

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on April 29, 2020, at 10:00 a.m. This meeting was held by electronic communication means using Zoom and a telephonic connection due to the COVID-19 state of emergency. This meeting was adjourned from April 15, 2020.

PRESENT: Mr. Ned Gallaway, Ms. Beatrice (Bea) J. S. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer, and Ms. Donna P. Price.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeffrey B. Richardson, Deputy County Executive, Doug Walker, County Attorney, Greg Kamptner, Clerk, Claudette K. Borgersen, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 10:01 a.m., by the Chair, Mr. Gallaway.

Mr. Gallaway said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(6), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster."

Mr. Gallaway said the persons responsible for receiving public comment are the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County.

Mr. Gallaway said the opportunities for the public to access and participate in the electronic meeting are posted on the Albemarle County website, on the Board of Supervisors homepage and on the Albemarle County calendar.

Introductions. Mr. Gallaway introduced staff present.

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session – FY 2020-2021 Revised Operating and Capital Budget.

- Overview
- Revenues (pg. 35)
- General Government (pg.50)
- Fire Rescue System-wide Services (pg.55) (Dan Eggleston, Chief of Fire/Rescue)
- School Division (Roselyn Schmitt, Albemarle County Public Schools Chief Operating Officer)
- Capital Budget (pg. 69)
- Wrap Up

Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, presented.

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide about where they were in the budget process. She said they have done many things to date in working on the revised recommended budget. She said this was a three-hour work session, and that it would be followed by a public hearing on May 6.

Ms. Allshouse presented the agenda for the day. She said there were many topics to cover including revenues, and General Government, where they would broadly discuss categorical areas such as Community Development and Public Safety. She said any questions from the Supervisors could be covered on those categories.

Ms. Allshouse said after they go through the General Government departments, the Board would hear from Chief Dan Eggleston about the Fire Rescue systemwide services. She said there would then be a break and that afterwards, Ms. Rosalynn Schmitt will be speaking to the Board about a School Division update. She said this would be followed by information on the capital budget.

Ms. Allshouse said there is a work session process that uses an interactive approach. She said staff would present some information or dialogue questions for discussion. She said if there are items that staff needs to work on and get back to the Board with later, they would like to do so via email. She said they would answer questions along the way that could be answered quickly.

Ms. Allshouse said there was a placeholder for another work session, if needed, on May 11, and that the Board may decide they need to have this. She said there is a public hearing before that work session, which may present a need for having this work session.

Ms. Allshouse said on May 14, the Board would complete its discussion and approve the FY 21 budget.

Ms. Allshouse said the organization wants to adhere to the County's financial policies, continue to respond to the essential service needs of the community, position the organization to lead recovery efforts, remain flexible and adaptable in the budget process, and maintain strategic reserves going into FY 21.

Ms. Allshouse presented the 3-6-6 concept that includes periods of time. She said the first time period is the end of FY 20, before July 1. She said they want to maintain essential services and are

evaluating all discretionary spending. She said they have frozen 15 positions as of the time of putting together the budget. She said they reviewed capital projects and are coordinating closely with the School Division.

Ms. Allshouse said the first half of FY 21 starts in July and runs through January 2021. She said this is a time of responding, recovering, and recalibrating the budget. She said staff will be studying revenues each month and making adjustments as they see things improve or otherwise.

Ms. Allshouse said the second half of FY 21 would be a time where they would revisit the budget, responding accordingly, and implementing any longer-term structural changes that they may need or want to make based on the experiences and lessons learned through this event.

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide on the total all-fund budget, which totaled \$379.3 million. She said all funds include capital funds, special revenue funds, Schools, and their special revenue funds. She said putting together all the funds is a requirement, and that it shows a \$59.7 million decrease from FY 20. She said this is primarily due to the changes in the capital program.

Ms. Allshouse said much of the conversation is concentrated on the General Fund, which is where the majority of revenues come through the County. She said General Fund revenues total \$300.4 million, which is a decrease of \$6.4 million from FY 20. She said the majority of the revenues come from general property taxes.

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide showing the major drivers of local revenues, by category. She said staff projects a slight increase in real estate revenues (1%, or \$1.64 million). She said local personal property taxes show a decrease of 2.6%. She said business-driven revenues have been studied and are projected to decrease by 7.6% (or \$1.23 million). She said there is a projected decrease of consumer-driven revenues by \$5.17 million (or 12.4%).

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide showing the major streams of local tax revenue over time. She said the chart starts with FY 12 and shows how actual revenues changed over time. She said the last point on the chart was the FY 21 recommended figure. She pointed out the relative size of the revenue streams and how they changed over time.

Ms. Allshouse said staff is projecting a 1.2% decrease in sales tax, noting how it has changed over time. She said the next line on the chart represented business licensing fees, projected at a 5.9% decrease from FY 20. She pointed out another line that represented consumer utility taxes, projected at a 5.1% decrease compared to FY 20. She said food and beverage tax revenues are projected to severely decrease at 42.7%. She said the transient occupancy taxes are projected to decline by 31.1% between FY 20 and FY 21.

Ms. Allshouse said all the details explaining the projections, as well as the thought process for projections, begin on page 40 of the budget document.

Ms. Allshouse said she would present General Fund expenditures per category. She presented a slide showing the differences between the amount of funding that goes to the different categories in local government, through which divisions and departments are organized per State requirements. She said a large portion of the chart represents the transfer to Schools, through the formula. She said Public Safety is the next largest category.

Ms. Allshouse said there are some expenditures that cross all categories, which are called "cross-departmental." She said this information is included on page 51 of the budget document. She said there are no market increases for FY 21 salaries. She said the retirement system rate change had an increase of \$871,000. She said this was something the Board was aware of in the first recommended FY 21 budget and has not changed.

Ms. Allshouse said there is a budgeted salary lapse for vacancies, and that there is a change to this number based on behavior and monitoring done on salary lapses over the years, as staff believes it will increase.

Ms. Allshouse said there is a decrease in health insurance costs. She said the County is self-insured with its health insurance and monitors it carefully. She said staff projects a savings in health insurance of \$632,000.

Ms. Allshouse said they have also decreased travel, training, and education throughout all the departments, which results in a savings of nearly \$400,000.

Ms. Allshouse said they have also deferred capital outlay expenses, including fleet replacement, at a savings of \$1.2 million.

Ms. Allshouse shared a slide showing some of the position changes that will occur throughout the budget chapters. She said in FY 20, the position count was 787. She said positions are being frozen based on attrition and strong strategic calculations. She said for FY 20, staff has already identified 15 frozen positions. She said there would need to be 20 more positions frozen, for a total of 35 frozen positions.

Ms. Allshouse said some additions will be recommended in the budget, such as an Assistant

Elections Manager, and an Environmental Systems Analyst (someone being moved from a temporary to a permanent position). She said they would later talk about the recommended changes in the Fire Rescue system.

Ms. Allshouse noted there is a net decrease in positions, resulting in significant savings of about \$1 million over the course of the year.

Ms. Allshouse presented categories of the General Government functions. She said the Administrative category, covered on page 53 of the budget book, includes the Board of Supervisors' budget, and Executive Leadership Team's budget, which has an increase of \$35,000 for equity, diversity, and inclusion efforts. She said this also includes Human Resources contribution, which is a shared position for the Schools and Local Government. She said this category also includes the County Attorney's Office, the Department of Finance, to which most of the funding goes to, Information Technology, and Voter Registration and Elections, which will remain at COB 5th. She said this budget does include a position for an Assistant Elections Manager for Voter Registration.

Ms. Allshouse paused to see if there were any questions about the departments in the Administrative category.

Ms. McKeel said there was a 1.0% decrease noted at the top of page 53, which she believed was the overall decrease in Administration. She said in looking at the individual areas, however, they vary greatly.

Ms. Allshouse agreed.

Ms. McKeel said she wanted the public to understand that, for example, Executive Leadership has a 5% decrease.

Ms. Allshouse said this was correct.

Ms. McKeel said that as another example, the County Attorney's Office was not seeing a change at all. She pointed out that within this chart, there are variables and that some are seeing a much larger decrease while others are not seeing one at all. She said Voter Registration and Elections is actually seeing a 20% increase based upon what is happening around absentee voting.

Ms. McKeel said she was concerned about seeing a 1.0% decrease in Administration, as it did not seem descriptive enough to the public with what is actually happening in these departments.

Ms. Allshouse said this was a good point.

Ms. Price asked if Ms. Allshouse could show the slide on Cross-Departmental Functions again. She said all of the bullets listed there show a dollar amount in increase or decrease, except the calculation for the bullet, "No market increase for FY 21 salaries." She asked what the estimated market increase had been.

Mr. Andy Bowman, Budget Manager, replied that in the previous recommended budget, there was a 2% market increase that was approximately \$1.2 million. He said this amount has now been removed in the revised recommended budget.

Ms. Price asked if this information could be included on the slide in the future.

Ms. Palmer asked if this includes the increase in the minimum wage, as she had thought that this was a separate number.

Mr. Bowman replied that in the previous recommended budget, there was \$745,000 budgeted for minimum wage, and that this has also been removed.

Ms. Palmer asked if this was not part of the \$1.2 million amount.

Mr. Bowman replied that this was in addition to the \$1.2 million.

Ms. Price said this would be an appropriate place to include the minimum wage number, as it does cross over departments, and actually shows the reduced expenditures as a result of eliminating both the raise in minimum wage and what had previously been a 2% salary increase.

Ms. Mallek said her perspective was that the salary increase didn't show as a number on the slide because it was not happening. She said she was pleased to see in the Administration category all the different amounts, as to her, it shows there is a much more line-by-line approach.

Mr. Gallaway asked if, when theorizing the revenue drivers for the coming year, if staff was hypothesizing any sort of bounce back or recovery, or if they were using worst-case, if nothing recovers.

Ms. Allshouse replied that it was a methodic, well-organized approach with 20 different employees, as well as through consultation of outside businesses, to first look at where they see FY 20 ending. She said in thinking about revenues, they think about what is currently going on, so they made projections on how FY 20 would end. She said projecting FY 21, they started with the end of FY 20. She

said staff felt there would be some severe reductions in some of the consumer-driven revenue streams in FY 20.

Ms. Allshouse said staff carried out scenario planning, then chose a severe scenario for FY 20, which was what they started with as they started looking at FY 21. She said they then had many conversations and looked at the situation at the end of April, then projected three types of scenarios that they could see playing out. She said they thought about how things might change throughout the year, and how things could go worse or get better.

Ms. Allshouse said as they carried out the scenario planning, they then chose for budget projections what they call the "middle" scenario for FY 21. She reiterated that the budget was launched off of the worst-case or "high impact" scenario for FY 20, and then used a middle approach. She said staff knows to monitor revenues ongoing, all the time, and that this was not simply a one-time projection. She said they would be bringing back information to the Board on any adjustments they see. She said it was uncertain on how everything would go, but that staff has built in flexibility in order to be able to make changes to the budget.

Mr. Gallaway said on salary lapse, he knew that they had targeted a percentage. He asked if it were about 97-98%, and what the percentage would be moving forward.

Mr. Bowman replied that they were assuming 1.5% of salaries would be lapsed based on general attrition and turnover, meaning they assumed that they would be fully staffed about 98.5% of the time.

Mr. Gallaway noted that Ms. McKeel's comment about the Administration category on page 53 was an excellent point, and that he had written down the same comment relative to the frozen positions. He said both in the current year and coming year, they are showing what positions are going to remain, but they are not showing where those positions are, department-wise. He said it could be important at some point during the budget sessions to show what this will mean not to have those positions. He asked if these would be coming from Police or Community Development, as these would be places where the community would feel the impact in delivery of services.

Mr. Gallaway said while he appreciated and understood why they were showing what they are including in the budget moving forward, he did not want to lose that part of the information because the public will need to understand what they are dealing with. He suggested this be added to the presentation at a future meeting.

Ms. McKeel said she was in no way trying to say that all the departments should take the same percentage of decrease. She said she thought that simply putting up a 1% decrease on the slide for the Administration category could be misleading to the community. She agreed with Mr. Gallaway that it is appropriate to look at each department individually and what needs to happen within that department.

Ms. Mallek said regarding the scenarios, she had a phone call recently from a constituent who lives in Crozet part-time and works on Wall Street, and that he said that in looking at the \$21-22 trillion economy in the U.S., many conservative people are saying to take projected revenues and, in the back of your mind, plan for a 20% reduction beyond what they are thinking. She said based on this, it seemed to her that they should be planning in a conservative way.

Ms. Mallek said that on page 66, she found the positions to be helpful. She said the print was small regarding which departments are losing staff, but that they could talk about this more in-depth so that people can understand what the implications might be.

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide showing the amount that Local Government contributes to the Judicial area, as well as what the State contributes. She noted that the percentage at the top was a summary. She said this category includes the Clerk of the Circuit Court, the Commonwealth's Attorney, Sheriff's Office, Courts Support, and Public Defender's Office. She said this chart is found on page 54 of the budget book.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was happy that this area was not taking a huge hit.

Ms. Palmer asked what was happening in the Sheriff's Department with regard to the 6.1% change.

Ms. Allshouse replied that it is a salary savings, and a \$37,000 net decrease in the capital outlay expenditures. She said they have also decreased the department's contribution to the Vehicle Replacement Fund.

Mr. Gallaway said it looked like they were going to have salary savings, regardless.

Ms. Allshouse presented the chart on Public Safety on page 55 of the budget book. She said the entire category had a reduction of \$372,000. She said this includes the Police Department, the largest portion of this category, and Fire Rescue services, noting there would be more slides about this later. She said Inspections is a category in Community Development that counts as Public Safety. She said the Albemarle Charlottesville Regional Jail, ECC, and other public safety agency contributions are included in the chart.

Ms. Price said she believed Ms. Allshouse had misspoken and that she had meant there would

be an increase to Public Safety of \$372,000.

Ms. Allshouse confirmed and apologized for the mistake.

Ms. Mallek asked if the savings and overtime don't pan out for ACPD, they have a contingency fund someplace that could replenish the money they are taking out for reimbursable overtime.

Ms. Allshouse replied yes. She said the expenditures for reimbursable overtime match the revenues, so it is a category where if the revenues don't come in, the police officers don't work the outside events. She said the revenues there tie directly to the expenditures.

Ms. Mallek asked if Reimbursable Overtime would not cover all-hands-on-deck, looking for missing persons, and other similar operations, and if it would strictly cover events such as Foxfield.

Ms. Allshouse replied yes.

Mr. Gallaway said at the last meeting, he had mentioned the point of when they come back online, they would have to determine what areas get attention. He said they had mentioned the Police Department, but in seeing the 45% decrease in department travel, training, and education, the training and education pieces for Public Safety departments, and especially the Department of Social Services, would be a place he would suggest being a priority for evaluation as they come back online.

Ms. Allshouse presented a chart on Public Works on page 57 of the budget book. She said this includes Facilities and Environmental Services (FES) and converts non-permanent Environmental Service Systems Analyst to a regular position. She said there are some Beautification Program adjustments and may be some service decreases in this area that may be visible to the public. She said the County would do the best they can, and it depends on how often it rains and how things are going.

Ms. Allshouse said the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority is also in this category, and funds operating costs associated with the opening of the Ivy Convenience Center.

Ms. Palmer said her question would be better directed to the Solid Waste Authority.

Ms. Mallek said she looked forward to an update, when it is available, about all the increased revenues from tonnage and how this is affecting the continually increasing cost there.

Ms. Allshouse presented the chart for the Health and Welfare category, on page 58 of the budget book. She said there are many agencies in this category, including the Department of Social Services. She said they are increasing funding to the Emergency Utility Program. She said this category includes transfers, such as transfers to the Bright Stars program and Children's Services Act (CSA). She said this category includes the Charlottesville Albemarle Health Department. She said there is a Community Health Worker position at Yancey Community Center that is included in the budget.

Ms. Allshouse said this is a category that includes Tax Relief for the Elderly and Disabled. She said there are also other agency contributions. She said primarily, most of the ABRT agencies are in this category, and that there is no change in the ABRT agency funding from what was included in the previously recommended FY 21 budget.

Ms. Allshouse presented the next category, which was Parks, Recreation, and Culture. She said the information and details on this could be found on page 60. She said there would be no Summer 2020 programs in the Parks and Recreation department in this budget. She said there is funding, however, for increased water testing, monitoring, and treatment. She said Darden Towe Memorial Park is included in this category. She said the Charlottesville Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau is included, as well as the Jefferson-Madison Regional Library. She said this does not increase any hours at Northside Library.

Ms. Allshouse said the category includes other agency contributions as well, noting that there are no new cultural agencies funded. She said there had been in the prior FY 21 recommended budget but were not included in this budget.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated the continued monitoring of the water testing. She said this is important, especially given the challenges around the algae blooms they have been experiencing.

Ms. Palmer asked what the cultural agencies were that had been recommended to be funded previously.

Mr. Bowman replied that on the bottom of page 60 and top of page 61, there had been \$2,500 for the Charlottesville Mural Project, which was sponsored by the Bridge Progressive Arts Initiative. He said there had been \$2,500 for the Charlottesville Symphony Society, and \$625 for the Sabroso Festival.

Ms. Mallek asked if the \$48,000 reduction for JMRL was totally focused on the increase in hours at Northside Library. She said if so, she would add this to the list of things that could come back more quickly than others when things change. She said what they found in 2009 and 2010 was that the need for the library was much greater than it was during times of a stronger economy. She said she expected people to need more hours from the library system once they begin to leave their houses again.

Mr. Bowman replied that the \$48,000 for JMRL is the cost of existing services and does not include the additional hours at Northside, projected at \$34,000. He said the reason for the decrease is that JMRL has had some changes in benefit costs as they follow some City personnel rates. He said they have also had some employees facing turnover and coming in at lower salaries. He said the regional funding formula for each category of library services changes, and the net result of all of those results in the \$48,000 decrease for existing services.

Ms. McKeel said it was important to keep in mind that the Board had had a discussion a month earlier about the Northside Library and the contract to ensure parking there. She said that goes to the heart of what staff is looking at in terms of when they come out of the disaster, residents will need the services the libraries offer. She said they will want to make sure that Northside can handle the increase in usership and cars as they come out of the situation. She said they had talked about spending \$5,000 for the parking contract.

Ms. Allshouse presented the chart for Community Development, which not only includes the Community Development Department, but Economic Development, other Community Development agency contributions, and transit. She noted there would be more information presented about transit.

Ms. Palmer said they had discussed the Strategic Priority Support Reserve, about \$145,000, that would be used for supporting Community Development in some of their initiatives. She asked if this fund was still there.

Mr. Bowman replied yes, explaining that the \$145,000 is budgeted by department category.

Ms. Price said there was a figure of \$9,080 showing on the chart on page 61 representing the reduction in the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service. She asked if there was a specific aspect to this being reduced.

Mr. Bowman replied that this reflected some of the cost of current services, similar to JMRL. He said there has been some turnover in the last year or so, and they have had employees start at lower salaries. He said at the time of the recommended budget, they were also decreased at that time, and by removing a salary increase, the number went down lower than it had been in February.

Ms. Price commented that the presentation demonstrated the depth of commitment to service that Ms. Allshouse and Mr. Bowman provide to the County.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was also impressed by the presentation of details.

Mr. Bowman said he had three slides with details on transit. He said he intended to review where they were with transit at the March 11 work session to where they currently are. He said he would also give an update on the federal CARES funding related to the Coronavirus Relief Act that was approved. He said he would also cover next steps.

Mr. Bowman said a work session was held on March 11. He presented the numbers for the County's share of the existing services for CAT (Charlottesville Area Transit) and JAUNT as of that March 11 work session. He said from the time of that work session to when they revised the recommended budget, there were three adjustments made to the numbers for CAT and JAUNT. He said the first item is a credit for a federal revenue update shared at the work session. He said Mr. Sheffield with JAUNT had identified an update from federal government that provided funding to CAT and JAUNT. He said the County's share of that is reflected on the first line.

Mr. Bowman said the second update was in response to Board questions. He said the CAT Director spends approximately 20% of his time providing management, oversight, and leadership to the pupil transit division of CAT, and the County receives a credit for this.

Mr. Bowman said the third update made is for the County's share of proposed salary increases to be removed from JAUNT and CAT to be consistent with Local Government, Schools, City, and State.

Mr. Bowman said those adjustments get to a revised recommended placeholder, subject to additional analysis, of \$2.4 million for JAUNT and \$1.1 million for CAT. He said this is not final and is subject to additional analysis because of the federal CARES Act funding update that is being analyzed.

Mr. Bowman said CAT will receive \$5.3 million of funding, and JAUNT will receive \$1.8 million of funding. He said this funding can be applied across FY 20 and FY 21. He clarified that these were the total amounts for that time period, and not for each year. He said those amounts are for the total system of CAT and JAUNT and not just for the County's share. He said the County's share would need to be determined. He said the funding may be used for operating costs, capital costs, or planning expenses. He said it can also make up for lost revenue, as ridership for both agencies was low at that point.

Mr. Bowman said adjustments have been made and that the funding allows for those costs to be recovered all the way back to January.

Mr. Bowman said now that they have additional guidance in terms of operating, capital, and planning expenses, the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation is strongly encouraging localities to prioritize operating expenses before considering the use of CARES funding for capital projects or planning expenses. He said the reason for this is that the intent of this funding is to continue

service as much as possible during this unusual time.

Mr. Bowman said they were currently in the middle of analysis and have been recently in touch with JAUNT staff, and the City's Office of Management and Budget, who works for CAT. He said there have been some big questions as they begin to assess what the true-up back to the County would be. He said some of this is part of the budgeting process, and they happened to be ahead of the City. He said the City had not yet finalized, and will be sharing with City Council, which will then have to review.

Mr. Bowman gave some examples of the complexities they were facing in terms of impact to the County. He said one question is how much of the funding will be applied to FY 20, and how much to FY 21. He said it was known that ridership was down, and that service looks differently now than it did two months earlier. He said there is also the question of what ridership and service would look like in the pandemic's transition and recovery phase. He said they are also still waiting on information from the State for the final budget update in terms of what may happen to the initial allocations provided to transit agencies.

Mr. Bowman said he was not able to provide the Board that day with exact dollar amounts in terms of the impact. He said instead, he would present the plan forward as far as how they will continue to monitor and evaluate this matter.

Mr. Bowman said they think of the issue with transit agency funding in the context of the 3-6-6 program that they utilized in the proposed FY 21 recommended budget and specifically, how this would work in FY 20 and FY 21. He said the County has a MOU with the City for CAT that has a clause that states when revenues come in that are different than what was initially allocated, or expenses change, there is a process that will take place for the first time this year to ensure that the budget is monitored and that everyone is paying their rightful share. He said this is a process that is already planned to happen and will continue to be evaluated.

Mr. Bowman said another milestone they can look to is when the City does finalize what their proposal for CAT is, and City Council reviews that, that gives the County another opportunity to update what FY 21 will look like.

Mr. Bowman said that they currently have the existing body with two Board members serving on the RTP. He said the body has not been able to meet in the past two months, but is intended to continue in June, at the next monthly meeting, where they can monitor the impact of this with both CAT and JAUNT to understand how service is being impacted along with ridership, State funding, and general revenue.

Mr. Bowman said as they get more information around certainty and what the impacts will be, funding can be updated at that time using the 3-6-6 framework.

Ms. McKeel said she wanted to thank him and the Board members for the work session they had around transit, and specifically, CAT. She said this was the very first year, out of all the years they have been partnering with and paying CAT for services, that they have received a credit for their director's time for pupil transit.

Mr. Bowman said this was correct.

Ms. McKeel said that the County has been losing money in previous years. She said this was the first recognition that CAT's director also runs the Charlottesville pupil transit system and was spending some of his time there. She asked if this was 20% of his time.

Mr. Bowman replied yes.

Ms. McKeel said this was transparency and that she wanted to point out this was the first time it was happening. She said she wished they could make this retroactive, but that at least going forward, they would now have this recognition.

Mr. Bowman said this was correct, and that they would follow up with the Board with any new information and how they can clarify anything.

Ms. McKeel said this would be put on the to-do list at the next Regional Transit Partnership discussion. She said in terms of the CARES Act, she knew that the Fire Rescue department has already tapped into and received notice of their funds from the CARES Act, and that the airport had already received theirs. She expressed that while she didn't want to jump too far ahead, by the end of the year, 28% was the percentage for the County. She asked why they are needing to replace at all.

Ms. McKeel said Mr. Garland Williams (CAT) sent an email to the Board saying that the CARES Act funding will also include revenues, salaries, fuel, and supplies, including Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and cleaning supplies, and administrative leave. She said it seemed to her that they could quickly move forward with saying that the \$5.3 million that CAT would be receiving from the CARES Act would certainly more than cover the County's share that year of the CAT funding. She said she wanted to be patient but wanted to make sure that the County was not paying a greater share than necessary.

Mr. Bowman said he did not view this as something that would be put on the back burner for a

few months, but that it would be one through which the County will stay engaged with the City, on a weekly basis, as they continue to move through their respective budget processes. He said there is a wide debt of expenses that can be reimbursed by the CARES Act funding, and that the other item CAT is reviewing is how their lost ridership revenue and lost State funding could be made up by CARES Act funding.

Ms. McKeel said in one email, Mr. Williams indicated that there was no deadline to tap into the CARES funding, noting that this was true. She said they are talking about money from the federal government. She expressed concern that if they remain quiet, there will be another priority that comes up, and if they do not use it, they'll lose it. She said it was important that CAT does not sit on the funding to the point that it is gone and is used for something else.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Bowman if he had said that the CAT director spends 20% of his time on the school bus system.

Mr. Bowman replied that 20% was correct.

Ms. Palmer asked how this math works, expressing that \$8,000 was not 20% of his salary.

Mr. Bowman replied that the 28% gets applied there as well, and the City was still paying a portion of that.

Ms. McKeel said the County's MOU with the City states 28% because of the amount of time that CAT serves the County versus the City.

Ms. Palmer said she would have to think about this.

Ms. Price expressed appreciation for the candor and articulating the uncertainties not only with regard to the CARES Act funding, but across the board. She said everyone wanted certainty and that currently, they were operating in a sea of uncertainty.

Ms. Mallek echoed Ms. McKeel's comment about not waiting on the funding, noting that they saw how quickly the SBA fund disappeared when they had decided that everything had been drawn down. She said she was not patient at all that this money will be received.

Ms. Mallek said the 28% was based upon runs, as she understood it. She said there was no reason at all why the County, in her mind, should be paying any part of the 20% or portion of the salary that is used for the school department in the City. She said this should be in a different category altogether.

Ms. Mallek said the County's urban ring population is important in drawing down funding money for CAT, yet they get almost no credit at all for the 45,000 people who are in their statistics that allow them to get money. She said she wanted the County to be determined to be able to get at least the 28% of the \$5.3 million and use that to offset this year and next year. She said they would then have other money to support what JAUNT is doing for which the County pays a greater percentage for that operation.

Ms. Mallek said it would be great if they could find a way to separate out the money for salaries that was set aside for JAUNT to be able to raise their drivers' salaries just enough to match what CAT has been paying. She said this is something the Board has been discussing for years and doesn't have anything to do with the overall 2% raise, which she understood needed to wait. She said if they are going to be able to keep their drivers, then the equity issue with the CAT drivers needs to be considered, and so she was hoping that the \$42,000 in that category could be considered in a different light. She said she would leave this for others to struggle with over the next few days.

Ms. Mallek said she also appreciated the transparency in the discussions at the transit agency, but that they still have not received any accountability for the last five years of lost runs in the County because they didn't get a bus out the door. She said that while she was glad there was some information coming, she would support retroactive clarification, certainly for the director salary used on schools. She said this was not something CAT didn't know, but was something they decided not to disclose. She said it should not have been up to the County to figure out what the right question was to ask, and that they should have provided that information from the start.

Ms. Mallek urged everyone to be firm and have a backbone in going forward to get this dollar amount squared away over the next couple months. She said another idea was that they would perhaps respond to invoices based upon delivery of service as opposed to handing over \$1 million at the end of the year. She said they should have them on a shorter leash, so they are sure they are getting the services the County's citizens are paying for and that they need.

Mr. Gallaway asked why the County's share was marked as "To Be Determined," and if this was relative to not knowing how much would be applied to the current fiscal year versus next year.

Mr. Bowman replied that this would be the biggest variable. He said there should be a large credit in FY 20, but that it was tough to calculate what that credit is in the midst of the current situation. He said whatever credit was not realized in FY 20 would be applied to FY 21.

Mr. Gallaway asked how well they understood the State funding and how this would play out. He said when Mr. Bowman said some of the money from CARES could go to State shortfalls, this was the first time he had thought about this statement. He asked if there was an idea of how the State funding would play out.

Mr. Bowman replied they did not at that time. He said Mr. Sheffield at JAUNT and City staff were watching closely to receive information from the State. He said there would be a cascade of the General Assembly taking action and would loop down to public transit.

Mr. Gallaway said if there were questions they would want to ask of the State, there was an MPO meeting later that day at 4:00 p.m., which would be a good place for him to ask some of those questions. He said if there were things they could ask to get this figured out, he would like to know what those questions are.

Ms. Mallek said she thought the meeting had been canceled.

Mr. Gallaway said he thought this was cancelation of the live meeting and that they would still be holding a virtual meeting.

Ms. Mallek said she would follow up.

Mr. Gallaway said in any case, they could still ask questions through the MPO.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated what Ms. Mallek said around history, and that the partnership was working hard to improve ownership and transparency around transit. She said she would support Ms. Mallek's thought around JAUNT's funding, as their salaries for their drivers have been a problem over the years, as CAT's salaries have gone up. She said the partnership has a committee that is supposed to be working on the issue of bus drivers' salaries and that so far, they didn't have a solution because the pandemic shut the meetings down. She said she would support some funding for JAUNT for salaries.

Ms. McKeel said currently, Albemarle County and the City were going to be applying for a grant through DRPT (Department of Rail and Public Transportation) for assistance with envisioning what transit should look like in the future. She said they knew that DRPT was going to do this study for them, and it would be two years out. She said it is important that since they have notice that the CARES Act is providing additional funding, they should have a discussion around this particular visioning plan funding and have a conversation about not just letting it go. She said when they come out of this current reality, there will be a new reality, and it would be ideal to have that plan happening over the next two years.

Ms. McKeel said the other grant that was more directed towards the County was a technical assistance visioning grant through DRPT. She said it was \$110,000 for the match, and that she would very much like to see at least Mr. Bowman and staff take a look at continuing that in the budget. She said she would at least like to know where it is, exactly, and if possible, if they can continue it. She said that work will be important, and to let it sit for a period of time over the next year would not be good for the County.

Mr. Bowman said the first grant Ms. McKeel referred to was for the Regional Transit Vision Plan. He said the funding for the first year of that continues to be included in the revised recommended budget, and so there was a solution in place for that.

Mr. Bowman said that regarding the second grant Ms. McKeel referred to, in the last communication he had with Mr. Chip Boyles (TJPDC), he was hopeful at that time that there would be enough funding provided that would eliminate there being any cost to the County. He said he has not spoken specifically with Mr. Boyles in the last few weeks about this, but if there was a cost to the County, they could look at the Board's strategic reserves in the current year as a possible solution to provide funding for that, as needed.

Ms. McKeel said Jennifer DeBruhl from DPRT had indicated that if that were important for the County, it would be something that they would consider. She said DPRT was amenable to this, and so she would like to take a look at this.

Ms. Mallek supported using funding from the CARES Act to offset the \$300,000 that the County was going to put in for our match. She said the County has many other things it can do with that money. She said if they could get direction from DRPT instead of waiting for it to filter through the City, that would be great.

Ms. Allshouse presented a slide on reserves. She said this would be the last slide on General Government before moving into the Fire Rescue portion of the work session. She said as part of the principles for the budget development, it was important to think about reserves.

Ms. Allshouse said the County has a 10% unrestricted fund balance reserve. She said they also have the 1% budget stabilization reserve. She said details on both these reserves were included in the Policies section of the budget document.

Ms. Allshouse added that there is a \$2 million Advancing Strategic Priority Reserve in the capital program. She said this was set aside in the past and is still available. She said there is also an additional \$1.5 million that was discussed prior to the COVID-19 situation. She said the Board had discussed

adding this to the Advancing Strategic Priority Reserve.

Ms. Allshouse said those reserves were all in place, and that this budget did not use any of those reserves for any specific budget item.

Ms. Allshouse pointed out a note on the slide that said, "Others." She said on page 65 of the budget document, as well as in a chart on page 63 in the budget book, there is information about other reserves the County has in different categories of the budget. She said the Strategic Priority Support Reserve is one that Ms. Palmer referred to earlier that is in the Community Development Department. She said there is also a Climate Action Funding Pool, and that the Board had approved \$500,000 to be placed in that pool to support the actions coming out of the Climate Action Plan. She said this \$500,000 is still there. She said there is a recommendation in the budget to add another \$250,000 to that pool, and that it would be specifically targeted for weatherization and home repair.

Ms. Allshouse said there is also a reserve called Business Process Optimization Reserve. She said this is an internal reserve as they are setting the processes and optimizing business processes. She said there is still \$250,000 in that reserve, which had been reduced from the prior recommended budget.

Ms. Allshouse said there is also a Salary and Benefits Reserve, which is for changes that may occur based on changes in positions, or as they freeze positions, there may be a new position that has to take over different jobs. She said this reserve has been reduced from the prior recommended budget, but that there was some funding in place there.

Ms. Allshouse said in the category of personnel savings, there is a reserve for anticipated future personnel savings for the 20 additional frozen positions.

Ms. Allshouse said there is a reserve for contingencies of \$600,000, which is for things that come up along the way in the budget. She said this is similar to the reserves that are put in place every year. She said this is an increase from the last year's budget.

Ms. Price referred to a comment Ms. Mallek made earlier about Wall Street projecting a 20% expectation of reduction of revenues. She said she has seen the news reports of the GDP recently. She said these reserves are critical. She said her question was what further actions can be taken to reduce overall expenditures and increase the reserves. She said she has concerns that the situation may continue to get more stressed than it currently is. She asked if there were actions that could be taken, and if Mr. Richardson or Mr. Kamptner could weigh in as well.

Ms. Price asked if there were additional ways to reduced personnel expenses. She recognized that keeping positions frozen in the open category does nothing but increase the workload on the remaining personnel, but that she was concerned that they may not have enough in the reserves if the financial situation continues to deteriorate. She said she was not asking for an answer immediately, but that she would appreciate information later on how to further reduce expenses.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley agreed with Ms. Price that they should do everything they can to build the reserves. She said she wanted to make sure the community stays safe while maintaining positions at the County and avoid layoffs.

Ms. Mallek agreed on the preservation of reserves, but that she also needed some guidance about how the County is living up to their agreements they have made; one of which has been in the Crozet Master Plan since 2005, which was a traffic study that she understood was now not being fulfilled, even though it was part of the agreement that was made for the Downtown approval. She said she hoped she was misunderstanding and that this was actually going forward. She said it was going to be reimbursed by VDOT anyway, and to hold it up for several years puts the project at risk when millions have already been invested and is trying to be wrapped up. She said this is something the County needs to continue to focus on and not be seen as backsliding.

Mr. Kevin McDermott, County Transportation Planner, replied that the County is still looking at trying to fund the traffic study. He said one of the major issues with doing this was they were having trouble figuring out how to get accurate traffic counts, and without those counts, it could be difficult to get reasonable results from that study. He said this is a major obstacle to overcome, but that staff was still looking at ways to advance that work. He said it is partially funded by the developer that proffered the work and did not believe that it was off the table and staff was trying to work through some issues.

Mr. Bowman clarified that staff has identified funding in Community Development in the current year, and that it was a question of when to move forward, given the traffic counts. He said if the project still needed work in 2021, they would consider reappropriating funding from the current year to the next.

Mr. Gallaway said he hadn't thought about this, and that traffic counts would be drastically different currently than is normal.

Mr. Gallaway asked about the Grants Leveraging Reserve and what kinds of grants this has been used for in the past.

Ms. Allshouse replied that the Grants Leveraging Reserve was put in place many years earlier for grants that departments were not able to find funding in their own budgets for. She said many times, a department leads in grant development, and when they know a match is coming or they know of a grant

they applied for, funding is built into departments. She said the Grants Leveraging Fund was a way to put funding together in the past for those that are unexpected.

Ms. Allshouse said this has been monitored over the years, and that more than needed was being put aside. She said this was removed from the budget, at this point. She said that for the grants they are looking at, they have built in a funding match for those grants and will keep an eye on them, moving forward. She said grants are important for the County to consider, given these times.

Mr. Gallaway said if departments are pulling back on their operations and were able to find monies in the past, it may be tighter now to find that money. He said he was not disagreeing with the piece here, but as it is monitored, it seems reasonable that departments could come to the Board if the grant is worthwhile. He said it seemed this would be justified under the Strategic Board Priorities Reserve if they wanted to match a grant for a department that was having trouble doing so.

Ms. Allshouse agreed. She said there is also a reserve for contingency, so there are a couple places that could be utilized.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, introduced the portion of the work session related to Fire, EMS, medical response, and transport service-related issues that Fire Chief Dan Eggleston would be walking the Board and community through. He said they started last calendar year and had key public safety agencies that the County works closely with and relies on. He said Charlottesville Albemarle Rescue Squad (CARS) worked with the County to identify continued challenges they have had in the area of Advanced Life Support (ALS) response to the County community. He said CARS indicated that as they crossed into the FY 21 budget year, they would be looking to reduce those services in the County and those services are provided for by CARS.

Mr. Richardson said early in the budget process, they began work with the Fire Chief, and identified 12 positions that are necessary to maintain ALS services as they cross budget years. He said as they experienced the decline in revenue associated with the pandemic, they have continued to maintain those positions in the budget for the need for continued service delivery.

Mr. Richardson said Chief Eggleston would be focusing on a second key agency, the Crozet Volunteer Fire Department, which indicated last year that they were having difficulty in maintaining the service delivery, Monday through Friday. He said this is a high-volume service area, so the County began to look at a variety of options with leadership of the Fire Rescue department.

Mr. Richardson said ultimately, in the second iteration of the revised budget, they identified federal funding available in the form of a competitive grant. He said they are poised to compete for the grant and are optimistic they will be successful. He said Chief Eggleston would walk the Board through the details, and that this grant opportunity not only gives the County the capacity to address some of the urban needs in Crozet and Pantops, but it also helps to solidify support in some of the key Rural Areas across the County.

Mr. Richardson said there is also a line in the capital budget addressing the need for one-time money for apparatus replacement and additions, both with engines and ambulances. He said in the capital budget for next year, they have also committed to radio and mobile data computers. He said this is IT-related infrastructure for the public safety system, and a need of first responders in the field that ensures they can continue to utilize a strong infrastructure.

Chief Dan Eggleston said he would start with a quick overview of the current station locations. He presented a slide showing 14 stations distributed across the County. He said those stations that are concentrated in the urban areas were purposely designed to cover those growth areas in the County.

Chief Eggleston said in some of the slides, the Board would see purple shaded areas that represent high rates of emergency calls for service. He explained that the darker the color, the higher the rate, which provides perspective in terms of where they are seeing most of the activity in the County.

Chief Eggleston presented a slide showing a snapshot of those stations in which they have career staff. He said out of the 14 stations, they have career staff assigned to 10 of them. He said of the stations with career staff, half of them are staffed during the daytime, Monday through Friday, from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. He said the volunteer staff work during nights and weekends. He said the other five stations are staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week with career staff.

Chief Eggleston said it has been about a year since they received a letter from the leadership at Crozet Volunteer Fire Department requesting daytime assistance based on their lack of volunteer support during the daytime. He said he has been working very closely with Chief Dillon and his staff since that request was put forward. He said in assessing the situation, they consistently hear that they need the staff there sooner than later because of the decline and the rapid growth they are seeing in the Crozet area.

Chief Eggleston said ever since they have been developing the revised FY 21 budget, they found a couple options they could take to try to honor assistance for Crozet. He said they have looked at the current hiring list they are going through and have an opportunity to hire four experienced firefighter/EMS personnel which, in essence, would bring the department up to full staffing. He said they can start an experienced Recruit School in the next week, which would put those people through an accelerated Recruit School in May. He said they would be able to graduate and train those people to actually begin

staffing the Crozet station in September 2020.

Chief Eggleston said this was a very rapid turnaround, but because these people are trained and have experience in other areas around the State, they believe this will work out well and will benefit the staffing in Crozet sooner than later.

Chief Eggleston said that while this is a more accelerated staffing model for Crozet, it will result in some overtime and likely the use of dynamic staffing, as it stretches them quite thin in terms of staffing. He said there are plans to backfill some of the positions in order to relieve stress on the system.

Chief Eggleston said the revised FY 21 recommended budget does not recommend the relocation of career staff from low call volume stations. He said they believe there is a great opportunity, however, to maximize the use of staff assigned to those stations using two strategies.

Chief Eggleston said the first strategy is cross-staffing, in which they take career staff and staff an engine and an ambulance based on the type of call. He said if there is an EMS call, for instance, staff would take the ambulance and run the call, and if there were a fire call, they would do the same with the fire engine. He said they have been doing the cross-staffing scenario in Earlysville for about eight years now and believe it has worked well not only for the staff assigned there, but for the community. He said it's raised the type of service and has benefited the community.

Chief Eggleston said the second strategy is dynamic staffing. He said this is where they reduce staff at a station in times of staffing needs across the system, from three to two. He said while the fire engine, in that case, would go out of service, they would still have people in the station that could respond in the ambulance and to provide much-needed EMS service, including ALS or paramedic-level services to the community.

Chief Eggleston said moving forward, they will want to implement these strategies more broadly for the lower call volume stations. He said the cross staffing strategy is where they would cross-staff a fire engine or ambulance and enables effective use of resources in the lower call volume stations.

Chief Eggleston said that by placing ambulances in low call volume areas, they experience two benefits: it improves the response time to those areas in terms of EMS, and also increases overall ambulance availability by keeping those urban, high call volume ambulances in the urban areas. He said instead of running out to the Rural Areas, the ambulances in the low call volume areas can answer those calls, creating the capacity for those urban ambulances to stay in those areas to answer critical calls.

Chief Eggleston said they believe that using one of the reserve ambulances, they are prepared to place a daytime ambulance at the Stony Point Volunteer Fire Department to begin cross-staffing as early as July 2020, while they work through the other situations. He said this will immediately enhance that area of the County through the use of the cross-staffed ambulance and will better utilize the staff there.

Chief Eggleston said in September 2021, with additional staff, they will place a daytime ambulance at the East Rivanna station and begin cross staffing there as well. He said this will provide the same benefits of placing an ambulance in that community and better utilizing the staff that are assigned there Monday through Friday.

Chief Eggleston said dynamic staffing and cross-staffing are used in unison, and that he believes that implementing dynamic staffing across the board to Earlysville, which already has dynamic and cross-staffing, Stony Point, and East Rivanna will benefit the system in a number of ways. He said they would cascade the use of dynamic staffing, meaning that in times of system need, they would go to Earlysville, bring that station from three to two, then move to Stony Point and do the same, and finally to East Rivanna, if needed.

Chief Eggleston said in this case, they will not shut down a station at all. He said unfortunately last year, they had to completely close the Earlysville station about 25% of the time. He said this new approach will avoid closures of all stations in those low call volume areas, which is a major benefit to those stations and better utilization of those stations in times of staffing needs and is a benefit to the community in a number of ways.

Chief Eggleston presented a slide about the recommended staffing for the Pantops engine during daytime hours, beginning in September of 2021. He said the Pantops engine covers a high call volume, high-risk area, indicating to the area on a heat map, represented in dark purple. He said this represents the second-busiest area in the County, with the first being the 29 North corridor. He said it also provides much-needed backup for Stony Point and East Rivanna, should those stations be taken down in terms of staffing from three to two, and provides fire suppression backup for those stations as well as backup if those stations are on another call. He said that station serves multiple rolls and provides a much needed service to the Pantops area.

Chief Eggleston summarized that in terms of the benefits of the proposal, the stations will remain open during the daylight hours due to sharing the dynamic staffing across three stations. He said the Stony Point and East Rivanna stations and the communities they serve will gain a cross-staffed ambulance without increasing staffing at all in those areas. He said Pantops gets a daytime-staffed engine that provides closer backup for Stony Point and East Rivanna and aligns resources to the second-highest call volume in the County. He said this is all done while honoring the commitment to volunteer stations that need supplemental career staff, as in the case of Crozet.

Chief Eggleston presented a slide with the timeline of these strategies. He said there is the opportunity to hire four experienced firefighters immediately that they can put in an abbreviated school. He said this will happen next week, in May, and will last until September. He said at that time, they can begin staffing the Crozet engine during the daytime.

Chief Eggleston said when the budget is approved in July, they can bring on 12 additional staff that will run a complete full Recruit School that will last through January. He said following that, they will have an in-house Paramedic School to ensure they have adequate paramedic staff for the system. He said additionally, when one school ends in January, they will start another in January 2021. He said hopefully, they will get positions from the FEMA grant funding, which will allow them to staff, on a more permanent and reliable basis, the Crozet engine as well as staffing the Pantops engine.

Chief Eggleston said the entire program should be wrapped up by September of 2021. He said there are many moving pieces, but that there is high confidence in the training staff to conduct the training programs. He said they also believe they have a good story on the FEMA grant, and high confidence in securing that grant for the staffing that will take place in September of 2021, starting with the Recruit School in January.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated the work on finding solutions for the community. She said this has been an education for her around the Fire Department, response times, and the way their large County is served.

Ms. Palmer asked if at Stony Point, during the weekdays, there is an ambulance and a fire engine. She asked if on nights and weekends, there is only a fire engine there.

Chief Eggleston replied this is correct. He reminded that they were going to put the ambulance there in July 2020, and there is currently not an ambulance at that station. He said they have already had a conversation with the leadership at Stony Point about the entire proposal and will put the ambulance there in July. He said during the evening hours and weekends, that ambulance would not be staff by the volunteers, as they do not currently have the capability, though they could work with them if there is a desire to do that.

Ms. Palmer asked the same question about the East Rivanna station.

Chief Eggleston said the same situation applies there, although East Rivanna already has a small number of volunteers that are trained up and released on demand. He said they are somewhat further ahead of the game in terms of helping to run that ambulance on nights and weekends.

Ms. Palmer asked if the ambulance physically stays there, and that there is no one there to run it at Stony Point, but there is someone at East Rivanna some of the time.

Chief Eggleston replied yes.

Ms. Price said she appreciated Chief Eggleston's calm demeanor over the course of the past several months, where there has been a lot of interest and concern in the matter, which raises emotions when it comes to public safety. She said the actions that he, his staff, and the volunteers have worked on together to come up with what she sees as a good solution was commendable. She said they could all be pleased with the situation with Stony Point in particular.

Ms. Price said this was not a process that would take place overnight and would take a period of time. She said the FEMA grant is critical to achieving this, but they also see that the grant is essentially, financially, a temporary resolution, which comes to the greater point that the Board needs to focus on which is, as they work forward through the uncertainty of the economy, it appears clear to her that they need to start preparing today to increase the budget to Fire Rescue services. She said they are currently able to meet the requirements, but they know they will continue to increase. She said she believes they can expect to see further pressures placed upon the volunteers, which will likely require a greater increase in permanent staff to meet future needs.

Ms. Price said for herself, in the Scottsville District, as well as Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley in the Rivanna District, she sees the use of the three stations, Stony Point, East Rivanna, and Pantops, are commendable. She said this was not an easy process, but that this was a great solution.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said Chief Eggleston and his staff have done a phenomenal job in coming up with the dynamic staffing and cross-staffing strategies. She said the people in Stony Point were happy and appreciative, especially about gaining an ambulance. She said the fact that Chief Eggleston came out to Stony Point to listen to the community, and met with her afterwards, showed her that he cared and was listening.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she hoped they could increase the number of volunteers and that she knew Chief Eggleston was interested in doing this. She said the reality is that there are unknowns, and that if they are lucky enough to get the FEMA grant, it will run out in four years. She said there is planning to do, as a Board, to make sure the staffing continues.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said the plan is creative, innovative, and meets the needs of the community, which is the most important.

Mr. Gallaway said there have been questions about the ripple effect, particularly on the high-volume Pantops area. He asked how this plan would specifically impact the stations at Berkmar as Hollymead as backups, or if it helps to deal with call volumes there in any way.

Chief Eggleston replied that there was time spent on trying to quantify the impact, and that this was difficult to do. He said in reality, the plan helps to create capacity across the board. He said in some cases when the system is busy, they have a lot of units crisscrossing the County and responding into other areas because of concurrent calls. He said the plan will provide more capacity for the Monticello Station (Station 11) as well as the 29-area Station 8, which is the busiest engine company and ambulance. He said this will be a huge benefit, as these stations often come into the Pantops area, as there is currently not a fire resource there and other urban areas.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the Berkmar station had been a first-serve or secondary call going to Pantops.

Chief Eggleston said it would have been secondary. He said currently, the first delay is covered with East Rivanna, but often times, Berkmar (Station 8) responds into Pantops as backup.

Mr. Gallaway said that they may get their own call while they are out on the secondary call.

Chief Eggleston agreed, noting that it is often times a domino effect.

Mr. Gallaway said this is where they will likely see an improvement; that perhaps the first call at Berkmar will find them not on a secondary call in another high-volume area.

Chief Eggleston said this was correct.

Mr. Gallaway asked if Hollymead was in a similar situation. He asked if Berkmar is on a secondary call, that Hollymead is coming down 29 to be the first on call.

Chief Eggleston replied yes. He said there will likely be less impact in Hollymead, but that some improvement will be seen there as well, which will be helpful because of all the growth happening in the 29 corridor. He said they need to make sure they have enough capacity to serve when those residents become occupied.

Mr. Gallaway said Hollymead is critical to the area Earlysville serves as well.

Chief Eggleston agreed.

Ms. Palmer said many people are predicting how the pandemic will influence life going forward, and that Ms. Price reminded her of something she has observed from people in the Rural Areas, who are putting their houses on the market and have now taken them off. She said this is not because the market is bad, but because they have decided not to move into urban areas because they appreciate the fact they can stay out of harm's way.

Ms. Mallek said she is grateful for the proposal, as it has been a long time coming and a struggle to find balance. She said Earlysville has had a painful 15 months of having the station dead when people show up, and so this could not happen fast enough to get two people as a minimum there or have someone else calling from home to be able to get an extra engine out. She said dynamic staffing has only been in Earlysville all this time instead of being shared. She said it was a good thing that the other stations would share this extra responsibility.

Ms. Mallek said the call volume at Station 4 is three times what it is in Stony Point, so they need to be able to use call volume as a way to cascade as far as how they prioritize pulling people. She said having the station empty 25% of the time is damaging to the community. She said ambulance cross staffing has worked well for a while in Earlysville, until they ran out of space. She said there was a whole new crew who joined up as volunteers to run the ambulance, and once structural changes happen there, they would be able to come back. She said there was a women's crew who gave up because they had no place to sleep.

Ms. Mallek said in 2011, there were 80 people in ACFR. She said there were several rounds of FEMA grants, which helped, but then all those positions became absorbed into the County budget. She said the difference between 80 and 122 is a large increase in staff, and that it is important from a leadership point of view that they do not become a self-fulfilling prophecy about recruiting volunteers being difficult and resulting in giving up. She said it will be dozens of millions of dollars to replace the services that volunteers provide. She said they have been consistent, around 400, for about a decade, even though in 2008, there were many people who said that volunteerism was dead.

Ms. Mallek said she hoped that Albemarle County would be the place to prove that volunteerism is still alive. She said this plan will move towards a more broadly-balanced sacrifice as well as some investment on the part of the budget to make some things happen.

Ms. Mallek said the stress on the system and individuals is real, and they are hearing much more about this relating to the pandemic from all over the country. She said when people take on hours and days of overtime, it wears them out and puts stress on their families as well. She said people moving

from station to station will be tricky to manage, but that it is worthwhile in the overall scheme of things.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated Ms. Palmer's comment about the Rural Area. She asked if it was important for the Board to remember that much of their work is predicated on a Development Area and a Rural Area, and that the Comprehensive Plan addresses services in those areas. She said there are those who like living in the Development Area, and that there is a tendency in the Board's discussions to look at the Rural Area versus the Development area. She said she didn't think this is where they want to go, and that they need to provide good quality of life for everyone, while trying to take out the divisiveness of the issues, whether it is about dogs on leashes or parking on secondary roads or eighteen wheelers parking on roads. She said they need to look at the area as one County.

Ms. Palmer said she wasn't going to go into detail about what she had brought up on that, but that her purpose was to reiterate something that had talked about before, that there is a difference in the response times in the Rural Area versus the Development Area. She said they had talked about trying to better explain those differences to the public in the future. She said there is a policy where they encourage people to live in the Development Area by making it a more livable space. She said she was not trying to be divisive in her comment. She said what she was trying to say was that as they increase broadband capacity in the Rural Area and have more people living there, they may have increasing needs in cost and communication.

Ms. McKeel agreed. She said when they look at the Comprehensive Plan again, it will be a great time to help educate the community around the Rural Area and Development Area.

Ms. McKeel said the SAFER grant funding runs out in 2025, and that Fire Rescue has built in a way to pick up those positions so that when the grant ends, it doesn't mean the positions go away. She said it is important for the community to understand this. She asked if her understanding was correct.

Chief Eggleston replied that this was correct. He said they wanted to be transparent about the overall cost of the plan, including the share and when the grant runs out, what the total cost will be coming into FY 25. He said the intent is to work with OMB and the County Executive's Office to ensure that they have this funding in a five-year plan, so they have revenue to support the positions in the future.

Ms. McKeel said it is easy to say that the grant runs out in FY 25. She pointed out that they have a plan already in place to pick up those positions.

Mr. Richardson presented a transition slide, noting that it was clear, pursuant to Ms. McKeel's questions, that this is a four-year phase-in. He said beginning in FY 25, the County would assume full expenses for all the positions that were asked for in the SAFER grant. He said this is a purposeful strategy to front-end load the current needs to fill the gaps with key partner agencies.

Mr. Richardson said in FY 21, net costs in Year 1 are just shy of \$169,000. He said the leadership team has loaded this into next year's budget and are making the assumption that if they are successful with the grant, they would run through the next four years with the partnership with the SAFER grant, and that they would need to make budgetary adjustments over the next four years, as this moves from majority-funded through the federal grant to majority-funded to the local side.

Mr. Richardson said in FY 25, the County would take on full-funding responsibilities. He said they would in no way anticipate that the need would go away, so they will need to plan for this budget-wise. He said it is a high priority, and they would need to plan for this along with other competing needs.

Recess. The Board recessed its meeting at 12:04 p.m. and reconvened at 12:17 p.m.

Ms. Rosalyn Schmitt, Chief Operating Officer, Albemarle County Public Schools, said she would present the slides that were used with the School Board the week before to provide an update on the development of their FY 21 budget.

Ms. Schmitt said she would start with the sentiment that Dr. Haas shared at the end of the work session with the School Board. She said although these are hard budget conversations, they are grateful for their collaboration with local government staff. She thanked Mr. Richardson, Ms. Allshouse and her team for the timely updates, transparent approach, and team mindset.

Ms. Schmitt said she would start with where the School Division is in their budget calendar. She said they have had a couple updates with the School Board, most recently last Thursday during their work session. She said the School Board has a special meeting scheduled for May 7 to receive updates on all of the operations, as well as the revised budget recommendation. She said a public hearing will be held on that same day. She said the School Board is scheduled to adopt their budget on May 14, which is the same day as the Board of Supervisors adopts their budget, with the understanding that there will be appropriation actions on June 3.

Ms. Schmitt said the School Division had to revisit their FY 21 budget and developed a series of five priorities. She said the School Board has endorsed these priorities, and that they are in the process of serving the community on them. She highlighted student learning as a priority, noting that they continue to fulfill their mission to establish a community of learners and learning through relationships, relevance, and rigor, one student at a time.

Ms. Schmitt said they will continue to focus on equity and during these trying times, make sure they are valuing and prioritizing employees, and despite virtual challenges, keeping stakeholders engaged.

Ms. Schmitt said they are in the process of surveying the community on these items, and that they received 3,000 responses. She said the community engagement is encouraging and positive. She said the survey is still open, and that it includes five questions.

Ms. Schmitt said the priorities were translated into strategies, which were mostly manifested in the scenario currently under consideration. She said in terms of student learning, it is their strategy to make as many departmental operation reductions first so that they can prioritize classroom positions.

Ms. Schmitt said equity is a continued focus of the School Division, so there is an intent to keep all previously-funded proposals fully funded and continue all current efforts.

Ms. Schmitt said they are making departments FTE reductions with all vacancies and are aligning instruction positions across schools where possible.

Ms. Schmitt said they are doing their best to maintain a fund balance this school year so that going into next school year, they will remain as flexible and agile as possible. She said stakeholder engagement includes the survey as well as the public hearing scheduled for May 7.

Ms. Schmitt said with regard to revenues, they want to illustrate a revenue estimate through two comparison points. She said the first is comparing current revenue estimates to what were previously thought of as FY 21 looking like when the School Board adopted their funding request in February. She said this is based on the major revenue categories, Local Transfer, State Budget, and Other. She said the current estimates indicate that they anticipate \$15.6 million less than what they had previously forecasted for FY 21 back in February.

Ms. Schmitt said the same estimates were compared to the FY 20 adopted budget, which is the current fiscal year budget. She said they anticipate a decrease in the Local Transfer, and a slight increase in the State budget and Other categories, for a total reduction of \$1.8 million as they compare to current funding levels. She said they are a growing school system, so when they talk about reductions to current funding levels and serving more students, this will present a challenge.

Ms. Schmitt said regarding the State budget, the Governor did revise his budget, which the General Assembly adopted. She said they did not, however, reforecast sales tax. She said there is some certainty as far as what local basic aid would be but have had to make local estimates of what State sales tax and lottery funding would be. She said they feel that they made some conservative estimates. She said they will hopefully have more information when the General Assembly reconvenes in early fall.

Ms. Schmitt said the School Division is anticipating student enrollment growth. She said in the current school year, there were 300 more students than anticipated, and that they project an additional 200 students next year, for a total budget-to-budget growth of 500 students. She said enrollment growth is uncertain but that this point, they did not anticipate updating this projection. She said they would have to evaluate this when school opens next fall. She said in the prior session, they had an increase in student enrollment due to economic circumstances, so they still feel fairly confident they will still see more growth.

Ms. Schmitt said she wanted to pause and discuss where the expenditures are in FY 20. She pointed on the slide to school-based compensation and department compensation numbers. She said 85% of their expenditures are around salaries and benefits. She said it is the School Division's desire to make as many cuts as possible in operations, and that she was presenting the chart on the slide so that the Board knows that their options are limited.

Ms. Schmitt said that the previous FY 20 funding request in February divided needs into four categories. She said there were non-discretionary and directed items, and an item around supporting the 500 student enrollment growth and growth in demographics. She said there had been an item of compensation increases and strategic proposals.

Ms. Schmitt said they looked at how they would revise the funding request and knew right after that that they would have no new spending, so all strategic proposals will be eliminated. She said in alignment with the decisions the County is making, they are suspending all salary increases initially. She said they have had to scrub growth and demographics and feel strongly that they cannot eliminate it altogether without significant service reductions. She said they are scrubbing technical and nondiscretionary items.

Ms. Schmitt said comparing these categories to the revision they were looking at, at that point, they can compare in two ways, just as they did with revenues. She said the first table on the slide showed the comparison of the proposed expenditure changes to the funding request produced in February, and that the second table is the comparison of how they would look compared to FY 20.

Ms. Schmitt said they have scrubbed their non-discretionary, directed, and technical items for a savings of \$1 million. She said they are proposing operational reductions, which is a savings of \$2.7 million. She said with those savings and making those cuts, the School Division feels that they can put

forward a portion of their growth and demographics, which is a \$1.9 million increase. She this was almost \$3 million less than what they need, however.

Ms. Schmitt said comparing this FY 20 budget from where it was in February to where it currently was, she would present a visual of how the story has changed; the swing from compensation increases in growth to minimal growth and operational reductions. She said she had a slide on each of those categories: growth, reductions, and non-discretionary items.

Ms. Schmitt said the remainder of the slides benchmark against current adopted fiscal year figures. She said the first is around non-discretionary, called "technical adjustments." She said they have scrubbed and updated what they call their "baseline adjustments," which are the majority of the savings as they roll over budget to budget. She said there is a health insurance decrease, or the holding of the rates, yields a savings of \$600,000. She said increases in this category are related to the SPED Restructure. She said this has not changed and has to do with changing guidelines and funding methodologies from the DoE related to regional programming. She said this increase is still planned and budgeted for. She said they still have to plan and budget for the VRS rate increase and some other miscellaneous operational changes.

Ms. Schmitt said the second category is operational reduction estimates. She said they are proposing that the department and school operation budgets be reduced for a savings of \$800,000. She said other departments include Building Services, Transportation, Technology, and the Central Office. She said each school gets per-pupil funding for their operations that they are proposing a reduction for.

Ms. Schmitt said they are proposing a reduction of 15 department-level positions. She said they think this can be achieved by freezing vacancies, which were well-distributed across departments.

Ms. Schmitt said the total savings of \$2.7 million allow the School Division to yield some increases for growth. She said there are three categories, and that they are proposing five Special Education teachers, 15 classroom teachers, and five additional transportation employees. She noted that the original needs for those items were, and that those have been included on the slide for comparison. She said with funding the bare minimum around SPED, it is half of the general teacher FTEs and about a third of the transportation drivers.

Ms. Schmitt said by not fully funding the number of general teachers, they anticipate a class size increase. She presented a slide comparing the average class size to the State staffing standards. She said they know in this community that there are small class sizes, which was a high priority, and that this funding decision was not one that the School Division takes lightly. She said they are fortunate that the community has invested in funding this and hopes that this is only a temporary increase that can be restored back in future years.

Ms. Palmer said one thing that the public will notice is likely to be the increased class size. She asked what other things Ms. Schmitt thinks the public (parents, families, and schoolchildren) will notice in these changes.

Ms. Schmitt replied that the impacts, in addition to class size, include transportation. She said if they are not fully funding their transportation levels, there will be service reductions, whether that means longer bus rides or double backs, where some kids are dropped off and then the bus goes back. She said they will see the number of build services work orders being reduced.

Ms. Palmer asked what impacts the public would see in terms of the work orders for the buildings.

Ms. Schmitt replied that this would be part of the discussion around capital, but that there were also impacts on the operational side. She said they would be able to do essential life and safety workorders, but not enhancement projects such as moving whiteboards or painting; it will be a bare minimum level of service.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said having gone through similar challenges in being a former teacher and principal, she believed the School Division's approach was a good one. She said the increased class size should have some impact, but that it should not necessarily have a major impact until about 2021, at the elementary level, or even 2022. She said they must do what is necessary.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if there would not be any change or increase in furniture, meaning the purchasing of additional furniture for the schools.

Ms. Schmitt replied that she imagined this would be limited. She said they would, however, if they were adding a classroom, as some schools were still growing. She said replacing the furniture would be minimal.

Ms. Mallek asked if the School Division was able to save anything as far as the expansion of the after school program, which much hard work has been put into over the past couple years.

Ms. Schmitt replied that at that point, there was a proposal on the extension of the after school program. She said this has been eliminated at this point due to the financial reality and cost of that, but that it was still something the School Division would love to pursue once revenues look more optimistic.

Mr. Gallaway asked if he heard correctly that the State has not re-forecasted State sales tax.

Ms. Schmitt replied that they did not. She said they would receive technical details on the basic aid, but that the State was not re-forecasting sales tax, which has a component both to basic aid and direct funding. She said the School Division has had to make local estimates on this.

Mr. Gallaway asked how, in the current year and since schools have shut down, operations have been hit. He asked if there was a savings there that would roll over.

Ms. Schmitt replied that the baseline adjustment on the slide is a comparison to the adopted FY 20 budget. She said the School Division is still in the process of unpacking the financial impact in this current fiscal year. She said they are anticipating some savings by the fact that the schools are closed, such as savings in fuel since the buses were not running. She said they have had substantial revenue impacts, however, both at the local and State levels, and that they are incurring increasing costs in other areas. She said they anticipate netting a savings to some degree, but that they would know more specifics over the next week or two.

Mr. Gallaway said he didn't expect that the decrease in revenues would be offset by the cost decreases, but that it would be important to know what the full story looks like.

Mr. Gallaway said the County has been looking at its own departments through the lens of Business Process Optimization and what they have been learning from the new reality such as virtual meetings and working from home. He asked if someone could speak to if the schools are tracking or following along with what they are learning from teachers working with students virtually that could potentially take the form of efficiencies or improvements down the road in some areas, whether for weather-related events or other pandemics.

Dr. Matt Haas, Superintendent, replied that the School Division is in the process of doing a program evaluation for their response to the closures they are experiencing from COVID-19. He said he had just reviewed four different surveys that morning that would go out to staff, teachers, students, and employees to find out how they performed with the response so that they can make short-term corrections in the program they are offering. He said this would also help them determine how they can keep improving in providing a virtual environment.

Dr. Haas said the teachers did an amazing job in standing up a 14,000-student virtual school in a matter of a couple weeks. He said looking around the State, there are mixed reviews in terms of the competency of different school divisions to do this work.

Dr. Haas said the technology department has done an outstanding job for support. He said that when they switched over to offering virtual continuity of learning, instead of just having a helpline for staff only, they converted it so that any parent can call in and have this distributed out to the schools to receive quick support from technology staff. He said this was an example of a lesson learned.

Dr. Haas said these lessons learned will pay off because the School Division does not know when they will be back at school on a regular schedule. He said they could be offering a hybrid of face-to-face, small groups, and virtual learning in the fall. He said he didn't think it would simply be a transition of going from no school to 100% of the students attending at one time. He said all the things they were learning now would be able to be applied.

Dr. Haas said there are many lessons learned, and there are teachers, ranging from those who just joined the schools last year to some teachers that have been teaching for over 40 years, who have jumped into the virtual environment and learned how to use the tools well.

Mr. Gallaway said he appreciated the response and that he has observed his own children adapting quickly to the virtual learning session. He said when he heard about technology cuts, though he understood some things will have to be cut, he would imagine that there would be needs for technology staff to run the virtual platform. He said he was certain the School Division was being mindful of what was being cut.

Dr. Haas said there were priorities the School Division started out with, in working with the School Board, and that keeping those priorities in mind as they move from responding to transitioning from the crisis will help them prioritize bringing positions back. He said if they remain focused on student learning, and if the economy begins to improve heading into the fall or perhaps wintertime, they will be able to bring positions back that support student learning.

Dr. Haas said in the technology department, for example, they have looked at freezing a vacancy or two they currently have, which will impact service levels. He said the good news, however, is that unlike teaching staff, they can hire back technology staff at any time. He said the School Division was thinking in the same way as Mr. Gallaway was in that making the cuts so they can have an operational budget to get things up and running, then bring priorities back once revenues go up again.

Ms. McKeel said she had a question about connectivity. She said she believed the School Division was mapping where they have gaps in connectivity for students, and that on the General Government side, there are gaps for employees to be able to easily join virtual meetings. She said connectivity is about safety, education, and being able to work. She asked if Dr. Haas could comment on where the School Division was on this issue. She said at some point, she would be interested in having a joint meeting of boards to talk about this issue, which spans both side of the house.

Dr. Haas said he was trying to look for the silver lining in this situation, and that for the schools, this has been the expansion of the program called "Check and Connect," where they ask all teachers to contact the students every week. He said the program had to be structured differently for secondary students, as they carry more students per class. He said one of the advantages of this program is that by making telephone calls or reaching out in other ways, the teachers have been able to have conversations with parents and students about their connectivity. He said the technology department has been gathering data from that.

Dr. Haas said they are also using a follow-up survey as part of the program evaluation in order to gather data around connectivity. He said they have been using Kajeet hotspots as a way to bring staff online who lack connectivity at home, as well as starting to prioritize students for that. He said there are more devices in the queue that they should be receiving later on, in the spring and early summer, and that can be distributed as well.

Dr. Haas said the schools have also expanded internet access into their parking lots so that people can pull up and download work via a platform called Schoology that was brought on board during the school year.

Dr. Haas said the School Division is poised to make some changes to help students and staff and at the same time, they are finding out to a greater extent and more accurately what the gaps are. He said Mr. Chris Bunin, Social Studies teacher at Albemarle High School, runs the GIS program at the high school and is also working with the technology department to create a map of the County that they can use to more accurately determine where the gaps are in coverage.

Ms. Schmitt agreed that this was a silver lining, and that they had never had this kind of data around connectivity before. She said this was a positive opportunity to get access to that data, and for students to work with GIS to map it. She said the School Division estimates that about 5% of its students do not currently have access.

Dr. Haas said that 5% is less than what he had thought, and that it is more accurate. He said 5%, however, is still an amount that would equal a school the size of Mountainview Elementary School, about 700 students or more.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked what the plan is for making sure that the 5% of students without internet access are reached.

Dr. Haas replied that the first piece is to accurately map where those students are located and then, based on their location and whether they are able to receive broadband, the next step is to figure out how to get broadband in proximity so that they can then be deployed a hotspot or some other device they can use.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked when the mapping would be completed and if there was anything the County could do to assist in that area.

Ms. Schmitt replied that she would have to defer to the School Division's Chief Technology Officer, who was not on the call, but that she could give the Board this information. She said any student who currently does not have access to internet is still being served. She said administrators and teachers are creative and have given students access, whether this is in the form of paper packets or other ways.

Dr. Haas said staff are using everything from telephone calls to mailing of thumb drives.

Ms. Mallek said there is enough broadband surveying that is being run by the IT department in order to provide the data for state and federal grants for fiber expansion. She said as the teachers are having these conversations with the families, if they could also be provided a link to that particular survey, this would help Mr. Mike Culp and the people gathering that information. She said one of the most powerful leverages they have is when they have a developable neighborhood area, such as 300 families, funders are much more willing to jump on that investment with the County. She said this is much faster than trying to go door to door, to figure out where the gaps are.

Ms. Palmer said as a member of the Broadband Authority, they have been talking about this and doing the mapping. She said they have done extensive work on the mapping in the past few months, and that her understanding was that the IT department is reaching out to the schools. She said there was a recent conversation about this in the past week with the understanding that there would be another outreach to the schools. She said there is also a project attacking some of the most difficult areas currently, and that her understanding is that the schools are aware of this, and that the schools' IT department is in contact with the County's IT department.

Dr. Haas said this was a correct assumption. He said Dr. Diggs, Chief Information Technology Officer, and Mr. Culp are working together and said he believed this was turning out to be a good team effort.

Ms. Price shared that she has to go from in-person to online Zoom classes where she teaches, and that it is not only difficult on the instructional side, but on the administrative and technical side. She said what the School Division has done to ensure that all students are still receiving instruction is a tremendous effort, as the challenges are great. She said as Ms. Palmer mentioned, there are limitations

on which the County is able to do relating to broadband. She said she was impressed with the actions the School System has taken to fill the gaps in internet access.

Mr. Culp said that he and Dr. Diggs met that Tuesday and are working to put a layer of teacher and student access in the County to help better build a broadband map that the Internet Service Providers can respond to. He said this will be put out and they will ask the ISPs to give them better information on what they need to lessen the number of students without access.

Ms. Allshouse said the County is unique in that it does its capital planning together with the School System. She said the two boards have worked together over the past year to put together a capital budget and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), which is a five-year plan. She said this work continues closely with the schools.

Ms. Allshouse said thinking about capital, there are projects that are ongoing. She said there is a long-range plan for the next five years as well. She said what was really at question that day, and what they need to focus on, is what they will place in the FY 21 budget.

Ms. Allshouse said as they entered the COVID-19 situation, all the work that was done on the operating side was also done on the capital side. She said the goals on capital are to preserve cash, minimize additional debt requirements until they know more about future revenues and future ability to borrow at good rates, and to delay certain projects while monitoring the economic situation. She said time was on the County's side on some of those things and if they can delay, it is a good idea to delay some projects until they see how things unfold.

Ms. Allshouse said that on the other hand, it is important as well to support the local economy with capital investments. She said while they want to delay projects, they are mindful that capital investments are important to the community and for those who work in those fields.

Ms. Allshouse said considerations moving forward include first supporting mandates and obligations. She said the County has always had the principle to maintain current facilities as a priority. She said there are central maintenance and replacement projects and programs that staff believes should continue. She said they are also selecting projects currently underway that are essential for infrastructure. She said there are a couple of projects moving forward from the current year budget at Red Hill and Scottsville, for example, and that these are recommended to continue.

Ms. Allshouse said the capital program often interplays with the operating budget, and so another thing staff considered when making decisions was about the items in the capital program that will not have a large impact on operational budgets.

Ms. Allshouse said the recommended capital budget is \$18.1 million. She presented a list of projects staff recommended to proceed with. She indicated to a box that included the Obligations and Mandates category. She said the contribution for the Senior Center at Belvedere, for example, is by an agreement. She said there are ongoing maintenance projects that will continue. She said there is annual debt service at Moores Creek Septage Receiving Station that they are required to do. She said there is annual maintenance at Ivy Fire Station 15. She said there is an agreement on the Regional Firearms Training Center to continue the County's share.

Ms. Allshouse said they hold funding available for a cost of issuance so that they can go into a future bond, the County has to have some funding available to secure the bond and to be able to do the proper paperwork, and so money has been reserved for this.

Ms. Allshouse indicated to the programs funded as requested. She said Economic Development funding is targeted for P3s. She said they also want to remain flexible on Economic Development funding and if some other priorities are placed higher, given the current situation, there is flexibility in that program.

Ms. Allshouse said Schools Technology Programs are all being funded as requested. She said the County Server Infrastructure is also being funded as requested.

Ms. Allshouse said Fire Rescue mobile data computer replacement was staying on schedule. She said Police radio replacements and video cameras were also still being included in the FY 21 budget, as well as two ambulances and an engine for Fire Rescue.

Ms. Allshouse said there are other projects that staff recommends continuing to fund, but that the scope or funding should be somewhat reduced. She said with regard to maintenance and replacement programs, those that are essential should move forward, but some other items should be delayed. She said people from departments such as Parks and Recreation and FES have looked through the items in those programs to see if there are those that can be delayed without issues. She said this involved a team approach across Schools and Local Government.

Ms. Allshouse said with regard to the School Bus Replacement Program, the School Division still has a need to replace three of the Special Education buses and radio equipment, but that larger bus replacements can be delayed for some time.

Ms. Allshouse said with capital, they were not talking about stopping things, but delaying things until they receive more information about revenues and about the future. She said the programs that are

recommended to be delayed include maintenance and replacement nonessential programs and large school bus replacements.

Ms. Allshouse said in terms of the ACE program, in the prior FY 21 budget, there was \$500,000 for the program, and that there is currently money available to carry forward for that program. She said staff recommended to delay additional funding for that.

Ms. Allshouse said the funding for the Bike/Pedestrian Quality of Life program, which was \$6 million. She said staff worked very closely with the Community Development Department, and they feel they can delay the decision on these funds until the fall. She said they need to look at this again in the fall, timing-wise, but for now, they are recommending delaying that until a later time when it can be discussed further.

Ms. Allshouse said for Crozet Elementary School Additions and Improvements, they are designing this, but that this was a joint conversation with the schools about delaying the construction on that for some time as they continue to see how things play out.

Ms. Mallek asked if there would be any more discussion about the Transportation Leveraging Program. She said what was listed in the budget book were projects only as compared to the bridge and roadway projects.

Ms. Allshouse replied that staff had submitted some information via email on that the evening before. She said Mr. McDermott was also available to answer questions.

Ms. Mallek said she would follow up with Mr. McDermott later.

Ms. McKeel said Ms. Allshouse had sent an email to the Supervisors about the current capital program and the currently-funded Transportation Leveraging Program projects. She said she was surprised because it had talked about the Eastern Avenue Bridge Study, which was proceeding to design; and the sidewalk at Commonwealth and Dominion Drive, which was proceeding and which she understood. She said the email said that the project for the sidewalk at Hydraulic and Barracks Road was proceeding. She said her question to Mr. McDermott was what project they were currently proceeding on at Hydraulic and Barracks Road, as she had thought those projects were completed.

Mr. McDermott replied that his understanding was that this was simply some remaining money on Hydraulic and Barracks Road sidewalks where the construction is complete, but the project has not been closed out.

Mr. Blake Abplanalp, Chief of Facilities Planning and Construction, said the project is complete. He said they held a small amount of money for building inspection by the Service Authority and some additional work requested, such as work on lowering a manhole, and reserved some money. He said the work had been completed and the money would be returned. He said there had been discussion about potentially trying to move this money to another transportation project, but that would have to be something that goes before the Board. He said in the current climate, there is an uncertainty on bids, and that they would be bidding a number of transportation projects in the near future. He said they are also looking at this money as a potential reserve, should they run into shortfalls.

Ms. McKeel said with regard to the Quality of Life project money and coming back to this in the fall, the Hydraulic CAC did not receive any of the money in that fund. She said at some point, she would like to look at a sidewalk project in the urban ring neighborhoods in the Jouett District, right off of Hydraulic and Georgetown Roads, that could tap into that fund, if possible. She said this was similar to the Tabor and High Streets project in Crozet and the Old Lynchburg Road project. She said it would be inexpensive because there was no right of way that would be required, according to VDOT. She said there are other aspects to the project that would be rewarding as well.

Ms. Palmer said there are applications that have gone in for the Quality of Life projects and are expecting to find out this spring if they would be receiving funding for those. She said she had no idea what was going on at the State level and if they would be changing that funding, and so she would like to hear input on that. She said she also wondered if they receive the funding in the spring for a project if it would still be there in the fall when they make a decision.

Mr. McDermott replied that they have been working with OMB on that question and generally, when they get word that projects will be funded, they will be funded in the new six-year plan, which would start on July 1. He said typically, they do not get any project agreements from VDOT until at least October of that year, so they could not ever start until at least October on those. He said they are often not able to start appropriating that money until the new year. He said delaying the decision on those for that six-month period is not expected to cause any problems. He said they will continue to work with VDOT if they do find out that the projects are funded in the new six-year plan.

Mr. McDermott said he knew that the State was reevaluating everything, but that he had not heard any definitive answers on whether or not they will continue to move forward with funding projects they have expected prior to the Coronavirus issues. He said currently, they are expecting that they will get those projects funded, and that they do not believe it would be a problem to hold off on the decision of funding those until this fall, when they expect to reevaluate the budget.

Ms. Palmer asked if there was then no reason to tell VDOT or the State yes or no, at the time

they grant the funding, whether or not the County will take it. She asked if there was no timeline to say yes or no on the County's part.

Mr. McDermott replied that this was correct. He said there was no timeline at least for the first 3-6 months. He said they would have no problem in holding off and not responding for that amount of time. He said they would continue to stay in touch with VDOT, so they know what the plans are, but that no definitive answer was needed during that time period.

Ms. Palmer said her comment was for the new Board members, as they had not heard her talk about this issue before. She said one of the greenway projects was supposed to allow easy walkability and bikeability under I-64, at the end of Old Lynchburg Road and over to Azalea Park. She said Azalea Park is essentially for the apartment complexes, many of which are affordable, on the south side of I-64 and is almost an attractive nuisance because there is no safe way to get over to the park. She said one has to get out into the road to get underneath I-64, and that the cars go quickly there.

Ms. Palmer said she has one constituent who lives in the Timberland Park Apartments who works and goes to school, has a voucher for housing, and has a six-year-old child with autism. She said her car is always breaking down and that she thinks it would be wonderful to not have to get into a car to take her son to Azalea Park.

Ms. Palmer said this is a real safety issue, and that Mr. McDermott had decided to fold this into a bigger project and go for funding on the Quality of Life project. She said going forward, if the Board finds that they cannot afford the larger project, she wanted to bring that piece of it to everyone's attention in that it is a dangerous situation for the people living in those apartment complexes on the south side of I-64.

Ms. Price thanked Ms. Palmer for her comment, as many people may misunderstand that something that is under a Quality of Life project also has a substantial safety component to it. She thanked staff for identifying and clarifying the responsibilities that the Board has and because capital is such a major part of the budget, there are some things they must do. She said there are some things that need to be finished, as they have already started. She said she appreciated the clarification that they are not eliminating projects so much as simply delaying decisions on many of them until they have a better sense of where they are financially.

Ms. Price thanked Mr. McDermott on his explanation and dialogue with Ms. Palmer on how they can still move forward with some of the applications or projects and still have the flexibility they need in this time of uncertainty.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley thanked staff for their detailed work, and that she approved of delaying projects rather than removing them. She said they will have to see where the pandemic is taking them, and that hopefully, there would be a quick recovery. She said she believed delaying projects was a smart thing to do.

Ms. Mallek said she was still unclear about the email about the Transportation Leveraging Program. She said her understanding was that they did an application for revenue sharing for the two highest-priority road and bridge projects. She said assuming they are approved for that, there would be funding somewhere they would find and move those forward. She said the Berkmar project was listed in two separate places and that she needed a better understanding of what was happening with the roadside as opposed to the trail side of Berkmar.

Mr. McDermott said with regard to the Berkmar Extension, this is a road extension project on the northern end of that road. He said it currently stubs out in the Hollymead area, and they want to make the connection all the way to Airport Road. He said that project was submitted for a revenue-sharing grant in 2019, and similar to the project that Ms. Palmer brought up, they would find out if that was going to be funded in the next month or so. He said in the fall, when they reevaluate the projects, they would make a decision of whether or not they have funding in the capital program to move that forward.

Mr. McDermott said the reason the project is in two separate places on the list in the response email Ms. Allshouse had sent out the night before is because they currently have approximately \$2.8 million in the Transportation Leveraging Fund that has not been assigned to any particular project. He said the total local share for the Berkmar project is approximately \$4.4 million.

Mr. McDermott said there is a balance there of about \$1.6 million, and that they were hoping that with some of the \$6 million for Quality of Life, they can move this to the Berkmar Extension Project, which could be considered a Quality of Life project in addition to the many bike/ped projects being moved forward. He said they felt they could move the \$1.6 million over to fund that balance so that they can move forward with that project in the beginning of the new year, if it were to exceed the funding, and if the County were able to match with that local portion.

Mr. Abplanalp said some of the things that may have been confusing is that they actually have three Berkmar projects in the planning stage. He said one is from the Transportation Leveraging Fund, and that project includes sidewalks and bike paths right behind Kroger on Berkmar, down to Hilton Heights Road behind Walmart. He said the project included in the Quality of Life submission is the stopping point behind Kroger, heading south to Rio Road. He said the hopes in the planning stage was that they would be able to combine those in the future, and they were still presently in the planning stages of both of those projects.

Mr. Abplanalp said there are certain time limits, and typically when VDOT approves a project to move forward, the County has one year to initiate a project. He said "initiate" means having issued a contract for design, for example. He said they have to show some sort of movement within a one-year period. He said currently, there are a couple projects facing deadlines in a few months, and they have been talking to VDOT about whether or not those deadlines are still going to be in place based on the pandemic and availability of State funding. He said VDOT was unable to answer those questions as they were also not sure. He said the State was trying to figure out what they are going to do.

Mr. Abplanalp said Ms. Mallek had asked about the Eastern Avenue project and should have been written as the Eastern Avenue Study. He said that while it does contain sidewalks, the bulk of the project is the bridge and road. He said the study is currently going on, and the final report is due to the County in November.

Ms. Mallek said that they divided the two number-one projects, and that the Berkmar project went ahead while the Eastern Avenue project did not. She said she was told that next year, with all the design information, the bridge, that is designed to carry ambulances to people in the other half of the growth area, where it takes an extra 10 minutes to get them there, that this would be done in the next round of revenue sharing. She asked when the next round of revenue sharing would be coming open, and if the report would be done in time to facilitate that.

Mr. McDermott replied that the Eastern Avenue study is still moving forward. He said they expect to have results from that in time to potentially make a submission for revenue sharing in the next application cycle in calendar year 2021 so they would be making that submission in the summer of 2021. He said they expect to have the results from the study by then. He said it was more than just a study, but also some initial design work included in the process. He said they can hold off on deciding where they would find that construction funding until early next year.

Ms. Mallek said this was one year later than the community was told by staff in the past year. She expressed her disappointment in that this was on the 2005 master plan and it would take another year, as it was number one on the list with the Berkmar project which, although great for economic development, is not a safety issue. She said there are 5,000 people living on the south side of that creek that don't get emergency services as well as they would when the bridge is there.

Mr. Gallaway asked how he could find the slide that says, "Reduced Funding." He said in the budget book, he could see the programs funded that reduced the level, and if there was detail in the budget book that explains what that means.

Ms. Allshouse replied that there are descriptions of all the projects starting on page 74.

Mr. Gallaway said he was on page 77. He said he could not see anything that is flagged as "Reduced Levels."

Ms. Allshouse replied that it was a definition of something different, and when they say "ongoing" on those descriptive pages, it means it is a project that they do every year. She said when they say "current," it is a current project. She said it was more of terminology on what type of program it is.

Mr. Gallaway said on page 73, there are examples of projects that will be delayed, recommended prior, and being carried forward. He said while he was glad to see that Red Hill and Scottsville were proceeding, but that when he sees "funded at a reduced level," he hopes these are projects where they can find cost savings without necessarily drastically altering the scope, or if the scope is being altered, it is being done for permanent reasons.

Mr. Gallaway said thinking back to the addition added at Greer and how that project drastically pulled back due to economic reasons, they did not see any real short-term purposes or objectives achieved because the school went back over capacity fast, and a major addition like that one shouldn't have been scaled back. He said he hoped that they would not make errors like this on the "reduced-level funding" projects, and that he would appreciate more details on those projects. He said he imagined those were much smaller in scale.

Ms. Allshouse replied that staff can provide the Board with more detailed information than is in the budget document on those items. She said they want to learn from the past on that, and everyone remembered how important it was to be thoughtful about this as they went through and did the staff work on those projects.

Mr. Gallaway said when they see a Crozet addition being put off, and seeing projects delayed that they have been trying to catch up on over the past 12 years, it is unfortunate.

Ms. Allshouse said the next step is the public hearing on May 6 and encouraged the Board to submit their questions to staff at any time.

Mr. Gallaway thanked Dr. Haas and Ms. Schmitt for attending and providing their input.

Ms. McKeel said she wanted to acknowledge VDOT staff, Joel DiNunzio, Alan Saunders, and Carrie Shephard, as the County was the recipient for four new lights along Barracks Road, under the Barracks Road bridge. She said that back in the 1990s, they had lights underneath the bridge because there were so many pedestrians and that years ago, people threw stones at those lights. She said VDOT kept replacing them and then decided not to replace them anymore, so they remained broken for about 15-20 years.

Ms. McKeel said she started working with Mr. Joel DeNunzio at VDOT three years ago, and finally, they have new LED lights under the bridge that the bypass goes over so that people will not be walking in the dark. She said the cost was \$22,500 and did not require any money from the County.

Ms. McKeel said the day before, the Board saw an announcement from UVA regarding layoffs and reductions at the Medical Center. She said the Medical Center is hemorrhaging about \$85 million a month and while certainly everyone is distressed by this news, they all understand how they have gotten there. She said there is a lot of empathy for those people and hope that this will be resolved quickly.

Ms. McKeel said for her, it points out how important the Board's work with Economic Development is. She said while UVA is now, has been, and probably always will be one of the biggest drivers in the local economy, it is important that the Board continues to think about diversifying the workforce in the community rather than sitting back on UVA's laurels. She said just as people diversify their own personal portfolios, it is important that the County sees its Economic Development as a driver for jobs and creating good in the community.

Ms. Palmer said she appreciated that staff said they were going to consider the Economic Development fund in a broader sense so that it could be adjusted to be used in a different way than previously thought. She said she wondered if they need some more help with businesses, and they may want to think about ways they can use the fund going forward, given the current situation.

Ms. Palmer said their new VDOT representative, Carrie Shepherd, has received great reviews from people in Howardsville in not only her correction of the Howardsville Turnpike washout, but willingness to make repairs that would, in the future, reduce the chances of that road washing out again, as it has been a chronic problem. She expressed appreciation to Ms. Shepherd.

Ms. Price said she is a member of the Albemarle-Charlottesville chapter of the NAACP and was contacted by that chapter about 7-10 days earlier about a letter that they have written to Governor Northam. She said it was the desire of the local chapter to actually appear before the Board during Matters on the Public Not on the Agenda and read the letter. She said given the way they are currently operating, however, and not having that public participation to the same degree they were before, she was asked to read the letter into the record. She noted that she had already provided a copy to the clerk to be included into the record.

Ms. Price said the letter was from the Albemarle-Charlottesville NAACP, dated April 16, 2020, and addressed to Governor Northam.

Ms. Price read the letter aloud:

"Dear Governor Northam,

COVID-19 has placed a strain on the economy, government, as well as health care services, and has exacerbated the chronic inadequate access to medical care experienced by African Americans.

What is clear now is the stratification of those effects and the disproportionate affect on specific socio-economic groups. The physical manifestation, the evidence of high rates of COVID-19 infection and mortality among African Americans, is an indictment against a moral failing far greater than can be rectified in our generation. But, you can take a big step forward!

Base on the data from the Virginia Department of Health, African American cases of the virus constitute a little over 30% of those reported. In Virginia, African Americans constitute about 20% of the population. So, if you are African American you have a more than 50% greater likelihood of falling victim to the pandemic than your fellow Virginians.

The demands on government services, particularly the Virginia Employment Commission and the Department of Medical Assistance Services (DMAS) have placed a barrier to healthcare for all Virginians. The current policy and process have created a backlog of Medicaid applications that is far from what will become at the apex of this crisis. For a significant portion of the newly Medicaid eligible population, that 45 day wait DMAS uses as its standard of performance may be a death sentence.

We call on you to use your executive discretion and the Federal CMS 1135 waiver process to speed up Medicaid eligibility determinations and provide critical access to care. We propose you allow a presumptive Medicaid eligibility status based upon data immediately available through the Department of Taxation and other sources. Leverage non-governmental resources such as the Federal Navigators and Certified Application Counselors to augment both Cover Virginia and the Department of Social Services in this endeavor.

Governor, you have an opportunity to establish policy that will significantly address this inequity while

improving the health and lives of all Virginians. Your prompt and bold action during this crisis is imperative. We implore you to act now. We stand ready to support you in this endeavor.”

Ms. Price said the letter was signed by Dan Sullivan, Health Chair of the Staunton NAACP, Greg Winston, Health Chair and 2nd Vice president of the Albemarle Charlottesville NAACP with copies sent to Senator Mark Warner, Senator Time Kaine, State Senator Emmett Hanger, State Senator Creigh Deeds, Delegate Sally Hudson, Representative Denver Rigglesman, and Representative Ben Cline

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley thanked staff and her fellow Board members for doing all that they could during the pandemic.

Ms. Mallek acknowledged Ms. Shepherd from VDOT for following up on requests. She said there was a new stop sign at the corner of Reas Ford and Earlysville Roads that was well-received by the neighbors. She said the hope was that this new structure would prevent T-bone car accidents that frequently occur there. She said the increase in safety was important, and that she understood that somewhere in the procurement process were two radar signs, which would help traffic in the other direction.

Ms. Mallek said regarding economic development, Rivanna Station was a critically important element, with 10,000 jobs relying on its presence in the area. She said she listened in on the new Chamber committee and encouraged everyone to find a committee in the email list Ms. Liz Cromwell sent out so they can listen in and understand what is coming up in the various workgroups being planned to help in recovery.

Mr. Gallaway said he had a final question about the budget. He asked Ms. Allshouse if there was a way to get emailed questions to staff combined into one document. He said he found it difficult to find an email versus one document tracking all the questions and responses. He said it also may be useful to post this publicly.

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

There was no report.

Agenda Item No. 5. Adjourn to May 6, 2020, 2:00 p.m., electronic meeting pursuant to Ordinance NO. 20-A(6).

At 1:44 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to May 6, 2020 at 2:00 p.m. which would be an electronic meeting held using Zoom and telephonic connection, pursuant to Ordinance No. 20-A(6), “An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster” and information on how to participate would be posted on the Albemarle County website when it becomes available.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date 2/15/2023
Initials CKB