

A special meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 28, 2017, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia, for the purpose of allowing a quorum of Board members to convene, to act on a motion to go into a closed meeting as authorized under Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A) to discuss and consider prospective candidates for appointment as County Executive; and a Budget Work Session. The meeting was held at 11:00 a.m., in the Lane Auditorium, Second Floor.

The Board convened at 11:00 a.m., and then adjourned to Room 241, Second Floor of the County Office Building at 3:30 p.m., for a Budget Work Session. The Board then went into a second closed meeting at the end of the budget work session (as time allowed), as authorized under Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A) 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.

PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, and Ms. Liz A. Palmer (arrived at 3:46 p.m.), Mr. Rick Randolph and Mr. Brad Sheffield.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Interim County Executive, Doug Walker (arrived at 3:39 p.m.), County Attorney, Greg Kamptner, and Clerk, Claudette Borgersen, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 11:06 a.m., by the Chair, Ms. McKeel.

Agenda Item No. 2. Closed Meeting.

Pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia: Under Subsection (1), to discuss and consider prospective candidates for appointment as county executive.

At 11:06 p.m., Mr. Dill **moved** that the Board go into Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia under Subsection (1), to discuss and consider prospective candidates for appointment as county executive. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Ms. Palmer.

Agenda Item No. 3. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 12:13 p.m., the Board reconvened into open meeting, and Mr. Dill **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 passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Ms. Palmer.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adjourn to Room 241, 3:30 p.m.

At 12:14 p.m., the Board adjourned the meeting until 3:30 p.m., Room 241.

Agenda Item No. 5. Call back to Order.

At 3:33 p.m., the meeting was called back to order by the Chair, Ms. McKeel.

Ms. McKeel introduced the staff and presiding security officer, Officer K. Kane. She announced that Ms. Palmer and Mr. Walker were running late as they had attended the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) meeting and were expected to arrive soon for this meeting.

Agenda Item No. 6. **Work Session:** FY 2016-2017 Operating and Capital Budgets.

Item 6a. Continued Discussions from Previous Work Sessions.

- Fire Rescue Services Fund
- Scenic Gateways
- Other

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, presented to the Board. She said this is the fifth budget work session and presented a slide that highlighted important dates in the budget process:

March 29: Fire and Rescue Services Fund Discussion, Entrance Corridors, Board Approval of Proposed Budget
April 11: Public Hearing on Board's Proposed Budget, Public Hearing on Tax Rate
April 18: Set Tax Rate and Approve Budget
June: Resolution of Appropriations

Ms. Allshouse presented her next slide, entitled "Desired Outcome: Board Discusses Items and Approves Proposed FY18 Budget for Advertising," with the agenda including Board discussion of Fire/Rescue Services Fund and Entrance Corridors; Board approves FY18 proposed budget for purposes of advertisement prior to the public hearing; and next steps. Ms. Allshouse introduced Andy Bowman, Senior Budget Analyst, to continue with the presentation.

Mr. Andy Bowman, Senior Budget Analyst, said he will discuss the Fire/Rescue Services Fund and explained that the fund was created in the FY16 budget process. He said that prior to its creation, all expenditures and related revenues were accounted for separately from the General Fund. He stated that the FY16 budget dedicated a one-cent real estate tax increase to help support a \$2 million or 16% increase in the operating and capital costs of fire/rescue. He said these dedicated one-cent real estate tax increases began in FY13 with funds dedicated to capital and debt. He stated that in FY14 and FY15, funds were dedicated to the school division, and in FY15 to water resources. Mr. Bowman said the total real estate funding for fire/rescue services from FY16 to FY18 is the value of 7.6 cents, with 0.4 cents of this figure dedicated to the CIP for capital and debt expenses and the remaining 7.2 cents to support operations. He said that each fall, ACFR submits a budget request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), budget meetings are held, a revised budget is prepared, and a meeting is held with the County Executive in January to finalize the budget. He said the volunteer stations also submit budgets to OMB.

Mr. Bowman presented a slide indicating that the Fire/Rescue FY18 recommended budget is \$15.4M, representing an 8.1% increase over the FY17 adopted budget. He referenced two pie charts showing budget revenues as: 58% (7.2 cents Real Estate Tax Rate), 13% (EMS Cost Recovery), 3% (State Revenue), 1% (Fund Balance), and 1% (Permits, Fees, Other Revenues); and expenditures as Fire/Rescue Department, 9% (Contributions to Volunteer Stations), 8% (System-Wide Fleet Management), 2% (Other Fire/Rescue including contract with Charlottesville), and 0.3% (Reserve Fund).

(Note: Mr. Walker arrived at 3:39 p.m.)

Mr. Bowman said he will address some questions asked during the last budget work session about changes to Fire/Rescue services and staffing. He said that between FY08 and FY12, there were no net additional positions added. He stated that in FY13, a number of changes took place, including the introduction of a 24/7 fire engine in place of a City fire contract, resulting in the addition of 12 positions; increasing coverage of Berkmar Drive ambulance service to 24/7, resulting in 5 additional positions; weekday daytime ambulance service added at Pantops, resulting in 3 added positions; and weekday daytime ambulance service at Ivy, resulting in 3 additional positions. Mr. Bowman said they also added a training position for volunteer services, which was paid for by grant funding in FY14. He stated that these additional positions were paid for by grant funding and phased in over three years, and another funding source was an increase in EMS recovery. He said that state regulations require a staffing minimum of two individuals per ambulance, and the County's own minimum staffing policy for fire trucks is three per fire truck, which is grounded in national standards. He said in FY14 they added one position, a Division Chief of Volunteer Services; in FY15 they added an EMS Cost Recovery Analyst; and in FY16 they added two over-hire positions at no additional cost, as these positions had been authorized. Mr. Bowman stated that in FY17 they did not add staff, and the FY18 recommendation is to add three positions to reduce mandatory holdovers and one position to implement a system-wide fleet management program.

Mr. Randolph asked about the two grant-funded positions added in FY13 for the Berkmar ambulance and a training division position. He said he does not see funding for the training position in the FY15 budget, and asked if this position was dropped. Mr. Bowman replied that grant funded positions were picked up in the regular budget once the grants expired.

(Note: Ms. Palmer arrived at 3:46 p.m.)

Mr. Randolph said that to be clear to the public, the County added two positions in FY15, a Cost Recovery Analyst and a volunteer training position. He then cited the FY16 budget, which shows the addition of two over-hire positions with no additional cost. He asked if the five positions that were grant-funded through FY15 should be added, for a total of seven new positions. Mr. Bowman said there were 10 grant-funded positions added in FY13: 4 for the Ivy fire engine, 5 for the Berkmar Drive ambulance, and 1 training position. He said the local cost for the training and analyst positions began in FY15, with the other positions added as local costs in FY16, for a total of 11 positions added.

Ms. Mallek asked for confirmation that since FY13, 19 positions have been added. Mr. Bowman confirmed this. Mr. Dill commented that a position previously grant-funded and then paid for locally should be counted as a position added. Mr. Bowman said they do show this in the budget document.

Mr. Walker said that when a position is grant-funded, there is still a revenue source, though it is not a general fund source and in the budget context they reflect both the source and use of the funding. He said it is a challenge to clearly present the distinction of when the position is added and when the fire fund began picking up the cost.

Ms. Mallek said she remembers the fire fund was introduced to make cost increases more transparent. She posed a question which she said does not need to be answered today and asked about the cost recovery for Berkmar.

Mr. Sheffield asked for confirmation that the fire fund was created the year after grant positions were picked up by local funds. Mr. Bowman said he does not recall the exact timing in FY15.

Mr. Sheffield said they did not dedicate the penny because of these grant unfunded positions. Mr. Bowman said in FY16 a lot of increases were occurring, with this being the most notable.

Ms. McKeel asked if there are any current grant positions now that they will be facing, as she would like to know ahead of time. Mr. Bowman replied that Ms. Kristy Shifflett and her office provide this information as part of their regular grant report to the Board. He said the only one he is aware of is the problem-oriented policing sergeant position, which is funded by a four-year 50% matching grant. He said they are in year two or three of this grant, which involves a gradual phase-in with the County picking up 25% more each year and full cost pick-up in the FY18 budget.

Ms. Allshouse said grant funding for another position will expire in FY19.

Mr. Bowman presented a slide showing total department authorized staffing from FY08 to FY18, with 80 positions authorized in FY08 and 113 positions recommended for FY18. His next slide shows total funded positions per 1,000 population, with 0.9 in FY08 and 1.0 in FY18. He said the minimum staffing level for FY18 is 84 positions.

Mr. Randolph asked how Albemarle compares to counties with similar demographics in terms of staffing per 1,000 population for fire/rescue. Mr. Bowman responded that he does not have this information and offered to follow up.

Ms. Palmer acknowledged that she missed the early portion of the meeting and asked what caused the large increase in employees from FY12 to FY13. Mr. Bowman said it was the addition of a fire engine at Ivy and replacing City of Charlottesville coverage, as well as EMS service expansion at Pantops, Ivy and Berkmar.

Mr. Randolph asked if yearly statistics are kept regarding the number of volunteers and asked if he could have this information.

Mr. Sheffield suggested they also be provided with the number of volunteers per full-time employee.

Mr. Bowman said he will provide this information. He commented that in the past, volunteers typically worked more hours than they do now, so more volunteers may be needed to provide the same level of coverage.

Ms. Mallek said the Board agreed to open the Ivy station because it could be funded with savings from the contract with the Charlottesville Fire Department as a day station, and the staffing level of 12 is a big change from what was originally undertaken. She said they have to be very careful and deliberate in the future to face this up front. Ms. Mallek stated that the increase in service at Berkmar was a great idea and intended to take staff from CARS to Berkmar Station with funding covered by cost recovery, but by increasing coverage to 24/7, they have required additional funding. She asked if she can be provided with information about the busiest times of day for calls to Berkmar. Ms. Mallek recalled former Supervisor Ken Boyd saying that when staffing is funded by grants, that would have future repercussions and they would have to be ready to make a choice about continuation of funding. She added that this has been a great concern for her.

Mr. Walker asked for clarification from Ms. Mallek that she wants statistics on service calls by time of day for Rescue 8. Ms. Mallek replied that it does not have to be very specific, and a comparison between night and day shifts would be sufficient.

Ms. Allshouse asked Ms. Mallek if it would be helpful to show what occurred with the savings from the City contract. Ms. Mallek said the savings from the contract was supposed to cover daytime staffing.

Mr. Bowman said the last payment to the City on the contract was close to \$1 million, and costs are now a bit less than \$200,000.

Ms. Allshouse said the rest of the savings is being used to support the system.

Mr. Walker said they would want to reflect the revenue from cost recovery and how this has helped support the system.

Mr. Bowman pointed out that the City had a fire station located near the Emergency Communications Center on Route 250 that was moved to Fontaine Avenue, and that would have created a large increase in response times to that part of the development area as well as to Ivy.

Mr. Sheffield asked if Mr. Bowman and his staff could project staffing needs for the next 10 years and provide this to the Board, with an assumption that the Pantops Station would be fully staffed. He said that constituents have asked him when the growth in fire and rescue staffing would stop, and his response has been that it would stop when population growth stops.

Mr. Dan Eggleston, Fire Chief, pointed out that similar questions arose last year, and the Board authorized the hiring of a consultant to conduct a long-term review of the fire and rescue system. He said they expect the consultant to have things wrapped up within a few months, at which time they can present a report to the Board that will present options as to levels of coverage.

Ms. Mallek said they need to know where roads are, as there is sometimes no connection between destinations.

Mr. Randolph urged the Board to review the costs of training police officers as first responders, which is done in some rural counties and can be cost effective. He said that a friend of his died on a golf course last summer, as it took 13 minutes for first responders to arrive and a police officer on patrol in the area could have responded more quickly.

Ms. Mallek asked for the amounts of unfunded requests made by the volunteer stations that are not met in the current budget. She also commented that volunteers are expected to perform duties such as cutting grass and plowing snow that are not expected of paid staff, and she believes this is a real and inexpensive grievance that comes up each year and was supposed to be addressed last year. Mr. Bowman said they have addressed the issue of snow removal, although there have been inconsistencies in the requests made by the stations. He stated that the Board could decide to fund grounds maintenance at the volunteer stations.

Ms. Mallek said she would like to make an official request that they address these issues during the next funding request.

Mr. Dill concurred with Ms. Mallek and said it would motivate volunteers more if they spent their time doing the more interesting work of firefighters and EMTs rather than dirty work.

Ms. Allshouse stated that the FEMS Board is meeting in May and would review volunteer funding so they could make changes for FY18.

Mr. Walker said he hears clearly from the Board an interest in re-evaluating the funding policy and previously made choices in conjunction with the work of the FEMS Board, prior to the FY19 budget process.

Ms. Mallek said she is not closing the door on making changes in the FY18 budget, though others may disagree. Mr. Bowman said that if a decision were to be made in the FY18 budget about grounds maintenance and janitorial costs, the fiscal impact would be about \$40,000 and he could obtain the exact figure later. He said only five or six stations requested this.

Mr. Bowman's presentation then focused on reducing mandatory holdovers at fire and rescue stations. He provided an example of a hypothetical day when two paramedics call in sick for their 12 or 24-hour shifts, in which case two personnel are needed to replace them, based on minimum staffing standards. He said that in an increasing number of cases, they have been unable to find people to volunteer to come in and must resort to requiring personnel to stay and work an additional shift, which can result in a 36-hour shift and be disruptive to the lives of staff. He presented a slide that showed the number of mandatory holdover occurrences for each year from FY12 to FY16 increased from 91 to 307. He said there has been an increase in employee turnover, which they attribute to lower morale resulting from mandatory holdovers; in FY16 there was 13% turnover, whereas in FY13 there was 0% turnover. He said the figures only included veteran employees and not new trainees, and a recent employee climate survey indicated that 22% of respondents are considering seeking employment elsewhere due to the frequency of mandatory holdovers.

Mr. Randolph asked what is driving the increase in holdover occurrences and if they track the reasons why an employee does not come in to work. Mr. Bowman responded that he believes staff could provide this data, but it is likely several factors and not just one single thing. He presented a slide listing five questions posed as potential remedies to the issue of mandatory holdovers: Can the over-hire that was expanded in FY16 help? Are 33 personnel needed in the field weekdays between 6 a.m.–6 p.m.? What flexibility is there with the number of personnel beyond weekdays? How much are mandatory holdovers part of the County's staffing model? Can volunteer support reduce the amount of mandatory holdovers?

Mr. Bowman stated that addressing over-hires allows the department to fill positions more quickly and minimize time between vacancies; in FY17, Fire/Rescue is authorized to hire up to 85 positions to provide minimum staffing of stations, but only has funding for 81 positions; department managers and OMB monitor salaries and overtime throughout the year to stay within budget. He said that it helps when there is anticipated turnover of employees, but does not help with day-to-day or temporary leave.

Mr. Dill asked what happens when there is not enough coverage and a station has to be shut down. Mr. Bowman said they do not shut a station down, and instead require employees to be held over.

The next slide presented staffing on weekdays from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. at both County and volunteer stations, with the County having 19 personnel: two for the Berkmar ambulance, five for the Hollymead ambulance and engine, five for the Ivy ambulance and engine, five for the Monticello ambulance and engine, and two for the Pantops ambulance. The next slide presented volunteer staffing as 14 personnel, with three for the Earlysville ambulance or engine, three for the East Rivanna engine, two for the Scottsville ambulance, three for the Seminole Trail engine, and three for the Stony Point engine.

Mr. Bowman said the formula used to calculate the minimum staffing level calls for 66 paid positions and 23 volunteer positions, for a total of 89 positions, but actual staffing is at 81 positions, with the gap filled by overtime and volunteers.

Mr. Bowman said voluntary overtime has been decreasing and mandatory overtime has been increasing. He expressed his belief that there are fewer volunteers for overtime because these staff members know they are likely to be held over anyway. He said that 79% of overtime occurs during the weekday day shifts. Mr. Bowman said the recommended solution, which has been submitted with the FY18 budget, is to add three positions at a cost of \$221,000. He said the intended outcome is to reduce mandatory holdovers, reduce employee turnover and increase morale, and to maintain current service delivery standards.

Ms. Mallek asked if car accidents represent the greatest number of calls within the development area. Mr. Bowman replied that medical calls in general represent the greatest number of calls.

Ms. McKeel said they have an issue with people using EMS transport to the emergency room as primary care, and this is something they need to discuss. Mr. Eggleston said they recently began a pilot program with Social Services and JABA, which is providing some great results. He stated that it is a complex issue that can involve mental health issues, issues with elderly individuals, and lack of family support.

Mr. Sheffield asked Mr. Bowman if the \$221,000 budget request to hire three additional fire and rescue staff includes capital costs.

Mr. Bowman replied that about \$25,000 represents capital costs and about \$200,000 would be annual costs.

Mr. Bowman next addressed system-wide fleet management and presented a graph that shows steadily increasing vehicle repair and maintenance costs from FY12 to FY16, with average increases of 23% per year, while County funding has increased only 10% per year. He said the current fleet includes 137 vehicles with a replacement value of \$35 million. He said repair and maintenance is managed by each of the volunteer stations, which are responsible for costs that exceed the County's contribution. He said that in FY16, maintenance and repair expenses were 100% funded, although actual costs exceeded this amount by \$176,000, with stations relying on their reserves to make up the difference. Mr. Bowman presented recommendations for the FY18 budget and said the Fire EMS (FEMS) Board supports consolidation of station expenses into one budget as a cost-effective measure, as well as the hiring of an analyst to perform essential preventative maintenance and coordinate repairs and contractual services. He noted that the cost of this position would be \$106,000 and, if approved by the Board, they would return in May with an appropriation to start the position on July 1 so they will not have a gap in coverage. He said the budget also includes a \$125,000 contingency for major unanticipated fleet repairs.

Mr. Bowman stated that the intended outcomes of changes to fleet management are to address the trend of significant increases in vehicle repair and maintenance; to ensure preventive maintenance for optimal lifecycle and to avoid major repairs; to reduce reliance on volunteer donations and reserves; and to increase support to volunteers to manage the fleet.

Mr. Randolph asked if the cost allocation formula is spread evenly among all the stations. He pointed out that some stations have newer equipment, and thus should have fewer maintenance costs. He asked if some of the professional stations are at an advantage compared to the volunteer companies that have older equipment. Mr. Bowman responded that each station presents its own operating budget request to OMB, and some stations have larger fleets and a corresponding larger budget than others. He said they rotate equipment among the stations to maximize the lifecycle. He stated that newer stations are at a disadvantage in one sense, as EPA regulations require engines to run cleaner than in the past, which requires more complex engines and parts, so newer engines can be just as expensive to maintain as older ones.

Mr. Randolph said they might be creating disincentives to prospective volunteers as they might need to spend time fundraising. Mr. Eggleston said he does not think they see a disproportionate increase in repairs and maintenance in volunteer stations, as newer equipment is provided to both paid and volunteer stations. He said the volunteer stations have larger coverage areas and thus have larger fleets, and the proportion of funds spent on repairs at both County-owned and volunteer stations is about the same.

Ms. Mallek said that preventive maintenance takes four days and one person cannot do this job and still be available to respond to emergencies. Mr. Eggleston said they could reduce costs by scheduling preventive maintenance ahead of time, as well as reducing trips out to the station to make minor repairs that could wait until regularly scheduled maintenance. He said a committee of Battalion Chiefs and fleet maintenance personnel is working through these issues.

Ms. McKeel said her understanding is that some repairs are done on site while others are contracted with private companies. Mr. Eggleston said they have a contract with a privately owned company for repairs.

Ms. McKeel noted that there is a repair shop off Lambs Road and asked if some engine repairs could take place there to save money. Mr. Eggleston said they are required to have a certified mechanic/technician, as the engines are very electronically sophisticated, though they could look into shared facilities.

Mr. Walker said there is a comprehensive fleet maintenance opportunity they could consider.

Ms. McKeel asked if they could come to the Board in the near future to address fleet maintenance efficiencies. Mr. Eggleston offered to come back in May or June.

Mr. Randolph agreed with Ms. McKeel and emphasized the importance of establishing a countywide fleet management recommended approach that includes vehicles of fire and rescue, police, schools, and County staff. He asked if a motion would be required to have staff work on this.

Ms. Mallek and Ms. McKeel said they could discuss this at another meeting.

Ms. Allshouse concluded the presentation and requested Board direction on changes to the County Executive's Budget for the Fire/Rescue Services Fund to be included in the Board's FY18 proposed budget.

Ms. Mallek asked if the entire increase in revenue from the penny increase is being spent, or if they are saving a fund balance for potential disasters, such as engine blow-ups. Mr. Bowman replied that there would be a fund balance of about \$30,000.

Mr. Dill asked if the budget would have been less if they did not have the funding formula and the budget had been proposed in the old way, and if it was just coincidence that all the money is used up. Mr. Walker responded that they have the resources to fund increases because the fire fund was created a couple of years ago for this purpose. He said that absent the fire fund, they would have looked at how to address this problem with resources from the General Fund. He stated that absent revenues from the fire fund, the budget would have had to contemplate an infusion from the General Fund to the fire fund or come up with another strategy, including reallocation of positions to address the challenge of mandatory overtime. He said that absent the revenues, staff would have suggested either some service reductions or changes or sources of additional revenue.

Ms. Mallek said they should look at the funding formula in detail and look to create a more inviting and hospitable physical environment for volunteers in the future.

Mr. Dill said he believes there is some interest among the Board for eliminating the fire fund and funding fire and rescue in a regular way as it seems so much cleaner rather than it being an obligation, and asked when this could be discussed.

Mr. Walker said staff has also had this conversation, and he recommended having this conversation in late summer or early fall before they begin the Two-Year Fiscal Plan process.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Walker to plan a work session for this.

Ms. McKeel asked Supervisors for consensus on moving forward with the FY18 budget for the Fire/Rescue Services Fund.

Mr. Randolph thanked Mr. Bowman for providing detailed information in the presentation.

Ms. Mallek requested that the Board be provided with a breakdown of funding requests by station, prior to their Board meeting in May.

Ms. McKeel emphasized that the direction needed from the Board now is to authorize advertising, and they would still have the opportunity to come back and make changes. She said they would move forward for now. She announced a five minute break.

(NonAgenda. At 5:12 p.m., the Board recessed, and then reconvened at 5:31 p.m.)

Scenic Gateways – Entrance Corridor Beautification Questions

Mr. Trevor Henry, Director of the Office of Facilities and Environmental Services, addressed the Board and stated that he is prepared to answer questions about entrance corridor beautification. He said the Board requested a cost estimate to move up timing of the funding of the strategic plan goal to work

with partners to increase efforts to address aesthetic appearance of entrance corridors and high visibility urban public spaces, by January 2019. He said his slide presentation will address the current scope of coverage, VDOT construction/warranty period for 29 North work, and near-term FY18 options for expansion of services. Mr. Henry presented a slide that showed a map of the locations of the 12 urban area entrance corridors to the County and showed photos of landscaping and signage at a few of the entrance corridors. He said his department manages two contracts for mowing and landscaping and provided a figure of \$29,010 for April–October twice per month mowing and curb edging of medians and shoulders. He provided a figure of \$20,230 for April–October landscaping that includes mulching, weeding, fertilizing and pruning.

Mr. Henry reviewed VDOT landscaping projects underway at the Route 29/Rio Road grade-separated interchange scheduled for completion by June 30. He said VDOT plans to provide mowing services one to three times per season, and he recommends the County pick up additional work. He stated there is a three-year warranty period on landscaping for the three projects. Mr. Henry provided suggestions for potential future enhancements, including the extension of mowing beyond the current permit area that allows \$2,700 per linear mile per year, resulting in two mowings per month. He said mowing could be extended on Route 29N widening up to Hollymead and Berkmar Extended for 4.5 additional miles at a cost of \$11,610/year. He showed a slide of the entrance corridor at McIntire and Preston with flower beds, with an annual maintenance cost of \$5K. He said he has spoken with Joel DiNunzio of VDOT about its Pollinator Habitat Program which provides habitats for bees and butterflies and reduces maintenance costs by reducing mowing and other vegetation costs by decreasing erosion and storm water runoff, noting that the cost of this program has not been determined. He said these pollinator habitats could be seen at rest stops along the interstates.

Ms. McKeel asked about an area within her district along Barracks Road that is adjacent to Charlottesville, stating that Charlottesville does landscaping and mowing in the median and stops at the County line. She asked if they could contract with Charlottesville to have them mow a couple of blocks into the County up to a natural stop at the Georgetown Road intersection. Mr. Henry said they have had discussion with Charlottesville about it, and it does make sense for this particular location.

Ms. McKeel said there are small banks that come down from the bypass that are in the VDOT right-of-way, which they could potentially get VDOT to do to reduce the amount of mowing necessary. Mr. Henry offered to bring this up at an upcoming meeting he has scheduled with a program manager.

Mr. Henry continued his presentation and stated that contractors pick up litter prior to cutting grass. He stated that VDOT has a work order system with the jails, which provide work crews for eight hours per day for litter and landscape maintenance. He said that he and Michael Freitas, Chief of the Public Works Division, had met with Colonel Martin Kumer of the Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail earlier that day to discuss the potential of having the County tap into these resources, including the utilization of a crew of weekend inmates. He said Charlottesville does scheduled gutter pan cleaning, and they could potentially contract with Charlottesville to extend cleaning into the County.

Ms. Palmer commented that the exit and entrance ramps to I-64 have a lot of litter and wonders if many people are littering in these locations or if VDOT is not picking up the litter often enough. She also asked if prisoners are paid and how contracting with the jails works. Mr. Henry responded that his understanding is that inmates receive a credit for their work, which is equivalent to the minimum wage and is used to pay off fines they owe.

Mr. Walker offered to have Colonel Kumer provide comprehensive information about this to the Board.

Mr. Henry said if they can implement a weekend inmate litter pick-up program, they can alleviate the problem of litter at the entrance and exit ramps. He offered to contact VDOT to try to gain understanding as to why there is so much litter at these locations.

Ms. McKeel said they need to have a litter education effort, although she is not sure how they would do this, and she asked Mr. Henry to confer with some other counties as to whether they have public education programs. She said she sometimes sees trash bags fall off sanitation trucks and wonders if the police department should communicate with haulers about covering their loads.

Mr. Henry said they have three staff for grounds maintenance, with one being a supervisor. He said an expansion of scope may necessitate additional staff for oversight, even if work is provided through contract. He said at a minimum they would require a .75 full-time, grade 10 employee at a cost of \$24,694, and an increase in complexity of landscape enhancements could necessitate a staff member with horticulture expertise, at a cost of \$58,099 for one full-time Grade 13 employee.

Mr. Henry listed some interim expansions of service that could be made with existing staffing levels, including the expansion of lane miles, off ramps, side streets, gutter pan cleaning/sweeping contract expansion, and addition of entrance signs and enhancements to current landscaping at signs on Route 29. He listed expanded levels of service that could be introduced in FY19, such as flower beds, sidewalk maintenance/plowing, Art-in-Place, and a turf management plan.

Mr. Henry stated that his recommendations are to have VDOT permit extension to include more frequent mowing of 29N and an extension of mowing to Berkmar Extended, at a cost of \$12K; investigate and recommend increased litter control programs; work with VDOT to implement a bee pollinator program

along 29N; and continue planning tied to strategic plan goals and have levels of service and identified program costs for the FY19 budget cycle.

Mr. Sheffield asked about plans for large flower pots put in along Rio Road. Mr. Henry replied that there is ample money within the current recommended budget to maintain the plants and change out the flowers.

Mr. Sheffield expressed his opinion that the current flowers are too small in scale for the size of the intersection, and he would like to explore options for larger plantings in this location.

Mr. Dill asked about the entrance corridor to the Pantops area, as he did not see this addressed in the presentation slides. Mr. Michael Freitas, Chief of Public Works, responded that they currently mow to Sleepy Hollow Lane twice per month, and they trim winter jasmine and put mulch in the median every year.

Mr. Dill said he was thinking more along the lines of flowers and signs, as it is a picturesque entrance with a view of the mountains.

Ms. McKeel said the community advisory councils (CACs) have been discussing landscape beautification in several districts and suggested that Mr. Dill connect with them.

Mr. Sheffield asked Mr. Henry when he envisions a plan for annual maintenance of corridors and nodes, so that future Boards can know what they are budgeting for. Mr. Henry replied that in responding to the Board's strategic plan item, and after conferring with staff and stakeholders, his plan is to bring back levels of service with recommendations for FY19 that could include a broader long-term perspective.

Mr. Sheffield said they are giving him a deadline of January 2019 to come up with a plan for an enhanced corridor plan.

Ms. Mallek asked Mr. Henry to look at what other communities have done with partnerships, citing attractive plantings at the entrance corridors to Lynchburg that have signs listing the sponsors. She urged everyone to reach out to community organizations and used the example of the Lions Club raising funds for plantings and signage at an entrance corridor to Crozet.

Ms. McKeel suggested Mr. Henry obtain input from the CACs.

Mr. Henry confirmed that he is very involved with CACs and plans to use their input to formulate plans.

Mr. Sheffield then **moved** that the Board authorize the additional funding for Entrance Corridor Improvements as recommended by Mr. Henry. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Item No. 6b. Finalize Board's proposed budget for advertising.

Ms. Allshouse stated that today is the day for the Board to approve the County Executive's proposed budget, which would then become the Board of Supervisors' proposed budget, so that they can advertise a public hearing scheduled for April 11. She said she would review some items from previous work sessions that the Board asked to revisit, as well as some staff recommendations they suggest be added to the proposed budget. Ms. Allshouse stated that she would first review some revenue related adjustments recommended by staff: a reduction in the expected state revenue sharing for constitutional officers, which includes the Commonwealth's Attorney and the Clerk's office in the amount of \$11,490; an expected increase of \$31,184 in state and federal revenue sharing for Department of Social Services; a regional jail increase of \$37,082 in state funding above what was originally planned, meaning the County can decrease its expenditure for the jail. She stated the net result of the three adjustments is a savings of \$56,776 for the County.

Ms. Allshouse said she recommends that the amount saved from the three revenue-related adjustments be used fund a portion of the \$73,089 estimated for the addition of an assessor position in the Finance Department, with the remaining funding for the assessor position coming from the reserve for contingencies, which currently has a balance of \$300,000.

Mr. Dill asked why the additional revenue to Social Services is being used to fund a finance position and is not allocated to Social Services. Mr. Walker said they are working with the Board and offering suggestions as to how to fund a new assessor position, though it is the Board's choice, and said they could also reduce expenditures in other areas of the budget to fund the assessor position.

Ms. McKeel said that Social Services is not being "dinged," and they are fully funded as to what they expect. Mr. Walker said that Social Services is receiving non-local money, which frees up local money, and it is the Board's discretion as to how to allocate these funds.

Ms. Palmer asked what would occur if a new assessor position had not been proposed and if the savings would go to Social Services. Ms. Allshouse said it would probably go into the reserve for contingencies.

Mr. Randolph commented that during the March 7 discussion, it was determined the assessor position would be funded by one-time funds from the CIP FY18 contribution. He said it would be better to fund the assessor position from salary and budgetary savings, rather than raiding the CIP. He said that Mr. Dill's concern is valid, but funding the assessor position with the funds recommended by Ms. Allshouse is much preferred and has his support. He said it is important to realize that, while they have funding available this year, next year's funding for the position would have to come from the budget. He commented that it is as if they are using a grant this year and would have to provide funding next year.

Ms. McKeel asked Ms. Allshouse if she wants a vote on each item as they go along or for them to wait until the end. Ms. Allshouse said they would need a vote, which could come at the end or after each item.

Ms. Allshouse continued with her presentation. She said the Board had discussed increasing funding to JABA by \$30,000, which OMB recommends be drawn from the reserve for contingencies. She said the Board had asked to add an urban neighborhood planner to the Department of Community Development, at a cost of \$82,658. She said a source of funding could be from a \$1.4 million neighborhood program, which includes \$200,000 for soft or support costs, leaving a balance of \$117,000 in this fund.

Ms. McKeel said the neighborhood planner position would be supported by the neighborhood improvement funding initiative.

Ms. Mallek asked if the soft costs include matches for grants, or if funds would come out of \$200,000 in their pot. Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive, replied to Ms. Mallek's question. She said matches would come from the \$1.4M, as soft costs are for things like scoping the projects, project management and design costs.

Ms. Palmer said she knows they will not be discussing the new parks person for Hedgerow until April, though it was pretty clear from Mr. Crickenberger that if they want to open they would need a new position. She asked if they would be backing themselves up. Ms. McKeel responded that they would not and said that Mr. Walker could address this.

Mr. Walker explained that the money in the budget identified for parks staffing is undefined and awaiting the outcome of a needs assessment. He said the Board's upcoming April discussion about Hedgerow should be enlightening with respect to how the project can be accomplished and he does not see an inherent conflict. He stated that if a conflict develops as the Board receives information, staff could come back to the Board at that point. Mr. Walker said they do have funding identified in the budget without a specific position attached to it, and it does provide some flexibility.

Mr. Palmer said Mr. Bob Crickenberger, Director of Parks and Recreation, indicated the new position for Hedgerow is not included in the budget, and Mr. Walker is saying it is a timing issue. Mr. Walker confirmed that it is a timing issue with respect to when the Hedgerow project is developed and when maintenance would be required. He said the funding identified in this budget was not intended for a maintenance position and has not been identified for a specific staff person, as the needs assessment has not been completed. He said staff believes it is premature to budget for a maintenance position prior to the needs assessment.

Ms. Allshouse said she would review a couple of capital budget adjustment proposals, stating that the first is to add \$500,854 to the FY18 capital fund balance reserve resulting from debt service savings. She said the general obligation and lease revenue bond interest rates were lower than anticipated resulting in this savings, and the interest savings could be placed into all five years of the CIP since savings would continue annually.

Mr. Dill stated it is surprising they would put all of the savings into the CIP budget without considering the allocation of a portion of this to other projects. Mr. Walker responded that staff makes recommendations based upon the source of the savings, which does not mean that funding cannot be allocated for another purpose.

Mr. Bill Letteri, Deputy County Executive, pointed out that while they are saving money with lower interest rates, this is somewhat offset by increased construction costs, and that is why staff is recommending the savings be allocated to the CIP.

Mr. Dill expressed his thoughts that savings in one area of the budget do not necessarily have to be redirected to the same area.

Ms. McKeel pointed out that savings in the Social Services budget is proposed to fund the assessor position in the Finance Department.

Mr. Randolph stated that it is important to be mindful of the dialectic between expenditures for today versus expenditures for tomorrow, as they are facing the potential of a \$70 million future outlay for a new high school and money placed in the CIP can lessen the future funding burden to the taxpayers.

Ms. Allshouse continued with her presentation. She said a second proposal is to add \$151,580 in expenditures to complete the time and attendance system capital project by using funds from the CIP. She said a \$621,000 multi-year appropriation has been made, although it has been determined that additional funding is needed to purchase electronic timekeeping equipment. She said this request would support both schools and general government and is expected to be operational by June 2018.

Ms. Allshouse said the last change involves an issue of timing. She said the Economic Development Authority (EDA) is considering whether to continue utilizing the County as its fiscal agent and the FY18 recommended budget assumes the County would no longer serve as the EDA's fiscal agent and does not provide funding. Ms. Allshouse noted that the EDA has requested that the County continue funding until a decision has been made and requests \$80,000 for FY18.

Ms. Palmer then **moved** that the Board authorize staff to advertise for public hearing the FY18 proposed budget, which includes the County Executive's Recommended Budget and the amendments made by the Board of Supervisors. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mallek. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

Agenda Item No. 7. From the Board: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 8. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Walker said he did not have any matters to discuss.

Mr. Trevor Henry asked the Board for feedback on the rented headsets provided for today's meeting, as their sound engineer said it is the best product they can use for the wireless system they have. He said if Supervisors like the headsets, the County can purchase them for work sessions. He said an alternative would be to build a wired system in the room, which could have microphones similar to those in the auditorium or that hang from the ceiling. He said there are available funds in the audiovisual operating budget.

Several Supervisors agreed that they like these microphones better than the clip-on mics.

Mr. Henry said they would proceed with purchasing microphones.

Agenda Item No. 9. 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.

At 6:38 p.m., Mr. Dill **moved** that the Board go into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.23711(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. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. McKeel. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

Agenda Item No. 10. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 7:19 p.m., the Board reconvened into open meeting, and Ms. Palmer **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 passed by the following recorded vote:

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

Agenda Item No. 11. Adjourn.

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 09/06/2017
Initials: CKB