

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on April 18, 2017, at 9:00 a.m., The Boar's Head Inn, The Ball Room, 200 Ednam Drive, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from April 12, 2017. The purpose of the meeting was to allow a quorum of the Board to attend a workshop meeting of the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel and Mr. Brad L. Sheffield.

ABSENT: Ms. Liz A. Palmer, and Mr. Rick Randolph.

Ms. McKeel welcomed members of the Commonwealth Transportation Board to Albemarle County.

At 9:30 p.m., **motion** was offered by Ms. McKeel, to adjourn the Board until 2:30 p.m., Lane Auditorium. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Ms. Palmer and Mr. Randolph.

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on April 18, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer, Mr. Rick Randolph, and Mr. Brad 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. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 2:31 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. McKeel.

Ms. McKeel then introduced County staff and the presiding officer, Officer Chris Levy.

Agenda Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance.

Agenda Item No. 3. Moment of Silence.

Agenda Item No. 4. Consent Agenda.

(**Discussion:** Mr. Randolph asked that Item 4.1 on the Consent Agenda be moved to the end of the meeting, as there was a bicycling topic he wished to discuss. Board members concurred.)

Item No. 4.1. Letter of Support for the Strengthening Systems Proposal to the Charlottesville Area Community Foundation (CACF) for Building a Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail Network.

Agenda Item No. 5. **PUBLIC HEARING: SP201700001 North Garden Farmers' Market.**

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Samuel Miller.

TAX MAP/PARCEL(S): 08800-00-00-006A1.

LOCATION: Monacan Trail Road (US 29) and Red Hill School Road (Route 760).

PROPOSAL: Farmers' market.

PETITION: Farmers' market under section 10.2.2.54 of the zoning ordinance.

ZONING: RA Rural Areas - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots).

OVERLAY DISTRICT(S): Entrance Corridor.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Rural Area – preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources; residential (0.5 unit/ acre in development lots).

(Advertised in Daily Progress on April 3 and April 10, 2017.)

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that at its meeting on March 21, 2017, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of SP201700001. Attachments A, B, and C are the Commission's action letter, staff report, and minutes, respectively.

The Planning Commission's recommendation included a change to proposed condition 2, to allow the market to operate from April through December of each year, rather than April through November as originally requested by the applicant. The Commission felt that this would benefit the market by permitting sales of locally-produced products during the holiday season. The applicant agreed to this change.

The County Attorney has prepared the attached Resolution to approve the special use permit.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment D) to approve SP201700001, subject to the conditions contained therein.

Mr. Scott Clark, Senior Planner, addressed the Board, stating that this is a special use permit request for a farmer's market in the rural areas zoning district. Mr. Clark presented a map showing the location of the property off of Route 29 on Red Hill Road near Red Hill Elementary School, stating that the property is facing onto Route 29 to the north. He stated that the property is owned by the Fire Department and has a large pond with a dry hydrant on it. The actual entrance to the property is off of Red Hill School Road, not Route 29. Mr. Clark said the farmer's market is defined in the zoning ordinance as "an outlet for local producers to sell products that are coming from productive agriculture in the County." He stated the proposal would comply with that and was originally proposed to operate one day a week from April through November. The market has space for 20 vendors and parking for 45 guest vehicles, and would use the existing entrance. Mr. Clark presented the conceptual plan for the use, noting the location of the sales area to the east of the pond with parking around it, and he pointed out the location of the vendor spaces and guest parking area. He noted that there will be signage in place to prevent entry off of Route 29, and to keep people from going down to the pond into the stream buffer area.

Ms. Clark reported that pertaining to the criteria for a special use permit for the property, there will be no substantial detriment to the property because this is an occasional use in an open field with no construction, it supports agricultural uses, and there would be no lighting or amplified sound. He stated that the character of the area will not be changed, and the project complies with the Comprehensive Plan in terms of supporting rural uses that the plan calls for the County to protect and encourage.

Mr. Clark stated that staff found the market proposal to be supportive of Comp Plan goals, with no permanent improvements needed and an existing entrance already in place. He said they found no unfavorable factors and in March, the Planning Commission voted 7-0 to approve the SP request with the conditions as presented, with one change being extension of operations to December, to accommodate holiday items such as locally grown Christmas trees.

Ms. Mallek asked if the applicants came in with the limitations, such as one day per week, or if staff or the Planning Commission imposed those restrictions. She stated the older markets in the area have evolved, with markets such as Earlysville moving from Thursday to Saturday during the winter, and summer markets operating on different days so they are not competing with one another and allow for harvesting at multiple times during the week. Ms. Mallek said she would be happy with fewer restrictions and would encourage the Board to be as lenient as possible, adding that there is no other market in this area of the County.

Mr. Clark clarified that the one day per week was part of the application, the timeframe of April through November came out of discussions with the applicant during the review of the SP, and the hours of operation are fairly typical as they would be contingent on daylight. He stated that his only concern with increasing use to more than once per week is related to erosion. Staff reviewed this under the assumption that once per week use could be easily managed in terms of erosion onsite, and if there was going to be more use than that, they would probably want engineers to review it for additional measures. Mr. Clark noted that there is only grass parking on the site and no surface parking.

Ms. Palmer stated that it would be best for the applicant to address the number of days per week, and staff had been great about suggesting longer hours and expanding use, adding that the meeting was well attended with no real issues raised. She said the only suggestion that surfaced was to place the portable toilets behind some trees.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Ms. Irma Mahone addressed the Board, stating that she is part of a task force that is working on the farmer's market project. She said the Thursday date was chosen based on community feedback for that as a good starting point, but they could revise the application and make it two days per week, as they had considered moving it to Saturdays for the second year.

Ms. Palmer asked how the Fire Department feels about the grass situation. Mr. Clark responded that the Fire Department access is right off of 29 directly to the dry hydrant and does not cross through the market area, so he does not anticipate any conflicts there.

Ms. Palmer clarified that she is talking about the impact on the grass turf, and staff and VDOT would likely be the most concerned. Mr. Clark stated that VDOT is not concerned about the interior of the site.

Mr. Madison Cummings addressed the Board and stated that they would need to talk to the Fire Department about the grass, and he does not know about the impact to the turf of an extra day.

Ms. Mallek stated that she would like to be as flexible as possible, and the field would most likely be damaged only when it is wet.

Ms. Palmer said she does not want to do something that the Fire Department would have issues with.

Ms. Mallek stated that the Fire Department does not have to permit it, and if the Board steps out of the way, they could handle it among themselves, and that would be her proposal.

Mr. Justin Shimp addressed the Board and said the Fire Department could choose to allow more than one day but could also permit just one, as part of their agreement with the market. He pointed out that this is a smaller farmer's market, and there would not be 300 cars given the layout of the site, and erosion would not be a concern with two days per week of usage.

Mr. Dill asked why they are not anticipating more use of the market, since this is the only farmer's market in southern Albemarle and is in a key location, and he would anticipate a lot more customers. Mr. Shimp responded that the site size at one-half acre would provide some limitations, and this is a different site than farmer's markets like that in Nellysford, which is a three-acre site that did experience some impact on the grass.

There being no further public comment, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Ms. Palmer stated that she is fine with two days per week, and wants to make sure she is not disrupting the process.

Mr. Clark responded that she is not, and said that two days per week does not seem like a big expansion. He commented that he thought Ms. Mallek was suggesting more than that, and three or four days per week could be a concern.

Ms. McKeel suggested language of up to two days per week.

Mr. Randolph said his only concern is that staff has not looked at this proposal for two days per week, so they do not have an informed opinion from the County Engineer as to the impacts to the soil conditions and turf of operating two days. He stated that two rainy days per week with large SUVs can tear up a lot of ground. Mr. Randolph noted that he is happy to give the applicant up to two days, but in terms of standard operating procedure, it is good to get staff input ahead of time on how adding days would impact the site.

Ms. Mallek stated that there is no soil geologist or similar expert on staff who can give that kind of advice. Mr. Clark responded that the County's engineers have quite a bit of experience, and he noted that there is a turf maintenance requirement as part of this SP.

Ms. Palmer then **moved** to adopt the proposed resolution as presented in Attachment D, approving SP 2017-00001, with the change that the farmer's market can operate two days per week. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

Ms. Mallek asked if there is any support for taking off the winter closure restriction, as she does not want the applicant to have to spend hundreds of dollars to come back in, and the Board is trying to get away from making people come back in.

Mr. Dill agreed, stating that winter is the new spring.

Ms. Palmer then agreed to **amend** her **motion**, and moved to adopt the proposed resolution to approve SP-2017-00001, with changes that the farmer's market can operate year round, up to two days per week. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Ms. Mallek commented that a few years ago, Albemarle was second only to Fairfax in number of farmer's markets, but the County has lost a few along the way.

Ms. Palmer noted that there are some individual family farm businesses in southern Albemarle, but not a collective market.

Ms. Mallek stated that this market would provide them with a place to come and would be fabulous.

Ms. Palmer agreed.

(**Note:** The adopted resolution and conditions are set out below:)

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE SP 2017-01 NORTH GARDEN FARMERS' MARKET

WHEREAS, North Garden Volunteer Fire Company, Inc. filed an application to operate a farmers' market one day per week from April through November each year on Tax Map Parcel 08800-00-00-006A1 (the "Property"), and the application is identified as Special Use Permit 2017-00001 North Garden Farmers' Market ("SP 2017-01"); and

WHEREAS, on March 21, 2017, after a duly noticed public hearing, the Albemarle County Planning Commission recommended approval of SP 2017-01 with staff-recommended conditions, with a revision to Condition 2 to extend the months of operation through December of each year; and

WHEREAS, on April 18, 2017, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors held a duly noticed public hearing on SP 2017-01.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, upon consideration of the foregoing, the staff report prepared for SP 2017-01 and all of its attachments, the information presented at the public hearing, and the factors relevant to a special use permit in Albemarle County Code § 18-33.8, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves SP 2017-01, subject to the conditions attached hereto.

* * * * *

SP 2017-00001 North Garden Farmers' Market Conditions

1. Development and use shall be in general accord with the conceptual plan titled "Red Hill Farmers Market" prepared by Shimp Engineering, P.C., and dated 03-01-2017 (hereafter "Conceptual Plan"), as determined by the Director of Planning and the Zoning Administrator.
2. The use shall operate no more than two days per calendar week.
3. The use shall operate no earlier than 8:00 a.m. and no later than 8:00 p.m.
4. No amplified sound and no lighting shall be installed or used for the market use.
5. If the use, structure, or activity for which this special use permit is issued is not commenced by April 18, 2019, the permit shall be deemed abandoned and the authority granted thereunder shall thereupon terminate.

Agenda Item No. 6. Volunteer Fire Rescue Vehicle Maintenance Expenditures; Budget Versus Actual for FY15, FY16 and FY17 (Projected).

Mr. Walker addressed the Board, stating that a few additional issues had arisen since this item was prepared for the agenda, and staff would mention the consequences of the new timing in the context of the public hearing for the tax rate and adoption of the budget. Mr. Walker stated that there would be consideration on the Board's May 3rd agenda of a resolution to extend the tax rate payment due deadline, and there was also a request from JAUNT for money to replace some state funding lost for the upcoming year.

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, addressed the Board, presenting a slide showing the timeline for the budget process and noting that they would be discussing the fire/rescue services fund discussion per the Board's request, with May 15th being the budget public hearing and the fiscal year beginning July 1st. Ms. Allshouse stated that staff is hoping that any budgetary adjustments would be finalized at this meeting, so that staff would have them incorporated into the budget document to be presented on May 15th for Board approval. She said the Board would also need to establish a due date for the first half of calendar year 2017 taxes, discuss volunteer fire/rescue funding, and consider JAUNT's request for additional funding to cover a state funding shortfall.

Ms. Allshouse reported that the Board would be adopting the tax rate on May 15th, and staff is recommending, due to the timing change, that the tax due date be extended from June 5th to June 15th for the first half of calendar year 2017 taxes. She stated that June 15th is the same date that BPOL taxes are due, and Finance would send the bills out on May 16th, the day after the Board adopts the tax rate. Ms. Allshouse stated that this would provide property owners with 30 days from the time the bills are sent to the time they are due, with the legal requirement being 14 days. She noted that this would have no material impact on the County's cash flow, and if the Board approves the change in due date, they would formally adopt it by resolution on May 3rd.

Board members agreed to the change in due date.

Ms. Allshouse presented information on how this change would be communicated to the public, with the one-time date change prominently noted on the tax bill and possibly the envelope, with the Finance Department's front line staff made aware of this change and an updated telephone greeting reflecting the new date. She stated that a display ad will be published in the local newspaper and a press release will be provided to local media, with the new date prominently displayed on the County's website, social media, and A-mail. Ms. Allshouse said that an announcement with the new date will be displayed at County office building locations, and mortgage companies will be notified.

Mr. Sheffield commented that in mentioning this to some residents, they indicated that there could be some lingering confusion when the date resumes its original deadline next year, and the Board should probably be lenient on late payments because of that.

Ms. Palmer stated that she did not think the Board could legally do that.

Mr. Kamptner said that part of it would be the County's awareness efforts next year, and staff

could bring it to the Board if there is a desire to extend the deadline again.

Mr. Sheffield stated it should be fine this year, but next year could be confusing for taxpayers.

Mr. Randolph said they may really want to emphasize the due date next year, and he thanked Mr. Sheffield for bringing it up.

Mr. Andy Bowman, Senior Budget Analyst, addressed the Board, stating that a question had surfaced from them recently as to the fiscal impact of funding for the volunteer stations for fleet maintenance or repairs and maintenance. Mr. Bowman explained that in the FY18 proposed budget, staff has included a proposal for system-wide fleet management, which is a concept that has been discussed with and supported by the Fire EMS (FEMS) Board. He said that FEMS has been supportive in the past and would be a partner in implementation, along with their fleet committee, with the County currently providing contributions to volunteer stations for fleet repair and maintenance expenses. Mr. Bowman stated that the contributions would be consolidated into a single budget where they would be centrally managed, and there would be \$108,000 allocated for a new position to perform essential preventative maintenance and coordinating contractual services for repairs as needed. He said that staff would recommend starting the position in FY17 so there is a seamless transition and volunteers have someone to come to when repairs arise. Mr. Bowman noted that there is a \$125,000 contingency fund included for major unanticipated fleet repairs, and the intended outcomes of this change are to try to address the significant increases in vehicle repair and maintenance costs in recent years, with the average increase from FY12 to FY16 being 23%. Mr. Bowman said the County wants to ensure that all preventative maintenance is being performed, to get the maximum life cycle out of the fleet, and wants to reduce reliance on volunteer donations and reserves, as well as providing a resource to limit the time volunteers are spending to maintain their fleets.

Mr. Bowman reported that in FY15, volunteer fleet repair and maintenance requests were funded 100% by the County; at the end of that year, the reported actual vehicle repair expenses were \$143,000 more than what was requested and funded, with 8 of 10 volunteer stations making requests. He stated that in FY16, volunteer fleet repair and maintenance requests were funded 100% by the County; at the end of that year, the total actual expenses were \$114,000 more than what was requested and funded, with 7 of 10 volunteer stations making requests. Mr. Bowman reported that in FY17, volunteer fleet repair and maintenance costs were 79% funded, with the County's budget holding the line on current expenditures and allowing the priority-based budgeting and two-year fiscal plan processes to take place before making investments in program expansions or other major changes. He stated that 7 fire stations have responded to inquiries about repair and maintenance requests for FY17, with 2 indicating they would be within budget and 5 stations estimating a total of \$125,000 more than the County has funded. Mr. Bowman noted that there is still three months left in the fiscal year so that number could change.

Mr. Randolph commented that one station came up with a total of \$382,000, and it was reasonable to assume a \$450,000 total by the time the other three stations respond. He asked how these fire companies have covered these additional costs over the last three years. Mr. Bowman replied that they could have looked elsewhere in their operating budgets, or they could have dipped into their reserves to cover costs, and the County has not provided any additional funding for those three years.

Ms. Mallek asked if 100% funding was based on the stations' requests, or what the County would allocate. Mr. Bowman responded that it was based on their request, and in reviewing volunteer stations there is no easy formula for budgeting fleet maintenance, so staff must look at the individual stations' history, apparatus age, and what they have experienced. He said the stations were provided with 2% across the board, in the context of the County's budgeting decision to hold the line on all expenditures. Mr. Bowman said there was an increase in funding for FY17, but it was less than requested.

Ms. McKeel noted that this was the 79% figure mentioned.

Ms. Mallek commented that FY17 is not over yet.

Mr. Dill asked if that is why, or whether it was not funded in the beginning.

Ms. McKeel said that Ms. Mallek's comment was related to the fact that the FY17 budget cycle was not over yet, but the 79% did not pertain to that.

Ms. Palmer noted that what was requested was more than the year before, and the 2% did not pick up the slack.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that the Earlysville Chief told her in an email that his station had two large repairs to be done in the next few weeks and were nearing their budget amount, and that indicated to her that there may be more to come from other stations.

Mr. Bowman pointed out that staff had reflected Earlysville's repairs in the figures he presented.

Mr. Randolph asked which stations they are still missing. Mr. Bowman responded that Crozet, Stony Point, and CARS has not yet responded. He said that staff is assuming there will not be any savings, and Crozet provided year-to-date numbers but no projection going forward. He confirmed that staff has information from all stations for FY15 and FY16, and the information on individual amounts would be coming later.

Ms. McKeel asked him to address the factors associated with the overages, such as aging equipment. Mr. Bowman replied that aging equipment is one factor, and staff does not know to what extent equipment was maintained in the past, and apparatus is becoming much more complex, which is also a factor.

Ms. Mallek commented that engines do not make it to 18 years old without being cared for, and she cautioned staff not to make dispersions about station maintenance efforts. Ms. McKeel said she does not think Mr. Bowman is doing that.

Mr. Bowman clarified that volunteer treasurers at stations have told him in the past that they have cut back on maintenance in the short term because of financial circumstances in a given year.

Mr. Randolph added that deferred maintenance eventually catches up with you.

Ms. Mallek stated that there is no opportunity to have those funds restored, and the overages for engines at stations 11, 12, and 15 were taken care of by the County, and she would like to see information on how the overages were distributed among the 15 stations.

Mr. Bowman said that in instances when the County's Fire Department went over in vehicle expenses, they needed to come up with that savings elsewhere in their budget, and the County has not gone back to them mid-year and asked them to provide additional funding for vehicle maintenance.

Ms. McKeel commented that those stations need to figure out how to cover it from their own budgets. She said she keeps hearing that volunteer stations are being treated differently from paid stations, but she wonders if that is really the case.

Mr. Bowman explained that departments are provided budgets that have to be managed throughout the year, and volunteer stations are provided with a quarterly contribution that is managed in the same way. He said in the past when these stations had the overages, they have funded them with savings elsewhere in their budgets or reliance on reserves.

Mr. Sheffield pointed out that paid stations do not fundraise in the way that volunteer stations do, and ultimately on the paid side, professional staff had the discretion to work with the County in a different way than volunteers did. He commented that departments facing a shortfall would not have to go out and fundraise, and volunteers were the only entity in the County that were faced with that.

Mr. Walker stated that the circumstances are different, but the methodology is the same in terms of making up the difference within other budget categories, and if volunteer stations cannot do that within the budget, they have to look at raising money or using reserves.

Mr. Sheffield said if they did compare those in the future, he wants to see how the budgets are put together for professional versus volunteer, but he does not think it is fair to compare the two and does not want to focus on whether they are taking away from one to give to another.

Ms. Palmer agreed, stating that her primary concern is supporting the volunteers as much as possible. She said that volunteers are time challenged and give their time, which is different from paid personnel who have this as their job.

Ms. McKeel stated that the suggestion is to help the fleet maintenance by centralizing this and making the repairs and maintenance. Mr. Walker responded that it is this particular problem the solution is intended to address, and it avoids this problem for the volunteer agencies, and the responsibility for managing it switched to the system, particularly on the career side. He added that agencies would coordinate their fleet repair needs with FEMS.

Ms. Allshouse pointed out that there is also a capital component to this, not just operating.

Mr. Sheffield asked if a station's deficit from one year is carried into the next, and what would happen if they cannot fundraise to close their gap.

Mr. Bowman explained that the County has not received any requests for funds until now, and said that resolving it would be a combination of looking into their current and future year budgets and fundraising, as well as any past reserves.

Ms. Mallek noted that some stations are saving their donations to be able to make improvements to their barracks and kitchens, so when they have to take money to fix apparatus, they cannot make those improvements for a few years. She emphasized that these stations have no slush funds, and there are a lot of things they have to pay for that requires them to save money.

Mr. Sheffield stated he would like to keep any past issues from haunting stations going forward, because if it impacted their ability to use the money raised or donated to do enhanced training or other things, it takes them years to dig out of previous holes.

Mr. Randolph said the Board needs to think about the revenue side as well as an expense side, and mentioned that East Rivanna had recently acquired a 501(c) 3 status that would enable their donations to be tax-deductible for donors. He stated that this station had traditionally relied on fundraising efforts such as bingo, but the demographics of the population were changing and they are facing

competition from the American Legion nearby, so they need different ways of fundraising. Mr. Randolph mentioned that Scottsville Volunteer Fire Department has been very successful with their annual Chili Cook-Off and Fourth of July parade, and have been ahead of the curve from that standpoint. He stated the Board needs to be aware of the challenges the volunteer stations face, as many people moving here from outside the community from places that had all-professional firefighting may not be familiar with volunteer stations and how they work. Mr. Randolph said the County should, at some point, have a discussion about capacity building for these volunteer stations and how they can be helped, particularly with raising more money.

Ms. McKeel stated that they want to make it as easy and rewarding as possible for people to give.

Mr. Sheffield agreed with Mr. Randolph's point about residents who are not familiar with volunteer stations.

Ms. Allshouse stated there is funding from the capital budget that also supports apparatus repairs for the volunteers, and said there are two places that the Board can get funding to support volunteers for costs that exceed their individual budgets. She explained the FY17 capital program has a fleet repair funding contingency in the apparatus category, with the balance expected to be \$100,000 in the current fiscal year and \$50,000 to be added in this contingency fund in FY18 as part of the capital budget. She said this fund intends to support apparatus purchases that exceed the cost estimate, and for large unplanned apparatus repairs that render both career and volunteer Fire/Rescue apparatus inoperable. Ms. Allshouse said the capital budget has supported volunteer Fire/Rescue repair costs for apparatus, helping East Rivanna in FY15, North Garden and Earlysville in FY16, and Seminole Trail in FY17. She noted that this will not be available in FY18 once they shift to a different fleet management approach, except for apparatus exceeding the original purchasing budget, but in the current year there is almost \$100,000 available for repairs or purchases that exceed the cost of the budget.

Ms. Mallek stated she had received an email from Station 4 showing that they were over budget by \$29,359 in FY15 and \$29,740 in FY16, both for vehicle repairs and maintenance only, and the information presented by staff showed assistance of about \$21,000. Ms. Mallek asked if there was any extra reimbursement done in another category. Ms. Allshouse responded that there was some assistance provided by capital, but there are still some shortfalls and Fire/Rescue has a process for volunteer stations to request funding, with the provision those costs are for large or unplanned apparatus repair that renders the apparatus or a system on the apparatus inoperable.

Ms. Mallek noted that there was one year in which four engines had systemic problems, and in that year both Crozet and Earlysville had a \$50,000 loss. She asked if those stations were provided any assistance for those purchases.

Mr. Dan Eggleston, Fire Chief, responded that the vendor covered a lot of the costs of the repair of Engine 41 in Earlysville, with ACFR covering some costs, but he is not sure of the exact amount. Mr. Eggleston commented that the fund has proven to be very helpful, and mentioned that Chief Brian Kester is present at this meeting and had experienced a catastrophic failure on a ladder truck that ended up costing \$18,000 for transmission repair.

Mr. Bowman presented a slide showing recommendations for the Board's consideration of additional funding for fleet repair or maintenance expenditures that are greater than County funding, and based on what stations have reported to date, the savings realized in the Fire/Rescue fund for FY17 would be great enough to cover the projected \$125,000 expense shortfall for volunteer stations. He pointed out that these were unrelated to fleet management funding and were the result of cost savings for things like fuel.

Mr. Walker explained that this is the same fiscal approach as that for other departments, with any remaining funds realized from lower than anticipated expenditures going into fund balance. He stated that this is the case with the Fire/Rescue fund for FY17, so this could go to the volunteer stations and would be used to support their costs, which are greater than anticipated.

Ms. Palmer commented that she would like to hear from Mr. Eggleston as to how those decisions would affect the system.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the Fire/Rescue system has been working closely with staff on this and supports this approach, realizing that the current trajectory for apparatus repair and maintenance is unsustainable. He said that OMB shows a positive balance for the end of the year, and he feels this is the right thing to do with that balance.

Ms. Palmer noted that she has heard from volunteer chiefs in the past that standardization from the central office can mean that equipment stations want to use is no longer supported, and she wonders how this approach would affect that issue.

Mr. Eggleston explained that Fire/Rescue has a committee comprised of staff and volunteers that determines those specifications, which are adjusted per the apparatus and equipment, to ensure that it is operable and to provide consistency and familiarity as personnel move between apparatus. He added that he does not think this decision would affect their approach, and the Apparatus Committee had met three or four times, with the anticipation that the new policy was going forward.

Mr. Randolph asked if this approach would allow for differentiated equipment, given that locations

like Scottsville do not have tall buildings and thus might need smaller apparatus, and sometimes streamlining with one vendor can impose limitations on flexibility.

Mr. Eggleston responded that there are two processes, and what they are addressing today is maintenance of the apparatus, with a different process for establishing fleet size and composition, which was established a few years ago but was periodically adjusted. He stated that Scottsville and all the volunteer stations participate in that process of selecting apparatus, noting that Scottsville has two tankers because they cover a rural area without a lot of water. He mentioned the system has a lot of equipment, so the hope is that the vendor will provide significant cost savings and avoid expensive time and material costs, as those can be very expensive when factoring in trip charges. He added that with a consolidated approach and the addition of a fleet supervisor, the Fire/Rescue system is hoping to reduce those costs.

Mr. Randolph asked if they are still considering tacking onto large localities' purchases, such as they have done with Houston, and wonders how they would be able to dictate which supplier to use if those localities have already decided on different equipment.

Mr. Eggleston responded that Fire/Rescue has been adding onto a very large Houston/Galveston contract, which a lot of other localities use because Houston gets an exceptionally good deal on purchases. He said this contract provides enough flexibility with minor adjustments to ensure that Albemarle gets apparatus that works for the community and accommodates both urban and rural areas. Mr. Eggleston stated that pertains to the fleet purchase, and ACFR feels they can take the consolidated approach and reduce costs by negotiating a maintenance agreement, which would not affect the purchasing side.

Mr. Randolph said there should be lesser costs if they use the same kinds of equipment, because they will keep the right supplies, such as tires, oil filters, etc., on hand.

Mr. Eggleston stated that there is enough history in the system now, and when Chief Chip Walker went to Wisconsin to work on engine specs for Crozet, there was enough knowledge about specific needs and performance to yield a better engine, and the system participates in that process.

Ms. McKeel commented that the equipment itself does not have to be cookie cutter, as the differences in areas of the County means that one size does not fit all. Mr. Eggleston responded that he hears this from volunteers.

Ms. Mallek stated that they need to discuss this in July, because the loss of the pump size in the latest engine is a significant problem.

Mr. Walker mentioned that this could be added for discussion in July, and FEMS is also working through those issues.

Ms. Mallek asked staff to talk about FY15 and FY16 fleet expenditures.

Mr. Bowman stated that a potential solution for those years would be a year-end balance of revenues over expenditures for FY17, which would be available after the audit is complete in October 2017, with those figures totaling about \$143,000.

Ms. Palmer commented that the Fire/Rescue fund may also have a surplus, and it would be her preference to use it from there.

Mr. Dill asked Mr. Bowman for a review of what the totals were. Mr. Bowman responded that the FY17 budget would cover the previous deficits.

Ms. McKeel said they are trying to make sure they have enough to cover it, and it is a bit confusing to jump from year to year.

Ms. Allshouse pointed out that some of these numbers are still estimates, and checking with insurance pieces provides the best estimates to date.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that there was only a seven-day turnaround for volunteer stations to provide their information so they may not have submitted it yet, and she wants to be sure that agencies know this money is available to cover their shortfalls, because if they do not, they likely will not make the requests.

Ms. Palmer stated the County could certainly make it clear that the \$125,000 is available, and that they are interested in looking at the balance of the fire fund to cover the volunteer stations. She asked if staff wants a motion to support this. Mr. Bowman agreed that they would, and should keep the dollar amount general to provide flexibility for station needs once those figures are known.

Ms. McKeel stated that staff could come back to the Board once all of the station information is submitted. Mr. Bowman said that they could provide a final accounting for each station at the end of FY17, which would direct how the Board approaches it.

Mr. Walker clarified that they do not need a vote, as they have the will of the Board, and staff will come back with a final accounting from volunteer agencies, and the amount of money to be transferred to

support them, and he does not anticipate that an ordinance amendment would be needed.

Mr. Bowman stated that staff would come back in the fall when FY17 is closed and assign that funding for the older years.

Mr. Walker asked if there is interest in discussing the fleet supervisor position. Ms. Mallek stated that she had been understanding different aspects of the position as it has proceeded, and noted that this would be a person to perform essential preventative maintenance, because the equipment would exceed \$108,000. She said this person is also going to manage contracts, which is a positive because one person would never be able to get all the work done for each station.

Mr. Dill commented that it seems like the position is calling on two specific but different skill sets, someone who can repair a fire engine but can also manage a sophisticated system for the apparatus.

Ms. Mallek noted that she is not interested in hiring an administrative person.

Mr. Dill said that it sounds like all that rolled into one. Mr. Eggleston explained that they want to hire someone who can do preventative maintenance and help assess problems with specific pieces of apparatus, and the Apparatus Committee had discussed the position and considered a schedule for maintenance. Mr. Eggleston said the hope is that this person could help avoid very expensive repairs through preventative maintenance and coordination but would not do major repairs, as the County did not have the facilities to do that, so that work would be handled by a contractor.

Mr. Randolph asked if there is already someone on staff who can step into this role. Mr. Eggleston responded that there have been a few people already coming forward and expressing interest in the position.

Ms. Mallek asked if the advisory group is working on a shuttle to get people back from dropping off engines at the repair shop, because that distance is 30 miles for some people. Mr. Eggleston responded that this has been a concern, and they could consider including "free delivery" of apparatus in the agreement with vendors.

Ms. Allshouse asked the Board support inclusion of the fleet position and approach in the FY18 budget, as staff would bring forward an appropriation ahead of their May 15 budget adoption date. Mr. Sheffield stated that he would support it with the changes.

Ms. Mallek noted that she would support it as a one-year trial, and mentioned the investment in tools that would be required.

Agenda Item No. 7. Volunteer Fire Rescue FY18 Total Expenditure Requests Versus FY18 Budget Recommendations.

Mr. Bowman presented information on FY18 volunteer Fire/Rescue station funding, noting the difference between FY17 adopted funding, FY18 requests, what stations have included in their FY18 budgets, and the change in the proposed budgets versus FY17 adopted budgets. He stated that because the FY18 proposed budget does not include contributions for vehicle and maintenance costs, staff has backed that out in order to provide an equitable comparison. Mr. Bowman said there are four categories of unfunded requests: grounds and janitorial costs total \$39,900; one-time costs by stations total \$744,000; operating costs exceeded the increases provided; and CARS expenses were \$694,000.

Mr. Bowman explained that under the current funding policy OMB uses as guidance in preparing the recommended budget each year, grounds and janitorial costs are not covered, and that policy is under review by the FEMS Board and would be considered by the Board in July. He stated that if that policy were to change over the summer, there is a reserve of unspent revenue in the Fire/Rescue services fund of about \$50,000, and that could be used for the grounds costs or any other purpose the Board deems appropriate. He stated that the \$743,000 in unmet requests are primarily capital in nature and may be more appropriate for the CIP, and they would be discussed when the Board holds its Fire/Rescue funding discussion over the summer. Mr. Bowman explained that the operating expense category of \$83,000 includes the difference between station requests and costs provided by formula, such as uniforms and training. He stated that if there were requests that were greatly above expenditure trends, with no additional information provided, the budget may reflect less than requested for those particular line items.

Mr. Bowman stated that regarding the category of CARS, about 20% of their calls had been in the County compared with calls in the City of Charlottesville, and the County's portion has been \$116,000 less each year, so the unfunded requests are due to increases related to the City, based on call volume. He noted that CARS has also submitted its own list of one-time requests.

Ms. Mallek stated that she hears a lot about meals for firefighters, and \$7 per meal does not cover people for dinner, and she asked what allowances are made for duty crew size. Mr. Bowman responded that the rate is \$9 per meal for a 12-hour shift, and the budget provided in FY16 was sufficient for all but one station.

Ms. Mallek stated that Western Albemarle brings in a lot of people to be able to run four vehicles at a time, so it is a busy kitchen and they cannot possibly make it with their allotment.

Mr. Bowman said they were the one station that exceeded the costs provided by formula.

Ms. Mallek commented that when grounds keeping services are provided for Station 11 and Station 12, they should be provided for other stations as well, and she is glad they are discussing it over the summer.

Ms. Palmer stated that different stations may want to use their money differently, and she wonders if the Chiefs would prefer to have that discretion.

Ms. Mallek said the concern is more about having items crossed out when they are requesting, and some stations have given up on even asking.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he feels uneasy about stations, like Seminole Trail, that are requesting training funds and not getting a sufficient amount, and he could not imagine that they are asking for unreasonable amounts.

Mr. Walker said that his expectation of what they would be discussing in July is the funding policy, what it currently says, what changes FEMS recommends, and what changes the Board feels should be considered. He stated that any items not included would lead to a larger discussion, and he would be interested in understanding which costs are still not covered with training, as that item has been consolidated for the entire system and it is unclear to him which costs remain.

Mr. Eggleston stated that this item is on the FEMS Board agenda for May and would include a discussion of updating the policy and what the Chiefs priorities are, and one of his priority concerns is building replacement and major renovations. He stated that currently this is treated on a case-by-case basis, which is frustrating to stations that may not have the option to fundraise to replace a building. Mr. Eggleston noted that the system did an assessment of all station buildings and that information had been turned into a list of needs, but some departments are faced with the situation of not being able to fund those improvements.

Ms. Palmer asked if stations need to be handicapped accessible. Mr. Eggleston responded that if the buildings are being replaced, they must meet ADA requirements, but he is not sure about those requirements if a major repair is being done.

Mr. Sheffield explained that the rule of thumb is that structurally changing a building necessitates bringing it up to code.

Ms. Palmer asked if the fire stations are ever considered emergency shelters. Mr. Eggleston and Ms. Mallek confirmed that they are. Ms. Palmer responded that they must have handicap accessibility if they are used as shelters.

Mr. Eggleston pointed out that Earlysville is the only shelter that accepts pets, which is important because some people will not leave their homes without their pets.

Ms. Palmer stated that the reason North Garden does not meet emergency shelter standards is because it is not handicap accessible.

Mr. Eggleston said that station is also located in the floodplain.

Mr. Eggleston stated that he is hearing from some station Chiefs that they will need help with building improvements, while some are saying they can handle it at the station level. He said that questions of ownership and ultimate site locations if buildings are replaced would be part of a larger discussion that could reflect a myriad of issues.

Ms. Mallek commented that during the derecho, they would have been able to use the Earlysville shelter more extensively if there had been shower capability, and the unfunded amount presented for that station was for dormitories for women who want to run calls.

Ms. McKeel suggested that this be a work session item in July, not just an agenda item, so they can give adequate time for discussion.

Mr. Sheffield said there is no doubt the community supports emergency responders, but the concern is whether volunteers are getting the same support as professionals. He stated that it is difficult for him to articulate the parity between the career and volunteer sides, due in part to the complexity of their respective budgets, and it is important for the Board to be able to do that in the community. Mr. Sheffield added that he does not want to be in a position of having the public question how the Board is spending their tax dollars. Mr. Eggleston responded that he would bring forth comparative information from other stations as to how they fund things like building improvements, so the Board has an idea of what is happening elsewhere with support as they form the basis for their decisions.

Ms. McKeel noted that some of the Board's questions were asked in an effort to better inform the public, as they listen to the meetings.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Eggleston to send the Board a list of emergency shelters in the County. Mr. Eggleston agreed, stating that he would share the whole list as it also includes University and City

locations.

Ms. Mallek commented that although she asks a lot of difficult questions, the Fire/Rescue services collaborative system has improved significantly over the last 10 years, and they have made giant strides, although there is still a lot left to be done.

Ms. Allshouse thanked the Board for their interest and said they would continue their discussion in July.

NonAgenda. (Note: At 4:03 p.m., Mr. Sheffield read the following Transactional Disclosure Statement and filed with the Clerk's Office: "I am employed as Executive Director of JAUNT, a regional public transportation provider owned by the City of Charlottesville and the counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Louisa, Nelson and Buckingham located at 104 Keystone Place, Charlottesville, Virginia 22902, and have a personal interest in JAUNT because I receive an annual salary from JAUNT that exceeds \$5,000 annually.

JAUNT is a subject matter of this agenda and JAUNT could realize a reasonably foreseeable direct or indirect benefit or detriment as a result of any decision related to JAUNT. He then stated that Ms. Karen Davis was present to answer questions. Mr. Sheffield disqualified himself from participating in the matter and left the meeting room.")

Ms. Allshouse reported that on April 12, Mr. Walker had received an email from Karen Davis at JAUNT requesting some additional funding from the County. She explained that when JAUNT submitted its budget request to the County, it reflected an estimated \$1 million in state funding, but was notified at the end of March that they would receive only \$940,959 in state funding, or a \$58,041 decrease. Ms. Allshouse stated that this decrease would have a negative impact on transient services provided to Charlottesville and Albemarle, and the impact to the County would be \$24,951 for FY18, with the City agreeing to fund their portion in an equal amount.

Mr. Randolph asked where staff would see the funds coming from in the budget to cover this cost. Ms. Allshouse responded that OMB always had to work through that in order to achieve a balanced budget, but staff had provided an estimate in state funding changes that reflected changes in other categories totaling about \$34,000 that would now free up local funding, so that seems like a good place to look first.

Mr. Randolph said it would be helpful to know whether the state reduction is part of a trend.

Ms. Karen Davis, Assistant Executive Director of JAUNT, addressed the Board and stated that JAUNT's funding is linked, in part, to efficiency in service, and the agency had budgeted optimistically based on the previous year, but because other agencies around the state outperformed JAUNT, the funding share was reduced. Ms. Davis stated that the funding allocation was based on a four-year rolling average, and JAUNT would be working with the state to identify a reasonable amount going forward. She added that one of JAUNT's goals is to be as efficient as possible.

Ms. McKeel clarified that the amount requested by JAUNT to address the state budget reduction is about \$25,000.

Mr. Randolph then **moved** to approve \$24,951 for JAUNT to replace reduced state funding for FY18. 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.

(Note: Mr. Sheffield returned to the meeting at 4:10 p.m.) Mr. Walker commented that there is a policy consideration regarding the Board's policy as it relates to having local revenue from taxpayers replace funding for lost state and federal revenue, as staff anticipated that happening going forward – without the resources identified to replace it.

Ms. Palmer commented that they need to look at their priorities, and they all recognize how unfair property taxes are compared to an income tax that the state depends on.

Mr. Dill asked Mr. Walker if staff feels the reduced state funding would focus on any specific areas. Mr. Walker responded that K-12 education would be one likely area, and there have been conversations about using block grants for certain types of funding for things like social services. He stated that support for the housing choice voucher program was also a possible target, and with each situation there would need to be a decision made about replacing it at the local level.

Ms. McKeel stated she had been informed recently that the state had some debt that was currently off the books would soon be coming on the books.

Ms. Allshouse reviewed the topics discussed at this meeting, and asked the Board if there were any other items to consider ahead of their tax rate public hearing on May 15. She stated that at that

meeting, the Board would hold a tax rate public hearing, set the tax rate, approve their budget, and consider a resolution of appropriations for the schools. Ms. Allshouse commented that she wants to make sure that OMB is addressing all of the Board's concerns prior to that date.

Ms. McKeel asked staff to address the schools' concerns as to whether the Board's delayed approval of the tax rate would affect their appropriations. Mr. Walker responded that their primary interest is having their appropriation approved by the Board, as it affects their teacher contracts, and approving it on the same day as the budget enables the schools to meet their deadlines. He stated that ideally, there are few, if any, changes through the process of the tax rate to budget appropriations, although the Board had not yet made its final decision. He said if there are changes to be addressed with an appropriation, they may need to call a recess so that staff has time to modify the appropriation ordinance to meet what is in the approved budget.

Ms. Allshouse noted that staff would prepare the school appropriation based on what they know today, with the understanding that there may be modifications at their May 15th meeting.

Agenda Item No. 8. From the Board: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Randolph reported that he and Mr. Dill had attended a "Reimagining the Suburban Strip" program, which County staff had played a key role in, and there was a lot of good discussion as part of that. He stated there was an architect from Detroit who made an excellent presentation on how Detroit was recovering from its economic setbacks over the years.

Mr. Randolph reported that Ms. Janine Caron had moved out of the Scottsville area and had left her Town Council position, and was replaced by Mr. Zachary Bullock on the council. He stated that Scottsville Supply had provided 40,000 Italian honeybees to Monticello High School for use in their AP science classes. Mr. Randolph noted that the same teacher is setting up an aquaponics project in his classroom.

Mr. Randolph stated that when he was in Scottsville on April 17, the Town Council passed a resolution in support of an application for playground equipment in Scottsville and are applying through the Neighborhood Initiatives program for the CACs. He said when he explained that Scottsville was not a development area, the mayor replied that it is a developed town, so there seems to be some confusion about the program and who qualifies. Mr. Randolph stated that he elaborated on the primary benefit of their proposal, which would be submitted to Parks and Recreation and could possibly be funded if it scored highly enough in the CIP process.

Mr. Randolph reported that several members of the CAC had gone out to the East Rivanna Volunteer Fire Company and were told that they needed a four-bay garage for apparatus, and his response was that it would exceed the capabilities of the Neighborhood Initiatives program. He stated that he explained to them that this was a CIP project, and he has concerns as people do not understand what the program is for.

Mr. Randolph stated that he had received some nasty letters from mountain bikers who did not appreciate comments Mr. Randolph had made on a video shot by a UVA student, where he said he did not want bikers going into areas where they would pick flowers for their honeys. He stated that his point was to explain that the Ragged Mountain Reservoir was not suitable for mountain biking, and the County stands by its position as it pertains to code.

Referring to Consent Agenda Item No. 4.1, Mr. Randolph said he had requested pulling this item from the Consent Agenda related to bicycling, and there would be consultation and discussion about cycling as it pertains to the 5th Street node, but there would be no eminent domain or property taken.

Ms. Palmer clarified that the letter being discussed was in support of a grant applied for by the TJPDC and the Piedmont Environmental Council, in an effort to improve bicycle pathways around the City. She emphasized that a big portion of this money would be going to citizen engagement, with communities affected by these plans fully engaged in the process going forward.

Ms. Mallek asked who would be doing the outreach and easement seeking, as the County has staff who have been doing that effectively for many years. She stated that she wants to make sure those folks are in charge and the County is not relinquishing its greenway efforts.

Ms. Palmer responded that this had nothing to do with the right of ways and intended to identify the sequencing and phasing of construction and educate and engage the public as to a greenway network and connections to move this forward. She stated that the County would obviously have to do all that work.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that there can be no timetable until all the easements are done, and if there are group meetings, that is great, but she does not want some of these people to go meet with landowners.

Ms. McKeel commented that this is a preliminary first step.

Ms. Palmer stated that it would be County staff who is meeting with landowners.

Mr. Walker pointed out that Mr. Dan Mahon is actively involved in this effort and is supportive of moving forward with it, and he has a good track record of success and communication with those being affected.

Ms. Mallek said she wants to make sure that Mr. Mahon is involved and not obstructed in any way.

Mr. Randolph asked that Mr. Mahon let him and Ms. Pam Riley know as to his attendance at HOA meetings, as there had been a very tense meeting when Mr. Mahon ended up not attending.

Ms. Palmer asked for the same for her district. Mr. Walker suggested that Mr. Mahon inform each Board member when he has a meeting in their district.

Ms. Palmer then **moved** to authorize the Board Chair to sign the proposed letter in support of a grant pursuing a Charlottesville Area Community Foundation "Strengthening Systems Greenways" proposal. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

"May 1, 2017
Mr. Rex Linville
Piedmont Environmental Council
410 East Water St. SW, Suite 700
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Re: Support for CACF Strengthening Systems Greenways Proposal

Dear Rex,

Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville are pleased to submit this joint letter of support for the Strengthening Systems proposal to the Charlottesville Area Community Foundation (CACF) for Building a Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail Network. Our localities see great benefits in a coordinated greenway network in the City and County. The network would contribute to the quality of life in our region, create effective alternative transportation corridors, and make areas adjacent to these trails attractive for businesses to locate. Bicycling and walking contribute to the health of our citizens, and the network would provide cross-benefits to both localities.

Both the City and County have adopted plans for such a greenway network and have a shared conceptual vision for connecting key destinations together for commuting, recreation, and health. Despite the vision and plans, there are barriers that have kept implementation from occurring. Interjurisdictional work is challenging and community buy-in can be difficult to achieve. Our area's topography is also an implementation factor. A concerted effort to identify the sequencing and phasing of construction and to educate and engage the public would move our localities toward realizing the vision of a coordinated greenways network. This effort would complement ongoing Memorandums of Understanding between Charlottesville and Albemarle promoting regional cooperation in the areas of housing, transportation, education and environmental stewardship.

Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville are pleased that your proposal includes the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission as a key member of the project team. TJPDC provides an independent partner for these discussions and brings considerable expertise in working with the public to provide education and opportunities to engage in the process. Their skills in mapping and visualizations will be assets in community engagement efforts.

We look forward to hearing of the success of your application and to working with the PEC and TJPDC to realize our shared vision for this key community asset. Our localities will participate in meetings to develop and build consensus on sequencing and phasing of projects in the greenway network, actively support public outreach, and work with partners to carry out the resulting implementation process.

Sincerely,
Diantha H. McKeel, Chair
Mike Signer, Mayor Albemarle County Board of Supervisors Charlottesville City Council"

Ms. Mallek said she had heard a rumor about special use permits for farmer's markets no longer being needed. Mr. Kamptner stated that there is a Resolution of Intent coming before the Board on May 3.

Ms. Mallek commented that she and Ms. McKeel had addressed the Commonwealth Transportation Board earlier in the day, and it had been a very positive meeting with accolades for recent projects being on time and on budget.

Mr. Dill announced that April 22nd is Record Store Day, celebrating the resurgence of vinyl records, and encouraged people to visit record stores in the community.

Ms. McKeel announced that April 26th from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. is the Senior Center parking lot paper shredding event, with reasonable rates offered for large shredding jobs.

Ms. Mallek noted that the staff for that event would do it while customers watch.

Agenda Item No. 9. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Walker reported that the Economic Development Strategic Plan is currently being drafted, with individual and group input being gathered during the month of April, and draft concepts slated for discussion with the Economic Development Authority on May 26th. He stated that this will be followed by additional input from stakeholders and further consideration by the Board. Mr. Walker said that a technical consulting firm has been identified as “most preferred,” and the County team would work to define a more specific scope and outcomes, which will come to the Board in early June. He stated that the Economic Development Director recruitment process has not yet been initiated, but staff is developing an action plan to work in tandem with the Economic Development Strategic Plan, and the new County Executive will select the new Director.

Mr. Randolph mentioned that he had been at the County Office Building on April 13, which is a holiday for the County because it is Jefferson’s Birthday, and he observed that about one-third of employees were at work. He stated that he would like to revisit the idea of not having that as a holiday, since most County employees are working anyway.

Mr. Dill said he did not think there were that many employees here, and definitely not one-third.

Mr. Walker pointed out that employees had the option of working that day in exchange for a different day off, so that holiday is unique in that way.

Ms. Palmer announced that the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority’s household hazardous waste days will be offered during the end of April, with bulky waste days offered in May, and that information is available on the rivanna.org website.

Agenda Item No. 10. Closed Meeting. *(if needed)*

There was no need for a Closed Meeting.

Agenda Item No. 11. Adjourn to April 25, 2017, 6:30 p.m., Martin Luther King Jr., Performing Arts Center.

At 4:38 p.m., Ms. Mallek **moved** to adjourn the Board meeting to April 25, 2017, at 6:30 p.m. at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Performing Arts Center in Charlottesville. Mr. Dill **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 09/13/2017
Initials CKB