



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Albemarle County Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session #4, Monday, March 25, 2024

Date Monday, March 25, 2024
Place Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length 2h 48m (video)

- Official meeting video (Granicus): https://albemarle.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=962
- Official agenda: https://albemarle.granicus.com/AgendaViewer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=962

Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-16. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:00] Good afternoon. I'm pleased to call in order this regular work session of the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors on this 25th of March to 3 p.m. on the room 241 of Lackertine Building. Like a note, Supervisor is present here. Supervisor Emanuele District, Supervisor Ben Galloway of the Iowa District, Supervisor Jack Jewett District, Supervisor Bela Peace Medana District, Supervisor Mike Pruitt of the Scottsville District, and myself, Ben Indy, for the Loon CME Northern District.

[00:00:27] The forum is present. We're also joined by Deputy County Executives Daniel Wall and Trevor Murray, County Attorney, Mr. Steve Rosenberg, and our clerk, Ms. Cladette Gorgerson. Also, let me welcome the Elmhurst County Police Officers present, Officer Parker Davis and Officer James Morris. We thank you for your service today and every day on behalf of the residents of our county for our safety and security. Before we begin, let me again remind people that the microphones are in the scene. They need to speak up, including me to be heard. The board, because we have an item on the consent agenda, we actually

[00:01:07] have to adopt an agenda, and then it's from the consent agenda, so I will first do a motion to adopt the final agenda. Second. Second. A motion from Supervisor Malik, second from Supervisor McKeel. Without objection, if the clerk will call the vote. Ms. Apista-Girtley? Aye. Ms. Malik? Yes. Ms. McKeel? Yes. Mr. Pruitt? Aye. Mr. Andrews? Yes. Mr. Galloway? Yes.

[00:01:30] Thank you. And that brings us to the consent agenda, which is just a kind of basically public hearing scheduling for the modification of real estate tax relief for the disabled. So I'm looking for a motion to adopt the consent agenda.

[00:01:46] Second. We have a motion from Supervisor Malek. Second from Supervisor McKeel. Without objection, it's a court to call me out. Ms. Lutista-Kirtley. Hi. Ms. Malek. Yes. Ms. McKeel. Yes. Mr. Pruitt. Aye. Mr. Andrews. Yes. Mr. Galloway. Yes. Thank you.

[00:02:02] All right. We're here for the work session on our fiscal year 25 operating and capital budget. At this time, I'll turn the meeting over to Mr. Andy Goldman, Assistant Chief Financial Officer, and allow you to introduce staff. Yes. Thank you, Chair Andrews, for the introduction, and good afternoon to the board.

[00:02:21] I'll ask other staff, just as I speak, to introduce themselves. I'll be facilitating a good portion of today with Mr. Davidson to my right. Starting before we look at today's agenda is really the remaining budget process ahead. We have two work sessions scheduled this week in March.

[00:02:37] In April, there's a to-be-determined work session if it's needed, as well as the only one public engagement. There have been town halls the board has held to date, and those will continue through April, as well as public hearings. The process will conclude on May 1st with the adoption and appropriation of the budget. Looking ahead to today's agenda, we are going to first pick up on the remainder of the capital improvement program that was not completed at the previous work session.

[00:03:03] We'll then also spend some time at debt management, which is closely connected to the capital program. If the board desires, after those topics, would it be a good time for a break? And when we come back from that break, we'll spend some time with the board walking through some technical updates and also options for the board as we get ready on March 27th for the board to take action to propose a budget and tax rates for advertising and public hearing.

[00:03:27] There is no action today other than one item that we would, well, there is no action today. If there is one item in the revenues, we'll be able to have some work consensus on. But we'll get to that a little bit later in today's meeting. So with that, we're going to pick up on the CIP. Where we were last time is we spent about the last half hour or so of the last work session talking through the process to get to the recommended CIP.

[00:03:50] And we spoke about Goal 5, which is educational learning in the majority of the county CIP with public education. So just to kind of ground us again before we look at the county government projects and the other five strategic plan goals. The starting point in developing the recommended CIP was last year's adopted CIP, so projects began to march forward a year with some refinement to those.

[00:04:14] That's a key point today, and we'll talk about it on a few items, because there aren't that many projects in year one that are new. They are added, though, more in the out year. We'll talk about that in more detail in a moment. Staff continues the work we usually do to update their financial assumptions. The board of supervisors held a joint meeting with the school board, And to the possible, will you continue to use the strategic plan as our North Star to develop the CIP?

[00:04:37] And that will be very apparent in Mr. Davidson's comments, where I'll turn it over to him to talk through the next five strategic goals. Good afternoon, board. Brian Davidson, deputy chief of budget. Similar to what we showed you when we were here discussing the school CIP, I want to start out with a summary of the projects here for county government from FY25 to FY29.

[00:05:05] As you can see, it's planned at roughly just shy of \$129 million over the five-year period. About \$34 million of that set for appropriation in FY25. Each of these check marks represents the year in which the funding is recommended for each of these projects.

[00:05:22] And we'll go into more detail on each of these projects listed individually through the following slides. But as you can see, so for example, transportation leveraging has funding in the first three years, same with parks and recreation. when you get down to central library we have funding in some of the out years and so on and we'll get we'll provide each more detail on the funding timing and recommendations on each of these as we move through so before we get into the project details i wanted to start by going showing a slide very similar to what we showed you on december 6th in our county government schools cip joint work session um as andy discussed in an earlier slide we came before you with our

[00:06:00] approach and assumptions for a plan for developing the 25 to 29 CIP. I'm using the approach, the approved FY 24 to 28 CIP as the starting point. And at that time, we discussed several of these projects shown here that were above and beyond our regular maintenance replacement programs and those types of projects and what they meant, the timing, and when they worked. As we move through the budget development process, as we move through the budget development process,

[00:06:29] The same as we did with public schools, we made changes and adjustments to that original plan for the county government CIP, the result of which was several new projects that were added to our CIP, the additions of which...

[00:06:48] I fall apart over here. No, you were right on this one. We're starting off on a solid footing here, all right. The additions from what we showed you on December 6th are shown here kind of off to the left-hand side of the slide, including the Urban Park, Woolmills ADA Trailhead, Central Library, some community non-profit projects, and Fire Rescue Station 11 renovations.

[00:07:19] We'll go through a little more detail on each and every one of these and each of the projects up here on the following slides. All right, first we'll look at the Courts Facilities Addition and Renovations Project. If you've driven or walked around Port Square, I think you've noticed that this project is well underway recently.

[00:07:38] We've started the construction of the first phase, which includes the construction on the Levy site. The second phase, which is the renovation of the current historic courthouse, will be up next. As we fund further examination of the cost updates for both phases combined, we looked at the total project.

[00:07:54] It was determined that an additional \$6 million would be needed in FY25 to fully fund that work. I did want to point out that for each of these slides in the top left corner or across the top, we'll have the name of the project, the recommended dollar amounts, and the years in which those dollars are coming in so that you'll have a little bit of the timing and the full cost in each of those years.

[00:08:22] Next is transportation language. This is recommended for \$30 million from funding in the CIP. As you can see, that's in the first three years, 25 through 27. And this program provides flexible and consistent funding to support high-priority transportation projects and initiatives in the county.

[00:08:38] These are typically high-cost projects requiring a significant financial commitment from the county to develop and to implement. These projects are listed and prioritized in the county's transportation priority listing, and that is updated and approved each year by the Board of Supervisors.

[00:08:55] Also, every other year, the county may apply for funding through various state and federal funding programs, such as the Transportation Alternatives Program, SmartScale, both of which are very competitive, and through VDOT Revenue Sharing, which is a less competitive program but is a one-for-one dollar match for the participating locality, up to \$10 million per application for the construction, maintenance, improvements to state roads.

[00:09:21] On the slide here, we've shown the projects that are included in the current transportation leveraging program, and when we get to the end, we'll be happy to answer questions. We have folks here to answer questions about those projects, should they? Northern Convenience Center.

[00:09:38] This includes the design and the construction of the Solid Waste Convenience Center, similar to what's in the southern part of the county now. This would be in the northern part. Funding for design is in FY25 at about a half a million dollars, with construction dollars to follow in 27, roughly \$1.3 million.

[00:09:57] This is a slight change from what we showed you back in December, where it was funding in 20, design in 25, and construction in 26. The new schedule reflects the sequencing of bringing online the various RSWA facilities, whether that be the Southern Convenience Center, the new Baylor facility that's under design and hopefully will be under construction soon out at the Ivy Materials Utilization Center, as well as the Northern Convenience Center.

[00:10:22] This allows us to better spread the operating costs of bringing each of those facilities online without bringing all of them online at one time. That allows us to spread it out over multiple years and be able to ramp up those operational costs and be able to afford those operational costs better. Central Library.

[00:10:40] This is one of the new programs that is in the CIP. This is not in FY25, but rather in the out years. And the Central Library, this serves as the main branch and regional headquarters for the JMRL library system, and it's co-owned by, the building's co-owned by Albemarle County and the city of Charlottesville.

[00:11:00] In addition to being owned 50% by the county, 50% of the circulation in this building is attributable to the county, even though it's located right in the heart of downtown, still 57% is county residents. Funding in the 25 to 29 CIP, about \$860,000 for design in 27, with another roughly \$9.6 million for construction in 29.

[00:11:25] And that's going to add public space for additional meeting rooms, technology, and youth services, as well as some core system upgrades to things such as HVAC, plumbing, electricity, security, networking, all those kind of things. As you can see at the bottom of the slide, the funding is going to be contingent on several factors listed here.

[00:11:43] And they're going to be worked through with the library and with our library partners, the city. And as you can see, the city's funding is required to fund its share. There will be an MOU that we're working on and an expectation that the library itself will leverage some outside sources of funding from community departments to assist with bringing this project to fruition.

[00:12:09] So when we talked about the Parks and Recreation Department several weeks ago, I guess it was now, a big focus for the department for FY25 budget was moving forward with our Parks Capital Projects and our Parks Capital Plan. The first of which we'll talk about here is Biscuit Run Park.

[00:12:26] Biscuit Run is budgeted at about \$9.2 million over FY25 and FY26 spread between the two years. And it's going to include several elements, first of which is that Route 20 enters its way in Trailhead to open the park and get us into the park. And then we have the trail networks, which includes three elevated boardwalks to the marshier areas.

[00:12:45] We have the athletic fields, the two athletic fields. Hickory Street, the bridge, and pedestrian improvements on the Trailhead. This was funding that was initially anticipated in the out years that we were able to look at and able to move up into FY26 to align with design and timing and all of that.

[00:13:05] So that has been able to be moved forward and be able to get that out for those residents sooner. And then finally, a maintenance facility that will house the equipment and the facilities for our Eastern Maintenance Group, which is not just biscuit run, but all the parks in the eastern part of the county.

[00:13:20] Darden Tau Athletics Fields. This was a project that began in FY24 and it's for the phased rebuild of the existing grass fields out of Darden Tau Park over a four-year period from FY24 through FY27. One of each fields will be taken out of use during the rehab process to minimize the disruptions for the recreational activities. Earthworks will be moved. The project will provide some revenue each year by the city of Charlottesville as determined by the annual

[00:13:56] funding formula for darden tower park which currently sits at about 69 county 31 city and after each renovation of each field there'll be a period of time to allow the natural grass to grow in and the first field will be ready for athletic play it's anticipated not guaranteed but anticipated by spring of 2025 based on the current schedule next urban park at pocket park

[00:14:24] In the 24 to 25, 24 to 28 CIP, we identified this project, but did not identify any funding and it was listed as a zero dollar project, knowing that there was a lot of staff work and internal work that needed to be done first before we could put some cost estimates to this.

[00:14:40] Parks and Recreation is still working through that site identification and development process for potential sites in the urban development area. And upon that identification, we've provided some funding for our initial estimates of about \$150,000 for design, followed by about \$1.5 million for construction.

[00:14:58] So as we further refine and define exactly which site that is, we may have to refine these cost estimates. But based on our best knowledge at this time, this is what we're anticipating for this meeting for this. So I want to take a minute to discuss two projects that are actually coming online in FY20 or coming up for funding in FY25.

[00:15:29] First is the Woolen Mills Trailhead. This is a project that will fund the design and construction improvements at the Woolen Mills Trailhead to improve its accessibility for disabled persons. This project may include signage, minor amenities, acquisition of temporary construction easements, permanent access to maintenance easements.

[00:15:50] This project was prioritized for compliance reasons and moved into FY25 for compliance reasons and to meet these ADA reasons. Next is station renovations. This is going to be at Station 11 Monticello.

[00:16:06] And this project includes the renovation and maintenance of several key areas in the Station 11. As you're aware, Amar County was awarded the FEMA Safer Grant for 30 individuals. Part of that would be provide additional staffing for the relocation of the ladder truck to station 11.

[00:16:25] The increase in personnel at that station is more than the station was initially designed for. And so this project was prioritized because it's a county-owned facility. The impact of the FEMA Safer Grant, which was not awarded at the time we were putting together the CIP, necessitated us putting this project in so that we will have these renovations at least well on their way to being completed at the time we're bringing the staff online into that.

[00:16:49] facility. Moving along to workplace and facility renovations. This project is related to the development and implementation of the space utilization project for the county office buildings both here at located at McIntyre Road and Fifth Street Extended and the FY24 budget included some funding for space program studying and some initial design with the capital work to follow funding the completion of that work and this project continues that cycle of design and construction moving through FY27.

[00:17:27] Core systems modernization, this is a project that we've spoken to you about previously in several different areas, whether it be the financial management system or community development system. This funding will advance future CSM work, which through the most recent systems have been about providing better customer service with modern interfaces and more transparency in the status of items, streamline process, but it's also about having data that we can use to drive process improvements, decision making, and resource management.

[00:17:55] Now I'm going to turn this back over to Mr. Bowman to discuss the community non-profit. Thank you. I have just a few slides before we open up the board, a question and discussion. This is just to take a moment and revisit this process that was last discussed by the Board of Supervisors in July of 2023.

[00:18:13] To go a little further back, about 18 months ago in the fall of 2022, the Board of Supervisors created a process for community non-profits to apply for capital funding. Prior to that time, they may come up as one-off throughout the year, and the board really wanted to build upon the process for other non-profit request processes to have one designated way to move forward. So after the first year, we came back to the board in July to get some updated guidance for what a framework of a good application, I should say good, the best quality application to be considered in the recommended budget, what that may look like, and the board approved some guiding principles. The first three which were unchanged of just really being an

[00:18:53] eligible capital project considering this in the context of the overall CIP. These items on the next slide were shown and I just want to emphasize without going through in detail, really those most competitive applications will leverage funding, be managed by the agency themselves rather than the county, be shovel ready, be about increasing services, and finally number eight, I can't summarize in a quick phrase, but it really recognizes that there are more than 60-some community partners we have if some of those didn't exist the county would be stepping in and providing that service that's not true with all 60 of those and that's not we don't need to go through and say who wouldn't who wouldn't be but

[00:19:32] recognize there is a different level of a durable partnership between some of our community partners in the county so with that framework we received another number of applications and four of which are included in the CIP although one is going to get an update in just a second the first of which is on the left a community nonprofit application from Bennett's Village this is to create an adaptive

playground that would be located at Penn Park several years ago our Parks and Recreation staff in the county met with this organization really find out is there a place in the county this could be located and there really weren't that good candidates so the next best option is really for the city to

[00:20:11] contribute land which is adjacent to the county and an immediate access of much of the development area for 65,000 to help bring this project to fruition this This organization has been leveraging funding, they've gotten state funding, other grants, and the counties would really be bringing this project to completion for the initial phase at Penn Park.

[00:20:31] And this also continues the spirit of, right now, the county and the city contribute on the other adaptive recreation programs that we do on an operating basis throughout the year. So this continues that partnership. The second item is an update to actually remove a project from the CIP. The Blue Ridge Area Food Bank had submitted a project to expand their freezer space.

[00:20:51] After the release of the recommended budget, they were actually able to secure funding for the total project without the county. And so this project will come to realization, and the county does not need to contribute anything to it. So this is one staff would recommend removing that from the CIP.

[00:21:07] And that will be part of the technical updates later that we'll touch on. The final two projects included I'll talk about together are some work about Earlyville, a volunteer fire company, and for Seminole Trail, looking at improvements to both of those two stations. The amounts are shown on the slide, about \$800,000 in Earlyville, \$230,000 in Seminole Trail.

[00:21:28] These projects are included in year three right now. The reason why this, and as Mr. Davidson mentioned, many of the other new projects tend to be in year three is because of the respect paid to the prior CIP, where projects tend to not come into year one, with the addition of where there are kind of compliance thoughts.

[00:21:47] So before I open this up to board comments and questions, I do want to share one request was made by a supervisor to consider moving Earlyville volunteer company up from year three to one, which would be fiscal year 27 to fiscal year 25. So our staff did the analysis to say, you know, what would be the financial implications of that?

[00:22:07] And the short answer financially is that because, you know, this is a cash-funded project and And while a million dollars is substantial and the CIP is a substantial amount of money in terms of the context of a more than \$300 million CIP, to make an adjustment of one year in a cash-funded project is not very impactful.

[00:22:28] So if the board wanted to, they could choose to either accept the recommendation as it is. They could move one or both of the projects up earlier than year three up to year one. Because that was a request made by a supervisor before we get into other general fund items, This is an item for capital that we would tee up for the board discussion.

[00:22:46] And that really concludes our comments. Before we get to debt management, this would probably be a good time to discuss any capital project questions. Okay, so would you like capital project questions and this? Yes, and this. That would be that. So that's just the board. So we'll go through our order for today.

[00:23:02] Supervisor Calloway, New Orleansville, I would be supportive of moving that up to year one. In fact, even before knowing the Blue Ridge implication and then another thought I had, you know, you framed that as the cost of moving this up.

[00:23:24] Like, what are the ramifications of it? If we leave it out there, because I'm guessing Supervisor Malik made this report, they've raised money, right? \$800,000 in hand all day. So, given the inflation situation and what happens with projects moving forward, it almost seems like we devalue what they have raised for their project.

[00:23:46] by putting it out for three years. So if it's not impactful or the impact can be absorbed, I think we get more bang for their buck by doing the project sooner rather than later. So I'm supportive of moving that. The urban park, the site has not been designated.

[00:24:07] Do we have sites in mind and we're just trying to figure out if they're going to work, or are we still hoping for sites to come forward? I'll ask Bob Grickenberger or Director of Parks and Recreation if you can speak to where they are in the process. We are currently, let me go back a little.

[00:24:26] We have gotten a list of all surplus county and school problems. We are currently going through over 160 portions and doing actually a site survey. We hope to complete that process very soon.

[00:24:44] In the next several months, hopefully we will come back to the board and present our findings with some options in terms of one through seven or whatever. the wish deal it's a work of progress i got you hey my thought was before not knowing the other ramifications of that is if the site's not found and we're planning for construction in year what was it 26 thinking of the earliest bill you could almost swap those as priorities you don't have the site you could sometimes just moving pieces around sometimes in those years so

[00:25:21] i don't know how simple that is that you'd have to tell me that and actually that's complicated But my thought is if the site's not determined, where we can't meet construction in one fiscal year, it seems to me that it would make sense to flip-flop maybe the timing of a couple projects. Perhaps if you keep things simpler, Earlesville couldn't be moved up regardless of what happens at this two-year one.

[00:25:42] I think our approach with Parks and Recreation would be to see in the coming year, where are they? And if a year from now, if we're not ready to move construction into fiscal year 26, we would push that back to fiscal year 27 at that time. I just came in in the spirit of trying to find other ways to pay for it if you want to move things around.

[00:26:00] I'm glad that I don't have to go to the Northern Convenience Center because that was on my radar as well in terms of priority. The work in the budget book for workplace, the facility renovations, the \$3.6 million. So I could see where the core systems modernization is.

[00:26:23] Where does that workplace fall in the budget book? Categories public works is it listed just as work funds facility renovations County office building space for the big works thank you that's all thank you supervisor mill thank you I will slide 22 eagerly encourage and support moving both of these forward if that's what the staff has found it's easily but I'm

[00:27:02] I'm desperately in support of moving the police forward in order for them to be able to proceed to permitting in Kraken, which is great. And I do have a few questions. Let's see.

[00:27:23] On 510, the courts, the \$6 million is the county share over it, or is some of that part of the city's share? This is all counties, so they're contributing extra for their share of you because they pay 15% or 20% of the courts.

[00:27:41] Sorry, I thought you're about to speak up I can I will speak to this Under the agreement, the city would not be contributing anything further The \$6 million is being provided by the county Great, thank you Let's see, on 12 I understand about the Northern Convenience Center The Green County has just notified Northern residents that they will no longer be accepting

[00:28:18] outlaw county donations to their transfer station as of July so that is going to be a total change of because we're 45 minutes from Ivnc and 10 minutes from green so a lot of our stuff goes up there um and that's going to change a lot for people north of 64. so i just want to pass that along um i don't know what to do about it but i'm just passing it along um and library's going and just for future thought i hope that we will try again on the state budget for biscuit run for

[00:28:58] various elements because other counties in cold pepper just got 25 or 30 million bucks for a new state park up there so we just not just because we were rebuffed one time we shouldn't give up uh and keep trying again on that because the weather all the different elements in there our possibilities I think for us and all right let me jump okay and the 17 the wool mills compliance that's the north side changes only am I correct about

[00:29:36] that we're not trying to do anything okay and on the workplace renovations did more details about how the spaces would be rearranged come to the board at some time this year or I mean is it phased because usually we learn things about I didn't know we haven't heard about it since the windows which was 10 years ago and they got done yeah yeah I'm sorry I'm putting Mr. Stewart on the spot I'm not sure if in the project timeline if something is planned or if

[00:30:16] that is not yet identified so we we started our efforts with a programming effort with the community I mean the social services department which appears to have a circuit of space and are now in the process of doing a similar exercise with five departments within the main McIntyre office building that either have space constraints or may also have space opportunities so we're moving that forward there's also some policy work that we'll be working with

[00:30:56] the executive's office to make sure we have a common understanding across departments for all employees about what expectations are. Your right to have an office. You are one of the tricky ones for us from a planning perspective. So we hope that by, it's difficult to say how quickly the policy work may happen, but we've got a good team on this with support from the mayor.

[00:31:27] So you're in the study phase. That's the short answer. Yes. Go. Thank you very much. I should have said that. No, that's okay. I didn't know if you were going to procurement right away, and I thought, I don't know anything about this. I should ask. Very good. Thank you. Oh, we did that already?

[00:31:44] Okay, I'm done. Thank you very much. Supervisor Proulx. So for the things that were kind of pitched to the board for feedback, I think unsurprisingly, moving forward with the Earliestville Station, Seminole Station, and of course the polling of the Blue Ridge Food Bank seems powerful.

[00:32:11] And this is, again, you know, every time I speak on something on the budget, I have to acknowledge, like, my newness to the process. I am not quite sure what the process looks like for our

community partners, and I'm wondering, is that something that is kind of compared to community partners in our operating budget?

[00:32:31] It's very front and center. We can very much see what that process looks like, what the applications look like, how they've created. Is there a similar level of transparency that's offered for this level of community partnerships? because I recognize these can be quite impactful and sometimes even much larger value projects.

[00:32:47] I guess I'm curious what the degree of transparency looks like and what kind of the current sunlight on that is. I would say this process is in its second year, so it is probably not as widely known as the others. We will do an orientation with really everyone who's on our distribution list, which is pretty much every agency we fund or request it has been in contact with us.

[00:33:08] When we do orientations with folks, we kind of outline for them, Here are all your possible paths of funding. Here's what's appropriate for you in which circumstance. And we're available in that process to answer any questions. So there really is no orientation for this. There's really an orientation for community funding. And from that, you may be appropriate for this, arts and cultural, the agency budget review team process for human service agencies.

[00:33:32] We talked with them about the human services needs assessment in those high-priority areas. So we really need to have one vehicle with them to use that to educate all of the agencies. Were there unfunded requests this cycle that are included in our budget book?

[00:33:50] Yes, we did. Those are noted in second on page 289 to 290. Same for public transparency.

[00:34:09] That includes a request from the Emergency Communications Center, Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville had two requests, Claudius Crozet Park, a group out in Crozet, and then WTGA Radio, which actually was requested but then directed to operating because it didn't meet the criteria, but we did show it as a request there.

[00:34:28] But it was considered. Just every time it comes before us, I also want to highlight just how pleased I am with the continued progress on this, and also thank my peers who have been here in the past years for moving up the Hickory Street Trailhead.

[00:34:50] I know that was an effort by a previous board, and I greatly appreciate that that has been incorporated for this year's portion of the capital. while we're on the subject i know that there's still a lot of plates we're spinning on the the extension of the greenway for biscuit run but i'm wondering how that works as we think about programming the capital plan and um whether or not it would be typical when there's still uh things that are like outstanding uncertainties in planning for us to start programming years out

[00:35:28] So that's kind of an open-ended question. But I guess, should I be expecting to see something about the Biscuit Run Greenway on here, given that we don't have all the finalities related to easements that we're going to do?

[00:35:49] Ms. Griggenberger, would you like to address that as part of the overall scope of the project to just clarify? As you mentioned, we're currently in the process of negotiating and discussing a potential land easement with two homeowner associations.

[00:36:09] And that has been a long, long process. We're making some gains with one and our discussion with the second will soon begin next month. So in terms of how that all unfolds, how it progresses, what the outcome is, we're just not real sure.

[00:36:31] But we feel very comfortable that we're in a much better position than, let's say, we were six months or a year ago. I appreciate that. I guess the question I'm trying to get at more is to what degree do we need to be planning for the capital outlays, presuming that we have effective negotiations in the coming years.

[00:36:53] Is it a concern that we have not already identified that in the – in the capital? I guess it's more kind of – I would say not immediately, and the reason for that is I mentioned a lot of negotiations still need to occur.

[00:37:09] that agreement has been reached, and we have to go in the process and take it to be a year. So I think it'd be – we're in a safe position to push that ahead a little bit. Mr. Crickenberger, just so I'm glad you're up here.

[00:37:26] I am curious – I know we do not have program funding for the old trail of extension Longshat. I'm wondering if that is something that we can expect to see as we move forward again in negotiations, I think, this time with the Donald Jefferson Council.

[00:37:42] or if this is representing a decision that we may not pursue. No, we're still in the end of the negotiation. And I assume that it's going to be in the same kind of bucket of there's enough flexibility in the capital improvement plan for us to actually address that the year the opportunity comes on.

[00:38:05] I would hope so, yes. Again, this is recognizing that this is a process I'm less familiar with. I want to know how many years out we need to be planning for things, and if something is not flagged well enough in advance, I just want to thank you so much.

[00:38:21] Thank you. I was just going to respond to that last point you made in saying that on an annual basis, we do look at each of the projects that are in our CIP and look at cost updates, project updates as things have moved and changed for timing, for cost, whether that be inflation, whether that be we've come across all the easements we need to be able to move this forward more quickly than we anticipate.

[00:38:46] So there is some some flexibility as we look each year We'll have to look at the available resources to us with that revenue within staff capacity and all those things to figure out where to slot these things into each year, but Just because it's not in something something in the current plan Does it mean you can't do it that in future it's locked out for the next five years will continuously update that and review those on an annual basis I hope you can hear me, or should I take off my mask?

[00:39:20] I agree with Supervisor Galloway, who brought up a point of whether or not we can move some lanes from here to move up, I think it was the Seminole Trail, Ned?

[00:39:40] Both the fire. Both the fire, right, to be able to move those up, which seems like maybe a more urgent need at this point. Um, so that would be something I would be in favor of.

[00:39:57] I also would like to see, don't know how, but the Northern Convenience Center moved up, especially in light of what Supervisor Malik said, uh, if that's something that is, is good. I think we're planning on, uh, we're design 25 and then build in 27.

[00:40:18] Did I have that right? That's correct. And if there's any way that can be moved up. Regarding Biscuit Run, I would encourage us to apply for, in addition to what we're doing, but apply for any kind of funding to help move that along.

[00:40:44] The workplace facility renovations, slide 18, I would also be in favor of looking at that. And I know that's over 25, 26, 27.

[00:41:00] But can some of those costs, important thing, I think it's probably all important, but look at it carefully, things that need to be done in 25 okay, but maybe some of the other monies can go back to Earliestville, back to Seminole Trail, because I do like the idea.

[00:41:22] I think it was mentioned that there are monies from non-profits that are with the fire stations that could also be, we don't want to lose that money in terms of expenses that go up. Am I making sense there? The core systems modernization, you talked about streamlining the process.

[00:41:45] Is that for staff or is that also for the community regarding streamlining of processes? Yeah, for staff and for the community. I didn't hear for communities.

[00:42:02] Okay, that's good. I like that. The fact that we have 60 community partners, I think, is very important regarding nonprofits and raising moneys. What amount was removed from the community nonprofit Blue Ridge?

[00:42:28] That was \$165,000 for the food bank. Okay, so that could be used. Later, we'll have a discussion about that. some other technical adjustments where we can see that in the context of any

[00:42:40] other changes the board would like to see. Okay, so I think that those are all my questions at this time. Thank you. Thank you. Supervisor McKeel. Thank you. Just a quick question about green. I'm sorry to hear what Ann announced about green not accepting our residents. What did you say? Starting July 1? That's what we were told at the gate the other day.

[00:43:08] So, let me just ask a quick question, and maybe this is not necessarily for Ann, but for staff. Were they making that decision based on the thought that we would be bringing online our recycling center, a convenience center, quickly?

[00:43:30] I'm just curious if we've had any dialogue with them, if that's something you all weren't aware of that was going to happen, or where are we in that? Was this the first time you all heard that as well? Yes. Okay, that answers my question. Sorry, I should have just asked it to begin with that way. So we might want to go back to Green and take a look and see if we can negotiate something or at least have a chat with them about, but I do understand separating out the project sometimes with a design and a construction phase.

[00:44:03] I think that makes a lot of sense so that we can actually maintain our CIP and look at it through a practical lens. So that, looking at my notes here, the workplace facility renovations, this building and certainly Fifth Street as well, but certainly this building we all know is due for, and overall, we've been talking about this for a long time.

[00:44:38] we were thrilled to get the windows took a long time to do that i have a question though when we're talking about the planning um of the this facility's renovations are we engaging with the school division because they do have half a floor three quarters of a floor just wondering what that uh what that conversation is like are we i don't know where the school division is on their space needs and what they are in this building with us.

[00:45:11] And I'm looking at all of you. I'm not sure who to ask. I know they're having discussions about it. I'll take this question, Professor McKeel. Right now, the process we're looking at is just on the county side.

[00:45:29] I know the schools have contemplated some of their longer-term plans, how they address more of their administrative offices. They don't have specific details of timing, what that would look like, So I'd say preliminary right now, what we have included in the CIP is really just focused more on county spaces within McIntyre.

[00:45:49] In some of the studies that were done over the past couple of years with some consultants coming in, analyzing departments' current and projection, schools were a part of that, schools administration. So they were a part of those initial?

[00:46:05] Yeah, kind of establishing the baseline needs now and what their projected growth rates are. They have occupancy on third floor, second floor, and first floor. So they're a school administration on multiple floors of a building. Good point, because I just was thinking about the third floor.

[00:46:23] Administration, HR, technology on the second floor. So that's a big part of our space. Yeah, so it would seem like to me conversations at the right time. Because I know they're looking at what to move off of Lambs Lane Campus.

[00:46:40] And they're looking at their IT and various, I'm just saying, through the work of the master plan. So it would really be good to see if we can't coordinate and see. Maybe there would be a win-win for all of us somehow or another. And I do have to, I would be good if I didn't mention that we have on 29 North proffered land for the government and for schools, facilities, that they do not intend to use for our hospital.

[00:47:13] And you all are aware of that when we're talking about space and where to do things. And there are, I think, I will take this opportunity to say, too, I think there are departments where co-locating the schools and county government, maybe not a lot, but there are several departments where there is some synergy around putting them at least nearby each other.

[00:47:42] We have all been in the position occasionally in the county of this, we have planned something and the school division has not been informed or the school division planned something, we weren't informed, and then we had to go back and redo.

[00:47:58] So just having some synergy around certain departments can be a good thing because we're, and I'll just leave it at that. And I was going to ask about the food bank, but we're talking about 165,000.

[00:48:18] So they managed to solve that themselves, which is great. So that frees up 165,000 is sort of what I'm hearing, I think. It will, and we'll show the implications of that. Okay, that's great. And you said that Penn Park, the city was contributing for the Bennett's Village, the land.

[00:48:42] Yes. Which is great. A shout out to the city. We thank them for that. That's great. great um team teamwork um i definitely would support removing the um earliestville volunteer and the seminole trail volunteer those two items i'm happy to support that you said we could do one or we could do both was your direction i think yes but both could be accelerated yeah and i'm in favor of both that's great um and that's right now that's all thank you um and i am also

[00:49:21] in favor of moving these up we should be raised funds for the original project most of my questions I guess the only question I left in an earlier request and I'll just bring it up now is that there's Ravana budgets that are coming I'm having trouble sometimes squaring the two and making sure that what we're saying what they're saying they may not be in the same years So that may be addressed later.

[00:49:57] I don't have any problem with what's happening. I can go ahead and address that now. We have some technical, that's also on a technical update slide. But what I will say is in the recommended budget document, we're actually showing our contribution to Ravana in two places. There's one in the CIP, which is our contribution to the IV landfill remediation.

[00:50:19] That's a piece of the Ravana budget that's in there. If you were to go online and pull the Ravana budget packet, that would be part of what they say is the overall contribution. And then also in our public works section of our document, in our contributions to public works agency, is the operating contribution to Ravana.

[00:50:36] When we were given these initial estimates, this was earlier in the budget process, and Ravana was still in the process of refining their budget. And as they went through this and we met with them just recently about increase in tipping fees, all of that stuff, as they continue to refine that, they came back with additional updates to us.

[00:50:56] That includes, and I'm stealing Mr. Bowman's thunder on the technical updates, that includes updates and increases to both the Ivy Landfill remediation and the operations piece. That includes, those updates include the increased tipping fee that the board approved them to look into.

[00:51:15] And so had the board not approved that, there would be an even larger increase from them. And so that's just, as we do with a lot of our regional partners, as we go through, a lot of times we're given initial estimates before their board and their budget committees have had the chance to look at it, review it, and approve those. And so this was one where they've done their work and they've come back to us and said, in actuality, this is what we need.

[00:51:36] And, again, as I said, we'll talk about that when we get to the technical updates, but we do have a plan to address the updates both on the general fund and on the capital fund side. Thank you. Any other questions?

[00:51:53] Does anyone else have anything for you at this time? We can move on to... Yeah, I want to recap just a few things before we move to debt. First is we hear a consensus to amend even one of the CIPs. We bring it back to a proposed budget on Wednesday. That will be reflected in that.

[00:52:09] The second, I'll mention this as a follow-up. There are some grant efforts already underway in partnership with the Parks and Recreation Department in finance and budget. Again, some of these are small. We just got a \$20,000 grant for signage. That's great. I also recognize the needs are much greater out there in the overall master plan.

[00:52:26] We can bring that back. And I just want to highlight that as an example as the board has supported our grants effort in recent years, how we've looked at how we can align that to some of our strategic challenges, whether that be Biscuit Run, Revanted Futures, the Changing Volunteer System. Many of the staff here are also very involved in those grants just across the board.

[00:52:44] So we look for alternative ways to give relief to the personal property and real property tax bases. The third follow-up I want to clarify as we get to Wednesday is there was a request from Supervisor LePistro-Kirtley to consider moving the Northern Convenience Center up, I guess, from year three to year two.

[00:53:03] That was a decision that Mr. Davidson spoke to. It's probably about the operating cost because it will take about \$400,000 to \$500,000 to bring that online. And so we don't know what the picture will look like next year, but we know that this will be another year where microtransit is phasing out. There will be FEMA Safer Grants.

[00:53:20] The renovation for the GL Debt Service will be ramping up. So I think this is one as staff took a look at multiple years, I think we were beginning to approach some caution about what that may look like. And so that was largely driven under the rationale why that was moved from year two to year three. But with that rationale aside, would the board want to see an option on Wednesday of moving that up from year three to year two?

[00:53:41] I'm just asking for staff direction so that we can support the board in a proposed budget. I didn't speak to it, just because I understood the rationale and agreed with the additional impact. Not that I wouldn't be interested in bringing it forward, but I mean, I understood the red flag you were throwing up.

[00:53:59] I wasn't in disagreement from that strategy myself. Can I agree, too? Only if a half-year became available because the construction went faster or something, then we can scrounge around. I wouldn't mind seeing if it could be, and I understand the operating costs, that rationale also.

[00:54:22] But anything, perhaps next year's budget or this year's budget, if it can be moved up, if there's an opportunity to move it up, I would be in favor of that. Perhaps that could be an alternative, and just to make sure I don't overpromise, I'll ask Mr. Stewart to correct me.

[00:54:41] But if we are in the design process and things are moving at a great pace and there is an opportunity to make an adjustment, that is something that you can communicate with our Finance and Budget Office and county executives, and we can rank back on board when the time is right. I just want to make sure I'm managing expectations clearly, if you could help with that.

[00:54:59] Don't mind. Would you mind restating that question? I was listening, so that didn't quite track. Sure. So if we go in year 25, and I'll get my dates right here. Yes. If we go through design in fiscal year 25, would there be an opportunity through that process if the opportunity opened up to accelerate the construction from fiscal year 27 to 26?

[00:55:23] Would that be information that we may have in the next year where we could take that action at this time, the next CIP? Yeah, I think the odds are strong that we'll complete the design if the funding is available when we want to defer operating costs, say, by 28, that we would get the design and just pause until we know that the timing of bidding and construction would open up to 28.

[00:55:48] We're already doing preliminary design now so that we can take care of our comprehensive plan compliance review, get that base done, and I think they'll be probably likely done with design by the end of the upcoming fiscal year.

[00:56:04] So I think with this funding scenario as posed, we would most likely just be stopping, pausing, up to a year before bidding so that the operating costs are different. So the opportunity is already there is

what I'm trying to say to be able to accelerate.

[00:56:25] If the funding were accelerated to 26 and the operating funds available to 27, that was the plan before and certainly could continue that way. Just a question regarding design, aren't we, don't we basically have a design from the Southern Convenience Center?

[00:56:47] The design is based on what we have at the Southern Convenience Center. The topography is quite different. The road that we're tying into is a different animal that has to be assessed.

[00:57:04] The stormwater management's got to be handled. So, you know, it is easier because we know this works for us, certainly, and so there's that much less work to do, but there's still a lot. So it's a more challenging department.

[00:57:19] It's just a different challenge. It is a little more challenging, actually, the site itself. It's steeper. I like that whole correction. No, actually it is. Actually, it's a little more. Okay. All right. Mr. Stewart, before you sit down, as I drive by there almost every day, I keep forgetting to send you an email and ask.

[00:57:39] Are the county project at the huge, the giant detention basin that BDOT built for Brown Mills, right across the street, and there's already a drain under the road? That's the part that they're just now getting to. Okay, well I hope that it works.

[00:57:56] I'm not certain. Thank you. Just to quickly hit our debt management chapter, just a couple slides to hit the highlights here.

[00:58:14] The borrowed proceeds that the county issues for its projects are the largest funding source of the CIP. So one of the things we want to look at is what does the county's debt service payments look like in the future and measuring that against our financial management policies. The board has two financial management policies about the county's debt capacity. These are very critical aspects of our triple AAA bond rating. This is the debt service which is the annual payment the county makes on its bonds to pay back its bonds as a percentage of general fund and school fund revenues. The target is 10% there. The tightest that we are ahead is going to be in year five.

[00:58:53] So year three is pretty close to there. We have a dip from year three to four when some debt is retired. And then year five, we see that go up again. For planning purposes, if the board wanted to consider something different, either this CIP or future CIP, if that blue line were to go to up to 8%, that would be about an initial 60 million of bonds that could be issued. We've discussed with the board before, theoretically, you could go up to 10%. However, the board has expressed concern to do so. One, because if there were ever to be a downturn in revenues, you could find yourself above the policy. If there was a kind of a once-in-a-lifetime or generational opportunity to come along, that gives you that flexibility to take advantage of that. And so that is why we

[00:59:33] haven't modeled it and they got high, but just for perspective on some of what that gap may look like. Also, because when the county issues bonds, we're making a decision to raise that blue line essentially for the next 20 years. This is not a line that can be as nimble to go up and down as other revenues. This is not planned for because of the related cash that would need to be required for that.

[00:59:53] If the board wanted to consider anything different, or in the future we can update these numbers, it doesn't need to be today. If we were to add additional projects in the CIP, we'd first look at does

net capacity exist and where would the related funding for that come from. This is an updated version of something we shared with the board and the school board back on December 6th.

[01:00:14] where in order to execute a capital project, you would need first what we call the pay-as-you-go, or 5% of funding for projects that are not eligible for full borrowing, which is most. For that \$60 million, you need \$3 million in one-time cash, and then we would need to pay debt service, which would be a little under \$5 million a year, depending on the type of bond that would be chosen.

[01:00:33] Least revenue, which is what the county traditionally uses, unless there is a general obligation or a referendum held in the first place, which would be those are the differences there. So I'll just wrap up the board and turn it over to the board discussion. I did not show the other metric in our financial policies because we have even more headroom in that particular policy.

[01:00:51] So with that, I'll open it up to any board questions or comments on debt management. Thank you. Supervisor Callum, I don't have any questions. Supervisor Malin. No questions and no inclination to change. Supervisor Brute. So several people on this board have recently had to talk to a variety of stakeholders, including the press, about a large expense for housing in the future and as a recurring issue.

[01:01:25] I know that some localities will fund major housing developments through the issuance of what we would end up going into. My general understanding is that that is not something that we would be able to do through the capital improve plan and thus not something that would show up in debt management because we are not operating public housing. I'm actually not sure.

[01:01:51] I am uncertain if something that went into the Housing Reserve Fund for the purpose of construction through third-party partners is actually something that could be added to our overall debt portfolio or not. So I guess I would like to start with that question.

[01:02:09] And from there, I would have curiosity over, from a financial standpoint, over whether or not that is a thing that would be better thought of as a way to leverage future revenue. If that is something we should be leveraging through debt, or if it is more prudent, if possible, to make that through.

[01:02:28] Supervisor Pruitt, I'll answer that question. We'll have to come back with more information on the... I realize it's authority. Sorry. No, no, no, that's fine. It's a good question. It's a good question to ask. But that's something we'll need to do just a little more research on. We have the legal authority to borrow for that use.

[01:02:47] But that is, so it's slightly different than what we currently use our borrowings for, because those are definitely related to capital projects. The program you described is really more of a grant type of program, so it's slightly different. We need to look at that a little bit further, but we can follow up with additional information.

[01:03:07] And just to – I do want to know just for now, I realize that the question of the statutory authority is complicated. There is also the question of if we could, is that even a prudent way to deliver that kind of money?

[01:03:23] Because I'm curious, because it is a very large number, the numbers that we have are very large. And I know generally it's often nicer to pay as you go. But I guess I'm just asking that from people who are much more expert in our books.

[01:03:40] Is it better to pay whatever the Fed's lending rate is that day every year for something that is looking at like \$10 million annually? Yeah, I think that program will need to really be built out further, particularly that funding mechanism.

[01:03:57] And so, you know, I would ask that we allow staff a little bit more time to think that through. And I'm not for sure this will be a Wednesday 27th follow-up. No, I understand. This is more me trying to suggest something for strategic help.

[01:04:22] I like what you proposed here. I don't have any other questions. I like the fact that we are keeping it under the 8% of the state. But anyway, under the 8% of the state, I like your proposal.

[01:04:39] Thank you, Supervisor Kim. As someone who's lived through several bad downturns over the last 27 years, I am comfortable with this proposal, and I appreciate the work that staff's done on it. Thank you. I also very much appreciate the work that you've done on it.

[01:04:58] I agree with it. I think it showed a lot of prudence with respect to recognizing operating impacts and capacities related to capital projects. I would ask just as far as general obligation bonds, which are referendum bonds, what sort of history do we have there, and are there any things coming up that we would consider?

[01:05:21] To the best of my knowledge, there's been two general obligation bonds. One was held back, I believe when, I'm not going to forget the school, back in the 70s, some time ago when it was constructed. I think it was Western, but... I think it may have been Western, but I could be wrong.

[01:05:39] Thank you. Much more recently, in 2016, there was a referendum that was held by, really for public school projects, where there was a package that was put forth in the presidential that year. There was a big kind of educational campaign around that, no pun intended. And then there was, you know, the projects then, you know, advanced after that.

[01:06:02] And at that time, part of the communication was in order to execute these projects in this package, there would be an associated tax increase that followed through a couple of years after that. And so that is a tool available to the board. It really is up to the board to weigh as a policy decision versus receiving a slightly better rate with all the other implications that go with the general obligation reference.

[01:06:24] Yes, Supervisor. Do we have an update on the 1% for school funding? Because that's going to be a referendum that passes. I've not heard an update this time. It's at the governor's desk, I believe, until April 8th is his deadline for action. I just realized I didn't speak to the fundamental question that we were actually presented here.

[01:06:47] So I apologize. I just wanted to acknowledge. I know I'm the person who is often saying that we should be less fiscally prudent and lean into service more. But in this case, yes, I believe that I fully am bought on to the 8% thinking.

[01:07:04] I think it provides flexibility. Does that answer the last question? I think we're a little agreed. Yes, and so I think at this point, this would be a good time if the board desires to take a break. The rest of the time is really our scenarios to prepare for the 27th.

[01:07:21] 10 or 15, what's your preference? The board's pleasure is that either will work. No problem. 10. All right. That works. That works. He's in much discussion as well. It's going to take you 10 minutes, 15 minutes.

[01:18:28] Okay. Back to Mr. Sumner, I think. Yes, sir. All right, so thank you, Supervisor Andrews.

[01:18:46] For the remainder of today's work session, we'll first provide the board with some technical updates, some adjustments to the budget, and we referenced some of those earlier in conversation. But then we're going to turn our attention to various expenditure and revenue scenarios. That's where we're going to spend the bulk of the rest of the time today, is walking through those scenarios.

[01:19:06] The goal for today is to narrow down the options for the board's consideration as we move to March 27th. On the 27th, this is where the board will take action to advertise the maximum tax rates. So that's our goal for today. And this next part of the presentation is to really help narrow down those options.

[01:19:26] So staff could be prepared to help the board return on 27th and set that maximum tax rate. We do have some questions that we would like for the board to keep in mind as we walk through the various scenarios on the expenditure and on the revenue side.

[01:19:42] We'd like to see, is there a slate of prioritized expenditure changes that a majority of the board will support? And we'll walk through various options here shortly. And at the same time, we would like to see if there is support from the board or a majority of support for prioritized funding sources.

[01:20:00] There's some revenue options that we'll present as well. So we're looking for board direction on how to narrow some of this down as we prepare for the 27th. That is an important date for us as we are looking to set the maximum tax rate and move through the rest of the budget process.

[01:20:19] So your feedback in these areas, as well as any additional information that you all may need to help make that decision on the tax rate on the 27th will be greatly appreciated. So that way staff can be responsive to your request and bring back the information appropriately on the 27th. So that kind of sets the stage.

[01:20:36] We're going to spend the next couple of slides going over one of the technical updates, and then we'll walk through the scenarios. So I'll turn this back over to Mr. Bowman, and he'll start with our technical components. Thank you, Jacob. The way I think about this slide is that if staff knew this information when the recommended budget was prepared and finalized in early February, this already would have been incorporated into the numbers.

[01:20:59] Just recognizing that we always have to finalize the recommended budget at one date and information continues to change. These would be, again, we're calling the technical updates for that reason. But I'm going to talk through these one at a time just to have an understanding of what they are. First, in the general fund, we have some changes on the revenue side.

[01:21:17] First of which comes from one-time funding from Jaunt, a little over \$250,000. Jaunt has a fund balance policy that is approved, their board manages, all the regional partners participate in. They have a target above their fund balance target, there's an amount of funding.

[01:21:35] That \$250,000 represents the share of the counties that will be returned to the county for the board's use and determination. The second update, as we get a little further into the state budget, staff believes we can confidently rely on an additional \$114,000 coming from the state.

[01:21:53] That is really for those four departments who are supported by the Compensation Board. The county provides funding well above the Compensation Board for those offices as well. And so by getting a

higher reimbursement rate for those costs, that frees up dollars, it can be reprogrammed to whatever the board's highest priority may be.

[01:22:12] There are some changes on the expenditure side. one change, another clarification. As Mr. Davidson mentioned, the ARD SWA, Solid Waste Authority Budget, is another moving target as we work through the agency process. We have an increase of about \$100,000 from where we were in the draft of their budget before we had from the draft last fall, but it's now been updated this spring. This does include the board's direction to consider increasing the rates for dollars that was provided a couple weeks go so if not for that action that dollar amount would have been even higher i'll show that it's reflected on the expenditure side both in the operating and it's also shown down on the capital

[01:22:51] side there's a portion of rswa that's shown down as well two items next are zero dollars they're not actual changes but they're a little bit a little bit of an update from what we previously provided the board we mentioned at work session number two or three anyway the uh charlottesville area transit would have where we were based on their their budget process working through collect a bargain and everything else. The city has continued to review and modify that budget and no additional funding is needed beyond the county executive's recommendation to ensure that same level of service is being provided. So again, thank the city for that update as I continue to

[01:23:29] work through that. This allows for a recommendation for CAT that is pretty close to aligned with CAT's five-year plan from a couple years ago updated. Another clarification, as we've talked in the budget where we have unfunded vacancies, working with our parks department, we're actually going to swap out a position that's unfunded. There's no dollar. In fact, previously there was a trail troop technician that was unfunded and that was actually switched to a maintenance worker instead. And that'll just be another thing that we continue to monitor as part of those other unfunded positions in the budget process. So before I go to capital, in the general fund, had we known all of this information back in February, we would have had a reserve for

[01:24:05] contingencies that was larger by \$250,007 one time and \$14,000 ongoing. That's funding the board can direct do something else with, but in absence of that, it would exist in the reserve contingencies, which is really a bucket of funds for just unanticipated or one-time or other situations that come up throughout the year. Next in the capital, we've had the update that we already talked about with the Blue Ridge Area Food Bank. Their funding is removed at \$165,000, and there's that other RSWA portion of about \$74,000, which leaves a balance available for

[01:24:41] other programming of about \$90,000. So as we go through the process, should there be other technical updates? I mentioned we've looked at our other items. We've looked at our other ongoing revenues to see if there's anything that may change. But right now, none of that is incorporated. There are no other recommended changes, which is why it's not incorporated.

[01:25:00] These are just those items to date. And before we get into some other options, maybe a good time just to pause in case there's a board question on any of these before we get into some denser topics okay supervisor golly so the rswa when they came to us with the tip thing was that they just didn't have the budget done they were waiting until they we made a decision on the tip fee how was that unknown at that point or i don't recall that being so late in the game in previous years sure um as part of their original budget they were proposing raising the tip fee two dollars as part of their original budget calculations that that are reflected in our recommended budget

[01:25:38] And as they further refined their budget, they looked at it and decided that \$4 was the right amount as they refined the budget. It wasn't that they didn't know at the time. It was as they continued to refine and when they came to us, they knew. We just did not have this full update with them.

[01:25:56] Once they knew that they were getting the approval to do the \$4 fee, then they came back and said, okay, this is what the amount would be minus the revenue, the leftover amount, or the remaining amount necessary from operations. So their operating budget, aside from the tip fee or the fee increase, was going up \$400,000.

[01:26:15] Change the tip fees, then the change that absorbed about \$300,000. \$290,000. I'd have to look at the budget packet, but that sounds in the ballpark. Yes, sir. Thank you. Supervisor Malin.

[01:26:32] I think I'm okay for now. Thank you. Supervisor Proof. I don't have any questions. Supervisor Lupisto-Curley? No questions. Supervisor McKinnon. I don't really have any questions about this. I do have a question about the Romana Solid Waste Authority, about the repairs.

[01:26:54] Do we know those repairs are outside of anything? We don't have any sense yet of what. You're talking about the Water and Sewer Authority as opposed to the Solid Waste Authority. Oh, I'm sorry. You're right. I was thinking of Romana.

[01:27:11] Sorry. I transpose those in my mind all the time. Yeah, it's easy to do because I'm thinking about a big price tag. Yeah, the cost of the water and sewer authority would be outside of the county's general fund. Yeah, it's payers. I mean, I understand it's rate payers. I just was wondering if we had an update. That's fine.

[01:27:33] Questions? Okay. So moving on from technical updates to some options for the board's consideration. This is a slide. It's a little busy, and we'll reference this a few times out here. We have on the left slide in kind of this dark blue color. is, in summary, some of the biggest ticket items that the board has asked to put in the parking lot for future discussion.

[01:27:53] Those include items that were discussed at the last work session, number three, around the fire rescue system, both North Garden and the Berkabar Ambulance. The sheriff's office is included as well. And I thank Sheriff Bryant for being here again today. The board also requests some additional information for branchy step-downs.

[01:28:13] I will tell you that I was just told when we were on break that Chan was called away. Okay, can't make it and she said a deputy. Okay, and he was called away So they were very apologetic that they don't have anyone here right now Certainly, if there's any follow questions, we'll take that with them And then there's some other items have been mentioned by board members that we'll touch on in a moment But this kind of shows on the left both the ongoing in the one-time cost Both fiscal year 25 and fiscal year 26 one of the things in the previous presentation We talked about it was being mindful of fiscal year 26 impacts.

[01:28:51] That is one of the reasons why we have shown that because some of these positions are only able to start part of the year. On the right are a combination of funding sources that we'll walk through as well. They may include one-time funding from the Capital Advancing Strategic Priorities Reserve, which we'll talk about all these in more detail, plus some options on tax rates the board could consider as well as some changes in expenditure reductions for services.

[01:29:15] So we'll revisit this slide a few times. what we'd like to do is to walk through each of the expenditures in a little bit more detail in terms of what they are, what's included, and also the items to note what are not as part of those big three, above the line in blue, and then we'll do the same when funding sources. Again, the goal is not to finalize what would be included in the proposed budget. There's a lot of directions, as one could see from the slide, the board could go, and he's trying to narrow down those options as staff works to prepare any follow-ups to come back on Wednesday for the board to have a proposed budget and proposed tax rates. So with that, I'm going to turn over the expenditure portion of the

[01:29:49] presentation back to Mr. Davidson. The first option we have prepared for the board's discussion is related to the fire rescue items we discussed at our last work session. This option shows the cost to provide 16 total FTEs, we're showing this as a package, to provide 24/7 supplemental staffing and coverage through North Garden as well as 24/7 coverage and staffing of a second ambulance at the Burke Mar rescue station, station 18. This option contains a half year of funding for fy25 to align with the timing and the start of the the fire recruit

[01:30:25] school when they would be able to bring individuals online to start hiring as noted here north garden staffing is planned to initially be funded um through the fema safer grant um for fy25 that's about 275 000 and fy26 would be 574 000 um if the fema we did want to point out that if the fema a safer grant is not awarded. The plan would be to initially reduce the Birkmar 24-7 ambulance down to daylight hours only, the reduced option that was discussed as part of the work session on the 13th, I believe it was. And then we would then go back and revisit the potential of

[01:31:05] expanding that back to 24-7 full-time coverage as we moved into the FY26 budget. So as you can see, with these options for FY25, we're looking at about \$665,000 cost with \$200,000 of that one-time, \$790,000 ongoing, and then the revenue offset, and then approximately \$900,000 worth of ongoing county cost FY26. The next option we have up for consideration is the expansion of a HART program to create a second response team. This is a little bit different

[01:31:45] them in the unfunded, the six-page unfunded document, which was requesting an additional peer navigator, and speaking with Ms. Dimmick, we asked what was the best, the highest and best use of dollars towards the HART team, and based on conversations with her, it was determined that actually standing up a second HART team would be the highest and best use, and most bang for our buck. The peer navigator is still included in the long-term expansion and build-out plans.

[01:32:12] It's just if we were going to say the highest use, we would really be looking at starting up that second team, and that would include three FTEs, a human service worker, a firefighter, a PMT, a paramedic, and then an ACPD officer. This expansion would allow for improved coverage during the daylight hours on the weekday, also allow for some expanded hours in the evening and potentially some expanded weekend hours depending on how the shifting and the timing was worked out as we went through this.

[01:32:44] And again, like the option we provided for the fire rescue department, this option would provide a half-year funding. Again, there are two public safety individuals that would be involved in this, and so in order to backfill those individuals, the recruit school and the academy timing, we would be looking at a half-year for all three positions to stand that team up.

[01:33:07] There is a slight state revenue offset, And that would be for the human services worker that would be a part of this team. And that's part of the normal state reimbursement of roughly 30 to 40 percent that we get on an annual basis for our social service workers, depending on the type of work that they're doing.

[01:33:23] The next option we have and scenario we have put together is for the consideration of an additional deputy position to help with the issues caused by the TDO transports, which we heard about again at our last work session.

[01:33:41] This would allow for some additional help to the sheriff for this task while we're continuing to evaluate the impacts and effectiveness of the new alternative transportation services that are coming available for our region, as well as if the board should desire to expand the hearts team into that second hearts team, what impact that would also have on TDOs as we move through, but again, still providing some relief to the TDO issues that are currently there.

[01:34:07] I did want to point out that the original request was for four and a half deputies for this, and what's shown here is really only represents one additional deputy at this time. The board could always desire to do more, but this would at least give you an order of magnitude should you decide to do more than what is shown on this slide.

[01:34:25] Just multiply by two, three, four, whatever that desire of the board is. Finally, I just wanted to put up a chart that provides the total cost of doing all three options we discussed on the previous slides.

[01:34:42] As Mr. Bowman noted earlier, for expenses, staff has not only shown the one-time and ongoing in FY25, but also a preview of FY26 and what it may cost there. This is because FY26 will hold a considerable list of obligations. Mr. Bowman ran through several that we've been looking at and discussing.

[01:35:00] And as the board usually does, staff will want to ensure that the board is considering FY25 decisions with FY26 in mind as we continue to plan each budget. And one more slide. On the previous slides, we discussed three of the items in which the board expressed a consensus on wanting additional information, details, and discussion for potential addition into the FY25 budget.

[01:35:27] However, we did want to acknowledge that some other items were requested by at least one board member for further consideration. We've listed these here on the slide in alphabetical order from what we've heard and from information that's been requested for us. We're showing these as this would be the time for the board to bring up any of these items for further discussion as well as any other items that are on the information packet that we, from that six-page document that we sent to the board titled general fund requests that are not included in the FY25 budget.

[01:36:02] And so at that, before Mr. Bowman goes through the revenue side of the equation, I'm now going to turn it over to the chair and the board for any questions on the expenditure side of things. How's it going? You may have said this, and I was writing some notes down.

[01:36:21] Remind me when we find out about the FEMA safer grant. I believe that is typically in September or early fall is when we find out.

[01:36:38] I'm excellent at police department. I think the answer is no, because it's a different type of position. But when we first established the HEARTS team, we didn't take an FTE for police.

[01:36:55] We added an FTE for the HARTS team. No, actually at the time, that was the year following the SROs leaving the schools. The schools identified an interest in not having any additional SROs.

[01:37:11] And so there were FTEs available in the police department budget that had previously been SROs. And so that first police officer took one of those FTE positions that had been in the state. So it didn't take them away, it didn't really take anything away though because if it wasn't to the Harts it would have been budgeted as an SRM but they didn't gain anything.

[01:37:34] If it didn't go to either of them, they may have gained. So in adding this position to the Harts team, this doesn't really change their capacity at all. Their capacity for anything else, no.

[01:37:50] Can you go back to slide 33, the expenditure summary? I just want to parse these out. You've got the one line and of course the total, then you do the revenue offset. So the total is 1.1, but if we're thinking about trying to come up with revenue, I often think about the operating side.

[01:38:11] So should I be looking at that minus the \$450,000? How does the revenue offset impact? What are we trying to come up with operating money of that \$1.1 million? Yeah, the ongoing funding revenue required would be that 1.1 minus the one time.

[01:38:32] So 1.154 minus \$450,000? So about \$700,000, \$800,000? Price by \$700,000, just under \$700,000. And that gets us those, that's one position under sheriff, full heart team, and the half year for both North Garden and Burke Mark provided we get the FEMA safer grant.

[01:38:59] Yes, sir. These positions are usually \$110,000, but then another basically \$115,000 for a place. For a police officer, it's roughly, for a starting police officer, it's roughly \$201,000.

[01:39:22] Total. \$201,000 total, yeah. It's about, just shy of \$110,000 in one-time cost, and right around \$94,000, \$95,000 in ongoing. And then, are we supposed to be answering questions at this point, or are we just asking?

[01:39:51] Yeah. Step one, if there's clarification questions, staff can address those, too. I think the question, too, going back to some of the questions that we introduced this topic with, and this is not the only time to address that, is really just trying to get a sense heading into Wednesday, are there kind of prioritized expenditure changes that a majority of the board may support?

[01:40:14] So if there was a topic where we had a consensus from the board as we head into Wednesday, That can help staff position the board for the steps that we need to be taken to have a proposed budget, proposed tax rates on Wednesday. I think at this point, given, I mean, I'm not, I mean, we still have to advertise and all of that.

[01:40:34] But the expenditure side, I'm still grateful for the creativity for the fire solutions here. I think getting a whole heart expansion teams on, and I think at a minimum, we need to add one to the sheriff's department. I'm still concerned that we're not adding to the police department.

[01:40:52] i don't need to go in the rationale for it that's just what it is so as an expenditure item that's still one that's not on your list for wednesday that i would like to see there and then given the revenue alternatives that you're showing it seems to me the ones the one-time money for sure would be more manageable for a police position and the expense for the police officer i think can be worked in here without too much change to the what some of your other revenue pieces are and i'm open

[01:41:28] to the revenue changes for advertisement, but I'm not agreeing to the, you know what I mean, that's, that, I still have to go through the process of hearing from folks and things like that. I'm sure we'll get into that in more detail, what those revenue things are. I can do more commentary at that point for that. Thanks.

[01:41:45] Supervisor Mellon. Thank you, and I really am looking forward to seeing around the corner the spreadsheet on what there is, but, um, I am very supportive of the things on slide 33 and I was just looking back to the original unfunded list or seven these officers requested so This reminds me of 2008 and nine For every year and getting there for so long so I will throw my hat in with If we can find the extra money to put an extra one in that

[01:42:29] Thank you, um, so I'm fully on board respectively. I would just highlight something I know came up in our two-on-tuos. Northgarden is who we were talking about because they came to us, came to us first, and they came to us with a very thoughtful presentation highlighting their future concerns. They are not the only volunteer firefighting station, and they're not the only one that is going to be having these kinds of shortfalls. This is a national problem and certainly a county-wide

[01:43:05] problem um so i want us to just grapple with that as a board that we are going to continue to see so long as volunteerism is what it is in this community um which i would personally reflect as being heavily influenced by the cost of living for many young people so long as volunteerism is what it is we're going to continue to see these kind of very serious expenditures coming before us so we shouldn't allow ourselves to think like we've solved this problem um as i have said um i with the framework that's been presented to us today, if this is all the revenues that we're

[01:43:41] playing with, I'm fully supportive, has to come to the chopping block. I have slight pause about the additional position for the Sheriff's Office. We are expanding the HARTs team, which we expect is able to decrease the frequency and necessity of TDOs, and there are continued projects in place at the state level that we expect will potentially decrease the need for for additional tdo transportation at the current level that the sheriff's office is

[01:44:14] facing they are under strain they have also not had an impact to operations um i wonder if this is a thing that we can push one year uh to have a more informed decision point as we engage with it so if there is something that needs to go this is what i would highlight um that being said it seems to pencil out and i think the revenue sources that we've identified with uh to accomplish that are adequate um if we can go to the supervisor pet project page i will not be able to sleep

[01:44:54] comfortably if i don't go to the mat um the emergency assistance funding is primarily used currently for eviction prevention for people who have become people who are a good underwriting decision for eviction prevention that is people who have an outstanding death their landlord that is going to result in an eviction even though they are able to stay crime that is the ideal case, and we can find certainly those people in our community. Nationwide, and in Albemarle specifically, over the past several years, we've seen a significant decrease in evictions in our

[01:45:28] community entirely because of COVID-related protocols, and that is gone. This is on track to be the most evictingest year in history in the county. We have a higher eviction rate than almost every neighboring jurisdiction. In Charlottesville, we have more than three times the eviction rate of Nelson and only Louisa and Waynesboro evict more people than we as a percentage. Again, this is mostly paying down outstanding debt. We know where people get

[01:46:06] evicted from. So just to give you a sense of this, a Timberlake two-bedroom apartment, their smallest apartment, costs about \$1,000 a month. Generally, one does not pay more than three months of arrearages. I would say we're averaging looking at two months of arrearages.

[01:46:21] That means to prevent an eviction costs about \$2,000. The request for increase of funding was incredibly modest, and our current fund, if I may be so bold, is incredibly modest for a jurisdiction as wealthy as we are and as high evicting as we are.

[01:46:41] I think we can and should fund what is, again, a very modest increase to just keep pace with the need. I think we can and should increase it significantly, but the request was only \$40,000 of additional funding. Over the previous year on Thursday we evicted or rather we process in our courts for eviction 23 people I can tell you almost all of those are going to be summarily evicted the moment they come up there because they either aren't present or they don't have a case to present because they

[01:47:14] know that they're in death Barry Valerie Irene Anastasia Pamela Kiana April Ashley Tedrick Madeline Alilia Maria and you'll apologize it's more than one thing well I lost the rest but there's about twice that many names. These are people who we represent, and these are also people who we don't have come before. That's 23 names I hoped to read, but I was only able to get about 11 of them. That is more people than we have for almost any issue before us, and that is in a

[01:47:52] single day. We normally have multiple days of the week that we allocate for evictions. That wasn't a single day. That's how many people were made homeless in our county. \$40,000 is about 20 of those people still in their home. It is very small. I think it is abundantly true, and I think it should be so I'll just leave that on the table I also point out every time someone is evicted you know the service process it's the sheriff so if we have fewer evictions in the county

[01:48:29] we will potentially decrease the operating load on the sheriff that's all I have thank you supervisor Lupisto Kirkley thank you very much um I like what is presented but I will look at I know we're applying for safer grants for North Garden and Burkemar that I fully support And hopefully we won't have to fully fund that because we'll get the safer grant will help out.

[01:48:58] The HART expansion team, I know it's a pilot program, and it's, what is it, June or July is when it started. So I guess the question is to Kaki that you feel that this is an absolute need for our community, enlarging the two teams.

[01:49:22] I feel that the HARCS team has had an extraordinary impact on community well-being and may, in fact, end up having the predicted system impacts, like around access to jail or hospital. I think we were all surprised to see that they served 150 individuals in the first six months after they got constituted.

[01:49:45] That demonstrated to us that our already strong sense of the need was undercounting by far. And I do know that part of the revenues would be offset by state increase. I agree also, if there is something that we had to do with that, at least temporarily, that would be the one position for the sheriff.

[01:50:11] I would like to substitute the one position for the sheriff, one position for a police officer. I think that does more in the overall safety, and I think the sheriff can, would be able to operate.

[01:50:29] Maybe it's something that we check out again in six months. That points to my wanting to see if there are any extra funding in six months, eight months, that if extra funding comes available, we can have that extra sheriff's position.

[01:50:50] But I would go with a police officer over a share because I think that has more of an impact on our community. And I would like to see when we go into revenues also because obviously if we do all of them, we're going to have to increase what we've all had meetings about.

[01:51:12] Well, we're going to have to increase some kind of as far as expenditures, everything else I agree. Thank you. Thank you. Supervisor McKeel? Sure. I am definitely in favor of what you see on page 33, North Garden Staffing and Burke-Mart.

[01:51:39] And it's hard expansion. And I think that one position for the sheriff, she asked for, how many was it? Four. Four and a half. Yeah, essentially. And I think one position is appropriate at this time.

[01:51:56] i do think that the hearts team will reduce their work but i'm not sure it will reduce it by four positions i think that's a lot of reduction so i'm happy to support um one fte for the sheriff's department i'm looking at i'm a little confused because i'm looking at the police fte which i really support we hear all the time from our communities how we need more police officers and and just in my work I see that and I don't look at the police as an either or I thought you

[01:52:35] all said we could do the police as well as the one position for the sheriff yeah I would say that on the slide this is really just based on a prior discussion we certainly have the dollars that we add in as we go to the next options this is really this discussion is great because it's helping elevate what were those things perhaps one member said versus others just didn't have a chance to weigh in on because we've been covered a lot of content very fast so it was not a comment about any boards or the board and total board members we kind of relevant preference there I was just trying to recap about the last 12 hours discussion we've had leading to

[01:53:10] where we are now knowing that we could easily miss something so it's not an either or yes to get back to my original question so i would support an additional police officer fte because i was going to ask the same question that ned asked because i was curious as to how that uh sro position played out and the sr and the um um and the hearts expansion having said that i would support a police officer fte as well as the one fte for the sheriff um and going to that, I have a question, and maybe it's just my not understanding, because when it comes

[01:53:49] to budgets, there are times when I, but we're looking at our technical updates, \$14,000 ongoing is noise, to be honest with you, or I would call that noise in our budget, right?

[01:54:04] But the \$257,000 one-time funding that we just talked about that could go to the reserve, Could we not use that? Yes, that would be an option for the one-time cost. Yeah, so I'd be very interested in taking that 257.5, which is more than noise, and moving it over to cover whatever we want to decide it could cover best in this list of items we want to find, along with the 14.

[01:54:35] Well, no, the 14 is ongoing, and so that's just kind of noise. But we have over here one-time funding issues that we could cover. And we have to be careful with ongoing and one-time. So I'm not saying to use one-time money to cover ongoing.

[01:54:53] You know that. But we could do some. And how you all want to play that out for me would be. This is helpful because as we get clarity in terms of where the board's kind of consensus may be, that can help narrow down what a package may look like for the board. We'll talk about the revenues more once we get into expenditures.

[01:55:10] But, again, this is very helpful to get a sense of where the board's thoughts are. And I just don't want to go through and pick what I would do as one time. You all are best to do that, but I'd be interested in a proposal coming back to us. And let me just see what else. I really appreciate Mike's discussion about the evictions and the lack of funding towards the evictions.

[01:55:36] And personalizing it is always a great way to present it. And I appreciate that as well. Having said that, I did say this was just announced on March the 19th. Mackenzie Scott just announced a \$1 million grant for the Virginia Poverty Law Center to help with evictions in Virginia.

[01:56:03] Now, \$1 million grant is not going to go forever. I get that. But that's pretty impressive, and that's a start. I'm really impressed. I would not have a problem. I don't want to commit right now, but I think at some point I'd like to have a discussion at some point later, and not next week necessarily, because I know you've got to get this figured out.

[01:56:26] But it would be interesting to know how this works out and what it impacts this \$1 million from McKinsey, Scott, how that helps. Anyway, so I think I've addressed all the questions you all had for me.

[01:56:41] Thank you. And I know we're going to talk about revenue sources, so we'll get to the one-time money and other sources. With respect to North Garden Bar, and one FTE sheriff I'm all in, I think these are really critical.

[01:57:04] And I understand several people have added that they'd like to see an additional police FTE, and I also would be in favor of that. I understand we're going to have a next look at where this is going to come from, but I will sort of, piggybacking on Supervisor Pruitt, express, again, sort of something I maybe didn't say when I should have when we talked about the ABRT process, the fact that everything just was kept exactly where it was before almost, with one exception.

[01:57:38] And that we really didn't, even though in July of 2023, I thought we approved a framework for having prioritized family homelessness, adolescent mental health, community safety, and navigation for seniors. And then we put 100,000 away for contingency for that.

[01:57:55] But we didn't identify any of these. And our ABRT process didn't really change, not only in the amount, but in the way it worked. All that's a long-winded way of saying I actually am very supportive of what Supervisor Pruitt suggested in terms of addressing family homelessness is that the emergency assistance fund is one of the ways in which that could occur.

[01:58:23] And so I just feel like we really haven't tried to do what we said we would do last July, and I understand that things didn't come out the way we hoped, but that was one of my concerns. I don't know if this has given you more than you asked for.

[01:58:42] I say this is very helpful. I'll just try and recap on this slide at the risk of doing some math out loud. But kind of the key number we want to look at is if we were to, where I've heard a majority of the board, whether it be for the three items on the slide and additional police officers, where I've heard a majority of the board say things.

[01:59:03] Emergency assistance was discussed as well, but I didn't hear a majority of the board say that. The board still has an option to revisit that Wednesday. That is certainly \$40,000 is a smaller dollar amount that could be adjusted in the budget compared to some of these larger funding items. So if we were to

think about, if you imagine that slide had an additional police officer included as a bullet point, that fiscal year 525 number would increase roughly \$100,000 one time, roughly \$100,000 ongoing.

[01:59:31] And so really that total cost of that package would be, in fiscal year 25, be about \$1.3 to \$1.4 million. And then the fiscal year 26 cost would be about, in total, about \$1.4 million as well. So just having that \$1.4 million number in whole as we move to the revenue side and where options could be to generate that amount of money.

[01:59:52] And again, the point that, I can't recall who did, one of the board members said, when rates are set on Wednesday, that's not a decision. That is just for the public to then weigh in and consider that as well because, as the board knows as well, but I'll say for any public who are listening, the board can go lower than advertised, but they cannot exceed it.

[02:00:14] So with that, going back to this slide, I'm now going to take a few moments to walk through the items in green and the funding sources where these could potentially come from. Some of this will be information the board has seen before, some of this will be new, and some of this also will be options that can stack together.

[02:00:30] These are just a starting point for staff consideration. board can mix these combinations pick different ones but this again just to get us grounded in some of those options so the very first topic is uh we have in the upper right the capital advancing strategic priorities reserve and just like the uh 250 000 coming in to the reserve contingencies from jaunt supervisor mckeel acknowledged that would be an appropriate place to identify one-time funding so could this advancing strategic priorities reserve this is a reserve that we We haven't talked by with this particular board in some time, so just to kind of ground us in what that includes.

[02:01:09] It's a reserve that was budgeted in the CIP, and it began in fiscal year 20. These are all the examples of how it's been used to date. In short, it's really about one-time studies done in the realm of community development or public works related to projects of high interest to the board.

[02:01:26] Because when we look at HARTs, the fire rescue system, the sheriff's TDOs, and police, all of those have a strong alignment to goal one of the strategic plan. the objectives so this could be a one-time funding source for a portion of that roughly 550,000 needed in total I want to clarify this reserve is not required by financial management policies it's been set aside really for the board's discretion to support our priority projects as shown on the screen just according out of the budget theory so this is an option available to the board there's a current balance of 1.9 so the board were to use a combination of the one-time funding from JOT in this there would still be some capacity left

[02:02:04] over to allow the board to continue to address strategic priorities so that is option one for the one-time costs moving into additional options I'm gonna have a few slides that will consider changes to various taxes these are just for the board's consideration again they can be used in combination and in part but one item that we discussed earlier at the first work session was the transient occupancy tax currently that rate is at eight percent right now the city of charlesville is uh proposing going to nine percent so this would be a just as when the county increased to eight a potential scenario where if the county wanted to continue at the same rate as

[02:02:42] the city if they moved to nine percent effective july 1st that would generate an additional just under nine hundred thousand dollars and we can see the split by the category with uh ten percent going to

capital and debt 54 going to public school operations and 36 to county government operations and i'll clarify all these charts there's a typo in the board's printed handout that says 56 34 not 54 36 the slide is correct apologize for that oversight the slide is the correct version so so that is an option that's available uh should the board wish to pursue that and again it's kind of to think of the expenditures conversation if the board needed to find uh you

[02:03:21] know 1.4 million portion of which is ongoing that could provide 313 000 of that when we open this for board comments it'll be very helpful to get some preliminary direction from the board if this is something that they would like to pursue. I say that because the public process for this is different than the real estate tax rate and other options, where in order to go through the usual process, we would look to add to the April 3rd agenda on the consent a board direction to hold a public hearing to amend the ordinance for this TOT rate.

[02:03:53] If that were to take place, we would hold that public hearing on April 24th, the same night as the other tax rates, and we'd ask the board to take action on May. may 1st thank you and so this is one where again the board doesn't need to decide but to make sure that we can get an item on the April 3rd agenda having that direction today will help us position the board to follow its usual progress process for ordinance amendments so that's transient document see the next item is you know the board could consider its personal property tax revenue this is a slide the board saw at the first work session just to walk through the history of where we are the personal property tax rate is

[02:04:33] primarily to individual vehicles and other items like motorcycles and boats, as well as business vehicles and other tangible property. This rate also applies to machinery and tools. It's a relatively small amount of the revenue, only about \$600,000 to \$700,000 of a more than \$37 million revenue, but it is also part of that rate as well. The current rate is \$342,000, and every penny is less than \$100,000. It rounds up to \$100,000. For the board, the board knows as well, for the public in calendar year 22 there was a dramatic increase in car values the board decreased that

[02:05:07] rate by 86 cents from 428 down to 342 calendar year 23 and 24 those values have continued to fall so that revenue has been declining in recent years including the impact in fiscal year 24 just compared to the fiscal year 24 adopted to the 25 recommended that would be a 1.2 million dollar decrease so in order to give the board something to consider staff contemplated what might be one metric just to give a sense of the order of magnitude the board could change and so this is for the board's consideration we could model a whole number of different rates but the approach was if we looked in the county's past what was the peak amount of revenue the county received from

[02:05:46] this tax which was in fiscal year 22. So the actual amount received not what would have been received if the rate had remained higher. So the total amount in personal property and machine retail tool taxes in fiscal year 22 was 36.6 million. In order to generate that same amount in fiscal year 25, the rate would need to be increased 54 cents to \$3.96, and that would generate a total of \$4.5 million in fiscal year 25, the split of which is shown on this screen of about half a million to capital.

[02:06:17] Now, that is half a million every year, so the CIP would receive over the five years about \$2.5 million, and then amounts for public school operations and county government operations. So I'll point out on this scenario, and this will be clear as we go later through this, This change alone generates \$1.6 million in revenue.

[02:06:37] So with nothing else done, this could fund the package that the board talked about on the expenditures. So that's the personal property machinery tools. That's the rate that the board will advertise on Wednesday. One of the things we looked at in this analysis was what might this mean for just individuals with different types of vehicles.

[02:06:59] So we put this chart together, and I'll share personal property is a little more complex than real property because for your first thousand dollars, you receive full relief from the state for personal property. You also receive relief from the state up to \$20,000 of your value, and anything over \$20,000 is taxed in full. So there's some different math here that applies to real estate.

[02:07:21] So what this chart does is it takes some common vehicles and looks at if a person had that vehicle from the time they purchased it, whether it be in 2018 or as late as 22, what has happened to that tax bill as a combination of the rate and the assessments and the personal property tax relief they received. So we can see here overall there has been a downward trend in these vehicles.

[02:07:41] These are just examples. I'll say that the Ford F-150 and the Honda CR-V are actually the two most common makes and models in the county. Not those specific years, but just these are the examples just to get us through before and during the pandemic. We picked a Hyundai Sonata. That's a vehicle that has an assessed value under \$20,000. That's the gray line to show what the impact of that looks like. We picked a couple of higher end vehicles with a Lexus and a Tesla just to get a sense of more maybe perhaps at that end of the assessment what that could look like. And also we modeled a Silverado because that is the highest business tax use and they do not receive any

[02:08:19] personal property tax relief. So everyone in the county will probably have a slightly different situation based on your number of vehicles, when you've had them, how long you've had them, and everything else. But this is just to show the board some sense in terms of if the rate were to go up to 396 what would be the impact of what that could look like for you know the folks who would be impacted on this slide finally moving to the real estate tax this one's a little more straightforward every value every penny on the real estate tax rate is about 2.9 million that is split shown on the slide about 300,000 for capital and debt again that's across all five years

[02:08:55] I'm sorry 300,000 or five years and then the amounts for public school operations and county government operations the final point I'll make I I don't want to get into the math today, but the board, those who've been on the board will recall because tax rates are based on a calendar year basis, and we budget on a fiscal year basis.

[02:09:16] There will be a collection this June impacted by these tax rates. So if the board were to increase tax rates, it would actually create some one-time revenue in the current year as well. And so that could be eligible to be put into the CIP or put into the housing fund or one-time cost for positions or other options.

[02:09:32] I really want to focus today's discussion on fiscal year 25, but when we come back on Wednesday, we can explore that a little bit more. I just wanted to mention that as an option, but not get so into details with all the other options the board is probably thinking through in this presentation. So with that, to put these together as just if they were stacked one after the other, again, these could be combined in different versions.

[02:09:54] If you focus on the second column in the total, that really is the first number. The numbers to the right are just how they are split. First, the 1% increase in T.O.T. would generate about \$900,000. If on

top of that you added 54% personal property and machinery and tools, you can get up to a total of \$5.4 million.

[02:10:12] There is a comment on service reductions we've added that didn't happen on this slide. I'm actually going to turn it to our CFO, Mr. Sumner, if you'd like to take a moment to walk through with staff that would have in mind around that. One of the options we laid out on the summary slide of the funding sources was a half million dollar in service reduction.

[02:10:30] So although that may not sound like additional revenue, it is a funding source where we would offset or lower our general fund expenditures by half a million dollars. That could be used for something else. So in that instance, it is a funding source. So what would that look like?

[02:10:48] How would we accomplish that half a million dollars in savings? Well, we don't have the specific line items for that right now. But what we would commit to and what we would work towards in achieving that half a million dollar decrease in service levels could look like freezing additional positions as they become vacant throughout the year.

[02:11:06] It could also mean additional personnel savings that we see. Perhaps there's some other personnel lines that aren't being utilized as much as we had anticipated that we would reserve that as well. There also may be opportunities for operational savings, whether this is through some efficiencies or through some reprioritization of work, that would be another opportunity that we could look at to reduce our expenditures to help fund an additional half a million dollars towards this effort.

[02:11:34] So while we don't have the specific line items, that would be the general idea. If the board wanted to increase the county government operations by an additional half a million, that's where it would be another funding source available. And while we're on this slide, But I did, if we could, just real quick, Andy, if you could go back to slide 33.

[02:11:55] I know that's a ways back, but I want to tie together the FY26 numbers. So FY26, if the board moves forward with the expenditures as you recommended we bring back, I wanted to remind the board of the FY26 impacts.

[02:12:14] So most of the items that are up here have a half-year cost. And so when we're looking at FY26 and we're planning for the worst but hoping for the best with our FEMA application, I do want to draw the attention to the \$1.9 million and the subtotal FY26.

[02:12:35] So if we move forward with the expenditures, in year 26, those now become full-year costs. And so I ask the board to keep that into consideration as you look at your revenues and what you would be looking to balance those additional costs off because those will have an impact not only on 25 but also on 26.

[02:12:54] And so, Andy, if you want to go back to the summary slide for the revenues, I just wanted to tie those two pieces together for the board as we move to the last part of this section before we open it up to the board for a conversation to keep in mind the FY26 full-year cost of the recommendations.

[02:13:16] Yes, so thank you for elaborating on that. And because of the service reductions, That's why the only change we see is in the county government operations there, and that 34%, I missed that one, 36%. Okay.

[02:13:32] Yes, that's why we see that change there. And then the last one there, if you throw in a one-cent real estate tax rate, the board could obviously have different options, but that is what the impact would look like there if all of those were to be considered.

[02:13:50] So with that, this brings us back, just as we were on the expenditures, is some time to one board has clarification on any of these revenues how they would work in the time in some of the impacts and also trying to get a sense in the terms of where the board's priorities may be if that 1.4 million total expenditures was considered where would the board's priority be looking for funding options for public advertisement for public hearing

[02:14:25] one this is your personal property just I'm sorry can you just walk walk me through the rationale again and so in the current budget for personal property there's a projection of 4.5 million less than 36.6 I mentioned the other day I'm not great with math in my head on the spot so really the idea was as a basis if we were to take what is projected in 25 and take that back to the peak of what was actually collected in Fiscal Year 22, that's a difference of about \$4.5 million.

[02:15:04] So really, it's a question then of what rate does it take to get to that amount of funding in Fiscal Year 25. That result is \$0.54 increase to get to \$3.96. The peak was before we did the change? Fiscal Year 22 would be a combination of before the change and a half a year of the change.

[02:15:25] because even when the board dropped the rate, it did not fully equalize the rate. It dropped it down to a more reasonable increase. All right, so the 36.6, okay, so half of it was after we made the change, half of it was at the highest tax, highest value. Yes.

[02:15:52] Jacob, thank you for the service reductions and making sure we keep that in mind. When you talk about freezes as they come open, do you do that across the board or do you protect some departments? We would look at all the positions as they come open, but i would say a lot of our first responders public safety departments are the ones that more than likely would not be part of that freeze because they have a direct service line impacts

[02:16:23] appreciate looking to fiscal year 26 and the impacts for that especially since we're not doing a cola raise cola adjustment this year cost of living adjustment and almost i mean with all the work that we've done to get our get the market and to do that i mean we have to be doing some sort of adjustment next year. I mean, I think that's a given, or else we're just going to find ourselves where we were at, that we were digging. We just got that. So we're going to keep that in mind

[02:16:59] as well as we look to the next year. Well, those are my questions. What else was I supposed to do? Was I supposed to do something else? Mr. Pascal, if you would, as we're working through these, if you have a we're looking for direction on the reference.

[02:17:16] So I'll answer this for advertisement. I'm happy to see the Well, happy. I'm never happy in the center. Never happy. But the transient occupancy tax, increasing that to 1%, I think that makes sense.

[02:17:36] I have said, I shouldn't speak for others, but I have said multiple times to my constituents that the folks that come here, that there's a portion that they need to pay as well, and that's where that comes from. So I think that should be included in for advertisement.

[02:17:54] I understand your rationale for the 54 cent on the personal property. I think I'm still weighing on that one. I think for advertisement, that I'd be supportive of taking it out to advertisement.

[02:18:10] I just don't know where I'm at on the rationale yet. I think the PP service, I think I am not interested at this time in doing anything with the real estate tax for advertisement.

[02:18:30] I think any time a service reduction philosophy should be on the table in any given year. So I would say let's keep that on the table as well for moving forward for to see where it all shakes out. Supervisor Mel.

[02:18:49] Thank you very much. So help me make sure that I've got the math right. I'm looking at slide 44, but referring back to 33. \$1.89 million was what we had, what we were needing to, yes, okay.

[02:19:10] So that's if we do the things we've talked about in the expenditure summary. That was the fiscal year 26 impact if we don't get the offset. So am I correct that looking now at slide 44, if I add together 313 at 1.9, I get 2.779013.

[02:19:33] So would we be balanced if we did those things? To clarify, the 1.9 includes both the TOT and the personal property adjustment. Both of those are included in the 1.9. Yes, yes. so does that sound right so we wouldn't be balanced at that rate I mean in the current proposal plus that would provide enough money to do the things we talked about earlier today yeah certainly yeah thinking they had to fiscal year 26 that would provide some and there would be an option for some one-time funding on Wednesday the board could discuss how they would want to it would direct to

[02:20:11] that so there's still more gap that I'm not accounting for here looks like we I would just add, Supervisor Malek, that there was more consensus around adding police officer as well. Oh, I forgot about that. So the 1.9 and 26 didn't include the additional police officer.

[02:20:29] So I would, doing the math on top of the head, add additional \$100,000 of ongoing, so it would be about \$2 million. Okay, so 2.7 is what we're generating and 2.0 is what we're spending extra over and above the proposal.

[02:20:47] Okay, so we're still, I think we've met our obligations as far as what we're trying to add. Is that correct? May I ask for clarification? You said 2.7. I want to make sure that I'm following the following. I added on local government share on slide 44, first two lines.

[02:21:08] No, the second line includes the first one. You see how it says plus, TOT plus. All right, thank you. That's why I asked to make sure I was not screwing up. Okay, so 1.9 there plus, aha, so we basically barely come out of it. Okay, or not. Got it. Thank you very much.

[02:21:31] Yes, am I correct in understanding that personal property and machinery and tools are not just being presented here in lockstep, but they are the same tax? It is a unified tax. Traditionally, the county has had the same rate for both of those. I do want to just prod on what you said. You said traditionally.

[02:21:51] Are they the same tax, or do we traditionally have them the same rate? They are two rates that the board sets. And to the best of my knowledge, they have been the same rate in recent history. I bring this up, I'm thinking machinery and tools is the primary revenue source of the very large solar developments we're doing, especially in their early years, which is where we are.

[02:22:17] And specifically, the amount that we get from our solar developments is, in the early years, entirely within them, because we have that flip-flop contract, right, where as another revenue source gets bigger, it transitions. But for the first, like, 10 years, all our revenue comes from machinery.

[02:22:36] I highlight that because when we talk about Woodridge, right, all that money is going to be based on what our machinery and tools is deflated from the decision we made during the coronavirus pandemic, I would suggest we are not realizing our full returns from what we would expect from that investment of our land as a community.

[02:23:03] I say that to support, at the very least, the 54% increase. And I think your office has done a really great job supporting the rationale for that. I wonder if it is worth de-locking them to give machinery and tools back up to its previous level.

[02:23:23] I present that just generally. Otherwise, I think the first three sources that are presented here are all prudent. I'm comfortable with advertising at all of these rates.

[02:23:39] not including the the real estate which i think you know the big lever i think we need to feel thoughtful about when and why we pull on it um and i think we're doing um tot tax i think um would be uh prudent even if we were not confronting a budget shortfall just because we want to keep up with the joneses uh next door um were there other things that i was being asked for feedback

[02:24:05] in this juncture. I believe we have done all of those. So if you go to slide 33, the expenditure summary for North Garden, Burk Moor, Art, Sheriff, one person, and Police, one person. Did you say that that was approximately 1.4 million? Yeah, for the net in fiscal year 25 and 26, that is about

[02:24:41] what it would be. Okay, so that's how much we need to have an additional revenue. With FEMA, in order to do this? Thank you, Mr. Henry. That is an extra clarification, because if the FEMA grant is not successful, then those numbers would change based on the, I'll call it the plan B, to reallocate the staff for the 24-7 from Burkmaar to Northgarden, and then to revisit that in fiscal year 26.

[02:25:05] Got it. Got it. Yes. I realize that. But if we do get all that, the 1.4 would be for all four positions, all four bullets? Yes. Okay, so we have to come up with the 1.4. And then if we go to slide 22.

[02:25:25] No, page 22. Slide 44. Slide 44, page 22. So going over in the total, that gives us, if we do all four things, that gives us 8.7 million.

[02:25:45] Yes, that is correct. And then it would be split according to the formula on the right. Okay, so myself, I'm in favor of the. That's what you want to know. The TOT, I'm not in favor of the ones that real estate tax. The service reduction, I would leave that up to staff to decide. We have unfilled positions. We need them. We don't need them. I would leave that up to staff to decide that.

[02:26:20] But I would not, I know that people are asking for more inspectors for things because we do have things going on in the county that we can't get to eliminate blight complaints and everything.

[02:26:36] So I wouldn't want to eliminate those. But that's why I said I'd leave it up to staff to say, well, we could have some savings here or we really don't need this type of position. That's going to be your decision. If I could just, I know Mr. Sumner used, for example, frozen positions.

[02:26:56] That is one lever. But also he talked about other operating efficiencies and improvements. An example might be we've had a very successful microCAT implementation. There is, we believe, some overlap with jaunt and on-demand, not ADA, but on-demand services.

[02:27:17] So there's a possibility that there may be an ability to draw back on, say, jaunt because the microcat is filling it up. It's a hypothetical, but that is some analysis that we're doing. So I don't want to just only hear that it's potential staff freezing.

[02:27:37] It really is other operational things that we should always be doing as far as efficiencies and whatnot. And I appreciate that, and I thought that in my mind also that you always do an excellent job of looking at efficiencies.

[02:27:54] So that's all part of it. I think that's great. Like I said, whatever savings you come up with, that would be up to you all. And maybe now, maybe later on as we go throughout the year. The personal property tax, I would like to see that if we need additional monies.

[02:28:18] What was the original rate? Please refresh my memory of it a few years ago. 428. 428. If we needed to increase that to what it was, because knowing with the public, we said we reduced it because of the high value of cars.

[02:28:36] If we needed to go back up there or closer to that, then maybe use a small portion to add to the emergency assistance fund. You know, perhaps. I don't know.

[02:28:52] The full increase would be something on the order of, what, was it, 82, 86 cents? 86 cents. Yes, 86 cents is how far the rate was dropped two years ago. Right, right. I don't know how you came up with the 54 cents.

[02:29:13] And I'm wondering why we didn't consider going back up to the full rate or closer. So those are the things that perhaps would, that's something perhaps you could look at.

[02:29:29] so as not to go into real estate tax. And I think, once again, the service reductions, I think that would be ongoing. Because we don't know all those intricacies. We will actually receive.

[02:29:45] Just to clarify two things. The basis of \$0.54 was the amount the county actually received in fiscal year 22, which was the highest amount in these revenues the county had ever received. So if we were to do a scenario above \$3.96, That would be working direct that it would just result in a total taxpayer impact.

[02:30:07] Everyone's individual circumstance will be different, but the total taxpayer impact will be what changes. And I'll clarify on the service reductions as well. I appreciate the board's difference to staff on what specifically that looks like. But in order to balance the budget, we would need a signal from the board if that is something staff is expected to do or not.

[02:30:25] So that is the difference in terms of what is asked for in that request. I would like to see if it went up to what it was, would there be a necessity in staff reductions or if you feel that you could do staff reductions efficiencies without raising that?

[02:30:44] Because, like I said, I would not be in favor of the one-set real estate tax. Supervisor McKeel. Yes. I'm in favor for advertisement purposes of what we have here.

[02:31:01] I think it's always a good idea to be with our partners in the city on the TOT. That only makes sense to me. Personal property rate, I'm happy right now for advertisement with what you've recommended. While I am not excited about the service reductions, I understand your recommendation.

[02:31:24] And for advertisement, we can use that. And I'm not in favor of a one-cent real estate tax increase at this time. I think cautioning about next year is really good.

[02:31:41] If you think about it, and my memory is not great on the year, but we had built in certain tax increases. What was it back in 21, 19, 20?

[02:31:59] Not 19, 20, 20, 20. Yeah, we had built in, and we've been able to avoid all of those for years, which is a great thing. But I think it's really wise for you to give us fair warning. Next year could be more challenging than this year.

[02:32:19] So I thank you for that. Did I answer your questions, Andy? Yes. Just to go back and make sure I answered them. Okay. All right. Well, we'll go back to slide 44, I guess, just to clear on this.

[02:32:38] Definitely, again, for advertising, the DOT, the 54 cents, I think the issue of service reductions is partly one of the one-timing because what we're not looking at here, when Supervisor Malik started comparing the numbers, I was recognizing that we were looking at fiscal year 26 and recognizing we have all these one-time things that are coming out of fiscal year 25 where we're identifying other sources of money that aren't mentioned here that already helped to bring that down significantly, and we don't know from there.

[02:33:12] But I do think service reduction should be on the table, but I think it's an issue for fiscal year 26 ultimately, or at least in part because of the one times that we haven't built into this. Am I correct on that? I see it as a timing issue at this point.

[02:33:28] It could be. I'll just say what's really helpful in this conversation today is I'll think back to the tax relief discussion the Board had back in December. There were a lot of policy options and other things that were considered, and the Board was able to take those down, provide some direction to narrow it down, and we refined that a few weeks ago. And I think this is the same thing playing out today in terms of where the Board's energy is and where it is not. And on Wednesday we can look at some more specific dollars and cents in terms of how that looks across in 25 and 26, now that we've narrowed down both the expenditures and are making progress too on the revenue side. I think that context will help display what 25 and 26 look like, especially the question of service reduction as personal property or some other change.

[02:34:10] So, and I'll agree that I'm not interested in advertising an increase in the real estate tax. I think we don't need to do that. I think we can accomplish what we've added, the important priorities. But I will say for, I don't think it will be for Wednesday, but obviously it will be for eventual discussion in connection with the discussions as we actually set the rate, To see how the additional revenues, I guess it's 2.9 million, going to the schools, what

[02:34:48] that does to their budget, because we know they presented us needs, and they were greater than what we were looking at at the time as a formula, but this obviously has an impact on that.

[02:35:04] But obviously the bigger elephant in the room is the state budget. we get some direction certainly from the board's action on wednesday i actually have a meeting thursday morning with my counterpart with the schools uh to really kind of update them with where this advertised uh budget rates will look like they're getting clarity in the schools uh from their state picture as well and that'll allow the school board to get a little more concrete around some of their options that we can share with the board as those are known okay yes i appreciate that i'm not putting forward to the discussion um supervisor did you have more i didn't No, I think I'm okay.

[02:35:42] But we've answered the question for the most part of the agreement, but any additional questions? I have an additional question. Remind me, there's been some conversation on the service

reductions, so you should always be trying to find service reductions, and in any given year, we always have service reductions.

[02:36:00] But that's very different than us directing you, because then you're setting the budget at \$500,000 once. If we didn't direct you to do that, and you have savings, remind me where the savings go. Does that go to one-time funds the following year? It would be one-time funds within the year.

[02:36:17] So if we realize the benefit of not directing you to find service reductions, it handcuffs us to only use it on one-time things the following. That would be the recommendation. So what I'm bringing this up for is a way to get capacity for operating for both the year you're in and the following years, realizing your services might be impacted.

[02:36:43] That's how you do it. Otherwise, if you just find it, and staff is always working to find it, you're kind of putting in a pen where those dollars can be spent in future years. That's true. So I'm just bringing that up, not that that changes the discussion here today, but could impact what we ultimately decide for that particular item.

[02:37:06] Supervisor Kirkland? Yes. On the second one, the TOT plus of 54 cents, our gain is \$1.9 million. And once again, to fund those four things that we wanted was about \$1.4 million.

[02:37:25] Assuming the FEMA grant is realized. Assuming the FEMA grant is realized. And not including the police. No, that's including the police. \$1.4 million. We were at \$1.2 million before the police officer was added in.

[02:37:42] Yeah. We're going to go back. \$1.4 million. The police officer was assuming \$1,000. Oh, my apologies. Yeah, that's right. You're entirely right. Once in a while. Not often, but once in a while. But yes, if, so doing that, okay, back to the other slide.

[02:38:05] Okay, that one. Yes, so the 1.9, we cover the 1.4, and that's assuming the safer grant. We don't get the safer grant. So let's say we go with that. What if we don't get the SAFER grant, what can we do to still, what would be the difference that we'd have to come up with, and what would be your recommendation?

[02:38:36] Knowing we have to make a decision now, and we won't know about the SAFER grant in September. The recommendation that staff presented would be if the SAFER grant does not get awarded, that we would move Berkmar, the second ambulance Berkmar, from 24-7, And so we stay within that expenditure and that would that would Including the police officer that would enable us to stay within that. Yes, that's true. Okay, because we have an extra

[02:39:11] 500,000, okay, thank you Thank you I wrote down that fiscal year 25 is the end of the micro cap as Designed so then at this time next year we get to decide What's gonna go forward fee whatever, but that's 1.5 million dollars right now We're having to come up with to carry the second year of that grant So anyway, I'm looking forward to that day, but and I'm not trying to leave directions I'm just leaving concerns for people to write down and figure out I am

[02:39:52] Shaking in my boots a little about Demanding the \$500,000 in service reductions because I'd like this idea that someone may be able to figure out to keep the lapse factor category live somehow to provide a little cushion rather than, I mean, I love sending things to CIP.

[02:40:12] That's a really great thing to do. But in this case, I don't know if there's a way to fix it. The two things that were on the not-funded list that have troubled me that may or may not be able to be solved, but I just want to leave it right to you and somebody can take care of it while I think about it, That there was unfunded the staff improvements which staff addition to be able to carry out the core modernization We have been struggling waiting for core modernization to be completed for a long long time And so to not put the staff person and that's needed to do that that worries

[02:40:52] and Someone mentioned inspectors a little while ago and plan reviewers And that may be wrong, but that's what somebody told me so those are concerns I have if we're continuing to have this onslaught of building permit requirements and requests and applications, et cetera, et cetera, and really making sure that we have the capacity fully up and trained to get those things accomplished in a timely fashion.

[02:41:20] Thank you. If we'd look at side 46, can we answer the questions that you have? So I believe so, and I'm going to recap.

[02:41:37] This is I did on the expenditure side. The board already gave the direction on the expenditure side. Those are really the items on the slide, plus police officer. Other one-offs were mentioned, and the board still has an option as a group to make some modifications on Wednesday, but we're going to bring forward on the revenue options to really narrow down, looking at the combination of one-time funding, the transit occupancy tax, the personal property tax, and then the service reductions really look like across fiscal year 25 and 26.

[02:42:03] What are some options that could be available to the board as they propose a budget on Wednesday? Mr. Sumner, would you add anything in that summary that I did not say? I believe that's accurate. I thought we were looking at perhaps not directing you for service retention.

[02:42:26] I think it would probably be easiest to continue that conversation on Wednesday where we can see that looks like in the context of all the other levers the board may pursue. So we can take it out at that time. Just a quick point, to Ann's point about microcat.

[02:42:44] It's going to be really important for our board and for the city to look at moving the authority forward and that needs to happen through the at least we need to be ready for the general assembly session next year and it's about timing because that authority is what's going to give us the ability to have some money for transit i'm just saying and it ties in together so just to we don't want to let that momentum fade because we have the momentum right now, and we need to keep moving it forward.

[02:43:24] One more thing I'll clarify, I said at the start, because we have consensus on the TOT, we'll add on the consent agenda for April 3rd, the notice for that public hearing on April 24th to follow all the normal procedure guidelines, so the reason that will be on the agenda on Wednesday is just because of, again, wanting to follow the normal process, and thank you to the clerk's office for helping me work through the math on that, so.

[02:43:47] I think the last slide is we'll be back Wednesday, I'll say right now on April 10th is to be determine there are no topics that'll be at the board's discretion whether to hold that and then public engagement will continue throughout the month of April thank you thank you just what one other question is for the personal property tax if keeping it at the same or raising it if we have more consensus

[02:44:22] or you can are you pretty confident that we if we don't raise it we can have the savings, perhaps through additional funds through service.

[02:44:37] Raise it beyond the 54. Yeah, raise it beyond the 54, because all I'm thinking of is, do we want to advertise it a little more, knowing that at least we can always reduce it? I'm just throwing that out. Above the 54? Yeah.

[02:44:55] Can we go around real quickly? Yeah, I have a follow-up. The follow-up question I have, and perhaps Ned can address it the best. I understand the used car values are up like 30%, and we're raising our rate already higher than that. So I don't want to put people in a position, going out of my way to put people in a position where they're back in total deficit of cost versus value, and I don't know the answer.

[02:45:21] I think we had a consensus around 54. I'm going to advertise. No problem. Thank you. Thank you for your hard work. Please, County Attorney. Mr. Chair, just looking at your schedule here, if I recall correctly, all of your work session dates are included on the board's calendar that was adopted at the organizational meeting in January.

[02:45:47] So if on April 3rd the decision is made not to conduct the work session on April 10th, then the board will need to consider a motion to formally cancel that meeting.

[02:46:03] want to keep that in mind I think we did say that it was to be determined not just at the end when I know it's when the next meeting is all right thank you Thank you, staff. If you have nothing further, we're to item five, which is from the board.

[02:46:30] Supervisor Gallery? No. Just to, I have, my last town hall is on April 13th, so please, I send those in to various community engagement people, but please make sure to add that to this, because I don't want people thinking they're not getting addressed, but I see April 10th.

[02:46:49] Moved. Thank you. Supervisor Pruitt? Town halls we've got one in pantops here in exactly one hour. And then we have our shared one down in the empty on Thursday. Not on Friday. Supervisor. Um, I just would like to ask the board respectfully that if we can finish it up, finish up on Wednesday, because I will not be here on the Tampa Bay.

[02:47:19] That was pre-planned, like, six months. I see how things... Exactly. If that can happen. Supervisor McKeel? I'm good. Thank you. Okay. And I have nothing further, but we are now back to our county executive.

[02:47:35] Deputy county executive. Deputy county executive. We're smiling, so we let's... Yeah, we're totally finished everything. So we will adjourn the meeting now to March 27th at 3 p.m. in this room. 2:41. Opportunities for the public to access and participate in this meeting are posted on the Albemarle County website, on the Board of Supervisors' homepage, and on the Albemarle County calendar.

[02:48:00] Participation will include the opportunity to comment on those matters for which comments from the public will receive. Thank you very much.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com