

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on February 26, 2019, at 5:00 p.m., Room 241, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from February 21, 2019.

PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill, Mr. Ned Gallaway, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer (arrived at 5:04 p.m.) 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.

STAFF PRESENT: Deputy County Executive, Doug Walker, Assistant County Executive, Trevor Henry, Director, Office of Management and Budget, Lori Allshouse, Budget Manager, Andy Bowman, Grants and Budget Analyst, Holly Bittle, Senior Budget Analyst, Tia Mitchell, and Chief Financial Officer, Bill Letteri.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 5:02 p.m., by the Chair, Mr. Gallaway.

Mr. Gallaway introduced Board staff and the presiding security officers, Officer Peter Schellinger and Officer Jason Freishtat. Board members, followed by County staff, introduced themselves.

Mr. Gallaway stated that Ms. Palmer was in transit to the meeting.

Agenda Item No. 2. Resolution of Appreciation for Sharon Taylor.

Mr. Randolph read and **moved** to adopt of the following resolution recognizing Sharon Taylor for her service to the County, upon her retirement:

A Resolution of Appreciation for Sharon Claytor Taylor

WHEREAS, Sharon Claytor Taylor, CMC, has faithfully served the County of Albemarle for over 42 years, serving in multiple roles, including: Appraisal Clerk then Land Use Clerk in Real Estate, Clerk and Secretary in Inspections, Administrative Secretary I and II in Zoning, Office Associate IV in Zoning, Recording Secretary in Planning, Office Associate IV in Planning, and Clerk of the Planning Commission and Planning Boards since 2007; and

WHEREAS, Sharon has supported the Planning Commission and Planning and Zoning Boards with countless hours of detailed attention to the preparation of meeting minutes and action memos and providing material promptly for decision-makers in the community and helping the County engage the community effectively through its boards and committees; and

WHEREAS, Sharon has demonstrated herself as a consummate professional, obtaining her Certified Municipal Clerk (CMC) designation from the International Institute of Municipal Clerks, being the first of only three Planning Commission Clerks to hold this prestigious designation in the State of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, Sharon has proven herself to be a true team-player, infusing her work with honesty, adaptability, respectfulness, a willingness to help others and a determined positive attitude.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, do hereby commend Sharon Taylor, for her many years of exceptional service to the residents of Albemarle County, the Planning Commission, and Planning and Zoning Boards; and for leaving the Department of Community Development strong, with the knowledge that proceedings have been transcribed, documented and archived by the contribution of a dedicated public servant such as Sharon Taylor; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting of the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors in perpetuity as a testament to the high esteem in which Sharon is held by this Board and with sincere gratitude for an extraordinary life of service to this community.

Signed this 26th day of February 2019

Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. 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. Taylor said she was honored and blessed to have her career with Albemarle County. She said she was proud to have earned the CMC, she has seen many changes and challenges, and have really enjoyed working with the Commission, the Board, and its great team members. She said she would miss everybody and thanked the Board for this recognition.

Agenda Item No. 3. **Work Session:** FY 2019-2020 Operating and Capital Budget.

- General Overview:
 - Capital, CIP (pgs. 241 – 279)
 - Debt Management (pgs. 281 – 290)

- Brief overview of changes associated with the following expenditure categories:
 - Administration (pgs. 65 – 84)
 - Judicial (pgs. 85 – 96)
 - Public Safety (pgs. 97 – 110)
 - Public Works (pgs. 111 – 119)

Ms. Lori Allshouse began the discussion with an overview of today's agenda. Ms. Allshouse said, as staff moves in the capital conversation, there are some important policy considerations for the Board to think about and discuss. The CY 2019 tax rate increase is all about capital and debt. There is also an additional tax rate increase built into the CIP modeling. At the prior budget work session, she shared with the Board some of staff's suggestions for use of the \$4.7 million in Unobligated General Fund fund balance (page 172). Staff believes it is important for the Board to think about the categories for use of those funds. She stated that last spring and during the fall, staff talked about \$12 million in quality of life projects for parks and bike/pedestrian projects. This is the time for Board members to be comfortable with where those funds are in the CIP. Also, in the CIP, programmed in FY20, was use of \$2.0 million advancing strategic priorities reserve; the funds are not dedicated to a specific topic. She also asked Board members to share any policy issues they wished to discuss.

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide on Use of \$4.7 million in Unobligated General Fund fund Balance (Page 172)

Economic Development Fund	\$3,200,000
Housing Fund	\$ 700,000
Broadband Incentives	\$ 800,000
Total	\$4,700,000

Ms. Allshouse commented that these funds are recommended for use in FY20, but some can be used in FY19.

Ms. Mallek commented that to date, in previous budgets, the County has spent approximately \$250,000 on broadband incentives. She asked if they have the capacity to spend \$800,000 in this period of time. Mr. Andy Bowman responded that in FY18, the Board allocated \$200,000 to broadband which has been reappropriated, which totals \$1.0 million for the Broadband Authority.

Ms. Mallek said she does not how to interpret how the County would be able to use these funds in the next year. Mr. Randolph said when the Board gets to this item in the budget, he and Ms. Palmer will be able to weigh in on behalf of the Authority about the rationale for the \$800,000. He added that everything has been laid out, and it is a case of positioning the County.

Ms. Palmer said by putting \$800,000 in broadband incentives, hopefully companies know that the County wants to partner with them. In terms of the economic development fund, she is concerned about people coming to try to get that money.

Mr. Gallaway said he does think the economic development fund was money people could look at that they could come and get; it is money the County is strategically positioning for its use to maximize investments on the County's behalf. This is not grant money available for private growth.

Ms. Allshouse said the funds will be discussed as part of the Economic Development department, but it is also important to think about those funds in terms of capital investment.

Mr. Randolph commented that these accounts could be characterized as leveraged accounts designed to create a multiplier effect in terms of the amount of money in play.

Mr. Richardson noted that Mr. Walker and Mr. Roger Johnson were present to answer questions about the fund. He reminded Supervisors that the County was part of a regional partnership and is tightly connected to the state. If they look at the portfolio projects they are considering for this area that might qualify for a local partnership, it would take about \$1.9 million. He emphasized that if all the projects were to move forward in a positive way, it would take \$1.9 million and leave about \$1.3 million moving forward over that period of time.

Ms. Palmer asked when she could bring up the County's solid waste issues. Mr. Richardson responded when the discussion gets to the \$2.0 priorities reserve.

Ms. Allshouse reviewed the FY20–24 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). She presented a slide with a pie chart of Recommended FY20–24 CIP Revenues (\$207.6 million) with data: Planned Borrowed Proceeds (74%), General Fund Transfer (13%), Local Revenue (4%), state Revenue (2%), Transfers (5%), Proffer Revenue (less than 1%). She reminded the Board that in 2016, voters approved a bond referendum of up to \$35 million in school projects, including the expansion of Woodbrook Elementary School and modernization and security projects at schools throughout the community. She emphasized that the bond referendum modeled and shared an associated tax rate increase that had been deferred. She noted that the CIP had \$35.1 million for High School Center 2, \$12 million for school investments, and \$12 million for quality-of-life projects, for a total of \$59.1 million.

Ms. Allshouse reminded Supervisors of the eight scenarios they had considered and that the Board asked to program a scenario with an up to 4.2-cent tax rate increase by FY22. She noted that they had been able to defer the tax increase as a result of strong revenues. She said the FY20–24 CIP model included a 1.5-cent tax rate increase in CY19 and 1.5-cent increase in CY20, fully dedicated to CIP equity and debt service. She emphasized that this does not include anticipated operating expenses for High School Center 2, which they believe would be in FY22. She noted that the model projects debt issuances were in 2019, 2021, and 2023 and that Mr. Letteri and his staff would carefully monitor this and may adjust the timing of the debt issuance.

Ms. Mallek asked for confirmation that High School Center 2 would not be built and ready this year, though they would put a placeholder in the budget for which they had to plan to be able to pay for it over several years. Ms. Allshouse responded that was correct.

Ms. Mallek said taxpayers may ask why they were not billed when the time came rather than now and asked staff why they were billing taxpayers now for something they would pay for in two or three years. Mr. Letteri explained that the burden on the planned debt service occurred once the debt was actually issued -- and if they spread the borrowing over several years, then the burden to the taxpayers would happen over that period of time and not all in the first year.

Ms. Allshouse pointed out that cash equity was needed and 100% was not borrowed for every project.

Mr. Letteri presented the following slide with a graph entitled “CIP Equity Funding–Pay As You Go.” It contained data:

	FY19 Projected	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	Total
General Fund Allocation to Debt and Capital							
Debt Service Obligation	\$23.4 million	\$26.0	\$25.2	\$31.9	\$29.5	\$31.4	\$144.0
CIP Pay-Go (GFT)	\$3.7 million	5.1	8.8	3.1	6.4	\$5.4	28.8
	\$27.1 million	\$31.1	\$34.0	\$35.0	\$35.9	\$36.8	\$172.8

CIP Pay-Go Goal: 3% of General Fund Revenues

	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24
Goal	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
GFT	1.7%	2.8%	1%	1.9%	1.6%

Mr. Letteri explained that these amounts represented transfer to capital each year, with the top amount representing what was used to pay debt service and the second line representing ongoing cash. He said they would like this number to be 3% of revenues over time as this was very important to rating agencies as a demonstration of consistent, reliable cash. He explained that the lower chart was how they expected to perform over the next five years, and this was an improvement compared to the past. He remarked that they have always been able to achieve equity ratios through the use of other funding sources such as prior year excess revenues, interest income, etc.

Ms. Mallek recalled that several years ago, following the advice of Davenport and Company, they remastered the policy on how quickly they were paying these off and asked if they were still using this. Mr. Letteri confirmed this. He added that they tried to pay off at least one-half the debt over a period of 10 years and were actually ahead of that.

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide with a pie chart of Recommended FY20–24 Expenditures (\$207.6 million). The pie chart included categories: School Division (49%), Judicial (20%), Public Safety (7%), Public Works (5%), Community Development (1%), Health and Welfare (1%), Parks, Recreation, and Culture (6%), Technology (1%), ACE (1%), Water Resources (<1%), and Other (9%). She pointed out that expenditures equal revenues and the CIP was shared between schools and local government. She emphasized that the recommended CIP includes mandates, obligations, maintenance, and replacement projects, continues with capital projects approved in FY19, and adds a new capital project in FY20: Western Albemarle Americans with Disability Act improvements and softball field restroom facility. She turned the presentation over to Trevor Henry.

Mr. Henry presented a recap of projects included in the FY20–24 CIP. He noted that this was an amendment year, and only the ADA improvements to Western Albemarle meet the criteria and would fall under the schools functional area at \$529,000. The first project he reviewed was the courts facilities addition/renovation at \$41 million. He said they would soon issue an RFP and expect design work to begin this fall, with expected construction to begin in late summer 2021. He said that the total project cost

was expected to be \$44 million, with \$3 million to be provided from appropriations. The next project reviewed was the Transportation Leveraging Program and Bicycle/Pedestrian Quality-of-Life Projects. He said the transportation program cost was \$2 million, which would allow them to draw an equal match from the state. He said the bicycle/pedestrian projects were \$6 million and the funds were currently within the functional area category of "Other" but would be moved to Community Development. The projects listed under bicycle/pedestrian quality-of-life included: Old Lynchburg Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement, Avon Street Extended Shared-Use Path, Tabor Street and Hilltop Street Sidewalks, Rio Road Shared-Use Path, Berkmar Drive Shared-Use Path, and Ashwood Boulevard Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements. He noted that most of these projects were in the planning/conceptual stage, and County expect to leverage the majority of the \$6 million as a one-to-one match during the upcoming VDOT revenue sharing cycle of 2019. He pointed out that construction would not begin for several years with the exception of the Ashwood Boulevard project, which may begin next year.

Mr. Henry next reviewed projects under Parks, Recreation & Culture. He listed projects to be undertaken over the five-year period for a total of \$11.6 million: Darden Town Park Athletic Field Improvements, Hedgerow Property Trail Park, Buck Island Creek Park/Boat Launch, and Rivanna Reservoir Boat Launch. He noted that \$5.6 million of this funding would go towards routine maintenance of City-County-owned parks maintenance, County-Owned parks maintenance, and Crozet Park maintenance.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Henry to comment on a suggestion brought up during the public hearing that Biscuit Run, which might be more useful for the community, be placed ahead of Hedgerow. Mr. Henry responded that staff anticipated this question and have created a Biscuit Run–Hedgerow Park Comparison matrix chart. He presented the chart, which listed the facilities/features that would be available at each park and the projected costs for each phase. He characterized Biscuit Run as a more costly and longer-term project.

Mr. Randolph remarked that the comparison was a helpful analysis of the uses, though their potential fund generator capacity was not factored in and should be. He added that multi-modal activity and accessibility to the greatest number of people were additional dimensions to consider. He emphasized that they should consider the maximum use per dollar of County money to generate the best recreational value for County and regional residents as an important consideration.

Ms. Palmer agreed with Mr. Randolph's request that they know more about potential fund leveraging for each project. Mr. Henry responded that the Parks Department could provide a report on leveraging opportunities. He noted that in both cases, they have the opportunity to draw on VDOT money for the entrance. He asked Blake Aplanalp to discuss leveraging.

Mr. Blake Aplanalp, Project Management Division, acknowledged the opportunity to draw on parks access grants and emphasized that because Biscuit Run was state property, it qualified for a higher grant of \$450,000 per entrance, compared to the typical \$250,000. He noted that to obtain the grants, they must meet certain VDOT standards of access.

Mr. Henry remarked that if Biscuit Run were included in the ranking of projects, it would probably rank second behind Darden-Towe, as it was a blend of urban and rural with a neighborhood park connection. He continued that if they were limited to \$6,000, he would recommend they at least get the Phase I access and parking completed so they could get use of the park as soon as possible.

Mr. Randolph remarked that he saw an opportunity for the County to try to pursue \$15 million in state funding within increments of \$5 million per year over three years. He pointed out that the Director of Conservation Resources wrote in a letter that the expectation was the County would take state funding, which now was not available. He said the state wants the County to get the park open promptly, which they are trying to do, though the original tranche funding was not going to be available in the time period they thought it would be. He said they need to do alternative planning; he thinks the state has a role, and the County has to make a commitment before asking the state for assistance.

Ms. Palmer remarked that she would not want to bank on the state doing anything, though it was pretty obvious that this park provides access to the most people. She expressed support for switching out Biscuit Run for Hedgerow.

Ms. Mallek said she agrees that Phase I (a) of Biscuit Run was a great way to spend the money. She asked staff to consider what small investments could be made to allow small vehicle access to a much more restrained place at Hedgerow. She emphasized that a transfer of the County initial investment to Biscuit Run would give them "skin in the game" and garner more respect from the state that they are serious.

Mr. Henry remarked that this was a decision point. He surveyed the Board for consensus about replacing Hedgerow with Biscuit Run.

Mr. Dill remarked that he was in general agreement with this. He asked who applies for and researches the grants. Mr. Henry responded that typically the grant request comes through a functional department and then comes to the Office of Management and Budget for management of the execution of it. He said it was his understanding that the access grant was underutilized, and in staff conversations with VDOT, they feel pretty comfortable they could draw down once they apply for it.

Ms. Mallek said that what was important to her was that the two separate dollar amounts were the same, and she would push back strongly if it means knocking out the other two small ones because they have been waiting around for years.

Mr. Henry indicated that it appears Board members support proceeding with Biscuit Run.

Mr. Henry next reviewed school projects (\$101.1 million), including High School Center 2, \$12 million in future school improvement projects programmed for FY21, and the \$529,000 Western Albemarle Americans With Disabilities Act improvements and a softball field restroom facility. He next reviewed Water Resources projects, which included \$186,575 in new funding plus carry-forward funds and would get them to a bridge year of \$1.6 million. He said this would allow them to continue with TMDL compliance, the watershed restoration program, and drainage infrastructure. He explained that the carry-forward consisted of revenues from a joint project with Charlottesville and \$650,000 in grants. He said they would continue to evaluate data obtained from cameras in pipes as they looked to extend service and would develop a program recommendation for the second year and beyond.

Mr. Randolph explained that they were still in the exploration and identification phase of water management problems and were not dedicating any money to remediation. He mentioned that there was to be a projected tax increase this year dedicated solely to water resource management that would contribute to infrastructure improvements in the urban ring planned residential communities and in the rural area. He emphasized that they were undercapitalized to cover risk exposure as they continue the exploration and identification phase.

Ms. Mallek remarked that many things were being done in addition to researching those things that they do not know about yet.

Ms. McKeel noted that they were not putting money into a fund they could use once they finish what they were doing now. She said the building of a fund would provide a resource to utilize after the mapping work was completed.

Ms. Palmer pointed out that they were dedicating seven cents.

Ms. McKeel acknowledged this, though she said they were not saving money in a bank from which they could access.

Mr. Henry then provided an overview of the following list of other CIP projects:

- ACE Program - \$500,000 per year
- COB Window Replacement
- Fire Rescue Apparatus Replacement Program
- Police radio, video and computer replacement programs
- NIFI projects
- Facilities, Parks, and School maintenance
- County server upgrades

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide entitled "Recommended FY20–24 CIP Operating Impacts." She emphasized the importance of considering the operating costs of capital projects. The slide contained a chart with a list of several projects and estimated operating costs each year over this time period.

Ms. Mallek asked about the operating costs of the electronic alerting system. Ms. Allshouse said she would have to get back with those costs.

Mr. Henry presented a list of examples of highly-ranked capital requests not included in the recommended CIP. The list consisted of 12 projects and said he expects to see many of these come back into the cycle next year.

Mr. Henry presented items on a watch list of potential future requests:

- Volunteer Fire Rescue Facilities Capital Maintenance Program
- Full Implementation of the Community Recreation Needs Assessment
- Future Master Plan implementations
- Potential future transportation-related items
- Water Resources Program

Ms. McKeel pointed out that transportation-related items were on the watch list and that they may meet to discuss the provision of transit to areas of the County that are not being served.

Mr. Dill asked when there would be some kind of dollar estimate for transit. Ms. McKeel responded that part of the committee's next work session discussion would involve how to obtain community agreement around transit, and they have a cost estimate formula the Transit Partnership Board would vote on.

Ms. Mallek noted that several commuter runs have been started and asked if there was a bucket in which they could put a small amount or if they should have funding for small projects come from another source. Ms. McKeel commented that she thought there was a request for \$132,000 in this year's budget to match federal funds for a Crozet commuter route.

Mr. Henry next reviewed the category of "Other", which included \$2 million in one-time money for Advancing Strategic Priorities Capital Reserve. He explained that this placeholder has been set aside to allow the Board to make some discretionary allocations. He presented a chart with potential items this funding could be allocated to: Climate Action Planning, Outdoor Recreational Parks and Amenities, Economic Development Program, School Space Needs, Infrastructure Planning, Aging Urban Neighborhood Revitalization, Court Complex Expansion/Upgrade Program, Rio/29 Area Redevelopment, and Broadband Expansion. He added that these items could involve transit, Biscuit Run, or a recycling center.

Ms. Palmer asked if the \$2 million would be over a five-year period. Mr. Henry responded that it was programmed for FY20.

Ms. Palmer noted that the RSWA would provide a cost estimate to install a composting facility at Ivy, for which they hope the City would be a partner. She said this would fit under the category of climate change, though they do not have a timeline or an estimate of annual operating costs.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarification as to the time period for the \$2 million to be allocated. Mr. Henry clarified that it was in the FY20–24 period but represents one-time money in FY20.

Mr. Richardson explained that they say FY20–24 because it was money within the five-year plan and could be spent any time during this period. He continued that they have three pots set aside: Sustaining the Organization, Supporting Strategic Initiatives, and Reserve for Emerging Opportunities. He emphasized that if the Board was interested in talking about items specific to the CIP or discretionary extra money, today would be the day to provide direction to staff before the tax rate was set.

Mr. Dill pointed out that \$700,000 was expected to go towards affordable housing from this year's one-time money and suggested that they work towards the establishment of a housing fund as a regular annual line item in the budget as they have done with the ACE Program.

Ms. Palmer agreed with Mr. Dill's suggestion that they establish regular appropriations for housing, though she would first like to know how they are going to use it.

Mr. Dill remarked that a lot of money go through Social Services for housing vouchers. He said he thought the \$700,000 in one-time money for housing should be \$1 million and they should establish permanent funding.

Mr. Randolph said he agrees with Mr. Dill's point, but there was a difference between funding housing through unobligated General Fund fund balance and \$2 million spread out over five years. He suggested they hold off on Mr. Dill's idea because at the same time they talked about the establishment of an ongoing housing department, they should also consider the establishment of broadband as a regular budget item. He emphasized that if housing and broadband were strategic priorities of the Board, then they should be identified and funded as such.

Ms. McKeel asked if this would be the time to request funding for a sidewalk project in an aging urban neighborhood. Mr. Richardson responded affirmatively.

Ms. Palmer pointed out that there was a dangerous area along Old Lynchburg Road between I-64 and the City limits she would submit for funding. She knows that staff was working on a larger grant-funded project -- but if this does not work, they would be stuck with a whole neighborhood of children and parents.

Ms. Mallek said it was her understanding there was a bucket for Brookhill river access that would involve cleanup of the site, making the existing parking lot useable, and a slide. She said she would like to put this on the list if funding that has not yet been set aside. Ms. Amy Smith, Assistant Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation, responded that they could do a soft opening of Brookhill River Park with no improvements of parking or a slide, and they could get people kayaking this spring.

Ms. Palmer said she would like to see the County fund a composting facility from one-time money.

Mr. Gallaway remarked that he does not have a specific project in mind but as he looks at the nine strategic priorities, it occurs to him that some of them were funded and should be removed from consideration for one-time funding. He cited the court complex as an example.

Mr. Henry said he could clarify the list of priorities shown in the slide.

Mr. Gallaway commented that smaller scale public safety and transportation projects sometimes get lost, as they often do not score well. He added that there may be some projects that would require a small amount of funding yet yield significant results.

Mr. Randolph recounted how they used NIFI to address these and it looks like a great experiment, with projects to roll out this year -- although they may require a lot of staff time.

Ms. Allshouse continued the presentation. She said she would highlight the first year of the CIP, which was FY20 and was recommended at \$68.4 million. She presented pie charts of Revenue and

Expenditure categories, which she noted Supervisors have access to on Page 242 of the budget document. She presented a list of FY20 Capital Budget Highlights:

- High School Capacity and Improvements Center 2—construction funding
- Parks and Recreation Quality of Life Projects
- Water Resources—carry forward funding and one-time money
- Maintenance/Replacement of County Facilities, Parks, and Schools
- Transportation Leveraging Program
- ACE Program Funding
- Advancing Strategic Priorities Reserve
- Fire Rescue Apparatus Replacement Program
- COB McIntire Windows Replacement—construction funding
- Western Albemarle ADA improvements and softball field restroom facility

She said the annual capital budgets has averaged \$39 million per year over the past five years and noted that the proposed amount for FY20 would be significantly greater at \$68.4 million. She said this would require some one-time support to shore up CIP debt management and increased attention to Facilities Planning and Construction.

Mr. Letteri reviewed CIP debt management: Pages 281–290 of the document. He presented a slide entitled “Summary of Debt and Projected Borrowing Activity”:

Existing Debt		Projected New Debt	
Balance at end of FY18		FY19 - 24	
Schools	\$122 million	Schools	\$101.3 million
Gen Gov't	<u>\$ 70.2 million</u>	Gen Gov't	<u>\$ 64.3 million</u>
Total	\$192.2 million	Total	\$165.6 million
LESS Retired Debt \$117.8 million =		Total Projected Debt \$239.8 million	
FY19–24		FY19–24	

He remarked that in spite of the debt increase, they have maintained their ratios of Debt Service as a Percentage of General Fund and School Fund revenues and Outstanding Debt as a Percentage of Assessed Value of Taxable Property. He presented a slide with graphs of these two ratios for the period of FY19–25.

Ms. Mallek remarked that if they were to overlay dollars, it would show a dramatic increase in taxable revenue over the time period and a parallel increase in what they were investing of that. She noted that the budget has doubled in the time she has served on the Board.

Mr. Letteri said the slides give a sense of capacity, though there was then the question of affordability and the necessary tax revenue to justify the affordability.

Ms. McKeel noted that they were providing support for infrastructure for roads and water. She recognized that some segments of the population became frustrated when the Board talked about a tax increase, though they were being well-served when the Board put money towards infrastructure yet maintained favorable debt ratios. She noted that there were resident quality-of-life benefits from these infrastructure improvements. She commended staff for its work managing debt capacity and for working with the Board on it.

Mr. Letteri remarked that the Board has consistently by formula transferred revenues into capital each year, which some communities do not do.

Mr. Letteri then highlighted the list of Debt Management Strategies:

- Adhere to Board Policies and Best Practices
- Maintain 10 Year Payout Ratios
- Issue Debt Every Other Year
- Establish Short Term Credit Line
- Careful Monitoring and Leveraging of Cash
- Continued Use of Spend Plans
- Practice Just In Time Borrowing Practices
- Restructure Accounting Systems Related to Projects

Mr. Gallaway pointed out that the 1.5-cent tax increase would go to capital and there could be an economic downturn in the future, and if they were to delay the tax increase, this could place them in an adverse situation. He asked Mr. Richardson to speak to this.

Mr. Richardson confirmed that the 1.5-cent tax increase was dedicated to capital in CY19 and they plan to recommend that it be dedicated to capital in CY20 to support the debt they were assuming. He said that he agrees that if they were to put off the tax increase for two years and the economy were to slow, they could run into both capital and operating issues. He emphasized that there would be CIP needs in the foreseeable future in addition to current capital needs.

Ms. McKeel commented that they did not build the CIP in the past and are now playing catch up.

Ms. Palmer reminded Supervisors that a previous Board dropped the tax rate by five cents in 2007. She recounted how the Albemarle County Service Authority and the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority were able to use their reserves to take advantage of favorable construction costs during the recession.

Mr. Dill asked Mr. Richardson what they would have done if assessments had come in at 2% instead of 4%. Mr. Richardson responded that the budget would have been different, as there was movement in their favor that created operating revenue capacity, which enables the Board to move on strategic and operational initiatives more aggressively. He commented that there were some things in the budget they would not have seen.

Mr. Richardson summarized important points from the presentations and noted that the Board had provided some amended direction with quality-of-life projects, including the prioritization of Biscuit Run over Hedgerow, and that the Board could utilize the \$2 million in one-time money available to further specific projects at its discretion. He invited questions.

Mr. Randolph said he applauds the effort to have dedicated pennies set aside for both debt management and the CIP. He said that 1.5 cents was the minimum and he would like to see more so they could build reserves in the CIP, which he characterized as being chronically underfunded based on the needs of the schools for high school modernization, Center 2, and elementary school capacity building -- as well as for Parks and Recreation. He said the projected FY21 borrowing of \$81 million and FY23 borrowing of \$48 million would dramatically increase the amount of CIP funding that needs to be dedicated to debt service and would cost taxpayers an estimated \$64.4 million in interest payments. He emphasized that while debt service increases, the capital needs would also increase as the County grows and infrastructure ages. He noted that debt would equal 14% of the FY21 budget, with total debt to projected revenue currently at 64% -- whereas by FY21, it would increase to 80 cents to be spent on debt service.

Mr. Randolph stated that it was helpful to review the CIP and big strategic items at the beginning of budget discussions rather than at the end. He urged the Board to place a cap on annual operating expenses in order to increase the prioritization of CIP projects. He noted that the Board was good at finding ways to spend money for strategic purposes but not good at not finding ways to spend money for strategic purposes. He emphasized that spending and not spending money could both be strategic. He suggested that they look at fund balances mid-year and not spend down anticipated fund balances due to a positive variance at year end, as this removes them from potentially being spent for capital purposes. Mr. Randolph stated that meeting debt obligations and capital improvements are the most important items as they position the County for future growth, though this equation would change dramatically if population growth of the County were not occurring. He emphasized that as long as they continue to grow, they need to stay ahead for schools, parks and recreation, and police/fire and they are still falling behind -- even with a dedicated 1.5-cent tax increase. He urged the Board, after he leaves to think about the future and position the capital program. He expressed confidence that voters are aware of future growth projections and would stand behind the Board if it tries to contain annual general government costs and dedicates tax increases to the CIP to address infrastructure growth.

Recess. The Board recessed its meeting at 6:58 p.m. and reconvened at 7:10 p.m.

Ms. Allshouse resumed the presentation. She presented a slide that posed the following questions to the Board for **Operating Budget: Policy Considerations:**

Does the Board desire additional funding for any unfunded requests not included in the FY20 Recommended Budget?

- This may include departmental requests, positions, community agencies, etc.
- If so, staff would develop options for the Board's consideration

Does the Board desire to consider removing funding for any items included in the FY20 Recommended Budget?

Ms. Allshouse said the presentation would now go into the various budget categories beginning with **Administration**, which equals \$16.8 million and represents 11.1% of the overall budget, a \$1.7 million increase. She presented a pie chart with sub-category expenditures under this category. She asked Mr. Bowman to talk about the Registrar's Department.

Mr. Bowman explained that there was more year-to-year fluctuation with this item based on the number of elections that take place, with primary elections to be held in 2020, and they have set aside fund balance for one-time costs. Additionally, they have experienced increased voter turnout in recent elections and have included \$51,000 for extra equipment to help election workers in the busiest precincts.

Ms. Mallek commented that extended no excuse voting was a factor that has brought about a drastic increase in costs. Mr. Bowman responded that Mr. Jake Washburn, the County Registrar, was keeping them informed. He added that Ms. Mallek was referring to state-level legislation that passed in the General Assembly that created a no-excuse absentee voting period that would take effect in 2020, though there could be changes for 2019; the County will continue to monitor this.

Mr. Randolph recognized the Office of the County Attorney for saving taxpayers money and delivering services in a cost-effective manner.

Ms. Allshouse noted that the budget document now has a category known as Executive Leadership, based on a model of the Prince William County budget, which includes the Office of the County Executive, Communications and Public Engagement, Office of Equity and Inclusion, Office of Management and Budget, and Project Management Office. She noted that these were separate offices with separate accounting codes but they work closely with the County Executive, and are being displayed in a connected way in the budget document.

Mr. Henry reviewed Business Process Optimization, noting that there were significant budget elements under Administration that crosses functional lines and ties to this. He explained that this budget element was part of the suring up of the foundation in order to meet their public service covenant to provide every internal and external customer with an experience that was professional, empathetic, and responsive. He reminded the Board that the 2017 technology assessment led to fundamental changes in the organization that they are still working through, such as integrating and standardizing processes. He stated that the Project Management Office used to be under Facilities and Environmental Services and was created around strategic plan work. He noted that one of the recommendations of the technology assessment was to centralize and elevate the Project Management Office as one that reported to the County Executive.

Mr. Henry stated that they have created an Enterprise Architecture Council as a vetting process for new technology, reorganized the IT Department around support of the organization, and earmarked funds in FY19 to support critical needs from the technology assessment and Strategic Plan initiatives. He said the GIS web application was the first project to come through this new process and he would discuss this next week. He said they are on the cusp of implementing a time management system on the local government side this spring to be followed by schools, in a phased rollout. He said they have been trying to understand their processes through process mapping and to make sure they are solving the right things before implementing new systems.

Mr. Henry presented a slide entitled "FY20 Recommended Funding BPO":

Business Intelligence Manager (IT)	\$114,000
Project Management Support (PMO)	\$250,000
Technology Trainer (HR)	\$ 33,000
Municode (County Attorney)	\$ 20,000
Transformational/BPO Reserve (non-departmental)	\$500,000
Operating Budget Reductions	<u>(\$205,000)</u>
Total	\$712,000

Mr. Henry stated that the Business Intelligence Manager would help manage the new Data Architecture and Assessment organization. He added that at a joint meeting last year of the Board, School Board and Planning Commission, for which his office conducted extensive data analysis that would help staff and the Board to make better data-driven decisions. He said an upgrade to the County's website has been put on the back burner due to position changes and realignment of the Technology Department. He said a part-time technology trainer would be converted to full-time position under the recommended funding, at a cost of \$33,000. He said that Municode has undergone a review process and was recommended for inclusion in the 2020 budget. He noted that in previous years, departments would request funding for systems and innovation. He continued that part of the technology assessment recommendations was to centralize and vet the process so that they prioritize the organizational.

Ms. McKeel asked if attention would be given to phones. Mr. Henry responded that in the past year, they looked over the County's phone systems.

Ms. Mallek said Ms. McKeel reminded her that several citizens called to complain that with some departments there was no option to speak with a person and the only option was to leave a message that may or may not be returned. She asked that this be addressed.

Ms. McKeel added that the County's phone tree was difficult to navigate through. Mr. Henry responded that they have made improvements but are not all the way there yet.

Mr. Randolph said the slide indicates the County would incur operating budget reductions of \$205,000, which he attributes to moving out of silos through the creation of a centralized office. He said he would like to see an overall design plan that demonstrates the efficiencies introduced, as this would help demonstrate to the public that they are delivering more cost-effective and higher-quality services.

Ms. Mallek recognized that these improvements cost a lot of money, were put off for years, but are now yielding a huge benefit.

Mr. Letteri said the Finance Department was the largest department under Administration at \$6.3 million, with a proposed increase of approximately \$411,000. He said he was proud and impressed by the work of the Department of Finance in providing many services such as financial management, financial reporting, assessments, revenue collection, cash, debt management, and risk management to internal and external customers. He continued that the department responsibilities include payroll, compensation and benefits, accounts payable and receivable, capital finance, general accounting, and quarterly and annual reporting. He then reviewed significant changes for this year. He said one change was the

movement of funds relating to technology from the operating budget to the IT budget. He said the budget proposed to add a P Card Program Manager position to facilitate the purchasing process, which would be funded from revenues generated by the rebate program, as well as a Land Use Administrator to focus a broader review of revalidations. He said this would be budget-neutral as they believe it would generate enough additional revenue to pay for the new position.

Ms. Palmer asked if the administrator would also help to educate landowners as to what they must do to stay in the land use validation program. Mr. Letteri responded "yes". He invited Peter Lynch to speak more about this.

Mr. Peter Lynch, County Assessor, said that if they find that someone was not in compliance with the land use program, their first act was to notify the landowner and to tell them how to become compliant, if it was possible.

Ms. Palmer asked if the administrator could provide face-to-face assistance. She said that some older constituents that have been in the program for a long time have had difficulty interpreting what they are supposed to do, and face-to-face contact would be helpful. Mr. Lynch responded that an administrator who has knowledge of farming and farming education would make field visits, whereas in the past it was the appraisers who did this work.

Mr. Letteri continued that the third position was a Tax Accountant for the Financial Revenue Administration, who would focus on delinquencies in food and beverage taxes, as well as business property taxes. He said the benefit of greater compliance with the additional revenues generated are expected to offset the cost of the position. He said they would add two temporary positions, one for CIP management and one for grants management. He noted that there has been a spike in capital fund activity and they need focused attention to manage the spending plan, debt, and the projects themselves. He said the grants manager would live between Finance and OMB and assist with compliance and with centralization of processes to create a system that ensures grants are done consistently across the County.

Ms. Palmer asked if Mr. Letteri was referring to ongoing compliance or for just the first year for the two temporary positions. Mr. Letteri responded that they anticipate compliance to be ongoing, adding that it would increase their ability to make collections.

Mr. Dill asked if the grants manager would track already obtained grants to make sure the County administered them correctly or apply for new grants. Mr. Letteri responded that the grants manager would primarily be responsible for making sure they have the proper systems in place that ensures compliance overall. He said the responsibility was currently decentralized, and with the current volume they need to have better control.

Mr. Dill asked what the yearly grant volume was. Ms. Biddle responded that there are grants for various departments and she would have to do some research, and get back to the Board.

Mr. Randolph commented that it was generally three to five grants per year for General Government. He asked if the grants person would also be responsible for the School Division. Mr. Letteri responded that he imagines there would be a partnership with schools. He noted that the responsibility for compliance rests with Department of Finance.

Mr. Letteri reviewed the category of **Judicial**, with a proposed budget of \$5.9 million, an increase of \$581,000 or 10.9%. He presented a pie chart with the percentages represented by Sheriff's Office, Commonwealth's Attorney, Courts, and Public Defender. The chart shows that the Sheriff's office represents the largest portion at 52%, followed by Commonwealth's Attorney at 25%.

Mr. Letteri presented a slide on Notable Changes: Judicial:

- Implementation of a full year of the Public Safety Pay Plan: \$900,000 across all impacted departments.
- Two part-time Sheriff Deputy positions becoming full-time positions: \$81,000
- One Deputy Clerk position for the Clerk of the Circuitry Court: \$54,000

Mr. Randolph observed a \$7,750 increase to purchase rifles for 12 deputies and other staff. He asked if they were AR-15 rifles and why other staff would need them. Ms. Chan Bryant, Chief Deputy Sheriff, responded that they are AR-15s and that they would only be used by deputies.

Ms. Palmer asked if the two full-time deputies have been hired. Ms. Bryant confirmed they were hired full-time on July 1, but were not eligible for insurance and other benefits prior to then, though they were working 40 hours per week.

Mr. Gallaway remarked that it would be helpful to know the costs of unfunded requests. He added that he would send staff a list to be researched. He used the sergeant position in the Sheriff's Office as an example.

Mr. Walker continued the presentation with the category of **Public Safety**, with a proposed budget of \$47.9 million, an 8.1% or \$3.6 million increase. He presented a pie chart which indicates that Parks and Recreation (43%) and Fire/Rescue Services (37%) represents the largest categories, with the Regional Jail, Emergency Communications Center, Building Inspections, and others.

Mr. Walker presented a slide titled, Notable Changes: Public Safety, which contains:

- Implementation of a full year of the Public Safety Pay Plan: \$900,000 across all impacted departments
- Continues Police Sergeant (25% grant funded in FY19): \$35,000
- One additional Police Officer: \$171,000, includes one-time costs
- Part-time Public Safety Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Specialist position: \$30,000
- Volunteer Fire Rescue operating support: \$244,000 or 14.5% increase
- Regional Jail: \$219,000 or 5.5% increase (County share of costs increasing by 1.5%)
- Emergency Communications Center: \$482,000 or 19.5% increase (County share of costs increasing by 3.2%, includes County's share of 3.25 new positions)

He explained that the FOIA position was intended to be in the Police Department, as the function was previously co-joined with the public information officer position in the Police Department that would now be allocated to the Office of Communications and Public Engagement. He said that the officer would still provide support to Police, Fire/Rescue, and Emergency Communications Center but FOIA volume was too much to be absorbed by that position.

Ms. McKeel commented that the FOIA specialist was a part-time position and the Emergency Communications Center also involves the City and University, and she wondered why they do not have a full-time position paid for by all three organizations. Mr. Walker responded that ECC has staff that would provide these services and may work in conjunction with the FOIA specialist; the three agencies determined that a half-time specialist was adequate to meet their needs. He offered to research the cost-sharing of this position through the formula in the agreement that supports the ECC.

Ms. McKeel noted that the County was the fiscal agent for a lot and wonders if they were losing money in these transactions. Mr. Walker remarked that they could review the Regional Jail at an upcoming meeting and discuss whether it makes sense for the County to continue as fiscal agent.

Mr. Dill observed that the budget for the Fire Department increases by 9% and asked if this was related to providing more support to volunteer departments. Mr. Walker responded that for all these departments, the full-year implementation of the Public Safety Pay Plan was reflected in the budget and there was also a \$244,000 increase in support of volunteer agencies for operating costs. He said the Fire/Rescue Department also provides support for services that benefit volunteers such as training, fuel, and fleet maintenance.

Mr. Randolph commented that there was an increase of \$100,000 for new equipment such as pistols, vests, and helmets, and asked what they would do with the old pistols. Police Chief Ron Lantz explained that pistols have a five-year service life, after which they traded them in with the manufacturer and got value back for each pistol. He said they would go from a 40 caliber to a 9 millimeter handgun, as an FBI study indicated that those having difficulty qualifying were increasing their scores with the lower caliber, though it had the same effect.

Mr. Randolph noted that a significant amount of money was spent by the County to prepare for August 11-12 and the MOU with the City. He said the City has reengineered these days for street festivals, and he assumes the County would have a minimal police presence. Mr. Lantz responded that this was the hope. He said that Mr. Mike Murphy, Interim City Manager, reached out to him and asked for assistance with law enforcement planning, though he has not requested the County to deploy officers. He said he hopes it would be a normal August weekend, though they would monitor social media and prepare for anything well in advance.

Ms. Mallek asked if the mutual aid agreement had a cap. Mr. Lantz explained that the County and City could call one another for help, with no cash given back, although the County could place parameters around how many people they could offer. He said that in the six years he has been with the County, they have asked Charlottesville for assistance one time -- for their SWAT team to respond to a high risk incident. He noted that a month ago the County SWAT team assisted Charlottesville with a high-risk incident.

Mr. Gallaway recalled that the school resource officer was a floating position that was not fully funded last year and asked if this was still the case. Mr. Lantz responded that if it were approved, they would look for calls for service for all middle schools. He said they have a floater that go to all middle schools, and the position he has put in the budget would probably be assigned to a specific middle school to be determined by need, based on calls for service.

Ms. Mallek commented that there were rate increases in overtime for fire prevention services and asked if they could do this work during the work day so as not to incur overtime. Mr. John Oprandy, Deputy Chief of Fire/Rescue, responded that most of their activities, such as smoke alarm installation, are conducted during normal business hours and most of the time they could get an engine company or volunteer company to participate in smoke alarm installations without a need for overtime.

Ms. Mallek asked Mr. Oprandy to furnish her with more detail about the \$100,000 budgeted for fire prevention overtime at a later date. Mr. Oprandy agreed to do so.

Ms. Mallek referred to development of the volunteer legacy service award program under Unfunded Requests. She stated that they have been talking about ways to improve retention and

recruitment since 2008, was almost there with health insurance and this program, which was supposed to have been worked on last year. She asked where they are now. Mr. Oprandy confirmed that Chief Tom Labelle was working on this with the volunteer FEMS Board and the Recruitment and Retention Committee, though there was still a lot of information to be gathered when Mr. LaBelle left in the fall. He said they would pick up this work once they are able to fill the position; which should be within the next month.

Mr. Gallaway commented that there were no unfunded requests under Inspections and Building Codes on page 107, though the Board discussions last year about addressing these issues. He asked if he was looking at the wrong section of the budget or if they have the staff they needed. He noted that they would do a revenue update in February, after which money may come available for which they would look to unfunded requests -- and they may miss out on potential funds. Mr. Walker responded that a position was added to address workload issues, though they are very careful to not overstaff because of the potential need to reduce in the future. He said he does not know the answer to Mr. Gallaway's question about why the department did not see the need to add or ask for another position.

Mr. Bowman added that Mr. Mark Graham's team was projecting a record number of building permit requests for next year. He said the building inspectors are busy, though overtime has not been necessary, and he would ask Mr. Graham to speak about this at Thursday's meeting.

Ms. McKeel observed that it showed a 16.2% projected revenue decrease based on anticipated development activity.

Ms. Mallek remarked that it was not likely that inspections for erosions and sediment would decrease and asked that Mr. Graham update the Board on this.

Ms. McKeel added that the Board's decision on Airbnb inspections would impact this area.

Mr. Bowman remarked that in the budget for the Department of Community Development, they have a contingency fund of about \$20,000 available to address a potential policy change of the Board.

Ms. McKeel thanked the staff for thinking ahead.

Mr. Randolph remarked that it would be good to have a program to generate revenue from registrations, and those who are noncompliant with the code would lose their license. He said this would take the burden off the police and County.

Mr. Walker pointed out that there were significant increases for the Regional Jail and ECC. He said the budget increase for ECC was partially due to a deliberate investment in staffing needs and both budgets are based on formulas to share costs with partners; the County's portion has increased.

Mr. Henry continued the budget presentation with the category of **Public Works**. He presented a slide that indicated a budget of \$6.5 million -- a 9.2% or \$546,000 increase. He said that the pie chart indicates that Facilities and Environmental Services represents 81% of the budget while the County's contribution to Rivanna Solid Waste Authority represents the remaining 19%. He noted the name to Facilities Planning and Construction to minimize confusion between the Project Management Office and E&B.

Mr. Henry presented a slide entitled "Notable Changes: Facilities and Environmental Services":

- \$150,000 for operational customer service and security enhancements at County Office Building McIntire
- Converts 2.5 temporary project manager positions to ongoing positions (Related to volume of work in CIP, Funded in Capital Budget)
- Transfer to Stormwater Capital Fund: \$187,000 (non-departmental) (Provides a bridge year until ongoing funding was identified)

Mr. Henry stated that they have increased levels of service in FY19 as a result of Board decisions, with increased mowing in the urban ring and the addition of off and on ramps, which would entail costs of about \$108,000 this year. He said they have added street sweeping, which was budgeted at \$70,000, and are optimistic they could partner with the City for some of this. He said they began weekend litter pickup utilizing inmates at the jail as a pilot in 2018 and continued this in 2019. He noted that the budget included \$100,000 to support the Climate Action Plan. He explained that the \$150,000 for customer service at the COB was to contract for a front desk/security/welcoming position to assist residents with navigation and respond to security issues. He said there are many meetings in the building that last well beyond business hours for which they do not have a police officer present. He noted that the conversion of 2.5 temporary project manager positions to full time was approved in FY16, with the referendum to handle the additional volume of work, which they expect would continue for the next five years. He noted that although they have a maintenance division, much of this work was contracted as a result of a decision made 10 years ago.

Mr. Lance Stewart, Director of Facilities and Environmental Services, presented on the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority budget. He stated that the budget was based on a very early estimate of operating costs conducted in December, and he described it as a worst-case estimate if no additional tonnage was received and the County has to completely reimburse for 100% of lost revenue as a result of reduced tipping fees. He said the RSWA Board made a decision earlier that day to open the facility on Monday's

beginning in late March. He said a revised Rivanna budget estimate that has gone through a full vetting process to account for tipping fees and the opening of the facility on Mondays would be completed soon.

Mr. Stewart presented the following information:

Rivanna Solid Waste Authority

Operating contribution totals \$1.2 million, a \$362,000 or 43.2% increase

- Reduction of RSWA cash reserves which had been used to offset the City's and County's contribution
- Full-year CIP operating impacts for the new transfer station
- Operating costs to open a recycling convenience center at the IVY MUC (Spring 2020)
- Decreased recycling net revenue due to the loss of markets
- Rising asset depreciation costs

Mr. Stewart noted that only about \$80,000 of the \$362,000 increase was related to tipping fee reduction revenue, with the remainder attributable to a number of drivers. He cited lost revenue from recycling due to the China embargo, depreciation costs of additional equipment at the transfer center, conversion of some temporary employees to full time to improve service levels, and reduced use of excess fund balance -- which has been used in the past several years to hold down costs -- as factors. He said he expects to have a final budget estimate in April.

Ms. Palmer asked if they have asked RSWA to present its budget earlier to facilitate coordination with the County's budget. She added that RSWA was replacing its 1940s tanker truck. Mr. Stewart confirmed that he has made this request.

Ms. Allshouse concluded the presentation and then reposed the policy consideration questions to the Board:

Does the Board desire additional funding for any unfunded projects not included in the FY20 Recommended Budget? (This may include departmental requests, positions, community agencies, etc. If so, staff would develop options for the Board's consideration.)

Does the Board desire to consider removing funding for any items included in the FY20 Recommended Budget?

She presented a graphic with next steps in the budget process, with the next meeting to occur on February 28 to review general government functional areas.

Mr. Richardson asked Supervisors if they have final questions about anything covered at this meeting.

Mr. Randolph requested that next year they dedicate a session to debt management and the CIP. Mr. Richardson agreed to do so.

Ms. Mallek remarked that she missed the scheduling for the CIP Oversight Committee and asked that next year staff send an invitation to all Board members about the meetings. She stated that it was very important to hear the discussion from start to finish to improve understanding.

Ms. Allshouse informed the Board that staff is planning to hold meetings about the CIP this summer and would provide dates.

Agenda Item No. 4. From the Board: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. Mallek reminded the Board that she had sent them an email about a resolution of support to name the bridge on Berkmar over the river Rio Mills Bridge. She said this suggestion came from the Historic Preservation Committee and the name represents its geographic location. She said the resolution would enable Mr. Kevin McDermott to work with VDOT, and she would request that this be added as an action item to a future agenda.

Ms. McKeel informed the Board that the Albemarle County High School Jazz band was one of only 12 high school bands in the country to be invited to participate in the swing central jazz competition during the Savannah Music Festival. She announced that the band would hold a "Swing into Spring" fundraiser benefit concert to raise money for the trip at the Jefferson Theater on Sunday, March 10, 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Randolph noted that he has forwarded an article to Supervisors about transit and would like the Board to consider how to address the challenges of E-Scooters in the County.

Agenda Item No. 5. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Richardson thanked staff who assisted with today's presentation, for attending the meeting and for their hard work.

Mr. Kamptner reminded the Board that the previous week they gave him the authority to address a letter to the Governor requesting that he veto a BZA-related bill that would lower the required vote for BZA decisions. He said the letter has been prepared but not sent, as Mr. David Blount, of TJPDC, has suggested they wait until the Governor receives the bill. He noted that VACO was floating a compromise position that would authorize local governing bodies to adopt an ordinance to lower the standard. He said his office has discussed this with the Zoning Administrator, who does not have a problem with this proposal to make it a local option, and this may be included in the letter as a compromise.

Ms. Mallek remarked that if they wait, the Governor might sign the bill without having read their letter, and she would suggest sending multiple letters. Mr. Kamptner responded that Mr. Blount believes the letter would get lost if it was sent too early.

Mr. Kamptner commented that the Board, at the previous week's work session, set aside time before Thursday's work session to address four items, mainly updates, and agreed to begin the meeting at 1:00 p.m

Agenda Item No. 6. Closed Meeting.

Agenda Item No. 7. Certify Closed Meeting.

There was no need for a Closed Meeting.

Agenda Item No. 8. Adjourn to February 28, 2019, 3:00 p.m., Room 241.

At 8:27 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to February 28, 2019 1:00 p.m. Room 241.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 06/05/2019
Initials CKB