An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on February 23, 2017, at 3:00 p.m., Room 241, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from February 22, 2017.

PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill (arrived at 3:17 p.m.), Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer, Mr. Rick Randolph, and Mr. Brad L. Sheffield.

ABSENT: None.

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. The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by the Chair, Ms. McKeel.

Board members and County staff then introduced themselves.

____

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** FY 2017-2018 Operating and Capital Budgets.

- **Overview.**
  - **Budget Summary**
  - **Revenues**
  - **Expenditures**

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, stated that this is the first work session for the FY18 budget, and in the past they have used an interactive approach, with staff presenting slides and working through the budget document, but welcoming questions from Board members at any time. She said that members of the budget and finance staff are present at the meeting to answer questions in their areas of expertise. Ms. Allshouse stated that they have also used a "list" in the past, to include items from the Board members for which they wish to have dialogue in the future. She said that on March 7, they would be finalizing the budget, and it would remain as the Board's proposed budget until they actually adopt it, at which time they would also determine the tax rate.

Ms. Allshouse reported that at this meeting, they would talk about revenues and expenditures, going through individual departments' budgets, and the School Board would join the Board for their February 27th meeting and present the schools' budget. She said the Board would then continue with some of the departmental areas not yet discussed. Ms. Allshouse stated that on March 2nd, they would discuss the CIP and debt service, and on March 7 they would finalize the tax rate for advertisement and public hearing, as well as approving the proposed budget. She noted that there are some placeholders for work sessions in the event they need them, and on April 11 there are two public hearings on the same night, the public hearing on the proposed budget and the public hearing on the tax rate. Ms. Allshouse noted that on April 18, staff would be asking the Board to set the tax rate and approve the budget.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the two-year fiscal plan set direction for the budget process, which recommended no tax rate increases and delayed the CIP-related tax increase; enhanced the use of dedicated revenues for specific services; strategically used one-time money and used existing funding formulas; and established three major goals. She stated that the focus of the FY18 budget has the three goals from their two-year plan and two additional goals: implement the Board's approved strategic priorities, drive transformation, support the quality organization; make thoughtful investments in the future, and meet mandates and obligations. Ms. Allshouse presented slides on the recommended total budget, which is the general fund plus the school fund plus the CIP and special revenue funds, constituting the "big picture." She stated that the budget is $397 million, representing a 5.8% increase over the FY17 adopted budget. Ms. Allshouse said the general fund revenues are 68% of the total County budget, and the budget document includes other funds and some other information.

Ms. Allshouse reported that general fund revenues total $274 million, and there are three general local revenue sections: general property taxes, including real estate, personal property, and public service taxes; other local taxes, including consumer-driven taxes; and other local revenue, which includes fees, building inspection permits, investments and charges for services. She stated that there is $14.85 million of growth in those areas projected for FY18. Ms. Allshouse said there are also state and federal revenues, transfers from other funds, including a tourism fund, and use of fund balance, which is basically use of savings from FY16 and earlier, but is considered revenue for purposes of crafting the budget.

Ms. Allshouse reported that real estate revenues are calculated at the current rate of 0.839 cents per $100 of assessed value, and the revenues are expected to generate $143.5 million, or 52.4% of the general fund. She stated that the revenues provide a $7.8 million increase over FY17, and a portion of it is due to the change in reassessment, with another portion due to new construction and land divisions. Ms. Allshouse said the tax rate is a calendar year tax rate, and it reflects a 2.87% increase for calendar year 2017 reassessments, and an assumption of a 2.5% increase in reassessments next calendar year. She stated that each penny on the tax rate yields approximately $1.7 million in estimated collectible real estate tax revenues. Ms. Allshouse noted that the effective tax rate to be advertised would be 0.809 for $100 of assessed value, and there is approximately $1 million available in tax relief for the elderly and disabled for the year.

Ms. Allshouse presented information on local tax revenue other than real estate: local personal property, which includes automobiles, other personal property, and business personal property, which is projected to increase by $2.9 million or 11.8%; consumer-driven activities, which include sales tax, BPOL, food and beverage tax, etc., which is projected to increase by $2.1 million or 4%; public service tax, which is railroads, utilities, and pipelines, which is projected to increase by $1.1 million. Ms. Allshouse presented information on trends in other local taxes, stating that sales tax generated a 6.2% increase or $16.2 million; and prior to the recession, the tax revenue was approximately $15 million.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the figure presented was projected for FY18, and when they would find out what the actual collections are. Ms. Allshouse responded that staff monitors it frequently and would have information available for each quarter.

Ms. Betty Burrell, Director of Finance, reported that sales tax is remitted on a monthly basis, so they know about 30 days after the money comes in, so they will not know FY18 until July of FY19.

Ms. Allshouse reported that business license fees are estimated to increase to $12.1 million, an increase of $700,000 or 6.1%, based on the strength in job growth, increasing construction, and increases based on how FY16 ended and how FY17 is projected to end.

Ms. Allshouse reported that there are two utility taxes in the budget, including consumer utility taxes such as telephones, gas and electric, which are projected to decline about 4.5% or $400,000 from an $8.5 million revenue stream for FY18. She stated that the reasons for the decrease are fewer land lines and improved energy efficiency. Ms. Allshouse said that food and beverage taxes were projected to increase $381,000 or 5.2%, bringing the total to $7.8 million in revenue from that category. She stated that the transient occupancy tax was projected to increase about 26%, and explained that one amount comes into the general fund, 2% or $1.3 million; there is also 3% that comes in under “other funds” in the budget, which must be targeted for tourism-related activities, such as Parks and Recreation or the ACE program.

Ms. Mallek asked if this is the line that is divided, with part sent to the Convention and Visitors Bureau, or if that is a separate pot. Ms. Allshouse responded that it is the pot in the tourism fund, and she clarified that what comes into the general fund can be used for anything.

Ms. Allshouse stated that there are other local revenues, fees for service, investments, etc., which she would not cover in detail.

Ms. Allshouse reported that there are four different categories of state revenues: non-categorical aid, which is not specific and includes personal property tax relief, totaling $14.9 million each year as a fixed amount; and vehicle rental tax and miscellaneous, totaling $15.9 million. She reported that categorical aid includes Social Services funding, recordation taxes, law enforcement funding under HB-599, and other miscellaneous categorical aid, totaling $5.7 million and representing a 10% increase. Ms. Allshouse reported that the third category is shared expenses, whereby the state shares expenses for the Commonwealth’s Attorney, Clerk of the Circuit Court, Sheriff, Registrar, and some funding for the Finance Department. She said this category totals $2.2 million and reflects a small reduction. Ms. Allshouse noted that the County gets payment in lieu of taxes from the University of Virginia as the fourth category, with a small increase of approximately $138,000 projected for FY18.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the federal funds for the general fund include payment in lieu of taxes for tax exempt parkland in the County, estimated at about $38,000; federal categorical aid of $5.7 million, designated for specific use, which is received on a reimbursement basis, primarily for Social Services and Medicaid expenses, with a $500,000 or 10.5% increase anticipated over the adopted FY17 budget. She noted that in FY16, approximately $6 million was received, so the FY18 projection is for a slight decrease.

Ms. Allshouse presented a chart showing expenditures, noting that these are broad categories required to be reported to the state, with the budget document following these categories: administration, judicial, public safety, etc. She stated that expenditures also include revenue sharing, transfer to the schools, transfers to capital and debt service, and some other uses of funds. Ms. Allshouse stated that the increase is 6.5% in the FY18 recommended budget over the FY17 budget. She said the last time there was an increase in the revenue-sharing payment to the City of Charlottesville was FY11, with a payment of $18.5 million, with a two-year lag in the formula and FY18 being the first year of an increase, with a payment of $15.9 million.

Ms. Palmer asked Ms. Allshouse to explain the specifics that were driving the increase. Ms. Allshouse responded that it reflects the actual economy and the two-year lag of revenues coming in, stating that the Finance Department could provide more details, and the increase is reflective of increased property values.

Mr. Bill Letteri, Deputy County Executive for Financial and Management Services, offered for staff to provide a breakdown of the key components used in the calculation. Ms. Palmer responded that it may be helpful to have a simplified version when trying to explain to the public what the main drivers are.

Mr. Kamptner noted that it is based on real property values, tax rates, and populations, and how the City’s relates to the County’s, and that information is plugged into the formula.

_____

- **Cross Departmental**

Ms. Allshouse reported that there are **cross departmental** expenses associated with a 2% market salary adjustment increase effective July 1, 2017, and the total cost of that for general government is nearly $1 million, including the general fund and fire fund. She stated that there is no increase for general government's VRS rate, which adjusts every few years, with Albemarle County having a sub-fund within VRS. She said that department operational costs increase almost 10% or $1.1 million, including items such as resources needed to support the strategic plan, increases in IT maintenance costs, training, utilities, health services for police officers and sheriff's deputies, operational impacts from the CIP, etc. Ms. Allshouse stated that for each departmental budget, staff includes information on the increase from FY17 if there have been any adjustments, and a category for those increasing in FY18.

Ms. Allshouse reported that with cross-functional agency funding, there are human service agencies reviewed by the Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT), which includes City and County staff and community members. She stated that the ABRT members do a thorough review, looking at outcomes and conducting site visits, then making recommendations to the City and the County. Ms. Allshouse stated that there are also cultural agencies, which the City still includes but the County handles outside of the ABRT process with its own internal staff team, showing up in the Parks and Recreation section of the budget. She stated that there are also agencies classified as regional authorities, joint exercise of power agreements such as ECC and the regional jail, agencies with written agreements such as the SPCA, and discretionary agencies that are not in the ABRT but are basically nonprofits. Ms. Allshouse noted that they have broken down the staffing resources into four categories to encourage more transparency and understanding, and some of that category funds temporary and contractual resources.

Ms. McKeel said there is a written agreement with JABA, yet it is not listed here.

Mr. Kamptner added that he was not sure why, but he would check into it and get back to the Board with that information.

Ms. Allshouse stated that there are also resources that continue approved positions during FY17, since the adopted budget, such as Community Development positions approved for the new fiscal year. She said the third category is recommended adjustments to current positions, and the fourth category is new positions recommended to be included in the budget for FY18. Ms. Allshouse noted that staff would like to hold off discussion on the Department of Social Services budget, as its Director, Phyllis Savides, was not able to attend this meeting; and the Community Development and Economic Development budgets, for which staff was adding some information.

_____

- **Brief overview of major changes associated with the following expenditure categories:**
    - **Administration Area**

Mr. Bill Letteri reported that the categories of expenditures in the general fund are listed in the budget document and include administrative, judicial, public safety, public works, health and welfare, parks and recreation, and community development categories. Mr. Letteri stated that he would highlight what he feels are the most important issues related to these expenditure areas, as well as pointing out the nature of the functional areas. He said that **Administration** is responsible for a lot of the leadership, management and operational areas of the County, including the Finance Department, Information Technology, the County Executive, County Attorney, the Board of Supervisors, Voter Registration, and the Office of Management and Budget. Mr. Letteri noted that these departments are largely responsible for advancing the Board's priorities and strategic initiatives, and are involved in a lot of the transformational and efficiency efforts underway now and projected to be underway in the future, as well as quality organizational issues such as the Human Resources department and employee recruitment and retention issues. He mentioned that the County has received national GFOA awards for both finance and budget departments and has been recognized nationally for the IT department for counties of this size, and most recently has established its AAA bond rating.

Mr. Letteri stated that beginning with the **Board of Supervisors**, total expenditures are approximately $674,000, with the recommended budget reflecting a decrease of about 1.5%. He said there is a small increase related to live video streaming, and the corresponding decrease was the change in benefit costs, due to elections made by those in this category regarding health insurance. Mr. Letteri said the **County Executive's** office is responsible for the overall administration of the day-to-day operations of the County and also has a division of community relations, and this category reflects a decrease of 0.2%, with net decreases of $24,000 related to expenditure reductions in software licenses and some other minor items.

Mr. Randolph stated that he had a question from a constituent about losing the full-time County Executive and gaining an interim County Executive, specifically why salaries are projected to increase 1.3%. Mr. Letteri explained that this covers another fiscal year in which the new County Executive would be hired, so it is fully funded at this point.

Mr. Doug Walker stated that they also include a salary lapse in the budget as a factor, but it is not on a position-by-position basis, and they have adjusted the allowance for lapse based on experience, benefitting more from a higher degree of lapsed savings as it relates to the expectations or projections for the FY18 budget. He explained that "lapse" is the difference between the budgeted salary for the year and the actual salary paid because of turnover.

Mr. Letteri reported that the **Human Resources** Department is a school department, and the budget before them represents the local government share of the cost of that department, which is approximately 25%. He stated that the total operation is about $2.5 million, with the local government component comprising $782,000. Mr. Letteri said that services provided by HR relate to recruitment, selection and retention; classification and compensation; administration of benefits; employee relations and employee rewards; performance management; workplace safety and wellness; teacher licensure and certification; and learning and development. He stated that the HR budget reflects an increase of 21.5%, with the reasons highlighted on page 90, including an unemployment insurance increase of approximately $33,000 and inclusion of a diversity generalist position.

Ms. Palmer asked who covers that responsibility now. Ms. Lorna Gerome, Director of Human Resources, responded that HR staff currently does some of that, including things like manager training, but there is more that could be done, and this position would go into departments and do needs assessments, modeled after the position on the school side that focuses on inclusion.

Mr. Randolph stated that at some point, he would like to address employee retention, as this position could possibly devote some staff time to that effort.

Ms. Palmer said that she understood Ms. Gerome to describe someone who would do both. Ms. Gerome confirmed that this would be part of the diversity generalist's responsibilities.

Ms. McKeel mentioned that she would like to discuss adding an analyst position to HR, as it would be valuable to have a person who could evaluate and recommend cost savings measures, particularly related to health insurance.

Mr. Randolph commented that he still feels the ratio of time the generalist position spends on those specific tasks should be established, discussing that with Ms. Gerome, and perhaps that person could have an analytical background or some statistics courses.

Ms. McKeel stated that she feels they need a real analyst, because the organization is now large enough that it would benefit from that position.

Mr. Letteri said that this budget makes progress towards addressing some of the positional needs the County has, although it does not cover them all and there were 47 positions requested that were not funded.

Ms. McKeel stated that they could possibly let health insurance pick it up, as it would probably save enough money to pay for itself.

Mr. Letteri noted that there were two unfunded requests in HR, an HR specialist, and a total compensation and benefits software program.

Mr. Letteri reported that the **County Attorney** provides legal services and advice on all civil matters to the Board of Supervisors and the School Board, and other boards, agencies, and officials of the County. He stated that the proposed budget for $1.2 million represents a 13.1% increase, driven largely by the request for a new Assistant County Attorney position. Mr. Letteri said they have been looking at other comparable offices around the state, and have found that Albemarle is at or below the level of attorneys needed for the complexities of things they have to deal with. He stated that the allocations for the school division take up almost a full-time attorney position, as does Social Services; Community Development requires 1.2 FTEs; and the Board of Supervisors and County Executive's office require an additional 1 FTE. Mr. Letteri emphasized that this leaves one other FTE to handle all the other work of the County departments, including finance, police, Fire/Rescue, human resources, facilities and environmental services, housing, emergency communications, and others. He stated that currently the workload has been at or above 40 hours to meet demand, and it is also anticipated that there will be a number of more sophisticated and complex issues for this office to handle, including local government personnel policies, the preliminary work on re-codifying the zoning ordinance, providing ongoing legal services to recharge the Economic Development Authority and the Economic Development office, and managing the legal aspects related to issuance of general obligation bonds. Mr. Letteri added that other issues include the possible formation of a wireless service authority, a stormwater utility, and service districts.

Mr. Dill asked how transformation affects the County Attorney's office and whether there are efficiencies to be gained there. Mr. Kamptner explained that physical transformation of his office is currently underway, with boxes of old material moved from the County Office Building to a secure offsite location, as it was a safety hazard that made it dangerous for people to access older files. He stated that they will also be modifying the space where paralegals work so they can be more efficient, with a workspace that is quieter and removed, and from a legal standpoint, having the capacity in the office to update a number of forms will also help achieve some efficiencies. Mr. Kamptner noted that he has had on his workplan for about five years the task of updating Community Development department-related documents that need to be revised, some of which have generated complaints from bonding companies because they are outdated. He stated that recently, his office revised the stormwater management maintenance agreement for all the private stormwater facilities in the County; and they are implementing processes with the Department of Water Resources and working with Community Development to improve communications in dealing with stormwater issues.

Mr. Kamptner emphasized that efficiencies will allow them to spend appropriate time in pursuing litigation, as it has always been a scramble to keep up with that, which is always an incredibly time-intensive endeavor. He added that two major items on his office's priority list are recodification of the County Code and recodification of the Zoning Ordinance, as a lot of time is spent on helping Community

Development interpret various provisions in the ordinance, with some of that text dating back to 1969. Mr. Kamptner stated that this will build capacity for his office as well as the Community Development department. He said they are also working more out of “subject matter silos,” so that attorneys in the office are engaged in cross-topic issues, in an effort to build redundancy in various legal sectors.

Mr. Dill commented that the County often seems to be in a Catch-22 situation in which they could find more time if they could build in efficiencies, but not having time to implement efficiencies.

Mr. Kamptner stated that they get caught up in the day-to-day activities, and bigger items get pushed aside, and while they are working on it, it takes some time.

Ms. McKeel asked if he feels one position would handle it. Mr. Kamptner responded that once they have the sixth attorney and he or she is up and functioning, the work will fill every hour of the day, and there is always work to be done and work that is not being addressed.

Ms. Palmer asked what the timeline is for completing recodification of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Kamptner responded that it is slated for 2018.

Mr. Walker clarified that in the fall, the Board had approved one-time resources to support Community Development and the County Attorney’s office to initiate the recodification process, and at the time indicated that this permanent position would be coming forward, meaning the one-time funds would not be needed in FY18.

Mr. Kamptner said this was delayed because in March, Community Development will be coming forward with their revised work plan, with the action plan for amending the zoning ordinance likely coming to the Board in April, including some resolutions of intent to get started. He noted that the amendments were non-substantive and fairly easy, but the planners would need at least a year to work on the substantive items. Mr. Kamptner said the ordinances being worked on now would be part of a two-step process, taking pieces at a time so the Board and Planning Commission can see what the changes are, with the Board adopting the entire ordinance at once when it comes back for recodification.

Mr. Letteri reported that the **Finance Department** also serves local government and schools, providing a broad array of services and functions including financial management and reporting, assessment and collection of all local revenues, cash management, debt management, risk management, and financial systems management functions. He stated that a number of the services provided to both schools and local government and joint agencies include payroll, accounts payable, procurement, capital financing, general accounting, quarterly and annual financial reporting, economic vitality monitoring and reporting, and revenue forecasting. Mr. Letteri said that this department has been very challenged to keep up with the workload, and the budget is one of the largest in the category of administration, at $5.6 million, and the recommended budget reflects an increase of 7.4%.

Mr. Letteri stated that the primary reason for that increase, in addition to the cross-departmental areas, is an addition of $90,000 in part-time salary and benefits to assist with the transition of a number of key positions in the department, to allow for the engagement of contractual labor and part-time staff to help with those transitions. Mr. Letteri said the other major increase is due to a buyer position in the procurement division, as the department deals with procurement for both schools and local government, and this year there would be significant increases related to the capital programs pertaining to the bond referendum projects and other initiatives. He stated that the other position is a management analyst position to address some of the critical work needs within the department and the four divisions that are part of it, as those positions have been absorbed elsewhere in the department. Mr. Letteri noted that this would enable the department to focus more on customer service and to work with the OMB department in the area of debt management and capital programs.

Mr. Letteri mentioned that one of the resource plan requests this year was for an additional real estate appraiser position, which was not funded in the FY18 budget, and that was one of the more difficult decisions made in bringing the budget forward, given all the growth in new construction and new permits, which requires additional assessment work.

Ms. Palmer asked why it was not funded and whether there has been discussion of going to biennial assessments to help free up staff. Mr. Letteri responded that there was a desire to get the new software implemented and understood before making decisions about how the positions might be funded, but staff plans to reintroduce the position in FY19.

Ms. Palmer said she would like to get input from the Finance Department or the County Assessor’s Office on the possible relief provided by going to biennial assessments, as the County did every other year assessments for many years. Ms. Burrell stated that staff has had discussions about what it would take to go back to a biennial reassessment process, and it is not a panacea that would suddenly mean a lot less work for staff. She said the Assessor’s Office is already greatly challenged in that no additional staff was added when the County went to an annual assessment process, and at the same time, the expectation of more thorough review of land use applicants’ properties put a tremendous amount of stress on existing resources. Ms. Burrell commented that staff has done a decent job, but would like to incorporate best practices in the assessment process.

Ms. Mallek asked if it was best to have the part-time people, who came back after retirement, helping as opposed to hiring a full-time person who could help consistently. Ms. Burrell responded that Mr. Butch Beverly, retired Assistant County Assessor, helped complete the 2015 revalidation process;

and Mr. Bruce Woodzell, retired County Assessor, who came in to assist while the new computer-aided mass appraisal system was being implemented. She said that it does make sense to have one FTE instead of numerous part-time people.

Ms. McKeel asked Ms. Burrell if she would like for the Board to consider another assessor position. Ms. Burrell responded that she would, if it were appropriate, and she feels a bit awkward talking about a position that is not in the budget.

Ms. Palmer stated the reason she brought it up is because when they went to annual assessments, no additional staff was requested, which did strain the department, and the question is whether or not there is a value in going to biennial assessments.

Ms. McKeel said her sense from Ms. Burrell is that going between one and two years is not going to solve the department's problem.

Ms. Mallek stated that she had already noted to add an appraiser to the list for discussion, and she would prefer not to go back to the up and down of switching from annual to biennial assessments, as it can create lasting problems.

Mr. Walker asked if the Board is interested in a presentation on an annual versus biennial assessment process. Ms. McKeel responded that she is comfortable with a two-year assessment cycle.

Mr. Randolph commented that Ms. Palmer raises a good point, and the County dedicated a lot of time to upgrade the software to be able to have an annual assessment, which after this year would bring the County up to date with market conditions so it reflects state-of-the art assessment of the value of properties. He stated that with this tool, the second year of the assessments works to the disadvantage of the homeowner if valuations increase, but they have to wait for assessments to come back around.

Ms. Palmer said that her issue is what is more efficient from a money standpoint, and what can be gained from a few less FTEs versus the change realized by going to biennial assessments.

Mr. Letteri stated that the other consideration is, when you are in a relatively stable market environment where there is predictability, but in an area of volatility, it can be problematic.

Mr. Walker commented that this is a balanced budget so choices were made, and there are certainly needs not included here that staff would love to talk with the Board more about.

Mr. Letteri reported that the **Office of Management and Budget** is involved in both the annual budgeting process and the planning cycles for both the five-year plan and the two-year plan, which has required a fair amount of effort. He stated that OMB also addresses performance management, and while they have made progress, they would like to be in a better place. Mr. Letteri said the total recommended for this budget is $512,000, an increase of 13%, driven primarily by an increase in salary and benefits related to FLSA regulation. He stated the additional change pertains to a resource plan request totaling $30,000, converting an existing part-time office associate to a management analyst position, which is badly needed to address some complications related to that program.

Ms. Allshouse stated that OMB is a fairly small department, responsible for long-range financial planning and the two-year balanced plan, with one person primarily working on the capital program, which is one year of a $174 million CIP, and she manages all the budgets for the projects as well as handling debt management work. She said this is too much for one person to handle effectively, and staff feels the capital program is one in most need of attention.

Mr. Letteri reported that **Information Technology** represents a $3.2 million component of the budget, increasing in FY18 by 8.5%, due primarily to anticipated increases in vendor prices for licenses and support for software. He stated the other major addition has to do with moving from the platform of housing software on servers in house, to a cloud-based hosting environment, which yields a cost savings on the capital side with the shift from purchase and maintenance of servers to house software to an operational expense in purchasing licenses.

Mr. Mike Culp, Director of Information Technology, addressed the Board and explained that the County is putting its servers up in the Microsoft community cloud, which is government based and is highly secure and meeting all federal regulations for security. One of the reasons the County is moving in that direction is to provide that type of redundancy and protection, with 365-day, 24/7 monitoring and security, as well as better power and access from multiple devices.

Mr. Sheffield asked what kind of redundancy there is for internet connectivity. Mr. Culp responded that the internet connectivity being pursued now includes two separate internet service providers, and staff is looking at bringing on a third, so there would be three different ISPs.

Ms. Mallek stated that during the derecho, there was no communications access, and they would be out of business if they put everything in the cloud. Mr. Sheffield responded that during the derecho, JAUNT had three different redundancies, which enabled them to maintain access to its files, and he assumes the County will have the same approach, and not all three internet providers went down during that event.

Mr. Randolph commented that he hopes none of the access codes were based on other languages. Mr. Culp responded that they are all based in the U.S., and stated that they would have to have a backup plan that allows them to continue operations if, for some reason, all internet is down.

Mr. Letteri stated there were three unfunded requests in the IT department, including an enterprise records manager, and the County is underway as a transformational item to address its records management program. He said the process started in Community Development and was moving earnestly to HR. They are talking about the conversion of the copy center to an imaging center, and as they are implemented, the County would be able to reevaluate the need for the position, probably in FY19. Mr. Letteri added that they have also requested a help desk analyst and systems analyst position, which were not funded.

Mr. Letteri reported that there is a decrease in the **Voter Registration** department, which was funded last year at an increased level because of the election.

Ms. Mallek noted that their share of state funds would also be decreasing, and she wants to know if the County is funding them sufficiently enough to keep the department whole.

_____

Note: At 4:27 p.m., the Board recessed, and reconvened at 4:34 p.m.

_____

- **Judicial**

Mr. Letteri reported that there were relatively few changes in the **Judicial** category, which includes the Sheriff's Department, Commonwealth's Attorney, Clerk of Court, Public Defender's office, and the Courts contributions. He stated the total budget for the **Clerk of Court** is $935,000, an increase of $21,000 or 2.3% due primarily to a new software system that allows that office to schedule jurors in a much more efficient manner. Mr. Letteri said that Mr. Jon Zug, Clerk, has been doing extremely well in his overall management of the department, and staff has been encouraged by the recent annual audit.

Ms. McKeel commented that he has been doing a great job with his records.

Mr. Letteri reported that the **Commonwealth's Attorney** office has a decline in the budget of 2.3%, with relatively few changes in the department, and there was a decrease in operating expenses associated with removal of some one-time expenditures. He stated the Commonwealth's Attorney asked for an additional position, a full-time Assistant Commonwealth's Attorney, and after discussing this with staff, he feels he can wait until FY19 to add the position, so staff has included it in the two-year fiscal plan.

Mr. Randolph asked for the number of unfunded positions in FY18 to be added in FY19 so the Board is prepared for that.

Ms. McKeel said this office is one that the County is always having to pick up costs for because the state was not funding. Mr. Letteri responded that the County receives $606,000 total revenue in support of the operation, with $536,000 coming from the state and it appears to be relatively flat from last year.

Ms. Allshouse agreed that the assumption is for flat revenue in FY18, and this sometimes requires local government to step in.

Mr. Letteri said the other challenge is that the state does not always support additional positions, even though population and caseload trends may warrant them.

Mr. Letteri reported that the **Sheriff's** department is a $2.4 million expense recommendation in the budget, a 0.7% increase driven by some operating cost increases as the department is vehicle intensive and has associated costs with fuel and maintenance. He noted that there is also the establishment of a regular health service physical program, and they are trying to transition from the use of shotguns to rifles, which is more standard in the industry, and this increase includes some of the necessary ammunition and equipment. Mr. Letteri stated that one of the requests not funded was additional training that staff feels could be done in FY19, and confirmed that they are currently getting training at the Milton facility twice per year.

Mr. Randolph stated the issue is not that the police forces are overusing it, it is just a question of having enough money in the budget for the ammunition required to practice at the range. Mr. Letteri confirmed that he thought this was the case.

Mr. Letteri reported that the County contributes to the **General District**, **Circuit**, and **Juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts**, as well as the **Magistrate's** office. He noted that there is very little change here other than the City of Charlottesville serving as fiscal agent for the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, managing the maintenance and repairs, which are expected to be reduced costs in FY18. He stated that other contributions are to the Public Defender's office, and the only change is the 2% salary increase in the budget.

_____

- **Public Safety**

Mr. Letteri reported that **Public Safety**, following school expenses, is the largest category of expenditures in the general fund, totaling $39.8 million. He stated that the Police Department comprises the largest category within the group, followed by the transfer to the Fire/Rescue fund, and the Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail expenditures, the Emergency Communications Center, other public agencies, and inspections, which is managed by Community Development but for purposes of classification is part of public safety. Mr. Letteri reported that the **Police Department** totals $17.9 million in the budget and has increases of $86,000 for overtime wages, most of which are reimbursed to the department, fuel and vehicle maintenance costs, a regular health services physical program for officers, and the 2% salary increase.

Mr. Letteri stated that the public safety category also involves transfers to other funds, which are related to grants, with an increase of $35,000 for the problem-oriented policing program and an increase of $14,600 or 18.8% for the County's contribution to the firearms training facility. He noted that the crime analyst has been funded through grant funds, and the budget proposes that it become a permanent position that will be funded in FY18. Mr. Letteri said that other resource additions include two additional police officers to keep up with population growth.

Mr. Walker noted that the positions are patrol-oriented officers, with the Police Chief determining how they will best be used to compliment his resources, and the intention being to help further implement the community-based geo-policing model by adding resources to existing shifts. He noted this was identified in the two-year plan along with two other patrol positions, but was advanced faster than the plan had posed.

Mr. Randolph stated that some police departments in Florida had picked up huge security costs by having the President arrive, and asked if the County is prepared to pick up those types of expenses if the President were to visit the local Trump Winery. Mr. Walker responded that it would be best for the Police Chief to address that directly, although there were overtime costs and other resource costs incurred when dignitaries and their entourages come into town, whether it is on a campaign, visiting Monticello, etc., and the Trump Winery may present other concerns. He agreed to have the Police Chief provide a response to Mr. Randolph's question.

Mr. Andy Bowman, Senior Budget Analyst, who works on the **Fire/Rescue** fund, addressed the Board and presented a slide with the Fire Rescue Services Fund. He stated that on the revenue side, the primary funding source for this fund is 7.2 cents on the real estate tax rate, which comprises 82% of the revenues in the fund, and the fund has also received support from the EMS Cost Recovery Program, as well as some related state funding. Mr. Bowman said there has been use of fund balance from one-time costs, as well as permits and other fees. He stated that in addition to the 7.2 cents, there is 0.4 cents on the real estate tax rate that goes directly from the general fund to the CIP to support Fire/Rescue capital and debt service costs. Mr. Bowman noted that on the expenditure side, the largest category is the Fire/Rescue department, which includes the various stations run by the department and their divisions, such as prevention and training. He said it also includes bulk purchases for the entire system, such as building insurance and turnout gear. Mr. Bowman stated that volunteer station contributions are direct contributions to the 10 stations for costs, such as building maintenance and utilities, uniforms, basic operating supplies, training, meals, etc.

Mr. Sheffield asked what percentage of the County's contribution covers the volunteer station operations, and what else is not covered. Mr. Bowman responded that there are unfunded requests, which staff has summarized in the budget document, and they include one-time costs of a capital nature, CARS' request for full funding, which has not been awarded because they largely serve the City of Charlottesville, as well as costs that are considered outside of the funding policy, such as grounds maintenance and janitorial supplies.

Mr. Sheffield asked if it was possible to get a quick summary of the total operating costs for the volunteer stations and what the County's contribution is. Mr. Bowman agreed to put something together with that information.

Ms. Mallek said that station by station would be most appropriate, and the FEMS Board would have that information. She noted that the station costs are usually about 80%, as they have to pay for engine repairs out of donations, which have taken a huge hit in recent years.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he has had conversations with other people throughout the southeast, and some localities pay the majority of the costs for capital related to volunteer stations, and he would like to get ACFR's opinion as to how the system compares to others in terms of County contributions to capital. He added that at some point, the Board may want to consider better capital support of stations.

Ms. McKeel asked for confirmation that CARS was not billing for service. Mr. Bowman confirmed that CARS is not billing for service.

Mr. Bowman stated that other Fire/Rescue costs include the contract with the City for fire services, a tax credit program for volunteers in the system, and some other smaller costs. He said the total FY18 recommended budget for this fund is $15.4 million, an increase of 8% over the FY17 adopted budget. Mr. Bowman stated the two issues he would discuss in more detail include system-wide fleet management and minimum staffing for the department. He said there is a strong connection to the County's budget goal of transformation, and innovation and transformation are nothing new to Fire/Rescue as ACFR and volunteers have partnered to create efficiencies by consolidating how they purchase fuel, how they do training, management and repair of turnout gear, and self-contained breathing apparatus in the CIP.

Mr. Bowman stated the next best opportunity for doing something transformative is with system-wide fleet management. He explained that currently for vehicle repair and maintenance, the County provides a contribution to each individual station for costs each year, and what they are proposing to do differently in FY18 is take those contributions and put them into one pool of funding, then create a new position with a total cost of $108,000, with that person being in charge of managing the centralized pool of funding for the entire Fire/Rescue system. Mr. Bowman said they would be coordinating all the central preventative maintenance to ensure it is being performed and make sure the best possible useful life is realized for apparatus, and looking at repairs and contractual services to ensure the best possible rates are obtained through the public procurement process. He noted that this concept has been discussed over the years with the FEMS Board and they are supportive of it, and will be an important partner with the implementation, utilizing their fleet committee in developing procedures that will work for the entire system.

Mr. Bowman said the information presented underscores the urgent need to try to do something different, as costs have been increasing in recent years. He presented the actual recorded expenditures for volunteer stations, which in FY12 and FY13 were approximately $300,000 annually, but now have increased to more than $550,000 in FY16.

Mr. Sheffield asked if this is because there are more vehicles or because they are holding onto vehicles longer. Mr. Bowman responded that there has not been a change in the fleet policy that would increase this.

Mr. Dan Eggleston, Fire Chief, stated that the system has extended the life cycle of apparatus out to 20 years, and this could be reflective of what that decision is in terms of increased cost and maintenance. He said there are two goals associated with this project: to honor the commitment to fund the basic operating costs for the volunteer department, as some departments are having to dip into their savings to repair their units, which means less money for their buildings and one-time maintenance costs; and to be more efficient in how they manage limited funds, with the system believing they can be much more efficient by contracting out and working together as a system.

Ms. Mallek asked for confirmation that the money to be spent is for someone to organize, so they would no longer use the repair person on Preston Avenue anymore and would hire a mechanic to do the work. Mr. Eggleston responded that the person hired would organize and would work through the FEMS Board to contract out to get a better price in terms of time, material and repairs. He said they would still likely use the shop in Charlottesville, as they would bid on the jobs, but the system wants to make sure they get the best possible value when taking apparatus in for repair.

Ms. Mallek stated that given the performance of three engines at Seminole, Earlysville, and another station that all got the same engine and all had lemons that cost stations like Crozet as much as $80,000, perhaps they should consider doing RFPs for each piece of equipment, rather than lumping them all together and risking getting nailed. She said there was a recent purchase in Crozet that ended up costing $200,000 more because they were trying to add on to a Houston RFP instead of getting a smaller engine that the station really wanted. She said this is an analysis she would like ACFR to come back and talk about. Ms. Mallek added that when the Fire/Rescue fund was created, it was supposed to create a budget that was going to stay, but they are still putting in extra money for operations. She stated they were also supposed to have transparency, and she would like to see more of the kind of detailed budget information that all the volunteer stations have to submit to ACFR, because they have to account for every penny, and that type of information never comes to the Board.

Mr. Dill stated he would like to see that information too, noting that the 7.2 cents happened before his time and he did not understand why one department has this automatic funding. He said this structure seems to greatly increase the responsibility to account for the money much more diligently.

Mr. Walker said that staff could furnish whatever information is available to help the Board understand how the Fire/Rescue fund works, and there is certainly a decision as to why the fund was created in the first place, which goes back three fiscal years. He emphasized that it was created to improve transparency with the costs associated with this major area of expenditure. Mr. Walker said the general fund continues to put money into the fire fund over and above the pennies that were dedicated. Mr. Bowman clarified that the 0.4 cents was originally part of the FY16 decision to put that money into the CIP, with 7.2 cents going into operations.

Mr. Letteri asked him to address whether the dedicated pennies and their growth is sufficient to fund operation. Mr. Bowman responded that everything included in the FY18 recommended budget is funded by the value of the 7.2 pennies, and there is no increase in dedicated money to Fire/Rescue.

Mr. Eggleston noted that they did get the Crozet engine purchase order in to avoid the price increase so they would not have to pay the extra $200,000.

Ms. Mallek said what was ordered was a bigger engine, not the smaller one Crozet wanted with a bigger pump to help the tower, and the bigger engine cost $200,000 more than the smaller engine the design committee had wanted to get. She stated that it is not always perfect to lump several purchases together for the same engine when there are different needs.

Ms. McKeel stated that perhaps they should get clarity on that one issue. Mr. Eggleston said this is not his understanding of the situation, but he would get more information about it.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarification that the position requested was the “one fleet management” position. Mr. Bowman confirmed that it was.

Mr. Dill asked what analysis had been done to show that it would result in savings. Mr. Bowman responded that the hope is in the long term, by making sure that all preventative maintenance is done, the apparatus will have a longer useful life. He said in the short term, there is work performed now at higher contract rates than what this position would be performing because the person would be managing the contract work, but also doing some of the work themselves.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the position could first try to diagnose what is going on to avoid a potentially time and materials charge and a trip charge for a mechanic to travel to stations. He stated that in looking at some of the information and having conversations with some of the chiefs and their motor sergeants, they feel they can find those efficiencies.

Mr. Letteri said the whole area of fleet management is a very important transformational-type efficiency effort going forward, and the amount of rolling stock countywide has reached a critical point that needs centralized management and maintenance of equipment. He stated that this position is really a first step in that direction.

Mr. Randolph stated that he would like to see a short job description for each of the four proposed positions, which they could revisit when they meet again. He asked what the expenses are with the planned use of $210,117 in Fire/Rescue services fund balance to fund a one-time expense. Mr. Bowman responded that they will establish a one-time contingency for major repairs just in case there is a bad year, which can happen in fleet management with things like transmissions, and this would provide a reserve to accommodate those costs. He stated that in looking at what they are projecting to spend on system-wide turnout gear, they are anticipating a one-year spike given the aging equipment. Mr. Bowman added that there are also some select one-time costs at volunteer stations that would be funded, for items such as replacing failed equipment. He said the last category is one-time startup costs for positions, and he would provide detail on everything on the list when the other information is given to the Board.

Mr. Bowman noted that three positions of the four Mr. Randolph mentioned are included in the support for minimum staffing, which is a change included in the FY18 recommended budget to align with the budget goal of sustaining quality organizations. He said the three positions total $221,000, and about $20,000 of that is one-time costs for the initial startup. Mr. Bowman said the three positions are seeking to reduce mandatory overtime, such as a paramedic who has completed a 24-hour shift in the field but due to the availability of staff, in order to keep the ambulance in operation, is required to be held over for an additional 12 hours, so they end up working a 36-hour shift. He stated that the data shows this is happening with increasing frequency, approximately 100 times in FY12 and FY13, and 307 times in FY16. Mr. Bowman said the hope is that by adding the three additional positions, they can have greater coverage to minimize the amount of times staff is mandatorily held over to continue to provide service.

Mr. Dill asked if it was mandatory by law or regulation. Mr. Bowman responded that it is not mandatory by law, but it is the County’s policy to safely operate apparatus with a certain number of positions.

Mr. Eggleston clarified that in order to maintain staffing for a particular unit, an ambulance would need at least a paramedic and an EMT to stay in service, so to keep the apparatus currently in the system in service, there is a minimum staffing every day. He said that when they fall below the minimum staffing, staff is held over.

Mr. Dill commented that it seems astounding to him that they are adding four positions and tens of millions of dollars, but cannot figure out how to staff when they are increasing the budget 8%.

Ms. McKeel said she has concerns too, and suggested that they have an in-depth discussion about this at a different time.

Mr. Bowman stated that they are requesting three staff so they can have coverage around the clock.

Mr. Dill commented that they make it sound like an absolute necessity, but plenty of other areas do not have this level of coverage.

Mr. Eggleston said that it is a choice, and they could certainly reduce service. He stated that when they added staff, they added such a lean group they are paying for it now, and their conservative approach to staffing is catching up with them now.

Ms. Mallek asked if they are fully staffed now. Mr. Eggleston responded that he thinks there is only one position open at the moment.

Ms. McKeel stated that this is a huge amount of money being requested.

Ms. Mallek said that as she understands this, the amount requested for appropriation is $1.1 million above last year’s revenue, so it is all being spent somewhere, as there is no carryover balance.

Mr. Bowman clarified that they are using fund balance for the costs mentioned earlier. Ms. Allshouse thanked him for all of his work on this issue.

Mr. Letteri reported that there is very little change in the area of **Building Inspections**, which are managed by Community Development, and the major change is expected revenues from permits and fees. He said the number of permits issued in FY16 exceeded the peak years of 2007, with over 820 permits issued that fiscal year, and this generates the additional revenues projected for FY18.

Mr. Letteri reported that with public safety contributions, many of these arrangements and partnerships are by formal agreement, and the overall category is reduced by 1% over FY17. He said there are a series of changes enumerated under FY18, with the Albemarle County Regional Jail contribution increasing by $196,000 or 5.3% as a result of the formula for the agreement, which relates to the number of actual inmates. He stated the Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention contribution decreases by $261,000, which represents retirement of the debt service obligation on that facility. Mr. Letteri noted that ECC center costs decrease by $8,397, and there are other categories of expenditures that show increases or decreases throughout.

Mr. Randolph asked for confirmation that the SPCA agreement is up for renegotiation in FY19, and he continues to be thinking about that date, as this is the third highest expenditure under public safety contributions.

Ms. Palmer noted that this was not for the SPCA's pound activities, as the line item to which Mr. Randolph is referring is for a legal obligation.

Mr. Walker stated that this question came up last year, and staff has a report coming out in advance of the presentation the following week by the SPCA, with some analysis on the value of this relationship versus what other communities have experienced in terms of the costs associated with doing it differently.

_____

- **Public Works**

Mr. Letteri reported that with the category of **Public Works**, the category totals $5.2 million in the general fund and is comprised primarily of the **Department of Facilities and Environmental Services**, with a portion of that program relating to the capital operation and contributions to the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority. He stated that this department was the result of combining General Services and Facilities Development, which has served the County well by coordinating the like activities of various functions into one coordinated department. Mr. Letteri said at this point, it is involved in maintaining and improving the physical assets of the County, including its buildings, grounds, the Keene Landfill, and other infrastructure. He noted that they are also involved in the environmental compliance for all of the operations, as well as environmental pollution prevention and minimizing waste, recycling, and other areas. Mr. Letteri said this department oversees all of the planning, design and construction of all major capital projects undertaken by both the County and the schools, and in some cases agencies. He stated that the department coordinates with Community Development in protecting water resources and natural resources through various programs.

Mr. Letteri stated the total budget is $4.6 million, increasing 5.4% or $237,000 for FY18. He explained that there are two components with the facilities team, those groups dealing with management of grounds and maintenance, stormwater facilities and environmental programs; and those dealing with the capital program. He stated the capital program is an internal services fund, receiving money through the capital program, so whenever a capital project is planned, fees required to pay the architect or engineer are included, as well as project management costs. He commented that staff feels this is an efficient approach because the department itself reflects the projects underway and allows for increasing staffing based on workload. Mr. Letteri noted the County has issued $35 million in additional projects for the schools, which has put a strain in the department, including some contractual positions that will be hired to accommodate the additional workload. He mentioned that this department is also proposing conversion of a part-time position to a full-time management analyst position to help handle the increased volume of contracts.

Mr. Randolph asked what the major driver is for the increased utility costs. Mr. Trevor Henry, Director, Facilities and Environmental Services, addressed the Board and said that increased utility costs were the driver.

Mr. Randolph said that recycling services increase by $10,000 for the RSWA and the County Office Building, and asked if a modest increase in services would increase the cost in the budget. Mr. Henry responded that the $10,000 is a placeholder put in at the request of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee, and part of the committee's charter is to increase recycling activities throughout the County, including the COB. He said in the original discussion, the request was to put a placeholder for Rivanna's budget so they could potentially look at expansion of services, hours and time at McIntire or Ivy, but because that recommendation is still being worked through, the budget office felt it was better to place it in the facilities budget as a line item. Mr. Henry stated that once they have recommendations go to the Board and the Board approves, they can use the funding as recommended and agreed to by the Board, so this is just a holding place while that is further explored, with the committee making recommendations to the Board related to that.

Ms. Palmer asked for confirmation that the County's recycling program instituted is actually a diversion when you take into account less trash that has to be picked up, so it may at least come out even. Mr. Henry confirmed that it is.

Mr. Randolph said that is what he was asking, and why he was struck by the $10,000 increase. He also asked about the $8,500 increase for the Scottsville pumping station for maintenance of the levee, as he thought they were working out an MOU with the town and that an added percentage of maintenance would be the responsibility of the town of Scottsville in the future. Mr. Henry responded that based on the discussions to date, they are anticipating an increase in costs, but because that has not been negotiated out, the cost is being built in and the work is still occurring.

Ms. McKeel asked if the custodial services in this building are contracted out, as she thought there was a list of possible areas, including this one, to combine with the school system to save money. Mr. Henry stated this was part of the efficiency committee that Mr. Letteri had chaired a few years earlier, and the plan was to use contractors at the schools, not the reverse. He said there was an analysis done that showed savings by implementing the contracted services at COB, but after some vetting the decision was made not to do that.

Mr. Letteri said it would be going back to an employee-based system, but converting to a contractual program saves about $200,000 a year, and if the schools were to participate in any way, they would have to go through a contracted fund as well. He noted that the schools are part of the transformation committee and looking at all of the items in an efficiency evaluation.

Mr. Letteri stated that public works contributions are contributions to the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority, which are increasing 19%, and this pertains to the projected value of recycled goods they are able to sell, and as fuel prices fall, it ends up costing them more money because there is less value in the recycled goods.

_____

- **Health and Welfare**

Mr. Letteri reported that with **Health and Welfare**, they will postpone the discussion of Bright Stars, DSS and CSA until their next meeting. He stated that the health and welfare category represents $5.2 million, an increase of 3.7%, and there is a whole list of various agencies under review, with three agencies funded this year for the first time: the Bridge Line program, the women's treatment program at Region Ten, and the women's initiative program at Region Ten.

Ms. McKeel asked why the Jefferson Area Board for Aging (JABA) is under a contract with the County and is part of this review. Mr. Bowman responded that JABA is reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget and is separate from the Agency and Budget Review Team process. Mr. Kamptner clarified that in looking at the documents and budget, JABA is here because of its functions and the service it provides, not because of its relationship to the County.

Mr. Bowman noted that the ABRT agencies are provided in one place in the budget document.

Ms. McKeel commented that she was just confused by the way it was listed.

Mr. Sheffield asked how an agency like JABA is reviewed. Mr. Bowman responded that they are reviewed by Ms. Kristy Shifflett, Grants and Budget Analyst, who partners with the Social Services staff and others who have knowledge of JABA's operation, who meet with the agency to conduct a review.

Mr. Sheffield stated that the funding does not necessarily go through a weighted process, and instead is based on a conversation with staff about what is funded or not being funded. Mr. Walker confirmed that JABA is outside of the ABRT process, and it is worth talking about the collaboration between JABA and Social Services with respect to the budget.

Ms. Kristy Shifflett stated that she reviews the JABA request and coordinates with Social Services, as staff does with all health and welfare areas, and also reaches out to agencies to discuss their requests. She said that with this case, staff met with the adult services coordinator and with JABA to discuss the request, which is partially funded, with the other part of the funding going into the Social Services for the part-time to full-time position, which will be discussed further at their February 27 meeting.

Ms. Marta Keane of JABA addressed the Board, stating that JABA has been hit with federal and state cuts and has been unable to increase funding or staffing for Albemarle. She said that last year, JABA served approximately 7,200 people, and that increase would continue. Ms. Keane stated that there is a huge need at Southwood for senior services that has not been addressed in the past, and information and assistance and options counseling were areas of need that would continue to grow. She said they would fund a half-time position rather than a full-time position, which is a matter of making decisions about working together and what they can accomplish. Ms. Keane stated there are things that adult services in DSS does that JABA could do more efficiently to meet some of their compliance and deadlines, but those were discovered too late for this part of the process, although they could be explored going forward. She said that every time a person asks a question, there are usually three or four other questions beneath the surface.

Ms. Shifflett stated that the DSS adult services team sat down with JABA and discussed how they serve the community, and discovered that there could be more solutions down the road, but what they decided to do for this budget was fulfill the part-time request for the adult services worker in Social Services and the $30,000 to JABA to assist them with options counseling. She said they were trying to approach it from both sides, and then look next year at how to improve their coordination.

Ms. Keane said that one of the things she has been working with Mr. Eggleston on is to try to have an options counselor work with the high-risk, high-repeat callers, as there are some people who inappropriately utilize calls to 911, and a big factor there is social determinants, rather than medical issues. She stated that they started with a pilot case the previous week, and hope that a small amount of money could make a big difference in calls that go out or times when the rescue squad would not be available because they answered an unnecessary call. Ms. Keane said they were not far enough along to determine that it was a proven thing, but they believe anecdotally that it would be. She noted that it is hoped this would have the same impact as the “hospital to home” efforts, in terms of preventing ER visits and rescue squad responses for repeated calls.

Ms. Palmer asked if Albemarle County had covered the gap in the state reduction of funds to JABA. Ms. Keane responded that as of October 1, 2016, the state cut funds by $58,000, and the state budget going forward did not replace that funding. She said the County provides about $30,000, so technically that could cover the 7,200 clients, but the costs are not necessarily evenly divided. Ms. Keane noted that it did replace the lost money, but did not accommodate any future growth.

Ms. McKeel asked if that should be put on the list. Budget staff indicated that it was already put on the list.

Mr. Dill commented that $30,000 is such a small amount when compared to other items, especially given that it is serving such a critical need. Mr. Walker stated that this is consistent with the County’s budgeting philosophy, and they try to look very discretely at all relationships and all service partners, and all areas that try to make a positive difference in the community. He said the Board can take the information and do what it wants with it, and it enables them to pull down more state money by converting the part-time position to a full-time position in Social Services, so there is an efficiency aspect to that.

Ms. Palmer said there is one FTE that helps pull down money from the state. Mr. Walker responded that in theory, it could help offset the lost money that goes to JABA, if those services are coordinated.

Mr. Dill said they do it with roads, so it would certainly seem they should do it with JABA.

Ms. Shifflett stated that in this instance, it was actually $30,000 to be recouped from the state, up from $10,000. She said that all revenue pulled down for positions is noted in the DSS information, which they would be discussing on February 27.

_____

- **Parks Rec and Culture**

Mr. Letteri reported that for **Parks, Recreation and Culture**, this category includes contributions to the Jefferson-Madison Regional Library and contributions to the partnership. He stated that this also covers the Department of Parks and Recreation, contributions to Darden Towe Park and other agency contributions, with a total of $8.2 million or an increase of 6.6%. Mr. Letteri said that in the area of Parks and Recreation, there has been a 9.2% increase in overall expenditures, and the transfer for the tourism fund has increased by $367,000, bringing the net cost from the general fund down from FY17. He noted that the only capital expenditure change worth noting is for additional trail maintenance equipment. Mr. Letteri stated that in the resource category, in this year’s budget there is $125,000 to do a community recreational needs assessment, and that work is underway. He said that staff anticipates implications for staffing as a result of that study, perhaps reclassifying or reorganizing that department to address those things, so $90,000 has been included for that purpose.

Ms. Palmer stated that she would like to put having a whole FTE for parks on the list.

Mr. Sheffield said that one of the Board’s strategic goals was entrance corridor beautification, and that would likely fall under Parks and Recreation, with Rio/29 possibly becoming an eyesore, but plenty of others have already been mentioned in previous discussions.

Mr. Randolph stated that there is a decrease for Darden Towe funding of $4,604, primarily due to increases in repair and maintenance costs, and he is not sure how that aligns.

Mr. Bowman responded that it was a typo, as it should be an increase of 4.4%.

Mr. Letteri stated that the total recommended budget for libraries is $4.4 million, an increase of $111,000 or 4.5%, and those increases have to do with the Regional Library agreement based on population usage, and the other increase relates to adding five hours of operation to the Northside Library and a part-time shelving position at the Crozet Library.

Mr. Sheffield stated that there have been more and more emails about the parking situation at Northside Library, and they need to come up with something soon in terms of how to address it. He noted that when he and Ms. McKeel had their economic forum at the library, the staff there was extremely helpful.

Ms. Mallek commented that the library staff throughout the region is spectacular, and each shelver has volunteers to help shelve.

Mr. Randolph stated that it seems that type of position would be volunteer.

Mr. John Halliday, Executive Director of the Jefferson Madison Regional Library, addressed the Board and thanked staff for their communications and the Board for their support of libraries. He stated that last year set a record for book usage and program participation, and said that staff is working to address the parking issue at Northside. He also said there are more than 200 volunteers who help at the libraries, but they need additional help at Crozet, as book checkouts there have increased 86% over the last three years. Mr. Halliday noted that this is the only position added since the Crozet Library opened.

NonAgenda. At 5:50 p.m., Mr. Dill **moved** that the Board adjourn to Room 228, the County Executive's Conference Room. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Note: The meeting was call back to order at 5:54 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. McKeel.

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

There were none.

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

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 5. Closed Meeting.

At 5:59 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 (7), to consult with and be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice relating to activities at the Ragged Mountain Reservoir. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

At 6:29 p.m., the Board reconvened into open meeting and, Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board certify by a recorded vote that to the best of each Board member's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Agenda Item No. 6. Adjourn to February 27, 2017, 2:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 6:30 p.m., Mr. Randolph **moved** to adjourn the Board meeting to February 27, 2017, 2:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 08/02/2017
Initials: CKB