

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on October 11, 2016, at 4:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from October 5, 2016.

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

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Thomas Foley, County Attorney, Greg Kamptner, Clerk, Claudette K. Borgersen and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by the Chair, Ms. Palmer.

Ms. Palmer introduced staff present and the presiding security officer, Officer Ronnie Vanderveer.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** Strategic Priorities

Item No. 2a. Review/Endorse Revised FY 17 – 19 Strategic Plan.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive, addressed the Board and stated that the primary outcome of this meeting is for the Board to endorse the objectives of the FY17-19 Strategic Plan, and to provide an opportunity for Lori Allshouse to follow up on comments made at the last work session on the program and service inventory. Ms. Catlin stated that staff also hopes the Board will have some time at the end to reflect on the process of priority-driven budgeting in their strategic planning. She said the process began a few months earlier with identifying and ranking of priorities, work from staff and direction from the Board, but they are at a moment now at which staff hopes they will review the plan as it stands now, make any adjustments, and subsequently endorse it. Ms. Catlin stated that the version of the FY17-19 before them is the most recent, reflecting the feedback provided at the Board's September 29 work session.

Ms. Catlin reported that one of the concerns the Board had expressed was the tiering of the priorities, and the two highest priority objectives were redeveloping the Rio/Route 29 area and revitalizing aging urban neighborhoods. She stated that the tiers have now been eliminated, and those two priority items have been categorized as the highest priority strategic objectives ready for immediate resource investment and action. Ms. Catlin said there are other objectives that were in tier one that are now other strategic objectives ready for immediate resource investment and action; and a third category of items having a less definitive direction and state of readiness categorized as strategic objectives requiring further development and direction. She stated that they tried to identify very specifically the fact that there were, in many cases, an already established triggering event that would provide the Board the opportunity to move them into the immediate category, if desired, such as broadband. Ms. Catlin noted that there is already a path underway for that, with the Board approving a study grant for that, so the action underway is that they will provide additional direction following completion of the study, anticipated in February 2017. She said it may be that a more defined immediate objective that will need required resources will emerge from that, and the Board will have the opportunity to do that at the time. Ms. Catlin stated another item in that category is the economic development action plan, with economic development being a highly important priority for the County, and a plan would be coming forward to them very soon. She said in terms of next steps, the draft strategic plan comes before them, with implementation of specific strategies following its adoption, possibly generating specific steps. Ms. Catlin emphasized that the former tier two and tier three objectives are not unimportant, but they are in a path for which there are no immediate actionable items requiring resources.

Ms. Catlin reported that several Board members have pointed out that it may not be as apparent as it should be that a number of these objectives are related to economic development, so she would address that in several ways. She explained the objectives would be part of a public document that would have an introduction, an explanation and background to it, with articulation that economic development is an underlying thread and very much a part of several of the objectives, although it may not be specifically called out. Ms. Catlin said the Rio/Route 29 intersection redevelopment, as well as many other objectives, have a direct or indirect influence on economic development. She stated the introductory or background on the strategic plan would call that out very clearly. Ms. Catlin said that on page one, the first highlighted item now includes "and improves the balance between residential, commercial, and industrial tax base," which emphasizes the focus on tax base from industrial and commercial versus residential.

Ms. Catlin stated the Board has made it very clear that they want those two actions to happen as quickly as possible, and the proactive rezoning is scheduled for October 2017, with May 2018 slated for the broader recodification, so staff has included a note that they will accelerate this timeline and work in sequence with related efforts, to the greatest extent possible. She noted that staff does not have an adjusted date for the Board yet because they are still working through how the timeline could be compressed, but staff would envision coming back to the Board once they are further along, to look at how the public engagement might play out or other parts might happen and give the Board options with variables along the timeline. Ms. Catlin presented an example of having a joint work session with the Planning Commission as a way of saving time, which would help accelerate the timeline.

Ms. Catlin reported that on page three, staff highlighted item seven by adding a statement that

“By January 2019, improved physical conditions in the County’s urban core neighborhoods” to demonstrate that this was about how things looked and the aesthetics, while addressing the significant deterioration issues they might be facing.

Mr. Randolph stated that in looking at this today, he is a bit concerned that they are establishing a very high goal by setting the bar high and trying to get over it by January 2019, as the language does not say “some,” so it implies all conditions in the urban core neighborhoods, which may be ambitious. He said it does not look like it would be that difficult, when looking at the Board intention dealing with entrance corridors and high visibility public spaces in the urban areas, and while he has not seen a list of those or associated costs, it could be considerable.

Mr. Dill stated that he did not look at it being finished, as the language says “improving.”

Ms. Mallek said the preceding paragraph says “to increase efforts to improve deteriorating physical...,” and she feels it is important to start and keep trudging along little by little.

Ms. McKeel stated that when talking about aging urban neighborhoods and improvements, they would need things like sidewalk projects, and infrastructure in new developments would go a long way to make them functional as well as aesthetically pleasing. She added that this is getting at more than just the small areas dedicated as entrance corridors.

Ms. Palmer commented that it also goes with what they appropriate as a Board.

Ms. McKeel agreed, stating that it goes into what is in the CIP and how they prioritize it.

Mr. Randolph suggested including parallel language between the paragraph above and below, to say that by January 2019, they would increase their efforts, just so they are consistent.

Ms. McKeel said that she might not have been clear when she spoke previously regarding aesthetics, as it may be accurate as it pertains to entrance corridors, but aging neighborhoods may not have sidewalks or may have deteriorating sidewalks and infrastructure. Mr. Foley responded that part of this is that staff wants to get a statement that defines an outcome, so there would be multiple steps to get there, including figuring out which of those neighborhoods are the most urgent to address.

Mr. Sheffield noted there is a difference between saying you are improving the deteriorating physical nature of urban infrastructure and completing those attributes.

Ms. Mallek asked for clarity as to how items seven and eight distinguish from one another, as one of them is more public works directed and the other is more related to construction.

Ms. McKeel added that there is also disconnect between Board intention and action objective, and perhaps maintaining an attractive aesthetic appearance in entrance corridors and public spaces is different from the urban core neighborhoods.

Mr. Foley stated that staff tried to make it clear that there are two things underway, and perhaps putting the word “aging” in front of core neighborhoods would help. He asked if there might be a way to improve Mr. Randolph’s language stating they would “increase efforts to improve deteriorating physical conditions in the County’s aging urban core neighborhoods” to make it clearer.

Ms. McKeel said the Board’s intent does not quite match with the proposed two-year action.

Mr. Foley said the statement above it, that was there originally, does match it well, so now there are two things being addressed, with entrance corridors being one thing, and aging infrastructure being another separate item.

Ms. Mallek suggested making it a separate bulleted item rather than just highlighting it.

Ms. Catlin clarified the change in the items and asked if there were any other concerns to be addressed.

Ms. Mallek suggested that they group the items by use category, such as transportation, water, and infrastructure, to provide three different items all dealing with different aspects of the same thing.

Mr. Dill asked if they were going to try to do the rezoning and related items and at the same time be evaluating the potential use of urban service districts, which is an entirely different project with a separate planning effort and research. Mr. Foley responded that the proactive rezoning is defining what they want to accomplish, with the service district providing a way to accomplish it, and staff is planning to bring that to the Board within the next month for their consideration. He said the proactive rezoning that occurs around Rio is what they have focused on, but there may be service districts in other areas that are ways to focus on what they want to accomplish and an enhanced level of service, through the establishment of service districts.

Mr. Sheffield said an example of this is Better Living, which must get a setback special exception, and a rezoning of the neighboring parcel is required to get a setback because it is residential and they want to switch it to highway commercial. He stated the County wants to focus on business development in that corridor, but both of those applicants have to go through a longer process to get them where they

want to be, which wastes the time and effort of staff and the applicant.

Mr. Foley stated the challenge with the timeline for the proactive rezoning is that it is a fairly involved process with a lot of property owners that will not necessarily agree with their neighbors about what they want to see, so staff is working to see how they can do this as quickly as possible, but the reality is that affected property owners will want to make sure there is a strong public process.

Ms. Mallek said they need to start somewhere, and if they assume there is going to be a big, long process, that item goes to the end of the list and never gets done. She stated that they have been talking about this since 2008, and while it may take longer than they hope, they at least need to start. Ms. Mallek said it would take months to get people interested and involved, even if they are the ones most seriously affected, so she hopes they will start this as soon as possible.

Mr. Foley stated the Board would need to make some choices about things like roundtables and how many to have, and there will likely be something else that comes along between now and the time that process is done.

Ms. Catlin shifted the discussion to resources, as there is obviously a big connection between what they want to do and how they will get it done. She said the resources for FY17 are the most immediate and are laid out pretty clearly for the Board, and the expectation is that if they endorse the plan at this meeting, staff will return very quickly with a re-appropriation to make the FY17 items happen immediately to meet the timelines. Ms. Catlin stated that staff has identified generally where the work impacts and resources would be for FY18 and FY19, and the idea is that the balanced two-year plan presented to the Board next month would be much more specifically defined. She said that because they are two years out talking about projects for which the scope is not yet developed, they would need to keep the dialogue going.

Ms. Catlin stated that there were some personnel and non-personnel items as part of the small area plan process, and staff has identified the need for \$25,000 in contractual services to engage data analysis, real estate, and redevelopment expertise, to support the economic development office as the small area plan process moves forward. She said this would be a one-time cost, and there would also be \$50,000 needed for blight remediation/spot improvement fund, which would allow them to move forward in the current fiscal year, with that effort added to the out years.

Mr. Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive, stated the previous iteration of the plan for FY17 identified some full-time equivalencies as a way to identify resources needed to drive this work, related specifically to the proactive rezoning and recodification work. He said this included planner positions and a partial Assistant County Attorney position to reflect the volume of work, and there is a lot of interest in how effectively to accomplish this timeframe, recognizing that current staff is in the best position to do that because of what they know already about the zoning ordinance. Mr. Walker noted that dedicating those resources to this effort creates the need to backfill from the work they are currently doing, so the thought was to identify resources that could do that backfilling using a combination of contracted positions and staff positions. He stated that because this is a project with a start and finish, they want to be thoughtful in constructing a resource plan, and perhaps using part-time temporary staff positions is the best approach.

Mr. Walker said the \$165,000 is a cumulative number, and when this was presented the previous week it was broken out differently.

Ms. Mallek stated there are many tasks that a staff person could move onto if the backfill people are doing other tasks, and given the experience of the County in having to redo the work of consultants, she would prefer to stay with in-house personnel when possible.

Mr. Walker said that there are some capacity issues that Community Development is addressing now, which the Board would see, and the reality is that their overall staffing has been reduced since 2008-09. He added that they have demonstrated their ability to reduce positions as workloads change, but there are also aspects after the redevelopment projects, with implementation and other aspects, that may require additional staffing.

Mr. Foley stated that what the Board is likely to see in the next month or so is addition of positions that are necessary to keep up with an increased workload, which has associated revenues that will also be increasing. He said at the same time, they will be trying to move strategic issues forward, and that is what staff is trying to balance out with the Board's fiscal plan. Mr. Foley said they are also trying to delineate which items can be handled by contractors and which are ongoing responsibilities that need to be handled by staff. He stated that next month, before the Board sees the two-year fiscal plan, they would likely see a request to address workload challenges in Community Development and things that are just now changing. He stated that while this is a work in progress, staff would still like to get the Board's general sense of direction.

Mr. Walker said part of that communication is negotiating between workload pressure and strategic objectives.

Ms. Mallek stated that the skilled people the County hires will be able to bridge that gap, and all hands are on deck when the deadlines approach and work has to happen. She said a lot has been learned in the last decade in terms of refined scopes and keeping better control of projects.

Mr. Randolph asked staff if there was any discussion of using TJPDC, as he would be

announcing the policy for which the organization would be providing so many hours annually back to each County based on the level of financial contribution, so while Albemarle would not get money, it would get allocated time. He stated that the TJPDC has transportation expertise and other expertise on staff that could lend itself to some of this work. Mr. Walker said he would take that back to Community Development, stating that they have talked about the TJPDC resource specifically in regard to transportation and how they can better leverage resources to accomplish goals and there are some strategic initiatives in the plan related to transportation. He stated that staff has not had a direct conversation about how that relates to proactive rezoning and recodification work, but to the extent that they are partners, the County would want to take advantage of what the TJPDC is able to do.

Ms. Mallek stated that people have also mentioned the river corridor, which the TJPDC could also be leveraged for, using money from the County and others in the Rivanna River Basin Commission (RRBC) funding formula.

Mr. Foley said they had done some preliminary work on this, and Chip Boyles of TJPDC had mentioned this at the joint meeting, so staff would make sure the item is carried into this plan.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that she wants to be sure people are not inhibited in coming forth to the Board to make requests because of the date on the plan, such as for the Department of Social Services, as they could leverage state dollars to help address their workload.

Mr. Randolph stated that regarding the RRBC, he was on that Board when they put together the funding formula, and it was specifically designed so as not to penalize larger counties and the City of Charlottesville, to ensure participation. He said that in FY17, the two smallest counties, Greene and Fluvanna, stepped up and supported the RRBC, but Albemarle and Charlottesville did not.

Mr. Foley asked if that was done through the budget process. Ms. Mallek confirmed that it was.

Ms. Catlin stated that Ms. Lori Allshouse would now respond to some comments that she heard about the program and service inventory, and after that staff would ask for endorsement of the plan as they talked about it today.

---

Item No. 2b. Follow up on Program and Service Inventory.

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director, Office of Management and Budget, addressed the Board and stated that she would talk more about the program and service inventory, noting that when staff was before them the previous week, they talked about a few changes they wanted to have in the inventory. She said that her slides provide an overview of the inventory, which includes 246 programs and services. Ms. Allshouse stated that there is also a Board-directed discretionary category, and staff looked at several options and decided that "elective" was a better word choice option than "discretionary," so it has been changed in the descriptions and throughout the program and service inventory before them. She said that staff also added a column to note which agencies receive regional funding support, such as Darden Towe Park and the regional firing range, with a total of 59 programs and services, or 24%, receiving regional funding support. Ms. Allshouse mentioned that this does not include all of the programs and services that have regional collaboration.

Ms. Allshouse stated that there were questions asked during the program and service inventory, including one related to the Fire Marshal's office and the building code. She explained that the office of the Fire Marshal provides guidance and education to citizens, businesses and visitors in the County to reduce the risk of fires, with activities including education programs, such as media blitzes, permits, inspections, investigations, community meetings, hazardous material safety programs, school safety education programs, citizen safety events, smoke alarm installation programs, and others that provide safety education for local businesses and investigations to identify reasons for emergencies. Ms. Allshouse said the Fire Marshal's office has 5.5 FTEs, divided into three sections in the program and service inventory.

Ms. Allshouse stated that the Virginia Code allows for recovery of some of the costs associated with these programs, and as recently as March 2015, the Board updated inspection fees to make them comparable with other jurisdictions. Ms. Allshouse stated that implementing the fire prevention programs is \$596,000, and approximately \$125,000 in fees are anticipated to be received this year to offset the cost, leaving a net cost to the County of \$471,000. She noted that the fees could be looked at again, and the County has the ability to increase them, if desired. Ms. Allshouse stated that Hanover collects \$146,400 in fees and has eight FTEs, and Albemarle's workload per FTE is higher in terms of actual tasks performed.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the Virginia Statewide Prevention Code is a statewide body of law that applies uniformly throughout Virginia, and if the County does not adopt it, the state Fire Marshal is responsible to do it. She stated the question is who enforces it, and with limited modifications, Albemarle County has fully adopted the state's fire prevention code. She said the County may enforce it if they choose to; the County must require compliance with the fire code in its entirety, or could require compliance with provisions of the fire code related to open burning, fire lanes, fireworks, and hazardous materials, so they could choose not to enforce the whole thing. Ms. Allshouse said that risk reduction in application of the code is a major factor in the ISO rating for homeowners, and the fire prevention efforts have been instrumental in reducing the ISO rating in the County, which provides the ability for citizens and businesses to reduce their insurance obligations.

Ms. Allshouse stated that there is another issue related to street sizes affected by state code, and the question of whether the County should keep its older, smaller fire engines to serve those smaller streets. She said that statewide fire code mandates that fire apparatus access roads must be a minimum of 20 feet wide unobstructed, with a height clearance of 13 feet, 6 inches, and must provide access to all portions within 150 feet. She noted that the access road is the path from the fire building to the home, and includes both public and private roads, and the width can be reduced to 18 feet and you can change your distance if there is a sprinkler system installed in the building. Ms. Allshouse stated that these restrictions are not different from the VDOT standards, and parking is usually the issue when discrepancies arise, and the VDOT standards allow for parking lanes in addition to the travel way. She noted that the newer trucks have a better turning radius than the older versions, so the size of the fire trucks is not an issue. Ms. Allshouse stated that the requirements are around the scene operation, when they get ready to fight the fire, rather than the size of the trucks.

Ms. Mallek asked about the four categories for which the County has a choice in enforcing. Ms. Allshouse clarified that the categories are open burning, fire lanes, hazardous materials, and fireworks, and if the County does not adopt and the state enforces it, the enforcement level is very minimal in all categories.

Ms. Mallek stated that there are 26-foot wide streets in mixed-use neighborhoods where residents have lived for several years and then were told they could not park on their streets because of fire truck access needed at 28-foot wide; this is the kind of enforcement that seems to be overturning the development process.

Fire Chief, Dan Eggleston, pointed out that street widths are 20 feet, and there is a lot of negotiation during development to strike a compromise to accommodate street widths and reduce parking on one or both sides. He stated that a big role of the Fire Marshals is to work with developers in the Community Development Department, and they have done some excellent work in negotiating smaller road widths and some developers choosing to install sprinkler systems in buildings so there can be narrower road widths.

Ms. Mallek stated that it is not working in existing neighborhoods. Mr. Eggleston disagreed, stating that it requires some compromise, and when you start limiting parking, that upsets citizens, but there has been a community engagement process to make sure that people understand. Ms. Mallek responded that this has taken place after the fact, and several neighborhoods in Crozet have had to have guests park three blocks away because they cannot park on the streets, and that is not what people understood would happen when they purchased their homes.

Mr. Dill asked which neighborhoods this was affecting. Ms. Mallek said it was several of the larger developments in Crozet where there were changes made after the fact, with residents arriving home to find "no parking" signs where there previously were none.

Mr. Foley stated this has been a concern a number of times, and it is important for the Board to get a report on this, working with fire staff, Community Development staff and the community, so they should fully assess the issue and determine if it leads to doing something differently. He said he would like to handle this as a separate item with an objective report. Ms. Mallek agreed.

Mr. Randolph stated that when he met with the Scottsville Volunteer Fire Company and discussed expanding their firehouse, part of the problem has been that one of the tankers barely fits into the existing space. He said it is easy to point the finger at the Fire Department, but the real problem lies with the engines coming down the pike, and the engines keep getting larger, which he understands in terms of carrying capacity for equipment and water.

Mr. Eggleston emphasized that the engines are still eight feet wide, and the turning radii are much better than what exists today, and the issue is still related to access and parking. He encouraged having a report come back so they can clarify some mistruths and understand what areas are open for compromise.

Mr. Dill stated that it is a high priority item, and not having guests able to park goes against the neighborhood model style development.

Ms. Palmer commented that it is like the big city.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was possibility to have some auxiliary people work in the Fire Marshal's office so there is not so much overtime, as it used to be just Chief Lagomarsino, but now there are 5.5 FTEs, and there is a big gap between service and cost.

Mr. Eggleston agreed that it could be evaluated, and in 2006, the Fire Marshal's office was cut by one position, and while part-time staff were added to address capacity issues, the full-time position was never restored. He stated that enlisting volunteer departments for the smoke alarm program has been the best utilization of volunteers to get out in the community, meet neighbors, and install smoke alarms, especially in target hazard areas as discussed in the past. Mr. Eggleston stated that Albemarle's numbers are very efficient in comparison to peer localities, and he feels there is a great program considering the resources available. He said he still feels that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and the Fire Marshal's office handles tent permits, hazmat permits, fire investigations, and environmental crime investigations.

Mr. Foley asked if the Board would like to take the review of the Fire Marshal's office to the next level of scrutiny, since there is a high level of concern with the level of staffing and activity. He stated that this would entail beyond just checking with peer localities, adding that he would like to assess whether this is a high concern for the Board.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he feels they are "tripping over themselves" when it comes to new developments, and he ran for office because of the truck issue in Belvedere.

Mr. Dill asked if there is another way to analyze this beyond comparing Albemarle to other places, because the emphasis on fire and rescue has shifted, with the statistics on the number of house fires down dramatically, accident rates changing over time because of safer cars, etc. He said he has heard that a lot of fire departments have been increasing their budgets more than they need to, so comparing to just a few other counties may provide a false sense of direction. Mr. Dill asked if there might be another standard they could use, such as outside experts who look at trends.

Mr. Sheffield pointed out that they are talking about prevention, not responding, and he would rather invest more in prevention than response.

Mr. Eggleston said he feels prevention is the best investment they could make.

Mr. Foley stated that there are national discussions going on that are not just about matching local benchmarks, and the ICMA for local government management is studying this, with Mr. Eggleston involved in those discussions.

Mr. Dill said he is just responding to what he hears from constituents, the County is building a lot of fire stations and does not cooperate with the City or CARS, there are too many engines responding to minor incidents, and it would help relations with the community to have an independent analysis.

Mr. Eggleston responded the standards of coverage, which is a third-party analysis of the system, is based upon risk with recommendations regarding addressing gaps in coverage, and they expect to come back in January or February with that. He stated that what they are discussing now is the prevention efforts in the Fire Marshal's office, and Mr. Lagomarsino has been very creative in using the limited resources he has. Mr. Eggleston said he would be very concerned with reducing any of that, but they could increase rates to cover the cost of doing business.

Ms. Mallek stated that the neighborhood model discussion would help all six districts, and she was not aware of the possibility of waivers, so it would help her better understand all of the facets.

Ms. Palmer said she would also like to address snow, as fire engines do not operate well on snowy streets. Mr. Eggleston responded that the analysis of street widths and vehicle size would hopefully provide more information so the Board can explain to their constituents in a logical manner.

Mr. Randolph stated that to answer Mr. Foley's question, it would be helpful to understand the responsibility of the Fire Marshal who was lost in 2006. Mr. Eggleston responded that at the time, they were in negotiations with the rescue squads to bill for service, and that was creating a lot of workload and budget work, so they decided to turn the position into a budget management analyst. He stated that they made that decision, which was challenging, with the hope of adding the position back.

Mr. Randolph stated that some constituents in Scottsville feel that Fire Marshal position had some responsibility for southern Albemarle County. Mr. Eggleston confirmed that this was not the case.

Mr. Foley stated that the standards of cover was a good way to get at the big issues, and they would work on the street width and truck issues in the meantime.

Mr. Dill asked who was doing the standards of cover study. Mr. Eggleston responded that it is Fitch and Associates, who were hired through a procurement process, and they started over a month ago with anticipation of completing in January or February.

Mr. Foley stated that staff would also explain the process by which they looked at this, so there are not questions about whether it was objective, had too limited a focus, etc. He said he wants to get at the broader question of how fire service is changing and how Albemarle's system looks to changes that might be on the horizon.

---

Ms. Catlin resumed her presentation and stated that staff is looking for Board approval of the strategic objectives, with the one change made in the language pertaining to improving urban core neighborhoods. She emphasized that the objectives provide a living document that serves as the foundation for what will be brought forth in the two-year plan, but also has the possibility for things that will be ready to accelerate.

Mr. Sheffield stated that they are going to have something about economic development in the intentions section to make it clear to the public that it is a priority. Ms. Catlin responded that what they talked about doing was making it obvious in the introduction and background of the document when it becomes a public document, underscoring that economic development is a connecting thread through all of it.

Ms. Palmer stated that there was someone from the public who wanted to make a statement in this session, and she did not get that on the agenda and was not sure if that could be done. Mr. Kamptner responded that the item is on the agenda, so it is at the Board's discretion.

Ms. Mallek stated that they have done it with work sessions in the past.

Mr. Sheffield agreed, but said the person may not have known it was on the agenda.

Mr. Dill noted that it is a living document, so there would be other opportunities for input.

Mr. Foley said there have been other opportunities for public input online.

Ms. Catlin stated that they have also planned to build the opportunity for public comment into the Board's two-year fiscal plan work sessions.

Ms. Palmer noted that they also have opportunities for public comment at the regular Board meetings.

Ms. Palmer then invited public comment.

Mr. John Martin of the White Hall District addressed the Board, stating that from the start of priority-based budgeting, he developed a sense of discomfort, partly because he has been coming to the budget sessions and many meetings for years, and it is complex and sometimes emotional. He stated that every year they do priority-based budgeting, and he does not understand what is different about this. Mr. Martin said his discomfort is with the fact that it seems decisions are being made two years in advance of actual budgeting decisions, and it seems as though staff is asking the Board to set things into stone, with the Board willing to do that. He stated that this seems to leave the public out of the process, and submitting comments to staff is not acceptable to him as a citizen because the Board represents him, not staff. Mr. Martin requested that as this process proceeds, he hopes they will make it clear that citizen input still counts in budgeting and they are not agreeing to any future budget.

Ms. Palmer stated that this is a concern to her, especially if they have new Supervisors after next fall's election.

Mr. Randolph said that Mr. Martin's points are well taken, but this process is really establishing a road map, and they may end up changing their route as they go along. He stated that he genuinely believes the more you give the public advanced notice, the more potential for participation there is, because they can digest it and respond to the direction. Mr. Randolph said he is hopeful that because they are giving taxpayers a greater awareness of where they intend to go, people will be more informed and will participate more because of it, and they have less opportunity to argue that they did not know things were coming.

Ms. Mallek stated that she hopes more people will come because they feel they can take a minute and talk to Supervisors after the work sessions.

Mr. Foley recalled a quote from General Dwight D. Eisenhower: "Plans are essential, and they're worthless." He stated this is because circumstances can change, but one of the dynamics here is to try to facilitate the priority setting of the majority of the Board so that actions and agendas can be accomplished, and the reality is that year-to-year budgeting does not get you there because most things do not take just a year to get done. Mr. Foley said this is the principle on which they work in strategic planning, but public engagement is essential.

Mr. Dill **moved** to accept the plan as amended and go forward. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

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

NAYS: None.

Ms. Catlin asked for comments from the Board on the priority-driven budgeting process, which has been underway since May.

Ms. Mallek commented that the extra homework done has been valuable for her to be ready for the kinds of investments required to carry out the highest priority items, and anytime they can get information ahead of time to think about it in depth is helpful.

Mr. Randolph said that he appreciates the work done by Ms. Catlin and staff to take a tremendous amount of information and winnow it down.

Ms. Palmer stated that she feels she will be more mentally prepared for the budget, and this process has really helped with that.

Mr. Dill agreed that this has been a very good process, and they will probably think of ways to improve it in the future. He said that perhaps they should take time to personally express their values, such as environmental and cultural aspects, prior to jumping into specifics, addressing what they want

Albemarle County to be. Mr. Dill suggested having a Ted-X kind of speaker come in to talk about things, like how cities are changing, how to support an agricultural economy, etc.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would like to have a discussion about the environment, climate change, and how this will impact things at a local level. She agreed to having someone coming in from the outside, adding that she is concerned about stormwater in the wake of more severe weather systems, with 100-year floods happening about every two years.

Mr. Dill commented that he was struck to learn that just in his lifetime, the number of wild animals has decreased by 50%, and Albemarle has over 730 square miles to consider.

Ms. Mallek noted that the safe chemicals policy they implemented is a great step in the right direction and has made a big impact.

Mr. Foley mentioned that the natural resources plan would be coming before the Board very soon, which would help continue this conversation.

Ms. Palmer said there are a lot of experts at UVA who could help.

Ms. Mallek stated that some of them serve on the County's committees.

Mr. Foley said this Board has provided more clear direction on priorities than any for a number of years, and this provides a clear path going forward and helps focus and energize staff.

---

Agenda Item No. 3. Adjourn to October 12, 2016, 3:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 5:35 p.m., Ms. Mallek **moved** to adjourn the Board meeting to October 12, 2016 at 3:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium. Mr. Randolph **seconded**.

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

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

NAYS: None.

---

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 08/02/2017
Initials CKB