A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on November 20, 2024, at 1:01 p.m. in Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia, 22902.

PRESENT: Mr. Jim H. Andrews, Mr. Ned Gallaway (left the meeting at 3:37 p.m. and returned at 6:01 p.m.), Ms. Beatrice (Bea) J.S. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, and Mr. Mike O. D. Pruitt.

ABSENT: none.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeffrey B. Richardson; Interim County Attorney, Andy Herrick; Clerk, Claudette K. Borgersen; and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

____

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

Mr. Andrews introduced the Albemarle County Police Department Officers present to provide their services at the meeting, Master Police Officer Dana Reeves and Officer Andy Muncy.

____

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

____

Agenda Item No. 4. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Ms. Mallek **moved** to adopt the final agenda. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, and Mr. Pruitt.
NAYS: None.

____

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

Ms. Mallek stated that she attended the conference sponsored by Senator Dave Marsden in Short Pump on Monday, November 18, 2024. She said that the event was an exhausting but informative nine hours, bringing together various stakeholders and legislators to discuss energy issues moving forward, particularly in the legislature, but also the 10-year projected doubling of electricity demand and rates for residential users by 2035, due to increased demand and investments needed for data centers.

Ms. Mallek said that the discussion was intense, but she had saved files that she would forward to everyone, allowing them to review the slides and catch up on the information. She said that the conference aimed to establish a better understanding of the key issues before the legislative process this year. She said that the number one takeaway when Senator Marsden did his introduction was that local authority was a given, which was a welcome message. She said that this alleviated some concerns, but it was likely that the issue would resurface in the future.

Ms. McKeel stated that she would like to bring a couple of things to the public's attention. She said that in today’s Board packet was the quarterly report by the County’s Facilities and Environmental Services (FES) team about the work being done in Albemarle County, and it was a great resource for the public to stay informed about what was happening and what their staff was working on. She said that they can find the report in their Board packet, which was currently on the consent agenda. She said that she would like to extend a big thank you to everyone involved in preparing this report.

Ms. McKeel said that additionally, she would like to recognize and acknowledge the upcoming launch of their Albemarle Employee Care Clinic. She said that two locations will be available: one on 29 North and one at Pantops. She said that employees should have received a notification card in the mail. She said that this clinic would be a valuable resource for their employees and would help the County organization become an employer of choice.

Ms. McKeel said that she would also like to address some questions she had received from constituents who had received a fine from the school speeding zone. She said that she had discovered that the County’s website has a Q&A document available under the government section, which answers many of the questions she had recently received. She said that this document will help inform their constituents about how the camera zone works and what it is all about.

Mr. Pruitt stated that he would like to bring up three quick points. He said that firstly, this Board often heard comments and discussed invasive species, and what it meant to mitigate and control those. He said that he recently attended an excellent event organized by the Rivanna Conservation Alliance at Darden Towe, and he would like to share some information about it with the community. He said that the event was a volunteer workday this Saturday, where a diverse group of volunteers, including representatives from other non-profits, learned how to cut down and mitigate porcelain berry and Asian bittersweet, two invasive strangler vine species that harmed the native tree canopy. He said that for those interested, additional workdays could be found on the Rivanna Conservation Alliance's website. He said that additionally, there was an entire non-profit dedicated to this cause named Piedmont Regional Invasive Species Management (PRISM). He said that he would also like to give a shout-out to the staff, particularly Jesse Wingo from Parks and Recreation, who was a key partner in this effort.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would also like to remind everyone that this Saturday marked the beginning of regular firearm hunting season for deer in Albemarle County, as the official dates depended on the region. He said that he encouraged hunters to familiarize themselves with the regulations, as this was the start of deer season, which ran until early January. He said that this was important for everyone, even those who were not hunters, as it raised basic safety concerns, such as staying on trails, wearing visible clothing, and keeping dogs curbed. He said that he also wanted to remind folks, especially in the Rural Areas in the southern part of the County, that this was a time when stray dogs were more likely to be encountered because some hunters hunted with dogs. He asked that everyone please ensure that they become familiar with their neighbors and established a method for communication when a dog on their property was not theirs.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would also like to highlight one other key point. He said that unfortunately, he was late to the last meeting and missed the public comment and announcements by Board members the day after the election. He said that he would like to draw attention to a matter that was currently on his mind and would likely be important moving forward. He said that the president-elect had emphasized the need to address illegal immigration in the United States, and some of these policies may have significant implications for local government, potentially. He said that he would like to bring this to the Board's attention now, so they could proactively consider how they would respond if there were any questions or calls from the federal government regarding their involvement in immigration in Albemarle County. He said that that was where he was going to leave that, as he needed to conduct further research on this subject.

Mr. Gallaway stated that several Board members had attended VACo (Virginia Association of Counties), and that he would not report a whole lot there, as they could share that in conversation. He said that following that, he attended the Virginia Governor's Housing Conference, where he gathered some useful information that he would share with the Board. He said that during that conference, the National Association of Counties (NACo) Community Workforce and Economic Development Committee held their monthly call.

Mr. Gallaway said that he would be sending a report to the Board based on the information shared during that call, focusing on what local governments could do, and innovative solutions related to affordable housing. He said that the report provided an overview, and that it included some solutions that had put in place around the country, some of which he had heard of and some which he had not. He said that he found the report to be informative.

Mr. Gallaway said that during that call, they also discussed homelessness, and the importance of having a homelessness plan in place, particularly in the context of disaster and emergency planning. He said that the discussion emphasized the need to have a two-pronged approach to address both how climate events impacted existing homeless people and how they resulted in additional homelessness. He said that he would share additional information in a follow-up email when he sent the report to the Board.

Mr. Andrews stated that he would be adding some additional information when they discussed this further during their reports from the Board later in the afternoon. He said that following up on the VACo annual conference meeting, he would like to extend his congratulations to Supervisor Mallek, who served as the president and is now the past president of VACo. He said that he was impressed with how effectively Supervisor Mallek ran the meeting, and she made them all proud.

Mr. Andrews said that he also planned to report later on the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority's (RSWA) final meeting of the year, which took place yesterday. He said that the RSWA Board of Directors recognized the service of Mr. Lance Stewart, who was retiring, and his contributions to that Board over the years had been invaluable.

Ms. Mallek said that she had one comment to add, which Mr. Pruitt had reminded her of during his discussion of deer hunting season. She said that for those living in the Rural Area, she would like to remind hunters that there is no going on private property without permission. She said that if they were unsure of whose property they were on, it meant they did not have permission. She said that she would like to offer some advice: do not shoot from the roadway. She said that these were ongoing issues that required them to call law enforcement for assistance.

Ms. Mallek said that if hunters were reclaiming their hounds, they may not bring their vehicle or their weapon onto private property. She said that they must walk the half mile to her house without their weapon to ask permission to look for their hounds. She said that if they failed to do so, they would likely receive a negative reaction from her, which had happened in the past. She said that she wanted to emphasize the importance of being respectful of the people who live in the community where you may be hunting. She said that they had two families who hunt with bow on her property, and that it was very important for them, as well as for the management of their herd. She said that people needed to be respectful of others.

Agenda Item No. 6. Proclamations and Recognitions.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 7. From the Public: Matters on the Agenda but Not Listed for Public Hearing or on Matters Previously Considered by the Board or Matters that are Pending Before the Board.

Mr. Neil Williamson, President of the Free Enterprise Forum, a privately funded public policy organization focused on Central Virginia's local governments, said that he came before them regarding an item on the agenda for this evening, but he would likely not be present for their evening session regarding AC44. He said that he had been following this issue since its inception and would like to reiterate his concerns about the Free Enterprise Forum's lasagna plan.

Mr. Williamson said that the Board had taken a position of not reinventing the wheel, and instead exploring ideas from around the Commonwealth, but had also enshrined a binary choice; Rural Area and Development Area. He said that the Rural Area composed more than 95% of the County's land mass. He said that the Board had consistently stated that there was a housing crisis. He said that he would like to ask a simple question: what steps was the AC44 Comprehensive Plan taking to address this housing crisis? He said that staff had previously indicated that the plan was based on a one-to-one trade for density in the 2015 plan, which would not increase density.

Mr. Williamson said that there had been no discussion about the lasagna plan, which was based on a plan in Loudoun County, where there were four distinct categories: urban, suburban, transitional, and rural. He said that other localities in the Commonwealth had different percentages of development areas or growth areas. He said that for example, Fauquier County, which is often referred to as being country, had approximately 52% of its land mass designated as Development Areas. He said that he was not suggesting that it had to go that direction, but as Supervisor Pruitt had mentioned in a previous meeting, when did supervisors get to discuss the map?

Mr. Williamson said that using the map, as in the children's show, "Dora," could help identify areas of high demand for single-family homes. He said that the market was currently lacking in this area, and he recommended moving away from the binary choice between Rural and Development Area and ordering the lasagna.

Ms. Emily Dreyfus, Rio District, said that she was there on behalf of a coalition of organizations that was very concerned about affordable housing. She said that the undersigned organizations, representing thousands of County residents, faith-based communities, housing providers, and advocates, asked that the Board initiate a rigorous approach to affordable housing in Albemarle County.

Ms. Dreyfus said that there was a wide array of critical unmet needs, and they hoped the Board would exercise its leadership to enhance the well-being and quality of life for all citizens. She said that they must anticipate decreased federal funding and a shift to increase the responsibilities of local government, making the affordable housing shortage even more urgent.

Ms. Dreyfus said that they stood together to ask that they take the following actions: the first is to improve funding. She said that they should first establish a housing trust fund with at least $10 million in dedicated annual funding specifically for affordable housing, up to 60% area median income (AMI) for rental and up to 80% for homeownership. She said that funding for new construction and preservation of existing deeply affordable housing was paramount, including the successful redevelopment of Southwood. She said that the housing trust fund had been unanimously supported by the Board as part of the Housing Albemarle Plan, which had been approved in 2021.

Ms. Dreyfus said that the second step is to improve the Albemarle County Emergency Relief (ACER) Program, to provide substantially more funding and provide more relief for each household. She said that the current limit of $800 per household was inadequate to pay even half of a family's average monthly rent. She said that third, the County's robust investment to expand resources to address affordability and community development needs would require using every funding opportunity in the toolbox, including possibly increasing property taxes. She said that if necessary, they should not shy away from taking those steps.

Ms. Dreyfus said that next, they need to strengthen AC44. She requested that they please ensure that the County's Comprehensive Plan included ambitious new approaches to address housing needs, including upzoning Growth Areas, developing a specific plan for future expansion of the Growth Areas while avoiding sprawl, strengthening inclusionary zoning and robust and affordable housing incentives and allowances, including incentives to reduce the impact on climate change, manufactured housing preservation, land banks, land trusts, and other options.

Ms. Dreyfus said that they should also exercise more discretion in setting parking minimums. She said that the organizations signing this document included the Blue Ridge Area Coalition for the Homeless, Charlottesville-Albemarle Affordable Housing Coalition, Charlottesville Low Income Housing Coalition, Community Climate Collaborative, IMPACT (Interfaith Movement Promoting Action by Congregations Together), Livable C'ville, and Virginia Organizing.

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

Ms. Mallek **moved** to approve the consent agenda. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, and Mr. Pruitt.
NAYS: None.

_____

Item No. 8.1. Personnel Policy Amendments.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that Albemarle County ended the shared service Human Resources (HR) model in Fiscal Year 2023 (FY 23) and approved the formation of a HR Department dedicated to local government operations. Foundational work in establishing a government-focused HR Department includes a full review and revision of all County Personnel Policies, which is now underway. During this review, staff identified opportunities to modernize existing Personnel Policies to align with changes in legislation and public sector best practices.

Under the County Code, personnel policies and amendments are adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

Staff is proposing updates to the personnel policies listed below with a summary of the proposed changes for each. The revised policies have been renumbered to improve ease of use and accessibility for all staff. The personnel policies utilize a new template in an effort to standardize the appearance of the documents.

§P-17 Classification and Compensation
Previously § P-60 Salary Administration and Position Classification (Attachment A), the proposed changes include: added sections for Roles and Responsibilities and Definitions; added section clarifying allowable types of employment in accordance with federal law and County operations; modernized the policy to reflect the County's market-based compensation philosophy; removed payroll processing procedures; removed pay types and administration, to be reflected in a separate policy.

The following personnel policies are proposed to be archived, as they are no longer relevant, as described below.

§P-02 Definition of Employee Status
This policy provided explanations of various types of employment that could be used by the County. Some of the information pertained to school personnel only. The relevant remainder of the policy has been incorporated in §P-17, as discussed above, and other County policy revisions.

§P-41 Release Time for Advanced Study
This policy, last updated in 1996, allowed staff to attend college classes in pursuit of an Advanced college degree, in lieu of dedicating the hours to fulfilling the work expectations of the job. The policy was written for and utilized by school educators at the time. It is no longer a best practice among school divisions, has never been a best practice for local government personnel, and is not currently being used by government personnel.

There is no budget impact associated with the proposed adoption of these amendments.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the Resolution (Attachment B), to amend personnel policy § P-17, and archive policies § P-02 and § P-41.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the Resolution (Attachment B), to amend personnel policy § P-17, and archive policies § P-02 and § P-41:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors may adopt Personnel Policies under Albemarle County Code §2-901; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to amend and re-number Policy §P-60 Salary Administration and Position Classification as §P-17 Classification and Compensation, and repeal Policies §P-02 Definition of Employee Status and §P-41 Release Time for Advanced Study.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, hereby approves the renumbering and amendment to the County's Personnel Policies as set forth in the proposed policy, and the repeal of Policies §P-02 Definition of Employee Status and §P-41 Release Time for Advanced Study.

* * * * *

	P - §17.0	Policy Name: Classification and Compensation	Approved Date: November 20, 2024
	Prepared By: Human Resources		Adopted Date: July 1, 1993
	Amended Date: September 13, 1993; June 19, 1995; July 8, 1996; December 8, 1997; September 3, 2008; May 3, 2017; February 6, 2019		

A. PURPOSE

Classification and compensation serve as a critical component in the County's total rewards strategy that encompasses not only a competitive market-based approach to pay, but also opportunities for career growth and development for our exceptional employees.

The purpose of this policy is to establish a compensation philosophy and methodology for categorizing jobs within the organization, ensuring fair and equitable compensation for employees while aligning with market wages.

B. DEFINITIONS

"At- Will" Employee - an employment arrangement where either the employer or employee can terminate the employment at any time, for any reason, without legal consequences, as long as the reason isn't unlawful

FLSA Status - an employee's classification as either exempt or nonexempt under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA).

Job Description – A formal document that outlines essential duties, qualifications, and expectations for a specific role within the organization.

Seasonal Employee – Employee who is hired for a position that is used for a cyclical assignment that recurs annually. Examples include, but are not limited to Parks and Recreation summer program staff and lifeguards, early voting election workers, etc.

Temporary Employee – Employee who is hired for a set period of time to cover a short-term absence or vacancy, or to work on a time-bound project. Employees can be full-time or part-time.

C. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Employees – Employees are responsible for staying updated on County employment and compensation policies and procedures. They should raise any classification or compensation-related concerns with their managers, supervisors, or Human Resources. Additionally, employees may participate in committees to offer structured feedback and assist in the review of classification actions as needed.

Managers and Supervisors – Managers and Supervisors are responsible for managing budgets, assessing and prioritizing staffing needs in alignment with department and organizational objectives, and maintaining accurate job descriptions within their areas.

Finance & Budget – Finance & Budget assesses the financial impact of classification and compensation actions, provides projections for future personnel costs, and allocates funds for Board-approved position changes and pay adjustments.

Human Resources (HR) – HR in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, develops, administers, and interprets policies, guidelines, and procedures. HR determines appropriate job titles, pay classifications, and FLSA status for positions, develops and maintains the County's compensation structures, and conducts research and analysis of compensation strategies, and market wages.

D. POLICY

1) Employment Types
   The County maintains standard types of employment and classifies employees in accordance with the types of employment authorized by the Board of Supervisors, notwithstanding immediate changes required by Federal or State law.

   a. Appointees – Any officers, directors, and department heads appointed by and directly reporting to the Board of Supervisors and serving under a contract of employment.

   b. Classified Employees – County employees, and partner agency staff identified by agreement as following the County's pay plan, who hold full or part-time positions included in one of the County's pay structures.
      i. Classified employees occupy an approved, budgeted, non-temporary, full-time or part-time position that is approved by the Board of Supervisors.
      ii. Full-Time Status: Employment in a classified position that is Board approved to work an average of 40 hours per week or more.
      iii. Part-Time Status: Employment in a classified position that is Board approved to work an average of less than 40 hours per week. All part-time classified positions will be FLSA non-exempt.
      iv. Probationary Status: Probationary employees are "at will" and ineligible to

use grievance procedures. The County's standard probation period is 6 months. Safety sensitive positions and other positions required by the commonwealth may have probation periods of up to one year. Employees must be informed of the length of probation at the time of job offer.

c. Temporary and Seasonal Employees - Employees hired for a specified period of time, not to overlap fiscal years without approval through the budget development process, or for the duration of a specific project or program.
   i. Temporary employees, both direct hire and through a temp agency, will be screened and hired through the County's Human Resources Department processes.
   ii. Temporary/Seasonal employees are "at-will" employees.
   iii. Temporary/Seasonal employees are not placed into positions in one of the County's pay structures, but will receive pay in alignment with similar County classified positions or a competitive market rate as determined by Human Resources.
   iv. Temporary employees, other than seasonal employees, will receive Cost of Living Adjustments in alignment with movement of the County's pay structures.

d. Unclassified Positions — Unclassified positions, for the purpose of compensation, are not subject to the County Pay Plan, unless otherwise specifically indicated by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. The following positions are unclassified:

- All elected officials, including constitutional officers
- Members of boards, authorities, commissions, and committees appointed by the Board of Supervisors
- Volunteer and internship personnel, to include those receiving honorarium payments
- Consultants and counsel rendering professional services
- Positions involving seasonal or temporary employment
- The County Attorney
- The County Executive
- Such other positions as may be designated by the Board of Supervisors

e. FLSA Status — All classified County positions are covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), which has two basic categories of jobs:

a. Exempt – Those positions not covered by the overtime provisions of the FLSA and are ineligible to earn overtime; or
b. Non-Exempt – Those positions covered by the overtime provisions of the FLSA and eligible to earn overtime at a rate of one and one-half times the regular rate for all hours worked over the allowable maximum within a pay period.

FLSA status is determined by Human Resources and is based on the essential functions and base salary of the position in accordance with the criteria established in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

2) Compensation Structure

The purpose of the Compensation Structure is to provide a consistent, equitable, and transparent system for establishing competitive market-based wages. The County utilizes traditional and public safety pay scales to meet these criteria. The Department of Human Resources is responsible for developing and maintaining the compensation structure which includes grades or bands with a salary range minimum and maximum.

The County Pay Plan, consisting of the compensation structure(s), approved Cost of Living Adjustments, merit pay, bonuses, recognition pay, and other pay types, is adopted by the Board of Supervisors annually and applied on a per fiscal year basis.

3) Position Classification

The County maintains a classification process which includes developing a job description for each position, assessment, and placement within the County's compensation structure. The essential functions of the position are used to benchmark against the County's competitive market, as established by the Board of Supervisors, for categorization and salary range determination.

4) Pay Determination

Each position is assigned a salary range on the compensation structure based on the essential functions of the position, the prevailing rates of pay in the competitive market, employee turnover, the essential functions of the position, the prevailing rates of pay in the competitive market, employee turnover, the County's adopted compensation philosophy, and economic considerations.

_____

Item No. 8.2. FY 25 First Quarter Financial Report, ***was received for information.***

_____

Item No. 8.3. Facilities and Environmental Services (FES) Quarterly Update, ***was received for information.***

_____

Item No. 8.4. VDOT Monthly Report (November) 2024, ***was received for information.***

____

Agenda Item No. 9. **Action Item:** SE202400022 3065 Gables Run Homestay. (Scottsville Magisterial District).

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the applicants are requesting a special exception for a homestay at 3065 Gables Run Road.

Accessory Structure. Pursuant to County Code § 18-5.1.48(d), the applicants are requesting to modify County Code 18-5.1.48(c)(1)(ii) to authorize the use of an accessory structure for a homestay use on a Rural Areas parcel of less than five acres.

Please see Attachment A for full details of staff's analysis and recommendations.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment F) to approve the proposed special exception to authorize the use of an accessory structure for a homestay use at 3065 Gables Run.

_____

Ms. Lisa Green, Manager of Code Compliance, said that for the Board's review, she presented Special Exception SE202400022 3065 Gables Run Homestay. She said that this application sought a special exception from County Code 18-5.1.48 to allow Michael and Cheryle Trice, the property owners, to operate a homestay in an accessory structure on their parcel, which was less than five acres in the Rural Area (RA) district.

Ms. Green said that the 4.229-acre parcel, located south of Milton along Gables Run Road, featured manicured lawns and trees and included the primary residence of the owners at 3065 Gables Run Road. She explained that the property also included a pole barn, and a two-story detached accessory structure built in 1992, which was the focus of this special exception. She said that the lower level of this accessory structure served as a garage, while the upper level was a one-room studio.

Ms. Green noted that the nearest neighboring dwelling was located over 650 feet away from the proposed homestay in all directions, and the surrounding properties consisted of a mix of forested land and mowed fields. She said that the parcel met all the requirements for homestay use, with the exception that it was just shy of five acres in size. She explained that the accessory structure was built prior to August 7, 2019, and met the primary structure setbacks. She said that the special exception was only required due to the property being less than five acres.

Ms. Green said that if approved, the owners would then apply for homestay zoning clearance and move forward with the remaining approval process. She said that the property was currently in compliance with all zoning and taxation requirements.

Ms. Green said that the proposed homestay structure had an entrance directly off of Gables Run Road and located near the primary dwelling on the parcel. She said that as they could see on the slide, there was ample on-site parking.

Ms. Green said that the following slides provided photos of the site. She said that the first photo showed the primary dwelling in context to the proposed homestay use. She said that the second photo showed the property from the center of Gables Run Road looking south, and here they could see the on-site parking for the primary residence. She said that the next photo was looking west, and here they could see the lower level of the garage entrance of the accessory structure and the on-site parking area for the proposed homestay use.

Ms. Green said that after reviewing the relevant factors, staff believed that utilizing the studio above the garage of the two-story accessory structure as a homestay on the owner's parcel would not adversely impact the surrounding neighborhood, or public health, safety, or welfare. She said that the homestay was considered an accessory use to the primary residence on the property and aligned with the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Green said that given that the parcel was just under the five-acre requirement, and considering the size of the structure, the dwelling was compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. She said that staff had analyzed the homestay use in the context of the property and the neighborhood, and therefore recommended approval.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked Ms. Green if they had accepted other homestays in the Rural Area which were less than five acres.

Ms. Green said that there had been a few, but not many. She said that mostly there was a 125-foot setback when they had done those special exceptions.

Mr. Pruitt asked if there was already a certificate of occupancy issued for this dwelling unit located above the garage in question.

Ms. Green said that it was not a full dwelling, but it did have a certificate of occupancy for the structure.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the unit had a kitchen.

Ms. Green said that it had a kitchenette, but did not have a stove for permanent cooking.

Mr. Andrews, hearing no additional questions or comments from the Board, said that they were ready for a motion.

Mr. Pruitt **moved** that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Resolution for SE202400022 3065 Gables Run Homestay (Attachment F). Mr. Gallaway **seconded** the motion.

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

AYES: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, and Mr. Pruitt.

NAYS: None.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE SE2024-00022
3065 GABLES RUN HOMESTAY

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the Memorandum prepared in conjunction with the SE2024-00022 3065 Gables Run Homestay application and the attachments thereto, including staff's supporting analysis, any comments received, and all of the relevant factors in Albemarle County Code §§ 18-5.1.48 and 18-33.9, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby finds that a modified regulation would satisfy the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance to at least an equivalent degree as the specified requirement, and that the requested special exception:

(i) would not cause adverse impacts to the surrounding neighborhood;
(ii) would not cause adverse impacts to the public health, safety, or welfare;
(iii) would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and any applicable master or small-area plan(s); and
(iv) would be consistent in size and scale with the surrounding neighborhood.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that in association with the SE2024-00022 3065 Gables Run Homestay application, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby grants a special exception to authorize the use of an accessory structure for a homestay use on Parcel 09300-00-00-06500.

Agenda Item No. 10. **Work Session:** Five-Year Financial Plan Work Session.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that long-range financial planning is part of the County's adopted financial policies: "The County will develop and annually update a long-range five-year Financial Plan. The Financial Plan will include a review of revenue trends and expenditures from the prior years' projections of revenues and expenditures, as well as future costs and the financing of the Capital Improvement Plan."

A long-range financial plan is different from the annual budget in that it emphasizes where the County may be headed at the end of the plan rather than the coming fiscal year. This planning can provide a helpful framework to inform the annual budget to ensure funding recommendations are aligned with County priorities. It also provides a framework to illuminate discussion around questions such as:

a. Are the County's operating and capital plans in alignment? For example, if the County starts constructing a new facility in the capital budget, is it able to open and operate it in a future operating budget - can the decisions being made today be afforded in future years?
b. What long-term strategies or policies could be considered to change the long-term trajectory of the financial plan?

The Five-Year Financial Plan is the next step in the County's long-term financial planning process, where to date:

- On August 21, the Board approved the FY 26 operating and capital budget calendar
- On October 16, the Board received an Economic Outlook Report
- On November 6, the Board received the County Workforce Annual Report

Next, in accordance with the budget development schedule, the Board will hold a series of work sessions in the fall to review long-range financial planning information prior to the annual budget process. The work sessions are scheduled for November 20 and December 4 (a joint meeting with the School Board).

During this work session, staff will present initial revenue and expenditures assumptions, which have been developed using the best information available at the time and illustrate the financial plan's alignment with the Strategic Plan. These assumptions will continue to be updated in the annual budget development process and subsequent financial plans. Staff will also share the proposed financial plan's alignment with the Strategic Plan and seek Board feedback on the financial plan.

Long-range financial planning connects long-range fiscal planning with strategic planning priorities and provides an important context for the annual budget process.

Staff recommends that the Board share feedback on the initial long-range Five-Year Financial Plan.

Mr. Andy Bowman, Assistant Chief Financial Officer, said that he would like to take a moment to recognize the four staff members currently in the Office of Management and Budget who had done an outstanding amount of analysis and coordination. He said that although they preferred to work behind the scenes, he wanted to extend his gratitude to this team for their tireless efforts. He said that as the voice and translator for today's presentation, he was aware that much of the good work was based on the hard work these individuals did every day.

Mr. Bowman said that today's work session focused on the five-year financial plan, and staff did not request any action from the Board. He said that he often framed this conversation within the context of their long-range strategic planning work the Board had been doing. He said that the first slide provided a recap of their progress this summer and fall, starting with the adoption of the budget calendar and the Board's first public review of the Strategic Plan Execution and Reporting Report, also known as SPEAR. He said that he highlighted this because they had been intentional in the last two years in tying their budget and long-range Strategic Plan together very tightly, ensuring that strategic planning and financial planning felt like a cohesive process.

Mr. Bowman said that they had previously discussed the economic outlook report with Dr. Bailey in October, and there would be another update on performance. He said that Jessica Rice, their Director of County Government Human Resources, had been providing reports on the work they had been doing and the status of some of the strategies they had implemented, such as the compensation and classification study.

Mr. Bowman said that this conversation would continue on December 4, 2024, in a joint meeting with the School Board, where the School Board would have the opportunity to share their story, with an emphasis on the capital program and engaging the Board on that matter. He said that they would come back in February for the annual recommended budget process and the subsequent work sessions.

Mr. Bowerman said that today's agenda consisted of two main items and desired outcomes. He said that the first was taking the Board's direction from the Strategic Plan, walking through where they were, and the projected revenues based on the Economic Outlook Report, and aligning expenditures with the Strategic Plan. He said that they would leave as much time as possible at the end of the presentation for the Board to provide feedback in terms of what the plan did well and what may be missing. He said that that was a question that the Board could take in a lot of different directions, but it will be helpful for staff to hear their thoughts on whether the plan meets their expectations or if there are areas that need further discussion. He said that this feedback will not only be valuable for the current budget process but also for those long-range discussions that they have.

Mr. Bowman said that before they dive into the plan, he would like to take a moment to ground themselves in long-range financial planning. He said that this was part of the Board approved County Financial Management Policies. He said that this exercise helps them ensure that their plans are aligned whereas they opened their capital facilities, they were able to operate them. He said that sometimes, the planning process itself is more valuable than the final plan.

Mr. Bowman said that he recalled a previous five-year plan session where the Board had extensive discussion on revenue diversification, which ultimately led to the Board being well-positioned to respond to changes in state enabling authority for food and beverage taxes and transient occupancy taxes. He said that this highlights the importance of policies in driving effective decision-making. He said that in the context of this plan, it was not just about the new dollars being added; they also need to consider the base funding. He said that they currently had a general fund budget of over $400 million.

Mr. Bowman said that as the Board evaluates the budget, they were not only looking at additive items but also what the base of funding was doing: how were they performing in their services, what were the policy levers and recent investments that had been made, and what were the results they had seen.

Mr. Bowman said that although this was a long-range discussion, it did lead into the annual budget, but today's presentation will have a different look and feel than the March work session. He said that typically, when he presented to the Board in March, it was usually changes that would happen immediately or within a matter of months. He said that this had a much longer time frame. He said that both the current year and the next year were important, but this was a much longer time horizon that they looked at.

Mr. Bowman said that additionally, the assumptions made are the best they currently knew, and they would continue to evolve as they move forward. He also wanted to acknowledge the Board of Supervisors for their understanding of five-year financial planning. He said that the next slide, which the Board has seen in previous budgets, examines the cost drivers over the last three fiscal years, including those expected in FY26.

Mr. Bowman said that the Board may recall that in FY24, the Board allocated $4.9 million to the capital budget to support one-time needs. He said that in FY25, that funding became available for County Government and Public Schools to support those operations. He said that last year, the Board demonstrated a similar ability to generate revenue to fund initiatives such as the Berkmar Ambulance and the HART (Human Services Alternative Response Team) team, even though those initiatives started mid-year. He said that the Board's ability to plan and execute these initiatives is a testament to their understanding of how this planning drives their Strategic Plan.

Mr. Bowman said that with that in mind, he would now present the bottom-line summary of their current situation. He said that they would take an overall look at the plan. He said that as shown on the chart provided, it reflected the County's general fund only and does not include the Schools fund or capital funds. He said that in the general fund, they assume two of the largest transfers are made to the Public Schools for operations and to the capital and debt program for those expenses. He said that these transfers are made by formula, so there will be work needed to balance the CIP (Capital Improvement Program) as there would be the Schools budget, just as they did every year. He said that the gap numbers at the bottom reflected a County Government gap, considering the other formulas are being made.

Mr. Bowman said that the second observation is the steady upward trend in revenues, which he will discuss in more detail. He said that the expenditure line shows significant gaps in the out years, a common issue in their past five-year plans and other localities. He said that the goal is not to balance FY30, but to position them to make informed decisions about how to do things differently. He said that just as they had an unbalanced budget for FY25, they now had a balanced budget. He said that this was an iterative process, which they continue to improve on.

Mr. Bowman said that his final observation was that the timing of some of those first years. He said that for many of the plans that they look at, at this time of year it was common to have a gap in the first year; FY26. He said that, however, sometimes they see a significant increase in obligations in years two and three.

Mr. Bowman said that if they examine this chart, they can see that if there is no gap in FY25, then they went to 3% and to 5%. He said that in some of their past plans, they saw that that trend occurred more in years two to three, rather than years one and two, which suggests that many of the expenditure pressures and obligations are coming sooner than they would have planned. He said that he would discuss these details in more detail throughout this presentation.

Mr. Bowman said that to begin at a high level, on the revenue side, he would recap the economic outlook report that the Board received in October. He said that the four main takeaways from their staff were first, Albemarle County' economy continued to be very strong and performed well. He said that second, they also followed state and national trends. He said that many of Albemarle County's revenues were backward looking, meaning that they received their consumer taxes based on past activity; so sometimes there were things happening right now that would take some time to show up in the County's economy.

Mr. Bowman said that the national economy was summarized as partly sunny, partly cloudy, with indicators pointing to both growth and potential recession. He said that while the threat of a recession was not as great as it was in the past, Dr. Bailey had recommended that they plan for some cooling in late 2024 through early 2025, followed by moderate growth. He said that it was also worth noting that the timing of revenue impacts could vary significantly from one industry to another and may not always be reflected in the County's financials in the same way.

Mr. Bowman said that to build on Dr. Bailey's economic outlook report, he would provide a high-level overview of their revenue outlook. He said that he would also caution the Board that this was probably the busiest slide that he would show the entire budget process from now through May. He said that he would get this out of the way, and if the Board could bear with him for a moment.

Mr. Bowman said that this graph illustrated all general fund revenue changes since FY2007 to the present and a future projection. He said that if the Board looked at the vertical lines, which varied in height over the more than 20-year period, those represented the year-to-year changes in general revenues, influenced by factors such as the overall economy, tax rates, and changes in state funding.

Mr. Bowman said that the red line running through the middle of the graph represented the average annual growth in the long term, which was approximately 4.7%. He said that, however, 4.7% was not a consistent trend when looking at historical data. He said that to provide context, he would take the Board through the story of the last 20 years, starting with FY2007, when the County began annual real estate reassessments. He said that prior to the Great Recession, they saw a strong revenue picture. He said that however, the Great Recession and its initial recovery had a profound impact on the real estate market, the housing industry, and the labor force, leading to a prolonged period of revenue decline.

Mr. Bowman said that as a result, the average annual growth from FY2009 to FY14 was around 1%. He said that in FY10, the revenue was actually below zero, with negative revenue growth. He said that however, from FY15 to the pandemic, the County experienced a steady pace of growth, averaging around 5%, which was at or above the long-term average. He said that FY20 was on track to be similar to FY18 and FY19, but the pandemic's impact led to a sharp decline in revenues in the fourth quarter.

Mr. Bowman said that since FY20 through FY24, the picture has been vastly different, with a stronger-than-expected recovery from the pandemic. He said that now, as they approached FY25, they were seeing a slowdown. He said that Dr. Bailey framed this very well, noting that a more than 4% growth rate in FY25, if they experienced that coming out of the Great Recession, it would feel like the economy is taking off; however, coming out of the pandemic, it feels like a slowdown, even though it was not in a recession.

Mr. Bowman said that the Board's consent agenda today included their first quarter financial report, which shows that revenues in FY25 are trending close to projections. He said that that was good, and that they were not experiencing a further slowdown. He said that notably, the Board has approved mid-year revenue updates in two of the last three years to apply those revenues, but staff does not anticipate bringing this forward, as the current trend is following projections closely. He said that looking ahead to FY26 and FY27, there is a bit of a slowdown, and knowing that if something happened, there would be a bit of a dip, but it does not appear to be a recession that appeared in the Great Recession or during the pandemic, and it represents some economic slowing that will rebound in the out years.

Mr. Bowman said that when examining the out-years, most financial analysts and economists agree that predicting beyond two years is a challenging task. He said that to assist the Board, they had planned for average growth in those years, taking into account the time they had to adjust their strategies. He said that as they considered the blue line on the summary chart, the green bars reflected where that was, representing the relatively steady economy, but anticipating a slight dip.

Mr. Bowman said that just as they continued to work with Dr. Bailey and her team on a quarterly basis, and they had quarterly updates to the Board of Supervisors, they would closely monitor this situation and remain adaptable as circumstances changed. He said that this addressed the revenue side of the equation. He said that next, staff would like to explore how their expenditures were tied to the Strategic Plan. He said that to begin this discussion, he would like to turn it over to County Executive Jeff Richardson.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that he wanted to thank Mr. Bowman for setting up today's work session. He said that the Board members had seen the current slide, which had been designed in different ways. He said that they would recognize the five strategic goals that encircled the middle goal, which was workforce and customer service. He said that the Board had revisited its Strategic Plan approximately two years ago, and that was a significant undertaking in this organization to identify a handful of five-year objectives where the Board and staff worked together to focus on areas where they needed to concentrate their capacity to make the biggest opportunities and address the biggest problems and issues they faced in this community.

Mr. Richardson said that as Mr. Bowman had mentioned earlier, they worked diligently every year to connect the Strategic Plan to the budget, and most importantly, the capacity that the Board and staff identified in their budget to connect to these opportunities and problems they heard and faced, and worked with partners, the City, and the community to address them.

Mr. Richardson said that he would like to take a minute to highlight three of the six goals that were red circled. He said that at the top, safety and well-being was highlighted. He said that to the left was education and learning. He said that in the middle, the importance of identifying and highlighting their workforce was emphasized, as this Board had been instrumental in saying, because without a strong workforce, they would not be able to accomplish their goals. He said that their strong workforce had allowed them to recruit and retain high-quality staff, but they had struggled in the past to do so, and they had been in situations where they had difficulty getting the work done.

Mr. Richardson said that he would suggest that these three goals served as the foundation, stabilizing the other goals, and they would see a lot of progress today with Mr. Bowman’s and Mr. Sumner’s work, which was a significant accounting of investment in these three areas.

Mr. Richardson said that the common thread through all of this was investment in infrastructure. He said that Mr. Bowman would discuss this in more detail, but investment in infrastructure had sometimes not taken place in past decades. He said that one example would be the regional jail renovations, which would bring the jail up to a basic minimum acceptable state of design and operational capacity with their daily operations.

Mr. Richardson said that the new courts project was similar, as they were modernizing the courts in partnership with the City to bring them to a basic level of functionality to deal with today’s demands. He said that three new schools were being built in the next five years after approximately 20 years of no new schools.

Mr. Richardson said that the infrastructure investment did not stop there; it also included workforce and customer service improvements. He said that several years ago, this Board had been instrumental in creating a public safety pay plan, which was part of their paying classification infrastructure, allowing them to be more competitive in recruiting and retaining police and fire personnel. He said that two years ago, the Board had supported modernization of the classification and pay plan for the balance of the organization, and they had received a report last month from their Human Resources Department on their progress in various areas with key metrics.

Mr. Richardson said that they had invested in key customer service systems, both in Community Development and Finance, as well as critical IT systems. He said that these upgrades and modernization would enable their organization to keep pace with the volume and complexity of work, providing their employees with the necessary tools and abilities to measure, to analyze metrics, to make adjustments where necessary, and monitor customer service, was what they aimed to achieve.

Mr. Richardson said that he had repeatedly stated that they could accomplish anything they wanted, but they could not do everything they wanted. He said that they had heard him say that before. He said that in the spirit of strategic planning, they would be able to identify more opportunities and more problems than they had the revenue capacity to address. He said that as Mr. Bowman had outlined, the out-year obligations were closely aligned with FY26 and FY27. He said that they saw those gaps, and they would be creative and aggressive as they began the budgeting process, they would be creative in developing their budget with the goal of doing as much as possible with what they had.

Mr. Richardson said that he believed what the Board would see today was significant investment in safety and well-being. He said that this had been a multi-year effort, with strategies such as pulling down federal dollars to pay for local operational needs in fire service as well as a number of other areas. He said that they continued to work hard on this. He said that he was proud of their staff, and he appreciated the Board's attention to these three particular areas today.

Mr. Bowman said that he would now walk through the six goals and their 23 objectives, connecting the actions in the five-year plan to these goals. He said that some of these items involved new funding, while others acknowledged recent funding that had not yet yielded full results. He said that there were items that required staff effort, utilizing the resources they already had. He said that it was how they directed those resources and prioritized their time that mattered.

Mr. Bowman said that he would begin by examining the goal of workforce and customer service, as the County Executive had emphasized its importance in driving other objectives forward. He said that the two objectives were highlighted on the slide in orange. He said that the five-year plan included compensation and benefit increases over the next five years. He said that Supervisors had noted in their comments that they were planning to implement and open the County Employee Care Clinic, with locations set to open in CY2025. He said that this strategy aimed to support the workforce, retain staff, and provide access to services, while also offering a cost-effective approach to managing healthcare costs, a significant expense in their society.

Mr. Bowman said that they had included an assumption that certain positions that they could not simply re-engineer themselves out of or improve a process, such as police officers and child protective services workers. He said that there was an immediate response and a call that took place. He said that as their community grew, they would still need to provide these services.

Mr. Bowman said that moving forward with workforce and customer service, a key emphasis was modernizing their processes and technology. He said that they had initiated the Core Systems Modernization Project, which had already seen the implementation of a Human Resources system. He said that in January, a Community Development system would go live, followed by the Financial Management system in April. He said that this would improve their reporting, provide data, and transform their processes in numerous ways, affecting not only their jobs but also customer service.

Mr. Bowman said that staff were also looking beyond the Core Systems Modernization Project, anticipating a significant impact on their CIP over the next five years. He said that they needed to plan for other end-of-life systems to avoid losing support or legacy systems that were no longer serving their purpose. He said that as the County Executive had emphasized, re-engineering operations was a commitment made in the budget. He said that to balance the budget in FY25, they had allocated $250,000 in savings, with a plan to increase it to $500,000 by FY26. He said that they were currently evaluating this and would present a report to the Board as part of the recommended budget. He said that this effort aimed to capture and acknowledge commitments to improving organizational performance. He said that the final objective in the CIP was related to space planning and strategies, which the Board had funded.

Mr. Bowman said that moving to the next goal was one of the large-budget drivers, which was safety and well-being. He said that he wanted to focus on supporting community safety through highly responsive services. He said that recent funding had expanded the HART team, which had been recognized locally and nationally for its work.

Mr. Bowman said that they had also increased police officer staffing. He said that the Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail (ACRJ) was a decades-old facility that was facing a renovation. He said that also added to the current fiscal year, although it had not yet begun providing services, was the Berkmar ambulance that served one of the busiest call areas in the County for emergency medical response services.

Mr. Bowman said that when examining new funding in the five-year plan, a significant portion was driven by prior commitments. He said that in the next calendar year, they anticipated the General District Court opening and continuing the phases of that project, which would have both operational and security implications that they needed to plan for as the courts expanded. He said that they also anticipated increasing police officer staffing in the next five years. He said that regarding fire rescue, they had successfully obtained four Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Grants, one of which had been fully picked up, but there were three remaining, totaling 57 firefighters. He said that they would discuss this in more depth later.

Mr. Bowman said that the last item he wanted to acknowledge in their planning was the changing landscape in their volunteer fire and rescue stations. He said that they had received requests over the years, and this was simply acknowledging that the landscape was changing. He said that they wanted to position themselves so that if volunteers needed assistance, they could provide an opportunity to not disrupt service to the community. He said that he wanted to provide more detail and historical context on this evolving situation.

Mr. Bowman said that starting around the turn of the century, and in 2008, there were a total of five requests from volunteer fire rescue stations for supplemental staffing. He said that the logic behind these requests was that if the County could staff the facilities Monday to Friday during the daytime, volunteers could cover nights and weekends. He said that several of these requests took place during that time frame, and then they experienced a steady period in the volunteer system where no requests were made for about a decade.

Mr. Bowman said that it was worth noting that the Board had been making other investments at that time with the other fire stations in the urban ring. He said that, however, over the past six years, since 2019, they had seen a shift with four requests for staffing changes, two of which included nighttime and weekend coverage. He said that as of today, they had not received any requests for additional staffing. He said that nevertheless, looking at the changes in recent years compared to the prior period, it may be prudent for them to plan, if needed, to support volunteer stations and the services they provided.

Mr. Bowman said that continuing with safety and well-being, they had the Human Services aspect of this, where their Board had continued the Community Assistance Program. He said that this was initially started with American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding as a short-term measure, and increased funding had continued in the Department of Social Services for that, as well as the Human Services Navigator position.

Mr. Bowman said that the last objective he would like to touch on was coordinated planning. He said that this was not so much a funding issue, but rather a staff time commitment, where they were currently underway in an organizational-wide effort for continuity of operations planning to ensure they were prepared for any disruption.

Mr. Bowman said that the third goal he was going to discuss, and the last that was circled in red, was education and learning. He said that this provided School funding based on the allocation of local tax revenue formula, just as they would in prior years. He said that he acknowledged that, during his meeting earlier today with the Schools' Budget Director and Chief Operating Officer, one of the concerns they expressed was the operating costs of their projects. He said that they had included in the CIP a new high school center, as well as two elementary schools, one on the southern end and one in the northern part of the County. He said that historically, the School Division had expanded programs, such as the recent expansion at Crozet Elementary, and those operating impacts had been able to be absorbed as part of the funding formula.

Mr. Bowman said that opening two new schools, which would open in FY27, would result in a much larger fiscal impact, with operating costs ranging from $1 million to $2 million. He said that this was one of the concerns on the School Board's mind, as they pondered how to plan for both the current year and the long-term obligations that came with it. He said that on December 4, they would have a meeting with the School Board to discuss their capital program and explore their long-term pressures, providing the Board with an opportunity to engage with them.

Mr. Bowman said that the fourth goal was the Resilient, Equitable, and Engaged Community Goal. He said that this goal was not about adding new dollars, but rather about implementing the resources, policies, and staff they already had. He said that this included climate action, for which they currently had ongoing funding. He said that while the Board had previously added one-time funding to support initiatives, staff anticipated that additional funding may be needed, which could start in FY27.

Mr. Bowman said that the final point he would make, which he could tie to multiple objectives, was that the Northern Convenience Center was included in the five-year CIP, and they would also consider the related operating costs, similar to the Southern Convenience Center.

Mr. Bowman said that the next three objectives focused on implementing what they had with community partnerships and engagement, community response readiness, and stream health initiatives.

Mr. Bowman said that their next goal was infrastructure and placemaking. He said that the Board had made significant investments in the Broadband Accessibility and Affordability Office, who was currently working with federal, state, and local partners to implement broadband improvements. He said that they were also partnering with the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) and the Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA) to advance this objective, without any new dollars associated with it.

Mr. Bowman said that the next slide was related to the public works function and improving that in the enhanced maintenance. He said that the Department of Facilities and Environmental Services (FES) had presented to the Board in recent months regarding the litter collection program funded by the disposable plastic bag tax. He said that this was another example of revenue diversification the Board had taken on in recent years, which had restricted uses, including the litter collection program. He said that they were continuing to implement the recent new funding for the entrance corridor and right-of-way programming in their facilities team.

Mr. Bowman said that another theme in their changing landscape was transit, which came up in their recent new funding. He said that the Board had supported not only the operational increases to Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) and JAUNT, their two primary transit providers, but also the exploration of the MicroCAT program, which had been in operation for approximately a year.

Mr. Bowman said that in the coming months, the Board would receive an update on the service's performance, usage, and other factors. He said that that was a two-year grant operated by the City of Charlottesville. He said that they would look to every option to extend or expand that grant as possible, but there would be a time in the coming years when that would shift to a more local cost. He said that furthermore, in the CIP, they were continuing the Transportation Leveraging Program, where the Board could put aside local funding to support transportation projects and leverage funding from the state.

Mr. Bowman said that moving into quality of life, which was the sixth goal they would cover today, they were including the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan, which had the necessary funding and staff support. He said that they also had funding in place for economic development, including one-time funding to the Economic Development Fund, as well as the acquisition of the Rivanna Futures Project and staff support for its future strategic development and policy ability with their partners. He said that in the past, the Board had invested one-time funding in economic development, similar to climate action, housing, and other areas, and it was contemplated in the plan that they would eventually look to balance a blend of both ongoing and one-time funding.

Mr. Bowman said that the next objective was in the area of parks. He said that this was bringing the current CIP to life, as Biscuit Run was scheduled to open on December 14, just a few weeks from now. He said that that would continue with other improvements in that park and the CIP around the athletic fields, and also the athletic fields at Darden Towe Park, which were approved by the Board and were currently under construction.

Mr. Bowman said that at this point, he had covered 22 of the 23 strategic objectives, but he would like to slow down and spend more time on Housing Albemarle as an example or case study. He said that when examining a strategic objective, they considered the funding provided to date, the results, the new funding, and how it connected to policy tools.

Mr. Bowman said that to delve deeper into this topic, he would like to invite Kaki Dimock, their Chief Human Services Officer, to walk through this and provide more detail. He said that they had not done this for all 23 objectives, but they wanted to take some time on this one.

Mr. Bowman said that the final comment he would like to make was regarding the expanded tax relief for the elderly and disabled, which was connected to the agenda item following this one. He said that the Board had provided direction on how to expand the program, and they had built that into the five-year plan, knowing that they would also discuss it further after this meeting. He said that he would like to acknowledge this connection to link the two agenda items together.

Ms. Kaki Dimock, Chief Human Services Officer, said that she was pleased to provide a more in-depth look at the Board's investment in affordable housing over the past several years. She said that to frame that conversation, she would like to remind them of the significant housing needs in their community. She said that as of March, the median home value was $522,000, and 44% of renters in their community spent more than 50% of their income on housing, which was considered a severe housing burden by the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) definition. She said that 16% of homeowners also spent more than 50% of their income on housing.

Ms. Dimock said that their community had a generalized need for approximately 10,000 affordable units by 2040, with a significant portion of those units needed for individuals with incomes below 50% of the AMI (area median income). She said that the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) was currently conducting a new regional housing needs study, which would refresh these numbers and likely result in a higher estimate.

Ms. Dimock said that the Board had invested $17.744 million in affordable housing over the last five years, which was a significant and exciting investment. She said that this investment included projects such as Hickory Hope Apartments, Vista 29, and the Southwood redevelopment, including deep investment in the Cardinal Hill Apartments. She said that the Board had also utilized a substantial portion of ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funds in addition to general fund investments.

Ms. Dimock said that since 2022, it was evident that affordable housing investments had had a significant impact on numerous individuals, including those who had access to new affordable and deeply affordable rentals, the maintenance of existing affordable rentals, support for owner-occupied units, safe shelters for domestic violence and individuals experiencing homelessness, and essential services such as housing navigation and counseling. She said that these services were particularly crucial for a community that was already experiencing stress due to the limited availability of affordable housing. She said that the adoption of the developer incentive package, which focused on tax abatement, had been a valuable tool in addressing affordable housing needs.

Ms. Dimock said that the tools used by Albemarle County to address affordable housing were robust and complex, and she believed it was beneficial to list and identify them all. She said that in terms of rental assistance, they utilized mainstream vouchers from HUD, supported the Scottsville school apartments, and provided various types of housing choice vouchers, including family unification vouchers and project-based vouchers, as well as permanent supportive housing and housing for special populations.

Ms. Dimock said that they had provided down payment assistance, housing development policy, which focused on density bonuses and affordable housing thresholds, and support shelters for individuals experiencing homelessness and domestic violence. She said that they offered emergency financial assistance, housing repair and preservation, primarily through contracts with Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP), a local organization that handled much of this work.

Ms. Dimock said that they supported a Community Land Trust, navigation services through the Financial Opportunities Center, and leveraged external funding sources whenever possible. She said that they had provided financial support for construction, including grants for nonprofit developers and tax rebates for all developers. She said that this was a deeper dive into one area of the Strategic Plan that the Board had made significant investments in.

Mr. Bowman said that to recap, they had covered the entire five-year plan on both the revenue and expenditure sides. He said that before they turned this topic over to the Board for discussion, which was the most important part of this work session, he would like to summarize some staff findings they had to provide context for this information. He said that the revenue outlook was mixed, with both positive and concerning signs on the horizon. He said that they would continue to monitor these trends. He said that the expenditure driver was well-aligned with their Strategic Plan. He said that although they had not covered every dollar in the five-year plan, the majority of the funding, particularly the new increases, were already included in previous slides they had discussed.

Mr. Bowman said that their out-year projections were increasingly out of balance, but they were committed to honoring prior commitments and obligations. He said that the first two years of the plan were greater than the recent plans, and these commitments were driven by their Strategic Plan, which included the opening of new facilities, public safety investments, and other initiatives.

Mr. Richardson said that he would like to delve deeper into two slides that focus on safety and well-being, their top priority in the community. He said that they strive for a safe community. He said that to begin, he would like to discuss the federal money he mentioned earlier that they had leveraged since he became County Executive.

Mr. Richardson said that he found it fascinating when he and Mr. Bowman reviewed the data over several decades. He said that firstly, the exemplary service provided by their volunteer fire departments in Albemarle County is truly remarkable. He said that they had saved the County millions of dollars over the years through their dedicated service. He said that he firmly believed that the significance of their contributions cannot be overstated. He said that every volunteer fire department played a vital role in the community they served, and these individuals had been truly exceptional.

Mr. Richardson said that, however, the Board had observed a recent struggle in delivering fire rescue services across Albemarle County. He said that to address this, their County government had pursued a funding strategy of securing federal FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) Safer Grant dollars. He said that they had been successful in securing funding in four separate rounds, and the results were evident on this slide, which showed a total of 57 full-time staff across the County over the course of several years. He said that it had a significant impact on reducing the local cost of fire services. He said that the federal money picked up more of the operational burden, providing operational support Monday through Friday, days, nights, and weekends, and the funding went away slowly over time.

Mr. Richardson said that their Finance and Fire Rescue departments worked closely together to ensure compliance with the federal funding requirements, and they had been successful in meeting these demands over the past four rounds of funding. He said that the infusion of federal funding had delayed the full impact of their local obligation over time. He said that observing the effect of the four grants, which had been obligated to them in different cycles, it was clear that from the beginning of next year through FY30, their local obligation would start at $2.3 million and peak at $6.5 million.

Mr. Richardson said that this strategy had been successful for the County, as they had continued to partner with their local volunteer fire departments to ensure they could serve all 725 square miles in Albemarle County. He would like to highlight the significance of the federal funding, their ability to remain competitive with it, and their commitment to staying in line with federal requirements. He said that however, as the Board is aware, several years ago, they had anticipated that by FY26 and FY27, they would feel their financial obligations become a reality for the County.

Mr. Richardson said that next, with a focus on safety and well-being, he proposed that they move away from the federal FEMA SAFER Grant money and instead highlight the obligations they were now facing, not just in Fire Rescue, but across public safety. He said that this included other significant cost drivers, such as the regional jail system upgrades, debt service, and operations associated with that, which would begin in FY26 at approximately $1 million and peak at $2 million by 2030.

Mr. Richardson said that they had obligations related to the courts, including operations, facilities, and security. He said that when he first joined the County in 2017, the staff had briefed him on the County and City's discussions since the early 2000s about the need to invest in upgrading their court systems. He said that he was proud to say that their efforts were becoming a reality, as they saw the results of their work firsthand. He said that they were on the verge of opening this facility, and it was a testament to their hard work. He said that next year, they would require approximately $1 million in operational funding for security and operations, which would remain relatively stable over the next five years.

Mr. Richardson said that the HART team expansion was a notable example of their response to the significant increase in calls for service, both from Fire and Police Departments, over the past three years. He said that it highlighted their efforts to address issues upstream, particularly with regards to mental health distress. By doubling the footprint of the HART team in the past year, they demonstrated their commitment to addressing these issues. He had previously discussed the SAFER grants and the Berkmar Ambulance.

Mr. Richardson said that the Board had also toured the Public Safety Operations Center at Fashion Square Mall, which was now in a five-year lease period with the ability to renew. He said that this facility featured a fire pharmacy, where they were now dispensing narcotics to their Fire Rescue crews across the County. He said that this was an unfunded mandate from the federal and state governments, which they had addressed through cross-departmental collaboration.

Mr. Richardson said that additionally, North Garden approached the Board last year during the budget process. He said that was the primary driver behind the fourth FEMA grant. He said that when the Board examined this goal, it encompassed a significant portion of the obligations they had committed to in order to maintain their community's safety and address the well-being of their community, which had evolved in response to the changes brought about by COVID-19 and its aftermath.

Mr. Bowman said that he would now turn the discussion over to the Board to hear their thoughts on this information. He said that staff had provided guiding questions to consider, focusing on what the plan was doing well and what may be missing. He said that this was not to say that they would solve everything today, but rather a starting point for future policy discussions and areas to explore further. He said that this was the Board's opportunity to review how the financial picture and Strategic Plan line up, and to assess the pace of progress. He said that staff would be happy to answer any questions, but this was a time for them to listen to the Board's input.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she appreciated this plan. She said that it was well laid out in black and white, frankly. She said that the question was the funding and such. She said that Mr. Bowman had addressed all the pertinent needs and priorities they were focusing on. She said that she did have a couple of questions. She said that on slide number 26, regarding affordable housing tools, with down payment assistance, she would like to know if he was referring to both rental and purchase options, or just one of the two.

Ms. Dimock said that down payment assistance is available to individuals who are purchasing a home.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she would like to clarify a few points on page 14, specifically regarding the goal of safety and well-being, with community assistance programs and the Human Services navigator. She asked if staff could provide a more detailed explanation of these components.

Ms. Dimock said that the Albemarle County Emergency Relief Program was funded by the Board last year with $260,000. She said that this funding was not drawn from general fund, but it provided emergency relief support to community members facing a shutoff notice or an eviction notice. She said that it was a one-time financial relief program. She said that there were some additional dollars that came in last year from ARPA funding, which increased the total amount available for the last fiscal year to approximately $480,000.

Ms. Dimock said that this was renewed in the general fund budget for the current year, providing $260,000 in available funds. She said that the Board allocated an additional $170,000 to that relief program. She said that the program's funding started at $260,000 and that it had received an additional infusion of emergency relief funds, which were typically reserved for individuals facing eviction notices or utility shutoff notices.

Ms. Dimock said that the Human Services Navigator was an individual who provided assistance to those in need, such as families or individuals who required guidance on accessing help. She said that this person served as a connection for how to navigate through the mental health system of care, helping individuals navigate the complex system.

Ms. Dimock said that unlike their staff members, who were dedicated to specific mandated services, the Human Services Navigator was available to provide general support to those seeking help. She said that with 170 staff members in the Social Services Office, many were tied to specific programs, leaving limited resources for providing generic assistance to those in need in their community. She said that this was a start to being able to do that.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if that position had already been funded.

Ms. Dimock confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Bowman said that to clarify, the funding for this project had a significant history, particularly with the Community Assistance Program. He said that in the current budget, there was $260,000 allocated for ongoing funding. He said that he would like to reiterate that there was a substantial history surrounding this funding.

Ms. Mallek expressed her gratitude to the staff for their help in avoiding surprises. She said that it did not mean they wouldn't face challenges, and the drug box issue they mentioned was a perfect example of the problems that had thrown all 96 counties in Virginia into disarray. She said that for a 5,000-person community which did not have the luxury of an extra $100,000 to address issues that should not be happening in the first place, it was particularly concerning.

Ms. Mallek said that the good news for some other communities was that the enaction had been postponed until April 1, 2025. She said that for Albemarle, they had the resources to meet their obligations, but it was still a reminder of the other challenges they were facing. She said that she was very concerned about the security of their 29 locations compared to one hospital. She said that was a topic for another day.

Ms. Mallek said that she did not think there was anything missing, but she would like to add a couple of personal thoughts. She said that her number one mantra was to finish what you start. She said that the County had invested significant dollars in various CIP items over several years, and some of them were nearing completion.

Ms. Mallek said that, however, they needed to be finished before they started new projects that might dilute the ability to complete others. She said that she hoped they would consider this approach, especially when they were facing potential budget challenges this year. She said that she appreciated the effort to get them started on good footing today, and she looked forward to the months ahead.

Ms. McKeel said that she appreciated staff's work and found the report to be well done and very informative. She said that on slide 6, she thought this information was particularly helpful for the public to understand. She said that when discussing the gaps they were looking at, specifically the revenue gaps, she noted that in FY26, the gap was 3.1%, and in FY27, the gap was 5.2%. She said that it was essential to note that these gaps were specific to those years and were not cumulative.

Mr. Bowman confirmed that was correct. He said that if FY26 was balanced at zero, then the 5% would decrease to a 2% gap, and this effect would cascade through the plan.

Ms. McKeel said that on page 16, they had references to the Climate Action Plan, and on page 17, they had their stream health initiatives, which had been a priority for them to complete, and also aimed to enhance communities' capacity to respond to disasters. She said that she requested that staff please help clarify what this meant for the public's benefit.

Mr. Bowman said that he would discuss what is currently funded. He said that in the environmental services portion of FES, staff had handled various programs, including water protection, climate action, and other initiatives. He said that with climate action funding, there was ongoing funding as support for partnerships. He said that grant programs had been awarded to community partners, and one-time funding had been used for initiatives such as low-income weatherization in partnership with the Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP).

Mr. Bowman said that the County had implemented initiatives like the chargers in the parking lot of this County Office Building, which received a grant from Dominion to reimburse them upon implementation. He said that these were some of the initiatives that had been implemented and considering that some of these had been funded with one-time money as they were one-time expenses, it was contemplated as a possibility that their approach may need to change after FY27, and they should position the Board accordingly.

Ms. McKeel said that she had a question regarding slide 26. She said that they had discussed the Community Land Trust, and she was aware that they often heard from the community about their affordable housing tools. She said that she was trying to understand how their Community Land Trust played into their approved affordable housing policy, particularly when it came to addressing community requests for completion. She said that a land trust, or a similar entity, had been requested by many community members. She said that they had passed an affordable housing policy. She said that she would like some insight into what this policy might entail or where they were in the implementation process.

Ms. Dimock said that there was already a Community Land Trust operating in Albemarle County, and the Board had provided support for it through various funding sources, including ARPA competitive funding and the traditional Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT) process. She said that the conversation about whether the County should establish its own community land trust was a policy discussion that the Board would consider at a future time and was not currently a priority on their radar.

Ms. McKeel said that she was attempting to help the public understand the conversations and their current situation.

Ms. Dimock said that one of the questions that often arose was whether they should run it or support someone else who was running it. She said that she believed that this was an open question at the moment. She said that the Board's historic decisions had been to support the existing land trust with additional funding.

Ms. McKeel noted that if the County were to operate their own land trust, they would need staffing.

Ms. Dimock confirmed that indeed, they would.

Ms. McKeel said that those were her primary questions primarily for public clarity. She said that she did not specifically see anything that was missing. She said that she thought staff had done a really good job. She said that overall, it was a great presentation that sets a great foundation for their budget discussions.

Mr. Pruitt said that as someone who valued clear communication, he wanted to ensure that the public had a clear understanding of the report's findings. He said that in his view, the key takeaway from this report was that they were facing either significant increases in real property tax or substantial cuts to government services, which would be extremely challenging to implement at the necessary scale to close the cap. He said that this pattern was likely to repeat at least until 2029 and asked if that was a fair characterization.

Mr. Richardson said that when reviewing the five-year budget planning and financial planning, he believed that they were facing some challenges this year and in 2027, which were not typical of past years. He said that they were still in the early stages of the process, and their revenue assumptions were not yet finalized. He said that over the next 30 to 60 days, they would gain more clarity on their revenue projections, including reassessment and natural growth.

Mr. Richardson said that when they revisited Dr. Bailey's presentation from October and examined the early work by Mr. Sumner and his team, he was concerned about the significant challenge of balancing and maintaining their obligations and services with the revenue they currently expected to receive. He reiterated that this was a significant challenge for the County.

Mr. Pruitt said that he appreciated the thoughtful analysis of the report. He said that in his opinion, it was easy to view the report as grim, but he would describe it as a challenging reality that reflected the serious issues their community would face over the next five years. He said that he must remind himself and the public that the report was not a reflection of their community's overall quality of life, but rather a trade-off they had made in exchange for the high-quality services they enjoyed, such as reliable fire service throughout the County, including their rural areas.

Mr. Pruitt said that it was essential to keep this in mind, as timely fire service was not a guaranteed right, but rather a privilege that some communities took for granted. He said that he had seen firsthand the impact of this issue, as a constituent had recently reached out to him seeking an affidavit to prove she had fire protection for her insurance company, which would otherwise significantly increase her annual fees. He said that he believed it was important for them to consider that, while they helped pay for this service through taxes, it came with the offsetting benefit of decreased insurance fees for their residents, particularly in rural areas.

Mr. Pruitt said that he wanted to acknowledge that real estate property taxes could feel like a zero-sum game, where the costs were borne directly by their community members and directly related to their housing costs. He said that this was more of a question, and he was aware that lobbyists from the development industry lobby and the housing lobby often claimed that the costs of real estate tax increases would be borne directly by renters in rental properties in a one-to-one relationship.

Mr. Pruitt said that he was skeptical of this assertion, especially for larger multifamily rentals. He said that he would like to better understand how property tax increases, particularly real estate property tax increases, directly translated into higher rental prices for renters. He said that this was an important issue for them to be prepared to address. He said that he had mentioned this before, and as they considered potentially increasing real estate property taxes, he would reassert his interest in learning about the processes they had in place to limit the burden of real estate property tax increases on lower-income homeowners. He said that for example, if they have a tax rebate program for low-income homeowners, such as a rebate after taxes were issued.

Mr. Pruitt said that although they currently had limited authority before taxes were assessed, he said that some localities offered partial tax rebates for low-income homeowners. He said that this would make him more comfortable if he knew the County could limit the burden on lower-income homeowners.

Mr. Pruitt said that he wanted to confirm that the County did not have ongoing funding commitments for the Community Land Trust, which operated by the Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA) and was at this stage a very small operation. He said that the County had supported it in the past, but to his knowledge, they did not have ongoing funding obligations for it at this time.

Mr. Pruitt emphasized that it was a separate entity from the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, which had approximately $2 million in ongoing funding. He said that this funding was allocated for the current year and had previously been funded in $5 million increments. He said that there was significant community pushback regarding the need to change some of their governing documents and increase the funding for this. He said that these were two distinct issues. He said that the Community Land Trust was not something he believed the Board was currently trying to take on, but the Affordable Housing Trust Fund was a pressing concern that required immediate attention, particularly in terms of scaling up funding.

Mr. Bowman said that the questions regarding the County's ability to offer a low-income rebate and the nexus between property taxes and rents could be considered follow-ups for staff to address and report back to the Board. He said that for public transparency, he would share that the full responses from staff when there are Q&A sessions with the Board during the budget process, are published on the website for everyone to review.

Mr. Gallaway said that to build on Mr. Pruitt's explanation of the trust fund, he wanted to reiterate that they did not have a trust fund in place. He said that this terminology had become ingrained in their language, but it was essential to distinguish it from their contingency or a housing fund. He said that a trust fund was specifically designed to build revenue through investments, allowing them to offset property tax revenue and diversify their financial resources.

Mr. Gallaway said that this was a critical tool when a fund grew to significant sizes such as $40 million. He said that by leveraging these funds, they could create a self-sustaining revenue stream. He said that he had been concerned about their use of the term "housing trust fund," as they did not have one in the County. He said that the speaker had correctly pointed out that it had been properly endorsed during the Housing Albemarle vote.

Mr. Gallaway said that in the context of their five-year financial plan, he believed they should be exploring ways to incorporate this concept, as it could help them address pressing issues and diversify their revenue streams. He said that they should be having that conversation, and in fact should have had it already. He said that this was less in response to the five-year financial plan itself and more in response to Mr. Pruitt’s earlier points. He said that he hoped that this point was understood, and if there was no disagreement, they must find what they were going to do about it.

Mr. Gallaway said that he did not find anything missing from the information presented, and he doubted that their financial team would have missed anything in that regard. He said that he suspected some information he did not hear about today still existed somewhere and had been discussed by staff, even if it was not presented.

Mr. Gallaway said that for page 8 of their revenue graph, which spanned from 2007 to the present, he would like to know if they had a corresponding graph that examined expenditures over the same period. He said that since they balanced their budgets, when examining a revenue graph, it was essential to consider the expenditure graph as well. He said that the revenues coming in during a given year could potentially exceed costs, so he would like to see if they had done a similar analysis for expenditures.

Mr. Bowman said that Mr. Gallaway made a valid point, as this example illustrated the actuals and actuals could indeed vary from the budget. He said that to further assist the Board, they could prepare a follow-up on how the budget compared from year to year for some of these comparisons in the general fund, and where some of those changes were.

Mr. Gallaway said that he knew it was challenging to create a graph for expenditures. He said that for him, a significant part of this analysis was examining the sharp decline in expenditures during the Great Recession. He said that expenditures and revenues were distinct from each other. He said that they typically examined historical trends on the revenue side.

Mr. Gallaway said that to his knowledge, they had not previously analyzed expenditures over this time frame. He said that he thought it would be beneficial for them to understand how expenditures worked, including costs associated with their services and how those costs changed over time, if there were any trends to be identified.

Mr. Bowman said that they could compile that information, because it was clear that while the majority of their County Government's costs, approximately 75%, were personnel expenses at present, there had been changes over time where the Board had made investments in areas such as water resources and the cost of services, including the evolution of the Fire Rescue system. He said that they had new functions. He said that once upon a time there was not the Broadband Office, and there were examples out there.

Mr. Bowman said that using the FY22 and FY23 as an example, the Board had experienced strong revenue growth during this period. He said that when coming out of the pandemic, the Board had utilized this growth to make one-time investments in areas such as capital, housing, economic development, and broadband to drive forward strategic initiatives. He said that while some expenditures may not directly correlate to a specific year, FY23 ended strong, and the Board wanted to make one-time investments. He said that they could compile something that helped to tell this story.

Mr. Gallaway said that two budgets ago, they had set aside funds for the following year, which was a good strategy. He said that for fire services, there is a lot of focus on FEMA and their efforts in fire and safety. He said that this was not an issue for today, but as they approached the budget season, he would like to see not just through FEMA, but in total the investment in the Development Area of fire services versus Rural Area fire services.

Mr. Gallaway said that this was triggered by their conversation at the last Board meeting regarding the Comprehensive Plan, where they discussed how if the Development Area was expected to take on all the growth, there was a difference in opinion about what service delivery model was best. He said that he believed that public safety would be a focus in this budget cycle, and they needed to see historically or at least over the last five years how they had invested along those lines, which seemed to be a point of agreement when they discussed the Comprehensive Plan a few weeks ago. He said that it was information that they needed to start looking at in that way.

Mr. Gallaway said that it may still be relevant that before they had raised the personal property tax last year, they were debating whether to provide a North Garden or an ambulance service, and that was right there, that was a Rural Area service versus a Development Area service. He said that they had to raise revenue to fund both, and that was a trend that he thought they needed to be mindful of as they worked on the budget for this year.

Mr. Gallaway said that given that they had invested in fire personnel, including FTEs beyond what was funded through the SAFER grant, he wanted to make sure they did not get lost in thinking that was the only investment they had made in fire personnel was just the SAFER grants. He said that he understood the reasoning behind the SAFER grant presence, as it delayed the cost and the burden down. He said that, however, the whole picture needed to be considered, including the total investment that had been made. He said that for himself, as well as for everyone watching, it was essential to understand the full scope of the investment; the SAFER grants served as a mechanism to achieve that total investment.

Mr. Bowman said that they could put together an analysis in response to that.

Mr. Gallaway said that the FEMA SAFER grants allocated 47 full-time equivalent positions to the Rural Areas and 10 to the Development Area. He said that this allocation method was not a proper way to assess the situation, as they could have invested outside of the SAFER grants because they had not had the volunteer issue and when they had added staff in the Development Area, that number was likely very different. He said that he believed the SAFER grants had helped them achieve the rural piece, so he did not want to give the impression that it was so heavily slanted.

Mr. Gallaway said that what was missing in the plan, or at least what was presented, was revenue diversification, financial tools, and planning that enabled them to build revenue for the County, not just through tax increases, property value increases, or economic development. He said that what they had started to do in-house, over the past couple of years, was build capacity and revenue based on their own financial standing, as a Triple-AAA-rated entity. He said that in today's consent agenda, they discussed the current portfolio statistics, and the revenue generated from that.

Mr. Gallaway said that this was revenue, and he was not aware that this report or this level of discussion existed five years ago. He said that if they had started to build revenue from investments, he had not heard a lot of discussion about how they could strategically continue this growth. He said that for example, they had quarterly earnings of $3 million from that particular investment pool. He said that if there were alternative ways to generate a couple of extra million dollars every year, whether through this portfolio or other means, that would significantly impact some of the initiatives this Board often wanted to pursue but could not due to budget constraints.

Mr. Gallaway said that the emergency assistance fund was a prime example of this. He said that if an additional $500,000 could be generated from an investment portfolio, it could be allocated to support smaller budget items that often got overlooked when competing with the large items. He said that he expected that this was an oversight in the presentation, although he was aware it was not missing in their thoughts.

Mr. Jacob Sumner, Chief Financial Officer, said that he appreciated Mr. Gallaway's acknowledgement of their efforts in structuring their investments and utilizing their available funds. He said that this was a relatively new initiative, which they really focused on in 2024. He said that at that time, they took a strategic approach to moving their cash reserves into more lucrative investments, while maintaining their liquidity and safety. He said that this allowed them to leverage their dollars for larger returns.

Mr. Sumner said that one area they were closely monitoring was the impact of interest rates and economic fluctuations on their investment income. He said that unlike some of their other revenue streams, which were more consistent, their investment income could be one-time in nature. He said that they were actively exploring ways to mitigate these fluctuations, particularly in relation to one-time costs associated with capital or other programs. He said that he appreciated his recognition of this initiative in the investment and debt management report, as it was a new initiative that they had structured and implemented.

Mr. Gallaway said that it was right to treat this as one-time initially, but when they looked 5, 10, 15, or 20 years down the road, they would start to consider it a base that would be present every year. He said that at that point, they could begin to treat it as ongoing in their revenue projections, and any fluctuations could be accounted for in a separate cushion. He said that he was not a financial expert, but it seemed reasonable to assume that they could start projecting a stable presence of this base every year.

Mr. Gallaway said that his next remarks were more of a commentary on the thinking of his thinking as an individual supervisor as they approached budget season. He said that having attended VACo (Virginia Association of Counties), NACo (National Association of Counties), and the conference held over the summer, he had seen affordable housing consistently mentioned in various conversations. He said that it was not just limited to housing discussions; it was a topic that arose in discussions on economic development.

Mr. Gallaway said that upon reviewing their Strategic Plan and circles, he agreed that education and learning, safety, and well-being, and workforce and customer service were the right priorities. He said that affordable housing was under quality of life, but that he thought general housing should be under quality of life. He said that he had come to realize that the affordable housing issues that they were dealing with were not quality of life. He said that instead, it should be categorized under public safety and well-being.

Mr. Gallaway said that he was always mindful of how their Strategic Plan aligned with their budget, and when he shared this information with the public, he often found that it revealed what truly mattered to their elected officials during budget time. He said that for him, this thread was very important to his role as a supervisor, and he believed that all of them thought that way. He said that if affordable housing remained linked to quality of life, implying that spending 60% of one's earned income on housing costs equated to a lower quality of life and was unrelated to public safety and wellbeing, that was not accurate. He acknowledged that he had made a mistake when they created their Strategic Plan.

Mr. Gallaway said that they could not revisit that Strategic Plan, but they could discuss and debate its accuracy during the next Strategic Plan review. He said that however, he wanted to emphasize that affordable housing was a priority for him, on par with not being able to provide fire service in certain areas. He said that as a supervisor, he would look for ways to address this issue in the budget, similar to how he had done in previous budgets.

Mr. Gallaway said that other supervisors had their priorities, so he was trying to convey this clearly, so they would not be caught off guard in the future. He said that if affordable housing did not link closely to everything else, then it might say under quality of life. He said that it significantly impacted their local economy. He said that the economic outlook report from Dr. Bailey showed that poverty had decreased in their County, but that was a result of people being forced out.

Mr. Gallaway said that they could not see the wealth they had; and the median sales prices for housing were over $400,000 in the six TJPDC counties, including Albemarle. He said that they were not just pushing people out of Albemarle; they were pushing them out of their entire region. He said that they had two options: accept the situation or take action to offset it. He said that in his opinion, this issue directly related to budget, as public subsidy played a significant role in achieving affordable housing. He said that he would continue this conversation as they worked through the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Gallaway said that he believed it was essential that they all acknowledged the need to address this in their budget. He said that they had several tools, but it was clear that it required a comprehensive approach, utilizing all the tools at their disposal, including those not yet on their list. He said that this effort demanded significant resources. He said that considering public safety, including fire, police, climate resiliency, emergency and assistance planning, affordable housing must be elevated to the same level of importance. He said that they simply needed to incorporate this into their financial plan and budget.

Mr. Andrews said that he was less worried about which of the six circled goals had red around them, but he saw housing in quality of life and under safety and wellbeing items such as the community assistance program, including funding for eviction and cutoff avoidance, which were related. He said that in that regard, he would like to address the public comment earlier which mentioned that $800 was not enough. He asked if that was correct in terms of what they provided for the community assistance program.

Ms. Dimock acknowledged that there were two approaches to operating an emergency assistance program, and there was no data to support one over the other. She said that one method involved allocating all available funds to resolve one person’s problem completely when it arose, which would likely result in spending 100% of the funds within the first quarter. She said that this approach would provide a complete solution for those who walked through the door.

Ms. Dimock said that the alternative method involved titrating out the amount of assistance provided over the course of a year, ensuring that there was sufficient funding for emergencies throughout the year. She said that their administration had chosen the latter approach for the ACERP (Albemarle County Emergency Relief Program).

Ms. Dimock said that as a result, they calculated the average amount of assistance needed per person based on the number of requests for assistance. She said that if they had access to all applications at once, they could assess them based on vulnerability and make informed decisions. She said that however, they did not have this data, so they must rely on a defensible yet somewhat arbitrary guideline to inform their decisions.

Mr. Andrews said that he understood that one of the biggest challenges they faced was not having a clear vision of what they would need in the future and what was coming forward. He said that he wanted to revisit comments previously made about the trust fund, even though they would not be discussing it extensively at this time. He said that he was still trying to understand the concept of setting aside $10 million, whether it was per year or a fund. He said that if it was per year, it seemed likely that the needs they were seeing would use it up every year, so he was unclear on how it would grow beyond that. He said that the possibility of using it as a loan fund was a separate conversation, but he would appreciate clarification on how this fund would grow.

Mr. Andrews said that on a minor note, he appreciated the discussion on cost and benefits, as it helped him understand where they could find savings. He said that they had highlighted some of these savings as they presented them, and he appreciated that. He said that he was curious about the new Albemarle Employee Care Clinic, which appeared to be an employee benefit as well as a potential cost savings measure for their healthcare expenditures.

Mr. Richardson said that Mr. Andrews was absolutely correct. He said that he believed that this was both an offensive and defensive move by Albemarle County Government. He said that he would like to remind the Board that they were in partnership with Albemarle County Schools on their healthcare plan. He said that as a result, they had a combined workforce of approximately 3700 staff members, which provided a solid foundation for their healthcare plan. He said that this initiative was not cutting-edge, but it aligned with best practices.

Mr. Richardson said that during their initial work on scoping the cost and operational steps for an employee health clinic, they had talked with consultants across the Commonwealth and found that many local governments in Virginia had already implemented similar programs. He said that Mr. Sumner had been working diligently to bring this project to fruition and may be able to provide some backfill. He said that this was a two-pronged approach. He said that on the healthcare side, they were removing barriers, making it easier for their employees to access healthcare services.

Mr. Richardson said that they were providing information on hours, location, availability, and services, which was helping them get employees and their covered lives into the clinic and getting them the care they needed to return to work. He said that this was very convenient. He said that by removing barriers, they were streamlining the process and getting people in and out. He said that this initiative was not intended to replace primary healthcare doctors or specialists, but rather to remove barriers.

Mr. Richardson said that it also would help hold down healthcare costs. He said that it was intuitive that an in-house program like this would be more cost-effective than an urgent care clinic. He said that by offering these services at a lower cost, they were able to catch potential health issues early, which could help reduce the overall cost of healthcare. He said that given the current healthcare inflation rate of around 10% to 12% since COVID-19, this initiative was a step in the right direction.

Mr. Richardson said that over time, they expected to see this trend slow down slightly. He said that their goal was to have employees who took a more active role in managing their health and numbers, as they were removing the barriers to access. He said that they were striving to make this initiative as cost-neutral as possible. He said that as their population became healthier and more proactive in managing their numbers, they anticipated that the overall cost would decrease.

Mr. Richardson said that they were now in year two of experiencing significant cost increases in their self-insurance fund, which was administered by a third party. He said that they were not purchasing their healthcare retail off of the shelf.

Mr. Andrews commended the effort. He said that he believed that was exactly the kind of thing they needed to ensure they kept things under control and improved their future prospects. He said that he would revisit the questions that had been posed. He said that they had asked what the plan did well and what may be missing. He said that he thought this document had done an excellent job, particularly in how it tied into the Strategic Plan and maintained a consistent format and presentation over the years, allowing him to compare it to previous years.

Mr. Andrews said that however, he also wanted to highlight that there may be something missing or that could benefit from additional information. He said that for instance, on slide 6, the grim picture showed the mismatch between revenues and expenditures. He said that a similar slide appeared on page 29 of the existing budget book from an earlier year, but there were differences, perhaps because it was before they decided to put in for the SAFER grant and bring on the additional people for North Garden and Seminole Trail, so there were expenses and needs that were not in that.

Mr. Andrews said that this was where people would start to look and compare the projections in the two years and to identify where things changed. He said that some of that would be reflected in rapidly increasing healthcare costs and other inflation factors that may not have been anticipated. He said that they should pay attention to these factors so they could explain where they came from.

Mr. Bowman said that he believed it was last year that they conducted a comparison of their five-year plans to prior years, highlighting the changes. He said that Dr. Bailey, who was often working with them, had emphasized the importance of planning, noting that things would always change. He said that he was still a budget analyst in his younger days and had seen firsthand how circumstances shifted coming out of the pandemic, and how they were able to adapt as circumstances changed by keeping their eye to the future and considering what if things got a little better or got a little worse. He said that they would provide some follow-up but that he wanted to share the staff's mindset as they continued to monitor their quarterly reports and as they build financial plans.

Mr. Andrews said that he appreciated the fact that he could review them together, as they were consistently prepared, allowing him to see how their thinking had evolved and planning had improved over time.

Mr. Bowman thanked Mr. Andrews. He said that he received his question with that intent.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was returning to page 26, down payment assistance. She said that in her opinion, she had concerns about this program if they did not already have a list of people ready go into homes because this was for ownership. She said that she was wondering if the funds were intended for emergency relief, rental assistance, or down payment assistance specifically, or if they were available for general use. She said that she would like to see more clarity on this. She said that she was not sure how much money was involved, but she believed these funds could be more effectively used for emergency relief or rental assistance, as their past experience with down payment assistance for ownership had been limited.

Ms. Dimock said that the down payment assistance program that they had supported in the past was actually operated by PHA. She said that as a result, they had a balance of funds previously allocated to them for down payment assistance, which they made available to the public based on AMI. She said that this program was means-tested by income, and if individuals qualified, they could take advantage of down payment assistance from the County, often as a way to match down payment assistance from another source.

Ms. Dimock said that the amount provided by PHA was quite low, as it was based on an agreement established many years ago with the County. She said that as housing prices continued to rise, this amount became increasingly less meaningful. She said that she did not think that there was a shortage of people who would be interested in qualifying, but that their ability to use that downpayment assistance to actually get into a home was pretty limited. She said that she believed there was an opportunity to revisit how these funds were used at the PHA level, but that those funds had essentially left the County and were now being managed by PHA.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she understood. She said that her main concern was addressing emergency relief and getting people into rentals, so she was wondering about applying down payment assistance to rentals.

Ms. Mallek said that she believed the down payment assistance fund built up when developers were allowed to buy out their obligation to build a unit, resulting in the loss of a $150,000 unit and receipt of a $16,000 cash payment. She said that she had never been in favor of that approach, and she was not sure where that was in the whole housing stuff. She said that she did think it was still a viable opportunity, so it was something to work on in the future.

Ms. Mallek said that she made some notes as others were discussing, and that on the mitigation of risk, what jumped off the page to her was the past discussion about upscaling the capacity of their public buildings, including fire stations, schools in rural areas, and even Albemarle High School, which was one of the few facilities that could accommodate a large number of people after the 2011 derecho. She said that there were some people who would not go because they were too far away, too old, or too frail. She said that what jumped into her mind was that, when doing some risk mitigation, they improved the ability of their fire stations all around to provide that kind of assistance, even for people who needed water and did not have any opportunity to get it. She said that this was something to consider for the future.

Ms. Mallek said that she would also like to zoom in on a couple of other points. She said that the 2007 spike, which someone mentioned earlier, the dive in investments during the recession, with the 2009 budget zeroing out $100 million in capital that they were still struggling to recover from. She said that every time she saw that graph, she realized how it may have been a temporary measure to survive the economic downturn, but it ultimately put them in a much deeper hole.

Ms. Mallek said that she was looking forward to the potential shift in how they responded to Growth Area investments, such as fire and rescue services, compared to Rural Areas. She was looking forward to that information because, in making a basic list, she had observed that they had 11 fire stations, with seven serving the Growth Area and four serving the Rural Area.

Ms. Mallek said that notably, all of these stations, except for recent investments, were built with donated dollars, resulting in a relatively good split. She said that she was looking forward to how those play out.

Ms. Mallek said that she agreed with the comments regarding affordable housing, which seemed to fit into all the other buckets as did the workforce umbrella they had discussed, for both their own staff and the workforce in the community. She said that having lived in Massachusetts for many years, she had learned that throwing money at a problem was not a solution; they needed genuine, effective solutions for housing. She said that if it were easy, someone else would have already figured it out. She said that she was looking forward to learning from other communities and understanding what they could do to make some bona fide full statements going forward.

Mr. Pruitt said that he had two points. He said that first, they were discussing the potential cost savings around the clinic as a way to offset the growing healthcare costs. He said that they had previously mentioned that healthcare costs on their insurance plan had increased significantly year to year, especially since the COVID-19 pandemic. He said that given their large workforce, these costs were substantial and needed to be anticipated. He said that when reviewing the five-year projections he had presented, he wondered if the assumption for healthcare costs on the insurance plan was already included. He asked if they would need to factor in any potential shifts in healthcare costs that may arise during this period.

Mr. Bowman said that they were at a point in the year where, whether it be with real estate assessments or other things, they were planning what the potential rates for FY26 could look like. He said that at this point, they would examine the performance of that fund and its relationship to their policies. He said that historically, when they had seen high costs, it typically took a few years for the trend to normalize. He said that as they had observed in other localities, this was not typically a one-year blip, but rather a pattern that usually emerged over time.

Mr. Sumner said that in the five-year plan, which was also tied to their workforce goals, that was built in. He said that as they looked further out in the five-year plan, it may become more challenging to provide a clear and specific number for future increases. He said that based on their recent history of increases, they had built the base for those increases, which had been carried through the five-year plan.

Mr. Pruitt asked if there was a baseline assumption for the cost of living for employee salaries that is already factored into their budget.

Mr. Bowman said that yes, that would be included as part of Goal 1, along with the benefits that came with it. He said that most of their benefits grew along with salaries, with the exception of health insurance, as far as a percentage.

Mr. Pruitt said that one other fundamental question that arose from comments between two supervisors was something he would like to delve into further with Ms. Dimock's assistance. He said that Mr. Gallaway described an affordable housing trust fund with a self-watering element, which allowed it to sustain and perpetuate its own investments. He said that Mr. Andrews questioned how this would work without an annual infusion of the same amount of funds.

Mr. Pruitt said that there were a few potential ways this could happen. He said that one was if the fund was structured as a loan fund, rather than a grant fund, which was how they currently disbursed, if the fund was supported by proffers, cash in lieu, or recordation fees, which was a zero-sum approach since they were already using recordation fees.

Mr. Pruitt said that another possibility was reserving a portion of the fund to take on interest. He said that these were the methods he was aware of that enabled trust funds to self-water or self-perpetuate. He said that he was curious to know if this was a fair characterization or if there was a key aspect they were missing regarding how to sustain investments without annual infusions of the same amount of funds.

Ms. Dimock said that the self-watering aspect was correct. She said that the definition of a trust fund encompassed various ways people supported affordable housing. She said that there were trust funds that were self-sustaining, often based on a significant principal that generated interest, which could be used as loans or significant investments in affordable housing. She said that the primary definition of a trust fund was a dedicated source of revenue. She said that in their case, they met this definition due to the funding they had received from their cash in lieu payments. She said that although this funding had not been a significant financial driver, it technically met the definition.

Ms. Dimock said that she thought there was much to discuss regarding what happened when a substantial amount of money was available. She said that it could be stashed to create a balance that could generate revenue or invested, or it could be spent. She said that they had had a backlog of requests for affordable housing funding in the community over the past five years, which had led to the use of available dollars. She said that as a result, they had not had the opportunity to have a more in-depth conversation about how a trust fund might operate in Albemarle County.

Mr. Sumner said that they had examined housing trust funds and examples from throughout the Commonwealth and other states. He said that as Ms. Dimock explained, the basic definition of a housing trust fund was clear, but its implementation varied significantly from locality to locality, with multiple attributes that differed. He said that the location, community needs, and priorities played a role in determining how housing trust funds were utilized.

Mr. Sumner said that their survey and review of other examples revealed differences in how these funds were used for eligible projects, including construction, rehabilitation, or preservation of affordable housing. He said that the beneficiaries of the trust funds, eligibility criteria, and distribution of funds also varied. He said that there were multiple ways to fund housing trust funds, such as an initial endowment with the source of the ongoing funds being the interest that grew off of that endowment He said that other localities had a dedicated tax to fund the trust fund that could be used with loans or grants.

Mr. Sumner said he mentioned the cash in lieu payments earlier, and that there were times when a one-time large lump sum investment into affordable housing fund that then had time limits of where they wanted to spend those funds over a set period of time. He said that the takeaway from this slide was that while there were common elements among housing trust funds, their implementation was largely driven by the specific needs and priorities of each locality. He said that as they continued their conversations about the affordable housing trust fund, he believed it was essential to consider the various elements and what they entailed, and he thought an important aspect of that would be the funding source.

Mr. Pruitt said that he had a brief question to follow up on this topic. He said that although they briefly discussed this during their budget meetings, he would like to elaborate. He said that they were currently facing the challenge of determining how to secure the initial amount of seed money for their affordable housing trust fund that could help it sustain itself, which was how they structured this.

Mr. Pruitt said that in the past, they had funded their contingency fund or trust fund primarily through direct general fund revenues, which were part of their operating budget. He said that other localities, such as Richmond, had successfully funded their similar programs through major infusions of capital or bonds, allowing them to pay down the initial costs of filling up that pot over time. He said that this approach would avoid a large, upfront budget line item of $10 to $20 million. He asked if this was a feasible way for Albemarle to approach this, and if they had sufficient room in their capital debt service to accommodate such a plan.

Mr. Sumner said that was a great question and a great suggestion. He said that it aligned with their conversation about different funding sources. He said that as he had mentioned, taking on long-term debt to secure seed money for a program like this could significantly impact their debt ratios and financial policies. He said that it contributed to that conversation where they allocated their dollars with a housing component, but also with a capital component.

Mr. Sumner said that these conversations were complex and centered around multiple priorities, structured around their Strategic Plan. He said that this was another tool that was not listed as a funding source on this slide, but one that they could explore further and provide more information on.

Recess. The Board adjourned its meeting at 3:27 p.m. and reconvened at 3:44 p.m.

Mr. Gallaway left the meeting at 3:37 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 11. **Action Item:** Schedule a Public Hearing to Consider Adoption of an Ordinance to Modify Real Estate Tax Relief for Elderly and Disabled Persons.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that in the FY 24 and FY 25 budget development processes, the Board of Supervisors indicated support for broadening the eligibility for real property tax relief through the current program for Real Estate Tax Relief for Elderly and Disabled Persons. For tax year 2024, the Board voted to modify the qualifying criteria to increase the income and net worth limits. The current eligibility criteria for the program are as follows:

- Applicant is at least 65 or applicant has been medically determined to be totally and permanently disabled as of December 31st of the prior year;
- Applicant is the Title Holder of the property as of January 1 of the current year;
- Applicant's Combined Total Income, for last year, from all sources does not exceed $88,800;
- Applicant's Total Net Worth, including spouse, co-owner(s), and their spouse(s) as of December 31st of the prior year, does not exceed $305,000;
- Applicant's Real Estate Property seeking tax relief may not be used in a business.

Staff is requesting the Board consider modifying the program criteria for tax year 2025 prior to the applications and program information being distributed in January. This will simplify the application process and avoid changes later in the tax year after approvals have been issued. Based on the application cycle for existing participants in the program undergoing the three-year review, tax year 2025 will generate a larger three-year review than other years with over 500 full applications to be processed in addition to recertifications.

Data about the program is available in Attachment A, 2024 Real Estate Tax Relief for the Elderly and Disabled Program Demographics. Among the data included:

- The change in 2024 increased the number of households in the program;
- The total dollar amount of tax relief increased by approximately $160,000;
- 73.50% of the applicants received 100% tax relief;
- The average income of the applicants in the program for tax year 2024 is $33,350 with an average net worth of $54,508.

This data suggests that the program is working to support the community's most vulnerable residents, with the majority of the recipients receiving full relief and the average income and net worth limits well within the eligibility thresholds.

For Tax Year 2025, staff recommends:
As was done in 2023 and 2024, continuing to increase the income limit to align to the current value for the US Department of Housing & Urban Development Area Median Income (AMI) Limits, using the value for 80% AMI for a family of four in Albemarle County;

- As was done in 2024, continuing to increase the net combined financial worth limit. In 2024, this limit was adjusted to reflect the change in inflation for the value of $200,000 in 2007 to 2024, as the net worth limit had not been adjusted during that time period. 2025 is recommended to be another inflationary adjustment.

Under Virginia Code § 58.1-3210, the County has authority to modify the qualifying criteria. Albemarle County Code Chapter 15, Article 7, Division 2, Real Property Tax Exemption for Certain Elderly and Disabled Persons, describes the County's real property tax relief program for elderly and disabled persons.

The proposed ordinance (Attachment B) would modify the current program criteria with the following:

1. Increase the net income limit from $88,800 to $97,650;
2. Increase the net financial worth limit from $305,000 to $312,000;
3. Modify the three relief percentage brackets from $0 to $48,825 for 100% relief, $48,826 to $73,238 for 75% relief, and $73,239 to $97,650 for 50% relief.

The change would be effective for Tax Year 2025, which begins on January 1, 2025.

The proposed modification to the Real Estate Tax Relief for Elderly and Disabled Persons program would decrease collectible tax revenues. For FY 26, the budgetary impact of increasing the income and net worth limits is estimated to be $120,000. If the ordinance approved after the scheduled public hearing, this action would be reflected in the County Executive's Recommended Budget scheduled to be presented on February 26, 2025.

Staff recommends that the Board schedule a public hearing to consider the adoption the attached proposed ordinance (Attachment B).

_____

Ms. Jennifer Matheny, Chief of Revenue Administration, said that this item was a request to schedule a public hearing to amend Albemarle County's Chapter 15 of Taxation, specifically to modify the Real Estate Tax Relief for the Elderly and Disabled Program. She said that she appreciated this opportunity to discuss this topic with the Board, which was one that she was particularly passionate about. She said that she had prepared 10 slides to share with the Board regarding their program, which would provide an overview of the proposed changes.

Ms. Matheny said that staff requested that the Board consider modifying the program criteria for Tax Year 2025 prior to the application and program information being distributed in January. She said that staff believed this would simplify the application process and avoid changes later in the tax year after approvals had been issued, based on the application cycle for existing applicants. She said that this program underwent a three-year review process, and for Tax Year 2025, it would generate a larger three-year review than their other years.

Ms. Matheny said that they anticipated processing at least 500 full applications in 2025, and staff's goal was to get their updated information out before the application cycle began, so that they did not send one letter of approval then have to send them another letter. She said that they believed this would simplify the process. She said she would provide an overview of the current program, followed by a review of the proposed program updates, and then request the public hearing.

Ms. Matheny said that she wanted to emphasize that her team and she believed this program was one of the most important offered by Albemarle County. She said that they found assisting these applicants to be highly rewarding, as they were able to help them remain in their homes. She said that many participants in the program would not be able to afford the taxes necessary to maintain homeownership in Albemarle County. She said that they witnessed firsthand the positive impact this program had on the community, and it was life-changing for those individuals.

Ms. Matheny said that with the current program, applicants must be at least 65 years old or totally and permanently disabled. She said that applicants must own the property as of January 1 of the tax year. She said that the applicant's property cannot be used for business that they were seeking relief on, and they must meet certain income and financial net worth criteria. She said that currently, the net income maximum was $88,800, and the financial net worth was $305,000 maximum. She said that the provided table illustrates the income thresholds and the percentages of relief.

Ms. Matheny said that it was worth noting that net worth did not exclude applicants with greater than 10 acres. She said that for example, if she had 15 acres and applied for tax relief, she would receive tax relief on her residence plus 10 acres, and she would pay taxes on anything over those 10 acres. She said that they did have people in the program with more than 10 acres.

Ms. Matheny said that she would next share some statistics from the 2024 program. She said that when the income and net worth limits were raised last year, it allowed more people to be eligible for the program. She said that as a result, 95% of applicants met the criteria and were approved for tax relief, up from 94% in 2023. She said that in contrast, the approval percentage in 2022 was 89%. She said that these changes are definitely having a significant positive impact on the data they were seeing.

Ms. Matheny said that the data she provided to the Board for this meeting was before the deadline was completely processed, so the numbers may be slightly different from what they would have seen prior. She said that they have 857 households participating in the program, which is the largest change. She said that they had a handful of applications in process, and a total dollar amount of $1.9 million was awarded in relief.

Ms. Matheny said that the average income for this year's applicants was $33,359, and the average net worth is $54,500. She said that these statistics are averages, but she believed this data clearly indicated that the program as currently designed was assisting those who are most vulnerable. She said that to further illustrate this point, 74% of applicants received 100% relief, while only 6% were at the 50% threshold.

Ms. Matheny said that the Board members had seen the next chart before, and she was sharing it again to highlight the updated 2024 relief numbers. She said that the chart's orange line represents the average tax bill based on the 2024 average assessed value of $436,300 in the County. She said that the chart reinforces the notion that the current program design is effectively helping those who need assistance the most, particularly those below the average income. She said that by focusing on those who are most vulnerable, they can ensure that the program is having a positive impact.

Ms. Matheny said that moving forward, they are proposing changes to the existing ordinance based on feedback from the Board during the past winter and spring meetings. She said that their goal was to expand the program in a way that was reasonably understandable, and they were recommending increasing the income limit and increasing the financial net worth threshold. She said that they wanted the changes to be prudent in financial management and they would be included in the FY26 Recommended Budget, and they were recommending expanding the relief by approximately $120,000. She said that they anticipated that this expansion could be implemented in Tax Year 2025 with minimal administrative and system impacts. She said that this recommendation had been included in the draft financial plan presented by Mr. Bowman earlier today.

Ms. Matheny said that for the past three years, the Board of Supervisors had tied the income criteria to 80% of the area median income (AMI) for a family of four. She said that this was tied to the affordable housing policy, using the same approach. She said that in CY2025, they were proposing to increase this limit to $97,650, which would further expand the program in a manner that was reasonably understandable and could be implemented with minimal cost, and they could easily and quickly make those changes in the system.

Ms. Matheny said that this continued to impact the total number of participants. She said that the increased cost was reasonably predictable, as they had been monitoring this trend over the past few years. She said that it would increase the higher band. She said that they were widening the income ranges to include more people within those bands, and they estimated that this would result in an additional $60,000 in relief.

Ms. Matheny said that currently, the financial net worth was at $305,000, based on the 2024 update. She said that staff was proposing that they increase this amount for CY2025, adjusted for inflation, which they had calculated since the $200,000 effective in 2007. She said that the past two years' updates had been an initial step to increasing this, and having received some data, they had more confidence in their ability to predict how much expanded relief they could expect from this change.

Ms. Matheny said that they anticipated that this would result in an additional $60,000 in expanded relief for FY2025, totaling $120,000. She said that this was a straightforward adjustment, staying with the same chart. She said that they were simply increasing the limits to expand the relief they were offering. She said that staff's intent was to bring this back to the Board on an annual basis to maintain the 80% of AMI and rate of inflation. She said that they had discussed this the previous year.

Ms. Matheny said that this concluded her formal remarks. She said that the next slide highlighted the recommended changes for CY2025, for Tax Year 2025, to be considered for public hearing. She said that the green represented the current program, and the blue represented their proposed changes. She said that she had a recommended motion for the Board on the next slide, and she said that she would now turn it over to Mr. Andrews for Board questions.

Mr. Andrews said that he would like to note that the motion was to schedule a public hearing and there would be no approval for the proposed changes tonight.

Ms. Mallek said that the income level increased more than the net worth level. She asked if it was possible that someone whose income increased would subsequently disqualify on the net worth side due to the $3,000 difference, potentially affecting those who previously qualified.

Ms. Matheny said that it was possible. She said that they could not be over the income limit, or the net worth limit, otherwise they would be eliminated from the program.

Ms. Mallek asked if there were different calculations to get to each limit.

Ms. Matheny said that was correct.

Ms. Mallek asked if income was a component of net worth.

Mr. Andrews said that it was not.

Ms. Mallek asked if income and net worth were completely separate categories.

Ms. Matheny replied yes.

Ms. Mallek asked if someone's income would not impact the net worth numbers.

Mr. Andrews asked if Ms. Matheny could explain how staff determined net worth and net income.

Ms. Matheny said that the net income limit was being increased based on the AMI. She said that they were currently at 80% AMI, which was how they arrived at that figure.

Mr. Andrews asked if they determined eligibility by reviewing tax returns or other documentation.

Ms. Matheny said yes. She said that when applying for tax relief, they require supporting documentation to verify the applicant's income. She said that this can include tax returns, if the applicant files them. She said that however, a significant portion of applicants in this program does not file tax returns. She said that in those cases, they will also request W-2 forms or benefit statements. She said that they may also consider other sources of income, such as an IRA distribution. She said that all of these documents are reviewed as part of the process to determine one's total income.

Ms. Mallek asked if they considered pensions and other forms of compensation.

Ms. Matheny said that they considered all types of pensions, including military and railroad pensions, and calculated the total income by adding them up. She said that the net worth was comprised of the assets an individual had, and they tied that number to inflation, recommending an increase to $312,000, where it was currently $305,000. She said that to support this recommendation, they required the same level of verification. She said that this included bank statements, investment statements, and property owned in other localities. She said that they also reviewed their personal property bills with Albemarle County to assess any additional assets they may own.

Ms. Mallek said that it was essential to note that the distinction was asset-based versus income-based. She said that she had been attempting to blur the lines between the two, and it was clear they were distinct. She said that on slide 5, she would like to know if an individual who possessed land without asset improvements, exceeding the 10-acre threshold, would therefore not qualify for the program. She asked if someone living in a tiny house on 10 acres but had 50 mountain acres would disqualify them from the tax relief program.

Ms. Matheny said that that is possible. She said that she had reviewed the information prior to today's meeting, and she was curious about the applicants. She said that upon reviewing the data from scenarios six, two, and one, she found that the youngest person was 84 years old, and in each scenario, except for one, the applicants were married and their spouse had since passed away, having owned these properties for a long time. She said that one applicant owned a property with more than 10 acres and was listed as 100% relief, yet they still paid a tax bill because they had more than 10 acres.

Ms. Mallek said that she was glad to learn about the guardrails for the program. She said that she was grateful they were able to assist those who needed it.

Ms. McKeel said that she wanted to clarify that, based on Ms. Matheny's presentation, it seemed that she was confident that what they had here and what they were proposing was actually reaching the people who needed help in their community. She said that she appeared to have a comfort level that staff had the ability to determine whether this was accurate and that they were getting accurate information from everyone.

Ms. Matheny confirmed that was correct. She said that to the best of their ability, staff is diligent in identifying any discrepancies or issues that may arise. She said that they will thoroughly review the matter and, if necessary, escalate it to herself or her deputy chief, who will then investigate further.

Ms. Matheny said that throughout her career in banking, she had developed a keen eye for spotting unusual patterns, and her deputy chief shared the same career expertise. She said that as a result, when they encountered something that seemed off, they would scrutinize it closely. She said that for instance, they had a situation where an applicant claimed their primary residence in Albemarle County, but their bank statements revealed frequent transactions in North Carolina. She said that this raised their suspicions, and they required additional documentation to verify their claims. She said that her team had consistently demonstrated exceptional diligence, with many team members having 29 years of experience with the County and at least a decade of experience in their respective fields. She said that they were highly skilled at detecting inconsistencies and would often investigate further by analyzing payment patterns, such as dividends or ACH transactions, to uncover potential issues.

Ms. McKeel said that was very helpful because they wanted to assist those in need, but they also wanted to exercise caution and verify the information.

Ms. Matheny said that was exactly right. She said that for most people in this program, there was a simple Social Security statement in showing their benefits. She said that it was obvious from the review of their bank statement or other supporting documents.

Ms. McKeel said that other than the approval for the public hearing for these changes, she would like to know if Ms. Matheny felt confident that they had the ability to reach out to the community and effectively advertise the program. She asked if the right people were hearing about this, or if there was something she thought the County could do to improve.

Ms. Matheny said that it was a great question. She said that her team and she had been actively seeking out the right locations to distribute the information. She said that they had distributed flyers in local food bank areas and various neighborhoods, and she had personally delivered the flyers to the intended recipients. She said that when they were assembling the food bank boxes, they would include the flyers for their distribution. She said that they had also distributed them to churches and had made presentations at Jefferson Area Board on Aging (JABA) meetings. She said that her staff and she had attended JABA meetings and made presentations, and she believed that the 857 applicants was a reflection of their collective efforts and the work that the Board all had accomplished.

Ms. McKeel asked if there was definitely an increase.

Ms. Matheny confirmed that yes, the number of applicants was definitely on the rise. She said that Ms. Stumpf had secured a spot on 29 News for January, which would allow them to promote the program, whether or not any changes were implemented. She said that even if no changes occurred, promoting the program would still be beneficial.

Ms. Matheny said that if the Supervisors had any ideas, she asked that they please share them with her, as she enjoyed speaking about the program and had staff members who also appreciated it. She said that she had made herself available at town halls and had had several individuals approach her to ask for information, even taking her business card. She said that this was a positive sign, as the increase in new applicants was likely due to the outreach and discussion they had had.

Ms. McKeel said that she was glad to hear that staff knew to connect with JABA and the local community centers like Yancey in order to communicate this information to the public.

Ms. Matheny said that they were definitely connected in the community. She said that Ed Brooks was a significant champion for their work, ensuring that their efforts reached the community. She said that that was one of the food pantries they partnered with for their flyers. She said that Ed consistently ensured that the flyers were included in the boxes when they sent them down.

Ms. McKeel said that it was great to hear, because it was challenging to reach people now, and it was not getting any easier. She said that she had noticed that their local news on television had changed to Harrisonburg news on the weekends, which she assumed was due to the lack of reporters in the area working on weekends. She said that this was a significant change, and it was very different from what they were used to.

Ms. Matheny said that they had a community day event recently that was very successful. She said that she would be glad to receive any other ideas from Supervisors if they had any.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would like to begin by expressing his appreciation for this program and the work that staff does. He said that he was sure that the other members of the Board also appreciated the value of this program, and it was remarkable how often it was brought up by people who were not even aware of its existence. He said that he recalled attending Ms. Mallek’s campaign announcement last year, and someone in the audience had asked why the County was not doing this, and Ms. Mallek had been able to respond that they were, and explained how they could learn how to apply. He said that this exchange highlighted the strong community support for this idea.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would like to take a moment to address a policy statement, and he would start by saying that this was the primary tool in their housing toolkit, specifically designed to help the elderly population, which was growing in their community. He said that however, he would like to draw attention to the fact that this tool was exclusively limited to homeowners, creating a significant blind spot in County policy regarding support for elderly renters.

Mr. Pruitt said that this limitation could lead to perverse incentives, where individuals were more likely to want to stay in their homes despite needing to downsize because they were reliant on the help that they received, but that there was not complimentary support for renters. He said that furthermore, he believed that this limitation disproportionately affected elderly homeowners, who were significantly proportionately white, which was exacerbating existing racial equity concerns. He asked if staff could please clarify how they were defining disability for the purposes of this program. He asked if they were using the broad-ranging standards set by the Americans with Disabilities Act, or if there was a separate state-level standard.

Ms. Matheny said that there are two ways to qualify someone as disabled: one is if they can receive disability benefits, which would put them in that category. She said that alternatively, they could obtain two notarized affidavits from board-certified doctors in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and if they had two of those, they could deem the person disabled for the program.

Mr. Pruitt said that he appreciated the clarification. He said that staff had mentioned that when evaluating individuals currently utilizing the program, they appeared to be the right people. He said that each case carried an evident sense of need. He said that he was curious if there were instances where applicants who did not align with the program's target demographic were still approved, despite their reservations, due to the structure of the program. He. He said that he was simply wondering if such instances had occurred.

Ms. Matheny replied no. She said that whenever someone had applied and staff had uncovered issues with their documentation, they were not approved for the program after that due diligence.

Mr. Andrews said that he believed that this was a great program, and they had discussed tweaks in the past. He said that he thought that this was not the time to make adjustments, but they had considered whether there would be a limit on how much so that they would catch that $80,000 plus . He said that it had not been a problem, and he was glad to see that. He said that they had also discussed the balance between these aspects. He said that he was curious about a specific point, which was highlighted on slides 7 and 8. He said that Ms. Mallek had alluded to it but had taken a slightly different direction.

Mr. Andrews said that the fact that the projected increase in income of nearly $10,000 had a $60,000 impact on the County's budget, as he understood it, was interesting. He said that yet, the next slide showed that increasing the financial net worth limit by only $7,000 had a $60,000 impact as well. He said that he found this surprising and did not know how the figure was derived. He said that he wondered if this was an estimate, or if there was data available on past applications that would explain why this $7,000 increase would have such a significant impact.

Ms. Matheny said that it was truly an estimate, and they were basing it on the increase they had seen based on the past two years that they had made these changes in terms of what came to the table to apply. She said that she would agree that proportionally, the income limit was expected to generate more than $60,000, and the corresponding financial net worth was likely to be less than $60,000 within that window. She said that it was an estimate, and she was basing it on the previous years' data.

Ms. Mallek said that to Mr. Pruitt’s point, it would take a different program for a landlord who certified that they were going to keep rents at a certain level to then have some kind of adjustment for those units. She said that it sounded absurdly complicated, but she was trying to figure out how, other than just handing out money, which would be helpful to those people and maybe was the simplest thing.

Mr. Andrews asked Ms. Matheny if she had a motion for the screen.

Ms. Mallek **moved** that the Board of Supervisors schedule a public hearing to consider the adoption of the attached proposed ordinance. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion.

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

AYES: Mr. Andrews, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, and Mr. Pruitt.
NAYS: None.
ABSENT: Mr. Gallaway.

Agenda Item No. 12. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that he appreciated the opportunity to present the November 2024 County Executive's Report. He said that he would begin by highlighting the Albemarle County staff's efforts to engage with the community through various events. He said that this fall, staff members connected with over 3,000 community members by attending 14 events across the County, focusing on topics such as back to school, culture and arts, sustainability, and community gatherings. He said that these events allowed staff to gather input, share county initiatives, build partnerships with local organizations, and were supported by 26 staff members from departments across Albemarle County Government. He said that at these events, staff posed a question of the day to engage attendees, such as asking kids to share ideas about being community heroes and emphasizing kindness, helping others, and protecting the environment.

Mr. Richardson said that the Communications and Public Engagement Office launched a new public engagement internship program, which brought two UVA students to engage with best practices and principles and analyze feedback from the community. He said that the internship program would be implemented again in the spring and summer. He said that this initiative demonstrated their efforts to tap into UVA's resources and provide students with on-the-ground practical experience.

Mr. Richardson said that the technology leadership group was launched by Information Technology to ensure that the County's major technology systems supported their goals and improved how they delivered services and operated across departments. He said that this group brought together IT staff and department subject matter experts to collaborate on systems upgrades, technology needs, and process improvements. He said that the quarterly team meetings promoted shared accountability and streamlined chained management, ensuring technology improvements and supporting the organization's evolving IT needs. He said that this was a great example of them working cross-departmentally, connecting their internal service departments with their primary customer, the external service departments. He said that Roderick Burton and his team did a wonderful job. He said that this was another excellent example.

Mr. Richardson said that the Board had seen this next image before. He said that this was their Women in Government Affinity Group meeting. He said that the Albemarle County Women in Government Affinity Group held its second meeting of 2024, continuing its mission to empower and support women within the organization. He said that established this year, the group focuses on fostering relationships, building networking, and mentoring opportunities to enrich the professional experiences of women across all departments. He said that this recent meeting allowed participants to recognize shared experiences, explore mentoring opportunities, and strengthen connections across all departments. He said that this group represents Albemarle County's commitment to creating an inclusive and supportive workplace, encouraging personal and professional growth among all women in public service.

Mr. Richardson said that the Office of Management and Budget received the Distinguished Budget Award from GFOA, the Government Finance Officers Association. He said that earlier today, Mr. Bowman was present, along with staff who were in the audience. He said that pictured here are Thomas Unsworth, Ryan Davidson, Laura Vinzant, Tia Mitchell, and Andy Bowman. He said that Albemarle County received the Distinguished Budget Award from GFOA, the highest recognition in government budgeting, validating the County's commitment to transparency and excellence.

Mr. Richardson said that the award reflects the use of the budget as a policy document, financial plan, operations guide, and communications tool, meeting rigorous national standards. He said that he would also like to highlight Tia Mitchell, who presented yesterday at the Economic Development Authority (EDA). He said that he has received emails from staff praising her outstanding work in supporting the EDA. He said that this is a great group of individuals, and they connect to this Board in a meaningful way.

Mr. Richardson said that next was an update from Resilient Together. He said that Resilient Together, a collaboration between Albemarle County, the City of Charlottesville, the University of Virginia, recently marked its first year. He said that a progress report summarizing the first year is included in the Facilities and Environmental Services (FES) Quarterly Report, which the Board has already recognized as part of the consent agenda. He said that in October, the City and County PC held a joint session where staff shared updates and led a discussion on the project's efforts.

Mr. Richardson said that the team also recently launched the Climate Resilient Cohort, funded by an EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) environmental justice grant. He said that this initiative partners staff with ten community-based organizations to develop strategies that will address the needs of vulnerable populations. He said that the approach leverages these organizations' expertise and community relationships to ensure inclusivity and resilience planning.

Mr. Richardson said that the participating organizations included the Community Climate Collaborative, Cultivate Charlottesville, Habitat for Humanity Virginia, International Rescue Committee, New Roots, Jefferson Area Board for Aging (JABA), Local Energy Alliance Program, Market Central, Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA), The Haven, and Virginia Clinicians for Climate Action. He appreciated the collaboration and partnerships.

Mr. Richardson said that the Albemarle County Benefits and Wellness Fair, which was hosted in October and featured employees from Human Resources, including Matthew Lawson, Kimberly Price-Chambers, Vanessa Stangil, Nikki Marshall, and Stephanie Henderson. He said that this fair provided valuable information about benefits and wellness resources, supporting employee retention by helping staff make informed decisions, particularly ahead of open enrollment, which they had now completed. He said that to enhance accessibility, all presentations from this year were livestreamed, recorded for those who could not attend in person. He said that as a hybrid work environment, employees could have been working from home or on a 24/7 rotation that day. He said that the videoing and livestreaming of these events also facilitated participation from more people. He said that one of the tables at the fair shared information about the upcoming employee clinic opening in 2025, which the Board had already discussed.

Mr. Richardson said that he would provide a quick update on the employee care clinic. He said that leases had been signed for both locations, at Peter Jefferson Parkway and 29 North. He said that the first clinic would open at the end of February, with the second following later in the spring. He said that services would include primary care, physical therapy, a registered dietitian, behavioral health, and occupational health. He said that strong collaboration between the County, Public Schools, their County Service Authority, and ongoing communication with employees would help keep this initiative front and center.

Mr. Richardson said that the purpose of the clinic was to improve the overall health of employees and their families, which could be measured and evaluated. He said that by providing dedicated quality health and wellness services, they aimed to enhance the well-being of their employees and their families. He said that this move was also anticipated as a step in the right direction to manage rising healthcare costs.

Mr. Richardson said that Mary Stebbins, their Director of Social Services, had recently been recognized for her work with the National Association of Social Work Board. He said that she had been involved with the organization since 2010, contributing to the development and oversight of social work licensing exams used in the U.S., Canada, and other countries. He said that her work ensured that social workers met minimum competency and ethical standards, protecting clients and enhancing the quality of services provided by licensed social workers.

Mr. Richardson said that her contributions included writing, reviewing, and improving exam questions, ensuring they met rigorous standards and included official licensing tests. He said that this role reflected her expertise and commitment to advancing the social work profession, providing valuable insight that strengthened Albemarle staff's expertise. He said that it was a great opportunity for them to recognize her contributions.

Mr. Richardson said that he had discussed their recent recognition of Veterans' Day with several Board members, including the Veterans' ceremony on November 11 and Operation Green Light. He said that Operation Green Light was a program of NACo (National Association of Counties). He said that their County Office Building had been illuminated with green flood light bulbs to recognize Veterans' Day. He said that this year's celebration marked the anniversary of Veterans' Day.

Mr. Richardson said that American Legion Post 74, with the support of the Board of Supervisors and County staff, had held a wonderful ceremony to honor their veterans on Monday, November 11 in Lane Auditorium. He said that the event had been attended by their entire local delegation, including all Board members who were not present at VACo, as well as City Council members, including the Mayor. He said that the auditorium was quite full, and he was impressed by the numerous wreaths honoring all branches and services. He said that he thought it was a wonderful ceremony, and he appreciated the staff who had supported it.

Mr. Richardson said that the Board had received this information in an email, but he would like to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Terry Walls, who would be retiring at the end of November after 27 years of dedicated service to Albemarle County. He said that during his career, he had held various assignments within the Albemarle County Police Department (ACPD) and served as a key conduit to the County Executive's Office on several initiatives.

Mr. Richardson said that these included their work to strengthen safety and procedures at Board meetings and their efforts to enhance safety and security at their building and property. He said that his most recent position was Deputy Chief of Police. He said that he would note the photo was with Deputy Chief Walls' nephew, Tyler Walls, who had been sworn in as a Police Department Officer in May 2024.

Mr. Richardson said that he would also like to recognize Andy Muncy, who is present today. He said that Mr. Muncy was here tonight assisting with the safety and security of the building, and he recently learned that Officer Muncy was planning his retirement, which was scheduled to take place at the end of November. He said that he would like to take this opportunity to express that his presence will be deeply missed in the community and in this organization. He said that he appreciated Officer Muncy sharing this information with him earlier today.

Mr. Richardson said that as he concluded his presentation, he said that he would like to briefly discuss customer service in this organization. He said that he believed that this Board excelled in customer service due to its active nature and connection to the community. He said that they paid close attention to the services they provided on a day-to-day basis. He said that a notable example of this was Ms. Matheny, who just reported to the Board about the tax relief program. He said that she spoke passionately about its importance to her and the community, and her outreach efforts were a testament to the organization's commitment to customer service.

Mr. Richardson said that Josh Minter, their security specialist, who was at the front desk of the building, was another example of this. He consistently provided top-notch customer service to everyone who visited the McIntire Office Building. He said that the provided picture, taken earlier this week, captured his dedication to his role. He said that County services in the building and staff happened to glance out the window and saw Mr. Minter exit the building and enter the parking lot, where he was assisting a gentleman as he arrived and departed. He said that they were about to discuss their customer service covenant, which emphasized being empathetic, professional, and responsive to the community they served.

Mr. Richardson said that he believed Mr. Minter embodied these values every day. He said that they received an email today from an employee who overheard Mr. Minter speaking with a resident at the front desk, who was seeking information about wills and land deeds. He said that Josh was courteous, advising the resident on where to go and even which floor to visit at the courthouse. He said that the resident initially appeared nervous, but after speaking with Mr. Minter, they seemed more at ease.

Mr. Richardson said that it was truly exceptional customer service provided by Mr. Minter, who was a pleasant and interactive person with the people who frequented their building on a daily basis. He said that he would like to highlight this exceptional customer service and express his admiration for Mr. Minter’s work at the front desk, where he consistently helped people and made a positive impact on their community. He said that with that, that was just a quick look at the Albemarle County events this month, and he would be happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was still a phone number posted outside the doors to the County Office Building for those who needed assistance entering and exiting the building.

Mr. Richardson said that he was unsure, but staff would follow up on whether they had such signs and determine if there were potential improvements to be made.

Ms. McKeel said that she knew at other locations there were phone numbers posted near handicapped parking spots for those who required assistance.

Mr. Pruitt congratulated Lieutenant Colonel Walls and Officer Muncy on their successful careers and wished them happy retirements. He said that he wanted to also commend Mr. Minter on his exceptional performance in his critical role. He said that when he first began attending Board meetings as a citizen, approximately three years ago, he was struck by the initial impression of intimidation that many citizens experienced when entering a large government building.

Mr. Pruitt said that this was a fundamental aspect of the citizen experience, similar to the feeling of being in the wrong place when entering a courthouse. He said that Mr. Minter’s approach and demeanor had been a perfect antidote to this trepidation, and he had done an outstanding job of making the interaction with the County Government more approachable and welcoming.

Mr. Andrews said that he agreed that Mr. Minter’s friendly demeanor was greatly appreciated and well-remembered by everyone who walked through the front doors of the County Office Building. He said that the announced retirements, while sad, made him particularly grateful for Officer Muncy’s service. He said that he wished him many happy years ahead.

Agenda Item No. 13. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley reported that the newly formed Albemarle County Fire Rescue Foundation had recently submitted their Articles of Incorporation to the SCC (State Corporation Commission), and after that, they would obtain an EIN (Employer Identification Number) and complete the necessary steps to establish the 501(c)3 organization. She said that so far, the process was proceeding well.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she also wanted to mention that regarding the new Fire Rescue team of recruits, she had recently learned from Chief Dan Eggleston that the top recruit in that team was a woman. She said that she wanted to highlight this achievement as part of their celebration of women in government.

Ms. Mallek reported that she had sent out an email with the links to the Board members, because this was the opportunity to sign up for steering committees at VACo (Virginia Association of Counties). She said that even if one had been a part of one last year, she would ask that they please indicate their continued interest. She said that the National Association of Counties (NACo) was offering free attendance for the legislative steering committees on Saturday and Sunday, March 1 and 2, 2025.

Ms. Mallek said that these NACo committees had similar topic names to the VACo ones and had been updated to match up better. She said that if they were interested in being appointed to one of these committees, please let her know. She said that she could connect them with Dean Lynch, who took care of that, or they could attend and see if they would like to continue. She said that the paid conference in Washington, D.C. on March 3 and 4 was still available. She said that she had only attended the paid one once in 17 years, but she had found the other events that were free to be valuable.

Ms. Mallek said that the legislative conference, who did the platform work for the July annual adoption, would be held in Philadelphia from July 11 to 14, 2025. She said that marking their calendars for 2026, the next conference would be held in New Orleans.

Mr. Pruitt reported that a report from the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) had shed light on how various localities were weighing their options for energy. He said that it highlighted an emerging trend between "blue energy" and "red energy." He said that this was well-articulated by a member of the Fluvanna Board, who explained how his residents were generally opposed to solar energy due to various reasons yet also supported small modular reactors (SMRs) as a solution. He said that it was interesting to see how their neighboring localities were engaging with this issue, particularly with significant SMRs being deployed in Louisa as part of their data centers. He said that this had significant implications for the state's clean energy goals, which were currently being met through two main solutions: solar and SMRs.

Mr. Pruitt said that secondly, he would like to share that the Village of Rivanna CAC (Community Advisory Committee) had recently reached the ability to have a quorum, and they were now in the early stages of discussing their initial meeting and key topics. He said that he was excited about this development.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would like to take a moment to acknowledge Transgender Day of Remembrance, which was observed annually to recognize the disproportionate gender-based violence faced by the transgender community and the significantly increased rate of suicide amongst members of the trans community. He said that there would be a vigil at 6:00 p.m. at the Beautiful Idea bookstore and art space, and a 7:00 p.m. potluck dinner specifically for members of the trans community, which would follow immediately.

Mr. Andrews reported that the VACo conference was very informative, and he would like to express his gratitude to Ms. Mallek for her efforts in the agricultural and rural affairs department, as their meeting was able to add water conservation and legislative priorities to their agenda, which he felt was a significant success from the outset. He said that the meeting also focused heavily on data centers, solar, and land use energy, and he would like to mention that a JLARC (Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission) study on data centers is scheduled to be released on December 9, which he believed would be informative. He said that there was a discussion about the legislative pressure to adopt permit by rule rather than local control for solar energy, which affected them all.

Mr. Andrews said that the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) meeting, which took place yesterday, provided reports on both future challenges and recent successes. He said that one of the successes was the electronic waste and appliances and mattresses amnesty program, which had seen significant participation and had been an ongoing success.

Mr. Andrews said that the report also noted that the Henrico Old Dominion landfill, which Albemarle County used, which opened in 1994 with a capacity of 35 million tones, and as of last year, had a remaining capacity of 7 billion tons and was expected to have a remaining permitted life of 17 years, although Virginia's DEQ (Department of Environmental Quality) report indicated that it had 21 years of capacity left. He said that this was a concern that if not this Board, then future Boards would need to address. He said that there were discussions about ongoing issues with leachate and PFAS (polyfluoroalkyl substances) and things like that, which affected their ability to continue to store and dispose of waste. He said that it was an eye-opening session.

Ms. McKeel said that perhaps that data might prompt the General Assembly to consider discontinuing their acceptance of trash from New Jersey and New York. She said that it had never been a good practice for their state. She said that the JLARC studies were now piling up, so it would be beneficial if they could encourage the General Assembly to implement some of the recommendations from the three JLARC studies, including the third one scheduled to be released in December, which would now be within their wheelhouse.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she also wanted to mention the SWAAC (Solid Waste Alternative Advisory Committee) meeting she had attended. She said that they were placing a strong emphasis on recycling, which could be challenging in rural areas, except for convenience centers, which were a blessing. She said that in urban areas, they lacked the recycling bins that were found in other areas.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that furthermore, it was unclear whether everything placed in a recycling container was actually being recycled. She said that this was a concern, and she thought this was something they were looking into. She said that they were also investigating ways to reduce costs by switching to 100% recycled paper, which would be a positive step towards their climate initiative. She said that the SWAAC letter would provide more information on all of these issues.

Ms. McKeel said that several major trash haulers did provide recycling; however, she often found that few residents were willing to pay $8 per month to participate in the recycling program.

Mr. Andrews said that some of this had also been discussed in the report from yesterday. He said that the amount of actual plastic, glass, aluminum, and paper/cardboard that got recycled was not what they would like to see. He said that having separate recycling containers at the materials utilization center and recycling centers, where people could sort materials on their way in, was more efficient and effective at producing useful recycling materials than the single-container approach, which often resulted in low recycling rates due to contamination.

Ms. McKeel said that there are countries that make recycling a priority and offer incentives, such as reduced property taxes, to those who recycle properly and consistently.

Ms. Mallek said that another potential solution would be for the producer to pay. She said that this approach would shift the responsibility for waste management away from the end user, those who generate the plastic bottles, cardboard, and other materials could be pre-paying for the cost of recycling.

Agenda Item No. 14. Closed Meeting.

At 4:45 p.m., Mr. Pruitt **moved** that the Board go into Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia:

- Under subsection (8) to consult with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice relating to the decision of the Board of Zoning Appeals in Case No. VA2024-00002.

Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, and Mr. Pruitt.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 15. Certify Closed Meeting.

Mr. Gallaway returned to the meeting at 6:01 p.m.

At 6:01 p.m., Mr. Pruitt **moved** that the Board of Supervisors certify by a recorded vote that, to the best of each supervisor’s knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting, were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting.

Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, and Mr. Pruitt.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 16. From the Public: Matters on the Agenda but Not Listed for Public Hearing or on Matters Previously Considered by the Board or Matters that are Pending Before the Board.

Ms. Sue Friedman, Rio District, said that she was honored to represent the Charlottesville Area Alliance (CAA) this evening. She said that she would like to introduce Brooke Hughes, who was currently participating in a UVA internship program placement with CAA for the semester. She said that they were benefiting greatly from Ms. Hughes’ involvement, and she will be presenting their annual report.

Ms. Friedman said that first, she would like to express their gratitude for the Board’s continued support of the CAA and their goal of creating an age-friendly, livable community in their region. She said that their support enables them to engage citizens and bring their voices forward around the Age-Friendly Community Initiative. She said that the Supervisors may not be aware that in 2015, five community organizations, including the Alzheimer's Association, which she led at the time, recognized the need to focus on senior issues and the growing senior population.

Ms. Friedman said that they came together to form the CAA, and it was essential to note that they were not a nonprofit organization. She said that instead, they were an alliance of businesses, governments, and organizations dedicated to supporting Age-Friendly Community Initiatives. She said that Albemarle County had been a strong supporter of their efforts through a resolution of support several years ago. She said that they were working to address eight domains developed by the World Health Organization and promoted by AARP (American Association of Retired Persons), which can help create Age-Friendly Communities.

Ms. Friedman said that they were proud to have been selected by AARP as their number one priority in Virginia for Age-Friendly Community Initiatives last year. She said that this recognition has allowed them to secure valuable consultants and focus on areas such as bus transportation, walkability, pedestrian and bike-friendly infrastructure, and housing.

Ms. Friedman said that she would like to thank the Board again for their support on these issues, particularly in regard to senior housing relief. She said that as they closed for 2025, they will continue to focus on transportation and housing. She said that she would be sending their annual report as a PDF for the Board's review. She said that she would also like to send the walk audit report, which will be included in the email.

Agenda Item No. 17. **Work Session:** AC44: Development Areas Land Use - Draft Actions

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that Albemarle County is updating the Comprehensive Plan through the Albemarle County 2044 (AC44) project. The project is in Phase 3, which includes drafting policy language for the Comprehensive Plan and developing actions for each plan chapter. The actions support the objectives and goal statement for each chapter in Part III (Implementation) of the plan document.

Between Phases 2 and 3, staff updated the AC44 plan document to combine previously drafted goals into a single goal statement for each plan chapter. Additionally, some objectives were reclassified as actions, and several objectives were updated to include more measurable language. The objectives articulate outcomes fulfilling the goal statement. The actions describe specific implementation strategies to achieve the objectives. During Phase 3, the draft actions will be evaluated and refined using community, Planning Commission, and Board feedback to ensure they adequately support Plan objectives, goals, and the Growth Management Policy.

The draft goals and objectives for each comprehensive plan topic were created in Phase 2 of AC44. These goals and objectives were drafted using content from the 2015 comprehensive plan, as well as feedback from the community, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, partner agencies and County staff. The draft goals and objectives also address data (both quantitative and qualitative), trends, and issues for each chapter.

During Phase 2, the draft goals and objectives were shared with community members (Attachment B) for input, which was incorporated into the updated goals and objectives. Additionally, work sessions were held by both the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for their feedback on Draft Goals and Objectives for the Development Areas (Attachment C). These work sessions included the following:

- At their Work Session on February 13, 2024, the Planning Commission reviewed the Draft Goals and Objectives for Development Areas Land Use and Transportation (now two separate chapters). The Commission suggested that the Development Areas goals and objectives include language supporting redevelopment and infill, increased residential density, increased building height, reduced parking regulations, incentives to support development density, and coordinated planning for parks, trails, and open space within the Development Areas.
- At their Work Session on March 20, 2024, the Board of Supervisors reviewed Draft Goals and objectives for Land Use and Transportation within the Rural Area and the Development Areas. The Board directed the goals and objectives for the Development Areas include language supporting increased building height, incorporating planning with the Capital Improvements Program (CIP), multimodal transportation improvements, reduced parking regulations and incentives to support development density, and tree replacement within the Development Areas.

A draft of the Development Areas Land Use chapter is provided in Attachment A. The draft goal statement, objectives, and supporting actions are found starting on page 33.

The Development Areas Land Use Tools and Policies were discussed at the previous work session on November 6, 2024. This work session focuses on the proposed actions for the Development Areas, which have been drafted to achieve the objectives and the goal statement. Specifically, staff is asking for direction on the following:

ACTIONS
1. Incentives for Activity Center redevelopment
2. Reduced/eliminated parking requirements for the Activity Centers
3. Balance between efficient use of Development Areas and quality of life and environmental stewardship
4. Needed action revisions, deletions, or additions.

Due to tight packet submission deadlines, Planning Commission for feedback regarding Development Areas actions from their November 12, 2024 Work Session will be made available as Attachment D.

There is no budget impact associated with this agenda item.

Staff requests the Board review and provide feedback on the draft actions and revised objectives and goal statement within the draft Development Areas Land Use Chapter.

_____

Ms. Tonya Swartzendruber, Planning Manager, said that tonight, she would like to discuss the AC44 Comprehensive Plan, specifically the Development Areas Land Use chapter and the actions outlined in that chapter. She said that they would review the chapter's objectives, the actions focused on, and their discussion topics for those actions. She said that they would also review the Planning Commission (PC) feedback received earlier this month and the upcoming schedule.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that as a reminder, they previously discussed the tools and policies for the Development Areas chapter, but tonight they would focus solely on the goal statement, objectives, and actions, which are represented on pages 33 and 35 in the draft chapter. She said that the topics they would like the Board's direction on are outlined on this screen, and a printed copy is available for their notes. She said that they would also display a slide at the end for their discussion.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that as a brief review, the Development Areas chapter was drafted with input from the community, the PC, the Board, and collaboration with partner agencies, a review of their current Comprehensive Plan, and best practices. She said that the chapter was guided by the principles developed in Phase 1.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that each chapter has a goal statement that reflects what they wanted their community to be like, updated objectives that are measurable, established targets to identify the desired outcome, and actions that outline how to achieve the objectives.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that next was a summary of their goal statement. She said that as a reminder, they previously had multiple goals, which were consolidated into one overarching statement that reflects community input and priorities. She said that the objectives they were working to achieve included increasing the use of infill, higher-density development, adaptive reuse, and redevelopment in the Development Areas, increasing the number of jobs in housing units, investing in existing neighborhoods, and increasing tree coverage.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that the direction topics they would focus on were incentives for redevelopment, parking requirements, site design and public realm standards, tree coverage, replacement, preservation, and street trees.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that she would summarize how this draft chapter differed from their 2015 plan in several key areas. She said that the 12 Neighborhood Model principles had been replaced with the Community Design Guidelines, which would be discussed at a future work session.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that they had standardized the 13 land use categories being carried forward. She said that they had reduced the number of centers across small area plans to 30, with a hierarchy of standard place types, and were focusing on mixed-use and commercial requirements in activity centers instead of requiring them with every ZMA (Zoning Map Amendment) and development. She said that they were also shifting their emphasis from net density to gross density. She said that in addition, they were placing a greater emphasis on investing in existing neighborhoods, replacing tree coverage, and encouraging infill development.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that they previously stated that parking would be covered in the transportation chapter, but staff felt that the land use chapter would be a better location due to it pairing well with the actions previously shared, and that they would go ahead and discuss that at this meeting. She said that evaluating parking requirements may incentivize development within the proposed activity centers, as it can be expensive to build and had negative effects of overparking such as increased impervious cover that affects the heat island affect and stormwater runoff. She said that it also takes up space that could be used for building and other uses and may result in teardowns of historic buildings. She said that it also breaks up the walkability, and reduces incentives for building smaller and more affordable structures because building parking was expensive, and those costs needed to be recuperated at some point.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that many localities across the state were updating their parking requirements, including both large cities and small towns, and some had even eliminated parking requirements in their urban cores, allowing the market to determine parking needs.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that a few local examples of the County's current parking requirements, many of which were established many years ago and did not always make sense. She said that they could expand on the existing alternatives allowed in their zoning code, such as allowing shared parking or even requiring shared parking, and they could implement some transportation demand management.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that the recommendations listed on the screen could be incorporated into this chapter, in addition to the actions they had already shared. She said that they could require that shared parking specifically in activity centers. She said that they could look at having the parking maximums only in regional centers. She said that if a project or application provided transportation infrastructure, they could consider allowing reduced parking requirements if other infrastructure was provided, including bike parking requirements. She said that additionally, they could strengthen design requirements for safe walkability through parking lots.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that the reuse of older shopping malls or surface parking lots for development presented both opportunities and challenges. She said that some of the challenges included required rezonings, which can be time-consuming and costly, and the need for large sites that could accommodate the construction. She said that they did not have the ability to stage off-site, often at a higher expense than greenfield development.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that some opportunities included the potential for development in areas that did not require disrupting existing structures or businesses, and the possibility of innovative parking or different parking configurations.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that staff's parking lot analysis in the Development Area for proposed activity centers found that 25% of the land was currently occupied with parking lots that could potentially be redeveloped. She said that this was slightly different from the Rio 29 Small Area Plan, which had a higher ratio of 39% of the land.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that another topic they had not discussed during their PC meeting was office to housing conversions. She said that they planned to discuss this in their housing chapter discussion, but given its frequent mention, staff thought it would be helpful to add to today's conversation. She said that to encourage these conversions, they could allow residential uses by right or at higher densities in commercial zoning districts, and with Board direction, this could also be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan update and the zoning modification project.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that a recent example is the Woodbrook Drive Special Use Permit, which was recently approved by the Board this month. She said that the proposed project involves tearing down the current dentist office building and replacing it with a new building with up to 15 housing units, with the office on the ground floor and a shared parking agreement. She said that as a preview of the housing chapter, an action is recommended to encourage the adaptive reuse of existing buildings in Development Areas for conversion to housing, including office and commercial buildings.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that depending on direction, this could be incorporated into the Development Areas chapter if a potential zoning change is considered to allow higher density.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that these conversions also come with challenges, which can be costly and difficult to retrofit to meet current code requirements. She said that also, residential use may not be permitted in the current zoning category. She said that a few opportunities included addressing a significant need for housing with a reduced need for office space that they were seeing across the County, housing in areas with existing infrastructure and services already provided, and grants, loans, and tax incentives were already available for these types of conversions.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that building on Action 1.6, to establish incentives for such conversions, they could incorporate PC and Board feedback on other recommendations or separate actions, with several ideas listed on the slide. She said that their main challenge is using the Development Area's land efficiently while ensuring quality of life and community resilience in the Development Areas, including protecting the natural environment. She said that this was important for ecosystem services, among other reasons.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that trees have been shown to increase retail sales when they are added to commercial areas. She said that for example, localities have been using transfer of development rights for trees, allowing for tree replacements in different key locations outside of the project boundary. She said that staff suggested prioritizing the protection of healthy native trees and tree clusters and groves in open spaces and stream buffers.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that balancing environmental protection and development was also a challenge, particularly with regard to lighting. She said that they want to preserve their dark skies while ensuring a safe and conducive urban environment. She said that green infrastructure could integrate environmental protection into development through amenity-oriented lots, creative site design, native ecosystems with community facilities, and public realm standards that include street trees and green stormwater management.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that she would like to provide a brief summary of the PC's input on the same topic. She said that at their November 12, 2024, work session, the PC suggested reducing parking requirements for non-residential uses in activity centers. She said that they also expressed a desire to continue identifying incentives for development within these priority activity centers, to consider allowing residential by right in at least some activity centers, and to broaden Objective 4 to encompass environmental stewardship and resilience more generally in Development Areas. She said that the PC noted that incentives could involve public funds, such as public-private partnerships, while others did not require direct public investment, like density bonuses.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that having already discussed this topic with the PC, staff was here tonight to hear the Board's input on Development Areas Land Use actions. She said that they would be meeting with the PC again on November 19 to discuss tools for Rural Area Land Use and would also be discussing goals, objectives, and actions on December 10, 2024, with the entire chapter before the Board in 2025. She said that Environmental Stewardship would be the next chapter, and they would be discussing this with the PC in the middle of next month, with a follow-up meeting in front of the Board at the end of January. She said that with that, she would proceed to the direction topic slide and open the floor for questions and comments.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that regarding bullet number one, she would like to clarify the parking requirements for activity centers, but earlier slides mentioned allowing by-right parking for both residential and activity centers. She said that she was asking if bullet number one specifically addressed reduced or eliminated parking requirements for activity centers, or if it also applied to residential areas.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that she believed the suggestion was to look at the most likely way they could consider looking at reducing parking was to start with the activity centers, as this was likely the most feasible approach.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that there were both residential and commercial uses in the activity centers.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that they would primarily focus on the commercial parking requirements.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she had no issue with reduced parking for commercial uses in activity centers. She said that she was strongly in favor of higher density in the activity centers, and this would likely be dependent on the developer's vision. She said that she acknowledged that they could build up to four or five stories, and if they exceeded that, additional or different materials would be required.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that regarding bullet point number three, in the Development Areas regarding tree coverage. She said that she was not sure if this was the correct time to discuss it, but that she thought that they should consider the space between businesses and trees, especially in activity centers with businesses on the first floor and residential units on top. She said that on Route 20, they had experienced the issue of wonderful trees obstructing signs in front of businesses, which negatively impacted their visibility and success. She said that to mitigate this, she suggested incorporating scattered trees or other forms of greenery between trees, allowing signs on businesses to be visible from the street.

Ms. Mallek said that pages 33 and 35 were where staff had guided them to go, so she had a few comments regarding activity centers in general, as she believed there was a significant difference between various types of activity centers. She said that for instance, in the Crozet Growth Area downtown, which was the form-based code, the Old Trail activity center and J.B. Barnes activity center were quite different from the proposed small Wickham Pond activity center, which may be a coffee shop but not a dry cleaners or other businesses.

Ms. Mallek said that people were concerned that these activity centers were being lumped together, so she thought it would be helpful to provide more information on the characteristics of different types of activity centers to promote understanding. She said that she believed they had Clover Lawn, the Harris Teeter area, Old Trail in downtown, and Wickham Pond as the four activity center, and she thought that was all there were. She said that originally, it was stated that these activity centers were the same as those described in the 2021 Master Plan adoption, so assuming no changes, she thought they were okay.

Ms. Mallek said that the Downtown Crozet District (DCD), with its form-based code, had reduced parking requirements when it was adopted in 2010, but did not have a solution with what has been going on since She said that for example, there were no sidewalks in some places, and people who had mobility issues could not walk a mile carrying groceries without sidewalks. She said that she thought they needed to be cautious about expecting a swift transition away from vehicles in the White Hall District, so that they could provide flexibility for people and ensure they had places to park.

Ms. Mallek said that as they moved forward, particularly with the Square construction next year, they would need to figure out how to address these issues quickly, as it was essential for the success of that project. She said that they may get some great experience with remote and shuttle services, which could also benefit the overall learning process for the community. She said that because of that experience, and considering the over 100 people who parked daily on the gravel lots at J.B. Barnes, which was going to be doing other things very soon, that dealing with that was contributing to her concern for the first bullet, because there was the need for individual consideration. She said that if they wanted to ensure that their approved rezonings succeeded, they must be willing to help where needed and get out of the way to allow. She said that one of the positive takeaways from COVID-19 was the way restaurants adapted by using their parking lots under tents with heaters, which allowed them to survive and thrive. She said that people enjoyed it because they could safely exit their homes and enjoy their surroundings. She said that it was not the end of the world to have tables on the parking lots; it was a positive solution that she held in her mind as they moved forward.

Ms. Mallek said that in addition to the different characteristics of the individual activity centers, it was essential that they prioritize the need for green spaces, walkability, and play areas. She said that if they failed to do so, their Growth Areas would suffer, and people would be deterred from living there. She said that she was not trying to be overly critical, but she believed they must maintain their requirements for essential amenities, regardless of the project's density. She said that this meant that some properties may not be suitable for all uses.

Ms. Mallek said that sometimes, she thought they may be too lenient in allowing substandard properties to be considered equally viable as those with fewer constraints. She said that ultimately, the higher density had to depend in her opinion. She said that some of the concerns she was hearing about net density versus gross density centered around the issue of cramming in units on properties with multiple constraining designations, such as floodplains, steep slopes, or some other constraint.

Ms. Mallek said that in her mind, this created a situation where totally constrained, inappropriate properties became targets for massive overbuilding. She said that she wanted to respect the topography and the needs of the environment, including buffers and other things. She said that this overly broad wording in these regulations was concerning to her.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding parking, on page 25, it mentioned a Rutgers study suggesting that lowering mandated parking requirements could lead to reduced rents. She said that she would like to see the data supporting this claim, as she believed rents were ultimately market-driven, and if somebody had lower costs, there was no obligation for them to have reduced rents. She said that she was reassured on page 33, where it talked about considering the surrounding context when reviewing applications in centers. She said that this aligned with her earlier point that each property was unique.

Ms. Mallek said that in her district, residents had expressed concerns about the loss of mature standing trees being replaced by much smaller trees. She said that this was not appropriate and was also detrimental to the ecosystem services. She said that forgiving developers who demolish buffer areas without consequences was not helping the County and also encouraged repeated behaviors. She said that while she appreciated the concept they were exploring here regarding tree coverage, as outlined on pages 35 and 36, it was very important that the recommendations were written clearly and firmly enough to be effective for the community as a whole.

Ms. McKeel said that she was in support of the first bullet point, which suggested reducing or eliminating parking requirements for activity centers and parking requirements in general. She said that as an aside, she was surprised to hear that the cost of a structured parking garage was approximately $75,000 per slot, according to Mr. Bivins' discussion with the PC the other day, although she had not confirmed that with developers.

Ms. McKeel said that given that, she believed that they should reduce or eliminate parking requirements for activity centers and other locations in the Development Area. She said that she was not ready to commit to the specifics, but she believed it was a good idea.

Ms. McKeel said that next, incentives for redevelopment and higher density in activity centers were something she was supportive of. She said that she would like to understand the concept better, and she thought this might be the right place to ask. She said that they had had several previous projects where commercial was on the bottom and supposedly residential on top, but they had failed. She said that she would like some insight into why that was. She said that the dental office sounded appealing, but at the time she heard about it, they all sounded great. She asked if staff could comment on the commercial-residential model. She asked what the public interest was for that, and if those projects failed due to economic situations beyond their control, or if there was another reason.

Mr. Barnes said that he believed it was a good question to ask, considering there had been a mixed track record. He said that for example, in places like Short Pump, some of these projects had had vacant upper floors, while others had been successful. He said that he thought that opening up the opportunity for this type of project in their community could be beneficial. He said that there were numerous examples where it has worked in the County, and in the City where they had seen more success with it. He said that to make it work here, they needed to focus on bringing density towards these walkable centers, which was one of the goals they were trying to achieve. He said that he recognized that financing mixed-use buildings could sometimes be challenging.

Ms. McKeel said that she was not suggesting that she was against this proposal. She said that the experience at Stonefield, which occurred during an economic downturn, did not seem to have been successful. She said that North Point had faced similar challenges and had gone back to the drawing board. She said that she was just curious about the potential outcomes of this proposal.

Mr. Barnes said that he acknowledged that the market presented challenges, and he agreed with that.

Ms. McKeel said that she thought it was a great idea, but she was curious to hear staff's thoughts on it. She said that the next point was regarding the balance between efficient use of Development Areas and quality of life, as well as environmental stewardship, including tree coverage. She said that she understood where they were trying to go with that balance, but having said that, she did have some concerns. She asked if they were suggesting that in the Development Area, they would have to make certain sacrifices for the people who lived in the Development Area.

Ms. McKeel said that as someone who lived in the Development Area, on slide 19, she noticed the statement that they "need to use land efficiently in Development Areas to protect the Rural Area." She asked if that was what they really wanted to say to the people who they were trying to get to live in the Development Area, that they need to live there so they could protect the Rural Area.

Ms. McKeel said that she understood that this might be a minor issue with the syntax, but she was bringing it up because she did not think they wanted to convey that the Development Area was a necessary compromise for the sake of protecting the Rural Area. She said that she believed they should strive to protect both areas and the people living in them.

Mr. Barnes said that he agreed with what was being suggested, that it should not be an either-or situation. He said that part of the question they were asking here was to protect water quality and the tree buffers associated with streams, as well as the critical slope systems, while also designing with the site to the extent possible. He said that these principles should always guide their decisions and efforts to protect the environmental features in the Development Area.

Mr. Barnes said that it was essential to recognize the need to balance the protection of all of the environmental features in the Development Area. He said that they needed to recognize that there may be impacts on features that may not be directly associated with water quality or buffers along streams and strive to find a balance between dealing with that and using the Development Area efficiently. He said that they had discussed increasing the percentage of parcels that met their development potential, and this was a question of how far they should push that envelope as a community.

Mr. Barnes said that it was important to hear from the Board on this matter, as they needed to always prioritize maximizing environmental protection while also, within reason, using the Development Area efficiently. He said that this should serve as a guidepost for them as a staff, determining where to draw the lines between trying to use the Development Area efficiently and trying to protect the environment. He said that he did not think this balance should come at the cost of eliminating inviting green spaces or amenities, as the livable component of the urban form was essential, regardless of any grading or other impacts associated with it.

Ms. McKeel said that she would agree with that because right now, the Development Area did not have much green space. She said that the older Development Area did have more green space, however.

Ms. Jodie Filardo, Director of Community Development, said that Ms. McKeel and Ms. Mallek had effectively covered both sides of this topic. She said that the intended meaning with this wording was that they wanted to encourage people to live in the Development Area, so it needed to be a vibrant and desirable place where people would want to come, which in turn enabled them to focus on housing within that area, allowing for more open space and watershed protection in the Rural Area. She said that it was not about making the Development Area merely adequate, but rather about creating a fantastic living environment that would attract people to the area, thereby directing their housing growth and density towards the Development Area.

Ms. McKeel said that she understood what staff was trying to convey here, but she would like to rephrase it in a way that better conveyed their message.

Ms. Filardo said that she understood and would make sure they fixed that wording.

Ms. McKeel thanked Ms. Filardo.

Mr. Pruitt said that Grit and Maple Pine in Pantops were located adjacent to each other and served as successful models for combined commercial and residential developments. He said that the bottom level featured commercial public space, while the upper levels were residential. He said that what struck him was how infrequently he saw these types of developments, making them feel almost alien, and it felt odd that his GPS to Grit led him to park in an apartment parking lot.

Ms. McKeel said that she agreed it was important to have that type of development.

Mr. Pruitt said that it was a lovely community there, pedestrian infrastructure notwithstanding.

He said that on the highlights, he would like to start by saying that he had previously expressed support for eliminating commercial parking requirements. He said that there was a previous slide that discussed specific options for parking reform, which he would like to revisit. He said that he would like to ensure he understood the concept of shared parking from a regulatory standpoint. He asked if staff could define what shared parking meant and what it might look like in practice.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that this concept involved two uses that may have different operating hours but would allow them to share the same parking lot. She said that by sharing parking, they could reduce the burden of providing separate parking facilities for businesses and residential or condominium areas. She said that an agreement was typically required, a legally binding document that outlined the terms and conditions of the shared parking arrangement. She said that this agreement had to be put in writing and remain in effect indefinitely. She said that the key factor was the operating hours, and it was feasible for a church and a residential area to share parking, for instance.

Mr. Pruitt said that this slide proposed requiring shared parking. He said that he could see how they might be in a position to require shared parking if they were approving projects and vetting them. He said that however, he did not see another context in which they would be able to do that, especially if they were not enforcing minimum parking requirements. He said that it would not make sense to say that developers did not have minimums but must share parking if they were within a certain distance of each other. He asked if that was a correct understanding.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that was her understanding.

Mr. Pruitt said that he was disappointed because shared parking made sense. He said that for example, Sugar Bear, a business in Charlottesville, shared a small parking lot with Hogwaller and Rivanna River Company. He said that the lot filled up quickly, and he would love to use the parking space across the street, but the owners were protective of it. He said that it was a shame that they did not have a way to encourage shared parking, other than through the zoning approval process.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would be in favor of removing commercial parking limits and examining and reducing residential parking requirements, especially within activity centers. He said that however, he did not think they were there yet for residential, and he did not think the will was there yet. He said that reducing parking requirements could also obviate the issue of creating parking maximums in regional centers if there were no commercial requirements.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that was right.

Mr. Pruitt said that he had done some research, but he would like to know what a public realm standard was in the minds of County planners and what it would look like for their locality.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that for their purposes, the public realm typically referred to the area between the face of the building and the parking lot, often found in urban settings. She said that this area may include a planting strip for trees, a sidewalk, and space for benches and other things. She said that it was usually in an urban setting that the term "public realm" was used. She said that, however, in a broader sense, the public realm could include any area outside of private property. She said that when they referred to the public realm in this specific situation, they were primarily focusing on the streetscape.

Mr. Pruitt said that essentially, these were things that felt like part of the shared environment but remained nonetheless private.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that was correct; they could nonetheless be private.

Mr. Pruitt said that he wanted to reiterate a concern that was present at the beginning of the year, rather than last week. He said that there was a shared concern about the measurability of objectives and capturability of completion of actions. He said that he was not sure that this concern had been fully addressed. He said that upon reviewing the objectives, he noticed that they were not measurable or quantifiable. He said that the actions seemed to be largely check-the-box in nature, with the ability to simply state whether they had been accomplished or not. He said that there were exceptions, however, and he could think of ways to modify these to make them more accountable.

Mr. Pruitt said that this did create a kind of "weasel escape" that they could not hold themselves to the fire on for the coordinate and collaborate ones. He said that he was struggling to envision what quantifiable objectives might look like for these items, as he believed they were the right kinds of objectives. He said that however, it was challenging to create a standard for measuring them, beyond simply stating that eight out of nine identified actions had been completed. He said that in his view, this was a shortfall.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that staff intended to develop measurable objectives and metrics for those objectives as part of the appendix. She said that they had not yet reached that stage.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would next like to discuss incentives for redevelopment and higher density. He said that incentives for redevelopment, particularly for housing, stood out to him. He said that in other words, redeveloping existing housing to create more housing, was what he was thinking about. He said that he was not sure that incentives were necessary, as the market was already favorable. He said that someone quoted the cost of redevelopment was significantly lower than building new, with estimates being $25,000 versus $300,000 per unit. He said that however, he recognized that this may not be the focus of the incentive discussion.

Mr. Pruitt said that they may be exploring other options, such as the redevelopment of the Hibachi restaurant on Route 29. He said that he generally had concerns when they were discussing dispersing public funds for private developers and the reasons behind it, and he wondered whether they had done enough to identify the urgency of the need and ensure that it would go toward a publicly realized goal. He said that in a vacuum, he had difficulty fully supporting this concept. He said that he believed he would need a better understanding of what this would entail and the stated objectives of those redevelopments.

Mr. Pruitt said that he felt that he needed to apologize for not having a clearer sense of clarity on this matter, as he was in favor of certain types of incentives. He said that they had spent a significant amount of time discussing a housing trust fund, which was an incentive for private developers. He said that however, without knowing the specific types of redevelopments, how they would be targeted, and their shape, he might have paused in supporting this concept outside of additional details. He acknowledged that this was challenging because of the long-range, five-year planning document.

Mr. Pruitt said yes regarding the balance between efficient use of the Development Areas. He said that he did not know that he needed to go into much detail about that. He asked if there were additional slides discussing opposing choices on this topic.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that they were not necessarily opposing choices.

Mr. Pruitt said that in contrast to the parking discussion, where they were presented with several specific approaches, he did not think that any alternatives were provided for this issue. He said that he simply wanted to ensure that he was not missing anything.

Mr. Pruitt said that tree coverage has to be an essential part of how they thought about becoming a more pedestrian-friendly world. He said that the cutover, which he was having trouble remembering the name of, was located over Interstate 64, just west of Wegmans, and was part of a SMART SCALE project that would result in a path from Wegmans, past Cavalier Crossing and the County Offices, terminating at Stagecoach Road.

Mr. Pruitt said that he was excited about this project, but he was also aware that it was unlikely to be used, given the lack of tree cover there because it was on a major highway, which was becoming an increasingly important factor in walkability. He said that as they moved forward, this would become even more true.

Mr. Pruitt said that he appreciated the action item for the Town of Scottsville, which identified the right focus areas. He said that these were the issues that came up most frequently in Scottsville, including parks and trails, public infrastructure, and enhancing human services and affordable housing projects.

Mr. Pruitt said that he had found that he and Bob Crickenberger often discussed collaborations and concerns in the Town of Scottsville, and these were the topics that came up most often. He said that although it may not be a typical concern for the town of Scottsville, the Scottsville town apartments were a popular topic, so he was glad to see that focus.

Mr. Gallaway asked if they were just addressing the three bullet points.

Mr. Andrews replied no; they were discussing the entire list of objectives and actions.

Mr. Gallaway said that most of his points he would like to discuss had nothing to do with the points on the slide. He asked if staff needed information regarding those questions.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that those were specific areas for which staff was seeking clarification.

Mr. Gallaway said that he was good here. He clarified that however, he did believe they had been telling people they had to live in the Development Area to protect the Rural Area. He emphasized that the wording was right; while they did not like the wording, that was what they had been telling people.

Ms. McKeel said that she did not like that wording.

Ms. Mallek said that it was 1990s wording and needed to be updated.

Mr. Gallaway said that it might get him in trouble, and while he appreciated Ms. Mallek's comments about because residents lived there and they valued their quality of life and environmental features, they wanted to preserve and improve on those aspects, he must emphasize that in a constrained Development Area, they could not have it all. He said that with a constrained area, they would not be able to achieve their desired density without expanding the area. He said that it would top out at some point.

Ms. McKeel asked if that meant she could not have trees in the Development Area.

Mr. Gallaway said that the Development Area featured a significant number of trees.

Ms. McKeel said that she did not have them in her world.

Mr. Gallaway said that if one examined the Google Map of the location, there were many trees, but they may not be publicly accessible. He said that there were many trees in the Rural Area that were also not publicly accessible. He said that he thought they should stop pretending. He said that as Mr. Williamson had pointed out earlier, when discussing transitional bands, the "lasagna method" implied that it was not just a clear-cut distinction between urban and rural, or development and rural, but rather a more nuanced approach with graduated pieces.

Mr. Gallaway said that this County had decided to draw a hard line, categorizing areas as either development or rural. He said that this approach restricted certain activities and mixes, and if they did not try to protect the trees, then it could change the costs of it. He said that in a constrained area, it would be challenging to provide it all with the growth that they were continuing to see come into the area. He said that if they did not just own this, they may eventually reach a point where they were forced to accept that their region was limited in its growth potential because there was no available space left. He said that he did not think that would happen. He asked where else that had happened.

Ms. McKeel said that she did not want to interrupt him, but she wanted to follow up on his point about Mr. Williamson's lasagna. She said that she would greatly appreciate it if they could discuss the possibility of implementing three, maybe not four, but three in some areas, as this would greatly benefit Lambs Road. She said that she was not opposed to exploring what other communities were doing.

Mr. Gallaway said that their goal was for all business redevelopment to occur within the Development Area. He said that they were not satisfied with the current 58% density being built out in the current Development Area and wanted a higher percentage of density to be achieved in the Development Area moving forward. He said that this was the purpose of the Development Area utilization review. He said that the question became, what did "efficient use" truly mean? He said that they had been efficient, but they needed to be proficient in maximizing the Development Area more.

Mr. Gallaway said that if they did not allow for sufficient density in the Development Area, it would lead to a strain on the Development Area to the point that they could not do anything else there, and it would have to go somewhere else. He said that he believed they must acknowledge that they needed to allow for density for both business and residential, whether through new development or redevelopment. He said that if they did not start allowing that to happen in their planning efforts, that of the 31,000 projected new residents, 16,000 of them would have to go to the Rural Area at the current 58% density in the Development Area. He said that if they did not provide a place for them to go in the Development

Area, they would be forced to go to the Rural Area, which did not have sufficient density out there to support them.

Ms. McKeel said that the Board had not approved some of the developments that had come to them that provided affordable housing.

Mr. Gallaway said that the Valerie Longs and clients of the world had brought forward projects that achieved 50% density with a significant amount of open green space, because this approach was more likely to appease the Board and allow them to approve upzoning without reaching maximum density, thereby also appeasing the NIMBYs. He said that they needed to start doing this in a way that specifically stated what they were trying to achieve. He said that they wanted to get as much as they could into the Development Area so they would not have to expand it to protect the Rural Area. He said that he was not bringing that up to be combative because he disagreed with the sentiment, but in order to achieve their goal, they needed to say it more plainly and plan accordingly. He said that he did not know that they were necessarily doing that.

Mr. Gallaway said that he did not want to see Development Areas with low quality of life. He said that he believed that developments had been doing a good job of environmental stewardship beyond just tree coverage and amenities. He said that however, they needed to take ownership of their role as a County in providing public realm spaces. He said that they could not just wait for others to develop them; that was what the small area plan was about. He said that they had done the work, but now they were waiting for something to come in before they could put in a public space.

Mr. Gallaway said that it was frustrating to read, and this was where many of his other comments would focus. He said that when he reviewed the document last week, he was disappointed to find that they were not getting to the objectives and actions. He said that the goal statement, objectives, and actions seemed disconnected from what he had read earlier. He said that that was where a lot of his notes and comments would go, to start speaking to those things. He said that some of the ambiguity and the things that existed in the past, and he didn’t think anybody could say that they were satisfied with the progress they had made in the past 10 years.

Mr. Pruitt said that he had not been thinking critically enough about this particular issue. He said that when considering how to balance quality of life within Development Area, he was not thinking about whether they had adequate tot lots in their sub-developments, as he saw this as wasteful. He said that it did not maximize the land and often focused on amenities that were not particularly desirable. He said that he did not see how a small triangle situated awkwardly between two private roads benefited him.

Mr. Pruitt said that this thinking was similar to what he had mentioned during the Montclair discussion, where the importance of development becoming multiplicative and closer in proximity to each other, which in itself was a cascading amenity that improved quality of life. He said that in his neighborhood, south of the City on Avon, he believed denser development would be more beneficial, as it would create a more urban feel, with closer proximity to other built environments, walkable spaces, and a more compact living arrangement.

Mr. Pruitt said that he agreed with Mr. Gallaway that what they actually did not want in the Development Area was to have more open space and amenities, and what their policies were currently demanding was the opposite. He said that he wondered if this was not inherently at odds with the goal of improving quality of life.

Mr. Andrews said that continuing this line of thought, he would like to again see slide 19, which stated the “need to use land efficiently in the Development Areas to protect the Rural Areas, while also ensuring quality of life and resilient community in the Development Areas.” He said that if they removed the words "to protect the Rural Areas while ensuring high quality of life," instead of “while,” it became "use Development Areas to create a high quality of life."

Mr. Andrews said that a point that Neil Williamson had made earlier was that sprawl did not have a definition, but he believed it did. He said that if someone could walk to a coffee shop in their neighborhood, he did not think that was sprawl. He said that however, some of the transition areas did look like sprawl due to the lack of walkability and tightness, and resources not being close by. He said that you would be more dependent upon a car, and have more cost and difficulty associated with putting in sewer, water, and transit.

Mr Andrews said that for him, these were the kinds of things that defined quality of life in the Development Area, where they could build areas with good transit, amenities, and walkable features. He said that this was why he looked at this issue differently, considering the trade-off between Rural Areas and Development Areas as one of needing density in Development Areas for a high quality of life and amenities.

Mr. Andrews said that he would like to return to slide 23. He said that from that perspective, when it said reduced and eliminated parking requirements for activity centers, he agreed that parking was not always the most efficient use of space, but it was a necessary one. He said that in residential areas, it was essential to provide some level of parking, as people would inevitably need a place to park their cars. He said that if they did not account for this, public space may be used for parking, which could be a problem.

Mr. Andrews said that perhaps they did not need two parking spaces for every single residence, but they should consider whether parking would be provided for those who would live there, and whether public transit was available in the area. He said that in commercial, the market should take care of parking needs. He said that however, he would provide an example of Top Notch up the road, where there were some businesses that were located tightly together that had scarce parking, resulting in each business claiming a few parking spots and policing them all day. He said that this highlighted the need for shared parking. He said that he strongly supported finding ways to reduce their dependence on parking requirements as part of development.

Mr. Andrews said that he viewed the second bullet point as incentives and not a question of redevelopment and higher density, which was something they were looking for. He said that the question was what they could offer as a County that was more efficient for them to offer than for developers to offer.

Mr. Andrews said that if they had the ability to bring resources or people together to help offer these incentives, then they could do it better than a commercial developer could. He said that he thought they needed that, and some of these things may not happen unless they have incentives, but it was a question of finding the ones that would be most efficient for the County to offer. He said that perhaps some of that was related to how they permitted these things, as reducing red tape would make it easier for developers to participate.

Mr. Andrews said that balancing efficient Development Areas with quality of life was addressed. He said that he would like to make a somewhat unconventional comment about trees. He said that as a member of the Board of the Schoodic Institute, which worked at Acadia National Park, he had seen the environmental stress on some areas become severe, to the point where the national parks were now using the “Resist, Accept, Direct (RAD)” framework. He said that this was a recognition that, when the PC directs developers to replace trees with the same species that were present before for a 20-year plan, the same trees that were suitable for that environment when they went in may not be suitable 20 years from now, or even sooner.

Mr. Andrews said that this was a concern at their national parks, where they were now exploring alternative species that could survive the changes occurring in the environment. He said that he was not suggesting that they were in the business of conducting experiments, as that was the role of the scientists. He said that however, they should be aware of the results of those and recognize that things were changing. He said that that was just a side comment.

Mr. Pruitt said that now, they needed to go back through because they needed to think about the goal statement, objectives, and actions to address the rest of the Development Areas chapter.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she agreed and was glad that Mr. Andrews had mentioned the importance of adapting to changing times for the trees. She said that what was once considered suitable 20 years ago may no longer be acceptable now, and it may be more suitable to have a bush or other type of greenery instead, especially in front of street-level stores. She said that Mr. Gallaway's point about flexibility was a crucial aspect to consider. She said that people who live in Urban Areas often wanted to be surrounded by city-centric amenities, such as coffee shops and community amenities.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that this was why they chose to live in Urban Areas, where they could be close to work, entertainment, and other urban attractions. She said that she thought it was essential that they address this and create spaces that catered to these needs. She said that to achieve this, she proposed that they invite developers to present their ideas for projects that met their criteria, including a minimum of 20% affordable housing. She said that she would love to see examples of how developers could create thriving developments that met their requirements and were desirable to live in.

Ms. Mallek said that she recalled a discussion about the first floor versus residential upstairs in mixed-use projects. She said that there was a period of time when it was a requirement in all mixed-use developments, but it proved to be a challenge. She said that bankers would not loan money for condo situations with commercial spaces on the first floor and residential areas upstairs. She said that it took around five years for the J.B. Barnes Project to eliminate this requirement. She said that the Downtown Mall was often used as an example, but that happened organically.

Ms. Mallek said that the Crozet downtown area was called "eclectic", and the residents loved it for that reason. She said that each building represented a different part of the history. She said that they should try to find a balance between density and environmental considerations. She said that for her, the goal was to preserve the amenities that benefited residents, who were the primary reason she was advocating for these features. She said that it was just like the Rural Area was not for the frou-frou scenery, but was for the survival of the people they wanted to attract to live in this urban form where they would have shade from trees when they walked on the sidewalk during extreme heat.

Ms. Mallek said that she was impressed with the appropriately sized criteria for trees. She said that Old Trail was built with design standards from 2005. She said that the developer had the option to choose between oak trees every 60 feet or more appropriately sized redbud trees every 40 feet. She said that the developer would have had to buy more of the smaller trees, so they did not do it. She said that now they had neighborhoods throughout Old Trail, and the 15- to 18-year-old trees were consistently requiring costly pruning services from tree companies.

Ms. Mallek said that the sidewalks were also suffering due to the trees being planted in small, four-by-four-foot grass areas between the road and sidewalk, often within six feet of the foundations. She said that residents had been raising concerns about this issue for at least eight years. She said that they had initially approached County staff, who at the time stated that they were not dealing with that now because that is a zoning redo, and that it was up to the developer. She said that she was interested in seeing planning that prioritized the selection of trees that were the right size for the area, as this was a significant burden on residents and could impact the success of the neighborhood.

Ms. Mallek said that, regarding incentives for redevelopment and higher density, the County could offer structured parking with a public-private partnership. She said that she had highlighted instances of structured parking throughout the plan, as she believed this could be a viable option for the County to offer, which could have a positive impact on other aspects of the plan. She said that she supported structured parking.

Ms. Mallek said that she was also concerned about the impact of climate change on their tree population, particularly the white oaks, which were struggling due to extreme weather conditions. She said that as a result, she believed it was essential that they prioritize planting species that were well-suited to their local environment and make informed decisions throughout the plan to create vibrant, livable spaces where kids can play and old folks can sit in the shade, and everything in between.

Ms. McKeel said that she agreed regarding the trees. She said that having lost oak trees in her own yard, she was replacing them with another species. She said that to move forward, they needed to consider the impact of climate change and the need for change. She said that she was not a fan of either tot-lots or dog parks, even though they received many proposals with them. She said that they were required, so they should reevaluate what they were actually requiring. She said she thought dog parks were awful and would never take her dog to a dog park. She said that they could do better than tot-lots and dog parks.

Ms. McKeel said that regarding connectivity, they often claimed to want it, but every time it was brought up, the neighbors or they themselves seemed to lose interest. She said that in the Development Area, they should be encouraging connectivity, not hindering it. She said that they were part of the problem by allowing neighbors to dictate connectivity based on personal preferences, rather than addressing the need for connectivity. She said that this loss of connectivity was a concern, although she did acknowledge there were instances where it was necessary.

Ms. McKeel said that she sometimes wondered if they were losing something with connectivity. She said that they used to say that they wanted multiple ways for people to drive around, spreading out traffic and avoiding congested roads like Route 29 and Hydraulic. She said that by offering various options for driving or walking, they could reduce the impact of everyone being on the same road or sidewalk.

Ms. McKeel said that they needed to update the County's lighting requirements. She said that, for instance, in her neighborhood, it was so bright at night that one could read the newspaper in the road at 2 a.m. She said that while people wanted lighting to feel safe, they could strike a balance. She said that it was decades old and did not account for modern needs. She said that they did not need to make every neighborhood completely dark, but this would help with dark skies initiatives.

Ms. McKeel said that one thing she would like to highlight was the need to coordinate with VDOT for approval of urban street standards. She said that she had noticed that VDOT excelled on interstates but struggled in Urban Areas. She said that while they had improved, she believed they needed to work more closely with them to develop their network of roads to reduce speeding.

Ms. McKeel said that they should explore ways to reduce speeding on their roads by reducing the width of the roads and incorporating bike and pedestrian lanes. She said that this would reduce the perception of being on an interstate, and that traffic would likely slow down. She said that traffic calming measures could be implemented in existing areas by building infrastructure that people want and that would slow down traffic. She said that she believed they needed to collaborate with VDOT to build roads and highways in their community.

Ms. McKeel said that monitoring the proportion of development within Development Areas compared with Rural Areas was a good idea. She said that they had discussed it at one point regarding a proposal and not having the necessary data about where they were. She said that they had discussed several years ago the need to consider having rezoning proposals reviewed by the Economic Development Department. She said that they should review what was included on the executive summaries to help them make decisions.

Ms. McKeel said that regarding transit routes, walking, and biking, that developers often would not develop areas without a transit route. She said that developers had to build the developments first so there would be people, and that they would not get transit until they had the people. She acknowledged that there was no transit in areas where there were people, and that the problem was that they had not figured out how to pay for transit. She said that the transit authority, if approved, would allow them to look at how to pay for robust transit, because they could not keep paying for it out of their operational budget.

Ms. McKeel said that she thought they needed to take a closer look at their plant requirements, whether it was trees or other types, to make sure they were suitable for their climate and not just assume they were doing what they had always done.

Ms. McKeel said that one thing she would say is that she appreciated Mr. Gallaway's frustration about density. She said that some of the blame lay with them, because they had not been willing to approve some of the neighborhoods with the density that came to them. She said that by the time it got to the CACs, the PC, and then the Board, the surrounding communities were upset, and the density decreased. She said that if they wanted density, they needed to be willing to say to the community that density was important to them and that they would approve proposals with appropriate high density, and not water it down until it was acceptable, because they were getting developments that did not solve the problem.

Mr. Pruitt said that 3.1 was a very specific action, and it stood out for being so specific. He said that it pertained to making it possible for mobile drink stands and kiosks to be placed along bicycle routes. He asked if they were not already permitted. He said that he wanted to know about why staff came up with this proposal.

Mr. Barnes said that, as a relatively new member of the team, many of the goals and action statements were carried forward from previous discussions. He said that he would follow up on that action item.

Mr. Pruitt said that he appreciated the idea. He said that he was having trouble visualizing it in their communities. He said that he was struggling to find a suitable location for a public greenway with a coffee shop, similar to what he had experienced in the Pacific Northwest. He said that in that region, every public parking area or commercial parking lot often featured a staffed espresso bar. He said that that was the image he was trying to picture here.

Mr. Pruitt said that while he did not think it was a bad idea, he said that he was uncertain about the commercial infrastructure required to support it, and he was not sure where this concept was headed. He said that he could potentially see it at certain points along the Rivanna Trail, but he was not sure. He said that they could also already incorporate these types of amenities in commercial parking lots.

Mr. Ben Holt, Senior Planner, said that action item 3.1 was related to the Free Bridge Lane area. He said that the proposal was to enhance pedestrian amenities along the greenway. He said that other localities had successfully implemented this concept, such as Roanoke. He said that in Atlanta, the Greenbelt featured small commercial nodes that served users.

Mr. Pruitt said that as a frequent user of the Washington Old Dominion Trail in the DC metro area, he had seen many of these. He said that this situation brought to mind what former Supervisor Price had discussed with them. He said that he appreciated the idea, but he was curious about the level of support from the commercial environment. He said that if they were standing in the way of it, then they should remove the roadblocks.

Mr. Pruitt said that, regarding developer incentives, he believed that certain types of redevelopment required incentives, as it was more profitable to hold onto the land. He said that he was not convinced that there was a strong business case for incentives for higher-density projects, particularly when density was already allowed. He said that in his opinion, higher density in and of itself was a significant incentive for developers. He said that he did not see a scenario where they were getting anything out of paying anything for greater density, except possibly to overcome the seven-story hump, which he was not sure there was a big desire to get over.

Mr. Pruitt said that he thought they needed to recognize that density itself was the incentive. He said that the state's enabling legislation understood density as the incentive, and their inclusionary zoning standards were based on the idea that increased density was the incentive that was given in order that the developer then had to pay an inclusionary zoning standard. He said that many other communities used greater density as a bargaining chip to secure greater affordability standards or to increase proffers. He said that he was not convinced that there was a need for incentives for greater density.

Mr. Pruitt said that there was a fundamental tension regarding tree coverage. He said that he would like to focus on this issue, as it aligned with one of their objectives. He said that he was not entirely sure how he felt about it because it was in tension with their stated goals of improving build out. He said that he would like to explore the need to preserve existing forest blocks within the Urban Area, and this kind of thing. He said that he was not opposed to these goals, but he thought they had not fully grasped the tension there.

Mr. Pruitt said that he believed street trees were necessary in a warming world, except in scenarios where building heights in the surrounding area were so high that they obviated the need for street trees. He said that he was not aware that they had reached that point in their Development Area. He said that in contrast, in Washington D.C., the tall buildings provided sufficient shade, making street trees unnecessary. He said that in the meantime, they needed to ensure that pedestrian viability was possible in the Urban Area, which was a core aspect of how they envisioned the Urban Area as a place where people could walk and bike. He said that some amount of tree cover was necessary to achieve this.

Mr. Pruitt said that he was not convinced that preserving tree canopy within a new sub-development was wholly tenable. He said that this issue was related to their previous discussion about tot lots and other amenities, as preserving tree canopy was typically done within designated amenity spaces. He said that in this context, they could retain old growth trees in new developments. He said that if they were criticizing the preservation of these spaces due to perceived wastefulness, he wondered if they should reevaluate their own goal of preserving tree canopy, especially in Development Areas. He said that many of these canopy blocks were on private property and did not benefit the public.

Mr. Gallaway said that he wanted to clarify that he was not opposed to trees, and they should have trees. He said that when discussing the Development Area, it was essential to acknowledge that not all aspects could be equal. He said that the priority of one over the other may change depending on the specific area within the Development Area. He said that they had defined the Development Area, and it included the big by-right project behind Belvedere. He said that it was a wonderful, wooded area with a trail that had been clear-cut. He said that it was the Development Area, and was zoned R-4, and that some level of tree canopy removal was necessary to accommodate this development.

Mr. Gallaway said that some people would probably say that R-4 was not dense enough for that area. He said he was not trying to suggest that it was someone else’s reasoning that got them there, and that the Board had to take the responsibility for it. He said that since they were working on this Comprehensive Plan, that they needed to pivot and do it differently so that folks could count on them to uphold the plan and ensure that future projects aligned with their goals. He said that he was committed to rectifying past issues and making changes to improve the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Gallaway said that he did not want people to think that he was against trees, and asked who would take responsibility for them. He said that they had attempted to incorporate some green spaces at the Rio 29 interchange, but without the right maintenance, they became an eyesore. He said that they had to be specific about maintenance.

Mr. Gallaway said that when he reviewed the objectives and action items, he first considered the same question: how did it achieve the objective. He said that instead of asking for justification for each item, he wanted to know what the background work was that decided the objectives and action items to be included. He said that if that work had not been done, it needed to be done and presented to the Board. He said that he was concerned about the disconnect between reading through the chapter and understanding the stated goals and objectives.

Mr. Gallaway said that for instance, he understood that tree coverage was an objective, but that if one read the entire chapter up until reaching the goal statement, there was no mention of tree coverage. He said that to understand the underlying goal, one would have to consider the overarching objective of climate change, resiliency, and environmental concern. He said that he could make those connections, but he was unsure if each action contributed to achieving the objective.

Mr. Gallaway said that without understanding the rationale behind each action, he could not determine if it made sense or if he agreed with it. He said that to drive this point home, they could consider item 1.9, regarding LUPEC. He said that continued participation in LUPEC and the three-party agreement, including coordinating with the University of Virginia's recommended land uses for areas A, B, and the Development Area. He said that the objective was to increase the use of infill, higher density development, adaptive reuse, and redevelopment of Development Areas.

Mr. Gallaway said that he was attempting to walk through the rationale behind that particular one to the objective. He said that while he could fill in some of the gaps, he assumed that the work had already been done to explain why 1.9 existed under this objective. He said that this was a significant amount of work, and he appreciated the effort being put into this. He said that without that information, he felt like he was working in the dark, as some of the objectives and actions were unclear to him.

Mr. Gallaway said that he believed an explanation of the objective or action was needed, and he was unsure about the approach to take for that. He said that he would like to know if there was a rationale behind each of these actions that explained why they were intended to achieve the objective.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that the rationale did exist, but she did not know if it was documented. She said that there was a significant amount of internal conversation and discussion that led to the development of these objectives and actions.

Mr. Gallaway said that he was requesting a significant amount of work. He said that without it, he was left wondering how the items had been able to get on the list. He said that he was struggling with the decision to split the discussion on the goals and objectives and the actions. He said that the next chapter they would consider in its entirety. He said that now, they were also dealing with a chapter that they had requested a lot of information for, and he was not seeing all of it yet. He said that as a result, he was struggling to align the goals and objectives with a chapter that was already likely to change.

Mr. Gallaway said that this uncertainty made it difficult for him to determine whether the proposed changes would align with his existing understanding. He said that to resolve this, they would need to go through multiple rounds of discussion and refinement. He said that in the meantime, he did not think they needed staff to present each point in detail, but they did need a document that outlined the changes, including the new language and rationale, to help them understand the impact and make informed decisions.

Mr. Holt said that he thought it was a very good question to ask staff, and he believed it was an important aspect to include. He said that there was an opportunity to delve into the rationale and detail within the appendix. He said that there had been significant collaboration between staff and partner agencies. He said that, for example, the particular action referencing the DRPT (Department of Rail and

Public Transportation) guidelines originated from their conversation and work with EPR, their consultants on activity centers in the Comprehensive Plan. He said that they had played a key role in developing the DRPT guidelines. He said that these improved standards for streetscape and pedestrian environments were what this was getting at, along with incorporating them into VDOT reviews and VDOT standards. He said that he agreed that providing that context within the appendix would be helpful.

Mr. Gallaway said that to clarify, he would like to understand how 1.3 translated into increased use of infill, higher density development, adaptive reuse, and redevelopment in the Development Areas. He said that specifically, he needed to see how this change would accomplish the stated objective.

Ms. Filardo said that she was hearing two things. She said that one point was that they should avoid using unintelligible acronyms when they were unclear.

Mr. Gallaway said that he knew what DRPT stood for.

Ms. Filardo said that the public may not, so they will fix it. She said that including the rationale for connecting a particular action to a particular objective could be improved by adding additional language or a sentence to make it more logical. She said that as part of adhering to the DRPT standards, they had multimodal transportation and grant opportunities, which enabled them to support density in Development Areas. She said that although they had thought they were conveying it, the rationale was not explicitly stated. She said that they could go back and add clarifying language.

Mr. Gallaway said that made sense. He said that he was not asking for the rationale to be included in the Comprehensive Plan. He said that he wanted the information so that he could determine if the actions aligned with the objectives and if he agreed with them. He said that he was not seeking the end goal to be an increase in the number of words or lines in the document itself. He said that he was looking for background information to help him make a determination about whether or not he agreed with the items.

Ms. Filardo said that she was having difficulty understanding how they could make that better if they were not adding language to the document itself.

Mr. Gallaway said that staff had done a lot of work in collaboration with the public, the PC, and various stakeholders. He said that that was the result of their efforts. He said that he had not been directly involved in those conversations or meetings, and he did not have the same level of information as staff did. He said that he may not be aware of the discussions that had taken place or the information that had been shared.

Mr. Gallaway said that for him to fully understand why an action was chosen, he needed to be aware of the connections staff had drawn between items. He said that he needed to see these connections so that he could make an informed decision about whether or not he agreed with the decision.

Ms. Filardo said that staff would take that direction under advisement and review the action steps to determine how they related to the goals and objectives.

Mr. Gallaway said that this was the first chapter, and he would have these same questions for every chapter and action that was presented to the Board. He said that from a public meeting standpoint, he believed this would save a significant amount of time. He said that he had reviewed many of these actions and was curious to know how each one aligned with its stated objective. He said that he was happy to work through this process, but it would be helpful if the rationale and objectives were provided upfront, so they could make informed decisions and avoid unnecessary discussion in public meetings.

Ms. Filardo said that the clarification was helpful for staff.

Ms. Mallek said that it sounded like a staff report should go with it. She said that she would greatly appreciate having the presentation itself. She said that having the presentation available, even on the same day, would be helpful, as it would allow her to review and print out the materials in front of her.

Mr. Gallaway said that he believed item 1.4, related to lighting, was a step backwards. He said that safety should be the top priority, while also adhering to the dark skies ordinance and reducing spillover. He said that in the Development Area, they must provide a safe environment. He said that there were specific areas along Route 29 and Rio where the lighting was terrible, and it had contributed to problems. He said that many of them had expressed concerns about visibility on Route 29. He said that he believed that the safety and safe environment aspect should be a top priority. He said that in his opinion, it should take precedence over light spillover, glare, and excessive brightness.

Mr. Gallaway said that they had to ensure the well-being of pedestrians and bicyclists, especially during peak hours when traffic was heaviest. He said that he did not think this was an insurmountable task, and they had been doing a good job of achieving this with new lighting technology. He said that he wanted to prioritize a safe environment for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Ms. Mallek said that installing downlights for people's safety on the ground was actually accomplishing everything else that needed to be done. She said that currently, light was facing up, and she could see it from Greene County.

Mr. Gallaway said that it seemed that the safe environment was a secondary consideration, and he was concerned about the wording.

Mr. Gallaway said that item 1.8 was regarding monitoring the proportion of development occurring within the Development Area compared to the Rural Area. He said that if residential development began to increase in the Rural Area, they should develop options to encourage and direct growth to the Development Areas and discourage subdivisions in the Rural Area.

Mr. Gallaway said that if they did the Comprehensive Plan correctly, this should not even be a stated action. He said that they were trying to put development in the Development Area, and they did not want increased development in the Rural Area. He said that if they succeeded in achieving their stated goals for this chapter, this should be a given and should not even be included.

Mr. Gallaway said that monitoring the proportion of development occurring within the Development Areas should be part of the development utilization review process, which came forward with each application. He said that he expected to see this item as a stated action item under one of these objectives in the chapter. He said that each application should come forward with a development utilization review, allowing the Board to determine the impact of each project on the larger goals of the Development Area land use.

Mr. Gallaway said that he had noticed the mobile food vendors item, but they were primarily serving car traffic, not pedestrian or bicyclists. He said eventually, the multi-use trail would be built on Berkmar, and other places might offer similar opportunities for food trucks. He said that he was calling attention to this trend, as anything they could do to support it was beneficial. He said that in terms of the other kiosks and food and drink stands, he did not know what those were, but having a mobile library right next to a food truck was a great idea, and he loved the organic nature of how those things were starting to pop up.

Mr. Gallaway said that they had been discussing incentives, but it was essential that they define what they were and establish a timeline for their development. He said that personally, he had concerns about the developer incentives for affordable housing, which had taken a significant amount of time to implement. He said that they could not include vague promises of incentives in their Comprehensive Plan, as the term was often used to describe various initiatives, including parking structures, redevelopment, housing, and business. He said that they needed to be more specific about these incentives and, if they did not have a clear understanding of them, they should say when they would.

Mr. Gallaway said that there was a lack of draft actions in these objectives to address the missing middle residential component. He said that he had recently listened in on a session at the Weldon Cooper Center, where a panelist had discussed population movement in Virginia and growth. He said that one of the key points made was that their aging population was staying healthier, living longer, and remaining in their homes longer, resulting in a demand for single-family homes.

Mr. Gallaway said that younger homeowners, when entering the market, preferred single-family homes over townhomes or condos. He said that since people were living in these homes longer, they were not becoming available, and there was a lack of starter homes, especially in their community, which could serve as a steppingstone for owning larger homes. He said that they acknowledged in their Comprehensive Plan that there was a need for the missing middle, but he did not see any clear objectives outlining how they planned to achieve this goal. He said that he was looking for some actions or explanations in the rationale regarding how this aligned with the stated objective.

Mr. Gallaway said that item 2.3 related to identifying and funding capital improvement projects that supported activity center development, such as multimodal transportation. He asked how it would support it. He said that this was a timing thing, and he sometimes wondered how they planned for projects that were outside of their control. He said that they needed to think more carefully about how to address this issue so that when it did occur, they could be prepared.

Mr. Gallaway asked if car dealership display lots were included in the parking lot percentage calculations in the Rio 29 Small Area Plan.

Mr. Barnes said that he was not involved in that. He said that they likely used areas classified as parking areas in the GIS (Geographic Information System) system.

Mr. Gallaway said that he agreed with objective 4, which was listed on the PC comments page. He said that they were suggesting broadening it to encompass more than just tree coverage. He said that this included water movement, water resiliency, and drainage infrastructure. He said that he believed broadening the objective would help capture how to provide that type of environment within the Development Area.

Mr. Andrews said that recognizing what they were looking for in terms of consistency and clarity was crucial. He said that he agreed with many of the comments made. He said that Mr. Pruitt's comments about incentives for higher density was distinct from incentives for redevelopment, and he appreciated that comment. He said that he also concurred with Mr. Gallaway's suggestion to monitor the proportion of development within Development Areas compared to Rural Areas. He said that 1.8 without mentioning 1.7 already said to update the land use build-out analysis to reflect the development utilization review. He said that that was in there and this was added, and in his opinion, it was also not really needed and not necessarily helpful, and not necessarily relevant in how they want to evaluate their success. He said that if somebody owned a property in the Rural Area and had a right to build a house there, he would not penalize the whole Comprehensive Plan because somebody built a house in the Rural Area where they owned a lot.

Ms. McKeel said that she appreciated the way staff framed the objective and action so they had something to go to for their discussion. She said that she found this particular aspect of the process to be particularly effective. She said that it was clear and concise, allowing her to focus on the key points without becoming overwhelmed.

Ms. Mallek asked what EPR stood for.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that EPR was a consultant that had been assisting staff with the Comprehensive Plan, primarily through analysis, map and graphic creation, and public engagement efforts.

Mr. Barnes said that they were based in Charlottesville.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that they had provided staff with a significant amount of information to consider and rework. She asked when this would be brought back for the Board to review.

Mr. Barnes said that the Comprehensive Plan was divided into three main parts. He said that the first part served as an introduction, while the second part focused on the Development Area policy and its broad application in the Rural Area and Development Area. He said that the third part was more specific, breaking down into ten chapters.

Mr. Barnes said that they had been working on the first of these chapters, and to make it more manageable, they had divided it into two sections: one covering policy aspects and the other discussing goals, objectives, and actions. He said that the remaining nine chapters would be presented in their entirety, with a similar structure of policy components and goal statements, objectives, and actions. He said that their goal was to complete this process by the June timeframe, at which point they would share the revised chapters with the Board.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was uncertain about how the rest of the Board felt on this matter, but for her, the Development Area land use and Rural Area land use were the two most critical issues. She said that while everything else was important, these two areas were particularly significant, as they involved the development of all kinds. She said that she was unsure if they would need to spend more time discussing this or if she should schedule another private meeting with staff.

Ms. Filardo said that they were not entirely sure how these meetings would unfold with the Board. She said that they appreciated the level of detail and the thoroughness with which the Board had pursued these matters, as this was precisely what they needed. She said that in their planning with the County Executive's Office, they had moved forward with some plans through February, outlining the cadence of when they would bring these documents forward, when they would be reviewed by the PC, and when they would return to the Board.

Ms. Filardo said that one area they were not certain about was the timing of when they would bring back the documents that they had already reviewed. She said that they had intended to assess the process by the end of February. She said that given the amount of valuable feedback they had received, they needed to revisit these documents to incorporate all the feedback. She said that they expected that, around February, the Board would start seeing the chapters they had previously reviewed come back for review. She said that they would then provide a new schedule for the remaining chapters.

Ms. Filardo said that they were aiming to have the Comprehensive Plan adopted by June or July, but this timeline may be adjusted depending on the extent of any recommended changes or enhancements. She said that by February, they would have a pause point where staff would assess with the County Executive's Office how staff was doing and where the Board wanted to go. She said that they would come back to the Board with a revised schedule if they needed to adjust the pace. She said that if they maintained this level of intensity, they may not have sufficient time to delve into the details of some of these suggestions and bring them forward in a final form and at a fast enough pace so that the Board would know that staff heard them and had made the adjustments.

Mr. Andrews said that it was essential that they understood they were working on the Comprehensive Plan, but there may be other things outside of the Comprehensive Plan that had already been acted on, such as Housing Albemarle, which may require revisiting in the future. He said that these items would not necessarily be included in the Comprehensive Plan itself, but rather referenced as they updated or modified them.

Mr. Gallaway asked if it would make sense for the Board to send questions via email to staff, like they did during the budget process. He said that this way, instead of dealing with a free-for-all in the public meeting, staff could address specific questions, allowing for more efficiency. He said that this process would not slow things down, as it would still be possible to address questions in a public setting.

Mr. Andrews said that was a good idea.

Ms. Filardo said that they could certainly consider that option. She said that they did have a couple of opportunities available through Engage Albemarle, including the Ask the Planner feature. She said that they would explore the possibility of creating that infrastructure. She said that she thought it was a reasonable and logical approach. She said that she just needed to think through the details.

Non-Agenda Item. Recognition of Andy Muncy.

Mr. Richardson asked Deputy County Executive, Trevor Henry, and Master Police Officer Andy Muncy to come to the dais. He said that earlier this evening, they took a brief moment to recognize Master Police Officer Andy Muncy during the County Executive's report. He said that when they went to break, Mr. Henry pulled him aside and said that they could do better. He said that he would like to take a moment to recognize Mr. Muncy.

Master Police Officer Andy Muncy said that tomorrow, eight recruits would graduate from the Central Shenandoah Criminal Justice Academy, and on Friday, they would be sworn in. He said that they had been working to increase their full staffing, which would address one cycle, and then on January 6, they would be sending six more recruits to the academy. He said that this was an ongoing cycle that they continually strived to manage and overcome, but they were making progress and heading in the right direction.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Deputy County Executive, said that in the military, a farewell ceremony often involved presenting a challenge coin to the departing soldier. He said that this tradition was also common in public safety. He said that the County had adopted this practice, and they had their own challenge coin. He said that on behalf of the County Executive's Office and the Board, he would like to extend their gratitude to Mr. Muncy for his dedication and service over the past 12 years of service with the County.

Agenda Item No. 18. Adjourn.

At 8:20 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to December 4, 2024, 1:00 p.m. in Room 241, Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA, 22902. Mr. Andrews said information on how to participate in the meeting would be posted on the Albemarle County website Board of Supervisors home page and on the Albemarle County calendar.

____
Chair

Approved by Board
Date: 09/03/2025 Initials: CKB