

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on February 7, 2018, at 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeff Richardson, County Attorney, Greg Kamptner, Clerk, Claudette Borgersen, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 1:01 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. Mallek.

Agenda Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance.
Agenda Item No. 3. Moment of Silence.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Ms. Mallek said she would like to add a discussion of the work group to study changes to the wine bill under Agenda Item 22. She asked that Item 8.4 from the consent agenda be pulled so some technical items can be worked out before it is brought back for further discussion.

Ms. Palmer **moved** that the Board adopt the final agenda, with changes. The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Dill.

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

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

Ms. Mallek then recognized the presiding security officer and County staff around the dais.

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

Mr. Randolph announced a Wintersongs benefit concert for the Shelter for Help in Emergency at Monticello High School on February 24 at 5:00 p.m. He stated that students from Charlottesville, Albemarle, Monticello, William Monroe, Orange County High Schools, Charlottesville Day School, Burley, Jack Jouett, Walton, Henley and Sutherland Middle Schools will participate as a response to violence in the community.

Mr. Randolph recounted his participation the previous day in a Senate Committee on Local Government meeting, stating that attendees had considered items to address and legislation to propose before the committee. He said they reviewed the issue of proffers and impact fees and that SB 208, SB 458, SB 469 and SB 993 will be reviewed by the committee this spring or early summer, according to Senator Bill Stanley, Chair of the committee. Mr. Randolph stated the committee wants to take a comprehensive look at the direction of proffers and consider if it is a suitable time to pivot towards the embracement of impact fees, with SB 208 proposed by Senator Richard Stuart, serving as a first step in this direction. Mr. Randolph mentioned that he had spoken to Senator Bryce Reeves' SB 993, in opposition to lowering the amount of time local government would have to address the pre-site planning process from 60 days to 45 days. He said the sense of the committee was that it should remain at 60 days.

Ms. Palmer reported that the Yancey School working group held a well-attended public outreach event on January 27, with participation by the police department, JABA, Southern Albemarle Family Medicine, the Department of Health, Piedmont Virginia Community College, and a nonprofit that is interested in working with at-risk children. She said all these groups are interested in using the building and community connections are being made.

Mr. Dill announced that the Pantops Fire Station at Peter Jefferson Place is essentially finished and is actively seeking volunteers for both EMT training and office work. He encouraged those who may be interested to contact Mr. Tom LaBelle, the volunteer coordinator for Albemarle County Fire/Rescue.

Ms. Mallek added that it takes many auxiliaries to support the active duty volunteers.

Ms. Mallek announced that a tourism bill carried by Senator Creigh Deeds was approved unanimously by the committee. She said that a bill requiring the shoveling of ice and snow from sidewalks

so that residents could safely walk the community was supported by a vote of 9-5, after a curious discussion with interesting questions raised.

Adding to Mr. Dill's comments, Ms. Mallek noted that current American Heart Association certification in CPR is required before one may participate in EMT classes.

Agenda Item No. 6. Proclamations and Recognitions:

Item No. 6a. Certified Public Finance Officer Award.

Ms. Mallek read the following remarks: The Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada, upon the recommendation of the Council on Certification, the Government Finance Officers Association is pleased to award the designation of Certified Public Finance Officer to Lisa L. Breeden. The designation of Certified Public Finance Officer is awarded to public finance officers who have successfully completed a series of examinations covering the major disciplines of public finance and who have committed themselves to maintaining the highest professional standards in accordance with the Government Finance Officers Association's Code of Professional Ethics.

Ms. Mallek presented the award to Ms. Lisa Breeden, Chief of Financial Management, and offered thanks. Attendees applauded.

Ms. Breeden thanked everyone for taking the time to recognize the achievements of individuals. She recognized the time and resources the County devotes to continuing education, which she said speaks to the culture of the County. She expressed appreciation to her colleagues and to Ms. Betty Burrell for her support.

Ms. Palmer remarked that Ms. Breeden had received many awards in her prior position and expects that she will receive many more in the future.

Mr. Dill remarked that Ms. Breeden was part of the team that had received a perfect score from the audit.

Mr. Richardson expressed appreciation to Ms. Burrell, who had recently retired as Director of Finance, for her presence at today's meeting to witness the presentation of the award to Ms. Breeden. He added that this reflects well on the organization. Attendees applauded.

Ms. McKeel invited Ms. Burrell to address the Board.

Ms. Burrell remarked that she is proud of Ms. Breeden because she had worked so hard to obtain the certification, which is held by less than 800 individuals nationwide. She added that Susan, Payroll Chief Accountant, also has this designation.

Item No. 6b. Go Green Virginia.

Mr. Andy Lowe, Environmental Compliance Manager, addressed the Board. He thanked Supervisors and the County Executive for allowing them and encouraging them to do these programs. He expressed thanks to Parks and Recreation, Facilities and Environmental Services, and Community Development, adding that the award is about energy efficiency, sustainability, recycling, land use, and protecting natural resources, for which Albemarle should be proud.

Ms. Mallek remarked that the award includes the safer chemical policy, which she hopes the Board will learn more about in the coming months. Attendees applauded.

Item No. 6c. Recognition of Diantha McKeel.

Ms. Mallek presented Ms. McKeel with a plaque recognizing her service as Chair of the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors from January 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017.

Ms. McKeel expressed her appreciation. Attendees applauded.

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

Mr. Thomas Sikes, resident of Albemarle County since 1992, addressed the Board. He said he would remark on the County's ability to annex as well as the economic growth sharing agenda. He stated that a temporary restriction on the City of Charlottesville's ability to annex parts of the County would no longer be in effect as of June 2018. He expressed support for removing the City's ability to annex land and noted that there are other communities in Virginia that encountered this issue. Addressing the issue of revenue sharing, Mr. Seitz said he had analyzed the agreement, believed it was reached under duress, and supports ending the agreement. He said that SB 1148 would allow and require review of the agreement every five years, emphasizing that the agreement had not been fair since the beginning.

Ms. Denise Bonds, Health Director for Albemarle County and the Thomas Jefferson Health District, addressed the Board and said she would provide a brief summary of what her organization does. She explained that the Department of Health is a state agency that is locally funded and has local responsibilities for Albemarle, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa, and Nelson Counties, as well as the City of Charlottesville. She said they have about 100 staff members, their office is located on Rose Hill Drive, and she invited Supervisors to take a tour. She reviewed their responsibilities, which include well approval, septic design and approval, monitoring of migrant labor camps, traditional clinical services such as family planning, a sexual health clinic, immunizations, care to refugees, communicable disease control, and population health. Ms. Bonds said they are executing the community health improvement plan known as Map to Health. She said they had just received grants for renewal and expansion of HIV prevention and testing services which includes pre-exposure prophylaxis, a Saturday STD testing clinic, and opioid prevention and monitoring. She said they provide free Narcan to individuals who need this. She distributed some handouts and invited questions.

Ms. Mallek asked if residents could bring old medications to the Health Department office and if they use a specific bag. Ms. Bonds replied that they hand out purple medication disposal bags that can be disposed of in the trash after adding water, which deactivates the medications. She added that Walmart now offers a disposal bag when an opioid prescription is filled, Sentara Martha Jefferson Hospital holds semi-annual prescription take-back days, and the University of Virginia Health System is working on developing a permanent drop box.

Ms. Palmer remarked that the solid waste committee has been active in advocating for this.

Ms. Mallek said she had benefited from the Department of Health septic evaluations and repairs and remarked that the staff is very accessible. Ms. Bonds responded that their staff really wants to be a service to the community and ensure that people do the right thing.

Ms. Mallek noted that the Health Department also deals with animal issues. Ms. Bonds replied that they perform rabies testing.

Ms. Rebecca Schmidt, Populations Health Manager for the Thomas Jefferson Health District, addressed the Board and stated that her team partners with communities to make permanent changes in health. She stated that their partnership with the Yancey Elementary School Advisory Committee was an example, as they use federal funding for community health and wellness activities in the school – including fitness equipment and a potential walking trail in the building. She brought copies of their 2016 Map to Health report and invited Supervisors to take a copy. Ms. Schmidt announced that they would partner with several County agencies to conduct worksite wellness programs and would send the Board a summary of her organization's activities. She said she would also send the Board an email with a listing of disposal locations.

Mr. Neil Williamson of the Free Enterprise Forum addressed the Board. He commended staff for their research and follow-through on applications to the Architectural Review Board, whereby they had identified a flaw that had existed in ordinances since 1990, which would start to be corrected with a resolution that was pulled from the consent agenda. He noted that there are 21 County entrance corridors, which seems unreasonable because 8 of them are not arterials as required for the designation as an entrance corridor. Mr. Williamson expressed hope that the purpose for removing the resolution from the consent agenda is to consider the elimination of more corridors rather than changing and switching what the designation for the roads might be. He commented that he hopes this presents an opportunity for the community to discuss what it wants to do going forward, as well as to determine the costs, benefits, or legal consequences of having a parcel in entrance corridors that lacks legitimacy.

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

(Discussion: Ms. Mallek asked to pull her assigned minutes of November 29, 2017.)

Mr. Dill **moved** that the Board approve the consent agenda, with the exception of the minutes as indicated by Ms. Mallek and the removal of Item 8.4. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Palmer.

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

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

Item No. 8.1. Approval of Minutes: November 1, November 8, November 16 and November 29, 2017.

Mr. Randolph read the minutes of November 1, 2017, and found them to be in order.

Ms. McKeel read the minutes of November 8 and November 16, 2017, and found them to be in order.

Ms. Mallek pulled the minutes of November 29, 2017, and carried them forward to the next meeting.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved the minutes as read.

Item No. 8.2. FY 2018 Appropriations.

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

The total increase to the FY 2018 budget due to the appropriations itemized in Attachment A is \$535,337.17. A budget amendment public hearing is not required because the amount of the cumulative appropriations does not exceed one percent of the currently adopted budget.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment B) to approve appropriations #2018062, #2018063, #2018064, #2018065, #2018066, #2018067, and #2018068 for local government and school division projects and programs as described in Attachment A.

Appropriation #2018062 **\$(3,090.00)**

*The \$150,000 in State (VDOT) revenues and CIP General Gov Fund balance fund does not increase the Total County Budget

Source:	State Revenue	\$ (3,090.00)
	State Revenue – VDOT*	75,000.00
	CIP General Gov Fund fund balance*	75,000.00

This request is to appropriate funding associated with capital projects:

- This request is to reduce the current appropriation of \$3,090.00 in State revenue from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Revenue Sharing (RS) Program for the State Farm Boulevard portion of the Crozet Avenue North & South Pantops Drive/State Farm Boulevard sidewalk capital project to reflect the finalized award amount.
- This request is to provide an administrative amendment to correct the sources of revenues associated with appropriation 2018017 for the Hydraulic-Barracks Road Sidewalks project, approved by the Board of Supervisors on August 2, 2017. The correct revenue sources associated with this appropriation are \$75,000.00 in State revenue from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Revenue Sharing (RS) Program and \$75,000.00 in General Government CIP Fund fund balance. The August 2, 2017 appropriation narrative had identified the revenue as \$150,000.00 in VDOT Revenue Sharing Program funds.

Appropriation #2018063 **\$18,000.00**

Source:	Federal Revenue	\$ 18,000.00
---------	-----------------	--------------

This request is to appropriate \$18,000.00 in grant funding from the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services to the Police Department to provide diversity recruitment support through community outreach centering around four (4) major community events. \$2,000.00 in in-kind services will also be provided.

Appropriation #2018064 **\$45,549.63**

Source:	Local Revenue	\$ 45,549.63
---------	---------------	--------------

This request is to appropriate to the CIP \$45,549.63 in insurance recoveries received by the County to replace a school bus that was totaled in an accident. This funding will support vehicle replacement costs in the CIP School Bus Replacement program.

Appropriation #2018065 **\$41,925.54**

Source:	Local Revenue	\$ 35,717.00
	State Revenue	\$ 1,304.96
	Federal Revenue	\$ 4,903.58

This request is to appropriate the following School Division's appropriation requests approved by the School Board on December 14, 2017:

- This request is to appropriate \$20,000.00 in grant funding from the KOVAR Corporation to purchase iPad mini devices that will be equipped with software to improve communication for students with intellectual disabilities at the preschool, elementary, middle, and high school levels. Students in these classes utilize these devices as communication tools on a daily basis as well as a method to practice daily living skills that

- will enable them to be productive citizens upon graduation.
- This request is to appropriate \$17,021.96 in State and local revenue to the Individual Student Alternative Education Plan (ISAEP). The mission of the ISAEP is to supplement existing General Equivalency Diploma (GED) services by developing specialized occupational training and employment necessary for students 16 years of age or older to become productive and contributing citizens.
- This request is to appropriate \$4,903.58 in grant funding (Federal) to the Migrant Consortium Incentive Program. The mission of the grant is to provide teachers with tools to quickly assess and provide supplemental research-based lessons to migrant students to improve their foundational literacy skills.

Appropriation #2018066 **\$0.00**

*This appropriation will not increase the Total County Budget

Source: Reserve for Contingencies* \$ 18,940.00

This request is to appropriate \$18,940.00 from the Reserve for Contingencies to the Community Development Department pursuant to the Board of Supervisors' action at its January 3, 2018 meeting directing staff to conduct a traffic engineering study for Miller School Road and Owensville Road to evaluate potential through truck restrictions.

After approval, the FY 18 General Fund Reserve for Contingencies balance will be \$207,879.00.

Appropriation #2018067 **\$32,952.00**

Source: Federal Revenue \$ 32,952.00

The Emergency Communication Center (ECC) requests that the County, acting as fiscal agent for the ECC, appropriate \$32,952.00 in Virginia Department of Emergency Management Local Emergency Management Performance grants to the ECC. This total amount includes \$25,452.00 awarded to the County of Albemarle and \$7,500.00 awarded to the City of Charlottesville. This funding will support emergency management salary and operating costs.

Appropriation #2018068 **\$400,000.00**

Source: General Fund fund balance \$ 400,000.00

This request is to appropriate \$400,000.00 from General Fund fund balance as a contribution to the Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville to support Phase 1 of the Redevelopment of Southwood Mobile Home Park pursuant to the Board of Supervisors' action at its January 10, 2018 meeting. This request is to provide support to continue development and submission of the Phase I rezoning application and for the creation of documents and drawings to leverage public and private funds for architecture and engineering services and for the implementation of the project.

This proposed use of the General Fund fund balance will not reduce the County's 10% unassigned fund balance reserve; however, it does reduce the amount of General Fund fund balance monies that would be available for other uses in the future.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following Resolution to approve appropriations #2018062, #2018063, #2018064, #2018065, #2018066, #2018067, and #2018068 for local government and school division projects and programs:

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE ADDITIONAL FY 18 APPROPRIATIONS

BE IT RESOLVED by the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors:

- 1) That Appropriations #2018062, #2018063, #2018064, #2018065, #2018066, #2018067, and #2018068 are approved; and
- 2) That the appropriations referenced in Paragraph #2, above, are subject to the provisions set forth in the Annual Resolution of Appropriations of the County of Albemarle for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2018.

**COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
APPROPRIATION SUMMARY**

APP#	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
2018062	4-9010-41350-441200-950038-9999	-3090	SA2018062 TRSP Adjustment
2018062	3-9010-24000-324000-240231-1004	-3090	SA2018062 TRSP Adjustment
2018063	3-1248-33000-333000-330412-1003	18000	SA2018063 Approp: FEDERAL - DCJS - BYRNE/JAG CATEGORICAL AID
2018063	4-1248-31013-431010-600100-1003	6700	SA2018063 Approp: OFFICE SUPPLIES
2018063	4-1248-31013-431010-580000-1003	11300	SA2018063 Approp: Misc. Expenses for branded/logo materials
2018064	4-9000-63905-462320-800506-6599	45550	SA2018064 School Bus Repl Program
2018064	3-9000-69000-319000-199900-6599	45550	SA2018064 School Bus Repl Program
2018065	3-3159-63519-318120-189913-6599	20000	SA2018065 KOVAR Grant
2018065	4-3159-63519-461102-800100-6599	20000	SA2018065 Machinery/Equipment - Addl.
2018065	3-3142-63142-316000-240203-6599	15717	SA2018065 Alternative Education Misc. Revenue
2018065	3-3142-63142-324000-240203-6599	1305	SA2018065 Categorical Aid - State Revenue

2018065	4-3142-63142-460410-112100-6530	14600	SA2018065 Salaries-Teacher
2018065	4-3142-63142-460410-210000-6530	1117	SA2018065 FICA
2018065	4-3142-63142-460410-601300-6530	305	SA2018065 Ed/Rec Supplies
2018065	4-3142-63142-460410-800100-6530	1000	SA2018065 Machinery & Equipment
2018065	3-3173-63173-333000-330073-6599	4904	SA2018065 Migrant Consortium Incentive Grant
2018065	4-3173-63173-461101-132100-6530	4482	SA2018065 PT/Wages - Teacher
2018065	4-3173-63173-461101-210000-6530	343	SA2018065 FICA
2018065	4-3173-63173-461101-601300-6530	79	SA2018065 Ed/Rec Supplies
2018066	4-1000-81021-481020-312700-1008	18940	SA2018066 Through Truck Restriction Traffic Study
2018066	4-1000-99900-499000-999990-9999	-18940	SA2018066 Through Truck Restriction Traffic Study
2018067	3-4100-24000-324000-240548-9999	32952	SA2018067 Alb + Cville LEMPG Emergency Mgmt Grant
2018067	4-4100-31045-435600-312105-1003	1500	SA2018067 Alb LEMPG Emergency Mgmt Grant
2018067	4-4100-31045-435600-312210-1003	1000	SA2018067 Alb LEMPG Emergency Mgmt Grant
2018067	4-4100-31045-435600-520300-1003	384	SA2018067 Alb LEMPG Emergency Mgmt Grant
2018067	4-4100-31045-435600-550100-1003	15000	SA2018067 Alb LEMPG Emergency Mgmt Grant
2018067	4-4100-31045-435600-600000-1003	5000	SA2018067 Alb LEMPG Emergency Mgmt Grant
2018067	4-4100-31045-435600-600100-1003	2568	SA2018067 Alb LEMPG Emergency Mgmt Grant
2018067	4-4100-31045-435600-110000-1003	7500	SA2018067 Cville LEMPG Emergency Mgmt Grant Outreach materials
2018068	3-1000-51000-351000-510100-9999	400000	SA2018068 Habitat for Humanity - Southwood
2018068	4-1000-89000-489000-563110-1008	400000	SA2018068 Habitat for Humanity - Southwood
TOTAL		1,070,674.340	

Item No. 8.3. ZTA2018-02 Commercial and Industrial Zoned Properties Not Served By Public Water.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the Zoning Ordinance regulations for Industrial (LI, HI and PDIP) zoning districts were amended in 1985, and Commercial (CO, C1, HC, PDSC, and PDMC) districts were amended in 1989, to require a special use permit for by-right uses under the following circumstances: Uses permitted by right, not served by public water, involving water consumption exceeding four hundred (400) gallons per site acre per day.

The stated purpose of the regulations was to protect surface and groundwater supplies from overdraft and pollution. The water withdrawal limitation of 400 gallons was based on health department assumptions and regulations at the time for water consumption of a dwelling. Health department regulations employed a water usage rate of 150 gallons per day per bedroom. A four-bedroom house would have a daily consumption of 600 gallons. The minimum lot size for a dwelling not served by public water and public sewer was 60,000 square feet. Therefore, the per acre consumption would be 400 gallons per day.

This Zoning Ordinance provision has led to several appeals to the Board of Zoning Appeals. The appeals arise because regulation on water consumption is not listed as a weekly or other periodic average limit, instead its “per day”, rendering peak days as the consumption standard. In addition, there is no universally accepted industry standard for water consumption, leading to debate as to projected consumptions.

Staff recommends amending the Zoning Ordinance to eliminate the current provisions and amending the list of uses in the Commercial and Industrial districts to allow some uses not served by public water as by-right uses and to allow other more intensive uses not served by public water by special use permit. Updating the Zoning Ordinance would allow both the goals of resource protection and Rural Area policy to be better achieved.

A preliminary review of GIS indicates there are approximately 125 properties zoned Commercial and Industrial that would be affected by this potential amendment, and staff believes those affected should be given a public meeting opportunity to discuss any proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommends the following tentative process for this Zoning Text Amendment:

February- March	Staff study period and development of outline for proposed changes
April	Public input meeting to review proposed changes, with affected property owners and stakeholders invited
May	Planning Commission work session
June	Planning Commission public hearing
July	Board of Supervisors public hearing

Amending the County Code to address the water consumption regulation should not result in budget impacts. The proposed amendment should save existing staff resources necessary for review under the current ordinance. While this provision doesn’t arise frequently, it does involve staff time from multiple County divisions and departments including Planning, Zoning, Engineering, and the County Attorney’s Office.

If the Board wishes to pursue a zoning text amendment to amend the water consumption regulations for Commercial and Industrial properties not served by public water and sewer, staff recommends the Board adopt the attached Resolution of Intent (Attachment A) and endorse the public

process outlined above.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following Resolution of Intent and endorsed the public process outlined above:

RESOLUTION OF INTENT

WHEREAS, the Albemarle County Zoning Ordinance requires a special use permit for uses permitted by right, not served by public water, involving water consumption exceeding four hundred (400) gallons per site acre per day in the Commercial (C-1), Commercial Office (CO), Highway Commercial (HC), Light Industry (LI), Heavy Industry (HI), and Planned Development Industrial Park (PDIP) zoning districts pursuant to Albemarle County Code §§18-22.2.2, 18-23.2.2, 18-24.2.2, 18-26.2, 18-27.2, 18-28.2, 18-29.2 ; and

WHEREAS, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors enacted the four hundred (400) gallons per site acre per day standard for by-right permitted uses not served by public water for industrially zoned properties in 1985 and for commercially zoned properties in 1989; and

WHEREAS, it is desired to amend the regulations by specifically delineating water-consuming uses not served by public water as by-right or by special use permit rather than by water consumption.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT for purposes of public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning and development practices, the Board of Supervisors hereby adopts a resolution of intent to consider amending Albemarle County Code §§18-22.2.2, 18-23.2.2, 18-24.2.2, 18-26.2, 18-27.2, 18-28.2 and any other sections of the Zoning Ordinance deemed to be appropriate to achieve the purposes described herein; and

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

Item No. 8.4. ZTA2018-01 and ZMA2018-01 Entrance Corridor Overlay District.

Under adoption of the final agenda, this item was removed from the agenda.

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

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

The attached Grants Report provides brief descriptions of two (2) grant awards received during this time period. This report also includes a comprehensive look at potential Five Year Financial Plan implications if projects and/or programs that are supported by grants are continued with local funding after the grants end. As grant funding ends, recommendations will be included in the County Executive's proposed annual budgets for the Board's consideration as to whether local funding should be used to continue those projects and programs. No County funds will be used to fund the continuation of those projects and programs without Board approval.

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

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

GRANT REPORT ACTIVITY – December 14, 2017 through January 12, 2018

No Applications made during this time.

Awards received during this time.

Granting Entity	Grant Project	Type	Amount Awarded	Match Required	Match Source	Department	Purpose
Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development	Virginia Telecommunications Initiative with Comcast 2018	State	\$473,366 (announced, pending DHCD letter)	Comcast \$202,871 County \$0	Comcast	Information Technology/ Albemarle Broadband Authority	This grant will provide for broadband expansion to the Greenwood area of the County in partnership with Comcast and will offer broadband to 178 residential and commercial locations as well as the Greenwood Community Center.
Virginia Department of Emergency Management	2017 Local Emergency Management Performance Grant (LEMPG)	Federal	\$25,452	\$0	None	Emergency Communications Center (ECC)	This grant will augment the ECC's public outreach, training, and exercises for the region.

Comprehensive Look at Potential Five Year Financial Plan Grant Impacts:

The following chart includes grants that are expected to end within the next five years and an estimate of the County's cost over the next five years if the grant-supported position, project or program is continued after the grant ends. The continuation of those positions, projects and programs will be considered as part of the County's annual budget process.

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

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

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

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

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that The attached Quarterly Financial Report (QFR) (Attachment A) provides information regarding the County's FY 18 General Fund and School Fund performance as of December 31, 2017. The General Fund Revised Financial Projections Report (Attachments B and C) includes projected General Fund revenues and expenditures for FY 18. The Quarterly Economic Indicator Report (Attachments D and E) provides an overview of recent general economic conditions in the County. Early in the FY 19 Budget Work- session process, the Office of Management and Budget will include a discussion of the variances between actual revenues and expenditures as compared to FY 18 Budget, the Current Year End Fund Balance, and the recommended uses of Fund Balance in the Recommended FY 19 Budget.

Quarterly Financial Report

The Quarterly Financial Report (QFR) (Attachment A) reflects year-to-date (YTD) data through December 31, 2017, the end of the second quarter (Q2) of FY18. The data in the attached QFR is organized in a way that is consistent with Exhibit 12 of the County's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). Most line item titles in the QFR match the line item titles in the CAFR. Highlights from the QFR include:

Revenues - YTD Actual

YTD total revenues in Q2 FY18 were \$123,899,488 compared to \$117,999,514 in Q2 FY17. In percentage terms, FY18 YTD actual revenues as a percentage of FY18 Revised Budget revenues were 44.61%, compared to 45.62% in FY17.

Expenditures - YTD Actual

YTD total expenditures in Q2 FY18 were \$128,096,505 compared to \$121,504,452 in Q2 FY17. In percentage terms, FY18 YTD actual expenditures as a percentage of FY 18 Revised Budget expenditures were 46.12%, compared to 46.98% in FY17.

County Executive Authorized Transfers and Appropriations

A table listing the County Executive authorized transfer and appropriations made during the first and second quarters of FY18 is included on page 8.

ACPS Quarterly Financial Report

As requested by the Board, the Albemarle County Public Schools Quarterly Financial Report as of December 31, 2017 is included as a table on page 11 of the QFR. An Investment Activity Summary for the Quarter Ended December 31, 2017 is included on page 12.

General Fund Revised Financial Projections Report

The General Fund Revised Financial Projections Report (GFRFPR) (Attachment B) provides a streamlined summary of forecasted revenues and expenditures. The GFRFPR indicates that by June 30, 2018, actual revenues, including transfers, are forecasted to be above appropriated revenues by \$0.824 million. This result reflects better-than-expected growth in most major revenue streams. Expenditures, including transfers, are projected to be \$1.488 million below appropriated expenditures. The difference between appropriated expenditures and forecasted expenditures is due primarily to savings associated with salary lapse, insurance, and fuel/utility usage. The result of the surplus in revenues plus the anticipated expenditures savings is a projected net increase (rounded) of \$2.311 million additional fund balance by the end of FY 18. Please note that this projected \$2.311 million in additional fund balance equals only 0.84% of the forecasted \$276.275 million FY 18 expenditures and transfers; this small percentage "buffer" would seem to indicate a fairly tight budgetary environment.

Quarterly Economic Indicators Report

The Quarterly Economic Indicators Report (QEIR) (Attachment D) shows the state of the County's economy. The QEIR contains data taken from the most recently available quarter and compares this data with data from the same quarter of previous fiscal years. General economic activity, as measured by five select revenue streams, collectively grew between Q2 FY 17 and Q2 FY 18 (the most recent quarter for which complete data is readily available), although revenue in one stream fell steeply while revenue in other streams increased moderately or grew substantially. The unemployment rate in Albemarle declined between Q1 FY 17 and Q1 FY 18, dropping from 3.80% to 3.43%. This year-over-year decline was consistent with drops in national and state rates. Nominally, the County appears to have reached "full employment." The County's jobs base, meanwhile, appears to have experienced robust growth between Q4 FY 16 and Q4 FY 17, again the most recent quarter for which information is available. The total number of jobs increased from 54,798 to 57,666. This growth of 2,008 positions is consistent with a healthy local labor market. The strength in the County's labor market apparently bumped up the inflation-adjusted average weekly wage by 1.5% between Q4 FY 16 and Q4 FY 17. The Federal Housing Finance Agency's Home Price Index for the region, meanwhile, grew by 4.48%. Collectively, the data suggests that the County's economy grew at a healthy pace in the most recent year, a situation that is consistent with the U.S. and state economies. The outlook for the County's economy in coming quarters generally looks good.

Revenues and expenditures data contained in the UQFR reflects the state of the County's FY 18 budget-to-actual financial performance as of December 31, 2017. Year-end projections contained in the GFRFPR are subject to change, based on the result of actual collections and expenditures through June 30, 2018. Data shown in the QEIR reflects economic variables that impact the County's current and future revenues and expenditures.

These reports are for information only. Staff welcomes the Board's feedback regarding the content and presentation of these reports.

Item No. 8.7. Capital Projects Status Report, 4th Quarter CY 2017, ***was received for information.***

Item No. 8.8. Environmental Quarterly Report – 2nd Quarter FY 18, ***was received for information.***

Item No. 8.9. Solid Waste Alternatives Advisory Committee (SWAAC) Semi-annual Report, ***was received for information.***

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the Solid Waste Alternatives Advisory Committee (SWAAC) was established by the Board at its March 2, 2016 meeting as a standing advisory committee. The Committee is charged with developing sustainable materials management policies for consideration by the Board including those related to waste and litter reduction, material reuse, recycling and composting, greenhouse gas reduction, waste collection and transfer operations, and waste disposal. The Committee provides semi-annual reports to the Board on initiatives and work planning and provides specific policy proposals as they are developed.

The Committee has met monthly since June 2016. The Committee submitted its first semi-annual report in February 2017. The Committee submitted a request to extend operating hours at McIntire Recycling Center June 2017 and submitted its second semi-annual report as part of the August 9, 2017 agenda. The attached report is the third semi-annual report for the Committee.

The Committee report is for information only and does not have budget impact.

Review recent activities and affirm support for future priorities and goals.

Item No. 8.10. Board-to-Board, January 2018, ***A monthly report from the Albemarle County School Board to the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, was received for information.***

Agenda Item No. 9. **Work Session:** Community Development 2018-2019 Work Program.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the purpose of this work session is to consider the Board's interests, as expressed by established priorities and newer initiatives, and assure that CDD is responsive to the Board. The Board's Strategic Plan Priorities and previously established work program initiatives have provided good direction, but staff recognizes there remains an interest in a number of other initiatives that are not yet part of CDD's work program. The ongoing challenge is to assure staff remains focused on completing established expectations, while being responsive to the Board as new interests emerge.

Staff is not recommending a solution at this meeting. Instead, we hope to engage the Board in a dialogue to assure we are being responsive to emerging interests without sacrificing established expectations. The visionary aspects of the Board's interests excites staff, but there is an ongoing essential need to prioritize these opportunities without sacrificing established expectations, such as maintaining the quality of work and public engagement.

First, Attachment A provides a summary of the work program efforts over the last year, current efforts underway, and additional interests that have not been started. You will note that we have made significant progress towards the priorities and are continuing to work on those remaining priorities. Additionally, there remains a significant number of initiatives that have not yet begun due to resource limitations and staff sees the Board developing additional interests, such as planning for Biscuit Run park, that are anticipated to become new priorities.

Second, staff notes that resource capacity continues to be a primary factor for the success of the work program. We have added a number of interim resources to help, such as part-time interns, planning assistance from the TJPDC, and contracting with outside firms. Even with those helpful measures, we are bumping up against our capacity to effectively manage these resources. Moreover, though the CDD turnover rate improved this last year overall, it remains much higher than the County average and requires CDD to spend much of its management capacity on additional training and quality control.

Finally, there have been unanticipated demands on staff that have diverted resources, such as dedicating a planner to assist with Southwood and shifting a planner to economic development. With the development workload remaining very high, staff capacity will continue to be a limiting factor for new initiatives.

Going forward, staff anticipates the focus will stay on current high visibility priorities. This includes the Rio/29 Small Area Plan, the Hydraulic/29 Small Area Plan to the extent it relates to proposed transportation improvements, the Pantops Master Plan update with a Rivanna River Corridor Plan, assisting Southwood, and transient lodging. Other strategic plan priorities and the recodification of the Zoning Ordinance are anticipated to be the next level of priority, with remaining initiatives being started once some of the current priorities are completed and resources become available.

No changes to the budget are proposed at this time, though additional planners have been requested for FY18-19 which, if approved, will ultimately improve overall capacity in the department and help address resource needs in key areas.

This matter is being presented for discussion. Staff requests that the Board consider the initiatives described and, following a short presentation, share its perspective on how staff can best assure the Board's interests have been maximized in CDD's work program.

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, explained that he would review the priorities set by the Board and where they will focus their efforts next year as well as check in with the Board as to whether the Board has additional items it has an interest in. He reviewed a three-part agenda as follows: 1. Background – Where have we been?; 2. Overview of Established Priorities and Other Interests – Where are we going?; and 3. Board Perspective – are we on the right path?

Mr. Graham stated that he would provide an understanding of how Community Development allocates resources, and he presented a pie chart of the following programs: Work Program, Planning, GOS, ARB, Legislative, Ministerial, Zoning, and Building Permits. He noted that they have flexibility to adjust efforts according to the demand of the various programs. Mr. Graham presented a slide with a graph of residential units permitted for each year from 2005 – 2017 and commented that the record was reached in 2016, with permits issued in 2017 at almost the same level and continuing at a very fast pace. Mr. Graham stated that his next slide showed permitted construction values for each year from 2005 – 2017, noting that the graph shows a sharp decline in values from 2007 – 2011 except for 2009, which he attributes to the permitting for construction of Martha Jefferson Hospital, and a trending increase since 2011. He next presented a graph of Community Development staffing levels for each year from 2005 – 2017, which showed a decline from 2008 – 2011 with gradual increases each year since then, though staffing levels are still below the level of 2008 by 14 employees. Mr. Graham stated that they had streamlined and updated their processes during the recession, which has been beneficial. He said his next slide lists 2017 priorities, including those in the strategic plan, which he noted are contained in Attachment A.

Mr. Graham said the residential impacts proffer policy is listed, though it has not come before the Board yet, although the committee has developed a recommendation. He stated that his next slide lists 2018 priorities that are underway, with emphasis on items in the strategic plan. He said the Southwood Action Plan will be prioritized, as well as the Economic Development Strategic Plan, transient lodging changes to the zoning ordinance, and Hydraulic Road/29 small area plan implementation. He said the Natural Resources Strategic Plan had been endorsed by the Board and is moving forward, along with a number of ordinance amendments. Mr. Graham next presented a slide that listed interests not yet prioritized and said that although these items are important, the County is trying to focus on those items that have already been prioritized.

Mr. Graham stated that his next slide is entitled 2018 Crystal Ball and reflects his opinion on future direction. He said they are seeing some signs that the development boom is cooling off and that interest rate increases could cool demand. He commented that in his conversation with representatives at the Urban Land Institute, they had indicated that this cooling is a national trend and they expect a soft landing. Mr. Graham emphasized that staff recruiting and retention remains a problem as there is competition for hiring good, professional staff. He said he has seen an increased interest in affordable housing at both the local and national levels and reminded the Board that they are working with the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission on a regional analysis of this problem. He stated that he expects to report to the Board later this year with some results of the analysis and asked them for feedback as to whether they are on the right path in terms of current priorities and issues identified. Mr. Graham also asked the Board for feedback on the public engagement process, as well as work capacity and resource issues.

Mr. Randolph related how part of the previous day's discussion regarding Senator Reeves' bill had concerned the Senator's effort to introduce a higher level of efficiency, with several members of the Local Government Committee supporting expedited processes for developers. Mr. Randolph stated that he and several others had pushed back and emphasized that public engagement must be balanced with efficiency. He said he had commented that limiting the public engagement process to a 30-day window, prior to consideration by the Planning Commission, would obviate public participation and the whole aspect of participatory democracy. He expressed his view that they have the right balance and acknowledged that Neil Williamson and others would push back, stating that sometimes applicants do not complete items or complete them as promised.

Mr. Randolph thanked Mr. Graham for his department's responsiveness with the application for Solar Farms, which he described as being a speedy but careful and thoughtful review process. He expressed interest in getting rural recreation uses back on track sooner rather than later. Mr. Randolph suggested that Mr. Graham come back to the Board to discuss the issue of turnover, which he noted is higher in Community Development than the County average. He asked Mr. Graham to compare Albemarle to similar counties including Hanover, James City, Stafford, and Roanoke, in terms of community development staff. He speculated that after the County has trained staff, the private sector is luring staff away, and he asked for feedback from Human Resources' exit interviews.

Mr. Graham replied that they would try to get back to the Board with this information.

Ms. Mallek asked Mr. Graham to inform the Board regarding enough staffing capacity. She said she appreciates the Board's attempt to be frugal, but emphasized that if staff is overworked this could cause problems with retention. Mr. Graham emphasized that he is seeking feedback from the Board as to whether the volume of work performed by his department aligns with their expectations or whether they are looking for more than what staff has been delivering.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Graham to review the Community Development resource allocation pie chart, in particular the items that fall within the legislative category. She noted that the Board would be considering additional funding for the Ivy MUC and the model convenience center, which will help them decide where to put other facilities in the County. She said that Community Development had already worked on this several years ago and asked if additional work is needed or whether it is up to the Board to make a decision.

Mr. Graham reviewed the pie chart categories and emphasized how building permits represent a sizeable program and zoning represents a broad category from zoning enforcement to abandoned cars to appeals and determinations. He noted that the ministerial function of zoning represents site plans and subdivisions and the legislative category represents items the Board acted on, such as property rezoning and special use permits. He said the Architectural Review Board is self-explanatory and this category also includes enforcement of entrance corridor guidelines. He said GDS represents Geographic Data Services, including maps and road numbering and naming for 911. Mr. Graham stated that planning represents all the other planning functions that do not fall under the legislative category and typically fall under the Comprehensive Plan, and state law requires a review of the plan every five years. He said the work program represents what is left after everything else has been done and this piece of the pie shrank when development activity was up and increased when development activity dropped.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that Albemarle County has one department for zoning and inspections, while other jurisdictions have several small departments that address these issues. She indicated that this must be taken into consideration when assessing staffing levels. Mr. Graham agreed.

Ms. Palmer asked if a convenience or recycling center concept could be fit into this. Mr. Graham responded that since it is a public facility, they have to rezone or comply with the Comprehensive Plan, and the plan spells this out. He said a site plan would be required to assure that development of the site meets the requirements of the zoning ordinance in terms of set-backs, building heights and access, as well as the water protection ordinance to make sure storm water is properly treated under the Virginia Stormwater Management Program. He said that after the site plan process, it transitions into a building permit.

Ms. Palmer asked if this would go under work programs or another category. Mr. Graham replied that this is a routine part of what they do. Mr. Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive, added that Facilities and Environmental Services may play a different role now because of the orientation they have towards delivering solid waste services, which Community Development was doing before. He explained that it would be a natural iteration for Facilities and Environmental Services to take the lead on site selection, with Community Development playing its role as described by Mr. Graham.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the move of the planner to Economic Development was due to all the work being done on economic development or if this position would be returned once a Director of Economic Development is hired. Mr. Graham replied that the intent was to return the position to Community Development once other positions are filled within Economic Development.

Mr. Walker explained that the position is on loan to fill a vacancy created when an employee left Economic Development, and staff believed it was an opportunity to have these two departments collaborate, which would benefit both departments. He emphasized that Mr. Graham was interested in knowing if he would have this position back or if he would have to fill a vacancy.

Ms. McKeel emphasized the importance of collaboration between Community Development and Economic Development, adding that they should look to make this relationship closer rather than pulling them apart again.

Mr. Graham described the situation as short-term pain for a long-term gain, which would pay dividends to the County in the long term.

Mr. Randolph commented that it may arise that Economic Development needs a dedicated planner who would have access to the County GIS system and could assist with economic development proposals as they come to the County. He said he has already communicated to personnel within the Southwood office and relevant County staff that what the County is doing in Phase 1 does not equate to what the County will do in Phase 2. He stated that Phase 1 is capacity building to get Habitat for Humanity operational for the strategic and implementation needs of the County and to learn to deal with a level of government with which they have not had an involved relationship. He said the project is huge and innovative and they need support; however, there is not an expectation about the fact that they are issuing a multi-year financial and staffing commitment to Southwood. He emphasized that once Phase 1 is completed they would need input from County staff so that Habitat for Humanity and the Board would know once the terminal point in the road has been reached and intense involvement is no longer necessary – and at that point, Community Development could have its planner back.

Mr. Graham emphasized that as with Economic Development, they are getting an incredible opportunity for affordable housing and doing something unique.

Ms. Palmer stated that she does not think they are hearing any tremendous opposition from the Board if Mr. Graham feels they must hire additional planners.

Ms. Mallek recognized that it could take several months to hire an employee and then another six months before they are fully trained.

Mr. Randolph asked that they project what the needs are and get the Board to agree rather than wait and come to the Board in December. Mr. Gallaway said that in terms of public engagement, the Board has to be able to satisfy the demand for input from the public. He endorsed the prioritization of Economic Development and the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Dill stated that he has had several recent conversations regarding Barboursville Road in the Keswick area, including the path between Monticello and Montpelier and a strong desire to maintain a sense of community. He listed concerns about traffic, trucks, and narrow roads, and added that there are also positive developments such as renovations at Keswick Hall, plans for additional vineyards, and a shift in thinking among residents from being against development towards viewing it as a positive that could attract people to come.

Mr. Dill addressed the review of the Rivanna River Corridor Plan as part of the Pantops Master Plan Update. He said that Charlottesville has several proposals from private groups to build along the river and to open it up to recreation. He said the recreation department would propose ideas for recreational activities along the river in this area and he supports working with the City on these efforts.

Mr. Dill addressed the streamlining of processes and emphasized the importance of having County departments work together and continuously focus on this idea.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would like to go on record as saying it is really important to complete what is in the plan before trying to broaden objectives or take on new initiatives. She speculated that some ordinance changes would be required as a result of what they would receive in upcoming reports, many of which are driven by citizen complaints. She added that they are having difficulty enforcing existing ordinances due to staffing issues. Ms. McKeel emphasized that she deals with these issues on a regular basis in the urban area, and they have work to do to support urbanization as they are no longer a sleepy little bedroom community but are now an urbanizing county, which brings challenges and issues to deal with.

Ms. Mallek commented that they would likely need stronger rules under the Step 1 maintenance process and they should be able to move onto the next step to see how they can improve. She expressed support for strengthening rules in small, effective ways to save time with staff enforcement. She explained that citizens can become frustrated when they witness something egregious and learn that there are no rules to prevent it. She used the example of an animal control officer returning over and over to the same location. She said Engineering is doing a great job in supplying links to improvements, which saves significant amounts of time.

Ms. Mallek brought up the issue of honeybees and expressed her opinion that they should not be classified as livestock because they do not require manure barns, feed, and other things that cause damage and difficulty among neighbors. She said they have a real environmental problem that could be helped by allowing people to keep a beehive or two in their yard. She said she has been speaking with Zoning for quite a while to see if there is a way to make a small change to address this.

Ms. McKeel said she thought they had already agreed to address this.

Ms. Mallek expressed support for allowing a notice of intent to be brought to start the discussion.

Ms. McKeel stated they should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good and there are things they can do without having to spend months and months on the issue. She said they can strengthen the ordinances to give staff the ability to get something done.

Mr. Richardson stated that the manager's recommended budget would be presented the following week, followed by staff recommendations and a number of work sessions in which they will hear proposals for additional personnel as a result of the increase in development activity described by Mr. Graham. He emphasized that the Department of Human Resources has a sophisticated process in looking at the competitiveness of pay ranges, turnover, recruitment and retention, and he would like the opportunity to work with Human Resources and Mr. Graham to identify policy issues and present specific policy recommendations to the Board.

Ms. Mallek stated that they appreciate the effort to be frugal, but the Board wants staff to be able to do the job they were asked to do, so they have to give them the tools to allow them to do this.

Mr. Randolph said that although SB 684 had passed committee yesterday, it could face resistance with the full senate. He noted that once the County agrees to a code and ordinance change that stipulates that sidewalks in the urban ring must be maintained by homeowners along roads, Zoning will be responsible for enforcement and that could pose a challenge to zoning staff. He asked Mr. Graham how he would address this. Mr. Graham responded that he has experience with this from his work in Arlington and that the devil is in the details. He said it is not as simple as people may think at first.

Ms. McKeel stated it was her understanding that the General Assembly may give them permission to do several things that urbanizing counties need permission to do, though this does not mean these would be effective across the County. She said she thought the Board was going to review areas where these changes may be appropriate and emphasized that this would require both Board and staff time. She agreed with Mr. Randolph that they should review this very carefully and said they should use the models from communities that have been successful in this regard.

Mr. Kamptner said the staff impacts would likely be distributed among Community Development, Facilities and Environmental Services, and Police.

Ms. Mallek recounted the local government committee meeting she attended yesterday where Barbara Favola from Arlington stood up for local governments and expressed that local governments do this work already in northern Virginia and in 33 cities where they are empowered to do this. She said that Ms. Favola defended Albemarle's right to do the same.

Ms. Mallek noted that a question had arisen concerning the transfer of liability and potential risks to homeowners and counties regarding sidewalks, and she asked Mr. Kamptner to research this subject and come back to the Board. Mr. Kamptner responded that the case law is pretty clear that liability is not transferred to the owner if people are injured on sidewalks.

Ms. Mallek commented that she thought it was brought up to divert votes instead of being a real question.

Agenda Item No. 10. **Work Session:** Electoral Board and Registrar-Proposed New Voting Precincts and Voting Locations.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the Electoral Board of Albemarle County prioritizes keeping the size of County precincts small enough to improve voter experience and large enough to provide efficiency in holding elections. In response to growth and changing conditions in the County, the Electoral Board is proposing changes regarding precinct and polling place locations. The proposed changes fall into two categories: absolute immediate necessity and compelling urgency.

First, of absolute immediate necessity is the matter of the Belfield voting precinct. The St. Anne's Belfield School is no longer available to serve as the voting location for the Belfield voting precinct; the Electoral Board is proposing the merger of the existing Belfield precinct with the existing Jack Jouett precinct.

Second, as to compelling urgency, the Electoral Board proposes to subdivide several existing precincts, because the number of registered voters in those precincts is getting sufficiently large that it is presenting congestion for voters in those precincts on election days.

For all of these changes, all affected voters will continue to be in the same Magisterial district, state Senate district, and House of Delegates district. There is an urgency to complete these changes before the end of 2018, as we will be unable to make any precinct changes prior to the next Presidential Election in 2020 after January 1, 2019.

In an effort to identify a suitable alternative polling location for the Belfield voting precinct, the Electoral Board evaluated fourteen locations. Of the fourteen locations considered, none were found suitable to replace the St. Anne's Belfield polling place. With no appropriate replacement, the Electoral Board has devised a solution that involves the merger of the Belfield voting precinct with the existing Jack Jouett precinct. Jack Jouett Middle School would serve as the voting location for the expanded precinct, and retain the name: Jack Jouett precinct. Detail for the rationale/justification of the merger is provided in Attachment A.

Additionally, the Electoral Board has identified three opportunities to provide additional voter capacity in Albemarle while improving voting line length, wait times, and parking lot congestion.

1. Divide Brownsville and Crozet precincts into three - Crozet, Brownsville and Mechums River.
2. Divide Cale Precinct into two precincts, Cale and Biscuit Run (western part of current Cale).
3. Divide Free Bridge Precinct into two precincts - Free Bridge and Pantops

Details on the location of each proposed precinct and information on the number of registered voters currently in each existing precinct versus the number of registered voters in each proposed precinct is available in Attachment B. Please refer to Attachments C-G for detailed mapping of the proposed precincts.

The Electoral Board would assert for future consideration that the continuing urbanization of Albemarle County will result in the need for future additional precinct changes and additions. The most recent experience in locating appropriate polling locations demonstrates the need to consider future County construction to anticipate the need for new polling places. As new schools, fire stations, libraries, or other County buildings are planned, the need for flexible space which could also serve as a polling place should be considered.

Staff anticipates that there will be both one-time and ongoing costs associated with the proposed changes.

- A one-time cost of approximately \$5,000.00 for mailed notification of changes to residents in the affected areas, drawn from the reserve for contingency fund.
- An ongoing budget expense of approximately \$14,000.00 for additional election staff and operational supply needs.

The Electoral Board recommends that the Board of Supervisors:

- 1) approve the following changes in voting precincts:
 - The merger of the existing Belfield precinct with the existing Jack Jouett precinct.
 - The division of Brownsville and Crozet precincts into three: Crozet, Brownsville and Mechums River.
 - The division of Cale Precinct into two precincts, Cale and Biscuit Run (western part current Cale).
 - The division of Free Bridge Precinct in to two precincts - Free Bridge and Pantops; and
- 2) direct staff to bring a proposed ordinance back to the Board to implement the changes at a future Board meeting.

Mr. Jake Washburn, General Registrar, addressed the Board and explained that they would propose to rearrange some voting precincts as a result of a larger number of voters in some precincts. He pointed out an error in the maps he had provided as they were titled "Redistricting" instead of having the correct title of "Reprecincting." He emphasized that the proposed changes would not affect magisterial or state senate, delegate, or congressional districts. He introduced Peter Wurzer, Chairman of the Electoral Board, as the presenter.

Mr. Peter Wurzer addressed the Board. He offered to skip the presentation since the Board had already had a chance to review the maps and proposed changes.

Ms. Mallek encouraged Mr. Wurzer to give a short version of the presentation for the public record and for people who may be listening who had not heard of this proposal.

Mr. Wurzer said they are addressing two things, with the first being to combine the St. Anne's Belfield and Jack Jouett precincts. He explained that there are two reasons for doing this; the first is that St. Anne's Belfield School is no longer available as a polling place, and the second is that they have not been able to find a property that meet Americans with Disabilities Act guidelines under federal and state law. He said there is one potential polling location, but it is very close to two others in the Jack Jouett precinct and is located in an area that is difficult to find. He said they elected to bring St. Anne's Belfield back into Jack Jouett, which would result in a precinct with 3,700 registered voters. He explained that a positive aspect of this location is that the area is already well-developed and unlikely to grow. He said they would add a second scanner and relocate personnel from St. Anne's Belfield to Jack Jouett. He noted that schools are considered to be the gold standard for polling locations as they have parking, are well known, are easily accessible, and are usually closed for most major elections.

Mr. Wurzer reviewed the Brownsville-Crozet precinct and commented that it and all three proposals are in the growth area. He said that Crozet has 4,140 and Brownsville has 4,635 registered voters, and he recounted how in Crozet, Brownsville, and Cale, the lines were out the door and around the block on election day in 2016. He emphasized the importance of being able to have adequate parking and to be able to move voters through more quickly during presidential elections, which could be accomplished with smaller-sized precincts. He said they recommend splitting the two Crozet precincts into three, with the new one to be known as Mechums and to be located at Western Albemarle High school.

Ms. Palmer asked if travel time to the precincts was taken into consideration. Mr. Wurzer replied that they did not look at this specifically, although it normally happens since they try to keep the precincts as tight as possible.

Mr. Gallaway asked if Henley was considered as a location and also asked why they lost access to St. Anne's Belfield School, and if the electoral board would post a notification for those who come there to vote. Mr. Wurzer replied that they did but prefer Western Albemarle because it is clearly differentiated and has sizeable parking, adding that St. Anne's Belfield had decided to no longer host elections and a notification would be posted.

Ms. Mallek added that voters would receive notification by mail.

Mr. Wurzer next reviewed the Freebridge/Pantops area, wherein they had 4,238 registered voters at the Elks Club, which is at capacity. He noted that additional housing units were proposed for the area, and he proposed to maintain the Elks Club with about 2,500 voters and add a precinct at the Broadus Memorial Baptist Church in Pantops.

Ms. Mallek commented that it is great they are located near one another so that voters who go to the wrong place could easily go to the correct location.

Mr. Dill asked if the church has sufficient parking. He asked where the polling location would be within the church. Mr. Wurzer pointed out that this precinct would have fewer voters than the Elks Lodge, and he feels confident it has enough parking. He said the voting would be held in the sanctuary, which he described as a very large area.

Mr. Wurzer next reviewed the Cale precinct, which had 5,098 voters and was proposed to be split – with 2,926 voters remaining in Cale and a new Biscuit Run precinct to be in the gym at Monticello High School with 2,172 voters. He cited development statistics, with 300+ additional units proposed for each precinct area, and said they plan to station someone outside the building for the first few elections to minimize confusion.

Mr. Randolph asked for confirmation that Monticello High would have two precincts located at different areas of the building. He added that there is a strategic vulnerability to take into consideration, which is that the quickest route to the school is 5th Street Station Parkway and if this road has to be closed by VDOT or police and fire, then voters would have to make a right turn and cross Elliot and come back down Avon Street Extended, then make a left to Mill Creek and then enter the high school. He said this extra time could lead some constituents to not vote, and a long-term solution would be to use a potential Southwood community center, as there are multiple ways to access Southwood.

Mr. Wurzer confirmed that Monticello will have two precincts and agrees with Mr. Randolph's comment about using a Southwood community center as a polling station, if it is constructed.

Ms. McKeel noted that it is difficult to find willing partners to serve as polling sites and to find sites that comply with government guidelines. She said it would be great if Habitat for Humanity could work with County election officials to make sure the Southwood community center is designed to be in compliance with ADA regulations. Mr. Wurzer agreed to consider this.

Ms. Mallek suggested that if there were a traffic issue, they would advertise alternative routes on television.

Mr. Wurzer concluded his presentation, stating that what they are doing will make a major difference in voter satisfaction by reducing wait times. He emphasized they need to accomplish the changes before 2019, in time for the next presidential election. He asked that as the County constructs new buildings, they make sure there is space for polling locations and sufficient parking. He asked that as the Board considers uses for Yancey Elementary School, they keep it as a polling location – and he urged them to move quickly.

Ms. Mallek commented that she feels the changes are wonderful.

Ms. Palmer concurred.

Mr. Randolph said they are ready for the proposal to be brought back for a formal vote.

Mr. Kamptner said that staff has been working with GDS on the metes and bounds descriptions.

Ms. Palmer asked for the number of registered voters in the Porter's Precinct. Mr. Wurzer responded that it is about 1,500.

Mr. Dill asked when the Board would be asked to decide on names for the new precincts. Mr. Wurzer replied that they decide on names in time for when the ordinance is written.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Wurzer to comment on issues with the University Hall Precinct.

Mr. Wurzer noted that this is a large precinct with a high turnover of registered voters. He said the heat is not turned on during the winter and the area around the voting location is used by walkers and joggers. He said they are looking at an alternative location that will be accessible to the general public and within walking distance for students.

Ms. McKeel urged them to work with University of Virginia officials to get this worked out quickly.

Mr. Gallaway asked if voters at one of the polling stations at Monticello High School were to go to the wrong location, if there is access to the other location through the building. Mr. Washburne confirmed that there is.

Mr. Dill, recognizing that there are two County office buildings and absentee ballots are accepted at one location, asked if they place a notification directing voters to the other location. Ms. Clarice Schermerhorn, Elections Manager, confirmed this, though she acknowledged that during the last election an outside door was locked so voters could not see the sign posted on her office door. She added that staff directs stray voters to the correct location on 5th Street when they appear at the County Office Building.

Ms. Mallek asked that election officials place signs in the parking areas directing the disabled to the in-car voting area before they leave their cars.

Ms. Palmer **moved** that the Board approve the following recommended changes: 1) the merger of the existing Belfield precinct with the existing Jack Jouett precinct; 2) the division of Brownsville and

Crozet precincts into three: Crozet, Brownsville and Mechums River; 3) the division of Cale Precinct into two precincts, Cale and Biscuit Run (western part current Cale); and 4) the division of Free Bridge Precinct into two precincts - Free Bridge and Pantops; and to direct staff to bring a proposed ordinance back to the Board to implement the changes as soon as possible. The motion was **seconded** by Mr. Dill.

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

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

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 11. **Presentation:** Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment Update.

Mr. Bob Crickenberger, Director of Parks & Recreation, stated that his presentation follows up on a November 2017 presentation to the Board at which process, methodology, and intended outcomes from the community needs assessment were discussed. He turned the presentation over to Mike Svetz, a consultant with Pros Consulting.

Mr. Mike Svetz of Pros Consulting stated this is the second of four to five presentations he will make. He said he will share information from the statistically valid survey that was provided to the Board, which would be used to prioritize needs assessment. He presented a slide with a graph of estimated County population and households, which he said was derived from the Environmental Systems Research Institute. He said the County is expected to add 23,000 people over the next 15 years and referenced a graph of population estimates by age segments, which showed that the population would be increasingly older. Mr. Svetz emphasized that by 2030, 37% of the population would be age 55+ – a 7% increase over today's figure. The next slide showed a graph of population by race, which he emphasized is an important consideration as different cultures recreate in different ways. The next slide presented a graph that showed the County's average income to be above that of state and national figures. The next slide showed a comparison graph of the population by tapestry segmentation in the County with that of the United States, which included the categories Exurbanites, Soccer Moms, In Style, The Great Outdoors, and Top Tier. He noted that these five segments represented 54% of Albemarle's population – compared to only 10% of the national population – and by virtue of that, Albemarle is unique. He emphasized that parks and recreation systems are supposed to be driven by the needs of the community, and they would do some benchmarking related to this demographic information.

Ms. Palmer asked if the tapestry segments represent how people recreate. Mr. Svetz replied that the tapestry segments represent characteristics such as food consumed, where people shop, how they bank, vehicles driven, and recreation.

Ms. McKeel asked what the In Style segment represents. Mr. Svetz replied that they are trendy. He added that tapestry segment information is used by companies to determine where to locate franchise restaurants and stores.

Mr. Svetz presented the next slide, entitled Market Potential Index, which he described as the participation and demand for recreational activities. He said his next slides compare participation in various sports, fitness and recreational activities, with national averages, and demonstrate that the County has above average participation in most categories.

Mr. Svetz informed the Board that they held 15-20 focus groups in the fall, and he presented a slide with the following key themes that participants discussed:

- Public values Parks and Recreation system
- Parks and Trails Provide Community Connectivity
- Growth Areas were Underserved – Athletic Fields and Indoor Recreation Spaces
- School Parks were in Need of Renovations
- Increased Awareness was Needed
- Parks and Recreation should Play a Role in Economic Development
- Fund and Maintain New Parks and Facilities as We Grow

Mr. Svetz next presented the results of the statistically valid survey, which was conducted in late October and consisted of 521 completed surveys – with a margin of error of 4.4% and a confidence level of 95%. He presented a map of the County, with red dots representing the households of survey participants, and he emphasized that this mirrors the population distribution within the County. He said his next slide contains a pie chart showing survey respondents by age, which he said also mirrors the age demographics of the County, and it was followed by a chart showing survey respondents by ethnicity.

Mr. Svetz said his next slide lists the percentage of respondents who replied that a member of their household had used or visited a park or recreation facility, and the graph indicated the most popular use, at 79% of respondents, was for trails. Mr. Svetz commented that across the country, trails were the most in-demand category for parks and recreation systems, and some other categories of use were beaches and swimming lakes, playgrounds and park shelters, and dog shelters. He said his next slide presents a pie chart of how respondents rated the physical conditions of parks and recreation facilities, with 26% rating them as excellent and 64% as good – compared to the national average of 31% for excellent. He stated that there was some room for improvement and this was related to the age of assets and to issues of staffing capacity. His next slide presented results of a question about how many times facilities operated by Parks and Recreation were used in the past 12 months. Mr. Svetz reported the

survey found that Darden-Towe Park was the most popular, followed by Walnut Creek and then school sports fields. He commented that the growth areas were underserved, particularly with respect to athletic fields. His next slide showed that 29% of respondents had a member of their household participate in a recreation program, compared with a national benchmark of 34%.

Ms. Mallek asked if the 29% represents use of a Parks and Recreation Department sponsored program or any program. Mr. Svetz replied that it represented any program.

His next slide presented the results of respondents' assessment of overall programs members of their household had participated in, which indicated that 90% rated them as excellent or good. His next slide contained information on how respondents learned about programs and activities – with the most popular response, at 59%, being that they learned about programs from friends and neighbors. He said this was followed by the County website, facilities, newspaper articles, social media, and several other responses. He commented that Parks and Recreation may want to increase its presence on social media. His next chart listed programs that were most important to households, with Adult Fitness and Wellness topping the list, followed by Nature/Adventure, Youth Sports, Adult Sports, and Youth Learn to Swim programs.

Ms. Palmer commented that she heard a lot of complaints that there were not enough dog parks and that they are not evenly distributed. She noted that dog parks were not listed as a survey category.

Mr. Svetz replied that he would address this later in the presentation.

His next slide presented an estimate of the number of households whose needs for programs were being partly met or not being met, with Adult Fitness and Wellness and Nature/Adventure topping the list. Mr. Svetz emphasized that these had also topped the list of programs that were rated as most important. His next chart ranked respondents' assessment of which facilities were most important, and he indicated that Trails were ranked first, followed by Natural Areas and Wildlife Habitats, Community Parks, Neighborhood Parks, and Unleashed Dog Parks. His next chart listed an estimate of unmet needs for facilities – with Trails, Indoor Fitness, Adventure Areas, Indoor Swimming Pools, and Small Neighborhood Parks representing the top five responses.

Mr. Svetz presented a chart that indicated the overall level of satisfaction of respondents, with 22% responding that they were very satisfied and 42% responding as somewhat satisfied. He noted that the national benchmark for very satisfied is 27%. His next chart listed the results of a question about what actions were most important for Parks and Recreation to develop, and said the list was headed by trails, acquisition of new park land in underserved areas, upgrades and new amenities, and several other categories. His next chart indicated survey respondents' answers to a question on how they would allocate \$100 for Parks and Recreation services. He noted that the most popular responses were to maintain and improve existing parks, acquisition and improvement of land for walking and biking trails, and development of an indoor, multi-use facility.

Mr. Svetz reviewed the quantitative and qualitative methodology and scoring used to determine priorities, which were categorized as high, medium, and low. He noted that socialization with dogs fell within the high priority category. He emphasized that it is important to understand what people want to experience and then match facilities and amenities to these needs. He commented that priorities rated as low had a small target market of users, though this did not necessarily mean the County should overlook these. He concluded and presented an outline of immediate next steps: Levels of Service Standards for Parks, Facilities, and Amenities (early March); Equity Mapping for Parks, Facilities and Amenities (early March); Operational Assessment and Staffing Capacity (April); Capital Improvement Plan (May).

Ms. Palmer said she wants to be sure the County is working with the UVA Foundation on some of the needs, as she understands they are expanding their facilities.

Mr. Svetz recounted that he had recently met with a representative from UVA outdoor sports and recreation to discuss this.

Ms. McKeel suggested that Mr. Svetz provide a copy of his survey report and/or present the findings to the school system, emphasizing the importance of cooperating with schools for the use of many of the facilities.

Recess. The Board recessed their meeting at 3:41 p.m. and reconvened at 3:52 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 12. **Presentation:** Department of Social Services Annual Report.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that Pursuant to Virginia Code § 63.300, all counties in Virginia are required to establish a local board to oversee the provision of social services to its residents. The Board of Supervisors established the Albemarle County Department of Social Services Advisory Board in 1997. One of its required duties is to make an annual report to the Board of Supervisors, concurrent with the Department's budget presentation, concerning the administration of the public welfare program.

The FY17 Annual Report (Attachment A) provides a summary of the Department's programs and services, including the number of cases in each program area for the year, coupled with stories of some

of those served. Also included are the Department's Key Performance Indicators and unaudited statements of financial resources. Of particular note in this report are (1) the significant increases in valid Child Protective Services and Adult Protective Services referrals, (2) the number of individuals served through our Department's Medicaid Program, and (3) the number of lobby visitors with Limited English Proficiency. One positive change is that due to our intensive family finding efforts and prevention services, the number of children that are able to remain in their own homes/with their families has increased. Finally, the workload measures data show that the department continues to operate with less than the required number of staff as determined by the 2008 VDSS Workload Measures study. BUDGET IMPACT: Funding for the Department of Social Services is included in the County's annual operating budget.

Staff recommends that the Board receive the Department of Social Services Advisory Board's FY17 Annual Report as presented. No formal action is required.

Ms. Jennie More, DSS Advisory Board Chair, addressed the Board and stated that the theme for this year's report is "Investing in Families." She said the report identified several individuals who had been served by DSS and the specific services they had utilized, in order to provide a sense of how County residents are impacted and strengthened by services. She said the report also provides an overview of the department's programs and services. Ms. More encouraged Supervisors to read the powerful stories and quotes, and she offered to review key points and to take questions at the end.

Ms. More presented a slide of key performance indicators that listed levels of service for various functions. She reviewed the first performance benchmark, which was that 97% of Medicaid applications were processed within 45 days. She said that ongoing problems with the Virginia case management system and receipt of late applications from the central processing unit of Department of Medical Assistance Services (DMAS) and the federal marketplace presented a challenge to meeting this goal.

Ms. More reported that the number of children in foster care had decreased from 154 to 123 between FY16 – FY17, which she attributed to their pilot family finding efforts, with an additional position supported by the Board of Supervisors. She said a key to lowering Children's Services Act costs was to prevent children from entering foster care. She said as the number of children in foster care decreased, the number of families receiving prevention services increased.

Ms. More next emphasized that they had seen a significant increase in the number of child protective services referrals, which she said would be a point of discussion during the upcoming joint session with the School Board and Planning Commission and attributed the increase to substance abuse. She next presented a chart that indicated reductions in SNAP recipients and said they had hypothesized that some were not aware of the benefits or were ashamed to apply. Ms. More emphasized there is a strong correlation between local unemployment rates and SNAP enrollment with a stronger economy leading even those who are eligible for benefits to not seek them or those who are receiving benefits to not reapply. She presented a chart of the number of households receiving energy assistance and noted that this fluctuates according to the weather. Ms. More pointed out that the calculation of eligibility for benefits is different for undocumented households, and some households with undocumented members may qualify for SNAP but not for energy assistance.

Ms. More next presented a chart indicating the number of TANF recipients, which she noted had decreased because of stricter eligibility and compliance rules in comparison to other programs. She noted that a required referral to Child Support Enforcement may be another factor. She presented a chart reflecting the number of people who had visited the career center, noting that there had been an increase in the number of first time visits. She said they were in the second year of the SNAP employment and training pilot and invited Supervisors to visit the center at the 5th Street location.

Ms. Mallek added that they are well-connected with the workforce center. Ms. More commented that the level of service provided from such a small space is astounding.

Ms. More reviewed the number of Medicaid recipients and attributed an increase in applications to the Affordable Care Act and the fact DMAS had recognized the need to help people apply, creating the Cover Virginia call center to allow applications by phone. She noted that County applications and the Common Health website presumed a basic level of literacy and the ability to navigate technology, as well as public confidence that it was secure. She said that despite paper and online application options, some people need a guide or navigator to assist, which is being provided by DMAS. She said the USDA needs to allow telephonic applications and to provide a means to accept and funnel them, which would help reach the underserved who are undereducated and intimidated by written words or technology. Ms. More reviewed the pet companion service which she said has limited funding and a wait list, though referrals from adult services has increased, largely due to requests for screenings from nursing homes and assisted care. She reviewed interpretation services for those with limited English proficiency.

Mr. Gallaway referred to key performance indicators on Page 4 of the presentation, specifically regarding the number of children for which safe, ongoing child protective services requires a number of monthly contacts statistic. He asked if there is an issue with face-to-face contacts and asked if it is a problem of getting through to people and their subsequent access of services.

Ms. Phyllis Savides, DSS Director, replied that once a child protective services investigation is completed, they have the responsibility to open a case for ongoing services to try to maintain the child in the home and to avoid further abuse or neglect. She said they are required to conduct a face-to-face visit

with every client in the family unit, and the number of caseloads for staff is making it difficult to get these visits done. She stated that other service providers are seeing the families multiple times per week in some cases, but they cannot count these visits because the state requires that the primary case manager from the Department of Social Services conduct visits.

Mr. Gallaway asked about their goal to be a good steward of financial resources, with a target of operating 1% below budget, though for multiple years they had been 10% below budget. He stated that this is one area for which he wished this were not the case. He said he appreciates the effort to be under budget, but this is a department he would never want to see under budget.

Ms. Savides replied that this referred to local funding of the budget, which meant they had been able to maximize state and federal revenue to save the locality funding.

Ms. Mallek asked if this has to do with being understaffed and not being able to address everything. Ms. Savides replied that turnover was a factor, as a staff member may leave and open a position that remains vacant for a period of time. She explained that sometimes an employee at a higher pay grade leaves and is replaced by an employee at a lower pay grade.

Mr. Gallaway commented that it would be appropriate to have a mechanism that would allow the department to shift funds or have control over lapse. He referred to Child Protective Services (CPS) referrals and the number under the category of "Other," which exceeded the number under "Accepted." He said that his understanding was that if accepted, a referral is made to CPS to conduct an investigation – and if a case is categorized as Other, they have investigated and determined that it is not a CPS issue.

Ms. Savides clarified that accepted referrals are those that are considered to be valid by policy and regulation, but they also receive referrals that are invalid that they can respond to without having the proper authority. She added that the CPS intake worker handles information and referral calls in which she gives information, and this number included those types of requests for information. She said each call must be thoroughly assessed as they do not want to not go out on something if a child is at risk.

Mr. Dill commented that he had read some articles about the level of violence in society declining, though he had not seen statistics on the number of children being abused. He asked if there had been an overall decline in family violence.

Ms. Savides replied that recently DSS had begun tracking child abuse and neglect calls to determine if substance abuse or domestic violence were involved. She offered to filter out the percentage that had domestic violence. She remarked that she had heard anecdotally from staff that domestic violence had increased and was difficult to intervene with.

Ms. McKeel remarked that this discussion reminds her of an offer by Chiefs Eggleston and Lantz to show the Board a "heat map" of response calls that demonstrated that calls to fire and to police mirror each other on the map. She suggested they layer DSS calls on the heat map. Ms. Savides replied that she would present a map of DSS service calls to the Board the following week.

Ms. McKeel asked Mr. Richardson to pull this information together to compare it with fire and police calls. Mr. Randolph commented that they need to have an informed discussion about this when reviewing strategic priorities to determine if they have the proper proximity and effectiveness of current resources aligned with the needs identified on the map are rising. Ms. Savides commented that DSS receives calls from all areas of the County.

Ms. Palmer asked if the number of domestic violence calls increased during difficult economic times and wonders if calls were more likely to be made by neighbors in an urban area, where more people can hear what is going on, than in a rural area. Ms. Savides replied that it would be difficult to segment the data in this way, noting that the largest number of referrals comes from schools and physicians.

Mr. Randolph commented that in affluent communities there are underreported cases of substance abuse and therefore underreported cases of domestic violence and child abuse, because of the nature of the communities. He said there is a class and privilege dimension to the statistics that are reported. Mr. Randolph asked for an explanation of why the adoptive children supported with subsidy payments, as listed on Page 9, declined in FY17. He asked why referrals to adult protective services had increased by 40% and wonders whether these were random changes or if they signified something else.

Addressing the question of the subsidy payments, Ms. Savides responded that this was related to the decrease in the number of children coming into foster care because with fewer kids entering care there were fewer exiting through adoption. She added that this was not a bad sign, and emphasized that when a child is in foster care they work hard to achieve permanency and consider adoption to be the best alternative if they cannot go home. She admitted that the adult numbers are confusing with one of the reasons due to a change in the law regarding what a valid referral is for finance, partly due to the fact that in the past an adult over age 65 had to be incapacitated – a provision that has been removed and which has opened doors in terms of receiving more valid referrals for financial exploitation. Ms. Savides added that some referrals to adult protective services may include referrals for companion services and screenings. She said she had spoken with the program manager about breaking down these numbers, which were lumped together in the state system and said another factor was increased reporting by financial institutions and home care agencies.

Mr. Dill added that he just did a Google search and had found that abuse of children had gone down significantly since 1990, and particularly since 2000. Ms. Savides replied that prevention programs have really helped to lower the incidents of abuse and neglect, though they still receive a lot of calls.

Agenda Item No. 13. **Presentation:** Bright Stars Annual Report for FY17.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that As a result of the Virginia Pre-School Initiative (VPI) funding initiated by Governor Wilder in 1994, the Board established the County's Bright Stars program as a collaboration among the Department of Social Services, the School Division, and Local Government. The Department of Social Services serves as the coordinator and fiscal agent for the program. The first classroom was established at Stone Robinson Elementary School, and this year (FY17), the program had eleven classrooms in seven elementary schools, including three at Cale, two each at Greer and Agnor-Hurt and one classroom each at Red Hill, Scottsville, Stone Robinson, and Woodbrook. In 2009, the Pre-School Network for Albemarle County was established to oversee the blending of funding streams from the VPI, Title 1 and Early Childhood Special Education programs to serve more children in inclusion classrooms.

The FY17 Annual Report includes a review of the Pre-School Network services, including the number of children served and the results of educational and family outcomes. Also included are the Program's Key Performance Indicators and VPI unaudited finances.

Continued funding for the program is being requested in the FY19 budget.

Staff recommends that the Board accept the FY17 Bright Stars Annual Report.

Ms. Mary Stebbins, DSS Assistant Director, addressed the Board and said she would review highlights from her report. She said they were able to serve 187 at-risk four-year-olds in FY17 within 11 classrooms. She stated that they piloted a new model of inclusion and had three classrooms at Cale Elementary that had special education students participate. Ms. Stebbins said a classroom was moved from Stony Point to Agnor Hurt to better serve the needs in the urban ring, with students from the Stony Point classroom moved to Stone Robinson. She said they had placed 17 children in two private preschools in cooperation with the Early Education Task Force. She referred to Page 3 of the report that showed the number of Bright Stars participants to be more linguistically and ethnically diverse than the overall County student population. She emphasized that they were more likely to be from a minority group, 83% were free or reduced lunch eligible, and they were more likely to be of limited English proficiency (41.7%). Ms. Stebbins presented a chart with data on performance goals. She stated that a large piece of their program is engaging parents in their children's education as this lays the foundation for continued parent involvement in the schools and serves as a critical factor in ameliorating the future risk of school failure. She said they have nine family coordinators that focuses on engaging families and has been quite successful, as 96% of parents of participating children attended Bright Stars events, 84% attended parent-teacher conferences, and 84% made progress on the goals they had developed with the family coordinators.

Ms. Stebbins next reviewed results data collected from fall and spring assessments of pre-literacy, early math skills, and social/emotional development. She reported that 12% passed the pre-literacy measure given in the fall, known as "pre-K PALS," while 66% were able to pass in the spring; and 17% passed the early numeracy assessment in the fall while 77% passed in the spring. She next referred to Page 9, Long Term Academic Benefits, which contained charts of Bright Stars students' progress compared to that of the overall student population. She referred to Page 11, Personal and Social Development, and commented that students had made considerable progress, which is an important predictor of future success, and she noted that her charts show significant improvement from the fall to the spring in student assessments. Ms. Stebbins stated that the ability of children to manage themselves, regulate their attention and behavior, work with others, and handle frustration grew by leaps and bounds over the course of the school year. She referred to Page 3, which contained results of parent surveys about the program. She summarized that parents report considerable progress by their child in multiple areas of development and parents' perception of the program continues to be very positive. She said parents reported positive interactions with program staff, their participation was encouraged, and their children benefited from the program – with 100% responding that they would recommend it to others.

Ms. Stebbins next played a clip of a video of interviews with former Bright Stars students who are now in high school, which she said is a testament to the impact the program had on these students that they carry with them throughout their lives. She thanked the Board for their time, interest, and critical financial support of the Bright Stars program.

Mr. Dill asked if there is a waiting list or opportunities for more kids to take advantage of it. Ms. Stebbins replied that this past year they did not have a large waiting list and were able to place these kids in a private school through the Early Education Task Force. She commented that the number of four-year-olds is down across the board this year though projections for the upcoming year are much higher which will require at least one or two additional classrooms.

Mr. Dill asked if kids who attend the private schools show different results from those who attend public schools. Ms. Stebbins replied that they do not have data on this, but through part of the grant that helped fund the private placement program there was an evaluative component so there would be data

coming out. She added that they placed the highest risk kids in the public school program so it would be hard to compare.

Ms. Mallek asked if the PALS assessments were the same and if the same teacher certification skill levels are required. Ms. Stebbins responded that the private program conducts the same assessments, though the private school teachers are not required to be certified in early childhood education.

Ms. Savides interjected that the state granted a waiver for the mixed delivery, which enabled them to place the kids in the private settings.

Mr. Gallaway referred to the outcomes shown on Page 6 and suggested they present this in a way that shows progression across the years to tell a better story. He asked if the Woodbrook addition would create additional classes. Ms. Savides replied that Woodbrook is adding two classrooms and it is up to the Department of Social Services to create and staff these classrooms, which would be part of the budget discussion.

Mr. Gallaway applauded the focus on social-emotional learning, which he described as incredibly important.

Ms. McKeel added that she had read Dr. Moran and the School Board's funding request and noticed the cover talked about the student survey and requested stronger mental health services, which is being responded to in the budget.

Agenda Item No. 14. **Presentation:** 2018 Real Estate Reassessments.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that Albemarle County Code §15-1000 requires all real estate in the County to be assessed annually as of January 1st each year and requires the County Assessor's Office to conduct new reassessments. The Constitution of Virginia, Article X, Taxation and Finance, Section 2, Assessments dictates that "all assessments of real estate and tangible personal property shall be at their fair market value, to be ascertained as prescribed by law." Also, County Code §15-1000 (C) requires all real estate assessments to be made at 100% of fair market value.

The Real Estate Assessor's Office has completed the annual reassessment process for 2018 and notices are scheduled to be mailed to property owners on January 26, 2018. Among the information traditionally provided by the County Assessor's Office is the average change in assessed value. For 2018 the average property value increased by 2.2%. However, the majority of properties' assessed values have changed by an amount either greater than or less than the 2.2% average, and in many instances, the 2018 assessed values are substantially different than the average.

Property owners who wish to appeal their annual reassessment to the County Assessor must do so by February 28, 2018; this level of appeal is referred to as an Administrative Review and is allowed by County Code §15-1002. Appeals may be made also to the Board of Equalization, if filed by March 30, 2018 or 30 days after the County Assessor has rendered his decision on the Administrative Appeal. The March 30 deadline is new this year, changed from March 15.

Preparation of mass appraisals that result in fair and equitable assessments requires the work of competent, well-trained personnel in the Real Estate Office in their application of assessment principles and best practices, adherence to Virginia Code and Albemarle County Code, and compliance with regulations promulgated by the Virginia Department of Taxation.

The focus of the Assessor's office in 2017 was to fully review as many properties as possible, updating property descriptions as needed, to create more accurate assessed values. The best indication of the progress made in 2017 was the creation of sketches in the Computer Aided Mass Appraisal (CAMA) system. While approximately 12,000 were created in the 16 years between 2000 and 2016, or 750 per year, we have created 4,600 new sketches in the past 18 months. This level of review has allowed us to find many improvements and additions to properties that had been added either with or without permits over the past decade.

County Assessor, Pete Lynch, will make a presentation to the Board of Supervisors regarding the reassessment process and outcome for 2018 as part of this agenda item consideration. The presentation will highlight statistical information about reassessment results by magisterial districts and the change in value for the "average" homeowner, as well as other useful statistical and demographic information.

A Frequently Asked Questions document (FAQs) has been prepared by County staff for distribution to property owners and has been included in the mailing of assessment notices. A copy of this FAQs sheet is included as an attachment for your reference.

Although the results of the 2018 reassessment process greatly inform the budget development process, there is no direct budgetary impact specifically related to this information.

Staff recommends that the Board receive the 2018 Real Estate Reassessment report as presented. There is no formal action required.

Mr. Peter Lynch, County Assessor, stated that he would discuss the primary functions of the Assessor's Office, 2017 achievements and 2018 goals, assessment value changes, sales to support the assessments, review and appeal procedures, and land use rates.

Mr. Lynch reviewed the primary functions of the Assessor's Office, with the first being to reassess all properties annually, and said this function consists of the following steps: review all property data every five years (1,059 per appraiser); validate all sales and update description of sale properties (235 per appraiser); update the valuation model annually; and calibrate that with sales. He stated that the second primary function of the Assessor's Office is to add new construction to the tax rolls (175 per appraiser), which consists of adding the value of completed improvements when substantially complete and adding partial value of incomplete structures as of January 1. He said the third main component of the Assessor's Office is to administer the Land Use Program (270 per appraiser), which includes the steps of conducting biennial revalidation of all parcels in the program and reviewing new applications for the program.

Mr. Lynch listed the following achievements of his office: a) reorganized 17,000 properties in the rural areas into geographic market areas; b) reviewed and sketched 4,600 properties in Computer-Aided Mass Appraisal (CAMA) system since going live with the system 18 months ago; and c) reduced the large backlog of building permits. He listed the following 2018 goals: a) add a minimum of 5,000 sketches to the CAMA system; b) further reduce backlog of building permits and add all improvements to tax rolls within six months of comparison; and c) reduce COD (variance) for the County overall and for the rural areas in the 2019 reassessment.

Ms. Palmer asked how long it had taken in the past to add improvements to the tax rolls. Mr. Lynch responded that he does not have statistics, but he related an instance in which they had sent a retroactive tax bill for three years to a property owner who had made improvements.

Mr. Lynch reported that overall, countywide assessments on all taxable properties will increase by 2.2%. He presented a slide listing overall change by magisterial district as follows: Rio 1%, Jack Jouett 2.5%, Rivanna 2.9%, Samuel Miller 2.5%, Scottsville 2.5%, Town of Scottsville -2.3%, White Hall 2.1%. He emphasized that they are seeing more increases in rural areas and less increases in commercial properties, and he attributed the low increase in the Rio district to the higher percentage of commercial properties compared to other districts.

Mr. Lynch presented a slide listing overall change by state property class:

Class Code	Category	Number	Change
01	Urban Residential	21,425	2.5%
02	Other Res. (up to 20 acres)	17,452	3.2%
03	Multi-Family	155	.8%
04	Commercial	1,347	1.4%
05	Rural (20 – 99.99 acres)	3,630	.2%
06	Rural (100+ acres)	900	0%
07	Exempt, Utility, HOA	1,468	N/A
	Total Taxable	46,377	2.2%

Mr. Lynch reported that just over 500 new parcels were created last year and over 800 were created in the previous year.

He noted that his next slide lists reassessment results by use type:

Value Range	Number	Average Change
Single Family	30,949	2.2%
Vacant Residential	8,052	5.3%
Residential Condos	2,938	5.7%
Other Residential	1,623	1.3%
Commercial	1,347	1.4%
Exempt, Utility, HOA	1,400	N/A
Total	46,377	2.2%

Mr. Lynch said that his next slide presents data on single family residential results by value range:

Value Range	Number	Average Change
Up to \$125,000	1,240	8.4%
\$125 - \$200,000	4,321	5.0%
\$200 - \$275,000	5,691	4.4%
\$275 - \$350,000	5,678	3.7%
\$350 - \$450,000	5,043	2.3%
\$450 - \$600,000	3,800	1.7%
\$600 - \$800,000	2,467	1.2%
\$800 - \$1,000,000	1,069	1.5%
\$1 - \$2,000,000	1,281	0.2%
\$2 - \$5,000,000	307	0.7%

\$5,000,000+	52	0.0%
Total/Overall	30,249	2.2%

Mr. Lynch said that his next chart lists single family residential results by taxable assessment change:

Change Amount	Number	Percentage of Total
Decrease > 10%	467	1.5%
Decrease up to 10%	8,957	28.9%
Increase up to 10%	17,237	55.7%
Increase > 10%	4,288	13.9%
Total	30,949	100%

Mr. Lynch said that in the future they expect to see more increases in the middle and very few large decreases or increases.

Ms. Mallek asked if the larger changes represents a correction or continues a trend. Mr. Lynch replied that a major change to the model was made last year that caused larger increases and decreases, and this year is building on those changes with changes to some components.

Ms. Palmer asked if some properties were still valued below pre-recession levels or if they have fully recovered. Mr. Lynch replied that many properties fully recovered by last year and others will recover this year.

His next slide presented residential sales ratios:

	Arms-Length Sales	Median A/S Ratio	COD
2017 Residential Sales for 2018 Reassessment	1,980	0.99%	6.2
2016 Residential Sales For 2017 Reassessment	1,918	0.98%	7.6

Mr. Lynch explained that one part of an assessment could be correct and another part could be erroneous, and the new software allows reports to be run and provides a good tool to make sure they are doing the right thing. He next presented a slide of residential sales ratios by year built, which contains statistics from 1930 – 2016. His next chart presented residential sales ratios by square footage:

Building Size	Count	Median A/S Ratio	COD
500 – 999	96	0.98	7.4
1,000 – 1,499	445	0.98	5.73
1,500 – 1,999	387	0.99	5.15
2,000 – 2,499	345	0.98	5.17
2,500 – 2,999	290	0.99	6.21
3,000 – 3,999	211	1.00	5.46
4,000 – 4,999	66	1.00	5.61
5,000 – 9,999	18	1.02	7.63

The next slide listed residential sales ratios by style of house. He pointed out that CODs are very tight. The next slide presented residential sales ratios by residential grade.

Ms. Mallek asked if the fact that the ratios are tight in every category indicates they had good sales data to work with. Mr. Lynch confirmed this.

His next slide presented sales ratios by neighborhood, with a sampling from 9 of over 400 neighborhoods in the County. His next slide presented residential sales ratios by price range. Mr. Lynch pointed out that the ratios were good for all price ranges.

Mr. Lynch listed the three steps of the review process:

Step One – Ask the Assessor’s Office

- Explain the valuation process
- Confirm property description
- Correct incorrect data

Step Two – Request a Review

- Fill out and sign a 2018 Real Estate Assessment Review form – Submit by February 28
- Form can be mailed or faxed to property owner.
- Fillable form is available on website and in the office.
- Provide a reason and support as to why the assessment was incorrect.
- Allow exterior and interior of the property to be inspected.
- County would send written response with conclusions.

Step Three – Request a Board of Equalization (BOE) Appeal

- Fill out and sign BOE appeal form by March 30.
- Exception: Can submit BOE appeal within 30 days of date of letter of response from a review requested by February 28.
- BOE form available by contacting assessor's office.
- BOE sets hearing dates beginning in June and must resolve appeals by September 1.
- BOE was comprised of six residents of the County with certain requirements regarding a real estate background.

Mr. Lynch presented a chart of land use values from SLEAC rental rate analyses which he said he had shared with the board of the Farm Bureau. He explained they use these rates to determine land use rates. He concluded and invited questions.

Ms. Mallek emphasized that requests for review must be made by February 28.

Agenda Item No. 15. **Presentation:** Albemarle-Charlottesville Criminal Justice/Mental Health Linkage Study.

Mr. Neal Goodloe, Criminal Justice Planner with the Thomas Jefferson Area Community Criminal Justice Board, addressed the Board. He reported that they had taken on a number of studies intended to guide collective decision making among the various agencies that make up the Evidence-Based Decision Making (EBDM) policy team, which includes the Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail. He said the University of Virginia Systems Engineering is a partner that had assisted with a number of initiatives, and he explained that many challenges were big data problems. He said that UVA Systems Engineering had also helped establish the CIT program methodology and is working on a first of its kind in Virginia study, which may be the first of its kind in the country. He said they wanted to know two basic things as follows: 1) What was the preponderance of serious mental illness in the criminal justice system at each point of contact (arrest, detention, pre-trial, jail population, those on probation) and does it change and does it matter geographically? 2) How well were these individuals being linked to services? He said Region Ten had been enlisted to provide HIPAA protected, personal level data in order to match name for name, across the criminal justice and mental health systems. Mr. Goodloe said they used UVA's institutional review board process that governs human subject research to craft a research design that does not violate HIPAA. He explained how they identified the subjects of the study by establishing a mental health screening process at the jail, OAR pretrial supervision intake, OAR misdemeanor probation intake, and felony probation intake.

Mr. Goodloe explained that they began with a small cohort, examined them for eight months, and found that nearly one in four met the minimum screening criteria for serious mental illness such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression. He said they looked at initial treatment linkage rates and found that 28% of those meeting the screening criteria at the jail were found on Region Ten's service rolls for ongoing mental health treatment. He explained that Phase 2 was launched the following year to gather a larger data capture and confirm what they had initially found, and he presented a flow chart showing the different agencies involved. Mr. Goodloe reported that the findings, after 18 months of study, were that 23.1% of inmates booked to the regional jail and held long enough to screen met the minimum screening criteria of a well-respected, nationally validated mental health screening tool. He commented that they do not know about the cohort that was not held long enough to screen. He noted that they found that women were more likely to be screened than men, as they represented 19.9% of the jail population but 28.4% of those screened. He said about 5.6% of the inmate cohorts were "super-utilizers" of the jail with four or more separate booking events, accounting for 21% of bookings. He said this group was overrepresented in the screened population for mental illness, adding that the data suggested there were those who were cycling in and out of the jail with mental illness being a part of this pattern.

Ms. Mallek commented that medication is available in jail and she had heard stories of people getting arrested on purpose in order to obtain medication. Mr. Goodloe replied that jail may be the only place they can get reliable medication, either because they are unable to get it on the outside or because they chose not to seek services.

Mr. Goodloe explained that there was no significant difference found in the percentage screened in at different decision points, with significant percentages of those with mental illness at all intake points. He said they had also found no significant difference in the mental illness levels of OAR, Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail, and Central Virginia Regional Jail – nor geographically among urban, suburban, or rural settings. He commented that they had expected mental illness to be correlated with population density but found that it was not, and they found that those released on probation were more likely to fail probation supervision if they scored high on the mental health screen vs. low on the screen. He stated that Phase 3 would look at probation outcomes and return to custody rates for low vs. high scorers.

Mr. Goodloe next reviewed linkage rates. He said they took the 495 individuals in the study and compared them to Region Ten service rosters, finding that 44% had received a service from Region Ten during the same timeframe, with 23% receiving a mental health service. He said they know that more than half of those who left the jail received no service and only one in four were linked to mental health services with Region Ten.

Mr. Dill asked if they received services while in jail. Mr. Goodloe replied that there were extensive services including psychiatric, case management, and medication – case law was murky in terms of enforcing medication and forcing an individual to go to Region Ten. He said they were looking into whether the application of probation services improves linkage, and they feel that it should because a probation officer should be requiring individuals to receive services if they were part of a court order.

Mr. Goodloe presented a graph of emergency 911 mental health crisis calls from 2001 – 2015, which showed a dramatic upward trend since 2006 when CIT was implemented in the County. He said the number of those sent to jail dropped and the number sent to UVA Medical Center started to rise, which was the intention. He stated that CIT was not enough as there were some individuals with mental illness who end up in jail repeatedly.

Mr. Goodloe presented the following next steps for 2017 – 2018:

- Further expand time horizon for data collection at all agencies.
- Increase sophistication of person level data matching.
- Measure differences in criminal justice outcomes between high and low scoring BUMHS cohorts.
- Measure whether successful linkage to mental health treatment improves criminal justice outcomes.
- Examine whether proximity to treatment increases successful treatment.
- Calculate the total cost of super-utilizers to the combined criminal justice health systems.
- Investigate whether CIT diversion reduces the likelihood of future arrests.
- Compare the preponderance of mentally ill inmates at ACRJ and CVRJ.

Mr. Goodloe presented recommendations based on the results of the study: 1) Screen inmates for serious mental illness as soon after booking as possible to identify potential candidates for diversion; 2) Refer those that are found suitable to the newly-created Therapeutic Docket in Albemarle and Charlottesville General District Courts; 3) Improve treatment linkage and reduce jail bed days through diversion and comprehensive release planning; 4) Improve our utilization of CIT intervention; 5) Improve the “warm handoff” from the jail to Region Ten and from UVA hospital to Region Ten; and 6) Invest in treatment services and other resources that reduce the recycling of mentally ill citizens through the jail repeatedly.

Mr. Goodloe explained that a group consisting of the Commonwealth’s Attorney, Public Defender, Chief of Probation, the Executive Director of OAR, representatives from Region Ten, and a representative from Western State had met and begun planning for a therapeutic docket for the Charlottesville and Albemarle General District Courts, which went live on January 23. He said they hope to serve 40 – 60 individuals per year in this docket, which he described as a good start. Mr. Goodloe noted that they were operating under a Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services grant of \$64,504, which expires June 30, and they are seeking City and County support to continue the program after July 1.

Ms. Mallek asked if the diversion is to Region Ten for residential treatment. Mr. Goodloe replied that those charged with a misdemeanor are presented with a treatment plan and a deal under which they are offered the opportunity to enter a treatment plan with a guarantee of linkage to services and intensive case management, and they are required to report to the docket every two weeks to speak with the judge. He remarked that this combination of treatment has been shown to improve mental health and criminal justice outcomes.

Mr. Dill asked if there are savings benefits from the program to offset the investment in the court. Mr. Goodloe replied that he chose not to use the word “savings” when talking about criminal justice, as he had been in the business for 36 years and had not yet seen any savings, and he does not believe in cost avoidance. He explained that although crime rates in the County had dropped significantly over the past decade, they had not seen a public safety dividend by way of a decrease in the number of bookings, average daily population of the jail, or the costs paid by the City and County to support jail operations. He said they are looking at ways to save jail bed days, which cost \$91 per day. He said that to be able to close a portion of the jail, they would have to save 40 to 50 beds per day, which would be the only way to save a full \$91 per day. He added that the mentally ill population is the most expensive inmate population as they require more resources.

Ms. Palmer asked how much he is asking from the County. Mr. Goodloe replied that they need \$110 thousand to operate – with \$55 thousand each from Albemarle and Charlottesville. He explained that they would have liked to submit the funding request during the budget cycle, but they had to wait a substantial amount of time to receive approval from the state court to operate the program.

Ms. McKeel asked if the request went to the jail board for approval through the budget process, and asked if he had discussed this with the jail warden. Mr. Goodloe replied that he doubted this is part of the jail board’s budgeting process. He added that Superintendent Kumer is part of the therapeutic docket planning team and is thoroughly familiar with it.

Ms. McKeel said the Board would discuss this item during budget meetings later in February.

Ms. Palmer remarked that it sounds like a great thing.

Ms. McKeel agreed.

Mr. Goodloe said he would be present at the next jail board meeting if anyone on the Board wished him to bring this up for discussion.

Ms. Mallek asked Mr. Goodloe to share the financial information with the County Executive.

Ms. Pat Smith, Director of OAR, addressed the Board. She explained that budget requests would normally go through OAR or through the ABRT budget process, and OAR had not envisioned that it would come through the jail board. She explained that half the money would go to OAR and half to Region Ten. She noted that they did not put this into OAR's budget as it was a total budget of the community and not really an OAR process.

Mr. Goodloe remarked that for ABRT to certify funding, a program must have been in operation for two years, though that could be a good approach for the long term.

Ms. Mallek said she is very glad to hear about this and thanked Mr. Goodloe for his presentation.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the jail would be the recipient of the \$91/day cost avoidance that was equated to bed days. Mr. Goodloe replied that if bed days were reduced enough to close a portion of the jail and they reduced staff accordingly, then both the City and County would be the beneficiaries of that lower cost. He said another way they looked at cost avoidance was by not having to build another jail, and he noted that the Central Virginia Regional Jail had completed a \$16M addition to its facility. He added that with population increases, they could still have more individuals that need to be incarcerated despite a lower crime rate.

Ms. Mallek remarked that it is fantastic to hear they are down 150 individuals from a few years ago.

Agenda Item No. 16. Closed Meeting.

At 5:47 p.m., Mr. Gallaway **moved** that the Board enter into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A of the Code of Virginia, under Subsection 1, to consider appointments to boards, committees and commissions in which there were pending vacancies or requests for reappointments. Under Subsection 8, to consult with and be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice relating to the Entrance Corridor Overlay District. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. McKeel.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 17. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 6:26 p.m., Mr. Gallaway **moved** that the Board of Supervisors certify by a recorded vote that, to the best of each supervisor'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 session were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed session. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. McKeel.

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

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

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

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

- **reappoint** Mr. Rod Gentry as the Rivanna District representative and Mr. George Ray as the Rio District representative to the Economic Development Authority with said terms to expire January 19, 2022.
- **reappoint** Mr. David van Roijen as the Samuel Miller District representative and Mr. William Cromwell as the Rio District representative to the Equalization Board with said terms to expire December 31, 2018.
- **appoint** Mr. David Farrall as the White Hall District representative to the Equalization Board with said term to expire December 31, 2018.
- **reappoint** Mr. William "Bill" Palmer to the Planning Commission as the University of Virginia Non-voting representative with said term to expire December 31, 2018.
- **appoint** Supervisors Diantha McKeel and Rick Randolph to the Executive Team (Southwood).

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

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

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

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

As no one came forward to speak, Ms. Mallek closed this part of the agenda.

Agenda Item No. 20. **Presentation:** Hydraulic Area Project Advisory Panel Update.

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, stated that he anticipated the completion of a technical analysis this month and said there were three options under consideration. He reminded the Board that he had sent them a link to a video that presented the three options and remarked that viewing the videos may be the easiest approach. He outlined three points of his report: to inform that Board public meetings would be held in late February and early March to obtain community input on the three options; to begin a process with the County to consider a possible Smart Scale application comprehensive plan amendment; and to reconsider the need for the County to have a comprehensive plan amendment, as they may only need a resolution from the Board to support a Smart Scale application. He stated that they may do this under an official map for the Hydraulic Road/Route 29 intersection that is already in place, and they would have to remove this official map as part of choosing another transportation improvement project. He said they may be able to exchange this map for another official map. He invited questions and emphasized that no action is required at this time.

Ms. Mallek asked if there is a process to do the map change. Mr. Graham reminded her that this was discussed in November when the Board endorsed the Kimley-Horn plan in which they had laid out a process for doing this, though they wanted to wait until they could see where the transportation improvements were going in order to mesh this in. He said that given the timing, they may be better served by just doing an official map update and hold the comprehensive plan amendment for the Places 29 update.

Ms. Mallek stated that the official map is different from a comprehensive plan amendment. Mr. Graham agreed, stating that an official map was adopted 10 years ago and was updated 4 years ago and since they are required to update it every 5 years they would have to either update it or delete it next year.

Ms. Palmer asked for clarification of the Smart Scale project that may no longer be relevant. Mr. Graham replied that Smart Scale is the Commonwealth Transportation Board's funding for transportation. He said there was some thought last fall from VDOT that a comprehensive plan amendment would be needed so that it would match what is in the Smart Scale application, though VDOT now says it is not really needed and that a resolution would be sufficient. He said he realized they already had an official map that requires amendment or deletion next year, and they could swap this transportation improvement into that official map and save the comprehensive plan amendment for when they did the Places 29 update.

Ms. McKeel asked for the timeline. Mr. Graham replied that a Smart Scale application must be made by the end of May, after which they would have two months to finalize any changes and submit it to VDOT by August 1.

Agenda Item No. 21. Development Services Advisor – Pre-Marketing Proposal Approval.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that Albemarle County has been engaged for some time in a thorough analysis and assessment of the County's future court needs and the best way to meet those needs along with an investigation of the potential to which this project could promote its highest strategic priorities of development, redevelopment and revitalization in the County's urban areas. This work directly supports two strategic plan initiatives: Redevelop Rio/Route 29 Intersection Area; and By June 2019, establish direction, complete design, and be under construction for the project to expand the General District Court.

At the December 14, 2016 Board meeting, staff presented a proposed process for moving forward with the exploration of a P3 to relocate the courts and/or County administration to a site in Albemarle County. Stantec Consulting Services was contracted in June 2017 and provided a final report with findings and conclusions to the Board at its Dec 13, 2017 work session. Stantec consultants presented an initial report on the costs, fiscal impacts, cost benefit analysis and any updates to the previously submitted Program Analysis Documents and Adjacency Study report, along with overall recommendations and a proposal on next steps. The Board received Public comment and feedback on the analysis at a Public Hearing on December 18, 2017 and provided direction to staff at a special meeting on December 20, 2017, specifically:

1. The County will impose a moratorium on further discussions of the courts potential relocation from downtown from today until March 2 in response to the letter from the Mayor of the City of Charlottesville.

2. The Board is directing Stantec to continue to explore the development of, and facilities in Albemarle County, such as the County Office Building, a performing arts center, and a convention center.
3. The County Executive and the County Attorney will resume negotiations on the Board's behalf with the City of Charlottesville, on the County's ownership and the County's control of the 7th and Market Street parking lot and other related issues and terms.
4. Land-use valuation should be recognized in the revenue-sharing formula between the County of Albemarle and the City of Charlottesville.

Following Board direction to continue to explore the development of, and facilities in Albemarle County, please see attachment A that details the Stantec Proposal for the next phase of work (Pre-marketing), along with Attachment B, the proposed schedule for the work. A summary of the proposal is as follows:

The goal of this scope of work will be testing the market to identify the answers to three key questions:

1. Are there appropriate parcels to accommodate the desired mixed use form of development in Albemarle with a focus on the identified target area of the Rio/Route 29 intersection area, and what are the property owners' willingness to develop/redevelop their property or partner with a developer, if the County were to participate in some manner?
2. What type of County participation would be most attractive? Would the owners likely respond to a solicitation for expressions of interest?
3. What is the development community's appetite for the Albemarle market with a County tenancy? Would the developer(s) be interested in responding to a solicitation for expressions of interest?

Task 1: Information Gathering and Prep - 1 Month, Stantec/Staff coordination

Task 2: Outreach & Pre-Marketing - 3 months

The Consultants will schedule and conduct in-person meetings with the identified key stakeholders and target developers, but might conduct phone outreach to regional players in order to expedite findings. As part of this effort, the Consultants will have more detailed discussions with the Rio/29 landowners with whom they met previously.

We will seek to gather the following information from the pre-marketing process:

- Interested property owner(s)
- Interested developer(s)
- For each of the above an understanding of (as applicable):
 1. general pros/cons of a target location;
 2. existing zoning and key zoning issues;
 3. comprehensive plan conformity, as relevant;
 4. the developer's need to acquire a site or partner with an owner;
 5. the need for or desirability of site assemblage;
 6. a preliminary assessment of site readiness; and
 7. the need for certain improvements/commitments by County.

The deliverable will be presented by Stantec to the Board this summer, and will include the information above and solicitation strategy and process such as a Request for Expressions of Interest or Request for Qualifications/Proposals.

The proposal from Stantec includes a cost not to exceed of \$50,000 Fee + and estimated \$5,550 in reimbursable costs for a total cost of approximately \$56,000. The recommended source of funding is the Economic Development Fund and there is sufficient funding to cover this expense.

The direction provided for the Rio/Route 29 small area plan is foundational to the work outlined in the attached proposed scope of work. Staff recommends the Board authorize the change order to Stantec for the Pre- development services contingent on action taken on the Rio/Route 29 small area plan at the joint Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors meeting on January 30, 2018.

Mr. Walker reminded the Board they had been given an executive summary in their agenda packet, so he would not be going into a lot of detail. He presented a list of key milestones:

- December 13, 2017 – Stantec conducts work session
- December 18, 2017 – Board takes public comment
- December 20, 2017 – Board provides the following direction to staff:
- Moratorium on further discussion of potential courts relocation.
- Continue exploring development of facilities in Albemarle County
- Resume negotiations with City on parking issues
- Land Use valuation should be recognized in City/County revenue sharing formula

He said the goal presented to Stantec was to determine the potential for development/redevelopment of existing areas, with a primary focus on Rio/Route 29. He explained that the tasks in the proposed scope of work were: 1) Information gathering and preparatory work (internal staff work); and 2) Outreach and premarketing. He said these tasks would be undertaken to create the deliverables: summary of discussions; key takeaways; and overall recommendations that would inform a solicitation strategy and process, such as requests for expressions of interest or request for qualifications and proposals.

Mr. Walker explained that Task 1 began now and ran through early March, and Task 2 would take place from March to May, followed by a presentation to the Board of Supervisors in June or July. He said the Stantec proposal included a cost not to exceed \$50 thousand, with an estimated \$5,550 in reimbursable costs, for a total of approximately \$56 thousand. He said the recommended funding source was the Economic Development Fund, which had sufficient funding to cover the expense. He said that support for the design framework for the Rio/Route 29 Small Area Plan was foundational to the pre-marketing work described in the scope of work. He explained that implementation strategies developed for the Rio/Route 29 Small Area Plan would be informed by this work so the two efforts would remain closely aligned. He stated there had already been a good deal of conversation between staff and Stantec about how to align the work of the Rio/Route 29 Small Area Plan and the premarketing outreach, and they had an upcoming meeting as well as other future discussions planned.

Mr. Walker said staff recommended that the Board approve the change order to Stantec for predevelopment work as described in the attached scope of work.

Ms. Mallek asked if a County staff person would be involved in conversations with landowners or if they would be doing this on their own with their staff using an approved script. Mr. Walker responded that he does not know how forthcoming landowners would be with their opinions if County staff was present, and Stantec believed they would be better able to obtain candor and more complete information.

Mr. Dill asked how Stantec would present the vision to landowners. Mr. Trevor Henry, Director of Facilities and Environmental Services, addressed Mr. Dill's question. He said the initial phase of work with Stantec, Greystone, and staff would be to align the Rio/Route 29 planning work. He said they would query developers and property owners for general interest and appetite for development and what role the County might play in that. He emphasized they would stay connected to Mr. Graham's staff, which is working on the Rio/Route 29 project. He said they would reach out to regional and national developers and not just to local property owners.

Ms. McKeel stated that her understanding was they would be looking at a request for information, which would be issued locally and nationally. She said they had national developers knocking on the door with ideas and thoughts over the past couple of years, and this is a way to get more detailed information and see what interest there is and what the proposals could look like.

Mr. Walker confirmed the accuracy Ms. McKeel's understanding.

Mr. Randolph remarked that from reading the Stantec report, it appears they are conducting a SWOT analysis. He noted they had received feedback regarding a lack of awareness in the community that the Board is looking for a regional transportation hub to be potentially located in the same area, which he believes is critical to how people would assess the questionnaire. He added that it should be expressed to people that the Board is looking at this as a potential area of innovation as they approach it for redevelopment, and there should be a picture or vision of how this all fits together. He said a straight questionnaire would not get accurate responses because they would be based on a set of biases and implicit assumptions people had, as they would think about what is there now and not about what is proposed for tomorrow.

Mr. Walker said the small area plan design framework discussion held last week included representations of the transportation hub embedded in the GSI. He added that the design framework would inform the vision for what the area would become, and if there was a general understanding reflected in the design framework to include a regional transportation hub, it had to be part of the conversations held with property owners and developers so they know what they are being asked to have an opinion about. He said staff believes they have enough direction from the Board and Planning Commission to move forward.

Ms. McKeel emphasized that her primary transit concern is with what is needed immediately, and she hopes they would be moving forward with transit changes in the next year or two. She said she supports having transit as part of the discussion.

Mr. Dill agreed with the transit aspect and commented that they hired a nationally recognized Director of Planning in order to provide a vision. He said he was impressed by Peter Katz and his presentation of form-based code, as well as his leadership, vision, and ability to gain community buy in.

Ms. Palmer recalled that the Stantec report called for a parking garage in order to get the needed density and a walkable community. She asked if they are still looking at the same properties they considered in the previous study, with the assumption that at some point they would build a parking garage. She said she was confused as to what the Board was talking about putting into this monetarily since they had taken the courts off the discussion, at least temporarily. She asked what kinds of things Stantec would be talking about with property owners.

Mr. Walker responded that the scope of work anticipates that Stantec would ask those questions of property owners and the development community in terms of what would get them interested in a public-private partnership. He said one example was structured parking to obtain density and there may be other options, such as civic space or road infrastructure, of which they are not aware – which is why they planned to have these conversations.

Ms. Palmer commented that a developer would have to have some predictability and certainty to answer the questions that Stantec posed. She used the analogy of chicken and egg, as the Board does not know where they are so they cannot say a lot to property owners and developers.

Mr. Walker said if the Board is comfortable enough with the outcome of Stantec's engagement to issue a request for proposal or required qualifications, there would be associated timeframes.

Mr. Randolph remarked that things could move quickly if a developer found that the Charlottesville area offers what they need. He cautioned against offering too much specificity, as it could have the negative effect of discouraging certain types of development.

Mr. Dill said there would be an infinite number of people interested in doing projects, but the issue is how the County would control the neighborhood model, green space, walking trails, and the atmosphere of what is desired for the community. He said they need to have an idea of what they want, including what they desire in a transportation hub, density, form, and code. He said they do not want to just wait for somebody to show up with a plan.

Ms. Mallek disagreed. She recalled how they struggled for 12 years with Places 29 and had resistance from landowners who had other ideas besides what the County had planned for the site. She expressed support for an approach in which they demonstrate to potential developers that any number of things could be in the basket and they are seeking ideas. She said they need to put the developers' skills to work, though the County could certainly react to ideas and help mold them. She said she does not want to saddle County staff with the task of coming up with the design, which could take years to do.

Mr. Dill remarked that he does not think they are disagreeing, but that they need to have their own internal processes.

Ms. Palmer stated that she thought they were moving to form-based code.

Ms. Mallek stressed that small decisions regarding shapes, details, and colors should come from the applicants, and she recalled that when they used to require extensive plans that were costly and required much work of developers, it caused resentment.

Ms. Palmer recalled Stantec's assessment that the local market would not support private investment for structured parking and that parking is cheap locally. She expressed concern with the timing, as she is not sure they are ready for this and wonders if they should be doing more work on form-based code and the small area plan before figuring out what they are willing to spend.

Mr. Randolph interjected that they could do both simultaneously.

Mr. Walker expressed his view that the implementation conversation and this initiative could be parallel.

Ms. Mallek said the parking would evolve as soil gets more expensive as density grows.

Ms. McKeel commented that the developers would propose what the market would bear and the County needs to hear what they have to say.

Mr. Walker agreed with Ms. Palmer's characterization of chicken and egg, as they are trying to deal with both.

Mr. Gallaway asked if Stantec would make sure the focus is on the Rio/Route 29 area and would seek confirmation from developers that this is the right target area. He stressed the importance of facilitating ideas in the conversation.

Mr. Henry confirmed Mr. Gallaway's interpretation, adding that if developers offered ideas for areas that are outside the Rio/Route 29 area, Stantec would bring those to the Board's attention.

Ms. McKeel **proposed** that the Board authorize the change order to Stantec for the predevelopment services, contingent on action taken on the Rio/Route 29 Small Area Plan, at the joint Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors meeting on January 30, 2018. The **motion** was seconded by Mr. Randolph.

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

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

Agenda.

Item No. 22a. **Discussion:** HB 1148 Landes' bill to review revenue sharing agreements.

Ms. Mallek informed the Board that an update on HB 1148 regarding review of revenue sharing agreements was already on the agenda. She said that Delegate Landes had informed her that the bill was being revised, but she does not know if it is ready.

Mr. Kamptner added that he had communicated with David Blount earlier that afternoon, and there was nothing tangible to look at yet other than the bill that was filed at the end of January.

Item 22b. **Discussion:** Continuation of Winery Legislation Work Group.

Ms. Mallek said she had sent an email around asking that people consider extending the Winery Legislation Work Group for another year, as Delegate Hugo had proposed even more stringent changes to the state building code that would apply to all the County's wineries, breweries, and distilleries. She said she had asked Zoning Administrator, Amelia McCulley, to stay on and there was a slightly increased responsibility for Michael Bellinger, the County's building official, who had come up with some good suggestions for common sense compromise elements that would increase public safety but not require that every barn in the community have sprinklers, which she said was absolutely ludicrous.

Ms. Palmer asked what maintaining it for another year would mean. Ms. McKeel explained that there was a new bill that proposed to carry forward the study, with Margaret Walker of the Cooperative Extension as a facilitator, replacing the facilitator from the environmental negotiation people who was hired by the administration, to do more localized, facilitated discussions. She said that various suggestions by Albemarle County were adopted by the task force but had not been welcomed by the General Assembly thus far. She said the County's in-house group would be kept together to prepare suggestions as sessions get underway in March.

Ms. Palmer said she wonders if this impacts the Department of Community Development and its work plan. Ms. Mallek replied that it would take up time to attend weekly meetings.

Mr. Graham stepped forward and appreciated Ms. Palmer's concern, though he said he feels it is time well invested in order to stay at the forefront on this issue.

Ms. Mallek said they would go forward and let Ms. McCulley know that the Zoning Department has the Board's blessing, unless there is objection.

Ms. Mallek asked Mr. Richardson to update the Board on the structure for the CACVB discussions, as they only had until July 1 to figure this out and she wants to retain the momentum. Additionally, she asked that he determine the County point person to organize and reach out to officials from the state parks system to assist the County with a revisit of the Biscuit Run Master Plan. She recalled that the County staff members who were most involved with this previously were Dan Mahon and Bob Crickenberger. She expressed support for the addition of bicycling as a permanent activity in the level area where Avon Street comes together with Route 20, where there is limited road access.

Mr. Randolph commented on a recent *Daily Progress* editorial in support of Delegate Bell's HB 1546 that would mandate a referendum if the Board were to decide to move the courts from County-owned property downtown to other County-owned property. He recounted that he had provided the Board with a copy of his proposed counter-editorial, and he emphasized that he is not speaking for the Board but as one single Supervisor. However, he said, a representative from the newspaper wanted to make sure that what he had written represents the thinking of at least the majority of the Board, prior to publishing his response. He asked Supervisors to weigh in as to whether they are in favor of communicating that his opinion represents the majority of the Board and asked them to suggest any changes to what he wrote. Mr. Randolph said he feels it is important for the public to know there is another set of issues besides the moving of the courts, and this raised issues of good governance, which his editorial is designed to address.

Mr. Dill asked if the option to shorten it so it could be included as a letter was given, and if the issue was with the length of the editorial.

Ms. Palmer said that if it were shortened, it could be accommodated as a letter to the editor.

Mr. Randolph replied that in order to make the arguments he wants to make, he would need the additional length. He pointed out that the editorial board took quite a bit of time to make their argument, and he wants to have at least equal time to refute and counter the argument. He said if three other members of the Board do not agree, he could revise it and send it as a letter to the editor, but if four members support it, then he would so indicate and leave it to the editor to decide whether to publish it as a counter editorial.

Ms. Mallek promised to read his letter again tonight.

Mr. Gallaway commented that he intentionally did not read the letter so that he could comment on the process and not the content. He expressed his view that *The Daily Progress* should not require a majority of the Board to make a publishing decision. He stated that if an official communication were to come from the Board that was properly written by the Chair, and the Board had a chance to weigh in and endorse it coming from them as a whole, he supports that approach. Mr. Gallaway stated that he also supports Mr. Randolph's ability to write his own personal opinion on the matter, and feels it is odd that the paper is pushing the Board to essentially make an editorial decision.

Ms. McKeel recounted a situation the previous year when she was Chair, in which the Board was in agreement and had something to explain to the community about Ragged Mountain, but the newspaper refused to publish it. She said they had to pay \$1,200 to have it printed.

Mr. Gallaway added that he would hold his same opinion regardless of the content of the letter, and he feels that having a Supervisor take the initiative to write a letter is newsworthy in itself.

Agenda Item No. 23. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Richardson stated that staff would continue to work with Board schedules to look for time in April to plan a Board/staff retreat and would try to get back to the Board on this quickly.

Agenda Item No. 24. Closed Meeting. *(if needed)*

There was no need for an additional Closed Meeting.

Agenda Item No. 25. Adjourn to February 13, 2018, 3:00 p.m., Room 241.

At 7:24 p.m., with no further business to come before the Board, Ms. Mallek adjourned the meeting to February 13, 2018, 3:00 p.m., Room 241.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 05/09/2018
Initials CKB