An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on November 17, 2016, at 11:30 a.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from November 9, 2016.

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

ABSENT: Ms. Diantha H. McKeel.

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 11:33 a.m. by the Chair, Ms. Palmer.

Ms. Palmer introduced the presiding security officer and County staff present. She also announced that Ms. McKeel would not be in attendance tonight because she is traveling.

Ms. Palmer announced there would be time for public comment at the Board's work session in December, and the Board would allow for ten minutes of public comment at the end of today's meeting.

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** Two Year Balanced Fiscal Plan in Context of Five Year Financial Plan.

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, addressed the Board. She thanked staff for their hard work on the fiscal plan and said she will present slides with more detail than what County Executive, Tom Foley, presented at the Board's last meeting. She said there will be four work sessions, and on December 14 they will ask the Board for approval of the plan. She asked the Board to provide feedback as to whether the plan meets the Board's direction, the strategic plan, and the future of what they have in mind for the County. She said that on December 7, there will be time for public comment and they will discuss the concept of service districts in detail, and December 14 they will conclude their discussions, and hopefully the Board will approve the plan.

Ms. Allshouse listed three questions that she would like the Board to consider: how well does the plan advance the strategic plan, how well does the plan maximize transformation, and how well does the plan sustain our quality organization? She said she would also like them to consider what the strategic plan does not address, and her next slide listed plan highlights as follows: building blocks established by long-range planning and the FY17 budget, shaped by strategic plan and priority driven budgeting; opportunities provided by stronger than previously projected revenues and one-time year end funds; utilizes funding formulas for schools and the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP); no tax rate increases for operating costs and CIP tax rate increase delayed; strategic use of new revenue and one-time money; incorporates transformation concepts that reduce costs and improve productivity; enhances use of dedicated revenue for specific services; and continue to face unmet needs.

Ms. Allshouse listed guiding principles used to put together the strategic plan as follows: prioritize services; do important things well; question past patterns of spending; know the true cost of doing business; and provide transparency.

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide entitled "Revenues–Cautious Optimism," which she said lists some good news regarding revenues: a positive housing market with reassessment projections of a 1.8% increase in FY17 and 2% increase in FY18; new construction/land divisions estimated to add $137 million in taxable real property values as of January 2017; the local economy is better overall; fund balance provides one-time money for strategic investment; storm water mandates shift burden from real estate tax to storm water fees; a previously projected real estate tax increase for the CIP can be delayed from FY18 to FY19. She said the next slide shows projected revenues for the general fund and fire fund combined for FYs 18 and 19; for FY18 state, local, and federal revenues are projected to increase by 4% or $10.3 million; after including planned use of the fund balance and transfers, the total would be 4.5% or $12.2 million; for FY19 state, local, and federal revenues are projected to increase by 3.3% or $8.8 million; after including planned use of the fund balance and transfers, the total would be 2.6% or $7.4 million. Ms. Allshouse said the next slide is titled "Projected Percent Revenue Growth by Category: General Fund and Fire Fund," for FY18 and FY19, with information presented as follows:

	FY18	FY19
Real Estate Taxes	3.3% ($4.5M)	3.6% (5M)
Real Estate Tax Rate	83.9	84.5
Other General Property Taxes	9.5% ($3M)	2.3% ($0.8M)
Other Local Taxes	3.8% ($2M)	2.3% ($1.2M)
Other Local Revenues	8.4% ($0.7M)	16.8% ($1.4M)
State Revenues	-0.2% (-$44K)	0.3% ($67K)
Federal Revenues	5.6% ($0.3M)	4.7% ($0.3M)

Ms. Allshouse said other general property taxes include the vehicle tax, and the County has been seeing increased revenues from this tax with stronger auto sales. She said another source of revenue under this category is the public service tax, which includes taxes levied on railroads, utilities, pipelines, and other businesses required to register with the State Corporation Commission. She said an increased assessment by the state on one property affected this number significantly.

Ms. Allshouse referenced the next slide, which shows a graph depicting gradually decreasing state revenues as a percent of the County's general fund budget from FY 2000–2021, noting that it lists the following potential issues for counties: increased funding pressures on schools, shifting of more Children's Service Act expenditures to localities, reduced sales tax revenues for K-12 and regional transportation, and public safety funding not adequate.

Ms. Mallek commented that, in addition to regional transportation, local revenue sharing is under attack. She said the Water Quality Improvement Fund, which is used to address storm water, is only funded if there is a surplus, and there is none this year. She stated that counties are on their own, so they would have to find ways to take care of things and not wait for outside funding.

Mr. Randolph asked Ms. Allshouse if she could provide an additional graph that depicts federal revenues as a percent of the general fund budget as she has done for state revenues. Ms. Allshouse said that she would.

Ms. Allshouse next presented a slide with a chart provided by the Finance Department entitled "General Fund Estimated FY16 Year End Fund Balance, Preliminary End-of-Year FY16 Financial Report." She said the Board will soon receive the FY16 CAFR report showing revenues versus expenditures. Ms. Allshouse noted that the chart shows: the audited fund balance as of June 30, 2015 at $39,855,507; revenues at $255,007,275; and expenditures at $248,798,020, resulting in an estimated gain of $6,209,255 and a projected June 30, 2016 fund balance of $46,064,767. She noted the policy use of the fund balance is $33,738,188, and Board-approved spending is $3,690,873, which leaves $8,635,700 available for one-time uses. She said if the Board had not raised the tax rate, the revenues would have exceeded expenditures by 0.4%. Ms. Allshouse stated that the County saved some money with some unfilled positions in the County work force and a reduction in fuel costs, noting that the rainy day fund equals approximately $1.78 million.

Mr. Randolph stated that the Board was justified in cutting back the proposed FY 2017 tax increase from 2.5 to 2 cents, as they have a significant surplus even with 2 cents.

Ms. Allshouse next showed a slide listing recommended uses of the $8.6M available for one-time uses, stating that they are listed within three categories: approved and recommended uses, contingencies/reserves; and recommended two-year fiscal plan uses. She noted that under the third category, the following proposed expenditures are listed: additional cash to CIP for capital projects, additional cash for CIP, the Board's strategic priority support, economic development fund, transformational initiatives, grants matching fund, innovation fund, departmental workload capacity, and staffing plan.

Mr. Foley asked to reply to Mr. Randolph's comment about reducing the real estate tax rate increase by half a cent. He said they reduced expenditures by this half cent so it would not have an impact on the fund balance.

Ms. Allshouse said her next slide shows the amount of increases in FY18 and FY19 for funding shared by formula/funding guidelines:

	FY 18	FY 19
School Division	$4.6M	$2.8M
CIP/Debt	$896K	$550K
Fire/Rescue	$546K	$360K
Water Resources	$47K	$33K

She mentioned that the chart has the following note at the bottom: "General government also would continue to provide $2M annually in support to the school division (primarily through Finance and County Attorney's Departments)."

Mr. Randolph asked Mr. Foley if he was aware of other counties that have a similar arrangement with their school board under which county funding is included in the schools' budget, with the county being reimbursed for these expenses.

Mr. Foley responded that he does not have the answer, but a next step could be to learn how other localities track these expenditures so they can be accounted for. He said that Albemarle County is unique with the number of joint departments it has with the schools, citing Human Resources as an example as the County pays for 25% of its budget, but it is accounted for by the schools and local government. He also gave the example of a new buyer position that is driven mainly by the recently passed bond referendum approval, stating that it would be included in the Finance Department and included on the local government side of the budget, although most of the work would go towards the benefit of schools.

Ms. Palmer asked how per-pupil funding for schools is calculated. Mr. Foley responded that the estimate is made by the state based on the annual school report submitted by the schools. He said if an allocation study has not been conducted, and if spending by the Finance Department is not included, per-pupil spending is higher. He noted that staff could verify this.

Mr. Dill, using Human Resources as an example, asked if County employees record time spent working on school related issues, or if they assume that a particular employee would devote a certain amount of time to schools as part of his ordinary duties. Mr. Foley responded that they use a methodology to track this, but there is not a regular tracking of hours. He stated that they can track expenses without spending time completing time sheets, and said that for each position, they specify the percentage of time spent on local government vs. school issues.

Ms. Palmer asked about storm water fees, specifically, if they have decided not to expand their program for the next two fiscal years.

Ms. Mallek said there was support from the resources committee study to get started with assessments, adding that she feels this is really important. Mr. Bill Letteri, Deputy County Executive, addressed Ms. Palmer's question and said they plan to use a consultant to assess things and are continuing at the current level until this is done. He stated that staff is preparing an RFP that will go out very shortly, and they hope to engage with a consultant by mid-spring and report to the Board by late spring with some analysis.

Mr. Foley said the FY18 budget keeps current levels of service and requested that the Board let him know if they wish to increase spending on storm water issues during the current budget process, as it is part of the strategic plan.

Ms. Mallek said there was strong support to identify ground easements that were given to the County, as well as for a structural assessment of pipes in the ground. Mr. Letteri said the RFP is designed to be broader and to include an assessment of infrastructure, as well as the level of services they can provide.

Mr. Kamptner said that staff is currently assessing the existence of easements and determining if they are public or private, and identifying storm water management facilities and maintenance agreements to figure out what the next steps might be.

Mr. Randolph commented that it would be terrific to have a breakdown of the direct and indirect costs to the County. He gave police patrolling of school property as an example of an indirect cost of service the County provides. Mr. Letteri replied that the methodology used in the assessment was just that, and the report is complete and thorough.

Mr. Sheffield said when he worked in Tallahassee, the police patrolled their transit center and they had to identify the cost of this in their budget. Mr. Foley said it would be worth getting expenditures in the right budget to know the true cost of them, noting that staff could take this to the next level if the Board wishes them to.

Mr. Dill asked if the City of Charlottesville does this. Mr. Foley said they do not have joint departments, and said that Albemarle is used as the model in the state.

Ms. Palmer asked how much time is spent on figuring out how much is allocated to the schools from indirect costs. Mr. Foley responded that the auditors do a cost allocation plan and it is a common practice, although they would have to pay for this and it could be in the $1,500 range.

Ms. Mallek stated she is in favor of going ahead and getting an answer.

Mr. Dill said the responsibility of the police is to protect people wherever they may be, and they do not try to determine how much time they spend at Barrack's Road Shopping Center or providing security at Board meetings.

Mr. Randolph said the security at Board meetings is accounted for in the budget. He said a study of how spending is allocated would provide transparency and would be beneficial to the School Board. Mr. Foley said they could focus on direct and significant indirect costs.

Ms. Allshouse continued with the presentation, with her next slide showing revenue sharing changes with the City of Charlottesville for FY11– FY19. She noted that it shows payments to the City decreasing from FY12 to FY17, although they are projected to increase in FYs 18 and 19.

Ms. Allshouse revisited the areas of focus outlined at the beginning of her presentation, including advancing strategic priorities, redevelopment and revitalization, economic development, salary compression remedy, school facility needs, educational opportunities for at-risk four year olds, the Family Support Program, General District Court expansion, water resources/storm water funding, and the Pantops Master plan including the Rivanna River Corridor.

Mr. Foley noted that the list of strategic priorities displayed is not a complete list, and the complete list is in Attachment A of the plan.

Ms. Allshouse next showed a slide entitled "Redevelopment and Revitalization," which showed highlights, including one-time funding for strategic initiatives: an increase of $2M for transportation revenue sharing to support neighborhood revitalization; staffing resources; and the service district concept to be discussed during the December 7 work session. She noted that the next slide is entitled "Economic Development Fund – Three Objectives," and listed the following objectives: match specific state grant opportunities; encourage economic investment in development areas to support neighborhood revitalization; and implement priority economic development initiatives. She referenced a chart listing projected Economic Development Fund balances for FYs 17 and 18 available for these three objectives.

Mr. Dill asked how Ms. Faith McClintic's salary fits into the Economic Development Fund. Mr. Foley replied that her salary is an operating expense separate from the fund and appears under salaries.

Ms. Allshouse presented the next slide showing remedy for salary compression costs fully implemented across the County, including police with $383,000 for FY18 and $7,660 for FY19. She noted the second heading is "Support for Other Strategic Initiatives," which lists the following: expansion of the General District Court included in the CIP; storm water fee replaces water resources dedicated to tax rate funding in FY19; school facility improvements as a result of the recently passed bond referendum; and strategic use of one-time monies, educational opportunities for at-risk four year olds, increased resources for Family Support Program, and the Pantops Master Plan/Rivanna River Corridor.

Ms. Allshouse continued with the second focus area of "Maximizing Transformation." She said there would be reduced costs for ongoing obligations, with reduced increases for the health insurance fund compared to prior years and decreases in Children's Services Act costs. She stated that other savings listed are the purchase card program, increasing the amount of the "budgeted salary lapse" to support additional operating costs, reduction in overtime costs, finance process improvements: surplus management, paperless checks, automation, an exterior kiosk, and insurance savings.

Ms. Mallek asked if the cost of overtime savings is over and above the cost for new staff. Mr. Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive, volunteered to respond to Ms. Mallek's question, stating that he assumed reductions in overtime costs were associated with implementation of the new workforce management system to better manage how overtime is authorized and used, though it is not specific to any one position. He stated the new system has not yet been put in place, and they are making assumptions about costs.

Ms. Allshouse presented the next slide regarding the focus area of transformation, and listed the following pertaining to reinventing business processes: consolidation, technology, and growing innovation. She stated that under consolidation, the following efforts were listed: implement office associates pool, establish an office of housing transformation, and centralize approach to fleet management; under technology, the following were listed: transition copy center to imaging center, establish a kiosk for the Finance Department, and advance the records management effort; growing innovation it listed innovation fund expansion.

Ms. Allshouse said the office associates pool will allow administrative employees to be pooled to service multiple areas. She said they recommend consolidation of the Housing Department with Social Services, with responsibility for housing policy development moved to Community Development.

Ms. Allshouse said the next slide is entitled "Sustain Quality Organization" and includes efforts to support the existing workforce: market adjustment for employee compensation, health care premiums, classification reviews, compression remedy. She said the next slide is entitled, "Building Workforce of the Future," showing planned increases in County staff – for FY17, they plan to add two full-time planners and one full-time permit intake support position; in FY18, they plan to add 6.5 full-time positions including an Assistant County Attorney, Fleet Management Supervisor, a half-time Management Analyst, two Police Officers, a Crime Analyst and a Buyer (temporary); in FY19, they plan to add a half-time Assistant Commonwealth Attorney, a Management Analyst, two Police Officers, and a Diversity/ Inclusion Generalist (temporary).

Ms. Mallek asked if the buyer position is being created to implement the bond issue. Ms. Allshouse replied that it was.

Mr. Letteri stated that they anticipate requiring project managers and inspectors to implement construction projects as a result of the bond issue, and these costs are embedded in the capital costs set up for the projects. He said that Trevor Henry is working on determining staffing necessary for the projects.

Mr. Randolph asked what the responsibilities of a Diversity Inclusion Generalist are. Mr. Walker responded that it is a local government position designed to improve retention and recruitment of a more diverse workforce that better reflects the diversity of the community.

Ms. Mallek asked why they cannot use the diversity staff the schools use. Mr. Walker said the school position is maxed out.

Mr. Foley pointed out that it is being created as a temporary position, so they can assess it.

Mr. Dill asked about the use of contract and temporary employees, and if there is an upper limit of how many they can have before it affects the culture of the workplace and having employees who are committed to the organization. He asked if there is a possibility that some contractual employees would eventually be offered permanent employment. Mr. Foley responded that there are three contract employees tied to ongoing priority needs that have been identified, although he agrees that they should pay attention to this in the event the number becomes very significant. He stated that currently, it is a modest step to address some challenges, and they have discussed the potential of some temporary employees filling future vacancies.

Ms. Allshouse said the next slide pertains to the CIP, and said the Oversight Committee, which includes two Supervisors, is about to begin its work. She stated that highlights of the CIP include adjustment of the five-year plan time span from FY17-21 to FY18-22, revenue projection updates, and expenditure projection updates.

Ms. Allshouse concluded her presentation by addressing issues the two-year fiscal plan does not address, including a constrained CIP, staff capacity challenges, continued threat of uncertain economy, the school division's needs-based forecast, and the fact that aspirations are not fully met. She concluded her remarks.

Mr. Foley commented that the concept of transformation and reallocating priorities does not result in the cheapest budget that can be put together, but instead focuses on how to best allocate resources to address strategic priorities.

Mr. Randolph commented that in the recent election, 79% of County voters voted for a House of Representatives candidate who is strongly committed to expanding broadband in the rural areas. He said the strategic priorities, which he supports, primarily affect the urban and northern areas of the County but do not provide much for rural area residents. He suggested they look at ways to improve quality of life in these areas, with broadband expansion being one option, noting that he hears from residents of the southern portion of the County that broadband is a major priority for them.

Mr. Foley referenced Page 22, Item 2, which contains the rest of the strategic plan. He said they struggled with how to handle this issue and it appears under the heading, "Requiring Further Development and Direction." He indicated that at this time next year, they can put this in as a priority, as it is in the strategic plan but not yet primed for action because they are still studying the grant process.

Ms. Palmer said they can ask Chip Boyles of TJPDC to continue working on this as part of his regional plan and have him provide information to the Board. She said she constantly hears about the broadband issue from residents in the southern end of the County, and CenturyLink has recently begun connecting people in the rural areas by increasing its service. Ms. Mallek stated that hopefully by this time next year they would know more about CenturyLink's plans and could direct staff to take a specific action.

Ms. Mallek said they have to get the paperwork and analysis completed so that when federal resources become available they can go after them.

Mr. Sheffield said they are still struggling with identifying improvements that are actually needed in the urban ring. He suggested the Board consider allocating some of the surplus to retain consultants to study neighborhood-level planning so they can be better prepared for funding opportunities, such as smart scale. He stated that they do not have a good assessment of the key investments that need to be made at the neighborhood level within the urban areas, and said if they have this information, they could work with a developer that may come along to fill these gaps and be able to access grant funding.

Ms. Palmer asked if he is referring to areas along Route 29 North. Mr. Sheffield responded that each Supervisor can bring up areas for assessment within their district.

Mr. Foley cited two slides on Page 7 of the presentation that contain recommended uses of one-time money. He pointed out that $320K is allocated to support neighborhood revitalization initiatives, i.e., small-scale planning and improvements. He said these dollars could be used for an assessment as mentioned by Mr. Sheffield. Mr. Sheffield replied that he is not sure this amount of money would be enough to tackle all that they are seeking. Mr. Foley said it could be a start.

Ms. Palmer asked if new economic development money could be used for small area planning.

Mr. Sheffield suggested that each Supervisor come up with areas that they wish to be assessed, and then talk to consulting firms about what the costs might be.

Ms. Mallek suggested they give this responsibility to the CACs instead of bringing in outside people.

Mr. Randolph stated that he ran for office on a platform of bringing an Avon Street corridor study, which includes beautification and narrowing the street to slow traffic while still allowing it to be a connector. He said the study has been done and they need an honest, real dollar assessment of what the financial costs of neighborhood studies would entail, and then to allocate the funds accordingly in the coming year.

Mr. Sheffield commented that there is state funding for transit available once they identify the need.

Mr. Foley stated that this is the type of conversation they were hoping for at this stage, and they need to move from discussion to action, so he suggests they work with the CACs to identify areas for improvement within their districts.

Mr. Sheffield agreed and suggested that they task their CACs with this and then come back to staff with recommendations.

Mr. Foley stated that they would develop a way forward with the CACs, and this would provide those councils with an opportunity to be proactive rather than reactive.

Mr. Randolph cited the Pantops Master Plan/Rivanna River Corridor study as another area they could consider for a small-scale planning study. He said the corridor would run from Woolen Mills to State Farm to Martha Jefferson Hospital, and a study could look at both recreational and economic benefits.

Mr. Dill said that he attended a meeting about these two plans this morning, and they are in the works.

Mr. Sheffield asked if they would be able to adopt a policy by which they take a portion of the annual surplus and dedicate it to an economic development investment fund as a way of demonstrating their commitment. Mr. Foley stated they can put together a guideline document on the use of surplus funds, as they have done this before with the Capital Improvement Plan. He said this is a great idea.

Ms. Palmer addressed Mr. Foley and brought up the issue of historic properties within the rural areas, such as Clifton Inn, Keswick Hall and Michie Tavern. She said they have the option of going to Stage 2 if they wish, and said there are a lot of people who want to do things with their historic properties, so the Board will likely receive questions from constituents as to why they helped three particular properties.

Ms. Mallek stated that the Historic Preservation Committee has discussed this issue and they feel that having different rules for historic properties would lead to people focusing on them for the wrong reasons. She said that while she wants things to be preserved and not fall down, there is a huge can of worms that could be opened.

Mr. Kamptner said the only thing he is aware of that is pending is the amendment to rural area district regulations pertaining to restaurants and inns. He said that it is narrowly tailored to address three properties.

Ms. Palmer stated she is not suggesting they open it up, but she is getting calls about it.

Ms. Mallek said inns are an easy group to make separable.

Mr. Foley said he would like to go over a few items in the presentation to ask for the Board's direction. He asked the Board if they think the proposal to establish an Economic Development Fund with three objectives is a good idea. He said that if so, they would have to create an annual appropriation in the budget. He asked about the proposal to use a storm water fee to replace the tax rate in FY19. Mr. Foley asked if they should look into Mr. Sheffield's suggestion that a certain amount of budget surplus be allocated to the Economic Development Fund.

Mr. Randolph said they should have a discussion and inquire with other counties as to whether they set aside a portion of their surplus to seed economic development. He stated they need to look strategically at how to allocate taxpayer funds, and expressed support for making it a priority to address small area plan corridor studies and have them completed this year, if possible. He said this would demonstrate that local government is listening and aware of constituent needs and attempting to establish a consensus to improving the quality of life of residents. He stated that he supports building reserves in the CIP.

Mr. Foley said they would need to get together with Planning and Community Development to see what has already been identified.

Ms. Mallek said rather than coming from the top down, these suggestions should come from the community advisory committees as they meet this winter.

Mr. Sheffield expressed agreement with Ms. Mallek, stating that setting money aside to prepare for future opportunities is one of the best uses of one time money, which they can use as seed money.

Mr. Dill said he thinks they should have a goal for a pure environmental investment and cited Page 22 priority areas, specifically number 5, which calls for a "robust, natural resource program," and number 6, which deals with natural resource protection. He suggested they protect the most biodiverse areas of the County, and referenced a recently completed biodiversity report. He said he is not sure exactly what this means, but would like to seek assistance and input from environmentally oriented people for suggestions. Mr. Dill said that in addition to focusing on building and growing, they should also focus on what needs to be protected.

Mr. Foley said the natural resources plan would come before the Board in December.

Mr. Walker cited the committee report coming in December and the natural resources strategic plan draft to be presented to the Board in January.

Ms. Mallek said they can look at the recommendations made in the biodiversity report, as it identified six critical areas of importance. She reminded members of the importance of having protections during the approval process and being mindful of day-to-day environmental concerns in addition to having a big preservation program.

Mr. Foley said that items 5 and 6 referenced by Mr. Dill are areas where they can provide more detail.

Ms. Palmer then invited public comment.

Mr. John Morgan addressed the Board, stating that he is somewhat uncomfortable with the planning process, as sophisticated as it is. He said that preparing a budget document two years in advance and setting things in stone that cannot be changed proposes problems. Mr. Morgan stated that real life is not as predictable as the model being presented today, as things can change; as an example, the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) issued a scathing report just two days ago on how VDEP spends taxpayer money on economic development. He said they will need to examine this report very closely and decide if what the County is doing in terms of economic development is consistent with what JLARC is recommending. Mr. Morgan said this could result in changes to their plan. He commented on the recent opening of Wegman's that he attended along with 30,000 others, and said it is much needed by residents of the City and County and does not intrude on I-64. He stated that this development was paid for 100% by private business money with no government incentives, and encouraged individual Supervisors to feel free to express their views if they change their mind in the future about an issue related to planning, as this is what the public expects them to do.

Ms. Mallek told Mr. Morgan that he can count on it, and that she sees the fiscal plan as a living document subject to change. She stated that looking ahead more than one year helps them to make better choices, but she does not feel restricted from suggesting changes in the future.

Mr. Foley said the appropriation is the only thing that is set in stone.

Ms. Mallek said they can change that too.

Agenda Item No. 3. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 4. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adjourn to November 29, 2016, 5:30 p.m., Room 241.

At 1:33 p.m., Ms. Mallek **moved** to adjourn the meeting until November 29, 2016 at 5:30 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 and Ms. Palmer.
NAYS: None.
ABSENT: Ms. McKeel.

____
Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 04/12/2017
Initials CKB