

A Special Meeting of the Albemarle County School Board was held on September 17, 2019 at 3:30 p.m., Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Room 241, Charlottesville, Virginia 22902.

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Kate Acuff; Mr. Stephen Koleszar; Mr. Jonno Alcaro; Ms. Katrina Callsen; Mr. David Oberg; and Mr. Graham Paige.

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER ABSENT: Mr. Jason Buyaki.

SCHOOL BOARD STAFF PRESENT: Dr. Matt Haas, Superintendent; and Mrs. Jennifer Johnston, Clerk of the School Board.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill; Ms. Ann Mallek; Ms. Diantha H. McKeel; Mr. Rick Randolph; and Dr. Liz Palmer.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ABSENT: Dr. Ned Gallaway.

STAFF PRESENT: County Executive, Jeff Richardson; County Attorney, Greg Kamptner; Ms. Lori Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget; Mr. Bill Letteri, Chief Financial Officer; Clerk, Claudette Borgersen; and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1.1. Call to Order.

At 3:32 p.m., Mr. Randolph, Vice-Chair of the Board of Supervisors, called the Board of Supervisors back to order. Mr. Alcaro, Chair of the School Board, called the meeting of the School Board to order.

Agenda Item No. 2.1. Joint Meeting.

Introduction and brief recap of the process and funding strategies, overview and framework of meeting agenda.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that in January 2019, the CIP Oversight Committee (OC) recommended that the OC hold a discussion with the Board of Supervisors and the School Board to: conduct shared visioning, learn what the capital needs are for local government and for the schools, clarify shared priorities, discuss ways to prioritize the projects in the CIP, and consider reconceptualizing the way the County approaches planning for capital and operating budgets.

On March 20, 2019, the Board of Supervisors began planning ahead for the FY 21 - FY 25 CIP development process and directed staff to schedule a work session for the Board of Supervisors, the School Board, and the CIP OC pursuant to the OC's recommendation.

On May 9, 2019, the Board of Supervisors, the School Board, and the CIP OC held a work session, and continued working together towards addressing the community's capital needs, identified CIP affordability constraints, reconceptualized the way the County approaches planning for capital and operating budgets, reviewed the Public Private Education Act (PPEA) project guidelines, and approved a new CIP development process for FY 21 - FY 25.

On June 6, 2019, the Board of Supervisors held a joint work session with Charlottesville's City Council. During the work session, the Board and Council reviewed jointly-funded capital projects that have been recently completed or were underway, and those included in the jurisdictions' FY 20 - FY 24 CIPs. Board and Council members also discussed opportunities to connect on capital projects in the future, and planned to meet again for further discussion on September 9, 2019.

On July 10, 2019, the Board of Supervisors held a work session to prioritize General Government CIP projects. The School Board received a report from the Long-Range Planning Advisory Committee on July 11, and approved a prioritized list of School Division CIP projects in August.

On August 13, 2019, General Government staff presented information to the Planning Commission on the prior year's CIP development process and the new CIP development process approved on May 9 for the FY 21 to FY 25 CIP. The Planning Commission then discussed potential roles that the Planning Commission may desire to have in future CIP development processes for capital projects specifically associated with the Comprehensive Plan, Master Plans, and Small Area plans.

On September 9, 2019, the Board of Supervisors held a joint work session with the Charlottesville City Council to follow up on items identified at their joint June 6 work session, and to continue their discussion of potential connections on capital projects in the future.

Pursuant to the FY 21 - FY 25 CIP development process approved on May 9, the next Board of Supervisors and School Boards' joint work session will be held on September 17 from 3:30 to 5:30 p.m. for the Boards to share, discuss, and prioritize Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) projects in preparation for the next step in the process. Attachment A includes a draft agenda for the work session, and Attachment B includes a diagram of the FY 21 - FY 25 CIP Development Process.

In addition, the CIP OC will be changed to the CIP Advisory Committee (AC), and staff will request the Boards to approve a final CIP AC Charge.

The County's CIP serves as a planning and implementation tool for the acquisition, development, construction, maintenance, and renovation of public facilities, infrastructure, and capital equipment for a five-year period.

Staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors and School Board: 1) utilize this work session to share, discuss and prioritize (CIP) projects in preparation for the October 2019 CIP Advisory Committee's efforts in the continued development of FY 21-FY 25 CIP; and 2) approve a final CIP Advisory Committee Charge.

Ms. Kumazawa said she would be presenting to guide the boards through the prioritization for the Board of Supervisors and School Board capital projects. She thanked Ms. Rosalyn Schmitt, Chief Operating Officer of the School Division, and Ms. Tia Mitchell, Senior Budget Analyst for Albemarle County, and lauded their teamwork. She also thanked staff and community members attending the meeting.

Ms. Kumazawa explained that they would share, discuss, and prioritize general government and School Division CIP projects. She thanked the boards for the work they had done on reviewing the projects. She said at the end of the meeting, they would approve a proposed CIP Advisory Committee charge, explaining they would go into further detail on this.

Ms. Kumazawa presented the agenda, explaining they would have a brief recap and an overview of the process. She indicated that most of the work session would be spent on the actual prioritization as a larger group, and then work within smaller groups. She said at the end, they would discuss the Advisory Committee and then a summarized outcome with a 5:30 p.m. end time.

Ms. Allshouse said she would provide a quick recap of the work that has been done. She thanked everyone for working well together over the process, noting that it was transformational. She said the CIP is being done very differently than they have done in past years and expressed her appreciation for everyone's involvement in working through the process as staff worked to try to make the new process as clear as possible.

Ms. Allshouse, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, presented the development process for FY 21 – FY 25, noting that the boards have seen it at other times. She said she wanted to take a moment to ground themselves of where they are in the process and for those in the audience who may have not seen the process in the past meetings. She recalled that the boards held a joint work session in May, which was the starting point for the new process. She explained that what was very different about the starting point was that there was an affordability discussion, which took debt capacity under consideration.

Ms. Allshouse said that between June and August, the School Board and its staff completed much work on the school's look at the CIP projects and set priorities. She said at the same time, the Board of Supervisors worked with staff to set priorities on the general government side. She said this work was necessary in order to come together for the present meeting. She said in this work session, the boards would share their priorities with one another and then combine the lists, noting that this combining of priorities would be the transformational part of the process.

Ms. Allshouse added that since the boards last met, the Board of Supervisors also met with Charlottesville City Council in May, and again in September, as they often collaborate on projects with the City of Charlottesville. She also noted that since the boards last met, staff had attended a Planning Commission meeting in August to share where they are in the process and what they are doing differently. She explained that the plan is to then go back to the Planning Commission after the present meeting to update them on the priority setting that will have occurred.

Ms. Allshouse said they would discuss the CIP Advisory Committee, which was previously called the Oversight Committee in past processes, noting the name change and adding that the charge is somewhat different. She said staff sent information to the boards ahead of time about this and would have an update on it at the end of the meeting. She said the boards would be back together again in November for a joint work session and then will be finalizing a recommended CIP and adopting the Capital Budget, which is the money appropriated for the first year of capital projects.

Ms. Allshouse presented slides including information from the boards May meeting, when they reviewed the affordability and capacity considerations of the CIP. She recalled that they looked at the current CIP, considered growth operations, meaning the operational side of the budgets, discussed debt capacity and taxpayer considerations. She said as a result of this meeting, different scenarios were considered. She said they first looked at the current CIP and three levels of potential affordability and capacity to consider together. She indicated to a box around Level 2, where they landed as a group for planning purposes for the CIP process. She explained that where the slide says there is an additional \$61 million over 7 years, she reminded the boards that they have a 5-year CIP and they were considering 7 years, as there are expenses in the last years. She said that though they considered a 7-year period, they would pull it back into a 5-year CIP for planning purposes moving forward.

Ms. Allshouse continued that in the May meeting, the boards considered funding tools, options, and alternatives and set priorities. She said the higher priorities included encouraging the use of public and private partnerships and economic development; utilizing a referendum; considering leasing instead of building new facilities; reducing operating budgets, possibly to fund capital budgets; reviewed the current prioritizations of maintenance and replacement projects; and investing in solar and renewable energies.

Ms. Allshouse again mentioned the Advisory Committee, noting that it was very important that the Advisory Committee use the results of this present meeting, and the prior meetings on the CIP affordability cap, to guide their work. She said that for the FY 21 – FY 25 CIP time period, this would be around \$55 million because it is considering 5 years instead of 7 years. She said the CIP Advisory Committee considers many things and this information would provide good leadership for them.

Ms. Kumazawa reminded the boards that they would hold discussions as a larger group before breaking out into smaller groups. She said they would give an overview of what the larger group would be discussing. She presented a list of the School Board ranked priorities, explaining that the list was recommended by the Long Range Planning Advisory Committee and then adopted by the School Board. She noted that not included on that list are ongoing maintenance and replacement projects such as facilities and ground maintenance, the State Technology Grant, and the School Bus Replacement Program, as those are already considered to be included in the CIP as there are no significant changes to them.

Ms. Kumazawa indicated to two costs on the slide, noting that they are new costs for the Technology Replacement Program and the Furniture Replacement Program that were pulled out from a different project. She

said that those two projects, plus the 10 ranked projects, total about \$119 million over 5 years and this list would be discussed.

Ms. Allshouse noted that with the two lists, the board members would see they have a blue list in front of them that is similar to the lists on the slides. She explained they wanted to show the list on the presentation as well so that people in the audience could see it. She then presented the Board of Supervisors ranked priorities. She said they ranked somewhat differently than the Long Range Planning Advisory Committee has done because there were some ties and recalled that the prioritization had been done as a “dot” exercise that year. She added that agencies often request funding as well, such as libraries, and these requests were not included on the list at present time. She said the list includes more of the general government department’s priorities that were considered by the Board of Supervisors over the summer.

Ms. Palmer asked if they anticipated having anything from the election boards added because of the early voting and if there was an assumption that they would be coming up with additional figures. Mr. Richardson responded that Ms. Palmer was correct, and they will be working with their staff to ensure that as they move into the presidential 2020 year, they identify options and ways in which they will be able to incorporate these into the upcoming budget process for the following year.

Ms. Allshouse added that it was an important point that when discussing agencies as a capacity, they must be mindful that things such as elections can occur. She said for the purposes of today, they are working with the projects that have already been discussed.

Ms. McKeel asked if the lists from the two boards did not match exactly. Ms. Allshouse responded this was correct.

Ms. Mallek mentioned the State Technology Grant, noting that it used to cover the entire category. Ms. Kumazawa clarified that the State Technology Grant was not included on the list of projects but that it was still happening. She said the Technology Replacement Program and the State Technology Grant are two separate projects. She said there were previously four different technology and maintenance projects, the State Technology Grant, Instructional Technology, Administrative Technology, and Wide Area Network. She said that for ease of communication and transparency combined, everything for the State Technology Grant is what is called the Technology Replacement Program, which has seen cost increases. She said because it was a significant increase, it was deemed to be part of the discussion.

Ms. Allshouse said what was believed to work well for the next part of the conversation was for the boards to spend much of the time talking instead of staff and facilitators. She said they put some guiding questions in front of the board members to consider, then spend some time talking together. She said the guiding questions ask what surprised the boards about each other’s rankings, if there are patterns they see, if there are projects that they see on one list that may benefit both schools and general government, and how might climate action plan strategies be incorporated in the CIP.

Ms. Allshouse shared that the top priority in the Board of Supervisors’ strategic plan is climate action planning. She said they are not quite finished with the plan but there was a draft. She explained that the draft Climate Action Plan recommendations for public school and local government buildings include the following strategies: make targeted investments in energy-efficient projects; make targeted investments in renewable energy projects; adopt a green building construction policy for all new facilities, facility additions, and major renovations; and include climate impact and benefit statements for all capital project requests. Ms. Allshouse noted that both the schools and general government staff are working together on the climate action work and that it is being led by Mr. Lance Stewart.

Ms. Allshouse again presented the guiding questions for the board members.

Mr. Koleszar commented on green energy, noting that they have a long tradition of making the County’s schools very energy efficient. He said when Monticello High School was built and opened, the Board of

Supervisors required the School Board to do an energy efficiency and sustainability study. He said most of the recommendations in that study have a 20 year payback and the schools are already building sustainable buildings. He expressed that this has always been important to the School Board and should continue to be more important as they build school projects.

Ms. Mallek noted that in the past year, new solar projects were not done through the public partnership, where others do the capital investment, which was the first year at Monticello High School. She expressed hope that the partnership with private industry would stay on the list.

Mr. Koleszar added that they replaced all their fluorescent lights with LED lights, which are double energy saving because they use less energy and are cooler, and therefore less air conditioning is used. He said this was done with leased capital; the School Board did not put up any capital from the CIP but it was provided by the vendor. He said the energy savings are paying back that loan.

Ms. Palmer said there are many things that could be done regarding climate change. She noted that expanding support of AHIP helps with affordable housing, equity issues, weathering homes, and improving their efficiencies. She mentioned LEAP and said the County can try to support these groups undertaking many climate action activities.

Mr. Dill added that one of the things they are trying to do on the Climate Action Committee is to develop metrics in order to determine savings. He said that by using electric bills that have been tracked for a long time, they can tell and project what a new building would cost. He said it must be more than a “feel good” initiative.

Ms. McKeel said that looking at climate change and investments in environmental concerns ranked as the Board of Supervisors’ top priority, that they are looking at this very seriously going forward. She said the School Division has always been a leader in the past in building and retrofitting. She said having said that, over the past few years, things have changed. She said that as she was preparing for the agenda item for the Board of Supervisors’ September 18th meeting day, one of the things that struck her was that there would be value added for the two boards to have a work session around climate change and initiatives. She said they will not solve the problem in the community unless the School Division is pulled in and involved with the work around their school buses (which drive 14,000 miles per day). She asked how the carbon footprint would ever be reduced if they do not involve the School Division in the process. She asked to put aside the money issues for the moment and consider the big picture. She said the School Division represents 14,000 students and that while she understands and commends the staffs for working closely on climate action, the two boards need to be more unified with putting climate action into policy. She said it would behoove the County for the School Board, if possible, to have seamless policies around how the County is dealing with climate change in some of the things that we think we need. She said the schools and families could be the best advocates for the community as it is the largest group of people to reach out to. She suggested that in the future, the two boards reconvene to discuss their work around climate change and how they could make a difference working together. She said during the Board’s September 18th meeting, she would be mentioning many more opportunities she saw in the agenda packet for pulling the School Board in with discussions.

Ms. Acuff stated that the schools have done their job with buildings, but there is also the transportation system to consider, which is the largest in Central Virginia, with about 200 buses, 165 in operation daily. She said there are then 2,500 employees and about 2,000 students who drive each day to school. She said as a School Board, they should have something like the equity chapter if they are serious about and endorse the Climate Change Resolution in November. She said they need to have this as a template when looking at all their policies, noting they do not have a unified policy. She said they are encouraging student driving and she does not think this was in conformance with the goal of looking at climate change.

Ms. McKeel said the schools have a good policy about bus drivers not idling. She suggested that perhaps they could discuss having some educational signage to parents about idling. She said there are actions that do not have to always cost great amounts of money and to some degree, they need to role model to some degree, as best they can, from both sides of the organization. She said if they are serious about climate change being a concern,

everyone must have some skin in the game, and this includes residents, parents, students, boards, schools, and County office facilities.

Mr. Alcaro said that to Ms. McKeel's point, it would be of great value to include the students and parents in terms of being advocates. He said there are so many students and other organizations already within the schools that are promoting climate change solutions, noting that it was a live topic in the schools. He pointed out that with the light bulbs Mr. Koleszar had mentioned, this was their first measurement year of the bulbs, and the projections for the cost savings in power is \$705,000.

Ms. McKeel expressed that this was great and it would be ideal if the School Board was on the same page the Board of Supervisors was on and if they could understand their work and their recommendations.

Ms. Palmer expanded the discussion, pointing out that one of the things that would be discussed on September 18th within the context of climate action was that the Board of Supervisors received a report on solid waste, including composting, recycling, leaf and brush collection, etc. She said the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) later this month would be hearing from the City of Charlottesville as to the RFP that has been sent out to evaluate all their services that have anything to do with solid waste. She said the City would review their goals at the next RSWA meeting and that City schools would be involved in this, to some degree. She said this is a real opportunity to work together and connect with the City in a meaningful way. She acknowledged they have different issues in the County, with respect to busing, but that there were a variety of ways to interact.

Mr. Randolph recalled that there have often been discussions about the potential utilization of an overall transit plan that involves public transit that interfaces with public education transportation. He said they currently keep the two segregated as though there should not be any integration between them, but there was a great opportunity for talking about ways in which a public transit system could at the same time be a public school transportation system. He added that the boards need to be creative, noting that he saw in the Washington Post yesterday that Hyundai is now talking about including in their cars a collapsible e-scooter so that someone will be able not to pay the premium to park in a space but would go to a location where there would be lower parking costs, park the car, take out the e-scooter, and go to their jobs with the e-scooter, which had a total distance of nearly 30 miles. He said they would then go to work, come back, put the scooter in the trunk, and drive on. Mr. Randolph said that as discussed in the Broadband Authority regarding last-mile connectivity, they are discussing last-mile transport. He said the County should potentially think about using bicycles and scooters for students to be able to get the last mile or last several miles. He said there are many things on the table that would allow the County to move away from the old paradigm in which they automatically determine a necessary amount of parking spaces.

Mr. Randolph said on September 18th, the Board of Supervisors would be discussing an application for an independent school that intentionally lowered the number of parking spaces because they depend upon their students getting there via bus or by their parents transporting them, rather than having everyone in high school driving their own car. He said there is an opportunity for the County to think more broadly about many of the topics moving forward.

Ms. McKeel said Mr. Randolph brought up a good point. She said Mr. Jim Foley is part of the Regional Transit Partnership (RTP) because CAT runs the Charlottesville buses. She said if the boards had a joint work session, it would be a great opportunity to talk to the School Board about what the RTP is considering and how the boards might be able to look at transit in terms of students and not just adults.

Ms. Mallek said Mr. Foley mentioned in an early transit meeting that they would have to get legislative approval because they are required by law to take the children from home to school, and that transit could do something else. Ms. McKeel noted that there are lots of internships and kids that need to be moved around.

Mr. Randolph said the model was an outdated one. He said another angle to consider would be another learning center. He said this may be the time to take a fresh look of how transit is done in the County.

Ms. Mallek said that Climate Action was the number one priority for the Board of Supervisors because it was something they had never done before; it does not mean that the other projects are less important, but this is something they have never endeavored to do at this level. She said that as others have said, the right decisions and activities across the operation are going to benefit and it was not a separate thing as far as she can tell.

Mr. Koleszar said he was surprised by the \$25 million in transit improvements. He said he always thought that this was VDOT's responsibility and did not realize that the County was contributing that much money. Ms. Mallek responded that the County must match one-to-one.

Ms. McKeel said that the good thing about the \$25 million is that it turns into \$60 million.

Mr. Koleszar again said he was not aware that this was coming out of the CIP.

Ms. Mallek reminded the board members that in 2008, the County was receiving \$5 million from the State for their local secondary road funds, but now they get \$300,000. She said the whole system has changed and other counties have been putting \$10 million into the pot for decades and getting hundreds of millions of dollars more back. She said this was a big change in the County's view of how to get there and be able to draw down more State money.

Ms. McKeel agreed with Ms. Mallek and said that Mr. Koleszar was right to bring this up. She said this is one of the items that the School Division and Board of Supervisors have some overlap on. She said that she hopes they would be able to look at the School Division priorities and the Board of Supervisors' priorities from under one big umbrella rather than staying focused on their own worlds. She said for example, regarding the transportation that provides the money for their roads and intersections, she knows that the School Division was not currently meeting its self-imposed time to get kids to school on time, at least at several schools. She said the problem is traffic congestion. She said if Climate Action is a ranked project, it would benefit the School Division as well as general government, noting that transportation is generally not a School Division priority and they do not give it as much thought.

Ms. Acuff said the project list struck her so that perhaps the descriptions and conversations need to be made up stream from the rankings. She pointed out that Small Area Development, transportation, and climate all overlap. She said there should be explanations written as to why they overlap.

Ms. McKeel said that the Rio/29 Small Area Plan catalyst projects could include a center. She said the projects should be considered as far as how to synergize them together, as it would be to the benefit of both boards and produce a more successful CIP.

Ms. Mallek said another example is the implementation of the Master Plan. She said if there are sidewalks that are complete between the neighborhoods and schools, they could then say that the policy is that if one is within a certain radius and physically able, they need to walk to school. Similarly, she said that if one is on the bus route and it is a quick 20-minute ride, the policy would be for them to ride the bus. She asked the School Board to consider the \$15 million to \$20 million they and their predecessors have spent over the past 10 years putting the loops in to keep the drivers and buses separate.

Mr. Oberg commented that he was puzzled by the concept of making people ride the bus. He said the school's system, and how they are funding it, is based upon how many people ride it. He said if they declare that everyone must ride the bus, the costs will go up as they will have to have more buses and he does not understand how this would reduce the carbon footprint. He said if the buses are changed from diesel to natural gas, electric, or hydrogen, then the carbon footprint would be reduced, but putting more buses on the road would not. He explained that the routes are based upon who the buses are picking up and if there is an additional 20% of the population has to ride, they would not be on the same bus, but more buses would have to be put on the road.

Ms. McKeel said she was not arguing Mr. Oberg's point, but was looking at the viewpoint of the RTP transit partnership. She said there was some real synergy to be used in using the buses more efficiently. She said there are some things that could be changed and that she understands Mr. Oberg's point.

Ms. Callsen suggested that numbers would need to be evaluated on this, adding that saving 15 cars was not the equivalent of one bus. Ms. McKeel agreed and said it would be interesting to see how the numbers play out.

Mr. Oberg said that if they had to walk or ride a bike, this would reduce the carbon footprint. He said where he grew up, if a student lived within one mile of the school, they had to walk. Mr. Randolph assumed that Mr. Oberg had a sidewalk to walk on. Mr. Oberg responded that he did not.

Ms. Kumazawa acknowledged the points as being good ones and that they could go into more detail on them within the small groups. She pointed out that as they move into the small group discussions, they intentionally did not put funding amounts, as there are certain projects that are scalable or phase able and staff did not want to focus on the amounts as much as the rankings. She said that hopefully, the conversations would be focused on the order and priority and have the CIP Advisory Committee later focus specifically on funding levels.

(Note: Mr. Oberg left the meeting at 4:40 p.m.)

Review, discuss, and prioritize capital projects

Ms. Kumazawa said that as they move into the small group discussions, the activities would mirror more of what the board members saw in their homework. She asked that in the small groups, the board members choose 10 projects from the two lists. She explained the lists and the options they would choose from to come up with their lists. She said that similarly to the homework, there would be a couple write in options to include projects not listed. She presented the groups staff was asking the board members to work in, explaining who were in the groups and where they would locate.

Ms. Kumazawa explained that the purpose of the small groups is to come up with a combined Top 10 list. She said the three lists that would result from the activity would be taken to the CIP Advisory Committee, who would use that information to help inform their recommended scenarios. She acknowledged that this would be very difficult, noting that the activity would last one hour. She said the lists need to be in order, 1-10, and that the members would be given cards for prioritization. She said that each group would assign a notetaker, who would also present and report back to the larger group.

Ms. Kumazawa encouraged the groups to write down notes capturing caveats, qualifiers, and points of disagreement, compromise, to be presented out to the group. She said the group would have 40 minutes to do this portion and to help guide them, they would have a copy of the County's Strategic Plan, as well as a copy of the CIP Guiding Principles. She said these are the guiding principles previously used in past cycles by the TRC and various committees to rank projects. She said they also have a copy of the Board of Supervisors and School Board projects detailed descriptions. She said after the 40 minutes is up, each group would present for about 5 minutes each. She said they can open any remaining time for discussion and questions.

Ms. Acuff asked about there being space for a write in. Ms. Kumazawa responded that the groups will have two cards for write ins.

(Note: At 4:17 p.m., the boards then began their small group discussions. The boards continued its open discussions at 5:02 p.m.)

At this time, Ms. Kumazawa asked the groups to share their discussions.

Mr. Randolph presented for his group, which also consisted of Mr. Alcaro and Mr. Oberg. He said they started off in agreement that as prefaced by the discussion earlier, transportation was critical to everything being done. He said this needs to be looked at, perhaps not at the level that is proposed in the CIP, but it needs to be

considered nonetheless. He said the second area that was critical to all members of his group was brick and mortar school expansion. He said that both Cale and Crozet Elementary Schools have capacity issues, and both need to be addressed sooner rather than later. Mr. Randolph said that number four, Economic Development, was prioritized as such because of P3s, which is leverage money. He said that Mr. Oberg was correct in saying that in some cases, leverage money leads to more development and the County starts to chase it more emphatically. He said that it can also lead to more business growth, which is a net positive for the County. Mr. Oberg commented that with more development and business comes more people and students. Mr. Randolph agreed. He said they switched over to school safety improvements with the next priority, noting that it was absolutely critical along with the elevators being able to carry stretchers up to the second floor where in school buildings, a person currently has to be carried down the stairs. Mr. Randolph then presented climate action plan items, stating that they had no choice about quality total mandated TMDL and that it was a necessity. He listed drainage, infrastructure, maintenance and repair, pointing out that these items are climate related as they deal with the environment and stormwater maintenance. Mr. Randolph said the last priorities on the group's list were furniture and technology replacement, and middle school facility planning for the longer term.

Ms. Allshouse asked if there was any other discussion from their group. Mr. Randolph responded, "no", that they agreed on their priority list with very little controversy.

Mr. Dill presented for his group. He said that the only priority the group totally agreed upon was climate action, which was the top priority. He said the group liked the idea of making a profit on things, and so they wanted to place Transportation Leveraging and Economic Development as high priorities as they result in more tax revenue which would pay for some of the other items they would like to work on. He said most of the group felt as though the high school upgrades were the most visible and important. He said that both Cale and Crozet Elementary Schools were relatively high priorities. He said with the Technology Replacement, the group wanted to mix this project with the Data Center, as those two projects seem to be integrated and important. He said overall, one of the problems the group had was with determining the priorities as far as the actual projects and that it was difficult in this situation to figure out the best value. He said they may believe the Data Center was roughly as important as the Technology Replacement, but that it was much less expensive. He said recycling was deemed to be a part of the general environmental protection program, but it affects relatively fewer people compared to some of the other, larger projects. He said in terms of water quality, a controversial point was whether replacing the infrastructure was more important than working on all the streams overall and other water sources in the County. He said this was difficult to determine and the group put both projects on the list.

Ms. McKeel said they were impressed when the group first began their discussions because they had four projects that everyone agreed on. She said, however, they did not agree to where they went on the chart.

Ms. Palmer said that her group had a difficult time with the disparity in the costs of the projects. She acknowledged that the groups were asked by staff to ignore the costs, but they decided not to. She explained that this was why her group had extra cards. She said the School Board representatives in the group went through their priorities, as did the Supervisors. She said everyone put the Transportation Leveraging Program at the top of the list and generally agreed that the elementary school capacity issues were major. She said that after some discussion, Crozet Elementary came up to the top of the list, with Cale being very important as well. She said Economic Development for public/private partnerships was put in as the next high priority. She said that Mr. Koleszar made a good point, asking that if they did not have a project in hand, should they be denying the completion of a project that they already have in place and know that they need, considering that it will someday come up. She said she and Ms. Mallek agreed that if they do not have money in the budget, the project would not come up. Ms. Palmer said they then put in Cale Elementary as the next priority. She said with regard to the Recycling Convenience Center, this was put in as the next priority as it was a place not just for recycling, but to also drop off trash. She expressed her strong belief that this was an equity issue and that many people do not have the money to hire someone to pick up their trash. She said this is a basic government service and the Board of Supervisors has been discussing it for some time. She said the project has a relatively low cost and Ms. Mallek believed it could go lower. She said that priority number six was the Technology Replacement Program, as the School Board thought it was particularly important and that many of the programs they are doing are dependent upon it. Ms. Palmer said that the drainage and infrastructure program would be done over some time and phased

in. She said the group was not sure about the amount put in for this, but they know they must deal with it because they could have higher costs in the long run. She noted that water quality is a mandated project.

Ms. Palmer noted that climate action has a lot of overlap with many other projects. She said the group considered it extremely important, but they did not work it out as far as how it would play into the priority list. She said that they believed the greenways could also overlap with it. She said the School Board representatives in the group expressed that the costs for the high school renovations could be phased in over time. She said that the Furniture Replacement and Middle School Facility Planning could then be put in, as well as the Data Center. She said that all of this came out of the “AHS/WAHS” and the School Board wants to discuss it.

Ms. Acuff noted that their list did not include the additional security because there was no evidence that the additional measure would provide benefit. She said there was \$107.5 million worth of a final entrance improvement put in the last bond referendum, and so all the schools have secure entrances. She said there are locking systems and shades that come down. She said a couple years prior, they considered putting in bullet-proof material over the windows but that there was no evidence that this improves safety. She said the same was true, in her view, with the additional locking and clicking people in. She also mentioned that she thinks there is a better argument for the elevators.

Mr. Koleszar noted they kept the elevators on their group’s list, but they lowered the priority.

Mr. Randolph said that in past years, the two boards never had these kinds of conversations about the projects before going into the CIP. He said it was wonderful to get the School Board’s perspective and very different views on priorities.

Ms. McKeel said it was wonderful to see how much in common the small groups have.

Mr. Koleszar commented that under Economic Development, it could likely be put into year 2 or 3 and if there was not a project, it be pushed back a year. He said if they do have a project, it is there.

Mr. Randolph added that with Economic Development, the County cannot afford not to have the money.

Ms. Kumazawa said the Advisory Committee would take the groups’ input and determine which years, and how much based on trying to incorporate the three scenarios. She said to summarize they agreed there are many projects in common, including transportation, economic development, Cale and Crozet Elementary Schools, technology, drainage, and water that are across the board. She thanked the boards for their lists and that she was impressed, adding that they now have something tangible to move forward with. She said that by the time the boards reconvene in November, they will have made significant progress.

Review and approve recommended CIP Advisory Committee Charge.

Recommended CIP Advisory Committee Charge, Responsibilities and Membership

CIP Advisory Committee

The CIP Advisory Committee reviews the School Board and Board of Supervisors list of recommended projects and develops a combined School Division and General Government CIP proposal under the direction and guidance given by the two boards.

CIP Advisory Committee Charge

The CIP Advisory Committee will assist the County in the Capital Program process by reviewing and evaluating the recommended CIP projects brought forward by the School Board and Board of Supervisors. The Committee will ensure that the proposed Capital projects are aligned with County policies, established priorities, guiding principles and long-term vision, as defined in the County’s Strategic Plan [and the Comprehensive Plan](#). The

Committee will also ensure that the recommended five-year CIP is aligned with approved financial policies and that the County's financial stability is maintained through the prudent use of its revenues. The CIP Advisory Committee will report its recommendations to the County Executive, Board of Supervisors, Schools Superintendent, School Board, and Planning Commission. The County Executive will take the Committee's recommendations into consideration in preparation of the Recommended Capital Budget and Recommended Annual Budget to the Board of Supervisors.

Committee Member Responsibilities

- Review the recommended Capital Improvement Program projects presented by the School Board and Board of Supervisors;
- Develop combined CIP scenarios up to the maximum agreed upon funding levels;
- Ensure that all Capital projects carry out the County's long-range goals and objectives;
- Ensure that the recommended five-year CIP addresses County needs through the proper timing, prioritization and balance of local government and school division projects;
- Ensure that County revenues are used wisely to address the County's capital needs and that the recommended CIP conforms to approved financial policies, including the use of on-going revenues and borrowed funds;
- Recommend a five-year CIP;
- Provide process recommendations.

Committee Members include: 2 Members of the Board of Supervisors, 2 Members of the Albemarle County School Board, 1 Member of the Planning Commission, and 1 Citizen Representative. County and School Division staff will facilitate and provide support as needed.

Membership

Board of Supervisors: Rick Randolph, Norman Dill
School Board: Jonno Alcaro, Kate Acuff
Planning Commission: Bruce Dotson
Citizen Representative: Cal Morris

Ms. Allshouse said that staff sent the boards a copy of a recommended CIP Advisory charge (set out above). She said they started with the Oversight Committee's charge and then made some modifications to it. She said she would put this information in front of the boards with a summary, plus two more items that staff may want to consider including.

Ms. Allshouse presented the summary. She said they added the Comprehensive Plan as a guiding document for long range thinking, noting that this was important for the County as well as the Strategic Plan. She explained that the report will be recommended to the School Board, Board of Supervisors, School Superintendent, Planning Commission, and County Executive.

Ms. Allshouse said the next step in the process is that the County Executive must prepare a recommended capital budget and operating budget to the Board of Supervisors, and it was important to note that this is all taken into consideration. She pointed out that the first year of the CIP is the capital budget that ends up with the Board of Supervisors considering it as they make appropriations into the next year. She explained that other than the addition of the Comprehensive Plan, everything else was the same as when the process was sent to the boards the first time.

Ms. Allshouse said the proposed charge is to review and evaluate the CIP projects; ensure they are aligned with policies, guiding principles, and long term vision; and develop a combined School Division and General Government CIP proposal up to the maximum agreed upon funding levels that the boards came together on in May. She explained that the planning numbers the two boards came up with together around affordability is what the committee will have to work with, and then they will develop a memo reporting their findings.

Ms. Allshouse added that staff would like the Advisory Committee to offer suggestions on the process moving forward. She said this would be a good year as it was a different kind of year, and it was a request for the committee to add in their memo any guidance they may have on how the process could be improved in the future.

Mr. Koleszar suggested that it would be beneficial to have a member from the School Division's Long Range Planning Committee on the Advisory Committee.

Ms. Allshouse asked for more information about the Long Range Planning Committee. Mr. Koleszar responded that this was the committee that analyzes and prepares the School Board's CIP. He said the committee analyze the numbers, objections, capacity, and other issues. He said that staff has all this information, but they are there in a support role rather than an advocacy role. He said that someone who has done the analysis and is in an advocacy position is important to have on the Advisory Committee.

Ms. Allshouse asked if this was information that could be presented to the committee, or if Mr. Koleszar wanted them to be a voting member. Mr. Koleszar responded that their input should be considered, whether as a voting member or not.

Ms. Mallek offered that the May presentation was essential, as it is often at the last minute that things come up and the board finds out there is an emergency. She said this information should be obtained earlier.

Ms. Acuff said that the School Board hears its Long Range Planning Committee's recommendations and that is what they build their recommendations from. She said she respectfully disagrees with Mr. Koleszar.

Mr. Koleszar said that the people on the Long Range Planning Committee tend to have much more expertise in the CIP specifically. Ms. McKeel commented that staff is there for backup and if needed, they could request a presentation.

Mr. Alcaro said that this year, after the report came out, copies were sent to the Superintendents as well, and he agreed there could be some value to having someone in an advisory position.

Ms. Mallek said that having that advice at every meeting could be helpful because if something comes up that was not anticipated, that person could have something to say on the spot.

Mr. Randolph commented that Ms. Allshouse and Ms. Kumazawa came up with a terrific way of getting the two boards to work together energetically with real commitment. He thanked staff collectively, noting it was an effective process.

Mr. Alcaro said he wished the boards had been doing this for the past three to four years. He said that typically, the Advisory Committee meets in the fall and two to three times through November and December. He recalled that there was a meeting of the two boards in May, which gave them a springboard to arrive to the current meeting. He said that having additional meetings of the Advisory Committee, possibly in February, May and/or August, would be of value because it will have people thinking about what is coming up. He said that more communication is better than just receiving it and having to make decisions without having a background analysis.

Ms. Acuff asked if there had been a June meeting the year before last. Ms. Kumazawa responded it has been done in an off cycle. She said there is a different seasonal meeting about process improvements that has been valuable.

Ms. McKeel said that when the amounts are assigned, she hopes that they would feel as if perhaps not having to spend it to the exact amount might be helpful. She said that having some capacity for unexpected opportunities or allow for a project to come up could be beneficial. She said this was the case with the 5th Street Station transit expenses. She said that to think about not assigning the project to every dollar but to consider having breathing room would be beneficial for either the School Board, Board of Supervisors, or potentially both.

Ms. Mallek said when the Carrsbrook drainage failure happened and Carrsbrook Drive was about to fall in, it wiped out the Board's contingency fund, in addition to other things.

Ms. McKeel said there could be opportunities that come up that the boards want to be able to take advantage of or lose. She said something to that effect would be great.

Summarize work and next steps in FY 21 – FY 25 CIP development process.

Ms. Allshouse said that the next step was the Advisory Committee meeting on October 15. She said they would be bringing back the information about the CIP to the boards at their joint November meeting. She added that anyone can attend these meetings.

Agenda Item No. 3.1. Other Matters.

Agenda Item No. 4.1. Adjournment.

At 5:28 p.m., Mr. Randolph adjourned the Board of Supervisors meeting to September 18, 2019, at 1:00 p.m., in Lane Auditorium. At 5:28 p.m., hearing no objections, Mr. Alcaro adjourned the School Board.

Chairman

Clerk