

A special meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on December 7, 2023, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 241, Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902. This meeting was called by the Chair, Ms. Price, to allow a quorum of Board members to attend and participate in a Legislative Forum.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jim Andrews, Ms. Beatrice (Bea) J.S. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, and Ms. Donna P. Price.

ABSENT: Mr. Ned Gallaway.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeffrey B. Richardson; County Attorney, Steve Rosenberg; and Clerk, Claudette Borgersen.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by the Chair, Ms. Donna Price.

Ms. Price said that Albemarle County Master Police Officers Chip Riley and Dana Reeves were present at the meeting to provide their services.

Agenda Item No. 2. Welcome and Introductions.

Ms. Price welcomed the delegation. She said Senator Creigh Deeds was a resident of the City of Charlottesville and had served in the General Assembly for 31 years, first in the House of Delegates for 9 years from 1992-2001 and more recently in the Virginia State General Assembly from 2001-present, now representing the 11th Senate District, and will start 2024 General Assembly session as the second highest ranking member of that body. She said Senator Deeds was a graduate of Concord University and had his JD from Wake Forest University. She said he had been their friend and college for many years and thanked him for his presence and service there that day.

Ms. Price said she wanted to express her extreme joy in welcoming their two new Delegate-Elects. She said Katrina Callsen, who would be in her first term in the House of Delegates representing the 54th District, resided in the Rio Magisterial District of Albemarle County and most recently had served as both a member and the chair of the Albemarle County School Board. She said in her professional life, Ms. Callsen was the City Attorney for the City of Charlottesville, giving her a true city-county connection. She said Ms. Callsen had joined Teach for America and also served as a middle school math teacher in Lynn, Massachusetts and was a graduate of Yale University.

Ms. Price said Delegate-elect Amy Laufer would also be in her first term in the House of Delegates representing the 55th District. She said Ms. Laufer resided in the Rivanna Magisterial District of Albemarle County and previously held elected office on the Charlottesville School Board and founded Virginia's List to support Democratic women running for State office. She said Ms. Laufer was a graduate of University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Columbia University. She said she had previously served as a Peace Corps volunteer and a teacher.

Ms. Price said those present may have noticed the visual aids on the walls which were maps of the districts of Virginia that covered Albemarle County and that she was wearing her "vote" earrings. She said that she was wearing them because they measure and signify the power of the vote, and the power of the vote was most significantly shown many years ago when they passed a constitutional amendment which allowed for redistricting and had an escape clause to prevent gerrymandering. She said when they look at the maps on the walls they could see that Albemarle County was no longer gerrymandered into oblivion as had happened in the 2010 redistricting.

Ms. Price said that if they started with the Senate, that in 2020 each State Senate district had approximately 215,000 residents. She said 116,000 of the residents in this senate district reside in the City of Charlottesville and the County of Albemarle, which means that for the first time in a decade Albemarle County has a true strong voice and they know they have that voice with Senator Deeds to represent them.

Ms. Price said, similarly, if they look at the map in blue and yellow, that the yellow reflects the 54th District that Delegate Callsen will be serving and blue represents the 55th that Delegate Laufer will be serving. She said that Albemarle County was no longer divided up into a series of House of Delegates districts, which diluted their voice and diluted their vote. She said that while the House districts average about 85,000 residents, the County of Albemarle has over 40% of the 54th District and nearly 95% of the 55th District. She said this meant that for the first time in a decade the voters of Albemarle County impactfully have a voice and a vote. She said their two Delegates would represent the City and the County extremely well.

Ms. Price welcomed Mr. Blount from the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) and said she would turn the meeting over to him for the legislative briefing.

Agenda Item No. 3. Thomas Jefferson Planning District (TJPD) Legislative Program.

Mr. David Blount, Deputy Director of the TJPDC, said that he would like to discuss the top three

legislative priorities from the TJPDC Regional Legislative Program for 2024, which had now been adopted by all six jurisdictions in the region. He said that the priorities were recently communicated with a one-page summary included in their materials and would be available on their website shortly.

Mr. Blount said that for those who had been involved in this process, these priorities would look familiar. He said that the top priority across the region for local governments remained public education funding and increasing state support for K-12 education. He said that this position was strengthened during the summer with the release of the JLARC (Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission) report, which confirmed what they already knew and had been advocating for, which was a stronger commitment from the state to fund K-12 education, particularly in the standards of quality.

Mr. Blount said that they were aware that back in September, with the adoption of the budget, there were some additional funds for K-12 education. He said that the funds were allocated for the Literacy Act, compensation supplements, and support positions. He said that as they moved forward into the 2024 session, they would continue to see an emphasis on these areas as well as others. He said that this was a re-benchmarking year, which would also play a role as legislators addressed the K-12 budget.

Mr. Blount said that the next position related to budgets and funding served as a catch-all position that had been in place for several years within the regional legislative program. He said that this position emphasized avoiding unfunded mandates, supporting the state in providing enhanced funding for locally carried out state programs, and spoke to preserving revenue-generating authorities that they had so they were not infringed upon.

Mr. Blount said that the third priority, which used to be a priority in the past few years, was land use and growth management. He said that it was brought back to the forefront this year due to its significance. He said that local governments often played defense during the General Assembly, particularly in the area of land use. He said that some issues could be anticipated and they knew they would usurp or infringe upon local governments' ability to regulate land use, however, some things remained unknown. He said that with new members at the General Assembly and a changing landscape, it was deemed appropriate to elevate this priority this year.

Agenda Item No. 4. Albemarle County 2024 Legislative Priorities and Legislative Positions and Policy Statements.

Agenda Item No. 5. Legislators' Priorities / Questions & Answers.

Mr. Steve Rosenberg, County Attorney, said that he was pleased to present the legislative priorities of the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors for the upcoming 2024 General Assembly session. He said that before he delved into the substance of the priorities, he would briefly recap the Board's process in developing them. He said that the Board began in early summer, specifically in June, when they reviewed the 2023 legislation and initiated discussions on potential legislative priorities for 2024. He said that during September, there were continued conversations about possible legislative priorities as well as the Board's legislative positions and policy statements. He said that he would clarify the distinction between these two products. He said that both were available to them at their seats.

Mr. Rosenberg said that on October 18, the Board formally acted to adopt the priorities and the positions and policy statement, and today, they had this meeting with members of the local delegation. He said that the outcome of this process was the Board's adoption of three legislative priorities for the 2024 session. He said that this was a considerably smaller number of priorities compared to previous years. He said that legislative priorities were focused, specific needs requested by the Board to be addressed through legislative action by the General Assembly and the Governor. He said that they serve as a means for the Board of Supervisors to communicate with each of the members of the local delegation about local priorities for legislation or delegated authority.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the Board had prioritized three objectives, presented in order of the Board's adoption. He said that the first priority was to secure state funding for the County's Rivanna Futures project. He said that although he would skip discussing this priority now, he reminded them that it was the Board's top priority.

Mr. Rosenberg said that priority number two involved a familiar topic for Senator Deeds and others who had been monitoring the County's legislative endeavors over the past several years. He said that it was to grant the County taxing authority for school division capital projects. He said that presently, nine counties and one city possess this authority under state code, which were Charlotte, Gloucester, Halifax, Henry, Mecklenburg, Northampton, Patrick, and Pittsylvania are the counties, while Danville was the city.

Mr. Creigh Deeds said that he believed they would get that bill on the Governor's desk, but the only question was whether he would sign it or not. He said that they would probably do a statewide bill.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the history of the bill involved its failure in the House committee last year before reaching the Senate. He said it was passed and then failed in committee on the House side. He said that there were two distinct approaches. He said that one was to add the County to the list of currently authorized localities, and the other was to amend the code so that every locality in the Commonwealth had the option. He acknowledged that under the current statutory scheme, it required a local referendum to implement whatever authority was granted. He said, presumably, whatever bill was

presented to the Governor would have the same requirement. He said that under the current scheme, the authority to impose that additional 1% tax would expire 20 years after the initiation of the referendum.

Mr. Deeds said that the first one of these bills originated from Jimmy Edmunds, a Republican delegate representing Halifax County. He said that initially, many people doubted that Halifax County had sufficient retail business to generate enough funds for constructing a school. He said that however, they managed to build a new high school using the collected money. He noted that most of the Counties where this bill was enacted were governed by Republican delegates and senators. He said that only one referendum did not pass, which was Pittsylvania County. He said that the result was close, and after a reattempt, it eventually passed. He said the bill had been stalled by a Republican subcommittee within the House of Delegates.

Mr. Deeds said that it was a priority for both Charlottesville and Albemarle County, and Amherst County expressed their desire for it last week. He said that last year, they had attempted to take a broader approach by including the issue in the budget, which allowed them additional weeks to discuss it. He said that the conference committee transformed it into several months, and they were unable to reach an agreement. He said that this time, he believed that they could get a bill on the Governor's desk, and adopting a statewide approach would be more beneficial.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the third priority was to expand the County's authority to use photo speed monitoring devices. He said this had been a recurring priority of the Board. He said that last year, it was the subject of legislation introduced by Delegate Hudson, which failed in committee. He mentioned that there were concerns regarding this priority. He said that one issue was that in a prior session in 2020, the County was granted more limited authority to install these devices in school zones and school crossing zones and highway work zones.

Mr. Rosenberg said that as a result, there had been some reluctance among members of the delegation or the General Assembly to expand this authority when the County had not yet commenced its efforts to implement the existing authority. He said that the legislation for school crossing zones and highway work zones was enacted in the 2020 session. He said that earlier this year, the Board of Supervisors enacted a local ordinance to implement their authority, and the County was currently in the process of procuring a contract with a vendor to facilitate the establishment of a speed enforcement program as authorized in those zones.

Mr. Rosenberg said that he anticipated that sometime in the next several months, a contract would be awarded, equipment would be installed, and the program would be functioning. He said that the desire of the Board was to expand the authority so it would apply to segments of secondary roads that had posted speeds of 35 miles per hour or higher, which were selected based on speeding, crash, and fatality data, supporting the need for additional enforcement.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the rationale for these devices was to promote public safety by providing broader enforcement of speed limits and ensuring the safety of law enforcement officers who were called upon to make traffic stops on dangerous road segments. He added that the use of technology would allow law enforcement officers to focus on other critical police work.

Ms. Laufer said that she submitted this in a pre-file. She said that she had heard two concerns, one of them being the school zone issue. She asked when they would be active.

Mr. Rosenberg said that at the latest it would be the beginning of the next school year.

Ms. Laufer said that the other concern she had heard about secondary roads with a speed limit of 35 miles per hour or more not being sufficient. She said that people would like to see it implemented in more locations. She said that she had pre-filed the bill using the exact same language as before.

Mr. Rosenberg said that he had no doubt that the Board would welcome a broader scope than what had been requested.

Ms. Laufer asked what the broader issues the police department could potentially use this for. She said that she believed that Mr. Rosenberg had mentioned they might use it for something else.

Mr. Rosenberg said that he had suggested that if they had these devices available, it would free up personnel to tend to other critical police work.

Ms. Laufer thanked Mr. Rosenberg for the clarification.

Mr. Rosenberg said that they also had the legislative positions and policy statements adopted by the Board of Supervisors. He said that the three priorities already discussed were specific requests for legislation to be enacted by the General Assembly. He said the positions and policy statements were broad statements regarding direction and support for policy areas that could be addressed through legislation or other means, including study or funding. He said that legislative positions and policy statements were used during the legislative session, especially by County staff, to respond to inquiries by the local delegation to inform their decision-making.

Mr. Rosenberg said that to provide an example of how these documents were helpful, during the session, they received calls from VACo (Virginia Association of Counties), VML (Virginia Municipal League), and legislative assistants, asking what are the County's thoughts on a particular bill that had

been introduced by another member of the General Assembly, someone who is not a member of the local delegation. He said that staff found it difficult to get a sense of the Board between Board meetings and represent what they heard as an official position of the Board of Supervisors. He said that staff used legislative positions and policy statements to guide them in responding to inquiries from various associations during the session.

Mr. Rosenberg said that three of the positions and policy statements had been accorded higher priority than all others, which were legislative priorities from prior years when the Board sought legislation. He said that instead of focusing on multiple priorities, the Board now had a more targeted approach with only three specific asks. He said that these former priorities were shifted to positions and policy statements but given higher priority.

Mr. Rosenberg said that these three items included provisions for legislation that would enable localities to establish a schedule of civil penalties in lieu of criminal punishment for violations of certain local ordinances, as well as a provision for legislation that would enable localities to further regulate short-term rentals by imposing specific conditions. He said finally, there was a provision allowing local public bodies to hold all meetings virtually without the limitations currently present in the Freedom of Information Act. He said that there was a limitation on the number of meetings per year for which this could occur.

Mr. Rosenberg said that removing these restrictions and allowing localities to conduct virtual or remote participation meetings as frequently as they choose, provided they adhered to all other requirements for electronic communication meetings, would be beneficial. He said that they would be looking for opportunities to support legislation proposed by others that may achieve these particular positions, which have been accorded priority status. He said that there were relatively minor updates to other positions and statements previously adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Laufer asked if they could provide some examples of civil penalties. She said that upon reading the document earlier, she was curious about what it meant.

Mr. Rosenberg said that as he read through it, he realized that he needed examples. He said that he had some examples, but not with him. He said that he could provide them later.

Mr. Deeds said that this was a bill he introduced, or someone else introduced, two or three years ago, and it did not progress far. He said that he did not remember what the opposition was regarding the civil penalties issue. He said that the Freedom of Information Act had its detractors as well; both Democrats and Republicans disliked the bill. He said that very few people felt strongly loyal to him, only one or two individuals in the room, and everyone else voted against it.

Ms. Callsen said that Delegate Elizabeth Bennett-Parker highlighted expanding access to virtual meetings as one of her top priorities. She said that the language she had in mind did not refer to all public meetings being held virtually. She said that she anticipated that Delegate Bennett-Parker would introduce legislation addressing this issue, focusing on granting more flexibility for authorities, commissions, and committees to hold meetings.

Ms. Price said that for the civil penalties one, and as Senator Deeds mentioned, it was essentially like a minor transgression that was currently subject to being a misdemeanor prosecution and conviction. She said that they proposed a tiered level of civil penalties as an option that the local jurisdiction could determine whether they felt it was more appropriate to proceed under criminal or civil.

Mr. Price said that it would be tiered, with a lower fine for the first violation, a slightly higher fine for the second, and a higher fine for the third. She said that however, at any time, the local jurisdiction could pursue criminal prosecution. She said that she had been a strong advocate of this approach due to her observation of the over-criminalization of minor behavior conduct and the significant ramifications for an individual with criminal convictions compared to civil infractions.

Ms. Price said that it would be flexible, tiered, and optional. She said that they did not mandate the use of civil infractions but provided an opportunity to do so. She explained that these systems aimed to address two issues. She said that first, poor individuals who could not afford certain actions faced zoning violations, resulting in criminal convictions. She said that secondly, these minor offenses clog up the legal system when they did not need to be classified as criminal.

Mr. Rosenberg said that there were other subject areas in which the issue arose, and he had compiled a list. He said that he would email it to them separately for their reference.

Ms. Mallek said they had faced challenges in obtaining judicial support for a criminal conviction due to what appeared to be an excessive situation. She said that this issue had significantly increased their success rate.

Ms. Price said that the measure enabled enforcement without overwhelming the courts or having them refuse to impose a criminal conviction for a minor offense. She said that it provided an alternative means of enforcing the law.

Mr. Rosenberg said that Mr. Trevor Henry, Deputy County Executive, would provide further information about the first priority regarding Rivanna Futures.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Deputy County Executive, said before diving into Rivanna Station and the

Rivanna Futures Project, it was beneficial to provide an overview of the location. He said that Rivanna Station was a sub-installation of Fort Belvoir, an Army base in Northern Virginia. He said that the garrison commander of Fort Belvoir, currently Colonel Messina, had responsibility for the Rivanna Station installation. He said that as a sub-installation, it lacked some infrastructure and amenities found in a typical installation or base.

Mr. Henry said that it primarily housed office buildings and a child development center. He noted that these office buildings were at a very high security level, featuring secure spaces and conducting high-level intelligence work. He said that it was within a fence line, but Rivanna Station did not have basic public works facilities such as its own police force or hospital/medical services. He said that it served as a highly secured office space for supporting the intelligence mission.

Ms. Price clarified that SCIF stands for Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility, which referred to the highest classification of classified and sensitive information held by their government. She explained that essentially, it was like a safe.

Mr. Henry said that it was approximately a two-to-two-and-a-half-hour drive from the National Capital Region. He said that it was considered a coop site in some ways, representing a continuity of operations. He said that if something untoward were to happen in the D.C. or Pentagon area, this was where a lot of the intelligence activity happened today, and it would be relied upon for the nation. He said that Rivanna Station currently housed three entities, which were the National Ground Intelligence Center (NGIC), which was Army ground intelligence; the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency (NGA), which provided maps to the intelligence community; and the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA).

Mr. Henry said that NGIC was primarily Army, while DIA provided support and services to their armed forces and allies. He said that they knew that this facility was important to them as a community. He said that locally, there was something called a Defense Affairs Committee, which supported military and veterans in their region. He said that the Board of Supervisors several years ago funded a position through their Chamber of Commerce to support that work, but they did an economic development study and the state had done analysis of the impacts of defense in Virginia, which was significant.

Mr. Henry said that they felt that it was understated for their region. He said that to address this, funding through the County, City, and UVA supported a Weldon Cooper study on economic development in the spring. He said that the result showed that in their region, Albemarle County, Charlottesville, and Greene generated \$1.2 billion dollars annually, making it number two in their region. He said that UVA had a significantly higher impact, with approximately \$7 to \$8 billion, which made it an economic engine for their region. He said that Rivanna Station alone contributed 50% of the \$1.2 billion.

Mr. Henry said that since his work with Mr. Richardson in the County Executive's Office dating back to 2018, he had become more involved in supporting defense in their region. He said that they had developed a strong relationship with the Secretary of Veteran and Defense Affairs Office at the state level. He said that Mr. Richardson and he had visited the office frequently and met with Secretary Crenshaw multiple times. He said that their efforts had contributed to the progress they had made so far.

Mr. Henry said that since 2018, the Veteran and Defense Affairs Office began conducting SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analyses for all defense institutions and bases in the state. He said that they had completed this task at least three times, including a recent analysis at Rivanna Station in May. He said that representatives from Rivanna Station, stakeholders, and elected officials, such as Mr. Richardson and himself, attended the meeting. He said that during the meeting they identified areas of focus. He said that Secretary Crenshaw's office planned to publish this work in the fall, which would be submitted to the General Assembly. He said that there would be an opportunity for others to see the most recent update.

Mr. Henry stated that he wanted to share this because it created awareness and a sense of urgency in their locality, the Executive office, and their Board many years ago. He explained that the opportunity was there for addressing the needs for growth within their intelligence community that were not being met throughout the nation. He said that they saw this as an opportunity there. He said that there was a master plan that considered both off-site and onsite expansions and eventually landed on an onsite addition to the SCIF, which would be completed next fall at an estimated cost of \$90 million.

Mr. Henry said that in total, the military had invested around \$312 million in this site, so it was important for them. He also said they learned about concerns regarding encroachment, a problem they might be familiar with. He said that encroachment by bad actors and unsuitable development adjacent to the site threatened all military bases across the nation. He said that encroachment was identified as a clear and present concern, highlighting a weakness in force protection.

Mr. Henry said that Belvoir, located two hours away, did not possess all of the necessary on-base infrastructure for protection. He said that he spent five hours this morning with their senior police, fire, and rescue representatives meeting with Fort Belvoir and Rivanna Station reps discussing emergency response procedures, working on memoranda of agreement, and ensuring that they were as prepared as possible in case an incident occurred on base. He said that part of this work involved recognizing the importance of preserving and protecting the mission. He said that with the military, missions could always change.

Mr. Henry mentioned a base realignment several years ago, which led to the growth of Rivanna Station that they could see today. He said that they wanted to ensure that they had done everything in

their power to protect and preserve the mission. He said that this work began before the pandemic and resumed over a year ago with the guidance and support of their Board to explore what actions they could take as a locality to acquire land that would safeguard, defend, and maintain the existing function, which generated half a billion dollars annually for the economy, and what they could do to help facilitate the growth of this mission.

Mr. Henry said that Mr. J.T. Newberry would discuss some aspects of what this growth might entail. He said that for their reference, Seminole Trail was at the top of the image, and that north was to the right. He said that Boulders Road connected to Route 29, approximately a mile and a half up from UVA's North Fork, formerly known as the Research Park, near the airport. He said that the entire salmon-colored area represented the existing Rivanna Station, which spanned 75 acres. He said that it was enclosed within a secure perimeter and fence line.

Mr. Henry said that the fluorescent green rectangle in the image denoted a commercial building owned by an LLC. He said that the Army and DIA had four floors in that structure, housing staff, primarily contractors, but this space lay outside the defense line, so it was not within the secured area. He said that the building itself, however, had security within it, and that is how they managed that. He said that everything else was a single landowner.

Mr. Henry said that they developed a strategy internally, working with their Board, working with the Veteran Affairs Office, and negotiated through a blind LLC with a single landowner, and were able to land a contract based on affordability and trying to maximize the property that resulted in securing 462 acres at \$58 million. He said that they felt having site control of the land was the most critical part for being able to make all of this work, not just relying on future possibilities.

Mr. Henry said that he was happy to say that half of this land was in their development area, which meant they would be able to build it out in accordance with their Comprehensive Plan. He said that they would have to do a little bit of work on zoning to make sure everything was copacetic. He said that there were significant growth opportunities for this site along this corridor related to technology and defense. He said that the rest of the acreage, which he referred to as beautiful area with lakes and more natural areas, they were working in a rural area, and they thought that would continue to be an amenity but also provide a standoff distance that the Department of Defense was looking for.

Mr. Henry said that the slide he had before handing it off to Mr. Newberry was about performing due diligence. He said that the Board approved the contract publicly at the end of May. He said that they had been working diligently internally with staff and consultants to ensure that the land was buildable as they believed it to be. He said that they conducted all the tests one would do when purchasing a home, completing such work to confirm that it checked all the boxes for that purpose. He said that they carried out environmental assessments and other related tasks.

Mr. Henry said that they were in the process of finalizing details, dotting the i's and crossing the t's. He said that it was now in their attorney's hands to proceed toward closing. He said that next week, they would discuss the timing of this event further with their Board. He said that they were on a path leading to closing, where soon they would be the neighbor and partner to operate the station.

Mr. Deeds asked if they would be closing on the property next week.

Mr. Rosenberg said that they hoped to.

Mr. Deeds said that he thought the property was being purchased primarily to protect the NGIS. He asked if they planned to develop a portion of that property.

Mr. Henry confirmed that they were. He said that Mr. Newberry would discuss the topic further in a moment.

Mr. J.T. Newberry, Deputy Director of Economic Development, said that he would explain more about the vision for the future development adjacent to Rivanna Station. He said that he would provide a brief orientation using a 3D rendering of one of the earlier maps provided by the state through the Secretary of Veteran and Defense Affairs. He said that the map included approximately 600,000 square feet of additional development in phase one. He said that the anticipated occupants and tenants of this space were private sector users, academic users, as well as public sector, state, and federal users. He said that to ensure clarity on proximity, the existing Rivanna Station was 75 acres, and the phase one expansion was approximately 50 acres, about 600,000 square feet. He said they would examine the economic impact of this development shortly.

Mr. Deeds asked which building would not be a part of the transaction.

Mr. Newberry said that the privately held commercial space referred to a specific parcel that was indicated on the map. He said that before discussing its economic impact, it was essential to establish a connection with the state level. He said that the Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP) was an office they frequently worked with. He said that they were currently updating their economic development strategic plan, which they called their innovative framework. He said that the target sectors where VEDP saw future job growth in Virginia were knowledge, work, manufacturing, and logistics. He said that this space was well-suited for at least two of these three sectors, which were knowledge, work, and manufacturing.

Mr. Newberry said that when Virginia aimed to achieve its ambitious goals of becoming a leader in the country for job growth and economic activity, this opportunity could help defend and extend the gains it had made in the federal presence of investment related to the military. He said that another aspect of VEDP's innovative framework was the shift toward ecosystems, where they aimed to facilitate all the necessary inputs required to fuel job growth. He said that their area was particularly well-suited for investment decisions, especially in areas related to talent and capital. He said that they had 8,500 graduates from PVCC (Piedmont Virginia Community College) and UVA annually, providing a pipeline of talent for this growth.

Mr. Newberry said that they had different tracking mechanisms for DIA activity, and for venture capital and angel investments in local businesses that were growing. He said that throughout the process of socializing this opportunity, it had been consistently emphasized that meeting tomorrow's defense challenges required collaboration among academic, private sector, and public sector entities to compete with global interests not aligned with their national security.

Mr. Newberry said that the specific economic impact of the initial 50 acres in phase one was expected to be approximately \$135 million annually. He said that according to their analysis, the average wage was slightly lower than what had been observed in the Weldon Cooper Center study. He said that part of that was because it included those manufacturing and academic jobs, but they knew that defense employees starting at Rivanna Station today were starting with salaries of six figures. He said that there would be nearly 900 jobs in the initial phase.

Mr. Newberry said that Mr. Henry mentioned that they had approximately 232 acres in total, and the image displayed on the slide showed what the future expansion could look like, which would be at least a doubling of the initial economic impact that they measured. He said that it was an additional 150 acres and up to 1.2 million square feet of space for these types of uses.

Mr. Newberry said that he would break down the information provided by their engineers during due diligence prior to closing on the site. He said that they would be doing a Comprehensive Plan, master plan, and rezoning amendment planning for the future extension of Boulders Road. He said that currently, Boulders Road culminated at the commercially owned office space. He said they would then be looking at clearing and grading that 50 acres and conducting additional studies to ensure that the intersections with Route 29 on both the south side and the north side were adequately suited for the anticipated traffic.

Mr. Newberry said that this partnership model had had success around the country, and they could examine other innovation hubs in Huntsville, Alabama, San Diego, and in various sectors such as biotech, which had a significant presence there, areas like Boston, there was a mix of partnership and collaboration that led to the large opportunity they had been describing.

Mr. Newberry said that the County had focused on site control to ensure that they preserved the opportunity and adjacencies were protected. He said that they were now transitioning into the site development phase. He said that before handing over to County Executive Jeff Richardson, their region was highly enthusiastic about this opportunity. He said that they already had an existing ecosystem, including the Defense Affairs Committee, as Mr. Henry mentioned, which was through the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Newberry said that they had been meeting with the City of Charlottesville and Greene County. He said that Greene County had already adopted a defense production overlay zone, which they were also interested in investigating further. He said that they were not just talking about the 462 acres on the east side of Route 29. He said that immediately across the street, many of them would be familiar with North Fork, UVA's Discovery Park, which was 562 acres.

Mr. Newberry said that 40% of their tenants there were related to the defense industry. So, they saw a tremendous opportunity in Greene County, around Ruckersville there was an additional 500 acres of space. He said that they were looking at about 1,500 acres and an 8-mile corridor where some special things could really be happening that they were excited about.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that they were close to wrapping up and turning it over to the delegation for questions. He said that he wanted to take a moment to discuss this because it was interesting that Mr. Henry mentioned where they were one week ago today. He said that one week ago today, they were wrapping up with U.S. Senator Mark Warner and had just walked him through this process for 45 minutes, sat around a table with a big map, and talked about the process.

Mr. Richardson said that with all due respect, they did not just ask, and wanted to share with them not only what happened one week ago today but also specifically if their Senator remembered where he was in 2005, 18 years ago, when he was Governor, he came to Charlottesville because he was really concerned during BRAC, base relocation and closure. He said that he was specifically concerned about losing Rivanna Station.

Mr. Richardson said that he was worried that they would lose 3,000 staff, 300 military, and 2,700 civilians connected to three intelligence agencies in Washington, D.C., with really good paying jobs in their community. He said that these individuals were good citizens, and they were good community members, and they bought homes, and their kids went to their schools, and they participated in things, and they were good for their economy. He said that he reminded the U.S. Senator that he was there in 2005, and he was so concerned about encroachment, and he said that they needed to do something.

Mr. Richardson said that the punchline was that encroachment was no longer an issue because this Board of Supervisors had purchased the property and removed encroachment off the table. He said that Rivanna Station was now secure and would remain so in the foreseeable future. He said that it was one of the few military bases on the eastern seaboard that could expand without being landlocked, which was important for them to know, because in Washington, D.C., at the Department of Defense level, money was being invested into intelligence.

Mr. Richardson said that they were preparing themselves for this shift in focus. He said that they might ask what it was specifically that the County needed for them to do; he would discuss that shortly. He said that after gaining site control and owning the property, they decided to fully develop its potential. He said that this did not happen overnight but was the result of significant effort leading up to it. He said that once site control was established, preparations for site readiness followed. He said that Mr. Newberry talked about that, and then finally, vertical development. He said that the County's partners were obvious, out of Washington D.C. and the Department of Defense, how the County was going to grow this campus, which was ideally located two hours away from Washington, D.C.

Mr. Richardson said that executives at the DIA frequently traveled to D.C. for meetings and returned home to Albemarle County. He explained that they chose this location because it offered convenience due to its proximity to Washington, D.C., while still being outside the Beltway and Beltline, providing a different quality of life. He said that Albemarle County was a preferred location because of what it offered.

Mr. Richardson said that in August, they met with Secretary Crenshaw and four other secretariats to discuss their opportunities and ensure they had site control. He said that from 2005 to 2023, there was significant concern at the state level about how to prevent encroachment and maintain the base's presence. He said that they had taken that off the table, and now, they must transition from defense to offense, acknowledging that this endeavor would be both a sprint and a marathon.

Mr. Richardson said that they discussed this with Veterans Affairs and Commerce during a tour. He said that they began at North Fork to address the matter, as they did today, and subsequently proceeded to a windshield tour inside the fence line. He said that they had examined what currently existed and identified potential opportunities for the future.

Mr. Richardson said that scheduling was underway for an imminent meeting with the Governor and the chief of staff in their office, as they were eager to learn more about this. He said that they would be discussing a state investment as a durable partner. He said that in the world of site readiness, they had to have infrastructure investments. He said that securing the site was step one, and step two involved investing in infrastructure to prepare the site for partnership development. He said that this process encompassed not only their durable partners at state and federal levels but also included private sector involvement and academic institutions.

Mr. Richardson said that University of Virginia and Virginia Tech, both of which they had met with in that room, had expressed significant interest. He said that Virginia Tech had workforce development contracts with seven out of the 13 intelligence agencies in the Department of Defense. He said that this opportunity was exceptional for their community. He said that today's objective was to make the delegation aware that this initiative was the County's top priority, and to provide a little information about it, and insight into its alignment with state and federal partners. He said that they sought support, and they were there to address any questions or concerns that they might have.

Mr. Deeds asked what had been asked of Mr. Warner.

Mr. Richardson said they asked Mr. Warner to support and to convene at the federal level. He said that it was managed from the bottom up in Albemarle County. He said that they had connections with all three defense agencies, and he knew they were connected to the state.

Mr. Deeds asked if they asked him for money.

Mr. Richardson said no.

Mr. Deeds asked if when speaking with the Governor's staff and the agencies if they talked to them about inclusion in the Governor's budget proposal.

Mr. Richardson said yes. He said they had talked specifically to the Secretariat and their secretaries regarding a significant match on infrastructure to help them with site readiness. He said that they were specifically talking to commerce, trade, and VDOT.

Mr. Deeds asked how much money they had asked them for.

Mr. Richardson said \$58 million.

Mr. Deeds said that last year, during the budget proposal, there were items included in the Governor's budget, such as parks, that he had not anticipated being considered. He said that they were now in a normal budget year without any additional federal COVID funds, so finances would be tight this year. He said that \$58 million was significant. He said that they had done money in two different ways for sites. He said that in 2005, with the BRAC. He said that he did not complete his election until December 22, and that he knew exactly what he was doing in 2005. He said in those days, they were concerned

about development around Oceana.

Mr. Deeds said that they provided match funding to Virginia Beach for purchasing certain tracts. He said that that was aimed at creating a buffer zone and was not going to be developed. He said that it was to buy houses, tear them down, and establish a protective area around Oceana. He said that they contributed funds for site development. He said that they were telling him that they would do both things: protect the property but also develop it. He asked how it was going to work. He asked how much of the acreage would actually be a buffer and how much of it would be developed.

Mr. Richardson said that in the early stages, once they closed on the property, they were going to create a master plan and talk about the compatibility with the three intelligence agencies in the federal government. He said that they would also collaborate with state officials. He said that the 232 acres in the development zone would not be used for military or intelligence assistance purposes. He said that there were numerous opportunities to utilize the development area for a lot of different things. He said that staff had met with Rivanna Station representatives and believed that, through partnerships, they may enhance the surrounding area over time, making it more vibrant and beneficial for all parties involved.

Mr. Deeds asked if they needed a buffer zone around the growth area.

Mr. Henry said that the infrastructure development would be coordinated with DoD and existing agencies to assess the growth potential. He said that in their packet, they found a one-page document, which included an image depicting the possible development area. He said that the image represented the state's vision of the project, known as an art of the possibility. He said that it reflected input from agencies in 2014 through 2017 regarding a potential extension.

Mr. Henry said that they believed it would involve a fence line extension, additional classified SCIF space, and an unclassified academic area with a campus setting. He said that this development would serve as a buffer around much of the facility while supporting existing missions.

Ms. Price said it would not be that the property would simply be available to the highest bidder. She said that instead, it would involve controlled development and determining which entities would be allowed within that property. She said that this approach not only provided a buffer but also enhanced gross economic development in industries such as biotechnology, research, and others related to this intelligence area they had there.

Ms. Price noted that out of the 15 military installations in Virginia, this was the only one that was not restricted by other properties, and now they had successfully protected it. She said that a year or so ago, St. Louis was offering an attractive package deal to relocate Rivanna Station to St. Louis; however, they had managed to protect it and keep it here.

Mr. Deeds said that a future Board could potentially extend up to the fence line. He asked if there were any measures in place to prevent this from occurring.

Ms. Price said that certain actions could be taken.

Mr. Deeds said that there were steps that could be taken, but he wanted to know if these actions had already been taken.

Ms. Mallek asked if Mr. Newberry could discuss the defense overlay.

Mr. Newberry said that part of the Comprehensive Plan, Master Plan, and rezoning process would include the regulations that would govern future development within the purchase area. He said that they would be working closely together, as Deputy County Executive Henry had said, working closely with their partners to ensure any future development was entirely complementary and welcome.

Mr. Newberry said that the map included in the handout lacked a legend. He said that it was worth mentioning that the waffled area, the hatched area in white represented the total purchase area, and the area highlighted in yellow denoted their development area. He said that there were 230 acres, and nearly exactly half of it would be preserved in rural areas.

Mr. Deeds said that that was important. He said that he was just concerned, as all he knew was what he had read in the newspaper. He said that he had believed they were primarily interested in providing a buffer.

Ms. Price said that it was both.

Mr. Deeds said that in their plan, they could develop up to the fence line.

Ms. Price said that it was only if it was compatible with the protection of Rivanna Station. She said that they were nearing the end of their due diligence period, and they had decided that it was indeed an appropriate time to purchase the property, and they now shifted into the Comprehensive Plan for its development, which would involve addressing security aspects, such as what could be developed in addition to the buffer, which would consist of green space and similar features.

Ms. Mallek said that in 2008, the rough number of contractor tail jobs, referring to individuals working within the community but not based on site, was approximately 10,000. She said that this figure

has since decreased due to better-defined connections. She said she would not proceed with this plan unless it safeguarded the mission and did not get in the way. She said that she did not support establishments such as Walmart, dollar stores, or similar businesses, and that was not on the table at all.

Ms. McKeel said that she believed the term “development” could be confusing to some extent due to various interpretations. She said that they employed the word “development,” referring to a highly specific type that aligned with what the defense department was undertaking. She said that there were examples of this in other places.

Ms. Callsen asked what the standard buffer zone was. She said that upon examination, she found that this particular buffer did not fully encircle the property. She said that in relation to the development, some areas had an established rural buffer, while others directly bordered the boundary. She said she was curious about the definition of a buffer and the recommended buffer. She said that she was unsure if there was a standard for it or if it simply referred to having space around the area.

Mr. Henry said that the concern that was raised and articulated through their work with the state and their SWOT analysis was the adjacent development of standard commercial retail where bad actors operated.

Mr. Henry said that it could be human intelligence and other forms of signal intelligence were important. He said that the DoD had recognized County ownership as a significant advantage. He said that with this partnership, they could extend existing functions more effectively. He said that they would have a role in any future developments. He said that considering a hypothetical scenario, if Northrop Grumman or Boeing wanted to establish a training site, they would ensure minimal conflict and appropriate function alignment, such as technology and DoD support.

Ms. Price said that years ago, Long Beach Naval Station faced significant risks due to a Chinese company purchasing a large pier section directly across from the installation, jeopardizing its security. She said that the primary objectives would be to prevent such occurrences and ensure that any development within the area is compatible with defense industry uses. She said that by “compatible uses,” she meant industrial applications that aligned with the defense sector, which encompassed not only tanks and planes but also artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and other related fields.

Ms. Callsen said that Senator Deeds’ point was whether this partnership was simply formed due to relationships with the state, the Army, and the military, or if there was a contractual agreement in place for managing the property’s future.

Ms. Laufer asked if they had the right of first refusal.

Ms. Callsen asked if they had a say in what was going on.

Mr. Richardson said that the master planning process was critical for local government in having site control as they moved forward with existing infrastructure. He said that with 3,000 staff members, the site remained highly active today. He emphasized that it was essential to continue working with them to understand their needs and partner with them to maximize the footprint and facilitate growth.

Mr. Richardson mentioned that one of the key initiatives was the opening of a \$90 million SCIF space in the fall, which was being constructed due to demand. He said that they would all be invited to the ribbon-cutting ceremony whenever it took place, projected for November next year. He explained that this approach had been learned through windshield tours and assessing compatibility.

Ms. Callsen said that she did not envy Mr. Rosenberg, who had the task of figuring everything out. She said that she could imagine a scenario at some point where there might be competing interests, where there was a business that would be incredibly profitable and drive a great amount of economic development for the County but would be really easy for the military to say that it would be a pain for them to have that there, so they would turn it down. She asked how they would navigate that should it come up. She said that she was just trying to get a better understanding of everything.

Mr. Newberry explained that they had learned about the Virginia Business Ready Sites Program, which Senator Deeds was familiar with. He said that they were currently implementing a \$3 million grant across the street at North Fork to prepare land for development there. He said that it included a performance agreement with the state and the VEDP, stipulating that for 10 years, the uses must align with an innovative framework. He said that if the County ever rezoned it to something not commercial or industrial, there would be clawback provisions for any funds that had been allocated.

Mr. Rosenberg said that he wanted to draw attention to the slide, as it contained a rather lengthy term: the Intelligence and National Security Innovation Acceleration Campus. He said that he was not certain if these words were used to describe the concept earlier, but they did effectively convey its purpose. He said that the project was not merely an economic development initiative; instead, it aimed to collaborate with federal and state governments in developing assets that were closely aligned with Rivanna’s current mission for the long term. He said that the private sector and academic partners, as mentioned by Mr. Richardson earlier, would often have existing relationships with the ongoing activities at Rivanna Station, making them well-suited to align with this initiative.

Mr. Richardson said that he recalled when they were in a meeting with representatives from 11 different departments at the University of Virginia. He said that during the meeting, they discussed the

connections between these departments and Rivanna Station. He said that the University of Virginia was actively supporting research, particularly in biotechnology, and had an existing relationship with Rivanna Station. He said that in contrast, when they spoke to Virginia Tech, their focus was on workforce development for intelligence agencies in Washington, where they had contracts with seven agencies. He said that there was growth and interest in growth within this area.

Ms. Mallek said that Phil Roberts, the former and founding head of DIA and Rivanna Station, had consistently sought to recruit other agencies to this location. She said that this had been a priority for the DoD since 9/11 due to the serious nature of the blast zone and the need for continuity of operations. She said that smaller agencies required relocation to a secure area where they could continue functioning despite any circumstances. She said that there may be other agencies on the extensive list that could join once space became available for them.

Ms. Mallek said that Phil Roberts, the former and founding head of DIA and Rivanna Station, had consistently sought to recruit other agencies to this location. She said that this had been a priority for the Department of Defense since 9/11 due to the serious nature of the blast zone and the need for continuity of operations. She said that smaller agencies required relocation to a secure area where they could continue functioning despite any circumstances. She said that there may be other agencies on the extensive list that could join once space became available for them.

Mr. Deeds asked if the development they were discussing would be only government entities or their contractors.

Ms. McKeel said yes, exactly.

Ms. Mallek said that it was important to know what the questions were to be able to tell the story more clearly.

Mr. Deeds said that if they made an attempt at this, they had to be able to. He said that there were some hard questions to ask. He said that in the past, he acknowledged that there was funding for BRAC and it was clear what they were doing—creating buffer zones around Oceana Air Base. He said that none of that property would be developed; instead, it would be fenced. He said that they demolished several houses in the area. He said that the state had allocated a significant amount of funds for site development for economic growth.

Ms. Price said that this was a different model.

Mr. Richardson said that it was just a different model. He said that when he took the windshield tour and was beside PJ Rooney from NGIC, she informed him that 80% of Rivanna Station's funding comes through the intelligence side of the DoD, not the military side. He emphasized that there were 3,000 people out there, including 300 military personnel and 2,700 civilian intelligence analysts. He said that this information was important to understanding the makeup at Rivanna Station, as its funding comes from the federal government through the DoD.

Mr. Richardson mentioned that one of the Board members brought up St. Louis. He said that this footprint existed throughout the United States and had been established across the country. He said that it was not a new or innovative concept; rather, it represented good economic development by aligning appropriate and compatible uses to maximize the footprint from an economic development standpoint. He said that several years ago, St. Louis was expanding and offering land for free to attract DoD-related agencies. He said that they were concerned that they might lose Rivanna Station in its current form. He said that their efforts had been both defensive and offensive.

Ms. Laufer asked if the County had ever developed sites before. She said that it seemed that if this was to be implemented, they were creating a site plan for another entity to utilize. She said that it appeared that the responsibility fell on the taxpayers of Albemarle County to develop a site for someone else's use. She asked if this was a better approach than those used in the past. She said that she could not help but wonder if some people might ask, if they were planning to relocate their business here, would they have been the ones to have the site work done.

Ms. Price said that she believed Albemarle County would not be operating the earth-moving equipment at that level; however, as Mr. Newberry mentioned, they were currently working on a business site development readiness project at North Fork. She said that within their area of expertise, yes, they could accomplish this task, but they would not exceed those limits. She said that it was similar to what they did with broadband. She said that their excellent broadband office had contributed to enhancing the area, but they did not actually run an Internet Service Provider (ISP).

Ms. Laufer asked if they were planning to purchase this next week, which would cost approximately \$58 million and were also requesting \$58 million in funding from the state for the site development. She asked if they could provide more precise details.

Mr. Newberry said that he would like to go back to the slide displaying the \$51 million cost estimate. He said that this particular slide discussed the breakdown of estimated costs from their engineering firm for phase one development. He said that the amount did not include any vertical construction expenses and was solely for pad preparation. He said that they had envisioned that they would have several existing public-private partnerships, and they would collaborate with a private development partner to handle the physical vertical construction.

Ms. Laufer said that she understood that. She asked if they were seeking state funds to prepare the site or to purchase the site.

Ms. Price said that the number was coincidental. She said that it was not that they needed the state to buy the land. She said that the County was buying the land and they needed help with site development.

Ms. Laufer asked if the County had done this before for other developments.

Mr. Henry said that he had dinner with Colonel Messina, the commanding officer responsible for Belvoir Station, almost a year ago. He said that during their conversation, Mr. Richardson asked what would be something related to Rivanna Station that could aid in their work. He said that Colonel Messina expressed concerns about base resiliency and security. He said that two key areas of improvement were dual sources of power and completing the road to enhance ingress and egress.

Mr. Henry said that they did not anticipate it being \$36 million two years ago. He said that the figure included construction costs, collaboration with VDOT, and their experiences in other parts of the County. He said that it was a one-mile extension that required a bridge. He said that this number would enhance the security and resiliency of the existing facility while also allowing for potential expansion of the campus if it becomes feasible.

Ms. Price said that there had been an increase in the high-voltage power lines entering the region. She noted that they had recently authorized a substantial solar installation within the County, which ensured energy stability. She said that all of these elements were coming together to contribute to this, which amounted to \$1.2 billion. She said that \$600 million was currently present, and if they lost it, they would suffer significant losses. She said that if they safeguarded and developed it, they stood to gain considerably more.

Ms. Laufer said that she wholeheartedly concurred with Ms. Price and believed that the proposal was exceptional. She said that one potential question others might raise could be unexpected, such as the fact that the military itself was not acquiring the property.

Ms. Mallek said that both the 2014 and 2018 analyses had shown that all the generals in the room repeatedly emphasized that localities must initiate action. She said that the state then came into play, followed by the federal government. She said that this had been the standard operating procedure, and it was a shock to her, and they tried for many years to change this approach without success. She said that was just how it worked. She said that they managed to reach a point where they could take that first crucial step. She said that regarding Boulders Road, the \$36 million allocated for this purpose for 20 years had been aimed at relocating the Guard House to Route 29 to prevent incidental drivers from accessing the interior of the project.

Ms. McKeel said that they wanted community support and vested interest, which was unsurprising.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she would simply state that this pertained not only to the support for military security but also cybersecurity and other related matters. She said that approximately five to six months ago, there were some bad actors who purchased land surrounding Edwards Air Force Base in California. She said that an LLC from Maryland claimed ownership of the property; however, authorities could not determine the true owner. She said that the Justice Department was now investigating and attempting to identify the owner of the LLC, as they suspect it may not be individuals or countries with a reputable standing.

Mr. Deeds said that the buffer made perfect sense, but he found the development somewhat surprising. He said that he could not speak for everyone, but they could certainly attempt to address this issue. He said that asking for such significant progress within a single year from a single locality was indeed a considerable request.

Ms. Mallek said that perhaps they could divide it into smaller parts.

Mr. Richardson said that this was similar to their conversations with the secretaries at North Fork last week. He said that it had been stated that this was a marathon; it was a long game. He said that the master plan, site development, and getting ready to move forward were full-time jobs for them once they had site control. He said to Ms. Laufer that the process was scalable in the sense that there was much work to be done, and they required alignment with the state for support.

Mr. Henry said that it was an intriguing conversation in Senator Warner's office, as he was known for his meticulous nature, and it was his first encounter with a Senator. He said that the Senator posed detailed questions, and they explained where they stood in the process. He said that the Senator supported their efforts as a convener and aimed to bring forth opportunities from an intelligence standpoint due to his role. He noted that there was an interesting dynamic between the Senator and his staff when they questioned him about how many times they were asked for assistance that was limited because they lacked property. He said that Albemarle County had resolved this issue in relation to anything concerning the intelligence community.

Mr. Richardson said that Mr. Henry reminded the Senator that it was their first time in a meeting

where site control was not an issue. He said that this caught his attention in a big way, as it led to a meaningful discussion. He said that he had been in Charlottesville 18 years earlier, expressing concerns about encroachment and BRAC, which was based on relocation and closure, and he understood the importance of maintaining economic vibrancy within their community. He said that he acknowledged that they were running out of time and that he would turn the meeting back over to the Chair.

Mr. Richardson said that Mr. Newberry's statement about interest around the world not aligning with national security had been particularly interesting. He said that they discussed where they were a week ago and where they were in 2005, and he would like to remind everyone respectfully that today marks the 82nd anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack, during which 2,403 service members and civilians lost their lives. He said that 82 years later, their efforts are focused on protecting the national security of the United States of America, with approximately 3,000 people at Rivanna Station working diligently toward this goal every day.

Ms. McKeel said that they appreciated the delegation's understanding and willingness to listen. She said that they were happy to meet again to discuss this as much as necessary in order to address all questions and concerns. She said that it was vital for their locality, state, and country.

Mr. Andrews said that regarding whether or not they had done this before in their locality, UVA was a public-private partnership for their locality. He said that this was an undertaking with significant importance for their future which required a long-term approach.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding the speed cameras, in 2017 and 2018, Albemarle County had the highest number of highway fatalities in the state. She said that most of these accidents involved single-car crashes where vehicles ran off the road at high speeds and collided with trees. She said that Fairfax, which has almost 10 times more residents than Albemarle, experienced fewer deaths due to different circumstances. She said that the fact caught her attention, along with that of their police chief, as it became evident that there were not enough police officers to adequately patrol all areas.

Ms. Mallek said that if they could sting someone with a \$200 fine, they may not climb a tree to kill themselves. She said that she hoped that it was an approach that would help them make progress this year in reducing the number of fatalities caused by people driving too fast in such hazardous conditions.

Mr. Deeds said that the issue regarding the red-light camera system had not been a matter of unanimous support from Democrats and opposition from Republicans based solely on civil liberties concerns. He said that there were numerous individuals on both sides who had raised various concerns. He said that just because the majority had changed, it did not necessarily imply that the outcome would be different. He said that there was a possibility that it might be different.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she wanted to clarify the statement about development. She said that it was mentioned that it was primarily for protecting Rivanna Station but also for developing certain areas to recoup costs. She said that it was done by aligning the development with the mission objectives, which allowed developers to provide valuable feedback.

Mr. Deeds said that he understood and wanted to confirm that the development would not involve encroaching on the property, which they were trying to prevent.

Ms. Price said that since Mr. Gallaway could not be present, she wanted to mention that they really wanted help with the schools where they could get it.

Ms. Callsen said that she had included this in the drafting process as well. She said that she presented it as the statewide versus locality option. She said that she had spoken with others about it, and they had been supportive so far. She said that she attended a meeting this morning with the Western District Commissioners of Revenue Association. She said that there was minimal pushback because the drafting included several protections, such as a referendum and expiration date for the uses.

Ms. Laufer said that she attended a superintendent conference in Nelson County, which was very rural, and they were all very supportive because it was one of their priorities as well.

Ms. Price asked if the delegation had any further questions or comments.

Ms. Laufer said that she did have questions on the remaining priorities; however, these were evidently the top three, so good enough. She said that perhaps at some point they could discuss the priorities with those responsible. She noted that Louisa County and Nelson County shared similar concerns regarding agriculture and other matters, but they could schedule a separate meeting for this discussion.

Agenda Item No. 6. Adjourn to December 13, 2023, 1:00 p.m. Lane Auditorium.

At 4:34 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to December 13, 2023, 1:00 p.m. Lane Auditorium, Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902. Opportunities for the public to access and participate in this meeting are posted on the Albemarle County website on the Board of Supervisors home page and on the Albemarle County calendar. Participation will include the opportunity to comment on those matters for which comments from the public will be received.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date: 05/21/25 Initials: CKB