

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on May 11, 2016, at 3:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from May 10, 2016.

PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer, Mr. Rick Randolph, and Mr. Brad L. Sheffield.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Thomas C. Foley, County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Clerk, Ella W. Jordan.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. Palmer.

Ms. Palmer also introduced staff present and the presiding security officer, Officer Goforth.

Agenda Item No. 2. Discussion: Strategic Priorities/Two Year Fiscal Plan Development Process.

The executive summary presented by staff states that during the FY17 Five Year Plan and Annual Budget development and approval process, the Board, staff and the public had significant discussions about the ongoing structural fiscal imbalance facing the County and the critical need to address that gap on a long term basis. The Five-Year Financial Plan demonstrates that the cumulative impacts of community and Board aspirations, growing citizen expectations, and service obligations created by population growth outpace available resources into the future. Natural growth in revenues is not sufficient to meet our obligations and commitments and also maintain critical services at existing levels. International, national and state economic pressures have prevented our economy from regaining the momentum we had hoped for and expected, and we firmly believe that is the long term reality we face. The adopted FY17 budget recognizes that finding a balance between a realistic level of revenues going forward into the future and the expenditures which can be supported by that revenue is a large and challenging task that must be accomplished through Board of Supervisors and community dialogue and serious choices about the allocation of available resources.

The FY17 budget includes instituting a priority based budgeting process and ongoing Board worksessions and community engagement to determine Board and community priorities in a constrained environment and to determine what our citizens are prepared to pay to achieve a more aspirational future. This will involve the Board and our citizens working through a comprehensive process of identifying priority services and necessary funding levels to support those services and then aligning resources and desired services in a sustainable way for the future.

The Five-Year Financial Plan process has been a valuable tool for taking a long term look at the County's revenue and expenditure picture but, because of the extended time frame, it does not allow us to be as precise as is necessary beyond the first several years. Given the critical circumstances we find ourselves in, expanding beyond the annual budget to include a balanced Two-Year Fiscal Plan will provide a more helpful framework for decision making on major financial issues.

The Board is scheduled to begin this critical process with a strategic priority setting session on May 17, 2016, and the process will culminate with the adoption of a balanced Two-Year Fiscal Plan by December, 2016. During that time, the Board will be actively engaged in identifying and ranking priorities, understanding specific program and service costs and impacts, and providing direction to staff regarding resource allocation that will shape the development and ultimate adoption of the Two-Year Fiscal Plan. Staff will introduce this process including major milestones in detail on May 11 for discussion with the Board so that clear shared expectations and understanding about how the process will occur can be established. Attachment A provides a high level look at the major milestones in the process.

Additional details about the May 17 strategic priorities session also will be discussed during this agenda item, including distribution of background materials for the Board's review.

Mr. Foley stated that the purpose of the worksession is to talk about some of the solutions discussed in their budget meetings and move into the future and away from the past, to address the existing structural imbalance through a priority-driven budget process and move the community toward its aspirations. He said that staff has laid out an extensive process over the next eight months in order to achieve a balanced two-year fiscal plan, beginning with the work the Board will do on strategic planning priority setting. Mr. Foley stated that the community has been faced with challenges but is very resilient, and the Board and staff have stepped up to meet these challenges, with staff talking today about opportunities to move into the future and get to some of the aspirations.

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, addressed the Board and stated that many of the initiatives on the chart before them were identified during the budget process and by the Citizens Resource Advisory Committee (CRAC) last summer. She noted that it was understood these things could not be addressed in one or even two years, hence the title, "Albemarle 2020." She stated this is a priority-driven budget process, and the information leads to a balanced two-year fiscal

plan, but also reflects other strategic priorities. Ms. Allshouse mentioned an “Enhanced Technology Productivity” category, which will include a comprehensive assessment of technology in the fall and preliminary steps toward productivity done sooner. She stated there is an area entitled “Next Generation Government,” which reflects plans toward a government that is more efficient in how it provides services, possibly incorporating measures from other localities around the country. Ms. Allshouse reported that the County will implement several of the initiatives put together by the local government school and efficiency group, leading into the two-year balanced plan, and the transformation efficiency study, recommended by the CRAC committee and funded in the FY17 budget as a third-party study, probably in the fall. She noted other measures identified by the committee, including enhancing grant attainment efforts, addressing capital need challenges including a possible bond referendum, initiating a pilot crowdfunding project, and increasing economic development opportunities and initiatives.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive, addressed the Board and stated that the priority-driven budgeting process will set the foundation and the context for a lot of the other work they have discussed. Ms. Catlin stated that staff will provide specifics as to the what, why, who, how and when, so they all have clear expectations about what lies ahead. She said that priority-driven budgeting is a proven approach to focus limited resources to meet community goals, and it results in prioritizing in assigning resources to certain services over other services. Ms. Catlin stated that the process is accomplished with feedback from citizens, with a focus on goals identified in the Board’s strategic plan, and it provides direction for the allocation of money to more critical services that serve critical community functions, while cutting back on what are determined to be less essential services as they move through the process. She noted that programs are eventually ranked on how they align with community priorities. Ms. Catlin emphasized that this approach is not completely new to the County, as they have been moving in this direction for a number of years with processes introduced in planning and budgeting, but they are talking about taking this to a much higher level of refinement to assist the Board in the challenging decision making that lies ahead in dealing with the identified structural imbalance.

Ms. Catlin stated that they have had a lot of discussion about fiscal challenges, so they know there is great awareness that they face a significant long-term challenge. Ms. Catlin said she will share reasons why priority-driven budgeting is a promising approach, sharing some lessons learned from other communities who have used this approach and found it effective. She said that Fort Collins, Colorado has been doing priority-driven budgeting for a number of years, and by all appearances is a thriving community, but during the recession they found themselves in a tough fiscal situation. Ms. Catlin presented the rationale Fort Collins had provided for embarking on priority-driven budgeting: the concept that revenue growth change is a permanent condition and not just a short-term measure, and the close alignment of services that are important to the community. She stated that another important lesson learned from them is that this is not a one-time thing and it would not be perfect the first time out, with improvements as the process continued. Ms. Catlin stated that Fort Collins has said that an outcome of priority-driven budgeting is the ability to prioritize services to do the important things well and cut back on the rest, to know the full true cost of programs and services, and to focus on results rather than incremental funding of items not assessed closely.

Ms. Catlin stated that staff understands the critical roles that must be played by different players in order for the process to have Board support and to have legitimacy in the community, with several groups involved. She said the Board of Supervisors sets the priorities and makes the final decisions as to what priorities receive what level of resources, and what programs and services may need to be adjusted to make sufficient resources available for those priorities. Ms. Catlin said that citizens are also very important stakeholders and will be providing feedback and insights at several critical points in the process, both formally and informally, to give the Board the benefit of their perspectives to help make informed decisions. She stated that staff also plays an important role, providing feedback and insight so the Board has the benefit of staff perspectives and the background needed, as well as preliminary recommendations. Ms. Catlin emphasized that everyone has a role to play, and it is important to recognize those going forward with the process. Ms. Catlin stated the how and when of the process starts with the step of determining the priorities, then moving into a program and service inventory and other tools, then looking at available resources and assigning them to priorities, then bringing forward a financial plan and annual budget for the Board’s consideration. She commented that while this looks like a very neat linear process, they will not want to lose sight of the fact that this will involve a lot of work, tough choices, and challenging conversations when thinking about where resources will and will not be allocated.

Ms. Catlin stated that she will expound on the milestones and expectations, with the first milestone in June to establish and rank priorities, with the outcome being a list of priorities identified and ranked by the Board, with insights provided by community and staff. She said the major steps are to continue to work with the leadership council to bring staff perspectives forward; priority identification and ranking sessions with the Board scheduled for May 17 and June 8; and citizen feedback opportunities in June and July as determined by the Board. Ms. Catlin stated that there are a few possibilities to consider, including a focus group with invited representatives such as the Citizens Resource Advisory Committee, listening opportunities that will allow interested citizens to provide feedback to the ranking being developed, and conversations with citizens’ advisory committees in the June/July time frame. She noted the Board does not have to provide definitive direction now, but in the May 17 session, staff will save some time for the Board to think about community engagement and opportunities for citizens to react.

Ms. Catlin stated that the second milestone will be in August, defining programs and services with the target outcome of providing a detailed inventory, enhancing the current one to take it to the level of being a more refined tool so the Board, public and staff better understand what resources are needed to make programs and services happen. She noted this will provide a fuller understanding of what it takes

to provide these things and help guide the Board's decision making, and staff plans to complete the inventory by July and bring it to the Board in August so they become familiar with it as a tool. Ms. Catlin reported that milestone three in September will be the discussion of allocating resources to priorities, with the outcome of having the Board provide direction for that allocation. She stated the idea is for the Board to give ranked priorities of what is most important to them for the County to achieve, with the program and service inventory helping to assign costs to those priorities and how far they can get with them with the available resources, as well as the impact on things that are not ranked as highly. Ms. Catlin said that after working with the leadership council, staff will bring those to the Board in September as an initial look at those resources and priorities so they can react and provide direction, so staff can then move forward with establishing a two-year fiscal plan.

Ms. Allshouse stated that staff will present a two-year fiscal plan to the Board in December, but will still do a long-range financial plan, as staff feels that it is important to them and to JFOA, and is an important tool for thinking of items in the context of a five-year plan, which has not been balanced for the last two years. She said that staff will bring something to the Board in the fall that will replace their regular five-year financial planning process, with something brought to the Board in November to be followed by several worksessions in November and December. Ms. Allshouse said that in March, the desired outcome is for an annual budget to be developed in the context of a balanced two-year fiscal plan. She noted that Fort Collins actually has a two-year budget and perhaps Albemarle can get to that point in the future, with a two-year balanced fiscal plan without the line item detail serving that purpose in the short term. She stated that as they go forward they can continue to refine that and make it even more specific until it becomes an actual two-year budget. Ms. Allshouse stated that several of the specific tasks include staff preparing the annual budget in the context of the two-year fiscal plan, the County Executive presenting the recommended adopted budget, and the Board holding worksessions and public hearings with final budget approval in April.

Mr. Dill commented that he likes the name "Next Generation," and asked about assigning overhead costs to programs and direct costs as there are choices to be made, such as health insurance or electricity, that are not assigned to a specific service.

Ms. Allshouse responded that in the current adopted FY16 budget, there is a program and inventory of everything in the budget shown a different way, so while departments are identified, there are items shown as "mandates" or "Board directives," and every cost in the general fund is costed out to be shown in a different way. She explained that as they are developing the FY18 and FY19 budget, they will start with the adopted FY17 version and will spread all costs out so things like healthcare are embedded into the actual cost of a particular function or program of a specific area, or percentages spread across the organization, with an adjustment to programs and services for those two years.

Mr. Randolph asked if Ms. Allshouse feels the County will also move in the direction of Fort Collins in terms of a budgeting process for outcomes.

Ms. Allshouse responded that she had spoken with a Fort Collins staff member who explained that their departments make "offers" as sellers of services, with the locality negotiating on the offer and certain aspects of the program. She stated that Fort Collins has been doing this for 14 years, and the process turns into an adopted budget with some adjustments along the way, with improvements happening over the years and advice from that locality to take time and work into it gradually. Ms. Allshouse added that there is something intriguing to her about this approach, and she would like to learn more about it.

Ms. Palmer commented that she would be interested to see how the Office of Management and Budget would make an "offer" to the Board.

Ms. Allshouse responded that OMB, for example, would say that it provides grant services, CIP development services, and development and management of budget throughout the year. She stated that staff has been working on an approach based on levels of services, ranging from a higher level provision of services such as a GFAO budget, or a lower-level budget without things like performance indicators.

Ms. Catlin stated that the May 17th Board priority-setting session will be the first step to get this process going, and it is dependent on getting a clear and well defined set of priorities that will set everything else in motion. She said the purpose and outcome of that session will be to allow the Board to share its perspectives on current and future challenges and opportunities, and then identify a consensus list of strategic priorities for ranking. Ms. Catlin stated that in order to make that session as productive as possible, staff will be providing background materials in the Board's Dropbox, as well as a meeting agenda and progress report on the current strategic plan, with some of those objectives completed, some now being more operational than strategic, and some still having an important strategic focus. Ms. Catlin noted that staff will also be providing a short dashboard of the 2015 Citizens Survey, a two-page item that shows where all the items on the survey ranks in terms of percentage, how people responded to them, how they trended, and how they compare with benchmark communities. She stated that staff also pulled out some questions they felt were particularly relevant in thinking about strategic priorities, what citizens were most satisfied with, and a summary of the questions. She noted that staff will also provide reflections from the leadership council, comprised of County department heads and senior County Executive staff, in terms of what they see as priorities. Ms. Catlin added that lastly, staff will provide the Board with some high-level County data that will help inform them of relevant topics of importance.

Ms. Catlin stated that the next steps after the May 17 session will be the ranking of priorities, which will take place at their June 8 worksession, and staff will provide the Board with materials in advance to give them an initial sense of where people rank items.

Ms. Mallek asked that the PowerPoint presentations also be put in the Dropbox since there are no handouts of that material.

Ms. Palmer commented that some things cost less than others and small items may not be as high a priority overall but because of its price might move up, and asked how that will be handled.

Ms. Catlin responded that the first step will be to get the Board's sense of priorities, then staff will bring them back with resources attached, at which time they will have the opportunity to shuffle them as desired.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that this is Mr. Davis's last meeting.

Mr. Dill noted that Mr. Davis has been in this meeting room more than any other Albemarle County official in history.

Agenda Item No. 3. Water Resources Program Funding Recommendations.

The executive summary presented by staff states that on January 8, 2014, the Board directed staff to develop a process to inform the public and to 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 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.

The Committee defined a model 10-year Program Plan to serve as the basis for estimating program costs and analyzing rate structures under various funding scenarios. The Program Plan consists of a range of operational and capital programs, including three new major program categories which go beyond the County's historic water resource protection services: 1) addressing mandated stream and bay cleanup requirements (known as TMDLs), 2) proactively repairing and maintaining public drainage infrastructure, and 3) voluntarily addressing stream impairments and other ecological issues throughout the County. The Board had an opportunity to review the proposed Program Plan on January 7, 2015.

The Committee's recommendations are detailed in its final report (Attachment A). In summary, the Committee recommended that the County implement a County-wide stormwater utility with fees based primarily on impervious area but including generous rate adjustments for private investments in stormwater management. The report summarizes the considerable public outreach and engagement effort conducted by the Committee and staff during the summer of 2015 and the abundant community feedback received. Staff provided a briefing of the Committee's recommendations to the Board on October 7, 2015.

It should be noted that the Committee provided only broad recommendations and that additional work, including the determination of a rate formula and credit and incentive program, would be required prior to actual implementation of a stormwater utility. This work would require hiring a consultant and would necessitate additional community outreach and stakeholder input. The process would likely take 12 to 18 months to arrive at a final recommendation. The process to pursue the service district funding option would be simpler and faster.

The purpose of this worksession is for the Board to 1) review the Committee recommendations; 2) receive staff updates to the TMDL cost assumptions; 3) consider the Committee's proposed 10-year Program Plan; 4) discuss funding options taking into account the latest cost and revenue projections; and 5) provide direction on its preferred funding method and next steps.

The TMDL requirements – imposed by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) – are the most significant drivers of new costs in the Committee's recommended Program Plan. The circumstances influencing the projected TMDL costs, however, have recently changed. Subsequent to the Committee's work, the County received DEQ approval (Attachment B) of its Chesapeake Bay TMDL Action Plan. The Plan demonstrates that the County has essentially met its long-term 2028 pollutant reduction requirements for nitrogen and sediment and has made considerable progress towards meeting required phosphorus reductions. The extent of County progress is not necessarily definitive due to the potential for DEQ to impose even more stringent requirements in the future – likely in response to Chesapeake Bay Model updates and as part of DEQ permit re-issuance in 2018. Despite this uncertainty, staff believes the annual estimated costs to meet TMDL requirements can be significantly decreased from those reflected in the Committee's report. Attachment C depicts the estimated costs over the 10-year planning period of major categories of the Committee's Program Plan (with revised TMDL costs) compared to anticipated revenues from existing sources – a 0.7-cents of the real property tax rate earmarked for the program and various permit fees.

Although there is a smaller gap between projected costs and revenues of the program due to lower anticipated TMDL costs, overall implementation of the new programs will ultimately require additional funding. A stormwater utility could serve to either replace or supplement existing funding. The advantages of a utility should be weighed against the greater financial and staff resource investments required to develop a utility, as compared to creating a service district or creating neither, and the strong opposition observed within some segments of the community to a new and separate fee.

Staff will present information to the Board on May 11 comparing the stormwater utility and service district options. The Committee's consideration of variations of those options are included in the Rate Structure and Rate Recommendations section of the report beginning on page 22.

Staff recommends that the Board 1) consider the 10-Year Program Plan recommended by the Committee with the understanding that the Program Plan may be revised in the future to incorporate new information and to respond to new mandates; 2) consider the options of a stormwater utility, as recommended by the Committee, or a service district; and 3) direct staff to begin the process of developing either a stormwater utility or a service district.

Mr. Bill Letteri, Deputy County Executive, addressed the Board and stated that he and Greg Harper will be presenting to the Board today, and stated that this follows the Board's receipt of the final report of the Water Resources Funding Advisory Committee in October 2015. Mr. Letteri said this is the result of several years of work, including many worksessions with the Board and the community, and the work of the committee intended to develop and articulate a 10-year model that incorporated mandates and regulatory obligations coming forward with MS4, TMDL and others; and to incorporate the infrastructure needs likely to be part of the program going forward, and the aspirations and goals related to water resources as articulated by the Board in worksessions and in its adoption of the comprehensive plan. Mr. Letteri said the second part of the committee's work was to look at funding mechanisms, and in looking at options for the Board to consider, general fund funding, service district, or utility, the committee had produced a recommendation in its report. He stated that at this meeting, staff will review the program identified by the committee and what is included in the program; program costs, some of which have changed, with a more favorable position to meet TMDL obligations; mechanisms for funding a utility of this type; and reviewing recommendations of the committee. Mr. Letteri stated that staff is not expecting actions or decisions from the Board, and this is one of two worksessions planned with the intent of gathering feedback on this ten-year program as it is now defined. He noted that staff would also like feedback on the different funding mechanisms available to the Board, and will talk about next steps, such as bringing back more information on a specific funding mechanism, or they may decide to defer discussion.

Mr. Greg Harper, Chief of Environmental Services, addressed the Board and stated that this process began with some mandates from DEQ that came about in the 2013-14 time frame, especially the TMDLs that were part of the permit issuance in 2013. He stated that staff recognized that implementing TMDL projects to address Chesapeake Bay pollution would be quite costly, so the Board, at the time, decided that it was probably a good idea to explore whether it was appropriate to fund the water resources program through a dedicated funding mechanism rather than the general fund. Mr. Harper said that an advisory committee was formed and met 11 times over the course of a year, and was supported by David Bulova of Foster Wheeler, with a fairly extensive community engagement process held last summer. He stated that they went through the committee's recommendations quite extensively, and the committee included representatives from various stakeholder groups throughout the County.

Mr. Harper reported the water resources program plan that would result in a cost that would need to be funded in some way, was the focus of many committee meetings, and it included meeting regulatory requirements and long-term infrastructure needs and responsibilities. He presented information on the things the County does and was just starting to do, and noted the three new programs recommended by the committee's program plan: the TMDL capital program; infrastructure assessment and regular maintenance, referred to as "gray infrastructure" including pipes and manholes; and watershed planning and restoration, or "green infrastructure" consisting of ecological systems. Mr. Harper stated that those are the major cost drivers over the existing programs, and given the changing environment of the County's permit with DEQ and TMDL requirements, staff and the committee looked at the three programs to see if the costs assumed a year ago were still appropriate. He pointed out the total cost of the recommended program over a 10-year planning period, with operating costs mostly consisting of salaries, and said the current revenues include the 0.7-cent earmark and \$1/4 million in permit fees collected by Community Development. Mr. Harper noted that the new programs in year 10 as of 6-8 months ago reflected about a \$4.8-million program cost on top of past efforts.

Mr. Harper stated the gray infrastructure includes mapping infrastructure, with a lot of the County's responsibilities unknown, and part of the process is determining whether drainage easements exist that have been dedicated to the public. He said that for a robust program, they would need to assess the condition of the system, including videoing of the pipes to identify any issues that would ultimately result in a problem and doing routine maintenance, as well as possibly doing major repairs and rehabilitation. Mr. Harper noted that an enhanced maintenance program will cost a significant amount that is currently not available, and he presented examples of some past projects, including a sinkhole in someone's backyard that is in a public easement. He pointed out that the hole was no bigger than a basketball but there was concern that someone could fall into it, and even though it was inexpensive, it took time to get a contractor out to fix it. Mr. Harper mentioned the large Carrsbrook sinkhole, which

ended up costing the County \$150,000 because it was a cost-share with VDOT. Mr. Harper stated that there are lingering items that will not be found out until they fail, because the current County program is completely reactive.

Ms. Mallek asked Mr. Harper to talk about the process by which the system assessment would happen, as a certain small percentage would be evaluated, but not all at once.

Mr. Harper responded that they would assess about 10 per year, assuming a 100-year lifespan.

Ms. Mallek commented that it is cheaper to fix the problems when they are small.

Mr. Harper agreed, and stated that a County staff member had found a cheap way to fix a sinkhole at Cory Farm by finding a company that would go into a manhole and inject polyurethane to some bored holes to fill the cavities behind it, rather than excavating the manhole at a cost of \$25K. He said that this was something they can do before a catastrophe occurs, because once it does occur it will be too late, and the trend is to maintain aging infrastructure, with the more done, the more found.

Mr. Harper reported that there are a lot of impaired streams throughout the County, and nothing is being done to address them outside of the permitted MS4 area, in part because it is not required. He noted that the County does not get as much Chesapeake Bay pollution reduction credit for the projects done outside of the urbanized area, so they are focusing on the things that have to be done, including watershed planning, stream restoration planning, and capital projects. Mr. Harper presented DEQ data on impaired streams that are located throughout the County, and the committee felt that it was important not to neglect those rural streams just because there is nothing mandated through state permit. He said there can be a low, medium, or high end of service, and the committee leaned towards the higher end of service for both gray and green infrastructure. Mr. Harper noted the County has received a lot of TMDL credit for a recent stream restoration project in the Four Seasons area, with small channel being the most cost effective, and the community was really pleased now that they do not have to worry about falling into a steep channel and getting tangled up in the exposed cable wires.

Mr. Harper reported that the most important cost is the TMDL cost, and 6-8 months ago the County was assuming a \$2.5-million per year capital program to meet the 15-year-long permit requirement, but the County was already far along with its pollution reduction requirements for phosphorous, nitrogen, and total suspended solids. He stated the County is essentially done with its nitrogen and total suspended solids goals, and is almost done with its phosphorous goals with about 70% done and almost 30% remaining for its goal by 2028. Mr. Harper stated that the County was not sure if the DEQ would approve what was submitted and was surprised by the results, until they got their approval letter in December 2015, so the committee proceeded with its recommendations without being aware of that progress.

Ms. Mallek asked for clarification of the bars in the graph provided.

Mr. Harper explained that the bars denote 10% increments of 0%-140%, and said the County needs to get 100% done by the year 2028 per its permit. He noted that the County is almost 140% done with its long-term goal for total suspended solids, and it got a lot of credit for previous measures as well as BMPs built by developers. Mr. Harper stated that the County has to reduce phosphorous discharges by 243 pounds per year, and assuming a cost of \$10,000 per pound, that totals approximately \$2.5 million over a 10-year period, with more expensive measures at \$20,000 per pound totaling about \$5 million per year, which was originally assumed to be the new cost.

Ms. Palmer commented that the County has a number of impaired rivers yet is being told by DEQ that it is meeting its requirements.

Ms. Mallek noted that it was for the MS4 only.

Mr. Harper added that it is possible that the next permit could have more stringent requirements, and when he has asked people at the state level if this was a possibility, they have said that it is.

Mr. Harper stated that the County has met its current cycle goals and is still working towards its 100% long-term goal, with a current project funded 50% by a SLAF grant of \$260,000. He noted the General Assembly is currently funding that grant program, but it is questionable as to whether they will be putting more money into it, so the more they do now with matching funds, the better.

Ms. Mallek commented that the legislature has not put any money back into it.

Mr. Davis noted that it has been funded.

Ms. Palmer asked for explanation of the comment that this is only for MS4.

Mr. Harper responded that the permit requirements only dictate that they clean up the impaired streams within the urban area, since the MS4 is an urban stormwater permit and does not cover the rural areas of the County.

Ms. Mallek noted that the committee did with its bigger aspirations in an effort to look at the long-term responsibility.

Ms. Palmer asked if the state, at any point, will require the County to address its rural areas.

Mr. Harper responded that there is no authority to require that because the MS4 permit regulated area is driven by whatever the census determines is the Charlottesville urban area, so while that area might grow, it will never suddenly apply to the entire County.

Ms. Mallek stated that phosphorous is tied to sediment, so reducing the rural runoff as well as urban would help address the 243 pounds per year.

Mr. Harper explained the sediment reduction is per year because every year more runoff will carry more sediment into the streams, so the 243 pounds is total.

Ms. Mallek stated it is also hard to measure, so stopping the runoff regardless of where it comes from makes the County better off, and in looking at the rural streams and rivers, some felt it was more cost effective to reduce phosphorous than build concrete structures in the urban areas.

Mr. Harper pointed out that the County gets more credit for measures in the MS4 permit area, so they have to focus the TMDL program within the urban areas.

Ms. Palmer stated they are about to get a quality report on the health of the Rivanna Reservoir from the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority, and depending on the recommendations she wants to know if those would apply since they will be in the urban area.

Mr. Harper responded that they could potentially get credit depending on what is done, and dredging out an existing stormwater facility that has been accumulating sediment might provide some credit, but it would probably come to Rivanna as a credit, and they in turn could sell the County the credits.

Mr. Randolph stated that environmental science literature talks about increased development correlating with increased pollution, but in the case of 5th Street Station, it could actually mean decreased pollution going into nearby Moore's Creek, so as the County does infill development, it may get better natural resources than leaving it in a degraded state.

Mr. Harper said that on paper, they have received credit for a lot of development, and accounting is what they go by as far as their permit goes.

Mr. Harper stated that there is some uncertainty as they move forward in time, and the County will be issued a new permit in 2018 that will reflect an update of the Chesapeake Bay model, which is supposed to be completed in 2017. He said the whole TMDL process for any impaired stream is an adaptive one, doing the best assessment possible to figure out how polluted it is and what can be done to bring it back to health, then measuring success and changing goals as needed.

Mr. Harper stated that it is more appropriate to assume a \$500,000 per year cost to meet the Chesapeake Bay TMDL as opposed to the \$2.5 million cost estimate put forth to the committee a year ago, and he presented an updated graph reflecting the new TMDL cost of \$500,000 per year, approaching \$5 million total. He noted the existing 0.7-cent earmark and the permit fees will cover a portion of the program including some operating costs, the entirety of TMDL costs, and a portion of the gray infrastructure costs, and can be distributed in any way.

Ms. Mallek said that no assessment of pipes and infrastructure is reflected in this budget.

Mr. Harper responded that the gray infrastructure cost, as depicted, is beyond what they are doing today, with very little money currently being spent except in cases like Carrsbrook.

Ms. Palmer asked what the 0.7 cents is covering now.

Mr. Harper stated that if they want to distribute the 0.7 cents plus the \$1/4 million annual permit fees, he is presenting one model for that distribution, with some funds split between TMDL and gray infrastructure.

Mr. Randolph suggested that when he presents this again, Mr. Harper should point out to the public with a single slide the fact that Albemarle County has done well in its efforts and has done well by the taxpayers, so that everyone understands the good work that has been done that led to this point.

Mr. Letteri suggested including key performance indicators in the budget that relate to this department, actually having a chart that demonstrates this.

Ms. Palmer agreed that the County has done a really great job, but all the waterways in the urban area are listed as "impaired."

Mr. Randolph agreed, stating that there is more to be done in the Rivanna River Basin.

Ms. McKeel stated that this was accomplished as a partnership with developers and the community, and it is important to recognize that.

Mr. Harper said that in talking with other communities, they did not account for BMPs built between 2006 and 2009 that were associated with development, and Albemarle went to the trouble of recognizing those credits.

Ms. Mallek stated that those other communities will be catching up, and that will change the pie for 2017, which is why Albemarle needs to keep moving forward and not rest on its laurels and stop improving.

Mr. Harper reviewed funding mechanism types and stated that Albemarle County currently uses the general fund, with the two dedicated funding mechanisms being service districts and stormwater utilities, which are typically the funding mechanism of choice for cities, and a lot of cities have adopted one including, Prince William County and Chesterfield County. He added that Chesterfield County's stormwater utility was very recently adopted.

Mr. Davis noted that it was implemented three weeks ago.

Mr. Harper stated that a service district is based on property value and land use value, unless a property owner willingly allows the tax to be on the entire property value, which would likely not be the case, so it would be the same value as a general fund tax. He explained that a stormwater utility is based on a physical metric, with the impervious footprint of a property, buildings, rooftops, parking lots and driveways, typically used because it is felt that measure is more correlated to land cover than property value. Mr. Harper said the stormwater utility has the strongest correlation by far between the actual rate and the need for services, but it is also the most complex as there must be good GIS data and financial systems in place, with some areas needing to be corrected in the event of data not sound enough to be used for fees. He stated that with the process of developing a stormwater utility, there are usually a few years in which people bring issues forward because they do not think their rate is fair, and there is work needing to be done on the front end.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there is more information he could provide to help clarify the correlation between rate and services, with a weak correlation noted between general fund and service district between the rate and need for services, and a strong one noted for stormwater utilities. He said if it is just based on an anecdotal understanding, that is fine, but he wants to know if there is additional correlative data that could be used.

Mr. Harper responded that staff did not do any analysis particular to the County, but there is probably some correlation between property value and need for services, although it is not known how strong that is, and it is assumed to be weak because similar property footprints would have a similar impact regardless of the value of the property itself. He stated that credits for lowering impact on a property cannot be offered for general fund or service district, but stormwater utility actually requires applying credit for someone's efforts onsite. Mr. Harper said that incentives are similar to credits and can only be offered with a stormwater utility, the local government-school funding formula only applies to general fund, and land use properties will not pay a discounted stormwater utility, although there was a recommendation emerging from the committee about discounting low-density properties in the case of properties with large open fields or forests.

Mr. Harper reported that these recommendations were based on the assumption that the TMDL program was going to be a \$2.5 million per year program, and there has been a lot of recent email correspondence among committee members that they would have changed their vote if they had known it was only going to cost \$1/2 million a year.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that this was a very small group out of the whole, so she does not want to lend the impression that there had been some kind of survey of the committee.

Mr. Harper responded that not every committee member was at the meeting where the poll was taken, but there was a slight majority, but not a consensus, that preferred a stormwater utility, and he is not sure how they would vote today but it would likely be a split.

Ms. Palmer stated that she recalled an approximate cost that the utility would affect the property owners, and she asked how this would be affected by the change in the dollar value.

Mr. Harper explained that they had landed at an average of \$250 per year per homeowner, but that would likely drop to about \$35-\$70 for the average homeowner. He stated that there were multiple scenarios put forth and it was quite challenging to keep up with the costs and impacts on various groups of landowners, so \$50-\$100 per year is very generalized. Mr. Harper said that in addition to recommending a stormwater facility, the committee discussed whether this or any funding mechanism should be applied only to the urban areas or only to the urban areas at a different rate than the rural areas, and ultimately there was consensus that everyone countywide would pay essentially the same rate. He noted that even though some of the programs have an urban focus, a lot of the programs recommended by the committee, the green infrastructure in particular, is a countywide function, and they feel that everyone in the county would benefit from the services provided by the program. Mr. Harper stated the committee also felt that basing the stormwater utility on impervious areas was the fairest way to distribute the cost of the program, but there should be rate adjustments for onsite BMPs and low overall density properties or some other measure just to reflect the true property characteristics. He added that the committee also felt that it was important to have financial incentives for private investments, and felt that technical assistance should be provided as part of the program.

Mr. Randolph asked if the proposed utility fees are necessary to supporting an expanded County staff to address increased federal and state mandates, and whether the utility fees are directly tied to reducing the major sources of pollution, phosphorous, nitrogen and sediment, which are primarily rural in location. He asked if these fees really address where the problem is, which is rural in nature based on the charts that he had exchanged with Mr. Harper, which David Mitchell had shared.

Ms. Mallek stated that those charts were not part of the material presented to the committee as part of the report, and it was apples and oranges.

Mr. Randolph said that whether it came through the committee or not, he is just asking the question of whether the fees are tied to helping reduce the major sources of pollution that are rural in location, and it is a yes or no question.

Mr. Harper responded that he thinks so, as much of the program is rural in location. He explained that the TMDL program is urban in focus, but the gray infrastructure maintenance and green infrastructure efforts are countywide programs, and any funding will result in a decrease in pollutants of concern for local streams and the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. Randolph asked if the government will pay utility fees for its properties under this scheme.

Mr. Harper responded that some communities pay but others do not, and that would be a question for a subsequent committee to decide. He asked David Bulova to comment.

Mr. David Bulova of Amec Foster Wheeler addressed the Board and stated that this is something they took into consideration with rate models, and the only category absolutely excluded by law would be public roads owned and operated by VDOT. He stated the law allows a locality to exempt its own properties, but some localities will assess themselves just to level the playing field with the private sector. Mr. Bulova said he does not recall how the committee constructed its particular model and whether those are included or not, but it is a policy decision that would be in the hands of the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Davis explained that local and state governments subject to an MS4 permit were prohibited from being subject to a utility.

Mr. Bulova agreed, citing the University of Virginia as an example of an entity with its own MS4 permit, as would be the case with a town, but said that individual standalone properties, whether federal or state, would be subject to the fee.

Ms. Mallek said the North Fork Research Park would be in that category, because it is out in the country and not part of Rivanna.

Mr. Davis clarified that it would depend on whether the University has an MS4 permit for that property.

Mr. Randolph stated that nonprofit organizations providing quasi-governmental services should be exempt from paying a utility fee because they provide those services, and he also feels that places of worship should be exempt because "the power to tax is the power to destroy" and he feels that it is corrosive.

Mr. Davis emphasized that under the stormwater utility enabling authority, a locality does not have the option to exempt nonprofits or church property.

Ms. Mallek stated that one of the strongest senses of unanimity on the committee was that all properties be included because it reduced the cost for all, and many stakeholders felt that exempting large nonprofit properties, such as hospitals, would just double or triple what the owner of a small house would pay. She said there was also strong support for relating opportunities for reductions when there is an investment that reduces impact, because in many people's minds the point of the stormwater program is to reduce impact and not just to collect money.

Ms. Palmer said it is pretty obvious that there is a sense of fairness with the utility, but what struck her was the discussion of how much would be credited for things like a rainwater garden given the cost associated with the BMPs, and she asked Mr. Harper to comment.

Mr. Harper responded that a lot of communities are finding that the rebate they offer for having onsite stormwater management has a really long payback period, so if a person invests \$1,000 in something and gets a rebate of \$5 per year, it really would not affect behavior. He stated that it depends on how much rebate can be offered, and even if it does not incentivize people who would not normally do it, it could be seen as a reward, and it is always nice to be rewarded for actions, even if it might not cause all property owners to want to immediately implement a lot of onsite BMPs. Mr. Harper added that some of that can be driven by education and cost sharing, which the committee talked about, but it has been difficult to see real success stories with the monthly rebates incentivizing a big change in behavior.

Mr. Bulova noted that if you have to put in a stormwater BMP by regulation, that is a sunk cost you already have, and getting a credit is a good thing that acknowledges you are doing more than your neighbor. He stated that Mr. Harper's assessment is right regarding the question of to what degree credits incentivize a change to prompt someone to put in a stormwater BMP. The payoff is very long and a person has the opportunity to put in a facility and get 100% credit for it, but generally the numbers do

not work for them. Mr. Bulova said the one caveat to that is when a property is redeveloping, and by regulation is required to put in a stormwater BMP, but there is an opportunity to oversize it, the cost dynamics change dramatically. He stated that one of the ways the County met the Chesapeake Bay TMDL is because it had oversized facilities that were meeting more than the basic minimum requirements under state regulations, and this might be a way to incentivize as people are redeveloping to treat more, so with economies of scale there may be an economic incentive.

Mr. Dill asked what the comparative administrative costs are for the different systems; because if there is not a lot of economic incentive but there are a lot of paperwork and inspection requirements, he wonders how those costs offset the fairness aspect.

Mr. Bulova explained that tacking on a service district fee is really coming up with a new line item on real property tax, so the infrastructure is already in place and there would be very few additional costs in terms of what the County would implement. He said that with a stormwater utility, the additional costs really pertain to maintaining a geographic information system and impervious cover layer that enables the County to make those charges in a fair and accurate way. Mr. Bulova noted that in terms of an MS4 permit, the DEQ is requiring localities to be able to map their infrastructure and impervious surface areas, which is starting to happen now, and it is certainly more than doing a service district fee, with a cost to maintaining the GIS and impervious surface cover. He added that typically a stormwater utility is still billed as part of the real estate property tax, so there is not a separate bill that goes out as it would still use the same billing system already in place.

Ms. Palmer stated that what concerns her is the possibility of localities getting more complaints from landowners who find discrepancies in what they are being assessed versus charged.

Mr. Bulova responded this is a concern, and the first few billing cycles usually catch people off guard, so all localities that put these together have a robust appeals process, and typically there are some dedicated resources to make sure that when someone comes in and has a question, the County can sit down with them promptly and confirm the accuracy through aerial photos and GIS. He said that for the first few years they can expect challenges, but it is important for a locality to have that customer service element to ensure the rollout is fair and an easy process by which to correct it.

Mr. Randolph asked if counties are finding that it is productive to roll out the utility tax six months after the property tax, so the County Assessor's office is not inundated with questions from the public; because it seems that this raises a very good question about a whole new level of the assessor to address these kinds of appeals and questions. He said if they try to address these at the same time as property taxes, they may be burying the County Assessor, and six months out of cycle would provide some lead time.

Mr. Bulova responded that to his knowledge that is not being done, but each locality is very unique in terms of how they prepare for the public response.

Ms. Mallek stated that one of the items the committee did not come to resolution on was how many layers would be in the tax and how to deal with specific details, like length of driveways, for which the GIS is not designed. She said that many who were concerned about the County's GIS system also expressed that it was the best in the state for what it was designed to do, such as roofs and building footprints. Another option to get the benefits and flexibility with the utility would be to start focusing it on rooftop hardscapes instead of adding in the roofs and driveways, at least in the first year.

Ms. McKeel asked if they need to take some time to look at mapping and infrastructure.

Mr. Harper responded that since the fees would be based on impervious areas and not infrastructure, the data exists now and is pretty good, and while it was not designed to serve as a measure for someone's bill, it can be. He stated that if data shows a property line shifted with respect to the road and the road is billed to a neighbor that could be a large bill put on another property, but most of the data, such as house footprints, that are within the boundary of a property would not get billed to another property. Mr. Harper noted that things like gravel driveways are already mapped for the most part, but there will be people who take issue with the bill and what was assigned to their property, and those things will have to be worked out during the first few billing cycles.

Mr. Davis stated that the ordinances that have implemented utilities are almost all based on an equivalent residential dwelling unit so there are blocks of impervious surface, with 40,000 square feet or less being one equivalent residential dwelling unit, and 60,000 square feet would be two equivalent residential dwelling units, so it is not based on a sliding scale of fee per square foot. He said this eliminated a lot of the fine tuning complaints, because it would either fall in one or two dwelling unit blocks.

Ms. McKeel asked if the committee feels comfortable that there is sufficient infrastructure to handle this.

Mr. Bulova responded that the County's GIS is fairly good in general, but like any locality they would want to do a thorough QA/QC because there would be gaps in data and places where parcel lines clearly do not match up, but those things are fairly easy to address. He stated the issues will typically be with driveways or gravel roads because they tend to meander a bit, and figuring out how to deal with those was a major component of the discussion of the advisory committee and was an acknowledgement that it would have to be a discussion of any future funding mechanisms.

Ms. McKeel said that she does not have a clear idea of what the drivers of overhead would be.

Mr. Bulova responded that the committee had come up with a cost estimate for the initial ramp up of QA/QC of the GIS, and the cost of maintaining it and the impervious layer as well as coordinating with finance to get those bills out. He stated that compared to the overall cost, it is fairly small, but it is a cost.

Ms. McKeel noted that it has the potential to grow.

Mr. Dill asked if that also includes inspectors, as it seems that would be more than just the Finance Department and the Assessor.

Mr. Harper responded that they assumed a few hundred thousand for startup costs for consulting and working with financial systems to modify them, then less than one FTE could probably manage the load over a period of time.

Ms. McKeel commented that she is not yet sold on the utility idea.

Ms. Palmer stated the Board is being asked to consider the options of stormwater utility, as recommended by the committee, or a service district, and direct staff to begin the process of developing one or the other. She said the Board seems to want some more information on overhead, and asked what the best way would be to proceed.

Ms. McKeel stated that she is a bit uncomfortable that the committee had different information and made a decision based on that, so if they are going to take a pause she would like for the committee to look at the new information and weigh in based on that.

Ms. Mallek said another benefit to that is that the committee could further hash out the sections of houses only versus others.

Ms. McKeel agreed, stating that they are not in an emergency situation and had a committee that spent almost a year on this, now with last-minute new information.

Mr. Letteri noted that staff has scheduled another worksession, possibly for July, and if the timing and ability to reconvene the committee requires more time they can move it to August or September, and this will also allow time to put together the analysis of the overhead and various burdens associated with running the utility.

Mr. Randolph added that this would also allow them time to evaluate how cost effective the program is, and it would be nice to reach a point where the budgetary support disappears and this is a self-sustaining program.

Ms. McKeel said she would also like to explore reallocating the 0.7 cents back to the CIP, and put the stormwater priorities within the CIP, as this would eliminate the desire for the utility.

Mr. Foley noted the capital portion could be done that way, but the operating would be an ongoing expense.

Ms. Mallek noted that the dam at Hollymead, which is already in the CIP and is required by the state, is taking up most of that.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would just like to take a look at it and see how it plays out.

Mr. Foley said staff can provide that information.

Ms. Palmer noted that Mr. Bulova represents the 37th District in the House of Delegates.

Recess. The Board recessed its meeting at 4:47 p.m. and reconvened at 4:55 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 4. Proclamation recognizing Police Week May 9-15, 2016.

Ms. McKeel **moved** to adopt a resolution recognizing the week of May 9-15, 2016 as "Police Week" and May 15, 2016 as "Peace Officers Memorial Day" in Albemarle County. Ms. Mallek **seconded** motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel and Ms. Palmer.

NAYS: None.

Lieutenant Mike Wagner accepted a certificate of recognition and thanked the Board for their continued support of County police.

**Police Week
May 9-15, 2016**

Whereas, *in 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed the first proclamation recognizing May 15th as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which it falls as National Police Week, "to pay tribute to the law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country and to voice our appreciation for all those who currently serve on the front lines of the battle against crime;" and*

Whereas, *the safety and well-being of Albemarle County citizens being of the utmost importance to the prosperity and livelihood of Albemarle County families and communities; and*

Whereas, *police officers throughout Albemarle County are dedicated to protecting and serving Albemarle County communities – our neighborhoods, schools, and families; and*

Whereas, *police officers risk their lives each and every day in order to ensure public safety and enforce the laws of the land. Albemarle County values the courage and devotion of our police officer, as our collective prosperity depends on the integrity with which our law enforcement officers maintain peace and security; and*

Whereas, *Police Week and Peace Officers Memorial Day are opportunities to honor the officers who have fallen in the line of duty, and recognize the sacrifices made by the families of those officers and the families of those who continue to protect and serve our communities;*

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that, we, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, do hereby recognize

**May 9-15, 2016,
as
POLICE WEEK**

and May 15, 2016, as PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY in Albemarle County and call these observances to the attention of all our citizens.

Signed and sealed this 11th day of May, 2016.

Agenda Item No. 5. Summary of Police Department Activities.

Colonel Steve Sellers addressed the Board and stated the best way to lay this out is to talk about the police department when he arrived five and a half years ago versus where it is today, along with some of his professional recommendations. Colonel Sellers said that in 2010 when he was appointed, the department had 112 authorized positions with 6 frozen, and most community outreach was suspended, which can create mistrust among constituents. He stated that he polled every employee individually in 2011 and attended 70 community meetings in his first year, including some Board members' town hall meetings, and the number one problem identified was public image of the police department. Colonel Sellers said the training budget was cut down to almost nothing, which is typical in a recession, but somewhat dangerous with policing because they fall behind on what is needed to effectively police. He noted the County was only beginning to acknowledge the presence of gangs locally, with the Board of Supervisors publicly recognizing it in 2011 or 2012.

Colonel Sellers stated that since 2010, the officer to population ratio has improved by about 8%, and response times in the urban area have improved from 4 minutes, 38 seconds to 4 minutes, 3 seconds; in rural areas it was 11 minutes, 37 seconds, and it is now 9 minutes, 26 seconds; and times were improved even more significantly in peak times. He said that in 2010, Albemarle County was the 5th safest of the nine counties served by county police departments, with Fairfax ranking higher than Albemarle, and that ranking has now changed, putting Albemarle 1st. Colonel Sellers reported that in 2011 when crash statistics were first collected, the County was at 2,466 crashes, and now is at 1,996, but he emphasized that Albemarle fluctuates between Prince George in terms of the most dangerous roads in Virginia for those counties served by county police departments. He emphasized they have reduced the rate, but more needs to be done. Colonel Sellers reported that Albemarle had counted 177 gang members and validated them back in 2010 and is now at 205, with the gang task force trying to verify numbers as high as 700-800. He commented that this does not surprise him, and feels the numbers were a lot higher in 2010 as well.

Colonel Sellers reported that overall for the last five years, there was a 65% reduction in crime in Albemarle County. He stated that in 2010 there were 73 citizen complaints, those formally filed by citizens against police officers for misconduct, and in 2015 that number was 45, 14 of which were filed by the County's own police officers, which shows the force polices itself very effectively. Colonel Sellers reported there were 79 formal citizen commendations in 2010, and that number was 368 in 2015, with both complaints and formal commendations, via letter or email, improving since transitioning to geo-policing in 2012. He noted the customer service piece is all due to geo-policing and retraining the force in problem solving and working with the community.

Colonel Sellers reported that in 2010, the department had no social media presence at all, but enacted its Facebook and Twitter accounts in 2012, with 10,000 social media followers currently and plans to activate Instagram soon to reach another demographic. He stated the department reaches an

average of 50,000 citizens every day, and that is part of community policing in the new age, as people are not coming out as much to meetings. Colonel Sellers noted that in 2010, the Police Citizens Advisory Committee was formed, and to get even more feedback, he created the Crime Prevention Council and citizen advisory teams for geo-policing. He reported they have formed a partnership with the African-American Pastors Association and meets regularly with them, so now they have five formalized feedback groups to provide input.

Colonel Sellers reported that in 2010, there were 170 instances of in-service training, with 297 in 2015, a number that was actually cut due to staffing shortages. He stated there were 16 weeks of basic recruit training in 2010 at regional academies, with the department now providing an additional 6 weeks of regular training. Colonel Sellers noted that this must be done regionally, as the department does not have the capacity to host its own big training, so the County counts on the City and University to help and vice versa. He emphasized that they must be consistent about handling these things, because they are often "patch to patch" and would have major problems with public safety if they did not actively train the same.

Colonel Sellers stated that as outgoing Chief of Police, he recommended that ACPD should continue its efforts toward geo-policing, the POP team, and right-sizing the police department. He said they need to completely change their approach toward training and become more regionally focused, and need to address pay and compression, which is imperative in these times, especially with law enforcement. Colonel Sellers reported that the ACPD has a professionally trained SWAT team, and while he hopes they do not have to use it, he called the team out six times last year. He stated he has fired 17 officers and has hired more than 65, with a dedicated workforce of which he is proud, adding that the department provides training that the academy is incapable of providing. Colonel Sellers stated that he is assured by the partnerships with the City and University, and the existence of a field force team that knows how to handle citizen unrest and protests. He said that he loses sleep because of staffing because when his pager goes off in the middle of the night and alerts him to a priority one call regarding a threat, and seven people working midnight shift is not enough. Colonel Sellers said he also loses sleep over the presence of organized crime, and they must have the capacity of a full-service police department to be able to put people undercover to address gangs, human trafficking, narcotics, etc., and he is also concerned about the basic training members currently receive at the facility in the Shenandoah Valley.

Colonel Sellers said he has talked about the importance of geo-policing and referenced a report from President Obama entitled "21st Century Policing Final Report," commenting that if the Democrats get the presidency, this will go forward. He stated if you look at the recommendations in the report, Albemarle County is 75% compliant, which is phenomenal. He stated that squad-based policing is all about accountability, and you cannot have accountability without the right amount of supervision. Colonel Sellers said the County, City and University Chiefs all agree that the level of training officers are required to have is not being met in a regional criminal justice academy in Weyer's Cave, and while there is nothing wrong with the training provided there, it is at a basic level. He stated this is why more training is required locally, and there is only one time you can withdraw from that academy, and it is once every five years. Colonel Sellers commented that he has heard the City Council and Board of Supervisors talk about collaboration, and their police departments, as well as the University's, demonstrate a classic example of working together, with the firing range that opens the following day being an example of that. He said that one of the things a police chief does is manage risk, and a better trained police department significantly lowers risk, especially with civil liability, but most importantly to save lives.

Colonel Sellers reported that police work in Albemarle County has changed significantly in the time he has been here, and the public scrutiny, criticism, and negativity articulated in the press wears on the men and women in uniform, while damaging morale. He emphasized that 95% of officers across the country serve because they care about what they do, but a broad brush is painted on the entire force because of the 5% who are involved in misconduct. Colonel Sellers noted that fewer people are signing up and taking the police test, and the quality of those taking the test has also declined. He added that compensation needs to be addressed, and the majority of those hired today come from other agencies, with two from the academy and seven from other agencies, and because of compression, they cannot be paid what they are worth. Colonel Sellers noted that Albemarle is an expensive place to live, and it is imperative for officers to live in the community they serve for community policing to be a success, but almost 2/3 of officers live outside of the County. He mentioned that ACPD is working with the police foundation to come up with strategies for the workforce, but also to pilot it with the department first.

Ms. Palmer thanked Colonel Sellers for his presentation.

Ms. McKeel commented that it is imperative for all of the work they do to have a safe community, and if the community is not safe, either because of gangs or traffic problems or whatever, they are not going to attract businesses and families. She stated that she is specifically concerned about gang activity in the urban ring, but she knows it is happening all over the County, adding that she is also concerned about gang recruitment in schools and would rather stop it before it occurs. Ms. McKeel said she had suggested during their budget worksessions about moving police officers away from the classified pay scale and creating a separate pay scale, just as they had with teachers a few years ago. She stated they realized that the pay scale was not right for teachers and they solved that problem, so given police officers' training requirements and everything else they have to deal with, perhaps they should be on a separate pay scale.

Colonel Sellers stated that in times like this, the flexibility to do something different with police is important, but this is difficult for the County Executive to balance because he has to look out for the whole organization.

Ms. McKeel responded that police officers are definitely different types of employees.

Mr. Randolph stated that the Milton firing range facility is an example of collaboration with the City and University, and commented that it will be helpful to have an understanding of the department's vision now that Milton is operational for small ordinance training, but there is still a need for an outdoor training, a track for high-speed chase training, and a need for an instructional building. He said that he hopes Colonel Sellers will leave to his successor and his team some suggested locations for this type of facility, and while the site in Keene was too controversial for a range, it could possibly be used for other purposes, such as classrooms. Mr. Randolph noted that his son had gone through the police training 10 years ago, he had a lot of dissatisfaction with it, and clearly things have not gotten better.

Colonel Sellers stated they have done a lot a work on envisioning an academy, and he encourages the Board to look at it like a school with multiple uses and the size and footprint of an elementary school. He stated that in terms of a long-distance firing range, the County does have access to other facilities, including one in Harrisonburg, for the limited amount of time they need it.

Ms. Mallek asked if they are using the driving track in Petersburg.

Colonel Sellers responded they have actually been using the Louisa Airport.

Ms. Mallek stated that the citizens of the Whitehall District emphatically understand the difference in the department from 2010, and they are no longer anxious and uncertain about interactions with the department, they have actually been supportive of additional ACPD needs. She asked if this is the year in which the County has to make the choice about participating in the academy.

Colonel Sellers responded that the Board would need to adopt a resolution in October for the agreement to be nullified beginning in 2017, and the next window would be five years from that point. He stated that ACPD is working with the academy now to explore the option of allowing them to do their own basic academy under their umbrella, but over here, which would buy them some time before asking the Board to make this commitment. Colonel Sellers said the other strategy would be to leave the academy now and not be fully prepared, but he is not in favor of that approach.

Ms. Mallek asked if he feels that a year would not be not enough time to get organized, and obviously a building could not be constructed in that time unless they could put a second floor on the firing range.

Colonel Sellers responded there are other options less than building a building to get them started, and that does not concern him as much as whether or not they have the capacity to support something like this, and he is going to try to broker this deal before he leaves.

Ms. Palmer stated that when she was campaigning, her constituents expressed concern about the police department, and those have turned around into very positive comments. She noted that 29 South is in her district and she received many complaints about safety, and asked why these roads are so unsafe.

Colonel Sellers responded that most of the fatalities were occurring in the rural parts of Albemarle County, where the roads were not as sophisticated, with no safe shoulder and trees beside the road that could be collided into. He stated that speeding and DUIs were also factors, and many of the fatalities were with drivers who were not wearing a seat belt, and 75% of the deaths would not have occurred had they been wearing a seatbelt.

Ms. Palmer asked why Albemarle County has these issues when the surrounding localities do not.

Colonel Sellers responded that Albemarle is the urban center, and all the people migrating here for work or entertainment have to cross through the more dangerous roads. He stated that drivers will often skirt the main travel ways and choose to travel Route 20, 231 or 22, assuming the police are out on 29.

Ms. Palmer stated that she is trying to ascertain what is different here in Albemarle, because the roads in other areas do not have shoulders either.

Mr. Dill said he was not familiar with this world prior to taking public office, and seeing the commitment and dedication on the part of the officers has opened his mind to a whole new wonderful group of people in the County.

Colonel Sellers thanked him.

Ms. Mallek commented that she hopes someone will share information about the pilot for workforce housing when that information is available, and residents of Crozet have expressed an interest in focusing rezoning on places where teachers, firefighters, and police officers can live, and it would be great if there was a way to solidify this.

Colonel Sellers responded this may go through the Planning Commission initially, then perhaps onto the Board.

Mr. Randolph commented that the Board will be invited to an upcoming workshop on workplace and affordable housing to directly address this point, adding this was an area of concern for him during his four years on the Planning Commission.

Ms. McKeel stated that members of the federal gang task force had met with the GRACE Committee that works to reduce gang activity, and had expressed concern that the Board of Supervisors and School Board are not paying enough attention to gang activity in the area. Ms. McKeel said she suggested they come to a joint meeting with the School Board and Board of Supervisors, and they responded affirmatively. She also thanked Colonel Sellers for his leadership.

Colonel Sellers thanked the Board for letting him work here, and said that it had often been a joy and a pleasure.

Agenda Item No. 6. Memorandums of Understanding Between the County and the City of Charlottesville.

Ms. Palmer stated that Mayor Mike Signer and Vice-Mayor Wes Bellamy are present at the meeting and said she is pleased they had come this far with the agreements. She said the former City Council member, Meredith Richards, had emailed the Board and asked them to insert "rail" into the transportation clause, and assumed that no one would have objection to that. Ms. Palmer stated the MOUs pertain to transportation, education, affordable housing, and the environment, and listed places in which the County already works with the City. She said the future plan being to designate a staff member assigned to promote the success, identify resources available to both localities, identify and consider potential efficiencies through harmonization, identify and consider potential impacts to each other's jurisdictions, with or without information-sharing where appropriate, and identify mutually beneficial ways in which to cooperate or communicate.

Mr. Dill commented that he is glad they are doing this, and noted that he had lunch with both the Mayor and Vice-Mayor prior to becoming a Supervisor.

Ms. McKeel stated the community really wants them all to work together, as they can accomplish a lot more with collaboration.

Mayor Mike Signer addressed the Board and stated that the MOUs come from a passionate and unanimous commitment from both governing bodies to define the areas that unite them, not divide them. Mayor Signer stated that a working group including himself, Mr. Bellamy, Ms. Palmer and Ms. McKeel had met to discuss areas that promote cooperation and increased regionalism, acknowledging that too often in the past there were times they had been at odds, but competing in those areas does not make sense for citizens or for many areas of public policy. Mayor Signer said that he will address the first two areas of interest that cross boundaries, and he will address the environment and transportation, with Mr. Bellamy addressing education and redevelopment. Mayor Signer stated that it makes more sense to find solutions together, rather than apart, and these will require commitment and trust from both sides, including both staff and elected officials. He noted that "One Charlottesville" was his campaign slogan, and he sees that as an aspiration for the City and the broader community that considers itself the larger Charlottesville area.

Vice-Mayor Wes Bellamy addressed the Board and said that both he and the Mayor are very pleased to be before the Board and look forward to working together, specifically regarding the MOUs for development and education. Mr. Bellamy stated that as a teacher, he knows that what is good for one school system is good for the other, and there is often transience with families between the two jurisdictions, without them even knowing whether they are in the City or the County. He added this further reiterates why they must work together, and the City is committed to working with the County, which will take a commitment on both parts.

Ms. Palmer stated that Colonel Sellers pointed out a great example of getting along, and they will need to pay attention to that.

Ms. Mallek **moved** to adopt the four City-County MOUs as presented. Ms. McKeel **seconded** motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel and Ms. Palmer.
NAYS: None.

Ms. Palmer noted that there is a copy of the signed documents for the City, and said the Board will visit Council the following week for their signing.

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR COLLABORATION
BETWEEN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE AND THE COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
REGARDING MULTIMODAL FORMS OF TRANSPORTATION**

WHEREAS, regionalism is a recognized governing principle across the United States in which neighboring jurisdictions can recognize mutual benefits, efficiencies, and harmony by working together on areas of mutual concern, rather than apart or even against each other; and

WHEREAS, both the City of Charlottesville and the County of Albemarle have recognized that all residents need to easily move across jurisdictional boundaries to access both employment and leisure activities; and

WHEREAS, the residents of the City of Charlottesville and the County of Albemarle desire a variety of transportation options to include automobile, transit, pedestrian, biking and rail; and

WHEREAS, both the City of Charlottesville and the County of Albemarle recognize that land use and development patterns impact the functioning of their transportation system and road networks; and

WHEREAS, both the City of Charlottesville and the County of Albemarle are committed to improving the automobile, transit, pedestrian, and biking connections available to all residents; and

WHEREAS, improved infrastructure benefits the residents of both localities; and

WHEREAS, existing examples of cooperation between the City and the County include:

- Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO);
- Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT);
- JAUNT;
- Charlottesville Albemarle Airport;
- Regional support of new train routes through the Downtown Amtrak Station;
- The City-County Long Range Bicycle Vision Network (Part of the City's Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan);
- Joint Comprehensive Planning Exercises; and
- Collaboration on Small Area Planning along Hydraulic Road and Route 29.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of Charlottesville and the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County hereby agree to this Memorandum of Understanding directing their respective City Manager and County Executive and staffs to develop and enact plans to:

- Designate a staff member assigned to promoting success;
- Identify potential available resources available to both localities;
- Identify and consider potential efficiencies through harmonization;
- Identify and consider potential impacts on each other's jurisdiction of acting with or without information sharing where appropriate; and
- Identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate and communicate where possible, including review of organizational structure of boards that serve both communities.

This Memorandum of Understanding shall begin on the date of signatures by both the Mayor of the City of Charlottesville and the Chair of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, as authorized by their respective bodies.

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR COLLABORATION
BETWEEN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE AND THE COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
REGARDING EDUCATION**

WHEREAS, regionalism is a recognized governing principle across the United States in which neighboring jurisdictions can recognize mutual benefits, efficiencies, and harmony by working together on areas of mutual concern, rather than apart or even against each other; and

WHEREAS, both the City of Charlottesville and the County of Albemarle have recognized that expanding access to pre-Kindergarten programs serves a crucial early childhood development need; and

WHEREAS, both the City and County are committed to expanding career and technical education, in the service of building a workforce equipped for the 21st century; and

WHEREAS, the populations served by the City and County's pre-Kindergarten and vocational and technical education programs frequently move across borders; and

WHEREAS, the programs offered by both locality impact and benefit both localities; and

WHEREAS, existing examples of cooperation between the City and the County include:

- Charlottesville Albemarle Technical Education Center (CATEC);
- Piedmont Regional Education Partnership Program (PREP);
- Charlottesville Albemarle Early Education Task Force;
- UVA Lab School Partnership;

- Investing In Innovation Grant (i3) for \$3.5 million; and
- Public Education Foundation (PEF).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of Charlottesville and the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County hereby agree to this Memorandum of Understanding directing their respective City Manager and County Executive and staffs to develop and enact plans to:

- Designate a staff member assigned to promoting success;
- Identify potential available resources available to both localities;
- Identify and consider potential efficiencies through harmonization;
- Identify and consider potential impacts on each other's jurisdiction of acting with or without information sharing where appropriate;
- Identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate and communicate where possible; and
- Consider recommendations of the pre-K task force.

This Memorandum of Understanding shall begin on the date of signatures by both the Mayor of the City of Charlottesville and the Chair of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, as authorized by their respective bodies.

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR COLLABORATION
BETWEEN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE AND THE COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENT**

WHEREAS, regionalism is a recognized governing principle across the United States in which neighboring jurisdictions can recognize mutual benefits, efficiencies, and harmony by working together on areas of mutual concern, rather than apart or even against each other; and

WHEREAS, both the City of Charlottesville and the County of Albemarle have recognized that protecting natural resources, including clean water, biodiversity and tree cover foster livable, sustainable and resilient communities; and

WHEREAS, both the City and County recognize the value of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving air quality, and anticipating and adapting to local impacts of a changing climate; and

WHEREAS, the populations served by the City and County similarly impact and benefit from natural resources, and the programs offered by and coordinated with both localities will result in a stronger and more resilient community; and

WHEREAS, existing examples of cooperation between the City and the County include:

- | | |
|--|---|
| • Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) | • Rivanna Stormwater Education Partnership |
| • McIntire Recycling Center Operations | • Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District |
| • Hazardous Materials Collection/Disposal | • Rivanna Environmental Management System Association |
| • Bulky Waste | • Livability Project |
| • Joint Solid Waste Management Plan – TJPDC | • Rivanna River Corridor Plan |
| • LEAP Governance Board | • Hazardous Spill Cleanup coordination – Fire/Rescue |
| • Local Climate Action Planning Process | • Imagine A Day Without Water |
| • Better Business Challenge | • Green Infrastructure planning |
| • Rivanna Conservation Alliance (Stream Watch) | • Rivanna River Basin Commission |

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of Charlottesville and the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County hereby agree to this Memorandum of Understanding directing their respective City Manager and County Executive and staffs to develop and enact plans to:

- Designate a staff member assigned to promoting success;
- Identify potential available resources available to both localities;
- Identify and consider potential efficiencies through harmonization;
- Identify and consider potential impacts on each other's jurisdiction of acting with or without information sharing where appropriate; and
- Identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate and communicate where possible.

This Memorandum of Understanding shall begin on the date of signatures by both the Mayor of the City of Charlottesville and the Chair of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, as authorized by their respective bodies.

**BETWEEN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE AND THE COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
REGARDING REDEVELOPMENT AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

WHEREAS, regionalism is a recognized governing principle across the United States in which neighboring jurisdictions can recognize mutual benefits, efficiencies, and harmony by working together on areas of mutual concern, rather than apart or even against each other; and

WHEREAS, both the City of Charlottesville and the County of Albemarle have recognized that vulnerable populations and housing costs impact both localities; and

WHEREAS, both the City and County recognize the value of having affordable housing for its constituents and is committed to working together to make each area one that is affordable for all; and

WHEREAS, the populations served by the City and County similarly impact affordable housing, and the ability to coordinate with both localities will result in a stronger and more resilient community; and

WHEREAS, both the City and County recognize the economic and environmental value of redeveloping underutilized and under invested properties over abandoned and neglected properties; and

WHEREAS, existing examples of cooperation between the City and the County include:

- The use of federal housing vouchers to support tenants at the Crossings;
- Joint Comprehensive Planning Exercises;
- Collaboration on Small Area Planning along Hydraulic Road and Route 29;
- Support of the Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless (TJACH);
- Support of organizations committed to maintaining and expanding affordable housing units;
- Collaboration on the Thomas Jefferson Community Land Trust;
- Collaboration on the Housing Advisory Committee (HAC); and
- Collaboration on regional housing authority options.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of Charlottesville and the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County hereby agree to this Memorandum of Understanding directing their respective City Manager and County Executive and staffs to develop and enact plans to:

- Designate a staff member assigned to promoting success;
- Identify potential available resources available to both localities;
- Identify and consider potential efficiencies through harmonization;
- Identify and consider potential impacts on each other's jurisdiction of acting with or without information sharing where appropriate; and
- Identify mutually beneficial ways to cooperate and communicate where possible, to ensure an appropriate range of housing choices for all community members.

This Memorandum of Understanding shall begin on the date of signatures by both the Mayor of the City of Charlottesville and the Chair of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, as authorized by their respective bodies.

Agenda Item No. 7. Closed Meeting.

At 5:48 p.m., Mr. Dill **moved** that the Board go into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia under Subsection One to 1) consider appointments to boards, committees and commissions in which there are pending vacancies or requests for reappointments; and 2) to discuss and consider the appointment of the Police Chief; and under Subsection Seven to consult with and be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice related to the negotiation of an agreement for court facilities. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel and Ms. Palmer.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 8. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 6:03 p.m., Mr. Dill **moved** that the Board certified 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: Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel and Ms. Palmer.
NAYS: None.

Mr. Foley recommended that Ron Lantz be appointed Police Chief of Albemarle County, stating that Ron has served as Deputy Chief of Operations for the Albemarle County Police Department since 2012, and prior to that had served for 24 years with the Fairfax County Police Department.

Ms. McKeel **moved** to adopt a resolution appointing Ron L. Lantz as Chief of Police of Albemarle County effective June 1, 2016, pursuant to County Code Section 2-500, and that he should have all duties and powers assigned to him by law. Ms. Mallek **seconded** motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel and Ms. Palmer.

NAYS: None.

Chief-Elect Ron Lantz addressed the Board and stated that he looks forward to working with the County and was fortunate to have worked with Colonel Sellers for the last 3½ years.

RESOLUTION APPOINTING THE CHIEF OF POLICE

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, that Ron L. Lantz is hereby appointed the Chief of Police of Albemarle County effective June 1, 2016 pursuant to County Code Section 2-500, and that he shall have all those powers and duties of a chief of police as provided by law.

Non-Agenda. Closed Meeting.

At 6:08 p.m., Mr. Dill **moved** that the Board go into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia under Subsection One to consider appointments to boards, committees and commissions in which there are pending vacancies or requests for reappointments, and under Subsection Seven to consult with and be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice related to the negotiation of an agreement for court facilities. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel and Ms. Palmer.

NAYS: None.

Non-Agenda. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 7:22 p.m., Mr. Dill **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: Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel and Ms. Palmer.

NAYS: None.

Non-Agenda. Boards and Commissions.

Vacancies and Appointments.

Ms. McKeel **moved** to appoint the following:

- **appoint** Mr. William Cromwell, as the Rio District representative on the Equalization Board, with said term to expire December 31, 2016.
- **appoint** Ms. Victoria Macmillan to the Route 250 West Task Force, with said term to expire September 5, 2018.
- **appoint** Norman Dill and Liz Palmer as the Board liaisons to the Solid Waste Alternatives Advisory Committee with said terms to expire December 31, 2016.

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

AYES: Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel and Ms. Palmer.

NAYS: None.

Mr. Randolph **moved** to request staff to prepare a public presentation within 60 days that investigates relocating only the General District Court to the County Office Building, and investigates relocation of the County Office Building. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel and Ms. Palmer.

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 10. General Obligation Bond Referendum Discussion.

Ms. Rosalyn Schmitt, Assistant Director of Facilities Planning for Albemarle Public Schools, addressed the Board and distributed copies of her presentation and handouts from a previous meeting at which this topic was discussed. Ms. Schmitt thanked the Board for the opportunity to provide an overview of the school projects for inclusion in the bond referendum, and stated there are five projects under consideration. She stated the projects are capital-cost only projects, and the costs have been updated to reflect the most recent estimates in the current bidding climate, adding that they capture years two and three of the current CIP request. Ms. Schmitt said the projects represent all schools in the County, from two sets of classroom furniture to the addition at Woodbrook Elementary. She stated the projects have been vetted through the school CIP process, starting with the long-range planning advisory committee, a citizen body comprised of representatives from each School Board and Superintendent appointees. Ms. Schmitt said these projects have gone through the process and have made it as far as the oversight committee, with all projects making it to the preferred scenario, Scenario Four, with the only exception being the high school planning process, which was deemed to need additional analysis.

Ms. Schmitt reported that they will spend the most time on the learning space modernization, and stated that they need to update the classrooms to accommodate the needs of 21st Century learners, with the average age of the schools' buildings dating back to the 1970s, with significant changes occurring since that time, both inside the schools and out in the world. She stated that to respond to that, the schools have developed a CIP project that can be organized into five categories: classroom furniture upgrade; modernization of classrooms and specialty classrooms such as career and technical education classrooms; media center modernization; modernization of science labs; and daylighting of buildings. Ms. Schmitt said the project total is \$10.9 million, with the highest priority being the science lab modernization, followed by secondary classroom modernization, and classroom furniture. She stated the schools intend to update furniture so that it promotes movement, flexibility, and student comfort and choice; improve lighting to increase natural lighting and use of dimmable LED lights; improving connectivity to the outdoors, adjacent classrooms and hallways; ensuring rooms have adequate power to support the technology students need and use; and updating finishes, casework and storage to ensure classrooms are functioning properly.

Ms. Schmitt stated this is a targeted instructional approach backed by research, and she presented three key articles that influenced this work. She reported that the most comprehensive study was one done in the U.K., which studied 34 classrooms at 7 schools and explored factors that influenced learning, such as noise, daylighting, clutter, and flexibility of furniture. Ms. Schmitt said the researchers found that the most distinctive classroom characteristics relating to the improvement of people's academic achievements relate to light, choice, flexibility, connection, complexity and color, and these attributes contributed to a 25% learning progression in pupils. She noted that the study is fairly detailed and she can share the specifics of the study as requested.

Ms. Schmitt said the third aspect of the study related to seating flexibility, and there is demonstrated science on the relationship between movement and brain activity, which ultimately leads to better focus and academic results. She said the schools have found that the most impact with the School Board is bringing teachers to the table to discuss what makes a difference, and she encourages the Supervisors to read the teachers' testimonials after the meeting, pausing to let them read a statement from one teacher at Woodbrook about the inclusion of three rocking chairs in the classroom. Ms. Schmitt also referenced statements from the Woodbrook and Cale principals as to the need for modernization, as well as statements from teachers at Albemarle High School regarding the recent modernization of a classroom space to support a pilot interdisciplinary program of four teachers in two classrooms.

Ms. Schmitt presented a photo of the Health Medical Science academy at Monticello High School, which is housed in a traditional classroom intentionally to promote flexibility and differentiated activities in that room, while connecting to the common space right outside the room that allows for larger group gatherings, small group research, and group collaboration. She referenced a statement from the Director of that academy and statements from the gifted teacher at Agnor Hurt and her colleague regarding student choice. Ms. Schmitt presented testimonials from the high schools and middle schools about the need for updated spaces, and testimonials from teachers regarding the positive attributes of LED lights, calmer students who are more alert with less headaches and better color. She presented another image of the T-19 classroom at Albemarle High School, noting that most of the modernization work to date has occurred at media centers, which was the first round of work because it is space that all students can access and use.

Ms. Schmitt reported that the second priority project is the Woodbrook Elementary addition, renovation and modernization, and stated that this project is in response to the problem of overcrowding in urban ring elementary schools. She noted that Agnor Hurt, Greer, and Woodbrook are those in the urban ring surrounding Charlottesville, with Greer currently using two trailers and a third planned for next year, with Woodbrook currently using three trailers and a fourth planned for this summer. Ms. Schmitt stated that the solution posed by the schools is to add onto Woodbrook Elementary, as the school is centrally located and the smallest in the area, and the addition will benefit multiple schools. She

presented a map of the elementary schools, noting the capacity of Woodbrook at 338. Ms. Schmitt reported the \$15.2 million request is both additions and improvements to the existing building, with a two-story 16-classroom addition, expansion of the cafeteria to support a larger student body, and construction of a new full-size gym, which will benefit the student population in terms of community use.

Ms. Schmitt presented a table showing how they arrived at the need for 16 classrooms, and said the 8 classrooms for the projected enrollment deficit relate to the original chart showing a deficit of space for as many as 138 students over the next 10 years. She also stated there is a deficit of 3 auxiliary classrooms in Woodbrook for situations when a student needs to be pulled out of the regular classroom, and while Greer also has a deficit of auxiliary classrooms it is hoped that those will be addressed through some interior renovations this summer. Ms. Schmitt noted that this brings the total classrooms needed up to 11, and there is also a demonstrated need of at least 3 additional pre-K programs for the area, with 6 currently at those schools, 3 at Greer, 2 at Agnor-Hurt, and 1 at Woodbrook. She stated that these numbers were reached by analyzing kindergarten free and reduced lunch numbers to assess unmet needs, and the plan is to build long-term capacity for 3 additional programs in the area, with 2 for future development. Ms. Schmitt emphasized that this is not to be confused with the development of Brookhill, as the 16-classroom addition would not be large enough to accommodate that large development.

Ms. Schmitt reported that the reason the schools are focusing on a Woodbrook addition rather than a new school is because building a new school would not be a solution to the current problem for three reasons. She stated the reasons are schedule, as a new school would open at least two years later than an addition, and they do not have that much time to wait; there would be a significant increase in operational cost with a new school compared to an addition, as much as \$1 million annually; and redistricting, with the new school needing to be filled with existing students while new developments and students come online. Ms. Schmitt emphasized there would be a lot of churning and impact with existing students in order to not open an empty school.

Ms. McKeel commented that those students would have to move back once the new school filled up, as the developments move forward.

Ms. Schmitt stated that the potential proffered site is in discussion, and the schools see that as a long-term solution for both that development and growth along 29 North, not the urban ring, with that solution being the addition to Woodbrook.

She stated the next project is the Western Albemarle High School science lab additions and modernization, in an effort to expand and improve science facilities, and they would be adding three science labs and modernizing seven existing labs, with the Environmental Studies Academy needing four classrooms to support its 400 students and Western Albemarle needing eight classrooms.

Ms. Schmitt reported that school security projects have the goal of forcing all visitors to enter through the main office. She said the schools began this project in FY14 and FY15, and after this summer only had four remaining schools, with the bulk of the schools done in 2014, involving minor interior renovations. Ms. Schmitt presented an image of Woodbrook Elementary School standing inside the foyer looking out toward the front doors, and said a simple storefront was added that would funnel visitors in. She stated the remaining schools, including those being done this summer, require a small, bricks and mortar addition of less than 1,000 square feet, and this was required because the current office locations are internal in the building with a main corridor between the office and the front door. Ms. Schmitt reported that there are four remaining schools, Baker-Butler, Scottsville, Henley, and Murray High School. She said when the CIP was adopted, these four schools were postponed for one year beyond what was requested, and the Red Hill and Jouett security projects would take place over the summer. Ms. Schmitt said that its presence on a bond referendum has allowed Scottsville to accelerate closer to the original timeframe.

Ms. McKeel stated this would also allow for the schools to be brought into parity with the other schools, noting the unfortunate possibility of an incident at one school that does not have security upgrades whereas the other schools do.

Ms. Mallek commented that she agrees with the importance of the parity issue and knows that they do the schools that are structurally easy first, but said that she thought these four projects were already in the CIP for FY17.

Ms. Schmitt explained they are already in the adopted CIP, but this was a change in timing that would allow Scottsville to accelerate by one year.

Ms. Mallek stated the projects could be funded beginning July 1, rather than waiting for the referendum.

Ms. McKeel noted there are projects starting this summer.

Ms. Schmitt explained that in the adopted CIP, Baker-Butler is FY18 and the remaining three are FY19.

Ms. Schmitt said the last piece is planning for additional high school capacity, referencing the current enrollment for Albemarle High School and the projected enrollment, as well as the building capacity. She stated that an eight-classroom modular unit is going to be installed this summer to address immediate overcrowding, but a longer term solution is needed. Ms. Schmitt said the Albemarle High School boundary matches the development areas, so they understand where the growth is coming from with no signs of it slowing down, and the planning study would allow time to study whether they look at additions to Albemarle or other schools, a new magnet high school, or other solutions.

Ms. Palmer stated that the Board's job tonight is to decide on the referendum and the size of it.

Mr. Foley clarified that the Board does not need to make that decision tonight, as the School Board will make an official request of the Board, with a Planning Commission hearing, then the Board will make a final decision at its June 1 meeting. He added that it would be helpful for the Board to have some discussion about where they stand, along with identification of anything they want to eliminate from consideration.

Ms. Mallek commented that she was struck by how small the investment was for daylighting, and \$200,000 does not seem like it matches up with 90 classrooms.

Ms. Schmitt explained that they are not doing all 90 classrooms with the \$200,000, as not all of them are feasible to get daylighting into. She stated that some simple measures, like adding skylights to bring in natural light, are not expensive, and secondary classroom modernization will also help to bring in natural light, so that money was included in the larger modernization projects. Ms. Schmitt said that they want to introduce daylighting as quickly as possible, but do not have the money to do 90 classrooms turnkey, so in some of the cases they are making larger improvements.

Ms. McKeel said when they did daylighting as part of the Greer renovations, the comments from teachers and students indicated that it had made an incredible difference in how they feel.

Ms. Mallek commented that she taught for 15 years in a basement and knows how important this is, and her husband ended up wiring up sun bulbs to provide better light.

Ms. Mallek stated the planning money seems like a lot, but perhaps that is going to be used in smaller inquiries.

Ms. Schmitt confirmed this, and said this will not be a single study, it will be a complex and multi-faceted analysis of how they would use and reuse space, and in looking at similar studies from other divisions, the order of magnitude seems on par.

Mr. Dill stated that he had heard from a constituent some resentment that Western Albemarle is going to get another big influx of science and technology when they already had a good program.

Ms. Mallek responded that Western is the only high school that does not have a science academy, so this is their science academy.

Ms. Schmitt explained that an addition was added to Albemarle in 2009 to provide science labs for the MESA academy; Monticello has some science facilities and the health medical sciences academy; with Western being the newest academy to come online and just one environmental studies academy center, which is just one classroom and greenhouse. She noted that the most recent addition was the addition of two science classrooms in the mid-1990s.

Ms. Palmer asked if they are adding additional science classrooms, not just modernizing them.

Ms. Schmitt stated they are adding three and updating seven.

Ms. Palmer said that when her children were there, they were unable to get into some of the science classes because of limited space, even though the teachers were willing to teach an additional class.

Ms. McKeel stated that Greer was going to make accommodations for the overcrowding, but in all fairness they are just taking their stage away, so while these accommodations would work, they are hardly long-term solutions to overcrowding.

Mr. Randolph said he had asked in the past for empirical information as to funding proposed here, and he noted that the study provided was from the U.K. This information does not provide insight into the degree of homogeneity of the population of these schools, and it is not always easy to make cross-cultural comparisons in different fields. He stated there was active seating research done in Germany, so again he is not sure what kind of school was used in that study. Mr. Randolph said that it

would help to have some Albemarle County statistics in support of modernization, and asked how long ago modernization efforts had begun in the schools.

Ms. Schmitt responded that they started doing proof of concept with a project called “contemporary learning spaces” about two or three years ago, starting with \$250,000 and gradually increasing to \$1 million.

Mr. Randolph stated it would be helpful to have some research provided on measurable outcomes before and after modernization, with different criteria used including testing results and perhaps creative writing, so they know that the \$15.2 million being provided had some established outcomes. He said the second issue is regarding addition versus new school, and the schools chose just a single recently proffered new school site for comparative purposes, so he would like to have other sites considered, such as 27.48 acres on Polo Grounds Road, with an option to purchase an additional 3.2 acres for \$356,000, making the total 31 acres. Mr. Randolph said there is some thinking that this site is actually preferable to the Brookhill site, and because the County already owns part of that acreage, it would allow the land as an alternative to the Woodbrook addition to be designed within the timeframe of 2016-2017.

Ms. Palmer said it would be helpful to have the information he suggested regarding modernization when they go out to the public for the referendum, but they have to be careful to get into that level of detail, because the School Board makes the decisions on what gets done in the classrooms and are the specialists. She stated that she would caution the Board against going down the route of taking things apart and taking things out of the modernization project. Additionally they could keep this going for a really long time and not meet their deadline. Ms. Palmer said that Ms. Schmitt could comment further on the alternative school site, and they would likely find that it was a similar argument to Woodbrook.

Ms. Schmitt explained that the Brookhill site would allow a walkable school, whereas the Polo Grounds site would not be; also, the Polo Grounds site is further down that road and there have been concerns about the rural nature of that road and the additional traffic, and the further down that road you go, the stronger the argument becomes. She stated that in terms of opening a new school instead of a Woodbrook addition, the Brookhill sited school would pull from Hollymead and Woodbrook and would take about half of the 300 students from Woodbrook and put them in a new school.

Ms. Mallek said that she thought Woodbrook was bursting at the seams, and they would not be taking all the kids from Woodbrook and sending them to Brookhill, there would be kids who were overflowing from one school.

Ms. Schmitt explained that in looking at the boundaries, the students would come from either Woodbrook or Hollymead to go to a Polo Grounds Road school.

Ms. Mallek stated that instinctively, the cost of a Woodbrook addition and the cost of a new school are so close that it seems to indicate that a new school would be a better choice, with new playground space and recess space on a 30-acre site. She added that 650 kids at Woodbrook on a tiny lot seems excessive to her.

Ms. Schmitt explained that the 16-classroom addition would add no more than 250 students and it reaches a staffing threshold that provides some improvements to the existing school.

Ms. Palmer added that it also deals with an undersized gym.

Ms. McKeel stated the gym will be available to the community for use.

Ms. Schmitt agreed, adding that Parks and Rec have already expressed an interest in potential new space there.

Mr. Sheffield stated he is not in favor of the Woodbrook expansion because he feels that it draws attention away from the need for a new elementary school, and his position has not changed since they discussed this during the budget worksessions. He added that he feels the bond referendum will be weakened by only having one school expansion versus capacity provided by a new school.

Ms. Mallek asked if there is phrasing possible for the referendum that references a choice of either expansion of an existing school or building a new one, whatever is best to meet demand.

Ms. McKeel expressed concern about the impact of not expanding Woodbrook, as it will be an educational benefit for the students who are there, and she is also concerned about the impact of not having Greer students switch to an expanded Woodbrook school.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Sheffield for clarification as to whether his lack of support is related to concerns about a weakened bond referendum.

Mr. Sheffield explained the main reason he is against it is because it draws attention away from the need for a new elementary school, adding that he has been asking these questions for two years now and has been told that it is not an issue. He stated that they either need new schools or they do not, and the Woodbrook expansion hides the need for a new elementary school.

Ms. Palmer commented that they need both.

Mr. Sheffield said that his main concern is for a new elementary school.

Ms. McKeel stated that it is the timing and the relief that the Woodbrook expansion would offer for the entire urban ring area.

Mr. Sheffield asked why this had not come up two years ago, if the timing was that important.

Ms. Schmitt noted that the Woodbrook addition has been in the CIP for two or three years.

Mr. Tistadt explained that if they build a new elementary school, either on Polo Grounds, Brookhill, or the existing site, the question is who they would put in it. He stated that rather than leaving a 400-500 seat school sit empty, they would put in existing students in that school, primarily from Woodbrook with some from Baker-Butler and possibly Hollymead. Mr. Tistadt stated that under that scenario, they would transplant a significant number of existing Woodbrook students out of their current school and into a new school, backfilling with Agnor Hurt and Greer students, which would mean there would be many more students changing their school assignments than there would be under a Woodbrook expansion scenario where none of those students would be moved out. He emphasized that it is not inconsequential to try to minimize the redistricting possibilities, as families tend to like their existing schools.

Mr. Sheffield pointed out that they are not expanding Woodbrook to serve existing students, they are expanding the school to accommodate more students, so the comment about existing parents does not apply. He emphasized that waving this as a flag for expanding capacity is one thing, but waving it as a flag for needing to improve programs for students is another. Mr. Sheffield added that with the single issue of expanding capacity, he does not agree that expanding Woodbrook is the answer.

Mr. Tistadt stated that long-range planners, the School Board and staff have looked at the issue and believe that Woodbrook is, explaining that adding to Agnor Hurt or Greer would make those schools 700-800 students, whereas Woodbrook would be 500-550 students, and the central location of Woodbrook also makes sense. He said this is a project designed not to solve a problem at Woodbrook, but to solve problems in the urban ring overall, primarily Greer, Agnor Hurt, and a little bit of Woodbrook.

Mr. Sheffield asked what would happen if they reach capacity at Woodbrook expansion.

Mr. Tistadt responded that this would only occur if there is development north of the river and along Polo Grounds Road, and the proffered elementary site at Brookhill provides that opportunity in the future, but the schools do not yet know if the Board is even going to approve that rezoning, and it would not be a good strategy to bank on something that may not happen.

Ms. Palmer added that the timing is a factor because it would be a phased development.

Mr. Tistadt responded that it is phased over an extended period of time, and it is uncertain as to when that school would be needed, 5, 10, or 15 years.

Ms. Palmer emphasized that it is really a timing issue.

Mr. Sheffield stated that page 20 of the schools' presentation shows that all of the schools continue to be over capacity, so they seem to be putting a Band-Aid on a problem. He reiterated that this is drawing attention away from building a new school, and whether it is at Brookhill or somewhere else is not a factor to him. He stated that he wants to support the best investment for the next 20-30 years, and he does not feel it is this investment.

Mr. Tistadt explained that the schools are currently projecting a maximum deficit of about 140 students, and they are hedging their bets that there may be a few additional classrooms needed for development along Rio Road and in the Stonefield area, but they do not see a whole lot of opportunity in housing developments.

Mr. Sheffield responded that they must be looking at very different maps, because his Rio District map shows almost 1,000 homes that could be built through infill, and if the rate of rezoning continues, he feels they will be faced with that.

Mr. Tistadt stated that the schools have been trying to meet with Community Development to gain as much understanding as possible, and he would love to have the benefit of this information.

Mr. Sheffield said this is where their philosophical differences of capacity are coming into play, with his concerns about where growth might occur versus where the schools are planning for it to occur.

Ms. McKeel stated she is concerned about where it already is and has an elementary school that is bursting at the seams and being cited by the Fire Marshal for being over capacity. She said if they do put the Woodbrook addition on, it has the added benefit of improving the educational opportunities for the students who are there.

Ms. Palmer noted that they have a long-range planning group that has been looking at this for quite a while, and staff that has been working with the Community Development office, and if there is something they are not seeing, then Mr. Sheffield needs to meet with them and go over it.

Mr. Sheffield stated that this is his opinion based on assumptions he is making about growth in his district, and in his mind they are masking the issue that they are not building a new school, which comes up as a great concern among residents that the County is doing a lot of patchworks through renovation and expansion, but is not adding new capacity.

Ms. McKeel emphasized that they cannot sacrifice the children in overcrowded schools at the expense of building a new school in the future, and while they will have to do both eventually, the immediate problem is the overcrowding at Greer and Agnor Hurt. She stated that Woodbrook is the logical solution that uses the least amount of taxpayer dollars and simultaneously benefits the students who are already there.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he fully understands the argument, but just does not agree with the approach.

Mr. Randolph said that he echoes the concern of kicking the can down the road.

Ms. McKeel asked how they would like to address the overcrowded schools in the urban ring, because schools like Greer and Agnor Hurt need relief, while the rest of the schools are not as overcrowded, so they are going to just sacrifice one school and jam more and more students in.

Mr. Randolph said he would not recommend that at all, but in following the recommended logic they are perpetuating the problem and not solving the long-term issue of continued growth north of Rio Road, as that population needs an additional school. He stated that with Albemarle High School, they are putting students into temporary facilities, and perhaps that scenario should be considered while they build another elementary school, or they are going to give the Board three or four years from now the same problem, with the same question asked as to why they did not build a new elementary school four years ago.

Mr. Steve Koleszar addressed the Board and stated that the Woodbrook expansion has been in the CIP, and what the schools wanted to do several years ago was to primarily increase capacity in the division, and according to projections it will meet enrollment growth in the elementary schools for the next 5-10 years. He stated that beyond that, they may need another school. Mr. Koleszar explained that as a School Board, they have consistently chosen to do expansions rather than build new schools, because for operations and programming reasons, a 500-600 student school is the ideal size, and a Woodbrook expansion fits that model. He stated at that point, they may need a new elementary school because all others have reached the limit of what they like to see.

Ms. Mallek asked if it is helpful to think of this as a solution for the next five years, but also include something for planning for the next five years so they are not scrambling around again at that point, and that way there is a recognition in the public's mind that this expansion is not it.

Ms. Palmer noted that Mr. Tistadt came from a locality where bond referendums were done on a fairly routine basis as needed for additional schools and whatever else is required, and if they are going to address the needs of the schools this year, they can do another one four years from now. She emphasized that the schools are the experts in deciding what they need.

Mr. Dill asked if the parents at Woodbrook now wants a school with a full-time PE teacher and art teacher and a bigger gym, or if they prefer a smaller, old-fashioned environment with a neighborhood feel.

Ms. Palmer responded that the parents she has interacted with have all been in support of the larger school.

Ms. Mallek commented that the recess space has always been a concern for her, with additional students crowded onto that space.

Ms. McKeel said that building upward would have more space for recess.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Sheffield if there is anything they could find out for him that would help gain his support, as it would be good to have full Board support as they go out to referendum.

Mr. Sheffield responded that he has been consistently against a Woodbrook addition and feels they are masking the real issue of building a new elementary school.

Ms. Palmer said that some of them feel they need both.

Ms. McKeel said they do need both.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he is willing to invest the money for a new school, even if it is more, because it is the long-term investment that makes sense to him.

Ms. McKeel asked where he would put the new school so that it actually works for the students who need it.

Mr. Sheffield responded that it is the schools' job to figure that out.

Ms. McKeel pointed out that the schools had just told them.

Mr. Sheffield said if the only options are Woodbrook or Brookhill, then the County is doomed with its choices for elementary school sites, because they are not making any more land.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Sheffield if he would be willing to meet with the schools.

Mr. Sheffield said that he would not.

Mr. Randolph stated that he echoes that and would only support this if it addresses elementary school capacity in the north end and leave it to be defined as to where that would be and how it would happen.

Ms. Mallek asked if he could support the two-step approach of an addition now and a new school plan in process.

Mr. Randolph said that he would support it, whatever way it works out.

Ms. Palmer asked about the fact that the schools' model works with a 500-student elementary school and it would cost significantly more to operate a new school, which is not needed for another 5-10 years, and why the Board would keep from doing a bond referendum now when they do not need another school in the short term.

Mr. Randolph stated that she is making compound assumptions that may be subject to scrutiny, questioning, and alternative analysis.

Ms. Palmer said that she is believing what she is hearing from the schools and their long-range planning committee.

Mr. Randolph stated that she is not listening to the Supervisor who represents that district, knows it well, and feels the growth in the longer term is appropriate at this point to go with another scenario. He said that as a former educator, he feels that when you start solving a problem with Band-Aids, you start falling behind and end up using resources to fix it rather than looking at long-term need. Mr. Randolph stated that what Mr. Sheffield is saying is that if we build it, they will come; if we build it, it will be filled; and if we build it, we will be able to meet the long-term needs there.

Mr. Koleszar mentioned that with his many years on the School Board, he has learned that development goes in cycles, and developments would start to produce a lot of elementary kids, but those same developments will start to cycle out and produce less. He stated that the net is not the net of the new development, it is the net of the new development less the changes in the existing development.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he agrees with that premise.

Ms. McKeel commented that as the Supervisor representing the district that is struggling the worst with overcrowded elementary schools, she is pleading to be able to build a Woodbrook addition to help solve that capacity issue as well as improving the educational options for the children at that school, which is supported by those parents. She said that she also recognizes that they will need a new school at some point and can work on that, but the urban ring needs more capacity now.

Mr. Dill agreed completely, stating that he is one of many educators who agree with that analysis. He said the schools have a long-range planning committee and competent facilities people, and he trusts their judgment, adding that this seems pretty clear to him.

Ms. Palmer commented that Ms. Mallek's idea was excellent to put in some planning money for the elementary school, as there is already planning money included for the high school.

Ms. Mallek suggested that it could possibly be folded into the planning money that is already in there and just broadened.

Ms. Palmer stated that they do not have to vote tonight but do have to give some consensus, and it sounds like they have four votes for the Woodbrook addition. She suggested that they move onto discussion of the modernization, and asked if they want to put that in the bond referendum. Ms. Palmer added that she feels it is up to the schools to decide what is included in the bond referendum, although they are already going down that path and should provide some direction to staff.

Mr. Dill stated that he is supportive of all projects included and feels they should respect the opinions of the experts in the education business.

Ms. McKeel stated that she supports the package as it is, with the expansion of the study to include the elementary schools if that is a viable option.

Ms. Mallek asked if the modernization is the same projects and is just being accelerated, and noted a cost of about \$3 million per year over the 5 years.

Ms. Schmitt responded that the original School Board request had grown, but the Oversight Committee scaled it back to the \$3 million a year.

Ms. Palmer stated that she is in favor of the whole package.

Mr. Sheffield said that he only has the one issue and is in favor of the rest of it.

Ms. Mallek stated that her questions were answered and she supports the package.

Mr. Randolph said he is not in favor of modernization as a referendum item because it is not well documented, and feels it should be rolled out as a CIP item.

Ms. Palmer asked if he would be willing to consider additional information from the schools on the modernization.

Mr. Randolph responded that he would be happy to review whatever he is furnished and would always keep an open mind.

Ms. Palmer asked Board members if they would reiterate what they are supporting.

Mr. Randolph clarified that he would not be in favor of the high school capacity planning at \$1/2 million as he does not feel it is a bondable item for referendum, and the same is true for the science lab and modernization at Western Albemarle at \$6 million.

Mr. Dill stated that other Board members have already indicated that they support the package.

Mr. Randolph added that he does support school security improvements.

Ms. Mallek stated the students are already in the existing science academy, and Mr. Randolph is saying that he wants to pay for it out of the CIP. She asked if there is a benefit for doing it as part of the bond in order to save money on interest, and if they are already admitting the students to the science academy, it makes sense to save money on it.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Tistadt or Ms. Schmitt to address the potential interest savings by using a bond referendum instead of the CIP.

Mr. Tistadt stated the CIP interest rate assumptions are 4.5%, which are higher than what is being paid now, but staff is being conservative, and the bonds would be at 4%, but if they got a 3% interest rate, there likely would not be a 1/2% savings.

Ms. Mallek commented that it would be worthwhile as long as the savings exceeds the cost of doing the bond referendum, which is the reason they have not moved forward in the past, because they are not going to save enough to make it worth it.

Ms. McKeel asked if there is a sense of how much that cost would be.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that it is \$1/2 million.

Mr. Foley stated that the County would realize a savings above and beyond the cost of doing lease revenue bonds, but the amount of that savings has not been calculated exactly for \$35 million. He noted that staff looked at \$100 million, and there certainly was a savings over a 20-year period.

Ms. Palmer said that knowing the difficulty the Board had in getting four votes for tax increases, she looks forward to taking this out to the public and letting them decide.

Mr. Sheffield asked Ms. Schmitt and Mr. Tistadt if they could send him information on what high school capacity they have done over the last few years, which is an issue he brought up a few years ago. He emphasized that it would not change his mind on supporting that, but he would like to merge that with the \$1/2 million request. Mr. Sheffield said that some of the feedback he gets from the public on the elementary school and the high school is the question of why the County has not been planning this all

along, so if they have been, it would be helpful for his conversations with the public to know what that has been.

Mr. Randolph stated that the reason he has wanted to whittle the \$35 million down is because he feels that a bonding proposal before the voters runs the risk of jeopardizing public support for the potential courthouse relocation to the County Office Building and potential new site, and for other new projects within the County.

Ms. Palmer said that putting money into children and the future is the number one thing they are supposed to be doing, and when they hear that the schools are overcapacity and 50% of children would be in overcrowded schools in five years, she is going to put that at the top of her list.

Ms. McKeel stated that next to community safety, the top priority should be education.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Foley what he needs from the Board at this point.

Mr. Foley responded that there is not necessarily anything more the Board could do, and four members are strongly in favor with one strongly against and one in the middle, with no unanimity on taking something out. He stated that it will go to the School Board for them to make a decision, then to the Planning Commission for them to hear from the public, and then the Board would have more information to make a final decision.

Mr. Davis explained that the School Board intends, at their meeting the following night, to adopt a resolution that would identify what projects they would support and the amount of a bond referendum they would support, and legally that is required. He stated this needs to happen in advance of the Board's action, and the projects the School Board has identified are likely the ones they will endorse at that meeting. Mr. Davis said the CIP Oversight Committee and the Planning Commission will take the input from the Board of Supervisors, as well as the School Board, and make a recommendation on an amended CIP, which will come back to the Board of Supervisors in June for them to consider an amended CIP. He stated that once they approve an amended CIP, the next task at hand would be for them to give consideration as to what the question would look like on the bond referendum, and the Board has had some background information on whether they want it to be specific or general regarding the school projects. Mr. Davis said the schedule calls for the County Attorney's office on July 6 to prepare a petition for the Board of Supervisors to approve by resolution, asking the court to set the referendum and identifying the exact question they want on the ballot. He noted that the CIP is important because it establishes priorities, a schedule, and a funding plan that will then be taken to the public as an educational process to garner their support.

Ms. Mallek stated that perhaps the schools can describe their planning more or differently to help it get support, and the last thing she wants to do is spend money on something that is not going to get support. She said that when they did the Crozet Library project, there was clearly concern about the cost, but it ended up saving them money in the long run. Ms. Mallek said that she was glad to know that the school planning was a number of different things and not just one focus, as that helps the Board understand it better.

Ms. Palmer mentioned a job that she had with the CDC in which she was in a room without daylight, and this influenced her feeling about the need for the school improvements.

Agenda Item No. 11. From the Board: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Randolph stated that he had participated in Piedmont CASA's "poverty simulation" in which you essentially become a family in poverty that has to negotiate the social services network to try to get the benefits you need for your family to survive. He said he would recommend that both Board and City Council members participate next year, as it helps to provide a sensitivity as to what the system is like. Mr. Randolph agreed to share the information with the rest of the Board when it becomes available.

Ms. Mallek reported that the PRISM group comprised of nonprofits and agencies working to eradicate invasive species announced that there is a grant of \$700,000 available for technical assistance and help with invasive species in the 10 counties as part of the region, with that funding assigned to private landowners, but not public properties. She stated this same group got legislation passed at the General Assembly to restrict sales of invasive species at nurseries.

Ms. Mallek stated that she learned through Crozet community policing the Zero Motorcycle Company has electric, low-noise vehicles that can be used on trails for police work, with infrared technology, and this will help on the trails in Crozet that are difficult to access.

Mr. Dill asked if they are legal for the general public to buy.

Ms. Mallek responded that he should go to the company's website to find out.

Agenda Item No. 12. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Foley stated that he did not have anything to report.

Agenda Item No. 13. Adjourn to May 17, 2016, 2:00 p.m., Room 241.

At 8:47 p.m., Ms. Mallek **moved** to adjourn the Board meeting to May 17, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. in Room 241. Mr. Dill **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Randolph, Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel and Ms. Palmer.

NAYS: None.

Ms. Palmer thanked Mr. Davis for all of his work, as this is his last meeting.

Mr. Davis commented that it has been a good run.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 12/07/2016
Initials CKB