County Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee, which found that existing disposal and recycling services for residents needs improvement. Ms. Levering stated that many residents are not adequately served by private trash-hauling services, and while a pilot program is in the works for one County neighborhood, curbside single-stream recycling is not an option for most residents. She said the County has failed to update and invest in its public waste disposal and recycling facilities, operated by the RSWA, and there are only two for the entire County. Ms. Levering said that public input and survey results show that a large majority of County residents want to increase recycling rates and more access to comprehensive recycling services such as composting of organic waste and safe disposal of hazardous waste such as unused pharmaceuticals and discarded electronic products. She added the County has a basic responsibility to ensure that every resident has access to cost-effective, reliable, safe and affordable waste disposal, as well as comprehensive recycling opportunities. Ms. Levering said the LWV endorses the sustainable materials management policy and strategies presented in the Solid Waste Advisory Committee's report, and urges the Board to take action on the committee's recommendations.

Ms. Kathy Rasche addressed the Board and stated that she is a farmer, vineyard owner, and resident of the Whitehall community. Ms. Rasche stated she organized the water resources funding meeting, which included Ms. Mallek and County Water Resources Manager Greg Harper and 107 members of the public. She said there is great concern in the community about this issue, and an environmental scientist under contract with the EPA and involved with the Chesapeake Bay program had spoken at the meeting. Ms. Rasche said she and other farmers in the area want to know if it is acceptable to gather petitions after the report and analysis, to address how this can be funded.

Ms. Robbie Savage, Executive Director of the Rivanna Conservation Society, addressed the Board and stated she had sent Ms. Palmer many pictures of the trash the RCS has found in their trash cleanups. Ms. Savage said they are doing well in places like Free Bridge that are easy to get to, but not in areas like Pollocks Branch. She stated they also do regular cleanups around the reservoir and in the Kmart area, with 27 cleanups done last year and 250 tires collected that had to be disposed. Ms. Savage said people who do not have the resources to pay for items to be taken to the dump just dispose of them randomly. She stated there are currently 20 tires at the reservoir to be picked up, but it is not the job of a nonprofit or community members to go out and pick up all of this, and she urges the Board to pass the recommendations before them.

Ms. Palmer thanked Ms. Savage for all the work that she and her group have done, and said that she had encouraged members of the public to provide input on illegal dumping as part of the solid waste discussion. She said she will circulate to the other Board members the pictures that had been shared with her depicting boatloads of illegally dumped items.

Ms. Savage recognized UVA for their role in the cleanup and said that members of the Law School, Batten School, and Rowing Club all volunteered.

Agenda Item No. 19. **Public Hearing:** An ordinance to amend County Code Chapter 2, Administration, Article I, Elections, by amending Section 2-102, Rio Magisterial District, to update the official address of the Senior Center, the polling place for the Branchlands Precinct, to 1180 Pepsi Place; and by amending Section 2-104, Samuel Miller Magisterial District, to update the name of the Berean Baptist Church, the polling place for the Country Green Precinct, to the South Ridge Christian Fellowship

Church, at the same location at 1284 Sunset Avenue Extended. (*Advertised in Daily Progress on September 21 and September 28, 2015.*)

The executive summary as presented to the Board states that on May 9, 2001, after the 2001 redistricting of the County's magisterial districts, the Board adopted Ordinance 01-2(1) to reflect the district changes and to include the polling place locations of the precincts in each district. The Senior Center, which is the polling place for the Branchlands precinct of the Rio Magisterial District, was identified as being located at 674 Hillsdale Drive in County Code § 2-102. The address is now officially 1180 Pepsi Place.

In addition, the Berean Baptist Church, which is identified as the polling place for the Country Green precinct of the Samuel Miller Magisterial District in County Code § 2-104, has changed its name to the South Ridge Christian Fellowship.

Staff has prepared the attached draft ordinance (Attachment A) to:

- amend County Code § 2-102, Rio Magisterial District, to update the address of the Senior Center as 1180 Pepsi Place; and
- amend County Code § 2-104, Samuel Miller Magisterial District, to reflect the new name of the Berean Baptist Church as the South Ridge Christian Fellowship Church.

The adoption of the proposed ordinance will have no budget impact.

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

Mr. Davis reported that this ordinance is a housekeeping matter, and said that upon review of the County's polling place ordinance in the code it was discovered that two of them had information related to them that had changed. He said the Branchlands precinct polling place, which is located in the Senior Center, had the formal legal address changed from Hillsdale Drive to Pepsi Place; and Berean Baptist Church, which served as the Country Green precinct polling place in the Samuel Miller District, has now changed its name to "Southridge Christian Fellowship Church." Mr. Davis said that in order for the polling places to be accurate in the ordinance, the Board will need to amend the ordinance to address the two changes. He stated the polling places are exactly the same other than the identifying information, and staff recommends adopting the ordinance in Attachment A to make these ministerial changes.

The Chair opened the public hearing. Since no one came forward to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Palmer then **moved** to adopt the ordinance as presented. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

(The adopted ordinance is set out below:)

ORDINANCE NO. 15-2(2)

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN CHAPTER 2, ADMINISTRATION, ARTICLE I, ELECTIONS, 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 I, Elections, of the Code of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, is hereby amended and reordained as follows:

By Amending:

Sec. 2-102 Rio Magisterial District
Sec. 2-104 Samuel Miller Magisterial District

CHAPTER 2. ADMINISTRATION

ARTICLE I. ELECTIONS

.....

Sec. 2-102 Rio Magisterial District.

The Rio Magisterial District shall be bounded, and contain precincts and polling places, as follows:

A. *Description of district:* Beginning at the intersection of Seminole Trail (U.S. Route 29) and the South Fork Rivanna River; then northeast along Seminole Trail to its intersection with Dickerson Lane (State Route 763); then west along Dickerson Lane to its intersection with Dickerson Road (State Route 606); then south along Dickerson Road to its intersection with Earlysville Road (State Route 743); then northwest along Earlysville Road to its intersection with Buck Mountain Road (State Route 663); then

northwest along Buck Mountain Road (State Route 663) to its intersection with Buck Mountain Road (State Route 664); then northwest along Buck Mountain Road (State Route 664) to its intersection with Buck Mountain Road (State Route 665); then southwest along Buck Mountain Road (State Route 665) to its intersection with Bleak House Road (State Route 662); then south along Bleak House Road to its intersection with Reas Ford Road (State Route 660); then south along Reas Ford Road to its intersection with the South Fork Rivanna River; then meandering southeast along the South Fork Rivanna River to its intersection with Earlysville Road (State Route 743); then south along Earlysville Road to its intersection with Hydraulic Road (State Route 743); then southwest along Hydraulic Road to its intersection with Whitewood Road; then east along Whitewood Road to its intersection with Greenbrier Drive; then southeast along Greenbrier Drive to its intersection with Seminole Trail (U.S. Route 29); then south along Seminole Trail to its intersection with Charlottesville's northern city limits; then along the Charlottesville city limits east to its intersection with the Rivanna River; then meandering north along the Rivanna River to its confluence with the South Fork Rivanna River; then meandering north and west along the South Fork Rivanna River, to Seminole Trail (U.S. Route 29), the point of origin.

B. *Precincts*: The district shall be divided into five (5) precincts, as described herein:

1. *Agnor-Hurt Precinct*: Beginning at Seminole Trail (U.S. Route 29) and its intersection with Greenbrier Drive; then northeast along Seminole Trail to its intersection with the South Fork Rivanna River; then meandering west and south along the South Fork Rivanna River to its intersection with Earlysville Road (State Route 743); then south along Earlysville Road to its intersection with Hydraulic Road (State Route 743); then southwest along Hydraulic Road to its intersection with Whitewood Road; then east along Whitewood Road to its intersection with Greenbrier Drive; then southeast along Greenbrier Drive to its intersection with Seminole Trail, the point of origin.

2. *Branchlands Precinct*: Beginning at Charlottesville's northern city limits and its intersection with Denice Lane and Rio Road East (State Route 631); then northwest along Rio Road East to its intersection with Seminole Trail (U.S. Route 29); then south along Seminole Trail to Charlottesville's northern city limits; then east along the Charlottesville city limits to its intersection with Denice Lane and Rio Road East, the point of origin.

3. *Dunlora Precinct*: Beginning at Rio Road East (State Route 631) at its intersection with the Norfolk Southern Railway right-of way and the Charlottesville city limits; then northeast along the Norfolk Southern Railway right-of-way to its intersection with the South Fork Rivanna River; then meandering southeast along the South Fork Rivanna River to its confluence with the North Fork Rivanna River and the Rivanna River; then running south along the Rivanna River to its intersection with the Charlottesville city limits; then south and west along the Charlottesville city limits to its intersection with the Norfolk Southern Railway right-of-way; then northeast along the Norfolk Southern Railway right-of-way and the Charlottesville city limits to its intersection with Rio Road East, the point of origin.

4. *Northside Precinct*: Beginning at the intersection of Seminole Trail (U.S. Route 29) and the South Fork Rivanna River; then northeast along Seminole Trail to its intersection with Dickerson Lane (State Route 763); then west along Dickerson Lane to its intersection with Dickerson Road (State Route 606); then south along Dickerson Road to its intersection with Earlysville Road (State Route 743); then northwest along Earlysville Road to its intersection with Buck Mountain Road (State Route 663); then northwest along Buck Mountain Road (State Route 663) to its intersection with Buck Mountain Road (State Route 664); then northwest along Buck Mountain Road (State Route 664) to its intersection with Buck Mountain Road (State Route 665); then southwest along Buck Mountain Road (State Route 665) to its intersection with Bleak House Road (State Route 662); then south along Bleak House Road to its intersection with Reas Ford Road (State Route 660); then South along Reas Ford Road to its intersection with the South Fork Rivanna River; then meandering east along the South Fork Rivanna River to its intersection with Seminole Trail (U.S. Route 29), the point of origin.

5. *Woodbrook Precinct*: Beginning at Charlottesville's northern city limits and its intersection with Rio Road East (State Route 631) and the Norfolk Southern Railway right-of-way; then northeast along the Norfolk Southern Railway right-of-way to its intersection with the South Fork Rivanna River; then meandering northwest along the South Fork Rivanna River to its intersection with Seminole Trail (U.S. Route 29); then south along Seminole Trail to its intersection with Rio Road East (State Route 631); then southeast along Rio Road East to its intersection with the Norfolk Southern Railway right-of-way and Charlottesville's northern city limits, the point of origin.

C. *Polling places*: Each precinct shall have a polling place at the location identified below:

1. *Agnor-Hurt Precinct*: Agnor-Hurt Elementary School, 3201 Berkmar Drive.
2. *Branchlands Precinct*: Senior Center, 1180 Pepsi Place.
3. *Dunlora Precinct*: Charlottesville-Albemarle Technical Education Center, 1000 East Rio Road.
4. *Northside Precinct*: Earlysville Volunteer Fire Station, 283 Reas Ford Road.
5. *Woodbrook Precinct*: Woodbrook Elementary School, 100 Woodbrook Drive.

.....

Sec. 2-104 Samuel Miller Magisterial District.

The Samuel Miller Magisterial District shall be bounded, and contain precincts and polling places, as follows:

A. *Description of district.* Beginning at the intersection of the Mechums River and Garth Road (State Routes 614, 676 and 601); then east and south along Garth Road to its intersection with Ivy Creek; then meandering west and south along Ivy Creek to its intersection with Old Ballard Road (State Route 677); then south along Old Ballard Road to its intersection with Broomley Road (State Route 677); then south along Broomley Road to its intersection with the CSX Railway right-of-way; then east along the CSX Railway right-of-way to its intersection with the U.S. Route 29/250 Bypass; then south along the U.S. Route 29/250 Bypass to its intersection with the U.S. Route 29 Bypass; the south along the U.S. Route 29 Bypass to its intersection with Fontaine Avenue Extended/U.S. Route 29 Business; then east along Fontaine Avenue Extended /U.S. Route 29 Business to its intersection with the Charlottesville city limits; then south along the Charlottesville city limits to its intersection with Sunset Avenue Extended (State Route 781); then south along Sunset Avenue Extended to its intersection with Mountainwood Road; then east along Mountainwood Road to its intersection with Old Lynchburg Road (State Route 780); then south along Old Lynchburg Road (State Route 780) to Old Lynchburg Road (State Route 631); then south along Old Lynchburg Road (State Route 631) to its intersection with a western branch of Biscuit Run (immediately south of and running roughly parallel to Forest Lodge Drive); then east along this western branch of Biscuit Run to its confluence with Biscuit Run; then south along Biscuit Run approximately 375 feet to its confluence with an eastern branch of Biscuit Run; then continuing east along this eastern branch of Biscuit Run to its intersection with Scottsville Road (State Route 20) (just north of the intersection of Scottsville Road and Cedar Hill Farm road); then south along Scottsville Road to its intersection with Red Hill Road (State Route 708); then immediately west along Red Hill Road to its intersection with the North Fork Hardware River; then meandering southwest along the North Fork Hardware River to its confluence with the Hardware River and the South Fork Hardware River; then southwest along the South Fork Hardware River to its confluence with Eppes Creek; then southwest along Eppes Creek to its confluence with Beaver Branch; then meandering southwest along Beaver Branch to its intersection with Plank Road (State Route 712); then southeast along Plank Road to its intersection with Esmont Road (State Route 715); then continuing northeast along Plank Road to its intersection with Scottsville Road (State Route 20); then southeast along Scottsville Road to its intersection with Langhorne Road (State Route 626); then southwest along Langhorne Road to its intersection with James River Road (State Route 627); then southeast along James River Road to its intersection with Warren Ferry Road (State Route 627); then south along Warren Ferry Road to its intersection with the James River and the Albemarle/Buckingham county line; then southwest along the Albemarle/ Buckingham county line to its intersection with the Albemarle/Nelson county line; then northwest along the Albemarle/Nelson county line to its intersection with Batesville Road (State Route 636); then east along Batesville Road to its intersection with Ortman Road (State Route 691); then north along Ortman Road to its intersection with Rockfish Gap Turnpike (U. S. Route 250); then east along Rockfish Gap Turnpike to its intersection with Interstate 64; then east along Interstate 64 to its intersection with the Mechums River; then meandering northeast along the Mechums River to its intersection with Garth Road, the point of origin.

B. *Precincts:* The district shall be divided into six (6) precincts, as described herein:

1. *Country Green Precinct.* Beginning at Sunset Avenue Extended (State Route 781) and the overpass of Interstate 64; then south along Sunset Avenue Extended to its intersection with Mountainwood Road; then east along Mountainwood Road to its intersection with Old Lynchburg Road (State Route 780); then south along Old Lynchburg Road (State Route 780) to Old Lynchburg Road (State Route 631); then south along Old Lynchburg Road (State Route 631) to its intersection with a western branch of Biscuit Run (immediately south of and running roughly parallel to Forest Lodge Drive); then east along this western branch of Biscuit Run to its confluence with Biscuit Run; then south along Biscuit Run approximately 375 feet to its confluence with an eastern branch of Biscuit Run; then continuing east along this eastern branch of Biscuit Run to its intersection with Scottsville Road (State Route 20) (just north of the intersection of Scottsville Road and Cedar Hill Farm road); then south along Scottsville Road to its intersection with Red Hill Road (State Route 708); then northwest along Red Hill Road to its intersection with the Norfolk Southern Railway right-of-way; then northeast along the Norfolk Southern Railway right-of-way to its intersection with Interstate 64; then southeast along Interstate 64 to its overpass at Sunset Avenue Extended, the point of origin.

2. *East Ivy Precinct.* Beginning at the intersection of Charlottesville's western city limits and Sunset Avenue Extended (State Route 781); then south along Sunset Avenue Extended to its intersection with Interstate 64; then west along Interstate 64 to its intersection with Dick Woods Road (State Route 637); then north along Dick Woods Road to its intersection with Bloomfield Road (State Route 677); then northeast along Bloomfield Road to its intersection with Ivy Road (U.S. Route 250); then east along Ivy Road to its intersection with Broomley Road (State Route 677); then north along Broomley Road to its intersection with the CSX Railway right-of-way; then east along the CSX Railway right-of-way to its intersection with the U.S. Route 29/250 Bypass; then south along the U.S. Route 29/250 Bypass to its intersection with the U.S. Route 29 Bypass; then south along the U.S. Route 29 Bypass to its intersection with Fontaine Avenue Extended (U.S. Route 29 Business); then east along Fontaine Avenue Extended/U.S. Route 29 Business to its intersection with the Charlottesville city limits; then along the Charlottesville city limits south to the intersection with Sunset Avenue Extended, the point of origin.

3. *Ivy Precinct*: Beginning at the intersection of the Mechums River and Garth Road (State Routes 614, 676 and 601); then east and southeast along Garth Road to its intersection with Ivy Creek; then meandering west and south along Ivy Creek to its intersection with Old Ballard Road (State Route 677); then south along Old Ballard Road to its intersection with Broomley Road (State Route 677); then south along Broomley Road to its intersection with Ivy Road (U.S. Route 250); then west along Ivy Road to its intersection with Bloomfield Road (State Route 677); then southwest along Bloomfield Road to its intersection with Dick Woods Road (State Route 637); then southwest along Dick Woods Road to its intersection with Interstate 64; then west along Interstate 64 to its intersection with the Mechums River; then meandering northeast along the Mechums River to its intersection with Garth Road, the point of origin.

4. *Porter's Precinct*: Beginning at the intersection of Warren Ferry Road (State Route 627), the James River, and the Albemarle/Buckingham county line; then southwest along the Albemarle/Buckingham county line to its intersection with the Albemarle/Nelson county line; then northwest along the Albemarle/Nelson county line to its intersection with Bear Creek; then meandering northeast along Bear Creek to its confluence with an unnamed southern tributary of Bear Creek; then continuing northeast along the unnamed tributary to its intersection with Bear Creek Road (State Route 774); then continuing along Bear Creek Road to its intersection with Appleberry Mountain Trail; then northeast along Appleberry Mountain Trail to its intersection with Barbershop Hill Road; then northeast along Barbershop Hill Road to its intersection with Bungletown Road; then southeast along Bungletown Road to its intersection with Green Creek Road (State Route 630); then east along Green Creek Road to its intersection with Secretarys Sand Road (State Route 717); then briefly northeast along Secretarys Sand Road to its intersection with Alberene Road (State Route 719); then north along Alberene Road to its intersection with Plank Road (State Route 712); then southeast along Plank Road to its intersection with Esmont Road (State Route 715); then continuing northeast along Plank Road to its intersection with Scottsville Road (State Route 20); then southeast along Scottsville Road to its intersection with Langhorne Road (State Route 626); then southwest along Langhorne Road to its intersection with James River Road (State Route 627); then southeast along James River Road to its intersection with Warren Ferry Road (State Route 627); then south along Warren Ferry Road to its intersection with the James River and the Albemarle/Buckingham county line, the point of origin.

5. *Red Hill Precinct*: Beginning at the intersection of Interstate 64 and the Mechums River; then meandering southwest along the Mechums River to its confluence with the unnamed northern branch of the Mechums River; then continuing west along the unnamed northern branch of the Mechums River to the Albemarle/Nelson county line; then southeast along the Albemarle/Nelson county line to its intersection with Bear Creek; then meandering northeast along Bear Creek to its confluence with an unnamed southern tributary of Bear Creek; then continuing northeast along the unnamed tributary to its intersection with Bear Creek Road (State Route 774); then continuing along Bear Creek Road to its intersection with Appleberry Mountain Trail; then northeast along Appleberry Mountain Trail to its intersection with Barbershop Hill Road; then northeast along Barbershop Hill Road to its intersection with Bungletown Road; then southeast along Bungletown Road to its intersection with Green Creek Road (State Route 630); then east along Green Creek Road to its intersection with Secretarys Sand Road (State Route 717); then briefly northeast along Secretarys Sand Road to its intersection with Alberene Road (State Route 719); then north along Alberene Road to its intersection with Plank Road (State Route 712); then east along Plank Road to its intersection with Beaver Branch; then meandering northeast along Beaver Branch to its confluence with Eppes Creek; then northeast along Eppes Creek to its confluence with the South Fork Hardware River; then meandering northeast along the South Fork Hardware River to its confluence with the North Fork Hardware River and the Hardware River; then meandering northeast along the North Fork Hardware River to its intersection with Red Hill Road (State Route 708); then northwest along Red Hill Road to its intersection with the Norfolk Southern Railway right-of-way; then northeast along the Norfolk Southern Railway right-of-way to its intersection with Interstate 64; then west on Interstate 64 to its intersection with the Mechums River, the point of origin.

6. *Yellow Mountain Precinct*: Beginning at the intersection of the Albemarle/Nelson county line and Batesville Road (State Route 636); then east along Batesville Road to its intersection with Ortman Road (State Route 691); then north along Ortman Road to its intersection with Rockfish Gap Turnpike (U. S. Route 250); then east along Rockfish Gap Turnpike to its intersection with Interstate 64; then east along Interstate 64 to its intersection with the Mechums River; then meandering southwest along the Mechums River to its confluence with an unnamed northern branch of the Mechums River; then meandering west along the unnamed northern branch of the Mechums River to its intersection with the Albemarle/Nelson county line; then northwest on the Albemarle/Nelson county line to its intersection with Batesville Road (State Route 636), the point of origin.

C. *Polling places*: Each precinct shall have a polling place at the location identified below:

1. *Country Green Precinct*: South Ridge Christian Fellowship Church, 1284 Sunset Avenue Extended.
2. *East Ivy Precinct*: The Miller Center of Public Affairs, 2201 Old Ivy Road.
3. *Ivy Precinct*: Meriwether Lewis Elementary School, 1610 Owensville Road.
4. *Porter's Precinct*: Yancey Elementary School, 7625 Porters Road.
5. *Red Hill Precinct*: Red Hill Elementary School, 3901 Red Hill School Road.
6. *Yellow Mountain Precinct*: Mount Ed Baptist Church, 1606 Craigs Store Road.

(8-19-71, § 1; 9-5-72; 7-15-81; Code 1988, § 6-1; 5-15-91; Ord. 95-6(1), 1-11-95; Ord. 98-A(1), 8-5-98, § 2-100(4), § 2-104; Ord. 01-2(1), 5-9-01; Ord. 04-2(2), 8-4-04; Ord. 11-2(2), 5-4-11)

State law reference – Va. Code §§ 15.2-1211, 24.2-304.1 *et seq.*, 24.2-305 *et seq.*

Agenda Item No. 21. Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee Final Report.

The executive summary as presented to the Board states that the Board of Supervisors created the Albemarle County Long Range Solid Waste Solutions Advisory Committee (the Committee) at its meeting on April 2, 2014 and appointed to it the County members of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Citizen Advisory Committee, along with Supervisor Palmer as Board liaison, with the expectation that the Committee would develop and submit to the Board a formal Charge for consideration and approval. At its meeting on July 2, 2014, the Board approved the Committee's Charge, which included specific goals, membership composition and a general timeline for completion of its work. The Charge was modified by the Board on February 4, 2015 (Attachment A) to better reflect an intent of the Committee to identify policy recommendations for the Board. The Committee is comprised of ten members who are appointed by the Board of Supervisors, as well as a liaison to the Planning Commission and a liaison to the Board of Supervisors. Over the course of approximately one year, the Committee conducted approximately forty (40) formal meetings and work sessions. In support of the adopted Charge, the Board approved a Public Engagement Plan on November 5, 2014 to guide the Committee in its efforts to both inform and involve County citizens in the work of the Committee. The specific engagement activities were numerous and varied. A detailed summary of all community engagement activity is attached (Attachment B).

The Committee was charged with presenting its report to the Board by September 2015. In an effort to solicit more input from the Board and the community, the Committee presented a Draft Final Report to the Board on August 5, 2015 with the intention of soliciting additional input before making its final submission. The Final Report is attached (Attachment C) and includes a summary of recommendations that serve to highlight the consensus of the Committee as an outcome of its work together. Careful attention was given to both the content and the structure of the recommendations. In particular, it should be noted that the recommendations are grouped in priority categories for consideration rather than being prioritized individually. This is not to presume that recommendations must be considered as one - merely that within the grouping the Committee assigns relative equal value to the individual priorities. Second, the recommendations include a representation of relative cost and/or impact as determined by Committee consensus. Staff acknowledges that more detailed cost analysis will be required as recommendations are brought forward for more in-depth consideration as part of the Five Year Plan process and the annual budget process, depending on the interest of the Board.

Costs associated with any specific recommendation would be developed as part of the budget process following direction from the Board regarding its interest in funding these activities, programs and services and would need to be determined based on specific proposals. For example, the impact of a new standing committee on existing staff resources can be quantified following the development of a specific charter with clear identification of staff support expectations, and the cost of a new position can be determined after finalizing all of its essential functions.

The Final Report is presented to the Board for discussion and consideration. Direction regarding implementation priorities and resources will ultimately be needed as it relates to the Five-Year Financial Plan and the annual budget process.

Mr. Leo Mallek, Chair of the committee, addressed the Board and stated he is before them to present the group's final report. Mr. Mallek said the changes that were made to the report had been minor, and thanked the members of the committee for their 18 months of hard work in establishing recommendations. He introduced Teddy Hamilton and said that she will present slides outlining the report's priority recommendations.

Ms. Teddy Hamilton stated the committee wanted to concentrate on a few items rather than every recommendation, with those items focusing on the things the Board would most likely address. Ms. Hamilton stated the top priority items were selected because they would have the most immediate positive impact, and for the most part required a low financial investment, allowing the program to establish a framework and providing an immediate delineation of responsibility for implementation. She said their top priority is to establish a standing advisory committee, which is the fastest way to get the program going and only spend a little bit of money. She said there is a large group of people working on this who are very familiar with the issues, and she feels that some of them will apply to be on the standing advisory committee, with others likely coming forward to provide diversity in the group. Ms. Hamilton stated the committee also feels that it is important to hire a coordinator within County government who will have the actual authority to make decisions and write contracts, and the combination of the two will make the program strong. She added the committee feels it is imperative to have both of these, not one or the other, to get the program off the ground successfully, and the standing committee will include both advocates and field professionals.

Ms. Hamilton stated the committee feels the best place to start a program is within County government, to use it as a training ground to determine what works and what does not. She said each area has its challenges, which are well known in the County, and additional funding will likely be needed

for additional custodial services, a means to have recycling picked up at County-managed facilities, and composting facilities. Ms. Hamilton said the educational component of the program is also very important because of the need for messaging to help get everyone on board. The committee recommends using champions within facilities or offices and having a way to measure the progress of the program because it provides feedback as to whether a program is working so that tweaks can be made prior to it going into the community. She stated the committee also recommends expanded use of the Ivy and McIntire facilities, which are somewhat limited in terms of access and capacity for solid waste, recycling, and special programs like household hazardous waste disposal. Ms. Hamilton said the coordinator and the committee should work to measure impact to ensure success, and the advisory committee also recommends the County reintroduce waste streams such as batteries that were once accepted at those facilities. She noted there may be some economic advantage to piggybacking on programs in surrounding counties that already have those options. Ms. Hamilton stated the committee recommends the Board continue to look at recycling at the Ivy MUC, with commercial haulers having the opportunity to provide for segregation there as part of any upgrade. She added the committee identified the facility as the first location for a model recycling center, which can be replicated elsewhere in the County, and it will be a volume change from what is being brought there today and what will happen in the future once it is implemented.

Mr. Mallek said the committee hopes some programming will come out of the report, and the group understands any process will take time, but they are currently disbanded as the report is the last step as part of their original charge.

Mr. Boyd asked if anything in the committee's research indicates that having better solid waste facilities will stop irresponsible people from illegal dumping. Mr. Mallek responded the committee has heard from constituents that the cost of recycling is a barrier for disposal, as is convenience, and this is why the committee recommends starting with a model recycling center at an existing location such as Ivy. He said that increasing the number of hours and days that McIntire is open will also allow individuals to recycle more easily, but whether it converts to an economic improvement can only be assessed as history through analysis quantifiable results. Mr. Mallek emphasized the committee feels it is very important to have measurable metrics, so they are not just shooting in the dark.

Mr. Boyd said it does not seem the committee has looked into the historical information from other locations as to whether improved facilities helps with the dumping problem, and he does not think that reducing fees for disposal of white goods is on the table at this point.

Ms. Mallek said she learned on a field trip to Nelson County that they allow for free disposal of white goods because they in turn make money on them.

Mr. Rick Randolph addressed the Board and stated there is no reason to invest in a program unless there can be a measurable return in terms of improvement, and said the economics of disposal drives people to look for the most convenient location. He said a lot of the dumping occurs in the southern part of the County, which impacts the Scottsville and Samuel Miller districts. Mr. Randolph said in Nelson County, they started out with a single facility that became a model facility, and then created three additional geographically easily accessible facilities. He stated the coordinator of that program indicated that one of the results was a reduction in dumping because of the convenience of the centers, as well as "Nelson pride" as people realized that the alternative would be increased waste disposal in the countryside. Mr. Randolph said there is a precedent in Nelson, and it has informed the solid waste committee's recommendation to establish Ivy as a model facility, with a future rollout sector by sector, as demand and interest arises, and with the support of the new Board of Supervisors and the community. He added that Nelson's program had rolled out over five or six years, so the committee is not suggesting rolling everything out at once.

Ms. Palmer stated she would like to hear from Mr. Layman, representing the hauling industry on the committee, and asked him to comment on the convenience issue.

Mr. Boyd noted he had spent two years working on the cleanup of an illegal dump in his district.

Mr. Randy Layman addressed the Board and said he has 40 years invested in the solid waste industry in Albemarle and has cleaned up many illegal dumps, much of which was due to people not having anywhere to go with their waste, especially after hours. He stated the cost is \$15 to \$20 per piece for white goods, and perhaps lowering that or getting the retail industry to pick them up, as a lot of them do, would be helpful. Mr. Layman stated that a lot of the disposal is done through ignorance, and he learned from his brother and his son, both police officers in the County, that unless you catch people in the act of dumping nothing can be done.

Ms. Palmer commented that having more convenient disposal sites will help reduce it to some extent.

Mr. Layman said it will help reduce it, especially after hours and on weekends, and the Keene facility had been closed on Saturdays and Sundays, so people would dump their items right at the gate because there was nowhere for them to go. He added that having more facilities and better facilities would likely reduce the amount of illegal dumping.

Ms. Dittmar said the Board would find a way to reach out and thank the committee, who had put in a lot of hours and hard work. Mr. Mallek responded that he accepts her thanks on behalf of the committee.

Ms. Palmer asked committee members in attendance to stand.

Mr. Doug Walker stated it is hard to find a group of harder working citizens, and the evidence of that is reflected in the quality of the product, with the group being largely self-directed. He stated the work of the committee will now transition to guidance from the Board and work staff will do to operationalize it for their consideration.

Ms. Palmer asked if the position will be somewhat influenced by any agreement made by Rivanna, as that will be required in order to run this, and said that it will influence the duties of that staff person. Mr. Walker responded that he envisions the position to work within the structure of current County government to work on those things over which they have direct control, in addition to being liaison with Rivanna as partner in managing McIntire and Ivy. He noted there is an educational component and some specific recommendations about how to increase the County's recycling effort, and some aspects of that can be independent, but to the extent that Rivanna is partner and agent, a big part of this will be a liaison role as well.

Ms. Palmer said she is very much in favor of having staff look at this, and commented that she is very eager to get going.

Ms. Mallek said she would say yes to both questions.

Ms. McKeel agreed, adding they will be hearing more about the possible position as she is interested in how it will play out and the implications for the next budget cycle.

Mr. Walker stated it would be best for the Board to consider this before making a funding decision so they should do that sooner rather than later, and he confirmed that staff will bring back information within a month or so.

Mr. Foley said that staff intends to bring these committee items back to the Board now so they can be included as part of their five-year plan discussion, and said they will also bring back the Community Development positions.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the solid waste position will be housed under Community Development. Mr. Foley responded that it will be under General Services.

Agenda Item No. 20. Water Resources Program Funding Recommendations.

The executive summary as presented to the Board state that on January 8, 2014 the Board directed staff to develop a process to inform the public and seek input on preferences for alternative funding sources to support the County's water resource protection programs. On February 5, 2014 the Board approved a community engagement process, and on April 2, 2014, approved an appointment process for a Water Resources Funding Advisory Committee (the "Committee"). The Committee was appointed beginning in August 2014 and was charged with reviewing alternative funding mechanisms, taking community sentiment into consideration, and providing recommendations to the Board no later than October 30, 2015. The Committee charge and membership are included as Attachments A and B, respectively. The Committee met monthly from September 2014 to August 2015. Meeting dates, agendas, presentation slides, notes, and other supporting materials are chronicled at the program funding website: www.albemarle.org/waterfunding <<http://www.albemarle.org/waterfunding>>.

While not expressly part of the Committee's official charge, the Committee defined a program plan, or range of operational and capital programs necessary to meet state mandates and proactively manage infrastructure and ecological assets. This program plan served as the basis for estimating program costs and analyzing rate structures under various scenarios. This program plan was presented to the Board on January 7, 2015. To inform the public and receive feedback on preliminary Committee recommendations, Committee members and staff conducted two communitywide open house events and met with eight community groups during the months of June, July, and August 2015. Public outreach during this period was considerable and included County A-Mails, Engage Albemarle, web surveys, and many news stories by various media outlets, providing both the promotion of and coverage of events.

The Committee's recommendations are detailed in its final report (Attachment C). In summary, the Committee recommends that the County support its water resource protection programs through a County-wide stormwater utility fee. The Committee proposes that the fee be based primarily on impervious area, but include a robust credit system or rate adjustments as provided by state law, based on permanent reductions in stormwater flow or pollutant loadings. The Committee recommends incentives and technical assistance to promote and reward private investments that create a public benefit.

The Committee believes that the recommended approach is the most equitable method to distribute program costs to individual property owners. While the Committee believes there is some public support for a utility, it also recognizes that there is apprehension regarding cost increases associated with the anticipated expansion of programs. There is also particular anxiety expressed by members of the public about shifting the cost burden to particular groups, such as owners of large rural properties, tax-exempt organizations, and commercial property owners. Some rural property owners expressed that the program does not serve them.

At this time, the Committee is providing broad recommendations that do not include the specificity to predict fees at the parcel level. Additional work, including the determination of a rate formula and credit and incentive program, will be required prior to the adoption of a funding mechanism. This work would require additional stakeholder input and the technical services of a consultant.

Staff recognizes that the considerations and recommendations communicated in the Committee's report are too extensive and complex to adequately review in a short work session. Staff recommends that several additional work sessions and opportunities for public input be scheduled in early 2016 to allow the Board to more fully consider and discuss the findings. If the Board then elects to proceed with the Committee's recommendations, the Board would need to engage in a process to evaluate and determine a specific rate formula and credit system. This work could take another 12 to 18 months and would require the services of a funding consultant at a level equal to or, more likely, greater than that required already. Following this additional work, the Board would be presented with the decision to adopt a proposed, detailed funding mechanism.

The Board's consideration of Committee recommendations is a preliminary step in the process of determining the appropriateness of a dedicated funding mechanism. There is no budget impact at this time.

Staff recommends that the Board direct staff to schedule additional Board work sessions and opportunities for public input in early 2016 to allow the Board to more fully consider and discuss the Committee's findings.

Mr. Greg Harper, Water Resources Manager, addressed the Board, stating that since the advisory committee for this study declined to elect a chairperson, he would present their findings and recommendations. Mr. Harper stated the committee is asking for the Board to receive their recommendations from the report and presentation, and to consider staff's recommendation to hold multiple work sessions in early 2016 so they can work comprehensively to discuss the complex issues as contemplated by the committee for the last year. Mr. Harper said there are four factors driving interest in looking at a dedicated funding mechanism, one of which is the new state mandates the County was obligated to do over the last few years, with increased work needed to meet them, the VSMP and MS4 programs, and the TMDLs for the Chesapeake Bay and local waters. He noted there are also some ambitious planning goals set by the Board and the Comp Plan, including one from the strategic plan to establish direction and funding for a program to improve water quality.

Mr. Harper stated the drainage infrastructure around the County has been aging, and as it gets older there will be more incidents where pipes fail and sinkholes form, and whether it is in a public easement or not people do not feel it is their responsibility to fix a pipe that conveys runoff from a 200-acre drainage area. He said that related to TMDLs, even for the streams they are not obligated to clean up, they need to recognize that there are a lot of impairments scattered throughout the County, and some on the cusp of impairment might be easier to bring back to health. Mr. Harper said the mandates began in 2013 but had really intensified over the last year, and a few years ago the Board had requested having staff look into a dedicated funding mechanism.

He stated the advisory committee had been meeting since September 2014, and they had conducted a wider community engagement process over the summer to try to get people to understand the details. Mr. Harper said that as part of the overall process, they needed to rely on consultant expertise and resources, so they hired Amec Foster Wheeler, and David Bulova of that firm is present to answer questions. He stated the committee is comprised of 13 individuals representing different stakeholder groups, and asked those members in attendance to raise their hands. Mr. Harper said the group met for two hours every month and sometimes got bogged down in numbers and details due to the complexity of the information, and the recommendations of the committee did not come easy, nor did most of the recommendations have complete consensus among members. He stated the consultant looked at the County's programs and provided an analysis of gaps and needs, with several recommendations as to small steps to meet some of the mandates and legal responsibilities. Mr. Harper said they also did an analysis of GIS and financial systems to make sure the systems are in place necessary to support either of the two main funding mechanisms under consideration, and the conclusion was that the systems are robust enough to support either type of mechanism. He noted there are some issues found with the geographic information, but they would not prevent the County from going with either type of mechanism, just require some staff work throughout to refine the GIS data as it came to their attention. Mr. Harper said there is always the possibility that the data can lead to misallocation of fees, but there can be a system put in place to address those concerns.

Mr. Harper said even though it was not part of their charge, the committee had started by looking at what the program needs to look like at the County that would be funded by a mechanism. This was necessary because a lot of the analysis required that there be costs over time to work into the equations to establish a fee structure. He stated it was a mandatory part of the process, and the recommendation is to adopt a program that meets not only the regulatory requirements but also the long-term needs and responsibilities of the County, which goes beyond mandates. Mr. Harper presented a 10-year timeframe reflecting the programs and corresponding years, with the program including continuing existing programs, expansion of some existing programs to be implemented in order to meet some of the mandates, such as the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, and said the program plan incorporates money throughout the 10-year program to pay for the projects necessary to meet the TMDL requirements long term. He said this also includes some new programs that are not mandated or being done now, but that the committee feels should be part of a broader program funded by a dedicated mechanism. Mr. Harper

presented a snapshot of all of the programs the County has already fully implemented, those that are on the books but not fully implemented, and those that the committee recommended be introduced, such as preventative maintenance of infrastructure for both structural and ecological reasons. He stated the County currently spends about \$1.8 million for the bulk of its programs, and expanding them to meet Chesapeake Bay TMDL requirements will add significant costs to the overall program, driven primarily by state mandates to address Chesapeake Bay and local stream impairments.

Mr. Harper reported the action plan the County had been working on for the last year was due to the DEQ last week and had been submitted, and the results of the plan have been surprising. He stated the regulated area is the area over which the state has jurisdiction, including mostly urbanized area, and the pollutants of concern are phosphorus, nitrogen and sediment, with phased pollution reduction requirements. He said the County only has to achieve 5% of its pollution reduction goals by the first cycle, ending in 2018, another 35% by the second cycle, and 60% by the final cycle. Mr. Harper noted the action plan is mostly an accounting summary, figuring out what the County's obligations are versus where it stands today, and guidance was provided from the DEQ as late as June 29, 2015. He said the DEQ also provided information to allow the County to take credit for things that had been done, such as stormwater management facilities that were built as part of a development that occurred between 2006 and 2009, with the development itself already worked into the Chesapeake Bay model, but not the BMPs, so the state said the County can get full credit for the BMPs. Mr. Harper stated it is uncertain as to whether the EPA will accept this from the Virginia DEQ, but the County is done with its long-term pollution reduction obligations for nitrogen and suspended solids, and 70% done for phosphorous.

Mr. Harper said that progress continues with these efforts, but the County does not have confidence in how things will play out because a lot of localities will be submitting similar results to DEQ, which will in turn tell the EPA that the localities are done with their work, but the Chesapeake Bay will still be impaired for sediment, nitrogen and phosphorous, so the EPA will likely move the goal post. He stated there is still not a good way to put a solid cost on efforts to meet obligations, and the implication for funding is that there is less urgency than thought a year ago, but they still cannot sit back and wait for things to play out. Mr. Harper stated the last thing added to the program plan costs are infrastructure, both green and gray infrastructure. He said the next recommendation is to choose between types of funding mechanisms, with the recommendation from staff being to go with a stormwater utility. Mr. Harper said the committee talked about the inequity of water resources programs being related to a tax on land, as there is no relationship between the value of that land and the impact of that property, so the goal is to correlate the fee or tax to the impact of the property. He noted they heard that from the public also, as people want credit for the positive things they have done on their property.

Mr. Harper stated that different types of mechanisms and rate structures within those types all changed the way costs were distributed out to various property owners, with the goal being to establish the fairest way to distribute program costs to property owners. He presented a chart depicting different mechanisms could change the proportion of cost responsibility, and stated the first pie is a service district option, with the next two being different types of stormwater utility rate structures, and single-family residences (SFR) have a larger or smaller slice of the pie depending on which mechanism and rate structure is established. Mr. Harper said that service district and stormwater utilities are the two dedicated funding mechanisms considered outside of the general fund. The service district is based on real property value, just as the general fund is, with stormwater utility based on a physical metric such as an impervious area. He stated he had highlighted some of the more interesting differences between the two mechanisms, and the correlation between rates and need for services can be very strong for a stormwater utility, and is pretty weak for the general fund and service district. Mr. Harper added that another point of interest is that tax-exempt properties will pay a stormwater utility fee, but will not pay a tax since they are exempt.

Mr. Harper stated the recommendation is to go with the stormwater utility because it is considered the fairest way to split costs up back to the property owners, and it can be set up so that it addresses how much impact a property is responsible for. Mr. Harper said the committee also considered a hybrid mechanism, such as a service district countywide or mostly countywide, and a utility for just the urban areas or regulated areas. A clear majority rejected that because they feel it is too complicated and there are not enough benefits. He stated they also feel that it does not solve any problems, so it was quickly rejected. Mr. Harper said the committee also considered whether the stormwater utility should be applied to just the urban area or the regulated area or countywide, and determined that many of the programs implemented by the County were done so countywide, such as VSMP. He stated while the MS4 permitting is key to urban areas, they still do a lot of MS4 programming countywide, and he noted the committee did not see a big distinction between urban and rural, as everyone in the County will benefit from cleaner streams. Mr. Harper said another item that needs to be decided is how to set a utility up, and a lot of localities, in order to simplify the math, would charge residents the same amount regardless of house size, measured in equivalent residential unit (ERU), whereas commercial properties are charged based on size. He stated the committee's recommendation is to use a billing unit, so that larger properties pay more and the cost is more equitable.

Mr. Harper stated that with the County having so many different types of land use and properties, the committee felt there needed to be some recognition and rate adjustment for factors that affected how much of an impact a property has on water resources. A low-density property such as a house on large acreage would have a different effect than the same size house on a smaller parcel in the urban area that discharges into a drainage pipe into a stream. He presented a visual example of the dynamic of two houses that are about the same size, and stated that a lot of the runoff is buffered by the forested areas between the stream and the house. In the case of two large rural properties, land cover can be an important factor because open space and farming uses have a different impact than forested areas. Mr.

Harper said this is getting the edge of the County's technical capabilities based on the information presently maintained at the County, but the committee was interested in pursuing use of as much information at hand as possible to account for all of the variations in land use. He stated the last item is to provide financial incentives and technical assistance to help property owners implement BMPs on their property, as it can help the County meet Chesapeake Bay or local TMDL requirements and help clean up impaired streams.

Mr. Harper reported the committee had done extensive outreach over several months, including a video to generate interest, a lot of media coverage, and feedback surveys. He said they also held a lot of meetings in addition to open community events, and committee members were invited to the meetings of standing community groups, such as that in Whitehall. Mr. Harper noted that community opinion was very mixed, with some people stressing the importance of cleaning up streams and others commenting that they did not feel the efforts were of benefit to them. He stated that in speaking with an individual before the Board meeting, one person said there needed to be a lot more opportunities for public engagement, and he realized that it is also important to have more input shared with the Board. Mr. Harper said the committee has recommended they regroup in January or February with three separate work sessions/public engagement opportunities, and after those meetings if the Board decides to follow the committee's recommendations, it will be another 12-18 months before any of the work can be implemented for a stormwater utility.

Mr. Harper noted he had volunteered to distribute an assessment for one of the committee members, with the intent of that information being to illustrate that a lot of pollution comes from a lot of different sources in the County and not just impervious areas. So a rate based just on those areas is probably not the fairest approach. He said this is not necessarily the committee's opinion as a whole, but is the opinion that a lot of people hold. Mr. Harper stated this is based on some EPA data delivered to Virginia regarding where the Chesapeake Bay model purports that pollution is coming from, and where reductions need to be made.

Mr. Boyd asked if there was a vote taken on this particular recommendation with regard to rate, and what the vote count was. Mr. Harper responded that every recommendation had a column next to it that shows whether there was a strong consensus or a slight majority, and when the vote was taken for a stormwater facility or some other type of mechanism, it was a small majority that had voted. He stated the majority opinion was for a utility, but it was a small majority. There seemed to be more consensus for a utility early in the process, but as they heard comments from the public and concerns about the precision of GIS data, there may have been a bit less comfort with a utility based on physical parameters that might be off. Mr. Harper said that overall the committee feels comfortable with the use of data in that way, and feels comfortable that a utility would include a process by which someone could come in and refute one of the parameters, such as location of a driveway. He stated it is hoped that any issues can be resolved without cost to the property owner, and he feels there are other ways to address issues like that.

Ms. Palmer said at one of the early committee meetings she had attended, there was a straw poll taken to gauge the feeling of the group, and she felt the general fund was the best approach because there was concern that there would be inaccuracies in the parameters measured. She stated that only one committee member agreed with her at that time, and it concerned her that the Board would have to field complaints.

Mr. Boyd stated he is looking for details in the report on the personnel, because there is no utility system in place, nor any methodology to deal with complaints, and he wonders if they are talking about building a huge staff to deal with this.

Ms. Mallek said the uncertainties are the reason that people on either side of the stormwater utility issue have the same concerns, and there are resources available to help accomplish this such as the Environmental Finance Center, which has worked with numerous jurisdictions on the funding issue. She stated there is also concern about transparency, and there has been a perception as to whether a utility makes it less transparent in the budget process than the general fund, and that is something the Board will have to decide. Ms. Mallek asked Mr. Harper to give examples of programs that met mandates as well as long-term needs and responsibilities, and she suggested that identifying easements the County has but is not doing anything with as one category.

Mr. Harper responded that staff is currently trying to map the infrastructure it is responsible for, and over the last 10 years they had not tracked all of the public easements that assigned the County the responsibility to maintain drainage infrastructure. It will be a few years before they have a sense of what is out there, and its condition. He said it will be necessary to hire a consultant to assess the condition and identify areas where there will be a failure soon, in order to prioritize those.

Ms. Mallek stated it is an example of something for which the County is responsible, and it is better to be prepared than to be surprised by a huge repair.

Mr. Harper said the big repairs had occurred over the past 10 years, and it would become more of an issue over time. He noted that some of the things the County had built that it received credit for are the church road basin on Hillsdale and Incarnation Drive, which was an old detention basin converted into a wetland system in the bottom that removed more pollutants; a small stream restoration in an urban area; the channel portion of the Crozet stormwater system; and the Woodbrook lagoon, which was a retrofit involving a sand filter and created wetlands to remove pollutants from the stream as water passed through. Mr. Harper stated that a number of these items are reflected in the committee's action plan,

which could be switched out, as they were trying to lock into existing reduction rates that would likely change in the future.

Ms. Dittmar stated that Mr. Harper had done a great job presenting at the East Rivanna Fire Station and met with the community advisory committee there, and asked him to comment on what other cities and counties are doing.

Mr. Harper said that in the information provided, any of the communities that were not doing stormwater utilities or other specific measures were just using their general fund. The easy thing was to do nothing additional, with many localities exploring other options but ending up just using their general funds. He stated there is a Virginia Municipal Stormwater Association (VAMSA) meeting the following day, and he is hoping to get an update on the status statewide for communities considering alternative funding mechanisms, but the data from them had not been very good.

Ms. Mallek stated it is challenging because the same people who are concerned about the administrative costs and transparency of the utility are also wanting the impact to be fee-based, and the ability to get credits, which are only available if the utility is in place.

Mr. David Bulova of Amec Foster Wheeler addressed the Board and stated that fundamentally this came down to whether they engaged in a paradigm shift to fund this program, and in terms of what other localities are doing, a lot of them have gone with stormwater utilities, with others, particularly in Northern Virginia, choosing a service district. Mr. Bulova said that Roanoke County had considered a stormwater fee but decided to stay with the general fund. He stated that James City County had started off with the general fund, then adopted a stormwater utility fee, then got rid of it and went back to the general fund, and they are considering going back to the stormwater utility fee now that they have a sense of costs. Mr. Bulova said that regardless of the approach chosen, the mechanisms must be put in place to take the Chesapeake Bay off of the impaired waters list by 2025. He stated that while a lot of localities are showing progress on paper, the reassessment process needs to be watched in 2017, because if what is on paper does not match what scientists are seeing in the water, the next permit in 2018 will reflect different goal posts. Mr. Bulova said it is important, regardless of the funding mechanism, to have the up-front planning so there is not a cost bubble to pay off later.

Ms. Palmer asked if there is any correlation between the amount of stormwater infrastructure a community owns to whether they have a stormwater utility or service district or general fund. Mr. Bulova responded that it makes it easier for a city or urban county to go with a straight stormwater utility because there was not an interaction between urban and rural. That is why the committee went with a utility as their recommendation but also recognizes that there needs to be thought given to the impacts of different land uses.

Ms. Palmer asked what most counties like Albemarle, which has lots of rural area, usually picked. Mr. Bulova responded those places are just starting to tackle those kinds of questions, and Roanoke County had gone through a similar process and recommended a countywide stormwater utility. Their board took it under advisement, but decided to stay with the general fund. He stated that Howard County, Maryland, had gone with a flat-rate tiered stormwater utility for residential, which made it easier to assess. He said that Fairfax County still has some relatively rural areas or large lot areas and have a stormwater service district. Their Board of Supervisors is relooking at whether they want to switch to a stormwater utility for equity reasons, but they are just starting to look at these issues.

Ms. Palmer asked if the ERUs would have a single-family home having one ERU, and a townhouse having a half, and each hotel room having a certain amount, and she wonders if that is a typical approach. Mr. Bulova responded that almost always with an ERU or flat residential fee, commercial is assessed in units of impervious cover. For residential, there is a particular rate for a townhouse or a particular rate for a small single-family home, or a particular rate for a large single-family home, and it depends on how much equity they want to build into their system.

Mr. Boyd asked if he is familiar with any other localities that can provide some guidance as to what is involved in setting up a stormwater utility. Mr. Bulova responded that his firm can provide some examples, with Howard and James City counties having set up utilities. The real work comes with the geographic information systems, and the County is supposed to be tracking this in the urban areas under its MS4 permit. There is a co-benefit with respect to the utility as well as DEQ's expectations for a locality to know where its drainage system, outfalls, and impervious cover are. He said the billing is not a big challenge because it is easy to tack a stormwater fee onto real estate bills, but staff will be required for appeals when landowners feel their parameters differ and want to appeal. Mr. Bulova noted that most localities put the information online in the interest of transparency, with a view of property and parcel boundaries, so the landowner can respond to whether or not they feel the assessment is accurate and the County in turn can address it.

Mr. Boyd asked if it can be broken down into how much the average household would be paying. Mr. Harper responded that staff had run some numbers to come up with an average of \$50-\$100 per residence per year, but that was based on a lot of assumptions. Mr. Bulova said they wanted to see what the order of magnitude would be, as they need to know how high the costs will be in order to inform the program.

Mr. Boyd said it would help to know what kind of cost will be involved in a utility fee. Mr. Bulova responded that with the information available, realizing that there are always caveats, they can assume the kind of bill associated with a particular type of property, based on a specific billing rate, and that can

be compared to what is paid with real property tax or general fund. He said they have to raise the funds no matter what, so the question is how they are distributing costs, and so anytime a utility is considered they have to compare it to how much they are paying on a service district fee or just real property taxes.

Mr. Boyd asked if there is a way to put that into a GPS online system, so that someone can look at what their bill will be based on different approaches. Mr. Harper stated it may be premature to do it at this point, but once they know more about the rate structure, they should do that before implementation.

Mr. Boyd agreed with that assessment, and said at some point that would be helpful to the Board to make that decision based on what it will cost a specific property.

Ms. Mallek said one benefit of a utility is the opportunities for biofilters and other measures around parking lots to reduce impacts so that costs come down, which will provide a better product in the end beyond just collecting money.

Mr. Boyd said that is definitely an advantage, to be able to give people credits so that people can make a financial decision as to whether to include measures like biofilters.

Ms. Palmer stated one of the things pointed out at the committee meetings was that people will be paying more for things like rain gardens than they will actually get back in credits.

Mr. Bulova said when the City of Charlottesville put together its credit program to incentivize people coming in to do the right thing, one of the things that was clear in that analysis was that credits must be provided by law.

Mr. Sheffield pointed out those credits only go up to a certain extent, and the City has said that no matter how much mitigation is done, they still need to collect the money.

Mr. Bulova noted the law does not say what the cap on the credit must be, as that is up to an individual locality and is usually done on an assessment of how much of overall stormwater issues can be addressed by an onsite stormwater management facility.

Mr. Sheffield stated that theoretically, a homeowner or business can mitigate all of their runoff, if they are ambitious enough, but that does not solve the bigger issues.

Mr. Bulova commented that it is typically not enough of an incentive to start a rain garden from scratch to provide mitigation, and you would not be able to make up for that cost unless you have a really high credit. He said where it often does help out is with cost-share, so a homeowner will get a direct grant and will get to take the benefit of the reduction for fees, or if there is expansion of a facility, such as a church, adding more impervious cover and putting a stormwater facility in.

Mr. Joseph Jones, a committee member from White Hall, addressed the Board and stated that initially in the meetings there was good consensus for a utility, but as they went along there was unease because of lack of understanding of all of the different aspects of it. Mr. Jones said at the last committee meeting, Roger Ray pointed out some discrepancies with the GIS system, including Ms. Mallek's driveway. He stated his understanding is there would be computer software reading the GIS maps to come up with the square footage rate, and if he has 40 round bails in a net trap on the corner of a field, the computer software might read that as a roof, so he will be charged for hay bales sitting out in the field. Mr. Jones said if they go with a stormwater utility, which he is very uneasy about, he will be calling Mr. Harper to come out and explain how the total is derived.

Ms. Dittmar said it is clear that if there are committee members who still have questions, the County needs to do good public engagement going forward.

Ms. Mallek clarified that it is not that the information presented is hard to understand, it is that there is so much uncertainty coming too them from outside sources.

Mr. Rob Neal, a committee member, addressed the Board and stated that he lives in the regulated area of the Scottsville District and is an agent for an entity that owns property in all districts. Mr. Neal said that Mr. Harper has done a great job in summarizing a year of debate, and going with a utility fee versus the general fund. He stated that going with the general fund does not incentivize change, and the only way to do that is to tie the resolution to the problem, which will require implementing a utility fee. He stated these are very rough numbers, but early on he had asked how much impervious surface is tied to non-taxable entities, and that number is 15%. Mr. Neal said the average ERU for a single-family house will mean that everyone pays the same, regardless of home size, and the commercial implications for something like Fashion Square Mall, with 500,000 square feet including parking lots and roof, the average ERU at \$60 will mean the mall will be charged about \$60,000, and removing tax-exempt entities will increase that bill by 15% or \$12,000. He stated he wants to support those entities, but they need to incentivize change and tie the problem to the financial resolution.

Mr. Boyd said he does not disagree with that, he just wants to get the facts.

Mr. Neal stated he appreciates that, and he also acknowledges the desire to look at other communities, but they are all in their infancy in terms of dealing with this, and some have gone back and forth several times in their approach. He said that locally the County needs to do what is right, not what is easy, and he and his enterprise are willing to pay more to do what is right. Mr. Neal said the City of

Charlottesville is easier to study for this, and they went with a utility fee.

Ms. Dittmar said they learn a lot by looking at the best practices of other communities, and sometimes they do not need to reinvent the wheel.

Ms. Palmer commented that she goes back and forth on this because with the general fund approach, places like Martha Jefferson will not pay a dime, but with a utility, if the credit received for what is invested is too much, it may not really incentivize anything.

Ms. Mallek stated the state has greatly enhanced funding for the urban cost-shares by the stormwater conservation district, so that is another player, and there will be some other outside players that can participate in that grant formula to provide assistance.

Ms. Dittmar thanked the committee and everyone for their work.

Agenda Item No. 22. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. Mallek stated that in reading her March 4 minutes, she noticed they were talking about the fireworks rules and fees and the parameters adopted, and talked about for community public displays having the option to make a donation to the Crozet Fire Department to cover the cost of the application fee, which is going from \$75 to \$600 for next year. She said she wants to make sure they have this well in advance so it can be put into a reminder file for next year on staff's to-do list.

Mr. Davis said one way to accomplish this would be for them to put it in their budget so they can budget for that type of donation; the other way would be for them to program it for a donation request. He stated it is unusual for the Board to make donations to organizations outside of the budget process.

Ms. Mallek redirected her request to have the item put in the budget.

Mr. Foley said he will follow up with staff on that to make sure he is clear on it.

Ms. Dittmar stated she had been told by a volunteer Fire Chief that some of the County's bridges need to be recertified for fire trucks to go over, and as they have increased the size of fire trucks, it is particularly important, so she wants to know who she should ask about that. Mr. Foley responded that Chief Dan Eggleston keeps track of that with VDOT, so staff can pass the word on that there is concern about that.

Ms. Dittmar said in each of their districts, they will probably want to know which bridges the volunteer fire departments are going over are certified.

Ms. McKeel stated this is why Broomley Bridge is currently being replaced, but it will be interesting to see a full list.

Ms. Dittmar said this is in the context of weight limits on bridges, but emergency vehicles can if they are certified once per year, so she wants to be sure that can be done, if possible.

Ms. Dittmar also stated the White House had come out with a report on how critical it is for the U.S. to remain competitive to be able to deploy broadband throughout the country, and the report had a lot to do with what local governments can do in that regard. She said the Senate Committee on Science and Technology is holding a hearing that day on how they can help deploy broadband, particularly as it applies to localities, and the U.S. is falling behind the rest of the world in this regard.

Ms. Dittmar reported that she and Ms. Mallek had met with Mr. Foley and Ms. Catlin in the summer to talk about the CACVB, which the Board provides about \$750,000 to each year to promote tourism, which is a nice component of economic development. She said in the special meeting regarding a possible company relocation here, they were asked if that is what economic development is, and she had responded that it is just a portion of it, with a lot of other pieces. Ms. Dittmar said they had talked about the City and County setting up a management committee consisting of the City Manager, County Executive, and two Economic Development Directors to look at the budget and performance.

Ms. Mallek stated this is the first step, and if this strikes a better balance between the City and County, she will be happy, but currently the County puts in the majority of the money, and she does not feel there is balance in terms of the management decisions or the benefits.

Ms. Dittmar commented the money put in is fairly equal, and they put in a lot of money also, and as the City builds more hotels, their share will go up. She added the County has a fiduciary responsibility to make sure their money is being spent well, and it is just a matter of meeting and agreeing.

Ms. Mallek presented the CACVB postcards being distributed, which only show the Downtown Mall, versus Nelson County's tourism brochure which shows all of their county's beautiful scenery.

Mr. Foley stated that he will be discussing it with the City Manager's office, and he will be

discussing it with City Council to see if there is support for an amendment to the agreement in place, and possibly establishing a management board.

Ms. Mallek said this Friday is the ribbon-cutting for the first Albemarle County Visitors' Center, to be held at the Crozet Depot. She stated the Board has not been invited, and that is one example of why a CACVB management team is needed.

Agenda Item No. 23. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Foley stated there should be some clarification and thinking particularly around the five-year financial plan, and about several of the items that will impact that plan.

He said the Board has made some tremendous progress with the citizens committees that were formed, which has been working for more than a year, and a lot of that was driven by the need to get input from the community on some of the major issues that will be faced in the five-year plan.

Mr. Foley stated the Board has talked about the Ivy MUC and the transfer station; the Solid Waste Advisory Committee will be doing an assessment of recommendations; information is expected from the community group looking at the potential expansion of pre-K services; and the Community Development work program and new staff that may help acceleration of the completion of some of its items.

He said the Board just heard from the Water Resources Funding Committee, and those objectives will not be too immediate, but will help drive the five-year plan.

Mr. Foley stated the Local Government/Schools Efficiency Study Committee will be bringing some recommendations forward. The Citizens' Resources Advisory Committee will be completing its work, which will be on the Board's agenda in November. He noted that all of these things are designed to feed into the five-year planning process, and next week there will be a joint meeting with the School Board and Board of Supervisors. The two Boards will be talking about compensation and benefits, and specifically about changes to the healthcare program, what the latest market raise data is indicating; other challenges related to the leave program because of the state's VRS changes, with hybrid employees getting a different benefit; salary compression; and challenges with the CIP.

Mr. Foley stated as the Board looks at the County's five-year plan, the Board will see staff's picture of the funding gap and why it exists, based on the assumptions behind it. Staff will then come to the Board with the work of the committees on specific items to show what their funding choices will accomplish. He said this will all be discussed in November, and into December at which time they will try to get to some kind of conclusion to the five-year plan, which will identify the budget drivers to help the Board establish priorities. Mr. Foley stated they did the five-year plan to have some good discussion about policy and direction, but a part of that is looking for some direction about the proposed budget and whether they support additional revenues.

Ms. Dittmar asked what the best way would be to thank the committees for their work. Ms. Mallek stated the volunteer citizen breakfast held at Northside earlier in the year had generated some great feeling, and perhaps something like that would be fun for the retiring committees.

Ms. McKeel agreed this was something more personal.

Ms. Dittmar said they will work with that offline with staff.

Mr. Foley confirmed the Board will be meeting with the School Board at 3:00 p.m., next week, not 2:00p.m., as previously discussed.

Agenda Item No. 24. Adjourn to September October 14, 2015, 3:00 p.m., Room 241.

At 9:32 p.m., Ms. Palmer **moved** to adjourn to October 14, 2015, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 241 of the County Office Building. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 01/06/2016
Initials: EWJ