

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on October 4, 2017, at 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from September 19, 2017. The night meeting was held at 6:00 p.m.

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

ABSENT: Mr. Brad L. Sheffield.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Interim County Executive, Doug Walker, County Attorney, Greg Kamptner, Clerk, Claudette Borgersen, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

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

Agenda Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance.

Agenda Item No. 3. Moment of Silence.

Ms. McKeel asked that the Board and public remember the mass shooting that had just occurred in Las Vegas. She said according to the Gun Violence Archive, a mass shooting occurs when four or more individuals are shot in the same general time and location. Ms. McKeel reported that the records of the Archive indicate that 273 mass shootings have occurred this year, compared with 483 last year.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board adopt the final agenda as presented. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Sheffield.

Ms. McKeel then introduced staff present and the presiding Security Officer, Officer Curtis Kenney.

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

Ms. McKeel announced that Mr. Sheffield is absent from today's meeting due to a work scheduling conflict.

Ms. Mallek invited the Board and the public to attend the upcoming weekend's Crozet Arts and Crafts Festival as well as the Montpelier Fiber Festival.

Mr. Randolph announced he had attended the AHIP gala last Friday, which had been very successful in raising funds for the rehabilitation of housing in Albemarle and Charlottesville.

Mr. Randolph announced that he had attended two meetings, including one attended by Supervisor Ann Mallek to discuss Southwood, which lies within the Scottsville and Samuel Miller Districts. He expressed approval that they are moving forward on an innovative and community-centric approach to affordable housing.

Mr. Dill announced that the two-day Rivanna River Festival held the previous Friday was a success and he expects it will continue as an annual event. He said it was an interesting offering for those who desired to preserve the health of the river.

Ms. McKeel said she learned a lot at the informative speaker session held on Friday at the river festival.

Ms. Mallek said Mr. Dan Mahon's suggestion that they have different types of activities to draw more attendees was proven right, as hundreds who represented a cross-section of the community had attended.

Ms. Palmer announced the ribbon cutting for the new \$30 million Rivanna Pump Station the following morning at Moores Creek. She said it will increase sewage capacity and solve the problem of overflows occurring during periods of heavy rain. She emphasized that water and sewer services are bedrocks to economic development activity, and she invited people to attend and tour the station.

Ms. Mallek asked if they would be having a future discussion of fire rules and proposed adding it to the meeting agenda. She asked that they also review the interpretation of the rules governing stream crossings, as there was word out in the country that these had changed.

Ms. Mallek congratulated staff for their work at Monday's CAC meeting, which she said had been the best yet.

Ms. McKeel agreed that the CAC meeting was wonderful and flowed well, and she said she has received positive feedback from attendees.

Ms. McKeel said she will add the two items mentioned by Ms. Mallek to the end of the meeting agenda.

Agenda Item No. 6. Proclamations and Recognitions.

There were none.

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

Ms. Marta Keane of the Rio District addressed the Board on behalf of the Jefferson Area Board for Aging (JABA). She reminded the Board of the upcoming Medicare Part D open enrollment for those ages 65+ as well as certain disabled individuals, to be held from October 15 – December 7, for which JABA would provide counselors. She said last year they met with 1,400 people and saved them \$968K by having them select the appropriate plans. She announced the telephone number to call for an appointment, 434-817-5248, with sessions held Monday – Friday at JABA's office on Hillsdale and seven additional satellite sites across the County. She announced counseling for the Affordable Care Act from November 1 – December 15, with representatives from JABA and the Legal Aid Justice Center. She emphasized that the enrollment period is shorter this year with less advertising. She announced that demolition had just begun at Mountainside Senior Living for a 20-bed dementia unit that will assist with the over 400 area residents who are in need of dementia care.

Mr. Neil Williamson of the Free Enterprise Forum, addressed the Board and said the Forum is a privately funded public policy organization focused on local government in Central Virginia. He addressed the work session item on rural area recreation, praising the quality of the staff report as well as its recommendations. Mr. Williamson said the potential path outlined includes new zoning code language to be developed that is less recreation specific, and development of supplemental regulations. He indicated that while his organization is willing to assist on this path, they prefer adoption of conditions in a special use permit. He stated that rural recreation is an economic driver in the community, representing almost 2,000 jobs and an annual payroll of \$40M as well as being part of the fabric of Albemarle County. He encouraged them to abandon this folly and utilize staff resources to meet the real planning needs of the community rather than devoting hundreds of hours to rework the zoning code. He indicated that the time would be better spent working on the solid waste plan or updating one of the development area master plans that are overdue. In the event they choose to move forward, he asked that the County legal team ensure the changes would not prevent existing facilities from replacing or expanding operations. He encouraged them to vote "no" on the resolution of intent and put forward conditions on special use permits.

Mr. Clark Tracy, resident of Still Meadow and Vice-President of Kingfishers Fishing Club at the Senior Center, addressed the Board. He said he will address water access for fishing and asked that the Board move quickly, as those in his group are aging and do not have a long timeline. He said there are two ramps, one by the bridge and the other by the dam, and the ramp at the dam is currently not useable due to the low water level, while the ramp by the bridge is a death trap as the parking area is too close to the boat loading area. He suggested that they install "no parking" signs, which could save a life.

Ms. Sally Thomas, resident of the Jack Jouett District, addressed the Board. She reminded supervisors of the 40-year sister city relationship with Prato and Poggio Asciano, Italy. She said that these cities are located near Florence and are a center of the European textile industry. She said when they had an Institute of Textile Technology in the area, the relationship was closer. Ms. Thomas stated that about 20 area residents visited Italy in July, and she had the opportunity to speak before the city council of Prato, who presented her with a book of the Medici family properties as well as a photograph with a poem as gifts. She suggested that they find a location to display the gifts.

Mr. Timothy Hulbert, President of the Charlottesville-Albemarle Chamber of Commerce, addressed the Board. He announced that today is St. Francis of Assisi Day and described the Saint as one of the great human beings in all of history. He acknowledged items the chamber and Board had agreed on, such as the business personal property tax, CATEC programming, credentialing, early childhood education, and the Meadow Creek Parkway. He read the opening lines of a prayer written by St. Francis: "Lord, help us to become instruments of your peace."

Ms. Mallek thanked Mr. Hulbert for his work on the Rivanna Station.

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

(Discussion: Ms. Palmer pulled her assigned minutes of July 5, 2017.)

Mr. Randolph **moved** to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Sheffield.

Item No. 8.1. Approval of Minutes: July 5, July 12, and August 15, 2017.

By the above-recorded vote, the minutes were carried forward to the next meeting.

Item No. 8.2. FY 2017 Appropriations.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that Virginia Code §15.2-2507 provides that any locality may amend its budget to adjust the aggregate amount to be appropriated during the fiscal year as shown in the currently adopted budget; provided, however, any such amendment which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures shown in the currently adopted budget must be accomplished by first publishing a notice of a meeting and holding a public hearing before amending the budget. The Code section applies to all County funds, i.e., General Fund, Capital Funds, E911, School Self-Sustaining, etc.

The total change to the FY 17 budget due to the appropriations itemized in Attachment A is (\$24,316.82). A budget amendment public hearing is not required because the amount of the cumulative appropriations does not exceed one percent of the currently adopted budget.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment B) to approve appropriations #2017106, #2017107, #2017108, #2017109, and #2017110 for local government and school division projects and programs as described in Attachment A.

Appropriation #2017106 **\$0.00**

This request will not increase the total County budget.

Source: VATPI Grant Fund \$ 2,513.03

This request is to appropriate \$2,513.03 to the Grants Leveraging Program from the special revenue grant fund established for the Department of Housing and Community Development Virginia Telecommunication Planning Initiative (VATPI) grant. The VATPI grant was completed in FY 17 with excess funds which were originally appropriated from the Grants Leveraging Program.

Appropriation #2017107 **(\$27,412.64)**

Source:	Local Non-tax	\$ (41,325.47)
	Federal	\$ 255.00
	General Fund Transfer to Debt Funds	\$ 13,924.94
	General Fund Transfer to CIP Funds	\$ (13,924.94)
	CIP Funds fund Balance	\$ 13,924.94
	Water Resources Fund fund Balance	\$ (267.11)

This request is to reconcile the FY 17 Debt Service funds and to also reconcile the General Fund Transfer revenues to Debt funds and CIP funds for a net decrease to the total County Budget of \$27,412.64.

The General Government and School Division each has its own Debt Service Fund that provides funding for fees, costs of issuances, and the principal and interest expenses associated with debt issuances for capital projects. This appropriation reconciles the budget to the actual expenses per fund and the actual receipt of revenues per fund in order to maintain a \$0 fund balance. To reconcile the FY 17 Debt Service Funds, this request is to:

- Decrease the appropriation of Piedmont Regional Education Program (PREP) rent revenue by \$41,325.47 to reflect the actual revenue received; and equally increase the General Fund Transfer Revenue to Debt Service;
- Increase the appropriation of interest reimbursement revenue for Qualified School Construction Bond (QSCB) revenue by \$255.00 to reflect the actual revenue received; and equally decrease the General Fund Transfer Revenue to Debt Service; and
- Decrease the appropriated expenditure budget and associated General Fund Transfer Revenue by \$27,145.53 to reflect actual expenditures incurred primarily for the costs

- associated with professional service for fees; and
Decrease the appropriated expenditure budget and associated Water Resources Fund fund balance by \$267.11 to reflect actual expenditures incurred for costs associated with water resources related debt service.

The net change for the above items results in increasing the General Fund Transfer to Debt by \$13,924.94. To complete the reconciliation of the General Fund Transfer Revenues, this request also reduces the General Fund Transfer revenue to the CIP Funds by \$13,924.94 and equally increases the use of CIP Funds fund balance by \$13,924.94.

Appropriation #2017108 **(\$34,224.91)**

Source: General Gov't CIP Fund fund Balance \$ (34,224.91)

This request is to reconcile the Facilities and Environmental Services Project Management Division (PMD)'s FY 17 appropriated sources of revenues with the expenses incurred in FY 17. The initial appropriated budget represents an initial estimate based on a projection of project management support and activities. PMD provides project management support for School, Stormwater, and General Government capital projects and for General Government projects that fall outside of the Capital budget such as the Belvedere and Lewis and Clark projects or other administrative, non-designated CIP activities. An internal service fund was established for PMD in FY 13 to collect fees for OFD's (now, FES's) staff work. PMD charges an hourly-based project management (PM) fee for its services to individual projects. In order to properly account for the FY 17 charges per activity and fund, this appropriation request is to reduce the currently appropriated project management services funds from projects within the General Government CIP Fund and equally reduce the appropriated use of General Government CIP Fund fund balance by \$34,224.91.

Appropriation #2017109 **\$0.00**

This request will not increase the total County budget.

Source: Federal Source \$ 419,487.60
State Source \$ (419,487.60)

This request is to reconcile the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) program funding in the General Government CIP fund by appropriating \$419,487.60 in Federal revenue and by providing a corresponding reduction in State Revenue. The revenue received from VDOT is federal pass-thru funds originating from the Federal Highway Construction Fund. These funds support various sidewalk projects.

Appropriation #2017110 **\$37,320.73**

Source: State Revenue \$ 34,950.72
Grant Fund fund balance \$ 2,370.01

This request is to reconcile the Police Department's Grace Project for gang prevention budget funded by a grant from the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services by re-appropriating \$34,950.72 in State revenue and \$2,370.01 in Grant Fund fund balance not used in the prior fiscal year.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following Resolution to approve appropriations #2017106, #2017107, #2017108, #2017109, and #2017110 for local government and school division projects and programs:

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
ADDITIONAL FY 17 APPROPRIATIONS**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors:

- 1) That Appropriations #2017106, #2017107, #2017108, #2017109, and #2017110 are approved; and
- 2) That the appropriations referenced in Paragraph #1, above, are subject to the provisions set forth in the Annual Resolution of Appropriations of the County of Albemarle for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2017.

**COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
APPROPRIATION SUMMARY**

APP#	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
2017106	4-1213-12200-412200-392000-9999	-2,513.030	16VATPI Grant Close-out
2017106	4-1213-93010-493010-930009-9999	2,513.030	16VATPI Grant Close-out
2017106	3-1000-51000-351000-512006-9999	2,513.030	16VATPI Grant Close-out
2017106	4-1000-99900-499000-999974-9999	2,513.030	16VATPI Grant Close-out
2017107	3-1650-51000-351000-510100-9999	-267.11	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	3-9010-51000-351000-510100-9999	13,924.94	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	3-9010-51000-351000-512004-9999	-13,924.94	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	3-9900-15000-315000-150253-9999	-41,325.47	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	3-9900-33900-333900-330063-1006	255.00	Debt Service Reconciliation

2017107	3-9900-51000-351000-512004-9999	24,760.45	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	3-9910-51000-351000-512004-9999	-10,835.51	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	3-9910-51000-351000-512050-9999	-267.11	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-1000-93010-493010-930003-9999	24,760.45	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-1000-93010-493010-930010-9999	-13,924.94	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-1000-93010-493010-930011-9999	-10,835.51	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-1650-93010-493010-930229-9999	-267.11	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-310000-9999	-16,202.00	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-312810-9999	-104.59	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-910039-9999	-0.32	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-910040-9999	0.32	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-910081-9999	0.41	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920037-9999	-0.12	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920038-9999	-0.50	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920039-9999	-0.21	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920040-9999	0.21	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920043-9999	-0.50	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920044-9999	-0.50	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920045-9999	-0.25	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920046-9999	-0.24	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920047-9999	-0.50	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920048-9999	-0.50	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920050-9999	-0.50	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920051-9999	0.25	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920080-9999	-0.50	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9900-95000-495000-920081-9999	0.02	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9910-95000-495000-312810-9999	-10,843.33	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9910-95000-495000-312811-9999	-4.94	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9910-95000-495000-910077-9999	0.24	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9910-95000-495000-910081-9999	-104.58	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9910-95000-495000-920074-9999	0.26	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9910-95000-495000-920076-9999	0.78	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9910-95000-495000-920077-9999	-21.82	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017107	4-9910-95000-495000-920081-9999	-129.23	Debt Service Reconciliation
2017108	4-9010-21009-421005-312366-2180	-14,393.28	FY 17 PM Services Reconciliation
2017108	4-9010-32018-432010-312366-3140	-2,613.26	FY 17 PM Services Reconciliation
2017108	4-9010-41020-441200-312366-9999	-492.91	FY 17 PM Services Reconciliation
2017108	4-9010-41350-441200-312366-9999	-14,480.26	FY 17 PM Services Reconciliation
2017108	4-9010-43100-443200-312366-9999	-110.64	FY 17 PM Services Reconciliation
2017108	4-9010-71020-471020-312366-7100	-2,134.56	FY 17 PM Services Reconciliation
2017108	3-9010-51000-351000-510100-9999	-34,224.91	FY 17 PM Services Reconciliation
2017108	4-9050-31029-431010-312366-3110	34,224.91	FY 17 PM Services Reconciliation
2017108	4-9050-31029-431010-999999-3110	-34,224.91	FY 17 PM Services Reconciliation
2017109	3-9010-33000-333000-330160-1004	419,487.60	SA2017109 VDOT Revenue Correction
2017109	3-9010-24000-324000-240231-1004	-419,487.60	SA2017109 VDOT Revenue Correction
2017110	3-1233-51000-351000-510100-9999	2370.01	Re-app: Grace Project Grant Close-out
2017110	3-1233-24000-324000-240403-1003	34950.72	Re-app: Grace Project Grant Close-out
2017110	4-1233-31013-431010-130000-1003	6792.12	Re-app: Grace Project Grant Close-out
2017110	4-1233-31013-431010-210000-1003	393.53	Re-app: Grace Project Grant Close-out
2017110	4-1233-31013-431010-312210-1003	30135.08	Re-app: Grace Project Grant Close-out
TOTAL		-44,141.80	

Item No. 8.3. Police Department Career Development Program Revision.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the Albemarle County Police Department (ACPD) has traditionally utilized a Skills Proficiency Program (SPP), which placed an emphasis on specialized technical trainings and task-specific proficiencies, to support raises and career enhancement opportunities. In August 2015, the ACPD transitioned to a Career Development Program (CDP), described in Attachment A. The CDP provides for a more comprehensive evaluation of an officer's development and focuses on not only an officer's technical skills, but also leadership development, and community-oriented policing. The new CDP focuses on career enhancements that build upon the ACPD's Geographic Policing initiative, a strategic priority of the Board of Supervisors.

During this 2015 transition, all Senior and Master Police Officers that were previously in the SPP were "grandfathered" into the CDP for three years with the stipulation that they would be required to meet the new requirements of the CDP by the end of the third year. At the time that these Senior and Master Police Officers made this transition, they did not receive the same pay adjustment that new officers entering the CDP would typically receive.

Under the SPP, officers received a 6% increase based on their entry-level hourly rate (the pay grade minimum) and new officers entering the CDP received a 5% increase based on their current

individual hourly rate. For the majority of the “grandfathered” officers, 5% of their actual hourly rate is greater than 6% of their pay grade minimum. The consequence of this discrepancy has been that these Senior and Master Police Officers have been compensated at a much lower rate than those entering the CDP now. For example, there is a Master Police Officer that was “grandfathered” into the CDP making \$5,210.23 less in salary for the period of August 2015 to September 2017 because of this difference in compensation between the two programs.

The purpose of this report is to present the Board with ACPD and Human Resources staff recommendation to remedy this inequity in a manner that is effective and equitable for all affected staff.

Chief of Police Ron Lantz was recently made aware of this inequity by staff members and is requesting a revision to the CDP that will allow impacted officers to be compensated using the rate basis in the CDP.

There have been nine (9) Senior Police Officers and fifteen (15) Master Police Officers identified as having been “grandfathered” into the CDP from the SPP. (Attachment B) These officers did not receive the adjusted hourly rate under the current CDP basis.

If this request is approved, the retroactive payments covering August 1, 2015 through September 30, 2017 will be a one-time cost of \$43,305, including FICA. Staff recommends this one-time cost be funded by a one-time funding source, the General Fund balance.

The approximate cost for the remaining nine months of FY18, which includes benefits of transitioning all officers from the SPP into the CDP effective October 1, 2017, is \$29,812. Staff recommends funding for the ongoing costs of \$29,812 be funded by the Reserve for Contingencies, which currently has a balance of \$312,184.

Together, these two recommendations have an approximate budgetary impact for FY18 of \$73,117.

If approved, the total ongoing cost of approximately \$40,000 will be included as part of the Police Department's FY19 Recommended Budget.

Calculation of transition costs is outlined in Attachment C.

Staff recommends that the Board authorize the following two actions:

- Make proposed one-time lump sum payments to affected officers to cover the retroactive pay for August 1, 2015 through September 30, 2017.
- Change the current hourly rates of affected officers effective October 1, 2017 to conform to the current CPD standards.

If approved, staff will prepare an appropriation request accordingly for the November 1, 2018 Board of Supervisors meeting.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board authorized staff to make the proposed one-time lump sum payments to affected officers to cover the retroactive pay for August 1, 2015 through September 30, 2017; and authorized staff to change the current hourly rates of affected officers effective October 1, 2017 to conform to the current CPD standards.

Item No. 8.4. Acquisition of Conservation Easements (ACE) Appraisals and Purchases for FY 2017 Applicant Class.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that under County Code § A.1-111(A), the Board determines which open-space easements to purchase under the County's Acquisition of Conservation Easements (ACE) program: "From the list of applications received under section A.1-110(D), the board of supervisors shall designate the initial pool of parcels identified for conservation easements to be purchased. The size of the pool shall be based upon the funds available for easement purchases in the current fiscal year and the purchase price of each conservation easement in the pool established under section A.1-111(B)." If any applicants withdraw from consideration, other applicants may be substituted until the eligible applicants or available funding is exhausted.

On June 7, 2017, the Board adopted the ACE Committee's recommendation to approve the final ranking order for the FY 17 applicant pool and to appraise the two remaining eligible properties: Kerley and Earnhardt. Two higher ranked applicants (Bloch and Robertson) withdrew from the program late to pursue other options. (See Attachment A for criteria scoring). Following the Board's June 7 action, the Kerley and Earnhardt properties were appraised at \$330,000 and \$248,000, respectively. Pursuant to County Code § A.1-106(B), the Appraisal Review Committee (ARC) then reviewed those appraisals to assure that they were consistent with appropriate appraisal guidelines and practices. Following that review, the ARC adjusted the Kerley property's appraised value to \$360,000. With that adjustment, the ARC is prepared to recommend these values to the Board. Though the ARC valued the Kerley property at \$360,000, the County would pay an adjusted value of \$122,400 for this easement, based on the income grid in County Code § A.1-111.

After two new acquisitions last winter, the County has now acquired easements on 48 properties

and protected the open-space resources on 9,284 acres. The County has acquired these easements at a cost that is 20% less than the appraised easement value using of grants and donations, and adjustments to price based on owner income.

Both properties under consideration (Kerley and Earnhardt) scored enough points to be eligible for ACE funding. With \$704,271 of County funding available for this class (carry-over and reimbursements from Virginia Department of Agriculture & Consumers Services (VDACS) Farmland Preservation), \$48,293 left over from a 2017 VDACS Farmland Preservation grant, and \$250,000 from the FY 16 appropriation, the County has enough funds to acquire easements on both properties. The large carry-over resulted when three applicants from last year's class withdrew after receiving the County's invitations to sell the County an easement. The acquisition of easements on the current two properties would eliminate 19 development rights and protect:

- 1) 327 acres of farm and forest land
- 2) approximately 2,100 feet of state road frontage, including 300 feet on Route 53
- 3) approximately 2,000 feet of riparian buffers
- 4) 159 acres of "prime" farm and forest land
- 5) two working family farms 6) one property in the Southern Albemarle Rural Historic District.

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

The ACE Committee and staff recommends that the Board:

- 1) Authorize staff to invite Kerley and Earnhardt to make written offers to sell conservation easements to the County for no more than: an income adjusted value of \$122,400 for the Kerley easement and full value of \$248,000 for the Earnhardt easement;
- 2) Accept offers from either or both of these owners to sell conservation easements for no more than the above amounts; and
- 3) Authorize the County Executive to sign the Deeds of Easement and related forms on behalf of the County for either or both of these two easements once such documents are approved by the County Attorney.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board:

- 1) authorized staff to invite Kerley and Earnhardt to make written offers to sell conservation easements to the County for no more than: an income adjusted value of \$122,400 for the Kerley easement and full value of \$248,000 for the Earnhardt easement;**
- 2) accepted offers from either or both of these owners to sell conservation easements for no more than the above amounts; and**
- 3) authorized the County Executive to sign the Deeds of Easement and related forms on behalf of the County for either or both of these two easements once such documents are approved by the County Attorney.**

Item No. 8.5. County Grant Application/Award Report, ***was received for information.***

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

The attached Grants Report provides brief descriptions of one grant application submitted and two grant awards received during the time period of August 13, 2017 through September 9, 2017. This report also includes a comprehensive look at potential Five Year Financial Plan implications if projects and/or programs that are supported by grants are continued with local funding after the grants end. As grant funding ends, recommendations will be included in the County Executive's proposed annual budgets for the Board's consideration as to whether local funding should be used to continue those projects and programs. No County funds will be used to fund the continuation of those projects and programs without Board approval.

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

This report is to provide information only. No action is required.

GRANT REPORT ACTIVITY – August 13, 2017 through Sept. 9, 2017

Applications made during this time.

Granting Entity	Grant Project	Type	Amount Requested	Match Required	Match Sources	Department	Purpose
Department of Justice	Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program FY 2017 – Community Policing	Federal	\$14,237.00	\$0	None	Police	This grant will provide support for Community Policing overtime activities provided by the Albemarle County Police Department such as bike patrols, participation in community events, etc.

Awards received during this time.

Granting Entity	Grant Project	Type	Amount Awarded	Match Required	Match Source	Department	Purpose
Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Driving Under Influence (DUI) Reduction	Federal	\$20,000.00	\$10,000.00	In-Kind	Police	This grant will be used to provide additional funds for increased DUI enforcement and saturation patrols in Albemarle County and sobriety checkpoints.
Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Speed Reduction	Federal	\$8,734.00	\$4,367.00	In-Kind	Police	This grant will be used to provide additional funds for increased traffic safety enforcement in Albemarle County.

Comprehensive Look at Potential Five Year Financial Plan Grant Impacts:
The following chart includes grants that are expected to end within the next five years and an estimate of the County’s cost over the next five years if the grant-supported position, project or program is continued after the grant ends. The continuation of those positions, projects and programs will be considered as part of the County’s annual budget process.

Byrne Justice Grants have 10% match first year, 25% 2nd, 50% 3rd, 75% 4th and 100 percent in 5th year. Updated FY18 to match request

Grant Entity	Grant Name	Summary	# of FTE	Designation of Current Budget Match	Expected End Date	FY18 Grant Amount*	Potential Financial Impact - Includes Five Year Plan salary assumptions				
							FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23
Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Service	FY16 Byrne/Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Law Enforcement	This grant provides funding for a current police Sergeant position to form and lead the new Problem Oriented Policing (POP) Team and includes overtime/equipment/ supporting costs. This grant requires the local match to increase each year with the goal at the end of the grant to be for a full time employee to be hired and associated costs to be absorbed in the department.	1	Grants Leveraging Fund	6/30/2020	\$69,950.00	\$ 104,925.00	\$ 139,900.00	\$ 139,509.00	\$ 139,509.00	\$ 139,509.00
*does not include local match funds							\$ 104,925.00	\$ 139,900.00	\$ 139,509.00	\$ 139,509.00	\$ 139,509.00

The following chart includes an estimate of the County’s cost over the next five years for the replacement of equipment that was purchased with grant funding. The replacement of such equipment will be considered as part of the County’s annual budget process.

						Potential Financial Impact					
Grant Entity	Grant Name	Summary	# of FTE	Designation of Current Budget Match	Actual End Date	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	
Federal Emergency Management Agency	2006 Assistance to Firefighters	This grant provided funds for the purchase of turnout gear in 2006. The equipment life is now expiring and the estimated amount of approximately \$140,000, which is typically budgeted in a given year for this expense, is now estimated to be inadequate to replace the equipment over time. The additional funds listed in this chart reflects the additional costs estimated to replace this equipment each year. Costs in the out years is estimated to decrease due to the newly centralized management process and expected efficiencies.	0	Fire Rescue Fund	6/30/2006	\$ 191,800.00	Starting in FY20 the turnout gear purchased with this grant will have been replaced based on the date of manufacture of 2008 and a useful life of 10 years after the date of manufacture.				
Virginia Department of Emergency Management	Equipment Grant	This grant provided funds for the purchase of fitness equipment. The equipment life span is expiring.	0	Fire Rescue Fund	6/30/2009	\$ 53,345.00	\$ 54,934.00	TBD	TBD	TBD	
						\$ 245,145.00	\$ 54,934.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	

Item No. 8.6. Annual Cash and Non-Cash Proffer Report, ***was received for information.***

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that in 2007, the Board directed staff to provide a quarterly report on the status of cash proffers. Since that time, the report has been expanded to include updates on non-cash proffers. The last quarterly report was provided to the Board on April 5, 2017. With that report, proffer reporting was switched to a yearly basis. This report includes cash proffer information for FY 2017.

Proffer Activity for Fiscal Year 2017:

- A. New Proffered Revenue: Two rezonings were approved this fiscal year that increased the amount of estimated total proffered revenue to be received. Brookhill was approved November 9, 2016 and a total of \$500,000 in cash proffers will be received to fund public transit. The Foothills/Daily property was rezoned February 8, 2017 and an estimated \$893,606 in cash proffers will be received for the CIP.
- B. Total Proffered Revenue: Total proffered revenue is \$50,265,932.45.
- C. Cash Revenue: The County received a total of \$1,546,350.48 from existing cash proffers during fiscal year 2017. (Attachment A)
- D. Appropriations: A total of \$1,168,101.09 was appropriated during fiscal year 2017.

(Attachment A)

- E. Expenditures: A total of \$77,952.72 was expended. (Attachment A)
- F. Current Available Funds: As of June 30, 2017, the available proffered cash on-hand is \$6,050,198.82 (including interest earnings on proffer revenue received). Some of these funds were proffered for specific projects, while others may be used for general projects within the CIP. Of the available proffered cash on-hand, \$3,729,628.29 (including interest earned) is currently appropriated (Attachment B). The net cash balance is \$2,320,570.53 and may be used for future expenditures.

FY 2017 Survey of Cash Proffers for the Commission on Local Government:

State law requires localities accepting cash proffers to report to the Commission on Local Government annually. The County's Report for FY 2017 is attached.

Cash proffers are a source of revenue to address impacts from development, and they support the funding of important County projects which would otherwise be funded through general tax revenue. Using cash proffer funding for current or planned FY17-FY19 CIP projects builds capacity in the CIP by freeing up funding for other projects. In addition, non-cash proffers provide improvements that might otherwise need to be funded by general tax revenue.

This Executive Summary is for information only and no action is required by the Board.

Item No. 8.7. Quarterly Transformational Initiatives Efforts Update, ***was received for information.***

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the Board directed staff to provide quarterly updates on the progress of the County's transformational initiatives.

The County is working on transformational initiatives intended to improve long-term structural realignment within the County. Attachment A provides brief updates on the following transformational initiatives: Time & Attendance, Website Redesign, Records Management and Housing Transition.

There is no budget impact associated with this project update.

This report is to provide information only. No action is required.

Agenda Item No. 9. **Work Session:** Rural Recreation.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that this work session is to seek better definition of the Board's interest in ordinance amendments that improve alignment between allowed recreational opportunities in the Rural Areas with the County's goals stated in its Comprehensive Plan. On April 5, 2017, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution of intent for a possible zoning text amendment to remove "swim, golf, tennis and similar athletic facilities" as a use by special use permit in the Rural Areas. During the review of the text amendment, staff discovered that other uses in the Rural Areas would permit these activities.

The Comprehensive Plan contains the following statement: "Review the zoning regulations related to recreational uses to see whether updates are needed to better reflect rural recreational activities that should be available by special use permit in the Rural Area." Relevant language from the Comprehensive Plan is included as Attachment A. The original resolution of intent included the review of only some of the recreation uses permitted in the Rural Areas (RA) zoning district. Staff has identified additional uses in the ordinance that may permit recreational activity in the RA. Attachment B includes provisions of the ordinance that staff has identified as related to recreational use of the RA. Staff has provided comments on each of the uses that permit some type of recreational activity in the RA in Attachment C. Numerous recreational facilities exist in the RA. These facilities are either non-conforming or were approved by special use permit. Staff recommends that any ordinance amendment not affect these uses.

Processing a zoning text amendment has an impact on resources. While this is not a direct budget impact, it directs resources away from other activities. A text amendment that simplifies the ordinance will have a positive impact on the budget, as it reduces processing times and resources required for review. Prohibition of activities may result in lost economic activity and a loss of associated taxes.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution of Intent and comment on staff's recommended approach for the zoning text amendment as contained in Attachment D. No changes to the ordinance development process are anticipated as a result of the new resolution.

Mr. Bill Fritz, Chief of Special Projects, presented. He noted that a staff report with attachments had been provided to Supervisors, and he presented a slide that reviewed the background of the rural recreation item. He said the 2015 Comprehensive Plan included a recommendation to review rural recreation, and in April 2017 the Board adopted a resolution of intent to remove swim, golf, tennis and similar athletic facilities from rural area zoning districts and specify that existing facilities were to be grandfathered. Mr. Fritz said in July 2017, the Board was presented with a process for moving forward with the first open house held that month, at which he said some problems were discovered. He stated

that he learned the changes would not be effective, as there were multiple other uses that permitted these activities. Mr. Fritz reviewed the Comprehensive Plan, which calls for a review of recreational activities in the rural area and specifies that some uses need to be located in the rural area while other uses were not reliant on a rural setting for their success. He acknowledged that the current list is outdated and does not reflect changing types of recreational activities. He said the criteria for new uses is that the activity not impact agriculture or forestry, change the character of an area, or impact rural resources, including natural and historic resources, should not require amenities, such as public water and sewer, or generate a need for fire, police, or rescue services. He said the recreation use should not generate traffic that would change the character of the area or exceed road capacity. He said the activity should be reversible so the land could be used for primary rural uses.

Mr. Fritz presented a list of recreational uses in the rural area zoning districts by special use permit, which includes the following: community centers; clubs and lodges; swim, golf, tennis or similar athletic facilities; and day and boarding camps. He noted that some of these uses mix recreational and non-recreational uses, and lodges are not recreational because they permit civic, patriotic, and paternal organizations. He said that day and boarding camps are specifically identified in the Comprehensive Plan as needing to be located in a rural setting to thrive. Mr. Fritz removed lodges and camps from the list and said the remaining items need to be addressed. He explained that a community center includes one that has cultural, educational, and recreational activities, which could be amended to remove recreational activities while retaining those that are non-recreational. Mr. Fritz noted that clubs in this context are defined as nonprofit facilities that have dining, golf, swimming, tennis, and other similar activities. He said these activities also allow for food and entertainment and noted that it is staff's opinion that a distinction between for-profit and non-profit has minimal land use implications. He stated that he recommends removal of the distinction with the substitution of a new use of recreational activities or some similar term.

Mr. Fritz presented a summary of comments obtained at a July open house on rural recreation and reviewed some themes: protect existing uses from change, include fertilizers and pesticides in addressing natural resources, recreational use does not qualify for land use taxation, recreation as a health benefit to the community, if rural land use restricts ballfields they may use up available space in the development area as an alternative to residential development on rural land, and the changes should not impact informal recreation. He stated that staff recommends three groups of changes to facilitate discussion, the first being to separate recreational from non-recreational activities by redefining community center to remove the recreational component from the definition, while leaving the cultural and educational component as by special use permit. Mr. Fritz noted that clubs and lodges would be separated, with lodges remaining as by special use permit.

Mr. Fritz said the second step would be to determine the level of recreational activities to be permitted and determine if there are some activities that would not be appropriate in any rural area. He reviewed the third step, developing review criteria for recreational uses appropriate in the rural area, which would involve revising and developing definitions and establishing review criteria and development standards. He said this would also involve ensuring that existing approved and nonconforming activities could continue and have options to modify, as necessary, to reflect changing needs. He said the next step would be to develop the appropriate process for the review of recreational activities by having staff work with stakeholders, hold open houses, present comments at Planning Commission work sessions, and hold public hearings. He concluded and invited comment.

Ms. Palmer asked for the distinction between clubs and lodges and what would happen to clubs if lodges remained as a special use permit. Mr. Fritz responded that clubs are nonprofit and have a recreational component, while lodges have a civic, fraternal or patriotic aspect and are allowed by special use in the rural area.

Ms. Palmer asked what would happen to clubs. Mr. Fritz replied that staff recommends a redefining of clubs to create a new category of recreational activities. He said they are seeking to regulate based on land use impacts and not on nonprofit or for-profit status.

Ms. Palmer asked about camps. Mr. Fritz replied that day camps have their own definition and may operate seasonally as commercial or non-commercial, relying on a rural atmosphere for their success. He said they are not proposing changes to day or boarding camps.

Ms. Mallek asked for confirmation that lodges are not residential locations where people stay overnight. She asked how this would affect community centers, such as the one in Whitehall. Mr. Fritz responded that they want to accommodate existing facilities by special use permit so they could continue to operate as well as allow them to modify or change, as needed. He said they would try to clean up the definitions of community centers and lodges.

Ms. Mallek emphasized the importance of benchmarks to use to make decisions so they would not make up things as they go along. Mr. Fritz explained that they already have some criteria in the Comprehensive Plan that they could turn into review criteria or regulations and are reviewing ways to do this, which would also involve discussions with the community to establish the criteria.

Ms. Mallek noted there is language that allows for grandfathering, additions, and evolutions. Mr. Kamptner confirmed that the grandfathering provision treats it as a conforming use and allows an organization to continue and to make structural changes and modifications.

Mr. Fritz said they would need to develop criteria for new items.

Ms. Mallek commented that the predominant question is whether they should have new ones. She addressed the issue of golf courses in the rural area, as the region is in the midst of a drought and these areas rely on well water. She expressed apprehension over golf courses that water every day and spew chemicals.

Mr. Fritz indicated that the Board could impose conditions on any special use permit or deny the permits, and said what they are talking about is cleaning up the ordinance so the definitions would be easier to read. He noted that when reviewing special use applications, they already determined if it was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Mallek brought up the issue of impoundments, which she said are part of the natural system. She said that an overflow from an impoundment would feed a stream all the way downstream, and one should not be allowed to do anything out in the country.

Mr. Randolph addressed Attachment C 10.2.1 and staff's comment on defining game preserves. He said this is a good idea and should be permitted in the rural areas, provided it requires a special use permit. He expressed agreement with staff that it is appropriate to remove recreation from the definition of community center. Mr. Randolph indicated that he would like to address the case of an existing recreational facility that is damaged by natural causes or malfeasance. He stated that he does not see any problem with permitting rebuilding as long as it is of the same scale and in the same location, though a special use permit should be required if either of these were changed. He proposed that they establish numerical performance criteria for staff to rate projects, which could include water use, land impacts, conservation, road and surface impacts, potential for reversibility, and noise and light considerations, to end the impasse and determine whether the special use process is necessary. He said this approach would make things clearer for both staff and the applicant.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Randolph if the list of criteria he suggested would already be evaluated. Mr. Randolph indicated that he supports a very clear set of criteria for assessment so that applicants would know what is required, and so that staff has a clearer understanding.

Ms. McKeel noted that she is a member and serves on the board of the Greencroft Club. She said she does not think this would impact her ability to be impartial on this matter.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Kamptner for more specifics in terms of what is covered under grandfathering. Mr. Kamptner replied that the County could tailor the grandfathering provision in any way it desired and could permit any building that was destroyed to be rebuilt. He said the nonconforming regulations also allows this, though it requires an analysis to determine if the destruction was at least 50%. He said it is easier to deal with through a grandfathering provision, as it provides facility owners with the greatest understanding and clarity and provides the County with a well-defined statement as to what this allows.

Ms. McKeel noted a comment about future growth and adaptation on a property and asked how this would be addressed. Mr. Kamptner replied that the Board could choose to incorporate this into a grandfathering provision or series of provisions.

Mr. Randolph expressed his desire not to put a straightjacket on clubs and organizations in the rural area by limiting their size in perpetuity, and said they should allow for elasticity while still requiring the special use process in cases of changes to scale or location.

Ms. Mallek stated they would have to find a way to distinguish changes that require review and those that do not so they would not have clubs having to come before the Board for minor changes, such as adding a bathroom. She expressed support for clearing up definitions and separation of use clarifications, adding that she would like to put off discussion of game preserves until another time because this is an important issue requiring discussion.

Mr. Kamptner reminded Supervisors that staff is asking for consideration of the adoption of a resolution of intent to begin a formal process.

Mr. Fritz offered to modify the process by holding community discussions and then having a joint work session with the Planning Commission.

Ms. Mallek and Mr. Randolph expressed their approval for a joint work session.

Mr. Dill asked if this would involve wineries, breweries, and distilleries. Mr. Fritz replied that the County views those as separate issues, although a winery could apply for a special use.

Ms. McKeel conveyed that leaders of the many clubs in the County had expressed concern with grandfathering, and she asked if staff would like to address a letter of reassurance to them.

Mr. Fritz indicated that he would invite them to the next open house.

Ms. Palmer **moved** that the Board adopt the proposed Resolution of Intent and the staff-recommended approach for a zoning text amendment. The **motion** was seconded by Ms. Mallek.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Sheffield.

Ms. Palmer thanked Neil Williamson for mentioning spending time on the Solid Waste Management Plan.

RESOLUTION OF INTENT

WHEREAS, the Rural Area Chapter of the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan states that one of the objectives of the County is to “promote rural and historic landscapes,” and one of the strategies to achieve that objective is to “review the zoning regulations related to recreational uses to see whether updates are needed to better reflect rural recreational activities that should be available by special use permit in the Rural Area”; and

WHEREAS, Albemarle County Code §18-10 lists permitted by-right and special use permit recreational uses in the Rural Areas zoning district; and

WHEREAS, it is desired to implement the Rural Area Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan by reviewing all zoning regulations related to recreational uses in the Rural Areas zoning district and amending the Albemarle County Zoning Ordinance to reflect which rural recreational activities should be permitted in the Rural Areas zoning district.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT for purposes of public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning and development practices, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby adopts a resolution of intent to consider amending Albemarle County Code §18-10 and any other sections of the Zoning Ordinance deemed to be appropriate to achieve the purposes described herein; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing on the zoning text amendment proposed by this resolution of intent, and make its recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, at the earliest possible date.

Agenda Item No. 10. Update on Stormwater Utility Program Scope and Program Costs.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that for the last several years, Albemarle County has been considering how best to support a water resources program that complies with federal and state mandates and that meets growing community expectations. Attachment A includes a brief history of Board actions related to this effort, updated from a version provided on July 5, 2017. In 2014, the Board appointed an advisory committee to develop recommendations for a funding mechanism. On September 7, 2016, the Board adopted the committee’s recommendations, generally summarized as follows, and directed staff to begin taking actions to establish a stormwater utility:

- **Scope of program** - implement a water resources program that fully complies with regulatory requirements, such as those associated with the cleanup of Chesapeake Bay, and that meets other long-term needs and responsibilities, such as drainage infrastructure maintenance and watershed improvements
- **Funding mechanism** - support this program with a County-wide stormwater utility with a fee structure that relates the fee to a property’s contribution to stormwater runoff, based in part on the amount of impervious area

On July 5, 2017, staff updated the Board on utility progress and an effort to characterize a stormwater infrastructure maintenance program.

County staff continues to work with the consulting firm Amec Foster Wheeler (AFW) to develop a stormwater utility. On June 20, AFW facilitated a brainstorming session with staff from multiple departments to develop draft policies related to the stormwater utility rate and credit program. A stakeholder advisory panel consisting of the members of the former Water Resources Funding Advisory Committee evaluated these draft policies in meetings on July 18 and September 11. As staff finalizes the proposed rate and credit policies, it is considering the panel’s feedback. Additionally, AFW has been working with staff to develop the processes and mechanisms necessary to compute fees for each County property and add the fees to the property tax bills.

Staff has been re-examining the resources - both human and capital - needed to implement the program scope over a 10-year period as articulated in the recommendations adopted in 2016. Additional staff will be required to manage the new programs, such as the infrastructure maintenance program discussed in July. In addition, staff anticipate that less than one full-time equivalent (FTE) position will be needed to administer the utility. A summary of anticipated staffing needs is included as Attachment B.

Quantifying the cost to comply with the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) mandate - for both the Chesapeake Bay and local streams - remains challenging to due to the uncertainty of future permit requirements imposed by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. Staff have made minor changes to the anticipated costs of this program based on current information and understandings. Likewise, staff have incorporated additional information into the predicted costs associated with a rural-focused watershed restoration program.

A summary of updated program costs is included as Attachment C.

Community engagement will be aligned with key milestones and will include a comprehensive webpage and “what’s my fee” look-up tool.

Attachment A includes a summary of the anticipated implementation schedule for remaining actions. Staff anticipates the utility to be introduced in FY 19, with the first billing occurring in May 2019 to coincide with the issuance of 2019 first-half real property tax bills.

This update on work progress does not have an effect on the budget.

No action is required. This work session is an opportunity for staff to update the Board on work efforts related to establishing a stormwater utility.

Ms. McKeel emphasized that this issue is for discussion only and no action would be taken today.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Director of Facilities and Environmental Services, presented a brief introduction. He introduced Greg Harper as the presenter, whom he said has been leading the utility analysis effort. He said they will provide an update on program costs and will come before the Board in December with an update on infrastructure costs and assumptions that feed into this, with a January presentation to review the assumptions that feed into the model.

Mr. Greg Harper, Chief of Environmental Services, presented. He outlined the aims of his presentation, which are to update the Board on progress made towards the establishment of a stormwater utility and refinements to the estimated costs. He presented a slide with the funding mechanism timeline, which began in 2014 when the Board began looking at dedicated funding and established an advisory committee, which presented recommendations in 2015 that were approved by the Board in 2016. He said they are now working out the details for the establishment of a utility with the first billing proposed for June 2019, and his next slide contained an implementation schedule. Mr. Harper stated that they plan to present to the Board again in December on a gray infrastructure or drainage management program, including proposed guidelines for the extent of service. He explained that by April or May 2018, they would plan to have the Board consider and adopt an ordinance to kick off the utility. He said a lot of public outreach would be necessary, for which they would have to finalize a draft rate formula and costs.

Mr. Harper next reviewed the fee calculation process beginning with the master account file, a spreadsheet containing all parcels and associated fees and data used to calculate those fees. He said this was fed by the rate formula, and the rate model would calculate the fee per billing unit, which represents 500 square feet of impervious area. He reviewed components of the rate model, including GIS data, financial criteria, and program implementation costs. He said they are making GIS refinements, which he estimated would not take more than a week or two of one person’s time. He reminded the Board that staff met recently to develop rate and credit policies which were brought before an advisory panel of former members of the Board appointed advisory committee, which provided advice on the draft rate policies.

Mr. Harper next reviewed program cost refinements, which he said involves four major areas: current costs, TMDL capital program, gray infrastructure, and green infrastructure. He next presented an Excel table of estimated costs for the first 10 years of operation by the four categories. The next slide presented these costs for the years 2015 and 2016, which totaled \$5.349 million in 2015 and \$3.653 million in 2016. He noted that the reduction in costs from 2015 to 2016 was due to a reduction in Chesapeake Bay TMDL requirements, as they had expected to be further ahead than expected in meeting these. Mr. Harper listed the most recent updated cost estimate at \$4.861 million, with the greatest change being estimated operating costs, which had increased to \$2.349 million from \$1.27 million due to increased staffing requirements and the fact they have now included additional programs in the model, such as contract services, including the Soil and Water Conservation District staff costs. He said the original estimate was net, after collection of program fees, whereas the current estimate does not include the fee collection. He explained the original estimate also did not account for increased staffing that would be needed as the program gets underway to do GIS work and to manage the infrastructure maintenance program. He said they believe administration of the utility would require less than one full-time employee.

Ms. Palmer asked if a public works department would take care of gray infrastructure and how many employees would be associated with it. Mr. Harper explained they are reaching out to Charlottesville and other localities to determine if it would make sense at any point during the next 10 years to have a crew. He said that at first it would make more sense to hire contractors, and they would need a program manager and two inspectors.

Mr. Henry interjected that the program would not require a public works department immediately but they would assess this over time, and at some point it might make financial sense to have an internal crew. He emphasized that the cost of the program was accounted for by the infrastructure cost.

Ms. McKeel asked if the summary of anticipated staffing needs in Attachment B is what Mr. Harper is referencing. Mr. Harper confirmed that it is.

Ms. Mallek commented that gray infrastructure work was possibly being conducted by emergency, which was the least cost-effective way, and this had been paid for by the 0.77 cents that was layered on in FY15 to pay for these costs. She said she believes the committee was convinced that being more organized, thorough, and planning ahead of time to determine where risky places were and to fix them was a better way.

Mr. Randolph encouraged them to look at what other localities are doing with gray water management in terms of using technology to provide monitoring, which could reduce the number of personnel required. He suggested they introduce robotics as a way to conduct inspections for leaks.

Mr. Kamptner addressed Ms. Mallek's comments about fixing emergencies, pointing out that they were private facilities that had failed and were converted to public facilities through the repair process.

Ms. McKeel emphasized the importance of having inspectors, as the County had experienced what could happen when a failure occurs.

Ms. Palmer indicated that constituents had been asking what the costs would be for an average home and asked if they could have this information available so people would feel more comfortable.

Mr. Harper said they estimated the average homeowner would pay \$50–\$100/year, and a proposed draft to be available early next year would give people a sense of what they might be looking at.

Mr. Dill reported that at the previous evening's stormwater management discussion, farmers had expressed concern that these fees could be the tipping point for marginal farmers. He said they were also concerned with loss of productive land from 100-foot stream buffers.

Ms. Mallek commented that the stream buffer requirement was separate, although people were worried about many different things.

Mr. Randolph said they were pushing towards a new world of permeable surfaces that they should encourage builders to utilize for driveways. He said that while there were local companies that could install permeable pavers for new driveways, he knew of no company in Central Virginia that is able to remove an existing driveway and replace it with permeable pavers. He said they should consider ways to incentivize companies to offer this service.

Ms. Palmer put forward a suggestion by a constituent that they consider offering continuing education credits to farmers who attend conservation or stormwater classes.

Mr. Harper said the next part of the presentation would provide detail on various cost categories and asked if the Board would like him to continue with this level of detail.

Ms. McKeel asked that he continue.

Mr. Harper indicated that the TMDL cost estimate was reduced but would be a bit higher than they thought. He explained that the first two years would have costs of \$750K/year followed by a lag until the next permit is issued by Department of Environmental Quality in 2023, which is likely to include new requirements. He said they are using a figure of \$500K/year going forward from that point, as the exact cost is unknown. He said they had estimated a cost of \$5 million to meet the local TMDL which totaled \$500K/year over 10 years. He next reviewed green infrastructure costs, which he said were non-mandated investments in watersheds to conduct assessments every other year and identify areas for improvement, such as public education or capital projects. He said by the third year they would conduct CIP plan implementation. Mr. Harper noted that the original estimate was \$474K, which has been revised to \$500K. He said he will skip over the revised costs of gray infrastructure implementation as this would be a topic for discussion in December. He reviewed estimated program costs for dam safety, which had originally been forecast at \$137K, but are now revised to \$40 thousand as they have wrapped up dam break analyses. He said they would soon conduct an assessment of the Mint Springs spillway which they think will need replacement, as it is old and crumbling.

Mr. Harper concluded his presentation with a list of next steps that included refining of GIS data, a focus on infrastructure management costs, finalization of the rate structure and credit policy, a return to the Board in December, and a public outreach campaign in early 2018.

Ms. Mallek emphasized the benefits of catching things when they are small and affordable, and she expressed hope that they could partner with the Soil and Water Conservation District and the Rivanna River Basin Commission, which conducts baseline stream assessments and brought in a \$500K grant that was used to construct a wetland in Crozet.

Agenda Item No. 11. BF Yancey Transition Planning.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that in May 2017, the Albemarle County School Board voted to close BF Yancey Elementary School after many years of studies, transformational initiatives, and community conversations in the face of declining enrollments and the loss of state accreditation and grant funding. At the same time, BF Yancey Elementary School is recognized as an integral part of the Esmont community. Recent capital investments like upgrades to the broadband internet, heating and cooling, and septic systems means the building itself is fit to remain in use.

Building Transition

On September 14, 2017, the School Board voted to declare the Yancey property to be surplus. On the filing of the resolution, the deed transferred to the Board of Supervisors at the end of September. Immediate use and budgetary impacts will be shared with the Board during the presentation of this agenda item. Staff plans to return to the Board in December with options for additional near-term uses.

Community Engagement

Over the summer, Albemarle County staff met several times with community members to devise public outreach strategies and understand community priorities for the building to transition into its next phase as a community asset. This effort has built on the work of the Yancey Workgroup, which met throughout 2013 to look at ways to utilize the building outside of the traditional school day to provide community services. This has included the following outreach initiatives:

- Letter mailed to all residences in the BF Yancey district with webpage, email, phone number to learn more and provide feedback, and invitation to Open House
- Community Open House at BF Yancey on June 29 (50 attendees) and online form to respond to questions (4 respondents) (Attachment A: Community Feedback Summary)
- Meetings of the "BF Yancey Transitions Team," June - present (Attachment B: Transition Team Statements).

In addition, community partners and County departments have been engaged in initial conversations to understand the level of interest and potential space needs for providing services across a range of program areas supported by the community, including recreation, clubs, food, intergenerational care, health, and education. To facilitate a community-oriented planning process now that the property has been turned over to the Board of Supervisors, staff recommends the Board direct the County Executive to appoint the BF Yancey Transition Advisory Committee (YTAC). The YTAC will work with a staff Technical Work Group and community organizations to develop recommendations to the Board for future long-term uses of the school building and grounds, and serve as liaisons to ensure the recommendations reflect community interests in Esmont and greater Southern Albemarle. The Technical Work Group will be comprised of staff from Facilities and Environmental Services, Parks & Recreation, Community Development, Office of Management and Budget, and the County Executive's Office, and will plan for the one-time and ongoing resource needs of the building and grounds. A full write-up of the proposed transition process is found in Attachment C. The draft YTAC charge will be sent under separate cover following a meeting with the Yancey Transition Team scheduled for September 28.

When the property transferred, the County's building insurance policy was amended to add BF Yancey to the portfolio, using FES's current administrative budget. The efforts related to the planning process require only staff time, which will be absorbed into existing departmental budgets. Future building use, operations, and maintenance will be planned for in FY 19 budget requests.

Provide input on the proposed transition process and Direct the Interim County Executive to appoint the BF Yancey Transition Advisory Committee.

Ms. Emily Kilroy, Community Engagement Specialist, presented. She reviewed her presentation outline as follows: Building and Grounds Status, Community Engagement, Proposed Process Timeline, and Discussion.

Ms. McKeel interrupted to recognize that School Board Chair, Kate Acuff, and Member Graham Paige had entered the auditorium. She thanked them for joining the meeting.

Ms. Kilroy reported that in May, the School Board had voted to reassign students to Scottsville and Red Hill schools, with the summer months devoted to moving furniture and equipment, although some items remain in place to support some level of continuing operation. She said a custodian had been onsite all summer to maintain the building. She reminded Supervisors that on September 14 the School Board voted to surplus the building, with deed recording on September 25. Ms. Kilroy presented a slide of the state code that authorizes a building transfer, highlighting that as soon as the deed is recorded the title should vest in the appropriate county, city or town.

Ms. McKeel asked for confirmation that the insurance transfer had been taken care of. Ms. Kilroy confirmed this, commenting that the School Board cannot insure a building it does not own.

Ms. Kilroy reviewed fiscal impacts, with the School Board having directed funding of \$1,850/month for the cost of reduced operating mode for the remainder of FY18. She said this was for basic upkeep management of the property, and a slide provided a list of items to which the funding was directed. She noted that a keyless entry system is being installed. She said the only impact to the County is the cost of insurance, which has been incorporated into the budget. She reviewed activities for which the school building is being used or will be used, including a food pantry, Albemarle County Police Department facility access, Parks and Recreation open gym and summer camp, and an election polling station. She said the Building Services budget will cover the cost of operating and maintaining the facility in FY18. She indicated that the County would create a technical work group comprised of staff to determine what it means to own, operate, and maintain the building and grounds. She said a database of potential future users would be maintained to assess potential opportunities and conflicts. She said they will engage FES, Parks and Recreation, Zoning, Office of Management and Budget, Public Safety and the County Executive to determine what level of financial support would be needed in FY19.

Ms. Kilroy next reviewed community engagement and said the school is an important asset for the Esmont community. She said a letter was sent to all residents of the B.F. Yancey school district in June that reviewed reassignment of students and steps to assess future uses of the school, and she noted that 65 people had attended an open house to share their hopes for uses of the building. She said the Yancey Transition Team was formed and met over the summer to give voice to the community and create dialog between the School Board, staff and the community. She reviewed feedback obtained from the open house, which demonstrated support for keeping the building open with many ideas for proposed uses, including child care, childhood education, senior programs, a food bank, recreation, adult education, and health care training.

Ms. Kilroy expressed that staff would like the County Executive to appoint a B.F. Yancey Advisory Committee to keep the momentum from the transition team moving and reminded supervisors that she had distributed a draft proposal to them last week. She reviewed the responsibilities of the committee as follows: serve as a conduit to the community, honor the history of the school, establish guiding principles for future use, and provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on future uses. She said the committee would work with the technical work group. She reviewed a proposed timeline, with the committee convening in October, proposals for near-term uses presented to the Board in December, final recommendations to the Board in March, and addition of items to the FY19 budget to be adopted in April.

Mr. Dill asked if they would consider commercial options to help defray rental costs. Ms. Kilroy replied that she thought the community was supportive of any kind of tenant, particularly one that would offer jobs.

Ms. Palmer stated that she was confused on the timing of recommendations for the budget. She asked what activities were considered to be near-term or long-term uses, with Wi-Fi access being an example. Ms. Kilroy replied that Wi-Fi and open gym access would be something to be considered by the Board in December. She said that use by Piedmont Virginia Community College would require more consideration and would likely be proposed in April.

Ms. Mallek asked if someone from the committee was engaging with PVCC, as she did not want to see any obstacles. Ms. Kilroy replied that staff is engaging with PVCC.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Walker if there was a placeholder in the budget in case the Board approved something substantial in March when the budget would be largely done. Mr. Walker responded that staff is aware the Board would make decisions on future use of the building. He noted there had been many proposals for uses of the building and cautioned that they should be careful not to over promise, while at the same time doing as much as they could, as fast as they could, to maximize the future benefit to the community.

Mr. Randolph emphasized that the school could not only serve the needs of the residents of the district but also of the greater area, including regional needs of neighboring counties. He said they may not be able to meet all the community and regional needs with this existing building and should remain elastic, flexible, and patient.

Ms. Palmer suggested that they allow residents of the community to use the building for internet access during weekend hours when the building would already be open for the open gym. She said they could then assess the number of users. Mr. Walker replied that they could look at what staff resources are available for this, including having the staff that supervises the gym also oversee the library internet use.

Ms. Mallek commented that the best scenario would be to have a lead organization come forward which could help smaller organizations share space. She said an old, abandoned hardware store in Earlysville was converted to a thrift store and was very successful and has added job training, literacy tutoring, and meeting space to its list of functions. She said there is a network of informal community center businesses throughout the County.

Ms. McKeel asked Ms. Kilroy if the direction she seeks is for the Board to appoint a B.F. Yancey transition team advisory committee. Mr. Walker said they are looking for authorization to do this through a vote.

Mr. Randolph **moved** that the County Executive appoint a B.F. Yancey School Transition Team Advisory Committee. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Palmer.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Sheffield.

Ms. Palmer thanked Ms. Kilroy for her work.

Ms. Mallek asked that Virginia Department of Health and Hamner Theater be added to the list of partners. Ms. Kilroy replied that they are speaking with the Virginia Department of Health and she would reach out to the representatives of Hamner Theater.

Ms. Palmer added that JABA is also interested and would be a fantastic partner.

Recess. The Board recessed its meeting at 3:03 p.m. and reconvened at 3:17 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 12. **Presentation:** Board-to-Board, September 2017, A Monthly Report from the Albemarle County School Board to the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Kate Acuff, Chair of the Albemarle County School Board, presented. She said they have accepted the resignation of Pam Moran, effective June 30, after her serving 13 years as superintendent. Ms. Acuff praised Ms. Moran for a wonderful job as the second longest serving superintendent the County had. She said that County Schools had moved up to third place in the state ranking and in the top 5% nationwide, graduate 95% of their students, and perform 40 points above the state average and 60 above the national average in the SAT. She said the School Board has unanimously appointed Deputy Superintendent, Matt Haas, to take the place of Ms. Moran, effective July 1, 2018. She explained the extensive research and interview process they conducted, which included an assessment of Mr. Haas' game plan for managing the schools.

Ms. Acuff next reviewed enrollment figures, which she cautioned are 10-day figures and are thus subject to change. She said enrollment continues to grow, with 13,844 students in pre-K – 12th grade, about 100 above the prior year. She said Western Albemarle High School grew by 55 students and Baker-Butler by 40 students, which has exacerbated the capacity issue. She announced that they erected a four-classroom learning cottage and a covered walkway at Scottsville Elementary School to accommodate the students reassigned from B.F. Yancey, which is working well as a short-term solution, though in the future they may have to move Scottsville up the list of schools that require capital improvements. She said Red Hill School has enough classroom space to absorb 40 B.F. Yancey students, but some staff are working in trailers and the gym is very small. She said they are looking to expand the size of the gym to better accommodate students during the winter months. She presented a brief film produced by students of Monticello High School that contained interviews with reassigned B.F. Yancey School students.

Ms. Acuff reviewed high school planning, noting they are utilizing the services of a consultant to conduct a holistic assessment and address issues of capacity, modernization, transportation, and curriculum revision. She said they will provide recommendations, options, and costs at the end of October. She reviewed referendum projects, stating that new construction to modernize classrooms at Woodbrook is going very well, the security project at Baker-Butler will be complete by December and at Scottsville by the spring. She invited Supervisors to tour the new science classrooms constructed at several schools. She said they are reviewing schematics for remaining projects including Western Albemarle High School science lab addition and modernization, security projects at Murray and Henley, and modernization projects at Henley, Burley, Sutherland and Albemarle High School. Ms. Acuff stated that they had recently entered into an LED performance contract through the use of Qualified Energy Conservation Bonds, which offered an effective interest rate of 1.04% to install LED lighting and water-efficient plumbing at all schools over the course of 12 years. She said the energy savings will cover almost the entire cost of installation and reminded the Board of interviews conducted last year with students and teachers who praised the benefits of LED lighting. She reviewed the food truck project, a collaborative project that engages students of various trades at CATEC, which has \$50,000 budget, with a \$25,000 Community Service Learning grant received from Lowes as well as some smaller contributions. She said the operation of the food truck will teach students work skills, with students of automotive technology maintaining the vehicle and culinary arts students developing menus and a business plan. She concluded and invited questions.

Ms. Palmer asked about the timing for the Red Hill gymnasium. Ms. Acuff replied she does not know and it is not first on the priority list.

Ms. Palmer asked if the Scottsville learning cottages have bathrooms and how long they expect to use the cottages. Ms. Acuff responded that they do have bathrooms, and she does not know the terms of the lease for the cottages.

Mr. Randolph interjected that he believes the lease is for three years.

Ms. Mallek suggested the School Board discuss the flood of parents who drop off students at the schools and do not utilize the bus. She suggested that they also consider eliminating the practice of having the sheriff stop traffic on Hydraulic Road for 20 minutes, which backs up traffic on Georgetown Road and in other directions.

Ms. McKeel asked if school buses still idle while waiting for students, and said she would like to know where the School Board stands on this, as well as vehicle idling by parents who pick up their children. She said this is an environmental concern. Ms. Acuff responded that school bus idling can be restricted through policy, though it would be difficult to have enforcement with private individuals.

Mr. Dill suggested that they have signage. Ms. Acuff noted there were studies being conducted of school bus idling and its effects on children with asthma. She said both environmental and health concerns could be invoked to establish a restriction.

Ms. Mallek said she had heard a lot of complaints about this issue, with parents sometimes arriving 20 minutes before dismissal time and idling the entire time in front of the school, and she hopes the School Board will consider restrictions on idling. Ms. Acuff offered to look into this.

Ms. McKeel announced that Supervisors had received the Virginia Association of Counties (VACO) 2018 preliminary legislative program, which includes its overarching legislative priority position to increase funding for education.

Ms. Acuff said the School Board had its legislative lunch in September, at which time they lobbied for school needs, including a request to return to prior funding levels.

Mr. Randolph asked for confirmation that the School Board will hold a business meeting on October 12 and work session on October 26. Ms. Acuff confirmed the dates and said the meetings begin at 6:30.

Ms. McKeel said they will miss Ms. Moran and she is glad they will have her for another year. She said she is pleased with the appointment of Mr. Haas to replace her.

Agenda Item No. 13. **Presentation:** 2017 Citizen Survey Results.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that since 2002, the County has contracted with survey consultants to conduct a reliable and valid County-wide citizen survey biennially. The survey results have been used by staff, elected officials and other stakeholders for community planning and resource allocation, program improvement and policy making.

This spring, the County conducted its 2017 Citizen Survey using the survey tool offered by the National Citizen Survey (NCS), which is conducted collaboratively between the National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). The NCS was developed by NRC to provide a statistically valid survey of resident opinions regarding the community and the services provided by local government. After the survey template selection, staff worked individually with Board members to add several customized questions to the survey template. Participating households were selected at random and multiple mailings went out to those households to give them several opportunities to participate. Results were statistically weighted to reflect the proper demographic composition of the community. There were 382 completed surveys, which is a representative sample. The results of this survey are statistically valid within a margin of error of plus or minus 5% points. There are six NCS reports that examine the survey data:

Attachment A, the Community Livability Report, summarizes all results and key findings.

Attachment B, the Dashboard Findings, provides data in a summary chart format that shows how Albemarle County results compare with national benchmarks as well as over time.

Attachment C, the Demographic Crosstabs, analyzes the data by age, sex, race/ethnicity and length of residency.

Attachment D, the Geographic Crosstabs, analyzes the data by geographic area. (Note: "Urban ring" = Neighborhoods 1-7, Pantops, Places 29; "Other developed areas" = Village of Rivanna, Crozet; "Rural areas" = Rural Areas (including Scottsville).

Attachment E, Technical Appendices, provides raw data and survey administration information.

Attachment F, Trends over Time, shows Albemarle County response trends between 2011, 2013, 2015, and 2017.

Attachment G, Supplemental Survey Results. For the first time, NCS gave us the ability to put the survey online for ANY interested residents to take. This report contains those results. Please note that these results are NOT scientific, and this data is not reflected in any other reports. We are still studying what, if any, significant differences there may be between the results of the scientific vs opt-in surveys.

Two important acknowledgements about this data:

1. The survey measures what citizens think about the community. Beyond the local government, other sectors that influence community quality include businesses, non-profit agencies, service organizations, and other community groups (like neighborhood associations). Therefore, some of these questions are not necessarily a reflection on County services.
2. Much of this data is most meaningful when compared to the national benchmark. Even then, as NCS points out, less desirable ratings for some indicators should not automatically be seen as negative for a community, but instead a reflection of the community's resources and priorities. Communities may have intentionally directed their resources to areas with a higher priority. In addition, not all indicators that show a lower level of achievement require a call to action, just as not all indicators that are strong should become a gateway to complacency. Without this framework in which to consider the data, it might be easy to misinterpret some of the data.

Looking at the 2017 survey results, citizens continue to rate overall quality of life in the County very high. Of the survey respondents, 89% rated the quality of life in the County as excellent or good, and 91% rated the County as an excellent or good place to live. Some overall conclusions about this survey data according to NCS include:

- *Residents desire improvements to mobility in the community-and they're willing to pay for it.*
- *Location, location, location could be the key to improving recycling in the community.*
- *Detailed survey data around citizen engagement will help the County better connect with and engage residents in the future.*

Staff plans to provide a more detailed overview of survey data early next year at the anticipated joint meeting with the Planning Commission and School Board. This more detailed discussion will be timed to inform the annual budget process and the Board's strategic plan retreat, which will be held later in the spring.

There is no budget impact related to this executive summary. The survey results will inform both the County's strategic planning and ongoing budget processes.

Staff recommends that Board members review the attached survey findings and provide any feedback or comment as desired.

Ms. Louise Wyatt, Organizational Development Manager, presented. She said she has served as the point person for the County's citizen survey and will present an overview of this year's results, which she noted are attached to the executive summary provided to the Board. She explained that the survey has been conducted since 2002, with the intention that the Board, staff, and other stakeholders use the data for community planning, resource allocation, program improvement, and policy making. She used an example of a finding from the 2015 survey, that mobility was an area for improvement, which was then reflected in the Strategic Plan and subsequent budget, as funding was provided for a new Fifth Street Station bus route, as well as increased funding for transportation revenue sharing. She noted that some NIFI projects are centered around mobility, and the County has decided to join a regional transit partnership.

Ms. Wyatt offered a brief overview of survey methodology, indicating that it is statistically valid, involves randomly selected households, was weighted to reflect demographics, consists of 382 completed surveys, which is considered to be sufficient as a representative sample, and has a 5% +/- margin of error. She emphasized that results are a reflection of the community as a whole and not just of local government, and the data is most meaningful when compared to national benchmarks. Ms. Wyatt said that highlights of the results are that 89% rated overall quality of life as "good" or "excellent," as well as giving a 91% rating the area as "an excellent or good place to live." She noted that of 123 rated items, 108 were rated similarly from 2015 – 2017. A slide presented the eight broad survey categories and Ms. Wyatt commented that Albemarle's results are similar to national benchmarks in each category, with the categories of mobility and economy identified as areas of priority.

Ms. Wyatt reviewed some conclusions from the survey, with one being that residents desire mobility improvements and two-thirds are willing to pay higher taxes to pay for sidewalk improvements and expansion of bicycle path trails. She said that a second is that three-quarters of respondents cited recycling as an important or essential service. She said they also inquired as to how residents obtain information about the County and found that younger people tend to look to social media and *Cville Weekly*, whereas older residents may look at the *Daily Progress* or *Charlottesville Tomorrow*. She said the data had been shared with Jody Saunders and Emily Kilroy so they could determine the best way to engage with all citizens. She explained that in addition to the random sample, they also provided an opt-in survey for anyone to take online to supplement their results, which she has included as an attachment. She cautioned that these results are not scientific and not reflected in the report. She said the supplemental survey respondents tended to be older, have higher incomes, have lived in the County longer, and were Caucasian. She said the findings from this group indicated higher levels of community engagement and satisfaction with affordable childcare and preschool. She said survey results will be available on the County website, shared with key partners, and reviewed at an anticipated joint meeting with the School Board in January to inform the budget process and assist with strategic planning. She said she is working with staff to create a citizen survey workshop to assist them with using the survey data, and she presented some slides that highlighted how responses sometimes varied significantly according to length of tenure in the County, by income level, or by region of the County. She concluded and invited questions and comments.

Mr. Randolph emphasized that the survey results were based on responses from only 0.2% of the population and thus are statistically suspect, so he suggested that the Board look for ways to increase participation for the next biennial survey as well as for other surveys they conduct. He stated he is reluctant to draw any conclusions based on the size of the sample.

Mr. Dill said that despite a small sample, a survey could still be statistically valid if it was representative. Ms. Wyatt concurred with Mr. Dill explaining that the company they contract with, NSC, utilizes statisticians and professional expertise to create a statistically valid result. She said the response rate was 30%, which is typical, and multifamily homes tend to have lower response rates so are pursued more aggressively.

Ms. Mallek asked Supervisors to consider spending a bit more money for the next survey to obtain a more useful result and to hire people who live in the community and conduct survey parties to do the work rather than use an outside consultant.

Mr. Walker added that the cost of the survey was \$15,000, and staff had pursued this survey mechanism because they believed it added value to staff and Board work, but they could do something different in the future if the Board so chose.

Mr. Randolph said the survey is useful, but is a snapshot and used the lowest possible measures to get to statistical validity. He said he is not confident they can extrapolate the results as representative of the County, and a larger sample size would help the Planning Commission, School Board, and others draw conclusions.

Noting the survey's highlights that found mobility and economy as two priorities, Ms. McKeel asked for clarification about the economy in terms of whether this means cost of living.

Ms. Wyatt said she believes the economy priority reflects high cost of living, but offered to look into this and get back to Ms. McKeel.

Agenda Item No. 14. **Presentation:** Albemarle County Service Authority Quarterly Report.

Mr. Gary O'Connell, Executive Director of the Albemarle County Service Authority, stated that he will quickly review his regular report and then focus on the drought and drought management. He said they are conducting a student art contest to elevate awareness of the drought and may look to do other community events. He said they are in the fourth year of a five-year strategic plan and have a number of successes, including improvements in water quality, particularly with granular-activated carbon advanced water treatment that will be online soon. He said they have worked with regional partners on emergency preparedness training. Mr. O'Connell stated that they will begin working on the next strategic plan, and he will inform the Board about this process the next time he presents. He said they are conducting a feasibility study on electronic metering, known as "advanced metering infrastructure," which has the benefit of providing instantaneous information on a customer's water use and can identify a water issue going on in a house. He said they are in the midst of a rate study they conduct every five years that analyzes rates they charge customers, cost of service, and connection fees. He said they will also review their rate model to be sure it can withstand some changes proposed in the General Assembly, and the ACSA will incorporate the results into the next budget. He reiterated that the ACSA follows the County growth plan, noting that there have been some questions about this. He stated that they have \$5.6M in capital projects budgeted this year, including water line replacements, the Glenmore tank project, as well as some smaller projects for a total of 25 projects.

Mr. O'Connell next addressed the drought and reported that the City, Service Authority, and Rivanna collectively announced a drought watch yesterday, which was aimed at raising awareness and conservation. He said they are seeking voluntary conservation of outdoor water, including watering during nighttime hours and encouraging people to water less. He said they will see what impact this has over the next few days.

Mr. Dill recalled that a few months ago they learned the reservoirs were full. Mr. O'Connell replied that the overall system is in a good place, particularly Ragged Mountain. He said the concern is with South Fork Rivanna Reservoir, which had recently dropped significantly. He said they have a formal, state-approved, area-wide drought plan, most recently updated in 2015 and consisting of formal steps. He reviewed the three phases of the plan – watch, warning, and emergency – and explained that the watch was voluntary and concerned outdoor watering. He said the warning involves some outdoor and indoor restrictions. He reviewed the activation process, whereby Rivanna will inform the City and Service Authority of the need for a warning, which will lead to a request of the RWSA Board to make a request to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. O'Connell indicated that the RWSA Board would have authority to move to the emergency phase if they do not have success with the warning stage.

Mr. O'Connell explained the importance of community awareness and informed the Board that he had asked the newspaper to take a photo of the reservoir to help tell the story as to why they need to conserve water. He said the Ragged Mountain Reservoir is full, but cannot fill the need of the entire community, though they have double the amount of water they would have had before the dam and would likely have had to enter into the drought watch stage earlier in the summer if not for Ragged Mountain.

Ms. Mallek recalled that during droughts in 2002 and 2007 it took a long time to get compliance, and she urged them to not wait too long to start. She emphasized it would take several rainfalls for feeder streams to fill.

Mr. Randolph concurred with Ms. Mallek's remarks.

Agenda Item No. 15. **Presentation:** Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) Quarterly Report.

Mr. Bill Mawyer, Executive Director, Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority, presented. He said Ragged Mountain is at 83%, Sugar Hollow 80%, and Rivanna is at 45% of capacity, despite being full as recently as August 3, with a precipitous decline over the past week. He said Department of Environmental Quality requires them to comply with the minimum instream flow release of 9 million gallons per day for the environment and he has asked if they could cut back on the release amount. He said he is fairly confident that DEQ will not be receptive to a cut back on the inflow release unless the community has moved to mandatory restrictions. He said Rivanna has about 400 million gallons, with 20 million gallons

per day going out. He said they have shifted some use of the Rivanna treatment plant that pulls water from Rivanna Reservoir to the Observatory treatment plant to take as much water from Ragged Mountain as possible, though Observatory is not large enough to serve the entire area. Mr. Mawyer stated that they are losing 10 million gallons per day, which Rivanna feels is being absorbed by streams on the way to the reservoir. He said they have a gauge in the Mechum's River off Garth Road that measures the amount of water flowing to the reservoir, and they believe some of this water is not reaching the reservoir, which is partly responsible for the decline.

Mr. Mawyer presented a slide that listed volume, surface area, and watershed of the five reservoirs, noting that Ragged Mountain has a very small watershed area with most of its water transported by pipe from Sugar Hollow Reservoir. He emphasized that the drought is only affecting Rivanna and all other reservoirs have healthy levels.

Mr. O'Connell added that drought restrictions are not confined to the region affected, but will be imposed on all users across the system.

Mr. Dill asked if specific neighborhoods would be affected because they are only served by the Rivanna. Mr. Mawyer replied that the urban area of the City and County is part of one system, and they are not able to identify which neighborhood could be affected. He said they would have low pressure and ultimately might not have any water, with houses at higher elevations losing water service first as they require higher pressure. He said they have backup potential with Beaver Creek Reservoir as they could release water which would find its way to the Rivanna Reservoir since it is part of the Rivanna watershed. Mr. Mawyer explained how Beaver Creek would still have a year's supply of water even with a release. He presented a slide entitled "Regional Drought Management Plan" and said they are currently under a watch, with the potential to enter into a warning in the near future. He explained how they use a hydrologic model, which predicts when water would enter the reservoir and estimates the risk of drought. Additionally, he said they monitor the Virginia Drought Monitoring Task Force report. He demonstrated how a color-coded drought monitoring map of Virginia works, with assessments of groundwater levels, precipitation deficits, streamflow, and reservoir storage. He reviewed how the Department of Environmental Quality allows them to reduce the amount of water that must be released as reservoir levels drop, but noted that the DEQ looks at all three reservoirs collectively, and since the overall average water level is normal, they are not allowing a decrease in the release. Consequently, he said they must release 70% of the water that enters the reservoir.

Ms. Palmer and Ms. Mallek emphasized the need for a pipeline to fill the Rivanna Reservoir from the Ragged Mountain Reservoir.

Ms. McKeel asked that they take a moment to explain why the pipeline has not been finished, so the public listening would have an understanding. Mr. Mawyer said his Board has approved a project to determine the final alignment of where the pipe would go and to acquire necessary easements. He said the CIP has not yet funded the project, which would cost \$60 million to \$100 million, as it would require pump stations at both ends.

Ms. McKeel asked if they have started the purchase of easements. Mr. Mawyer replied that the engineer had just begun the alignment analysis and would visit properties and then prepare plats and negotiate agreements with approximately 70 properties that would be crossed. He said some properties are owned by County Schools and the University of Virginia, with the remainder on private property.

Ms. Palmer informed the Board that the project was originally scheduled for 2011, then postponed to 2016, as they awaited completion of the Western Bypass so they could follow this line, which they had expected would make the project less expensive.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Mawyer to comment on capital project work that would be required if they decide not to build the pipeline.

Mr. Mawyer replied that there are two raw water stations that pump water from Ragged Mountain to the Observatory treatment plant that requires renovation. He said they are looking to interconnect the two pipelines that leave Rivanna Reservoir to allow for flexibility.

Ms. Palmer commented that they are looking to replace these, but if the pipeline were constructed then some larger projects would not have to be initiated. She noted that Mr. Mawyer was reviewing the timelines to see if some work should be done sooner rather than later from a financial standpoint.

Mr. Mawyer replied that he is sure the Board would discuss this, and the drought added perspective. He said they would analyze future water use estimates and talk with the service authority, City of Charlottesville, and Board of Supervisors. He said the pipeline is straightforward and would have a nine-mile pipe with pump stations at both ends and possibly a pretreatment facility at the Rivanna end. He said it would connect Sugar Hollow through Moormans to Rivanna to Ragged Mountain. He said that in the spring, when the Rivanna Reservoir is overflowing, they will pump excess water to Ragged Mountain and store and save it and send it back when Rivanna is getting low.

Mr. Mawyer indicated that he would review capital projects although he will not review them all. He said they received good bids for the Ivy Transfer Station and have awarded the contract to Lantz Construction of Broadway, VA, with a groundbreaking ceremony planned for November and construction

to take about one year. He asked the Board if they would prefer that he review additional capital projects or focus on the drought.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that 20 years ago climate scientists warned of extreme droughts and they should not be surprised that this is happening. She said she would pass along some suggestions from constituents, noting that a woman who lives next to the reservoir is convinced that when blasting occurs at Rockydale the water level drops one foot and suggests they check the bottom of the reservoir to see if a fault has developed. She said another constituent has urged them to take advantage of the low water level to remove snags from the reservoir. She said some constituents are convinced that the 2004 Crozet earthquake contributed to an elevation difference at Sugar Hollow that was causing the water to go somewhere else, and the current high level watermark was four feet below what it had been previously. She next related that some farmers along the 13-mile stretch of Sugar Hollow pipeline have told her they have seeps in their fields that had not occurred before, as the water is likely spewing out and being lost. She indicated there may not be anything they could do about this except to stop using it as soon as possible, as replacement would not be easy.

Mr. Randolph wondered if new technology allows a new pipe to be installed inside the existing pipe. Mr. Mawyer said the proposed new pipe would carry several times the amount of water per day as the existing pipe. He said the idea of installing a pipe inside the old pipe, known as "pipe bursting," would not allow them to increase the capacity to the level they want, but is a good thought. He added that the next stage of water supply is to raise the Ragged Mountain water level by 12 feet, which would add 600M gallons to storage capacity.

Mr. Dill commented that a lot of energy is required to pump water up Observatory Hill and across the County, which contributed to greenhouse gas emissions that then created the drought.

Ms. Mallek added that the new pumps would be powered by solar energy.

Mr. Mawyer said they have signed a contract with Community Power Group to build solar cells at the Ivy Landfill, which will be coming before the Board as a special use permit.

Ms. Mallek asked if they have to wait or if they can make a motion now to activate the drought warning process. Mr. O'Connell replied that they want to be sure they handle it appropriately, with Rivanna determining the warning and the ACSA Board to act on it then make a request to the Board of Supervisors for action. He said at that point, the ACSA Board would instruct staff to move forward.

Ms. Mallek and Ms. McKeel invited them to come back at the following week's Board of Supervisors meeting with a request.

Mr. Mawyer invited all to the grand opening of the new Rivanna sewer pump station the following morning at 10:30.

Mr. Randolph said he noticed an email indicating there was to be no watering between 9 p.m. – 10:00 a.m., which is the reverse of what the drought watch restriction is supposed to be. He hopes the public will realize the error.

Ms. Mallek commented that if people pretend they have a well they will be much more responsible with water conservation. She related a recent incident at University Hall during a children's tournament when people found two bathroom faucets they could not turn off that were spewing water. She said they called facilities management and were told it would be taken care of. She wonders how much water could be lost as it was a rarely used bathroom and the faucets could be running for weeks. She asked what the University of Virginia is doing to educate students about conservation.

Mr. Mawyer said they work with Laura Hildebrand of the City, and UVA is mostly a City customer.

Mr. O'Connell replied that UVA has a pretty strong environmental program that includes water use, adding that the University plays a key role.

Agenda Item No. 16. Closed Meeting.

Mr. Dill announced that he is disqualifying himself from participating in one of the matters that will be discussed in the upcoming Closed Meeting pertaining to an appeal of a real estate assessment. He said he is disqualifying himself because a business entity in which he has a personal interest, Seminole Auction, Ltd., has a relationship with the affiliated business entity of the plaintiff in the assessment appeal. He said his full written disclosure would be on file in the public records.

At 5:01 p.m., Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board go into a Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia: under Subsection (1), to discuss and consider appointments to boards, committees, and commissions in which there are pending vacancies or requests for reappointment; under Subsection (3), to discuss the expansion of an existing business where no previous announcement has been made of the business' interest in expanding its facilities in the community; under Subsection (8), to consult with and be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice about: 1. activities on a preservation tract in a rural preservation development; and

2. litigation related to a real estate assessment appeal, because a public discussion would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the County. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 17. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 6:01 p.m., Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board certify by recorded vote that to the best of each Board member's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 18. Boards and Commissions: Vacancies and Appointments.

Mr. Dill **moved** that the Board make the following appointments:

- **appoint** Mr. George W. Ray, to the Economic Development Authority as the Rio District representative to fill an unexpired term ending January 19, 2018,
- **appoint** Mr. Larry Brown to the Pantops Community Advisory Committee with said term to expire June 30, 2019.
- **appoint** Ms. Diantha McKeel and Ms. Ann Mallek, to Regional Transit Partnership with said terms to expire December 31, 2017.

The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek.

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

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

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

There was no one who wished to address the Board.

Agenda Item No. 20. **Transportation Matter:** Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Quarterly Report.

Mr. Joel DeNunzio, Charlottesville Residency Administrator of VDOT, stated that the November report will have four additional Smart Scale and HSIP awarded projects added, including 2649 intersection improvements at Profitt Road and Route 20, 151/250 roundabout, I-64 Exit 118 improvements, Rio Mills/Berkmar Extension improvements, and I-64 Exit 124 diverging diamond interchange. He said they would take a unique approach to these four projects by packaging them into one contract as the work to be done is similar. He stated that a consulting group is determining the risk of packaging them into one contract and is conducting site visits and data collection. He said they expect to save money and have quick delivery of the work by having one contract, and they expect to have the contract around this time next year with a 2.5-year turnaround until completion.

Mr. DeNunzio reviewed additional projects that are under preliminary engineering, beginning with bicycle/pedestrian enhancements at a couple of locations, with the largest on Route 240 in Crozet at the Starr Hill site. He said they did not receive a good bid for the project and are working with Starr Hill on revisions to make the project better by adding more sidewalk and better access for businesses. He said they have not decided whether they would rebid the project or use existing in force state contracts.

Mr. DeNunzio expressed enthusiasm as he presented a chart of statistics on Rio Road project crashes each year since 2012. He said the area included runs from 29th Place to Woodbrook Drive, and his chart shows a significant drop in crashes and injuries for the July 19, 2016–April 30, 2017 period when compared with the prior four years. He indicated the data demonstrates how a better flow of traffic and better access reduces crashes.

Mr. Randolph pointed out that during this period there had not been significant automobile safety advances, and reductions were the result of the Route 29 Solutions project.

Ms. McKeel asked if she could have a copy of the slide to present at an upcoming neighborhood association meeting.

Mr. DeNunzio next presented a chart comparing travel times on Route 29 between Hydraulic Road and Airport Road, which showed reduced travel times for the morning, midday and evening in both directions between August 9-10, 2014 and the same dates in 2017. He said they were able to measure this by tracking Bluetooth devices from one traffic signal to the next. Mr. DeNunzio attributed the reduction in travel times to a tweaking of the traffic signal system in June, pointing out that traffic was highest at midday and presenting a graph of travel times at different times of the day.

Ms. Mallek expressed her view that the graph demonstrates how the increase in traffic at midday was attributable to local residents and not travelers passing through.

Mr. Randolph asked Mr. DeNunzio how the statistics locally compare to improvements of major arterial routes made in other parts of the Commonwealth. Mr. DeNunzio replied that they have leading technology on this corridor and he does not believe he has another corridor in the residency for which he could collect data. He said another measure they observed was arrival on green percentages, and one could expect to arrive at a green light 80% of the time in this corridor.

Ms. McKeel said that a few people have commented to her recently that they were able to travel north on Route 29 without stopping at a light.

Mr. Dill stated that in his district, he is still hearing that it is difficult at Polo Grounds Road to turn right, as there is a long wait.

Mr. DeNunzio said he thinks the Brook Hill project will take care of the widening of Polo Grounds Road.

Ms. Palmer said she had recently heard from a soccer player who said that only five to seven cars can make the light, and she asked if the timing could be improved.

Mr. DeNunzio emphasized that every signal along the corridor is on the same cycle length, and the total amount of green time that could be allocated is limited. He said if green time is increased at one intersection it must be reduced somewhere else, although they could look at this and potentially make some tweaks during times when soccer events are letting out.

Mr. DeNunzio said they recently conducted traffic counts on Berkmar and learned that almost 5,000 vehicles per day use this road.

Mr. DeNunzio said Blenheim Road Bridge is almost complete and should open any day. He said the latex overlay on the Route 250 Bridge will be complete by late October. He said the Burnley Station Road Bridge was recently closed for replacement and they are working with detour signage to address concerns of local wineries and other businesses. He stated that the Dominion Drive concrete and gutter repair was completed earlier this year, and they are currently reviewing curbs and gutters at Four Seasons patio homes on Lake Forest Lane and plan to replace the sidewalks. He said they will do \$30,000 of work on Commonwealth Drive and Commonwealth Circle prior to repaving by Albemarle County Service Authority and the gas company. He said they have delivered six snow plows to the County schools for students to paint and decorate as part of the Paint the Plows program. He concluded and invited questions.

Ms. Palmer asked what was done on Old Lynchburg Road and Dudley Mountain, as she was not aware of this project although it was in her district. Mr. DeNunzio replied that he does not know the specifics, but offered to get back to her.

Ms. Mallek asked which bucket the Starr Hill sidewalk project was in. Mr. DeNunzio replied that it is from the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and part of an \$800,000 grant they had received.

(Note: The Board then took up Agenda Item No. 22.)

Agenda Item No. 22. **Transportation Matter:** Transportation Funding/Grant Application Review.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that in August of 2017 the Board reviewed and approved the updated list of Albemarle County Transportation Priorities for 2018 (Attachment A). Included in that review and approval were a number of projects recommended for funding through the Revenue Sharing and Transportation Alternatives Programs grant applications, including:

- **Berkmar Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements (#9)** from US 29 to Hilton Heights Road
- **Commonwealth Dr/Dominion Dr Pedestrian Improvements (#10)** from Hydraulic to Peyton Place, from Commonwealth Circle to Dominion Dr, and from Commonwealth Dr to US 29

- **Greer/Jouett Bike/Pedestrian Improvements (#13)** from Hydraulic Rd to Greer Jouett Schools
- **Cale ES Pedestrian Improvements (#14)** at Avon St Extended

The Cale ES and Greer/Jouett Projects are also being advanced as potential Neighborhood Improvement Funding Initiative (NIFI) projects. Other projects discussed for funding at the August Board Meeting are not yet developed enough to be part of applications for this round but will continue to be advanced in preparation for future applications.

Since the August Board meeting, a fifth project has arisen as a potential funding request: #11 on the approved Transportation Priorities List, the Library Avenue Extension from the current stub out at the Crozet Library to the current stub out of Hilltop Street in the Parkside Village development. Discussions with the developer of the future Barnes Lumber property have resulted in the development of a potential public-private partnership to address the need for this connection.

Based on funding provided for revenue sharing projects in the most recent CIP, there is funding available to support the local match required to complete all five of these projects. The deadline for the Revenue Sharing and Transportation Alternatives grant applications is November 1. A Board Resolution supporting these projects is required and must be submitted prior to November 1s for the Transportation Alternatives Grant and prior to December 1 for the Revenue Sharing Grant.

Staff is currently preparing the applications for the referenced projects. Detailed cost estimates for these projects have not yet been developed, however some planning level cost estimates are provided in the project descriptions below.

- **Berkmar Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements** - This project proposes to construct a Shared-use Path from Hydraulic Road to Hilton Heights Road to connect to the new Shared-Use Path on Berkmar Extended. It would be approximately 1.1 miles long and cost in the vicinity of between \$1.9 million and \$2.1 million. Under the Revenue Sharing grant the local contribution would be 50%, or approximately \$1 million. This project builds on the success of the new Berkmar Extended Bicycle and Pedestrian Path and is also an important segment of the Northtown Trail, which is ranked at #2 in the County's Transportation Priority List and is also on the list of top-ranked NIFI projects for the Rio Community Advisory Committee (CAC).
- **Commonwealth Dr/Dominion Dr Pedestrian Improvements** - This project proposes to construct three segments of sidewalk: on Commonwealth from Hydraulic to Peyton Place, and from Commonwealth Circle to Dominion Dr; and on Dominion Dr from Commonwealth Dr to US 29. This is approximately one mile of sidewalk for a total cost of between \$550,000 and \$750,000 making the County's share of 50% under the Revenue Sharing program around \$300,000. This project is located in an area that is a focus of the County's Strategic Goal to invest in aging urban neighborhoods.
- **Greer/Jouett Bike/Pedestrian Improvements** - This project proposes to construct a shared-use path from the Hydraulic Rd/Lambs Rd intersection to the Greer/Jouett School complex to provide a safe walking and bicycling connection for students, staff, and visitors to those schools. This is proposed to be submitted as a Transportation Alternatives project under the Safe Routes to School Program. The total length of the path would be just under a half of a mile at a cost of between \$625,000 and \$825,000 making the County's share of 20% under \$200,000. This project is currently being evaluated as a potential NIFI project for the Hydraulic CAC.
- **Cale ES Pedestrian Improvements** - This project proposes to construct a pedestrian crossing of Avon St Extended in front of Cale Elementary and internal sidewalks to connect from the road to the entrance of the school. This is proposed to be submitted as a Transportation Alternatives project under the Safe Routes to School Program. The total cost of the project is not yet known but a conservative estimate would place it between \$400,000 and \$600,000, making the County's share of 20% around \$100,000. This project is currently being evaluated as a potential NIFI project for the 5th and Avon CAC.
- **Library Avenue Extension** - The new project added to this list is the proposal to extend Library Avenue from its current terminus through the Barnes Lumber property to connect to Hilltop Street in Parkside Village and Crozet Square. This is being proposed as a partnership with the developer of the Barnes Lumber property in which the developer would provide the local match necessary for the Revenue Sharing Program. This project is being combined with a potential NIFI project to reconstruct Crozet Square to improve parking and pedestrian facilities and connect to the proposed road system of the Barnes Lumber Development. The project is ranked at #11 on the County's Transportation Priorities and can be seen as a catalyst for the redevelopment of downtown Crozet including the desired office and retail development that is envisioned in the Crozet Master Plan. To complete this project, a separate agreement will be necessary with the developer of the Barnes Lumber site to define roles and responsibilities but the only financial contribution from the County would be the NIFI funds to complete the Crozet Square portion of the project. Cost estimates are still being developed on this project.

Staff recommends using the County CIP funds to leverage against State funds to fully fund the identified transportation projects to completion. The funding requested has been previously approved through the FY 17-21 Adopted Multi-Year CIP and the FY 18-22 Recommended Multi-Year CIP expenditures Summary under the CIP Revenue Sharing program. If selected for funding through the

Grant programs, the County will be responsible for 20% of the total project cost of the Transportation Alternatives request and 50% of the total cost of the Revenue Sharing Request.

Staff recommends that the Board endorse the recommended grant applications and adopt the attached Resolution B and C for the two Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Grant applications. The Resolutions for the Revenue Sharing applications will be on the consent agenda for the November 1 Board meeting once the final costs are determined.

Mr. Kevin McDermott, Transportation Planner, stated that he will review grant applications they plan to submit this year. He noted that the application deadline is November 1 and they are on the state transportation department's two-year cycle, with the next deadline to occur November 1, 2019. He said they will apply for Transportation Alternatives grants and Revenue Sharing grants. He reminded Supervisors that the Transportation Alternatives grants requires a 20% local match, with adopted resolutions due at the time of application. He said the process is competitive with \$22.3 million available statewide. He said that revenue-sharing grants require a 50% local match, with resolutions due December 1 and requiring that the resolution include the cost of the project, and his office is still working on cost estimates. He requested they defer the resolution until he has these figures and place them on the November Consent Agenda. He explained that the grants cap the amount per year, per locality at \$5 million, and \$10 million over the lifetime of a project.

Mr. Dill asked if they could increase the chance a grant would be awarded by increasing the County's match. Mr. McDermott replied that this would not be the case with revenue-sharing grants, but could be a strategy to utilize with Transportation Alternative grant applications.

Mr. McDermott presented Transportation Alternative applications, with the first being a mid-block pedestrian crosswalk at Cale Elementary School on Avon Street Extended. He presented an aerial photograph of the site and indicated it is ranked 14th in the overall transportation priority list, with a cost estimate of \$512,000 and the County's 20% share at \$102,000. He said this is also being evaluated as a potential NIFI project for the Fifth and Avon CAC. He proposed that they use revenue-sharing funds made available through the CIP process to cover the 20% and allow the CAC to contribute more if they wish to improve the chance of it being approved.

Mr. Randolph commented that sweetening the pot is a great idea.

Ms. McKeel expressed her support for this idea.

Ms. Palmer asked how this improves the chances of having a project approved. Mr. McDermott replied that it both adds points, as well as reduces the cost to the state. He proposed that they add this to the resolution to be considered, provided the Board is interested.

Ms. McKeel and Ms. Palmer responded that the CAC should first have the opportunity to approve this.

Mr. Walker interjected that they could pass a resolution with language indicating that CAC approval is required.

Mr. McDermott reviewed the second Transportation Alternatives proposed project, Greer/Jouett shared-use path. He said the bicycle/pedestrian path would run from Hydraulic Road/Lambs Road intersection to the Greer/Jouett School complex and provide a safe route for students. He said it is ranked 13th in priority with total cost of \$700,000 and \$140,000 for the County's 20% share. He said this is also being evaluated as a NIFI project for the Hydraulic CAC, and he will attend a public information session about the project later this month.

Mr. McDermott next moved to revenue-sharing projects, with the first being Berkmar Drive bicycle and pedestrian improvements, which will extend an existing path 1.1 miles south to Rio Road. He said they expect the cost to be about \$2 million with a 50% cost share from the County and it is ranked 9th in priority. He said it represents an important segment of the 2nd ranked Northtown Trail.

Ms. Mallek asked what side of the road the path would be on. Mr. McDermott replied that the project management division is evaluating on which side of the road the path would be less expensive to construct.

Mr. Dill asked if a cost of \$2 million for one mile of bicycle/pedestrian path seems reasonable. He asked how much of the cost resulted from the purchasing of easements.

Mr. McDermott replied that those were the costs they are encountering, and he offered to provide details of costs for land easements that had been included in the packet with the consent agenda items.

Ms. Mallek commented that in the past they have had donated right-of-way stipulations for projects like this and hopes they can use this, considering the project cost.

Mr. McDermott reviewed the next project, Commonwealth Drive/Dominion Drive sidewalks, which would construct three segments of sidewalk from Hydraulic Road to Peyton Place, along Commonwealth Drive. He presented a map of the area with the proposed sidewalk segments. He said the one mile of sidewalks would cost from \$550,000–\$750,000, with a 50% cost share by the County. He said the

project is within the strategic goal to invest in aging, urban neighborhoods, and it is ranked 10th on the transportation priorities list.

Ms. McKeel said the area lies within the urban ring and has a lot of pedestrians and people waiting for buses. She stated that it is a really good project that spans both the Jouett and Rio Districts, and her CAC was very excited to learn of this project.

Ms. Mallek added that the northern section from Four Seasons Drive to Dominion Drive has people in the road and traffic flying by, so improvements are incredibly important.

Mr. Randolph commented that a project like this would allow people to walk to restaurants and not have to drive on Route 29 at lunch hour.

Mr. McDermott reviewed the last project, the Library Avenue extension from Crozet Square to Hilltop Street. He said it ranked high in the priority list and they have had discussions with the owner of the Barnes Lumber property about having a public-private partnership, with a developer to provide local funding and state funding to make up the difference. He said that it ranked 11th in priority due to the economic development opportunities and improvements to access to the nearby Foothills residential area, which currently have only one way in and out on Tabor Street. Mr. McDermott stated it would provide another connection to Route 240 as the Foothills project develops. He said this is also part of the NIFI program for Crozet Square and they could be combined and constructed together, with the County contributing NIFI funds for that portion of it.

Ms. Mallek asked if the CAC supports this. Mr. McDermott confirmed this.

Mr. McDermott reviewed the staff recommendation, which was that the Board endorse the recommended grant applications and adopt the resolutions for the two Transportation Alternative Set-Aside Grant applications. The resolutions for the Revenue Sharing applications would be on the consent agenda for the November 1 Board meeting once final costs are determined. He proposed they pass the resolution authorizing the County's 20% contribution to the Transportation Alternatives grant applications and allow the CAC to determine if it is willing to add more.

Ms. Mallek **moved** that the Board endorse the recommended grant applications. Ms. Palmer **seconded** the motion.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Sheffield.

Mr. Randolph emphasized that, for the benefit of CAC's, the Board is not moving ahead without their approval and consultation, but committing resources available to the County for both projects.

Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board adopt the proposed Resolutions for two Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Grant applications. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Sheffield.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Albemarle County Board has identified the Cale Elementary School Bike and Pedestrian Improvement Project, defined to include construction of a pedestrian crossing of Avon Street Extended and associated sidewalks to provide safe and convenient access to the school, as a transportation priority for the County through the Transportation Improvement Prioritization Process; and

WHEREAS, the County intends to submit an application for funding of the project through the Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program as a Safe Routes to School project; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Commonwealth Transportation Board construction allocation procedures, it is necessary that Albemarle County submit a resolution requesting the Virginia Department of Transportation establish a Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside project to be administered by Albemarle County; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Albemarle County requests the Commonwealth Transportation Board establish the Cale Elementary School Bike and Pedestrian Improvements Project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Albemarle County hereby commits to provide the 20% matching contribution for this project and any additional funds necessary to complete the project, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Albemarle County hereby agrees to enter into a project administration agreement with the Virginia Department of Transportation and provide the necessary

oversight to ensure the project is developed in accordance with all state and federal requirements for design, right of way acquisition, and construction of a federally funded transportation project, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Albemarle County will be responsible for maintenance costs of the improvements on school property and will work with the Department on arrangements to maintain those portions on the public road system, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if Albemarle County subsequently elects to cancel this project, they hereby agree to reimburse the Department for the total amount of costs expended through the date the Department is notified of such cancellation. Albemarle County also agrees to repay any funds previously reimbursed that are later deemed ineligible by the Federal Highway Administration.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby grants authority for the County Executive to execute project agreements for this project for Fiscal Year 2019.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Albemarle County Board has identified the Greer/Jouett Bike and Pedestrian Improvement Project, defined to include construction of a shared-use path along Lambs Road and Lambs Lane from Hydraulic Road to Greer Elementary School to provide safe and convenient access to the schools, as a transportation priority for the County through the Transportation Improvement Prioritization Process; and

WHEREAS, the County intends to submit an application for funding of the project through the Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program as a Safe Routes to School project; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Commonwealth Transportation Board construction allocation procedures, it is necessary that Albemarle County submit a resolution requesting the Virginia Department of Transportation establish a Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside project to be administered by Albemarle County; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Albemarle County requests the Commonwealth Transportation Board establish the Greer/Jouett Bike and Pedestrian Improvements Project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Albemarle County hereby commits to provide the 20% matching contribution for this project and any additional funds necessary to complete the project, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Albemarle County hereby agrees to enter into a project administration agreement with the Virginia Department of Transportation and provide the necessary oversight to ensure the project is developed in accordance with all state and federal requirements for design, right of way acquisition, and construction of a federally funded transportation project, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Albemarle County will be responsible for maintenance costs of the improvements on school property and will work with the Department on arrangements to maintain those portions on the public road system, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if Albemarle County subsequently elects to cancel this project, they hereby agree to reimburse the Department for the total amount of costs expended through the date the Department is notified of such cancellation. Albemarle County also agrees to repay any funds previously reimbursed that are later deemed ineligible by the Federal Highway Administration.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby grants authority for the County Executive to execute project agreements for this project for Fiscal Year 2019.

Agenda Item No. 21. **Transportation Matter:** County Transportation Planner Quarterly Report.

Mr. Kevin McDermott, Transportation Planner, presented. He noted that he had run over his allotted time and will go through the items quickly, and there are a few minor points he will clarify. He said they have been working on the transportation priorities list and NIFI funding and initiatives related to transportation and have pulled some of these into the capital improvement program. He reviewed the proposed capital improvement projects: the Route 20/US 250 intersection, Northtown Trail, Sunset Avenue Extended, Route 20 South/Scottsville Road, Albemarle County bicycle and pedestrian facility construction program, and Eastern Avenue/Southern connection.

Mr. McDermott stated the Regional Transit Partnership is moving forward as well as two transit development plans and a CAT transit stop improvement. He said they have been talking with VDOT about through-truck restriction requests at Reas Ford Road near Earlysville and Miller School Road off Plank Road. He said VDOT is willing to entertain the possibility of the County enacting through-truck restrictions, and the next step would be to perform an engineering study to determine appropriateness and factors to consider, which will be presented to the commissioner for a decision. He said they will come before the Board for an allocation of funds to hire a consultant and would have to hold a public hearing to review the final report.

Ms. Palmer emphasized that they have tractor-trailers in mind for the restrictions as they cannot make the curbs. She said she does not want people to think they are restricting local trucks. Mr. McDermott responded that trucks doing business on that road would be excluded from the restriction.

Ms. McKeel said she was told that GPS is directing drivers to the wrong spots.

Ms. Palmer informed them that she recently downloaded and experimented with three truck apps and plotted a route from Red Hill School to Crozet, and all three apps directed her through Batesville and around the curb at Miller School where it is hard to turn.

Mr. Randolph said he is familiar with the tight turns on the two roads from cycling on them and supports having restrictions.

Mr. McDermott corrected himself and said the restriction is on Owensville Road, not Reas Ford Road.

Ms. Mallek asked him to consider including the portion of Reas Ford Road from Woodlands to the industrial park, as there are sharp turns and precipices. Mr. McDermott said it seems as if there is general consensus among the Board for him to move forward, noting that they will have additional opportunities for discussion of these issues. He reviewed the Jefferson Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, which is planned for completion in spring 2018, and hope to perform maintenance on sidewalks that are in poor condition. He presented a list of pedestrian crossing priorities. He said a Regional Greenways Advisory Group, created through a grant from Piedmont Environmental Council, is looking at a number of projects. He next presented a list of the top 10 bicycle and pedestrian projects for which he has put in a SIP request. He said they are currently moving forward with grant applications for the top three.

Ms. McKeel asked if they are working with Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, which has conducted a study on gaps in connections. Mr. McDermott confirmed this and informed the Board that he is on the committee for the planning process and has submitted projects for them to evaluate.

Ms. Palmer asked for confirmation that the section under I-64 at Old Lynchburg Road would not be affected by the TJPDC study. Mr. McDermott confirmed this. He said they will talk with Charlottesville about this and it is within the Jefferson Area Bicycle Pedestrian Plan and makes the connections they are looking for.

Ms. Palmer emphasized the importance of the timing, as new sidewalks will be put in with a new development just south of I-64. She suggested they take a look at this while construction is underway.

Mr. McDermott replied that the developer is constructing a sidewalk to the south and timing with this is not necessarily a big deal, though timing with the City is important. He agreed that it is a low cost project at an estimate of \$200K. He said he has it ranked highly and suspects the Metropolitan Planning Organization will see the same.

Ms. Mallek asked why the Eastern Connector had dropped from 4th to 12th on the list of priorities. She followed up with a question about what factors contribute to the ranking. Mr. McDermott said the list used to be separated between bicycle-pedestrian, transit, and secondary road, and primary road projects and is ranked 4th of the secondary roads projects, whereas he has now combined the categories. He said the ranking criteria is land use, congestion, safety, economic development, and accessibility.

Agenda Item No. 23. **Public Hearing: FY 2018 Appropriations and Official Intent to Reimburse Expenditures with Proceeds of a Borrowing.**
(Advertised in the Daily Progress on September 24, 2017.)

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that Virginia Code § 15.2-2507 provides that any locality may amend its budget to adjust the aggregate amount to be appropriated during the fiscal year as shown in the currently adopted budget; provided, however, any such amendment which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures shown in the currently adopted budget must be accomplished by first publishing a notice of a meeting and holding a public hearing before amending the budget. The Code section applies to all County funds, i.e., General Fund, Capital Funds, E911, School Self-Sustaining, etc.

The cumulative total of the FY 2018 appropriations itemized below is \$13,600,923.84. Because the cumulative amount of the appropriations exceeds one percent of the currently adopted budget, a budget amendment public hearing is required.

The proposed increase of this FY 2018 Budget Amendment totals \$13,600,923.84. The estimated expenses and revenues included in the proposed amendment are shown below:

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES

General Fund	\$ 758,333.15
Special Revenue Funds	\$ 2,037,473.13
ECC Funds	\$ 322,432.50
Capital Improvement Funds	\$ 12,164,524.35
Storm Water	\$ 4,452.00

TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES – All Funds \$ 15,287,215.13

ESTIMATED REVENUES

Local Revenue	\$ 90,345.63
State Revenue	\$ 1,786,115.00
Federal Revenue	\$ 882,968.99
Bond Proceeds	\$ 8,576,033.63
Proffer Revenue	\$ 72,000.00
General Fund Balance	\$ 1,040,744.72
Other Fund Balances	\$ 2,839,007.16
TOTAL ESTIMATED REVENUES - All Funds	\$ 15,287,215.13

The budget amendment is comprised of a total of thirty-one (31) separate appropriations. Nineteen (19) have already been approved by the Board, and staff is requesting the approval of twelve (12) additional appropriations on October 4, as indicated below:

- One (1) appropriation approved on July 12, 2017 in agenda item FY 2018 Budget Amendment and Appropriations: #2018009;
- Nine (9) appropriations approved on August 2, 2017 in agenda item FY 2018 Budget Amendment and Appropriations: #2018010, #2018011, #2018012, #2018013, #2018014, #2018015, #2018016, #2018017, #2018018;
- Eight (8) appropriations approved on September 6, 2017 in agenda item FY 2018 Budget Amendment and Appropriations: #2018019, #2018020, #2018021, #2018022, #2018023, #2018024, #2018025, and #2018026;
- One (1) appropriation approved on September 13, 2017 in agenda item FY 2018 Budget Amendment and Appropriations: #2018033; and
- Twelve (12) appropriations for approval on October 4, 2017: #2018027, #2018028, #2018029, #2018030, #2018031, #2018032, #2018034, #2018035, #2018036, #2018037, #2018038, and #2018039 (see Attachment A).

This request is also for the Board's approval of a Resolution of Intent to Reimburse Expenditures Related to School Capital Projects with Proceeds of a Borrowing for these projects, and is contingent on the Board's approval of Appropriations #2018037 and #2018038. The Resolution would allow the County to use up to \$8,576,034 in borrowed proceeds to reimburse the capital budget for expenditures incurred prior to the programmed borrowing of funds for these projects.

After the public hearing, staff recommends that the Board: 1) adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment B) to approve appropriations #2018027, #2018028, #2018029, #2018030, #2018031, #2018032, #2018034, #2018035, #2018036, #2018037, #2018038, and #2018039 for local government and school division projects and programs as described in Attachment A and 2) adopt the attached Resolution of Official Intent to Reimburse Expenditures with Proceeds of a Borrowing (Attachment C).

Appropriation #2018027 \$1,253,102.39

Source:	Federal Revenue	\$ 49,615.72
	General Fund fund balance	\$ 961,719.86
	Fire Rescue Services Fund fund balance	\$ 232,964.10
	Sheriff Contribution Fund fund balance	\$ 240.21
	Water Resource Revenue Fund fund balance	\$ 8,562.50

The following requests are to re-appropriate FY 17 General Fund fund balance and Fire Rescue Services Fund Balance monies to FY 18 to complete projects that were started but not completed in FY 17, to provide funding for purchase orders initiated in FY 17 but delivered in FY 18, and to move FY 17 funding forward to meet ongoing or anticipated expenditures in FY 18. These \$1,253,102.39 in requests are planned to be one-time expenditures.

The proposed use of the General Fund fund balance for the following items will not reduce the County's 10% unassigned fund balance reserve, however, it does reduce the amount of FY 17 expenditure savings that would be available for other uses in the future.

General Fund

Board of Supervisors

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$22,866.08 to provide for costs associated with the County Executive search, including the consultant's fee and related travel expenses.

Finance

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$60,331.00 to complete Phase I and Phase II of the Buy Speed Online (BSO) Upgrade.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$26,250.00 to complete the Business Tax Payment Portal project. This project will provide for the development and implementation of functionality for filing and payment of business tax items through the Albemarle Tax and Pay website.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$18,422.45 for project management services to complete the Time and Attendance project.

Human Resources

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$2,500.00 for the One Organization Leadership Series which was originally planned in FY 17.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$4,027.25 in tuition reimbursement funding that was unexpended at the end of FY 17.

Office of Management and Budget

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$20,900.00 to complete Innovation Fund projects to assess and improve the County's CIP process and streamline the Appropriation Executive Summary process.

Sheriff

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$1,517.38 in donations received in FY 17 that were not yet expended in FY 17 to support the Sheriff's volunteer reserve programs. These contributions will support the various reserve programs such as Project Lifesaver, TRIAD, Search and Rescue, child fingerprinting, and any other community programs and activities in which the Reserves are involved.
- Request the re-appropriation of the \$3,965.58 balance remaining in collected fingerprinting fees at the end of FY 17 to purchase volunteer reserves' uniforms, equipment, and other miscellaneous expenses.

Police

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$43,206.84 to complete an update of the department's policy manual and to provide for ballistic vests and rifles planned to be purchased in FY 17 that will be delivered in FY 18.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$37,321.30 for traffic safety programs from the net revenues received in prior years related to the PhotoSafe Program. These revenues are intended to only fund traffic safety programs and operations, and not general local government operations.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$12,000.00 to complete an Innovation Fund project to provide background investigation software.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$8,400 to revise the planned replacement of a department vehicle to another vehicle type better suited to support the department's recruitment efforts.

FES

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$10,000.00 to complete an Innovation Fund project that will allow for the installation of a free standing information kiosk on the first floor of the McIntire Road County Office Building to assist internal and external customers with building and directional information.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$25,107.74 in Federal revenue from a National Fish and Wildlife Foundation grant and the appropriation of \$8,562.50 in Water Resources Fund fund balance for the required match to support operating costs for the completion of a study supporting a capital project, Large-Scale Best Management Practices (BMP) Retrofits on Private Lands, to make improvements to private storm water facilities.

Parks and Recreation

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$125,000.00 to complete a Community Recreation Needs Assessment approved in FY 17.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$12,700.00 for snowplows that were approved in FY 17 and delivered in FY 18.

Community Development

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$7,808.00 for replacement furniture approved in FY 17 and delivered in FY 18.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$1,300.00 for training approved in FY 17 that will occur in FY 18.

Innovation Fund

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$3,674.62 that was undesignated at the end of FY17.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$3,985.00 in unspent funding for two innovation projects that were funded in FY 17 back to the Innovation Fund.

Social Services

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$22,068.00 to continue the part-time Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) worker to develop innovative strategies that make healthy fruits and vegetables more accessible to families around the country.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$5,000.00 of restricted Federal revenue for transcription services to aid Child Welfare and Adult Services workers.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$32,787.05 to continue mandated training, the purchase of audiovisual upgrades, software and mobile file tracking system, the efforts of the Outreach team program, and process improvement training across the department.

Economic Development Fund

- **Economic Development Investment Pool:** Requests the re-appropriation of \$359,000.00 in funding remaining at the end of FY 17 in the Office of Economic

- Development and the Economic Development Investment Pool to support future opportunities.
- **Economic Opportunities Fund:** Requests the re-appropriation of \$160,000.00 in funding remaining at the end of FY 17 in the Economic Opportunities Fund to support future opportunities.

Fire Rescue Services Fund

The following items will be funded by re-appropriating fund balance from FY 17 to FY 18 from this fund and not from the General Fund:

- Requests the re-appropriation of \$67,213.00 to support volunteer recruitment and retention efforts by supplementing grant-funded efforts to develop a full marketing campaign to recruit new volunteers, to increase the public's interest in volunteering, and to provide training for leaders within all fire rescue system agencies to help ensure the retention of existing members.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$50,210.00 for equipment, training, and furniture planned in FY 17 and delivered in FY 18.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$50,000.00 for an updated assessment and analysis of the Fire and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) public safety training facility needs, including partnership possibilities, approved in FY 17.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$49,197.00 to complete the system-wide standards of coverage and staffing study and the strategic plan update approved in FY 16.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$10,000.00 to complete the EMS App Development Innovation Fund Project.
- Requests the re-appropriation of \$6,344.10 for supplies for the Hazardous Materials (Hazmat) Response Team. This funding is originally from (Hazmat) recovered cost revenue received in FY 17.

Appropriation #2018028 **\$328,510.10**

Source:	Federal Grant Revenue	\$ 3,596.27
	Local – Rent	\$ (2,272.00)
	Special Revenue Funds' Fund Balances	\$ 327,185.83

This request is to appropriate and re-appropriate funding associated with Special Revenue Funds, including seized asset accounts, grants, and donation funds not expended in FY 17 and anticipated to occur in FY 18.

- This request is to re-appropriate \$104,922.20 from Vehicle Replacement Fund fund balance for vehicle replacements appropriated in FY 17 and delivered in FY 18.
- This request is to appropriate a total of \$68,434.34 for expenses related to the Old Crozet Elementary School by appropriating \$70,906.34 in unexpended rental revenue (fund balance) received in prior years to provide for an anticipated increase in one-time maintenance costs in FY 18 and (b) decreasing the currently FY 18 appropriated rent revenue by \$2,272.00 which supports operational costs such as preventative maintenance contracts and utilities. This decrease in FY 18 revenue is based on the terms of the recently renewed leases with the Field School of Charlottesville and the Old Crozet School Arts (OCSA).
- This request is to re-appropriate \$151,357.29 in Seized Asset Monies received from State and Federal Agencies for the Commonwealth's Attorney and the Police Department. These monies will be used to purchase office supplies, furniture, training, and temporary help.
- This request is to re-appropriate \$1,238.79 in Federal grant funds from a State Department of Motor Vehicles Highway Safety grant to reduce motor vehicle accidents through increased speed enforcement, along with other traffic safety enforcement.
- This request is to re-appropriate \$2,156.14.00 in Federal grant funds from a U.S. Department of Justice grant to assist in funding overtime hours by current officers in support of reducing crime and the improvement of public safety through more "Community Policing".
- This request is to re-appropriate \$201.34 in Federal grant funds from a State Department of Motor Vehicles Highway Safety grant to reduce DUI accidents through increased DUI enforcement, along with other traffic safety enforcement, including speeding and safety restraint usage.

Appropriation #2018029 **\$318,279.00**

Source:	Local Revenue - Central Virginia Regional Jail	\$ 40,000.00
	Federal Revenue	\$ 278,279.00

This request is to appropriate \$318,279.00 in funding to Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR) to continue to provide pretrial services in the rural counties serving the Central Virginia Regional Jail. This amount includes \$278,279.00 in grant funding from the Department of Criminal Justice Services with the County acting as fiscal agent and a local match of \$40,000.00 from the Central Virginia Regional Jail located in the Town of Orange.

Appropriation #2018030 **\$74,530.20**

Source: General Fund - School Reserve Fund \$ 74,530.20

This request is to appropriate the School Division’s appropriation request approved by the School Board on August 10, 2017:

This request is to appropriate \$74,530.20 from the General Fund - School Reserve Fund to the School Division Capital Improvement Program fund to support technology associated with the Learning Space Modernization Project. The original Learning Space Modernization budgets were built on improvements to the physical space and explicitly excluded technology equipment. In the early stages, Department of Accountability, Research, and Technology (DART) was able to absorb new equipment purchases as only a small number of spaces were completed at a time. As the program scales up and more spaces are completed each summer, that method is not sustainable. The School Division has learned that the purchase of new technology is integral to truly transforming the environment to an agile, interactive space. Future modernization requests will include funding for technology, but in the interim the modernization supported by the bond referendum does not include funding for technology. This appropriation is to fund technology equipment for the newly modernized spaces at Albemarle High School, Western Albemarle High School, Jouett Middle School, Walton Middle School, and Baker Butler Elementary School. Equipment includes mobile interactive multi-touch panels which can convert into table form, short-throw projectors, and monitors for digital display. After the scope of work for modernization projects in the Summer of 2018 becomes more defined and technology needs are identified, a second and final funding request will be made.

Appropriation #2018031 **\$0.00**
This appropriation will not increase the total County budget.

Source: Information Technology Salaries/Benefits \$ 25,832.00

This request is to appropriate \$25,832.00 in funding from the Department of Information Technology (IT) to the Department of Human Resources (HR) for a 0.5 FTE Technology Training Specialist. The FY18 Adopted Budget included the funding and the FTE for this position within the IT budget.

Appropriation #2018032 **\$118,400.00**

Source: State Grant Revenue \$ 118,400.00
Grants Leveraging Fund* \$ 10,000.00
Centurylink (in kind)* \$ 24,600.00

*These components of this appropriation will not increase the County Budget.

This request is to appropriate \$118,400.00 in grant funding from the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) for the 2017 Virginia Telecommunications Initiative (VATI) to support efforts by established internet service providers (ISPs) to construct broadband access in underserved areas. The grant award requires a local match of \$10,000.00 from the County and of \$24,600.00 in in-kind contribution from CenturyLink. The County is partnering with CenturyLink to expand broadband to the following areas: Emerald Ridge/Saddle Back Drive, Tilmans and Old Green Mountain Road, and Yancey Mills.

Appropriation #2018034 **\$203,000.00**

Source: ECC Fund Balance \$ 203,000.00

The Emergency Communications Center (ECC) requests that the County, acting as fiscal agent for the ECC, appropriate funding for the following purposes as approved by the ECC Management Board, which would be funded by ECC fund balance:

- \$110,000.00 for information technology infrastructure upgrades, including the replacement of system backup and recovery software;
- \$50,000.00 for a replacement vehicle and associated equipment;
- \$35,000.00 for upgrading building security;
- \$5,000.00 for the regional Emergency Management Office to conduct citizen engagement activities; and
- \$3,000.00 for software that is used for testing in the hiring of new communications staff.

Appropriation #2018035 **\$90,000.00**

Source: Local - University of Virginia \$ 16,200.00
Local – City of Charlottesville \$ 34,200.00
General Government CIP Fund fund balance \$ 39,600.00

Pursuant to the regional agreement for the Regional Firearms Training Facility, this request is to (a) appropriate the FY 17 balance of the Regional Firearms Training Facility project to Regional Firearms Training Facility project capital reserve, and (b) appropriate the County’s FY 18 contribution of \$90,000.00. The regional partner’s shares are 44% County, 38% City of Charlottesville, and 18% University of Virginia. For the County’s FY 18 contribution, this request is to appropriate \$39,600.00 in General Government CIP Fund fund balance.

The project has a current balance of \$191,290.36 and is expected to be closed out in October 2017. Upon the completion of close-out, the remaining balance will become the capital reserve and will not impact the total County's budget.

Appropriation #2018036 **\$72,217.63**

Source:	Local – Interest Earnings	\$ 217.63
	Proffer Revenue	\$ 72,000.00
	Greenway Program*	\$ 9,532.63

*This portion of the appropriation will not increase the total County Budget.

Pursuant to the Board's approval on September 13, 2017, this appropriation requests \$20,000.00 in Belvedere proffer revenue, \$52,000.00 in Lofts at Meadowcreek proffer revenue, \$217.63 in interest earnings, and \$9,532.63 from currently appropriated Greenway Program (revenue source is General Government CIP Fund fund balance) for a total of \$81,750.26 to the capital project called the Greenways/Blueways Program funding. \$71,750.26 is for professional services for the greenway trail on County-owned property behind Still Meadows (TMP 046C0-00-00-000A1) that abuts the future Belvedere greenway parcel and the greenway bridge linking adjacent neighborhoods to the Rivanna River Greenway. Both the trail and bridge will be constructed in the future. \$10,000 is a set-aside towards the future design and construction of greenway construction at Belvedere. This appropriation is a net increase to the total County budget of \$72,217.63.

Appropriation #2018037 **\$8,412,907.16**

Source:	State revenue	\$ 726,000.00
	Bond proceeds	\$ 6,033,665.16
	School CIP Fund fund balance	\$ 1,653,242.00

This request is to appropriate \$8,412,907.16, net of transfers, for School Capital projects that are currently included in FY 19 of the FY 18 – 23 Adopted CIP pursuant to the Board's approval during the CIP Budget Work session on March 3, 2017. This is the final phase of an effort to better enable the School Division to enter into contractual construction agreements and begin construction of critical school projects while students are out of school during the summer.

In a separate agenda item, the Board will be requested to adopt a Resolution of Official Intent to Reimburse Expenditures with the Proceeds of a Borrowing for projects that are programmed to be paid for with borrowed proceeds currently planned to be borrowed in the spring of 2018 (FY 18). This Resolution will allow the County to reimburse any funds expended prior to the issuance of the 2018 bonds with those bond proceeds.

Moving forward, staff will recommend the School Division adjust the timing of future School Capital projects in the CIP, so that the projects will receive funding in the fiscal year in which the projects are scheduled to begin.

School CIP Fund Revenues:		School CIP Fund Expenditures	
Technology Grant	\$ 726,000.00	Administrative Technology	\$ 263,000.00
Use of Fund Balance	\$1,653,242.00	Instructional Technology	\$ 575,000.00
Bond Proceeds Transfer^	\$5,915,358.00	School Maintenance/Replacement Program	\$6,730,600.00
School CIP Fund Revenues Total	\$8,294,600.00	State Technology Grant	\$ 726,000.00
		School CIP Fund Expenditures Total	\$8,294,600.00
General Govt. CIP Fund Revenues:		General Govt. CIP Fund Expenditures:	
FY 18 Bond Proceeds	\$6,033,665.16	Borrowed Proceeds Transfer^	\$5,915,358.00
General Govt. CIP Fund	\$6,033,665.16	Cost of Issuance	\$ 118,307.16
Expenditures Total General		Govt. CIP Fund	\$40,799,170.15
		Revenue Total	

^Designates Transfers between funds

Appropriation #2018038 **\$2,729,977.36**

Source:	Bond proceeds	\$ 2,542,368.47
	School CIP Fund fund balance	\$ 187,608.89

Pursuant to the Board's approval on September 6, 2017 this request is to appropriate \$2,729,977.36, net of transfers, for School Capital projects included in the Board's discussion of the School Division's request for additional funding for Bond Referendum-supported School Division capital projects that have either already come in higher than the budgeted amount, or are estimated by the School Division to do so.

- Learning Space Modernization: Is being increased by \$1,467,750.00 to make the project whole after it was reduced to provide funding to the Woodbrook Elementary School Addition-Modernization project in the spring, and is also being increased \$497,500.00 based on staffs updated cost estimates specific to the second phase of Learning Space modernization work which includes work at Albemarle High School, Burley Middle School, Henley Middle School, and Sutherland Middle School. This project is to update

- approximately 100 of the School Division's 850 classrooms, affecting approximately 25 of the County's 26 schools.
- School Security Improvements Program is being increased by \$220,565.00 based on staffs updated cost estimates specific to supporting improvements at Scottsville Elementary School, Henley Middle School, and Murray High School. This project is for school security improvements at Baker-Butler Elementary School, Scottsville Elementary School, Henley Middle School, and Murray High School.
 - Western Albemarle high School Environmental Studies Academy Phase 2 Project is being increased by \$474,000.00 based on staffs updated cost estimates. This project is for new science laboratories and modernization of existing labs.
 - Woodbrook Elementary School Addition-Modernization is being increased by \$20,312.00 based on staffs updated cost estimates. This project is to alleviate overcrowding, modernize the schools' existing classrooms, and add a full-size gymnasium.
 - The Cost of Issuance is \$49,850.36 and reflects the estimated costs associates with issuing bonds at 2% of the total issuance and is funded with bond proceeds

School CIP Fund Revenues:		School CIP Fund Expenditures:	
Bond Proceeds Transfer^	\$2,492,518.11	Learning Space Modernization	\$1,965,250.00
Use of Fund Balance	\$ 187,608.89	School Security Improvements Program	\$ 220,565.00
School CIP Fund Revenues Total	\$2,680,127.00	Western Albemarle High School Environmental Studies Academy Phase 2 Project	\$ 474,000.00
		Woodbrook Elementary School Addition-Modernization	\$ 20,312.00
		School CIP Fund Expenditures Total	\$2,680,127.00
General Govt. CIP Fund Revenues:		General Govt. CIP Fund Expenditures:	
GO Bond Proceeds	\$2,542,368.47	Bond Proceeds Transfer^	
\$2,492,518.11		Cost of Issuance	\$ 49,850.36
General Govt. CIP Fund Expenditures Total	\$2,542,368.47	General Govt. CIP Fund Revenue Total	\$2,542,368.47

^Designates Transfers between funds

The 2016 Bond referendum, approved on November 8, 2016, authorized up to \$35 million in principal be issued for School Division capital projects. The amount issued prior to this appropriation was \$30.4 million. Combined with this appropriations request of \$2.5 million in bond proceeds, the remaining borrowing capacity associated with the Bond Referendum authorization is \$2.0 million.

In a separate agenda item, the Board will be requested to adopt a Resolution of Official Intent to Reimburse Expenditures with the Proceeds of a Borrowing for projects that are programmed to be paid for with borrowed proceeds planned to be borrowed in the spring of 2018 (FY 18). This Resolution will allow the County to reimburse any funds expended prior to the issuance of the 2018 bonds with those bond proceeds.

Appropriation #2018039 **\$0.00**
This appropriation will not increase the total County budget.

Source: Hollymead-Powell Creek Sidewalk capital project \$ 20,000.00

This request is to appropriate \$20,000.00 to the Adams Court Re-paving capital project from the Hollymead-Powell Creek Sidewalk capital project (revenue for the sidewalk project is General Government Capital Fund fund balance.) The roadway was originally constructed with the Jefferson Village subdivision on a 50 foot dedicated right-of-way and intended to be accepted into the State system. This funding supports re-paving the 220 feet of roadway to meet the requirements to be accepted into the State system. This project is expected to begin by October 15, 2017 and is estimated to be completed by November 15, 2017. The Hollymead-Powell Creek Sidewalk project is complete and no longer requires these funds. This will not increase the Total County Budget.

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director, Office of Management and Budget, presented. She passed out an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. Randolph asked when the FY17 audit is expected to be completed. Ms. Allshouse replied that the audit was conducted by the Finance Department, not the Budget Department, and she does not have an exact date, but that it is typically around the time of Halloween that it is complete.

Ms. Allshouse said that State Code requires the County to hold a public hearing before amending its budget when the total aggregate amount of the funds appropriated exceeds 1% of expenditures in the currently adopted budget. She said the amount in the amendment is \$15,287,215 and includes about \$13.6M for consideration at this meeting, as well as previous ones the Board had approved. She mentioned that one document in their packets had an error indicating the amendment was \$13.6 million, which they wish to correct, and said it had July, August, and September in the total number.

Mr. Randolph asked if requests for re-appropriations for FY17 would be added to the list she is keeping. Ms. Allshouse confirmed that they would. She said they would ask for three actions after the public hearing: 1) Approval of 12 appropriations as described in Attachment A, totaling \$13.6M. 2) Approval of revised Attachment B, that has the number of the budget amendment, \$15.3 million, consisting of tonight's amendment and amendment dating back to July 12. 3) Approval of the resolution of

official intent to reimburse expenditures with proceeds of a borrowing for CIP projects included in tonight's appropriation, as described in Attachment A.

Referring to Attachment A FY18 appropriations, Mr. Randolph asked why the police department had requested the re-appropriation of \$8,400 to revise the planned replacement of a department vehicle to another vehicle type better suited to support the department's recruitment efforts. He asked what type of vehicle this refers to. Ms. Allshouse replied that Andy is their budget analyst and would know the details. She said she thinks it is to be a more attractive vehicle, but does not know the detail of why.

Ms. McKeel opened the public hearing.

As no one stepped forward to speak Ms. McKeel closed the public hearing.

Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board adopt the proposed Resolution to approve the appropriations, as amended. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek.

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

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
ADDITIONAL FY 18 APPROPRIATIONS**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors:

- 1) That the FY 18 Budget is amended to increase it by \$15,287,215.13.
- 2) That Appropriations #2018027, #2018028, #2018029, #2018030, #2018031, #2018032, #2018034, #2018035, #2018036, #2018037, and #2018038 are approved; and
- 3) That the appropriations referenced in Paragraph #2, above, are subject to the provisions set forth in the Annual Resolution of Appropriations of the County of Albemarle for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2018.

Ms. Mallek **moved** that the Board approve appropriations #2018027, #2018028, #2018029, #2018030, #2018031, #2018032, #2018034, #2018035, #2018036, #2018037, #2018038, and #2018039 for local government and school division projects and programs, as described. The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Randolph.

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

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

**COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
APPROPRIATION SUMMARY**

APP#	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
2018027	3-1000-51000-351000-510100-9999	934,935.290	SA2018027 App FB: Routine GF Re-appropriations
2018027	3-1000-51000-351000-512020-9999	240.210	SA2018027 Sheriff Reserve Re-app
2018027	3-1000-33000-333000-330034-1004	16,545.240	SA2018027 Re-app: NFWF Grant
2018027	3-1000-51000-351000-512050-9999	8,562.500	SA2018027 Re-app: NFWF Grant
2018027	3-1650-51000-351000-510100-9999	8,562.500	SA2018027 Re-app: NFWF Grant
2018027	3-1000-33000-333000-330020-1005	6,002.480	SA2018027 Re-app DSS: Federal Revenue - Admin (32% reimbursement) - PASS THRU
2018027	3-1000-33000-333000-330020-1005	5,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app DSS: Federal Revenue - Admin (Transcription Services) - RESTRICTED
2018027	3-1000-33000-333000-330021-1005	22,068.000	SA2018027 Re-app DSS: Federal Revenue - Assistance (SNAP-ET) - RESTRICTED
2018027	3-1000-51000-351000-510100-9999	26,784.570	SA2018027 Re-app DSS: Local share (\$18,996.71 Training Pool & Innovation Funding + \$16,387.55 Remaining 68%)
2018027	4-1000-11010-411010-312210-1001	22,866.080	SA2018027 Re-app: Co Exec Search
2018027	4-1000-12141-412140-301210-1001	60,331.000	SA2018027 Re-app: BSO Upgrade Phase I&II
2018027	4-1000-12141-412140-301210-1001	26,250.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Business Tax Payment Portal
2018027	4-1000-12143-412140-320000-1001	18,422.450	SA2018027 Re-app: Time & Attendance Proj Mgr
2018027	4-1000-12030-412030-312500-1001	2,500.000	SA2018027 Re-app: One Org Leadership Series
2018027	4-1000-12030-412030-382000-1001	4,027.250	SA2018027 Re-app: Tuition Reimbursement
2018027	4-1000-12150-412150-310000-1001	20,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Innovation Fund CIP Project
2018027	4-1000-12150-412150-312210-1001	900.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Innovation Fund Streamline Exec Summ
2018027	4-1000-21070-421070-301230-1002	1,517.380	SA2018027 Re-app: Sheriff Reserve Program
2018027	4-1000-21070-421070-301235-1002	3,965.580	SA2018027 Re-app: Fingerprinting
2018027	4-1000-31013-431010-312716-1003	12,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Police Innovation Fund - Background Software
2018027	4-1000-31013-431010-690010-1003	37,321.300	SA2018027 Re-app: Photosafe Program
2018027	4-1000-31013-431010-310000-1003	12,000.000	SA2018027 Re-ap: Policy Manual Review
2018027	4-1000-31013-431010-601010-1003	10,159.440	SA2018027 Re-app: rifles

2018027	4-1000-31013-431010-601100-1003	5,733.000	SA2018027 Re-app: ballistic bests
2018027	4-1000-31013-431010-601100-1003	15,314.400	SA2018027 Re-app: plates
2018027	4-1000-31013-431010-360005-1003	8,400.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Recruitment vehicle
2018027	4-1000-71011-471010-392000-1007	125,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app: PR Recreation Needs Assessment
2018027	4-1000-71012-471010-800502-1007	12,700.000	SA2018027 Re-app: PR Snow Plows
2018027	4-1000-81021-481020-800201-1008	7,808.000	SA2018027 Re-app: CDD furniture replacement
2018027	4-1000-81021-481020-550100-1008	1,300.000	SA2018027 Re-app: CDD training
2018027	4-1000-93010-493010-930237-9999	519,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app: EDO, Econ Inv Pool, Econ Opp Fund
2018027	4-1000-99900-499000-999978-9999	7,659.620	SA2018027 Re-app: Innovation Fund
2018027	4-1000-53010-453010-110000-1005	20,500.000	SA2018027 Re-app: SNAP-ET Salary
2018027	4-1000-53010-453010-210000-1005	1,568.000	SA2018027 Re-app: SNAP-ET FICA
2018027	4-1000-53010-453010-312210-1005	5,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Transcription Services - Child Welfare & Adult Services
2018027	4-1000-53010-453010-550100-1005	7,400.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Unspent Training Pool - Mandated Child Welfare Training
2018027	4-1000-53010-453010-550100-1005	1,200.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Strumpf Assocs. - 1 mo. Continuation
2018027	4-1000-53010-453010-550100-1005	1,300.000	SA2018027 Re-app: FY17 travel expenses
2018027	4-1000-53010-453010-600100-1005	3,596.710	SA2018027 Re-app: Outreach Team - Innovation Funding
2018027	4-1000-53010-453010-800200-1005	3,067.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Child Welfare filing room
2018027	4-1000-53010-453010-800700-1005	1,500.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Outreach Team - Innovation Funding
2018027	4-1000-53010-453010-800700-1005	8,223.340	SA2018027 Re-app: Conference Room 231 Audiovisual upgrades
2018027	4-1000-53010-453010-800710-1005	6,500.000	SA2018027 Re-app: IARMT survey software Innovation Funding
2018027	4-1000-43205-482040-301210-1004	25,107.740	SA2018027 Re-app: NFWF Grant
2018027	4-1650-93010-493010-930009-9999	8,562.500	SA2018027 Re-app: NFWF Grant
2018027	3-1805-51000-351000-510100-9999	232,964.100	SA2018027 App FB: Routine FR Services Fund Re-appropriations
2018027	4-1805-32011-432010-392000-1003	25,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app: FR System SP Update
2018027	4-1805-32015-432010-392000-1003	24,197.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Stds of Cover & Staffing Analysis
2018027	4-1805-32011-432010-800200-1003	7,880.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Furniture
2018027	4-1805-32012-432010-550100-1003	12,330.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Training
2018027	4-1805-32013-432010-601109-1003	6,344.100	SA2018027 Re-app: Hazmat recovered costs
2018027	4-1805-32015-432010-312000-1003	10,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Innovation Fund EMS App
2018027	4-1805-32015-432010-800101-1003	30,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Lifepacks
2018027	4-1805-32012-432010-390000-1003	50,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Training Facility Study
2018027	4-1805-32016-432010-301200-1003	67,213.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Recruitment and Retention
2018027	4-1820-99900-499000-999954-1008	359,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app: EDO and Econ Inv Pool Balances
2018027	4-1820-99900-499000-999987-1008	160,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app: Econ Opportunities Fund Balance
2018027	3-1820-51000-351000-512004-9999	519,000.000	SA2018027 Re-app: EDO, Econ Inv Pool, Econ Opp Fund
2018027	4-8408-93010-493010-930009-9999	240.210	SA2018027 Re-app: Sheriff Reserve Program
2018027	3-8408-51000-351000-510100-9999	240.210	SA2018027 Re-app: Sheriff Reserve Program
2018028	3-9200-51000-351000-510100-9999	104,922.200	SA2018028 App FB: Vehicle Repl Fund Re-apps
2018028	4-9200-71012-412560-800500-9999	17,600.000	SA2018028 Re-app: PR
2018028	4-9200-32015-412560-800500-9999	58,008.000	SA2018028 Re-app: FR
2018028	4-9200-31013-412560-800500-9999	29,314.200	SA2018028 Re-app: Police
2018028	3-8610-15000-315000-150262-9999	-2,272.000	SA2018028 Old Crozet E S Rent and Reapp
2018028	3-8610-51000-351000-510100-9999	70,906.340	SA2018028 Old Crozet E S Rent and Reapp
2018028	4-8610-91081-496010-301221-9999	-2,435.000	SA2018028 Old Crozet E S Rent and Reapp
2018028	4-8610-91081-496010-331000-9999	1,670.000	SA2018028 Old Crozet E S Rent and Reapp
2018028	4-8610-91081-496010-331200-9999	3,986.000	SA2018028 Old Crozet E S Rent and Reapp
2018028	4-8610-91081-496010-332100-9999	1,141.000	SA2018028 Old Crozet E S Rent and Reapp
2018028	4-8610-91081-496010-510121-9999	-982.000	SA2018028 Old Crozet E S Rent and Reapp
2018028	4-8610-91081-496010-510210-9999	2,012.000	SA2018028 Old Crozet E S Rent and Reapp
2018028	4-8610-91081-496010-510300-9999	-649.000	SA2018028 Old Crozet E S Rent and Reapp
2018028	4-8610-91081-496010-600700-9999	-273.000	SA2018028 Old Crozet E S Rent and Reapp
2018028	4-8610-91081-496010-800949-9999	64,164.340	SA2018028 Old Crozet E S Rent and Reapp
2018028	3-1234-51000-351000-510100-9999	63,896.080	SA2018028 Appropriation - Fund Balance of Seized Asset Monies
2018028	3-1235-51000-351000-510100-9999	3,122.190	SA2018028 Appropriation - Fund Balance of Seized Asset Monies
2018028	3-1236-51000-351000-510100-9999	63,483.720	SA2018028 Appropriation - Fund Balance of Seized Asset Monies
2018028	3-1237-51000-351000-510100-9999	66.800	SA2018028 Appropriation - Fund Balance of Seized Asset Monies
2018028	3-1238-51000-351000-510100-9999	20,788.500	SA2018028 Appropriation - Fund Balance of Seized Asset Monies
2018028	4-1234-22010-422010-320000-1002	28,896.080	SA2018028 Temp. Help
2018028	4-1234-22010-422010-550100-1002	7,000.000	SA2018028 Travel/Training
2018028	4-1234-22010-422010-600100-1002	3,000.000	SA2018028 Office Supplies
2018028	4-1234-22010-422010-800200-1002	5,000.000	SA2018028 Furniture
2018028	4-1234-22010-422010-800700-1002	20,000.000	SA2018028 Technology Equipment
2018028	4-1235-39000-439000-580905-1003	3,122.190	SA2018028 State Drug Seizures
2018028	4-1236-39000-439000-580905-1003	63,483.720	SA2018028 State Drug Seizures
2018028	4-1237-39000-439000-580902-1003	66.800	SA2018028 Machinery & Equipment
2018028	4-1238-31013-431010-800100-1003	20,788.500	SA2018028 Machinery & Equipment
2018028	3-1245-33000-333000-330011-1003	201.340	SA2018028 DMV Traffic Safety Grant 17
2018028	4-1245-31013-431010-120000-1003	188.070	SA2018028 DMV Grant - unused funds
2018028	4-1245-31013-431010-210000-1003	13.270	SA2018028 DMV Grant - unused funds
2018028	3-1246-33000-333000-330011-1003	1,238.790	SA2018028 DMV Traffic Safety Grant 17
2018028	4-1246-31013-431010-120000-1003	1,150.040	SA2018028 DMV Grant - unused funds
2018028	4-1246-31013-431010-210000-1003	88.750	SA2018028 DMV Grant - unused funds
2018028	3-1247-33000-333000-300001-1003	2,156.140	SA2018028 JAG 16 Community Policing Overtime Grant
2018028	4-1247-31013-431010-120000-1003	2,003.640	SA2018028 JAG 16 Grant Year End Reconciliation
2018028	4-1247-31013-431010-210000-1003	152.500	SA2018028 JAG 16 Grant Year End Reconciliation
2018029	3-1520-19000-319000-199900-9999	40,000.000	SA2018029 OAR Grant - Regional Jail Contribution
2018029	3-1520-24000-324000-240440-1003	278,279.000	SA2018029 OAR Grant - DCJS State Contribution
2018029	4-1520-29406-421090-566120-1003	318,279.000	SA2018029 OAR Grant - Contribution
2018030	4-9000-69983-466732-312350-6599	74,530.200	SA2018030

2018030	3-9000-69000-351000-512012-6599	74,530.200	SA2018030
2018030	4-1005-93010-493010-930004-9999	74,530.200	SA2018030
2018030	3-1005-51000-351000-510100-9999	74,530.200	SA2018030
2018031	4-1000-12200-412200-110000-1001	-17,153.000	SA2018031 Tech Trainer funding to HR
2018031	4-1000-12200-412200-210000-1001	-1,312.000	SA2018031 Tech Trainer funding to HR
2018031	4-1000-12200-412200-221000-1001	-2,113.000	SA2018031 Tech Trainer funding to HR
2018031	4-1000-12200-412200-241000-1001	-225.000	SA2018031 Tech Trainer funding to HR
2018031	4-1000-12200-412200-231000-1001	-4,889.000	SA2018031 Tech Trainer funding to HR
2018031	4-1000-12200-412200-232000-1001	-125.000	SA2018031 Tech Trainer funding to HR
2018031	4-1000-12200-412200-270000-1001	-15.000	SA2018031 Tech Trainer funding to HR
2018031	4-1000-12030-412030-110000-1001	19,905.000	SA2018031 Tech Trainer funding from IT
2018031	4-1000-12030-412030-210000-1001	1,514.000	SA2018031 Tech Trainer funding from IT
2018031	4-1000-12030-412030-231000-1001	4,113.000	SA2018031 Tech Trainer funding from IT
2018031	4-1000-12030-412030-232000-1001	100.000	SA2018031 Tech Trainer funding from IT
2018031	4-1000-12030-412030-242000-1001	200.000	SA2018031 Tech Trainer funding from IT
2018032	3-1215-24000-324000-240500-9999	118,400.000	SA2018032 State Revenue -VATI from DHCD
2018032	3-1215-51000-351000-512004-9999	10,000.000	SA2018032 Transfer from Grants Leveraging Fund
2018032	4-1215-12200-412200-392000-9999	123,400.000	SA2018032 Contract Services - Centurylink
2018032	4-1215-12200-412200-300205-9999	5,000.000	SA2018032 Grant Administration Services
2018032	4-1000-99900-499000-999974-9999	-10,000.000	SA2018032 Transfer from Grants Leveraging Fund - VATI/Centurylink Grant - 1215
2018032	4-1000-93010-493010-930200-9999	10,000.000	SA2018032 Transfer to VATI/Centurylink Grant - 1215
2018034	3-4100-51000-351000-510100-9999	203,000.000	SA2018034 App: ECC FB 10/4/17 appropriations
2018034	4-4100-31045-435600-360000-1003	5,000.000	SA2018034 ECC FB: citizen engagement
2018034	4-4100-31040-435600-800712-1003	3,000.000	SA2018034 ECC FB: critical testing software
2018034	4-4100-31040-435600-800500-1003	50,000.000	SA2018034 ECC FB: replacement vehicle and equipment
2018034	4-4100-31040-435600-800700-1003	110,000.000	SA2018034 ECC FB: IT infrastructure upgrades
2018034	4-4100-31040-435600-800700-1003	35,000.000	SA2018034 ECC FB: security upgrades
2018035	3-9050-18110-318110-190435-9999	16,200.000	SA2018035 RFTC Capital Reserve-UVA Contribution
2018035	3-9050-18110-318110-190319-9999	34,200.000	SA2018035 RFTC Capital Reserve-City Contribution
2018035	3-9050-18110-318110-512031-9999	39,600.000	SA2018035 RFTC Capital Reserve-Co Contriubution
2018035	4-9050-31029-431010-999999-9999	90,000.000	SA2018035 RFTC Capital Reserve
2018035	3-9010-51000-351000-510100-9999	39,600.000	SA2018035 RFTC Capital Reserve-Co Contribution
2018035	4-9010-31029-431010-930226-9999	39,600.000	SA2018035 RFTC Capital Reserve-Co Contribution
2018036	3-8526-51000-351000-510100-9999	52,217.630	SA2018036 Green Blue-Still Meadows
2018036	3-8536-51000-351000-510100-9999	20,000.000	SA2018036 Green Blue-Still Meadows
2018036	3-9010-51000-351000-512098-9999	52,217.630	SA2018036 Green Blue-Still Meadows
2018036	3-9010-51000-351000-512068-9999	20,000.000	SA2018036 Green Blue-Still Meadows
2018036	4-8526-93010-493010-930010-9999	52,217.630	SA2018036 Green Blue-Still Meadows
2018036	4-8536-93010-493010-930010-9999	20,000.000	SA2018036 Green Blue-Still Meadows
2018036	4-9010-71018-471010-800605-7100	72,001.280	SA2018036 Green Blue-Still Meadows
2018036	4-9010-72030-471010-950026-7100	-9,783.650	SA2018036 Green Blue-Still Meadows
2018036	4-9010-71018-471010-950026-7100	10,000.000	SA2018036 Green Blue-Belvedere
2018037	3-9010-41400-341000-410530-9999	6,033,665.160	SA2018037 Borrowed Proceeds
2018037	4-9010-95000-495000-312807-9999	118,307.160	SA2018037 Cost of Issuance
2018037	4-9010-93010-493010-930004-9999	5,915,358.000	SA2018037 Borrowed Proceeds Transfer
2018037	3-9000-69000-351000-512090-6599	5,915,358.000	SA2018037 Borrowed Proceeds Transfer
2018037	3-9000-69000-324000-240265-6599	726,000.000	SA2018037 State Technology Grant
2018037	3-9000-69000-351000-510100-6599	1,653,242.000	SA2018037 School CIP Fund Balance
2018037	4-9000-69990-468200-800700-6599	263,000.000	SA2018037 Administrative Technology
2018037	4-9000-69990-468300-800700-6599	575,000.000	SA2018037 Instructional Technology
2018037	4-9000-69990-468300-800707-6599	726,000.000	SA2018037 State Technology Grant
2018037	4-9000-69980-464600-800614-6599	150,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-464600-800634-6599	100,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-464600-800665-6599	30,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-464600-800949-6599	640,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-464600-950257-6599	75,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466200-301210-6599	30,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466200-800140-6599	125,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466200-800675-6599	200,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466740-301210-6106	75,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466740-301210-6107	200,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466740-301210-6252	900,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466740-301210-6253	750,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466740-301210-6599	100,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466740-312350-6252	70,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466750-301210-6115	60,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466750-301210-6252	130,600.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466750-301210-6599	225,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466750-800725-6110	15,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466750-800725-6254	25,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466750-950184-6302	390,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466760-301210-6103	165,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466760-301210-6111	660,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466760-301210-6251	220,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466760-301210-6254	220,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466760-301210-6255	110,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466760-301210-6505	600,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466760-301210-6599	50,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466790-301210-6104	50,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466790-301210-6253	15,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466790-301210-6599	100,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-466790-800612-6599	40,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-646000-301210-6117	80,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-646000-301210-6301	80,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018037	4-9000-69980-646600-800614-6600	50,000.000	SA2018037 School Maintenance/Replacement Program
2018038	3-9000-69000-351000-510100-6599	187,608.890	SA2018038 GO Bond funded project equity
2018038	3-9000-69000-351000-512090-6599	2,492,518.110	SA2018038 2017 GO Bond Proceeds Transfer to School

			Division
2018038	3-9010-41400-341000-410530-9999	2,542,368.470	SA2018038 2017 GO Bond Proceeds
2018038	4-9000-69983-466730-800605-6112	20,312.000	SA2018038 Woodbrook Elementary School Addition-Modernization
2018038	4-9000-69983-466730-800605-6302	474,000.000	SA2018038 Western Albemarle high School Environmental Studies Academy Phase 2 Project
2018038	4-9000-69983-466731-800605-6599	220,565.000	SA2018038 School Security Improvements Program
2018038	4-9000-69983-466732-800605-6301	1,965,250.000	SA2018038 Learning Space Modernization
2018038	4-9010-93010-493010-930004-9999	2,492,518.110	SA2018038 2017 GO Bond Proceeds Transfer to School Division
2018038	4-9010-95000-495000-312807-9999	49,850.360	SA2018038 2017 GO Bond Cost of Issuance
2018039	4-9010-41350-441200-950522-9999	-20,000.000	SA2018039
2018039	4-9010-41020-441200-800875-9999	20,000.000	SA2018039
TOTAL		45,465,900.980	

Ms. Mallek **moved** that the Board adopt the Resolution of Official Intent to Reimburse Expenditures with Proceeds of a Borrowing. The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Dill.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Sheffield.

**RESOLUTION OF OFFICIAL INTENT TO REIMBURSE
EXPENDITURES WITH PROCEEDS OF A BORROWING**

WHEREAS, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, Virginia (the “Borrower”) intends to acquire, construct and equip the items and projects set forth in Exhibit A hereto (collectively, the “Project”); and

WHEREAS, plans for the Project have advanced and the Borrower expects to advance its own funds to pay expenditures related to the Project (the “Expenditures”) prior to incurring indebtedness and to receive reimbursement for such Expenditures from proceeds of tax-exempt bonds or taxable debt, or both.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors that:

1. The Borrower intends to utilize the proceeds of tax-exempt bonds (the “Bonds”) or to incur other debt to pay the costs of the Project in an amount not currently expected to exceed \$8,576,034.
2. The Borrower intends that the proceeds of the Bonds be used to reimburse the Borrower for Expenditures with respect to the Project made on or after the date that is no more than 60 days prior to the date of this Resolution. The Borrower reasonably expects on the date hereof that it will reimburse the Expenditures with the proceeds of the Bonds or other debt.
3. Each Expenditure was or will be, unless otherwise approved by bond counsel, either (a) of a type properly chargeable to a capital account under general federal income tax principles (determined in each case as of the date of the Expenditure); (b) a cost of issuance with respect to the Bonds; (c) a nonrecurring item that is not customarily payable from current revenues; or (d) a grant to a party that is not related to or an agent of the Borrower so long as such grant does not impose any obligation or condition (directly or indirectly) to repay any amount to or for the benefit of the Borrower.
4. The Borrower intends to make a reimbursement allocation, which is a written allocation by the Borrower that evidences the Borrower’s use of proceeds of the Bonds to reimburse an Expenditure, no later than 18 months after the later of the date on which the Expenditure is paid or the Project is placed in service or abandoned, but in no event more than three years after the date on which the Expenditure is paid. The Borrower recognizes that exceptions are available for certain “preliminary expenditures,” costs of issuance, certain de minimis amounts, expenditures by “small issuers” (based on the year of issuance and not the year of expenditure) and expenditures for construction of at least five years.
5. The Borrower intends that the adoption of this Resolution confirms the “official intent” within the meaning of Treasury Regulations Section 1.150-2 promulgated under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended.
6. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its passage.

**Exhibit A
Bond Funded Projects**

General Government

Cost of Issuance

\$ 168,158

School Division

Learning Space Modernization Project	\$ 1,827,683
School Security Improvements Program	\$ 205,125
School Maintenance/Replacement Program	\$ 5,915,358
Western Albemarle high School Environmental Studies Academy Phase 2	\$ 440,820
Woodbrook Elementary School Addition-Modernization	\$ 18,890
Total	\$ 8,576,034

Agenda Item No. 24. **Public Hearing: Implementation of \$25.00 Will Probate Fee.** To receive comments on its intent to adopt an ordinance to amend Albemarle County Code Chapter 15 (“Taxation”) by adding Section 15-501 (“Tax in Lieu of Probate Tax”) and renumbering current Section 15-501 (“Collection, Payment to Director of Finance”) to Section 15-502. Pursuant to Virginia Code Section 58.1-1718, the ordinance would add a \$25.00 fee to be assessed for the recordation of a list of heirs or an affidavit listing real estate owned by an intestate decedent in the Albemarle County Circuit Court unless a will has been probated for the decedent or there has been a grant of administration on the decedent’s estate.
(Advertised in the Daily Progress on September 18 and September 25, 2017.)

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the 2010 session of the General Assembly enacted Virginia Code § 58.1-1717.1 and amended Virginia Code §§ 58.1-1718 and 58.1-3805 to authorize localities to charge a \$25.00 fee for the recordation of a list of heirs or an affidavit listing the real estate owned by an intestate decedent. This fee is assessed unless a will has been probated for the decedent or there has been a grant of administration for the decedent’s estate.

Pursuant to Virginia Code § 58.1-3806 and current County Code § 15-501, the fee would be collected by the Clerk of the Circuit Court and remitted to the County’s Director of Finance, and it would be used to fund the maintenance, repair, and purchase of recording devices for the Circuit Court Clerk’s Office upon appropriation of those funds by the Board.

Jon Zug, Clerk of the Albemarle County Circuit Court, estimates that the collection of this fee would generate an average of approximately \$625.00 - \$750.00 in revenue each year.

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

Mr. John Blair, Deputy County Attorney, presented. He explained that when a person dies without a will they are classified as an intestate individual. He said that for them to transfer property they have to record a list of heirs as well as an affidavit that lists real property they own in order to document for the chain of title that property is transferred from the decedent to his heirs. He stated the proposed fee was enabled by Virginia Code Section 58.1-1718. He explained that the state audited the Clerk of Court’s office and discovered the County has not been collecting this fee and advised the Clerk to place this proposal on the agenda. He said the fee is used to finance the probate delivery system which records the lists of heirs and serves as an indexing purpose for the Clerk of the Circuit Court as well as for title searches. He said it will also go towards maintenance of computers used in the probate process. He noted that they do charge a fee for those who die with a will.

Mr. Jon Zug, Clerk of Albemarle Circuit Court, addressed the Board. He explained how this is an issue of equity, as those who die with a will must pay a fee and so it will be fair if those who die without a will also pay the fee. He estimated the fee would generate \$400 - \$700/year in revenue and would help maintain equipment in the office.

Ms. Mallek asked what proof is necessary to demonstrate that one is an heir. Mr. Zug replied that they take a person’s identification card. He explained that with intestate they are looking for a familial relationship and people attest under oath, which would result in a felony charge if they are lying.

Mr. Randolph asked what the fee is for those with a will. Mr. Zug replied that there is a \$16 recording fee to file a real estate affidavit. He said the fee for the will is based on the dollar amount that transfers and varies from person to person.

Ms. McKeel opened the public hearing.

As no one stepped forward to speak, Ms. McKeel closed the public hearing.

Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board adopt the proposed Ordinance to implement a \$25 will probate fee. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 17-15(3)

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 15, TAXATION, ARTICLE V, TAX ON PROBATE OF WILLS OR GRANTS OF ADMINISTRATION, OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE, VIRGINIA

BE IT ORDAINED By the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, that Chapter 15, Taxation, Article V, Tax on Probate of Wills or Grants of Administration, is hereby amended as follows:

By Adding:

Sec. 15-501 Tax in lieu of probate tax

By Renumbering:

Sec. 15-501 Collection, payment to director of finance to Sec. 15-502

CHAPTER 15. TAXATION

ARTICLE V. TAX ON PROBATE OF WILLS OR GRANTS OF ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 15-500 Imposed; amount.

There is hereby imposed and levied by the county a tax equal to one-third (1/3) of the amount of the state tax collectable for the state on the probate of a will or the grant of administration.

(Code 1967, § 9-9; Code 1988, § 8-10; Ord. 98-A(1), 8-5-98)

State law reference--Authority of county to impose probate tax, Va. Code § 58.1-1718.

Sec. 15-501 Tax in lieu of probate tax.

There is hereby imposed and levied by the county a tax of twenty-five dollars (\$25.00) for the recordation of a list of heirs or an affidavit listing real estate owned by an intestate decedent in addition to the state tax and fee imposed for such recordation pursuant to Virginia Code § 58.1-1717.1.

State law reference – Authority of county to impose recordation fee, Va. Code § 58.1-1718

Sec. 15-502 Collection, payment to director of finance.

The clerk of the circuit court of the county shall collect the tax imposed by this article and pay the same to the director of finance.

(Code 1967, § 9-10; Code 1988, § 8-11; Ord. 98-A(1), 8-5-98)

State law reference –Va. Code § 58.1-3803

NonAgenda. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

Mr. David Ball, a resident of Buckingham County and independent candidate for the 59th district, addressed the Board. He expressed concern that funds to support high speed internet service in rural areas has been diverted. He said that a compressor station was proposed for Buckingham County, and he has investigated the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and determined it does not make sense from a technical standpoint. Mr. Ball stated that the area is hurting for jobs. He said health care is a big issue. He said they must address issues with the state retirement fund. He said the state police are losing troopers at an alarming rate to other localities. He said the incumbent candidate has ignored these issues and is working diligently for the party whereas, he wants to work for the voters, as the needs of the people are more important than the needs of a political party.

Agenda Item No. 25. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. Mallek asked if they have set a time on the agenda to discuss fire rules. She indicated there is an issue with people wanting to take stumps to the dump. Mr. Walker offered to place it on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Dill said there must be a better way to burn things than letting them smolder for a month.

Ms. Mallek said that construction debris should not be allowed and gave an example of a pile at Still Meadow that burned for six weeks. She said rubbish could be hauled away and grinded up, the market for pallets is strong, and that people should not be allowed to poison the air.

Ms. Palmer said she has observed that many people have burn barrels in their yards filled with plastic and household trash.

Ms. Mallek indicated that Mr. Mark Graham would be getting back to her on the issue of stream crossings.

Mr. Kamptner said there was a significant change in the water protection ordinance in 2008 intended to clarify rules. He said every lot was entitled to one stream crossing and it could serve more than one house if it is on the same lot, though multiple stream crossings need to meet performance standards or be approved by the program administrator. He said he would bring this issue back before the Board.

Ms. Mallek said she had found a 1991 letter from Soil and Water Conservation District about buffers that she would scan and distribute this to Supervisors, as it may help with discussions about buffers.

Ms. McKeel asked if there is consensus about what to do with the Kingfisher Fishing Club boat ramp. Ms. Mallek responded that it is on a Parks and Recreation list, but there is no funding for it at the current time. She said Mr. Mawyer would not close his until ours is ready and that mud from the drought is preventing them from reaching the ramp.

Ms. McKeel asked for the Board's opinion about her writing a letter to the Kingfisher Club explaining what is going on. There was consensus to allow Mr. Walker and staff to draft a letter.

Ms. Mallek asked if the County has the authority to ban idling. Mr. Kamptner said they can ban idling of buses for more than 15 minutes, but this cannot include school buses. He said they can direct policy for County and school vehicles.

Ms. Mallek asked Mr. Walker if he could consider a policy discussion as well as deliver a message to staff asking they not idle in County vehicles. Ms. McKeel suggested they work with the schools on developing an educational message about idling for their next joint meeting.

Ms. Mallek expressed disappointment at learning that CATEC is still considering whether it will carry out its strategic plan that took four years to adopt. She said this would be on the March agenda for CATEC. She said if they wait then current students will be long gone and would not have learned skills they could have learned.

Ms. McKeel replied that the County is pushing more and more career and vocational courses in the high schools. She explained that CATEC is a City/County school run by the School Board, and the challenge is that they feel like there is no money. Ms. McKeel said that moving CATEC to Piedmont Virginia Community College is expensive as PVCC President, Frank Friedman, estimated it would cost \$40M to move the program. She said they could meet with the School Board about this.

Mr. Randolph announced that he may be absent from their October 11 meeting.

Mr. Kamptner asked about the Virginia Outdoors Foundation easement for Boyd Tavern and offered to provide a briefing next week and obtain direction from the Board.

Ms. Mallek said a briefing would be helpful.

Agenda Item No. 26. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 27. Closed Session. *(if needed)*

There was no need for an additional Closed Meeting.

Agenda Item No. 28. Adjourn to October 11, 2017, 3:30 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 7:45 p.m., Ms. McKeel adjourned the meeting until October 11, 2017 at 3:30 p.m.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 01/03/2018
Initials CKB