A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on December 7, 2022, at 1:00 p.m. in Room 241 on the Second Floor of the Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902. This was a joint work session with the Albemarle County School Board.

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

SUPERVISORS ABSENT: None.

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Graham Paige, Ms. Katrina Callsen, Ms. Judy Le, Ms. Kate Acuff, Mr. Jonno Alcaro, and Ms. Ellen Osborne.

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

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

SCHOOLS STAFF PRESENT: Chief Operating Officer, Rosalyn Schmitt; Director of Budget and Planning, Maya Kumazawa; Superintendent, Matthew Hass; School Board Attorney, Ross Holden; and School Board Clerk, Jennifer Johnson.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. Ms. Price called the Board of Supervisors to order at 1:01 p.m. in Room 241, Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

Mr. Paige called the Albemarle County School Board to order at 1:01 p.m.

Ms. Price introduced Albemarle County Police Officers David Sprouse and Andy Muncy.

Agenda Item No. 2. Adoption of Work Session Agenda.

Ms. McKeel **moved** to adopt the work session agenda as presented. Mr. Andrews **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Agenda Item No. 3. **Joint Work Session with the School Board:** Five-Year Financial Plan Work Session.

Mr. Andy Bowman, Chief of the Office of Management and Budget, stated that the Board's strategic plan was adopted the previous October. He said that on November 2, they had their first five-year financial planning discussion, and they focused on Goals 1-4 and Goal 6. He said that Goal 5 regarding education and learning would be the focus today. He noted that the School Board adopted its Strategic Plan in the summer of 2021. He said that in the Board's objective statements, they acknowledged the collaboration and partnership with ACPS (Albemarle County Public Schools). He noted that they would continue discussions the following week with the Board.

Mr. Bowman stated that they wanted to ensure there was a shared understanding of how they got to the present and where they were in the long-range financial planning as they built their annual budgets. He said that they wanted to provide an opportunity for ACPS to present their long-range financial plans. He stated that they wanted the Board to have the opportunity to learn about and engage in the work of the School Board. He said that a portion of the discussion would be spent on discussing strategies and next steps.

Mr. Bowman said that the work session was not a budget discussion and that those types of meetings would be held in February, March, and so on. He said that he would supply some figures, charts, and graphs.

Mr. Bowman said that there were five steps in the agenda. He said he would begin with a historical review of the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan). He said that he would provide an update as to where the County was to date in building the CIP for FY24 – FY28, which will be recommended by the County Executive in February as part of the annual budget process. He said that Ms. Kumazawa would discuss the ACPS's capital and operating five-year financial plan. He said that they would take a recess before they came back to discuss the next steps to take from the meeting.

Mr. Bowman said that he would begin with a historical review of where they had been in the CIP over the past 20 years. He said that they would review where the County's annual adopted capital budget had been from FY04 to FY23. He explained that when they discussed the CIP, they were talking about a five-year period, and the data points represented the first year of that five-year period.

Mr. Bowman presented a slide with a graph that depicted the level of CIP funding during three periods: pre-Great Recession, during the Great Recession, and initial years of recovery, and post-Great Recession and initial recovery through the COVID-19 pandemic. He said that the pre-Great Recession period was through the late 2000s, and that during the Great Recession and initial years of recovery, due to the overall economy and decisions that were made at that time, the capital budget was relatively flat and smaller than the preceding capital budgets. He said that since that time, in the post-Great Recession from FY15 to FY23, there was a gradual upward trend. He said in FY23, the County approved the largest CIP budget in recent history.

Mr. Bowman explained that three years ago, the County was working through a proposed FY21 – FY25 CIP five-year plan. He said that in the budget process, the CIP totaled $211 million, about $89 million was for ACPS, and $122 million was for the County government. He said that historically, both boards prioritized maintenance and replacement projects which made up about 42% of the budgets.

Mr. Bowman said that the plan as introduced in February 2020 was to contemplate a $0.01 increase to the real-estate tax rate from FY20 through FY25. He said that the plan was never adopted during the pandemic because the County had to dramatically readjust.

Mr. Bowman said that the FY21 annual budget totaled $18.2 million. He noted that the budget was crafted in less than two months as a result of the pandemic. He noted that many projects during that time were paused due to economic uncertainty. He said that the projects and economic forecast were reviewed in three- and six-month increments to make sure that they were responding to changing situations.

Mr. Bowman said that no CIP was adopted for that five-year period, but the 3-6-6 plan was implemented. He said that during January 2021, they resumed $34 million in projects. He said that the 3-6-6 approach continued into the FY22 annual budget process, where the capital budget totaled $57 million and additional projects were resumed. He said that projects which were not resumed in FY22 were to be reconsidered during FY23. He noted that during this time, there was no five-year CIP.

Mr. Bowman said that the adopted CIP totaled $298 million; $153 million for ACPS and $117 million for County government. He said that the CIP had a unique placeholder of $27 million in strategic planning implementation. He said that the $27 million was planned to be programmed during the upcoming CIP process. He noted that maintenance and replacement were a critical part of the five-year CIP. He noted that the plan did not anticipate a real-estate tax increase. He noted that the FY23 – FY27 CIP increased by about 40% over the FY21 – FY25 CIP.

Mr. Bowman explained that several changes occurred which allowed the increase to the CIP. He said that during the pandemic, the Department of Finance and Budget placed a focus on debt management. He said that in June 2021, the County had a refinancing and a bond issuance for the first time in four years. He said that the financing resulted in favorable rates due to the County's Triple Triple A (AAA/AAA/Aaa) bond rating. He said that the refinancing process was repeated in March 2022.

Mr. Bowman said that the Office of Management and Budget used to be part of the County Executive's Office, and that they were moved under the Chief Financial Officer to align their work efforts to make ensure they were working on priorities and to support each other in their shared knowledge. He said that they created a new Office of Treasury Management by reorganizing existing positions to create that intentionality to focus on their debt management and capital budget in a way they had not previously done. He said that all of the work positioned the County to twice reaffirm its AAA/AAA/Aaa bond rating. He noted that investments had been made into the Procurement Office. He said that they had worked in partnership with ACPS in how to manage capital projects with building services and facilities for any construction to improve the execution and service provided to the community.

Mr. Bowman said that they had reviewed their planning assumptions, such as how they borrowed or how they balanced their cash and borrowed proceeds. He said that they worked with the financial advisor to ensure that they were modernizing and using the best information for best practices.

Mr. Bowman said that they were trying to figure out how to both simultaneously navigate the uncertainty of the pandemic and then also move the community forward through capital projects. He said that they appreciated the Board's support as they began to work differently to make this possible. He said that both boards had invested revenue to allow for a larger CIP.

Mr. Bowman said that both boards leveraged federal revenues during the prior budget process. He said that the School Board leveraged federal funds through indoor air quality funding to modernize the HVAC systems, and that the Board of Supervisors invested ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funds to support County projects. He noted that in addition to federal funding, both boards invested one-time funds into the CIP to create a larger total budget.

Mr. Bowman said that there were intentional policy decisions made by the Board of Supervisors during the FY23 budget process. He noted that there was a focus on the diversification and investment of tax revenues. He said that the Board reviewed the County's tax rates and the enabling taxing authority provided by the General Assembly. He said that the Board increased the food and beverage tax rate and the transient occupancy tax rate, and prior to the budget process, it implemented a cigarette tax which had its first full-year impact in FY23.

Mr. Bowman said that the investment by the Board would have been equivalent to a 3.3 cents increase in the real-estate tax rate. He said that the Board chose these other tax revenues to diversify the County's revenue structure as part of its financial management strategies.

Mr. Bowman explained that in Calendar Year (CY) 2023, there was a strong reassessment, with the average property value increasing over 80%. He said that due to the rising property values, the Board was faced with a policy decision to maintain the current rate, which would have an effective tax rate increase, or to select a different rate.

Mr. Bowman said that the effective tax rate increase was 6.6 cents for CY 2023. He said that the decisions together resulted in an investment equivalent to 9.9 cents on the real-estate tax rate that went to fund the capital program, the County's debt services, and ACPS and County government operations.

Mr. Alcaro mentioned the 9.9 cents tax rate and asked for clarification as to what would be effective the first year.

Mr. Bowman explained that the current value of the penny was a little under $2.4 million, so the effective value would be $2.4 million multiplied by 9.9.

Ms. Price clarified that the 9.9 was referencing the combination of the 3.3 and the 6.6.

Mr. Bowman said that he would provide an update as they build the FY24 – FY28 CIP. He said he was before the School Board on October 27and before the Board of Supervisors on November 2. He shared a slide about staffs' approach, and said the boards had seen it before. He said that the starting point for the FY24 – FY28 CIP would be the adopted plan. He noted that the adopted plan made assumptions about projects which would begin between FY24 through FY27, which were years 2-5 in the old plan, and would be years 1-4 in the new plan. He said that they would look for ways to keep the plan intact based on the Board's prior approvals.

Mr. Bowman explained that for year five, they would look to maintain their obligations and maintenance and replacement programs. He said that the current CIP contemplated the construction of a third school, which would be a second elementary school. He said that the design for the school was scheduled for FY27, and the construction was scheduled for FY28.

Mr. Bowman said that they had not yet balanced the plan, and it was a work in progress. He said that the County was in an unprecedented time with project costs and interest rates. He said that based on the current projects in the FY24 through FY27 plan, they needed about an additional $30 million in updated cost estimates.

Mr. Bowman said that the borrowing costs and the new interest rate environment were different. He said that the County's bond rating allowed it to get the best rate possible, but that rate was relative to the market. He said that in the adopted CIP, $1 million in debt service afforded $13.1 million in projects. He said that lease revenue was the process through which the County traditionally issued its bonds, and currently, $1 million in debt service would only buy $11.8 million in projects.

Mr. Bowman said that an alternative would be if the County issued general obligation bonds after a referendum, such as with the school referendum in 2016. He explained that the County would be able to get a better rate of about 0.25% based on reporting from the financial advisors, and under those conditions, $1 million of debt service would afford $12.1 million in projects. He noted that this interest rate environment caused the County's dollar and debt service to not go as far and the dollars for the projects did not go as far because of rising costs.

Mr. Bowman said that they considered the timing of projects and the delivery of material. He said that the Office of Treasury Management in its modeling tried to ensure that they were not borrowing too early and paying unnecessary interest or borrowing too late and creating cash management issues.

Mr. Gallaway clarified that the difference in the general obligation bond was $300K. He asked if that value was derived from the net minus the cost of the bond or if it was what was gained in the financing.

Mr. Bowman responded that it factored in the cost of issuance.

Mr. Gallaway noted that they issued a bond of about $60 thousand the last time, and that was the cost of putting out the bond referendum. He asked if the $300 thousand was after the cost or if it factored in the cost.

Mr. Bowman clarified that the cost of issuance for the bond would be reflected in the $11.8 million and $12.1 million figures. He explained that not included in the figures were the cost of educational materials that would be distributed to the public to inform them of the referendum. He noted that the cost for those educational materials was about $40 thousand.

Ms. McKeel clarified whether it was $60 thousand plus $40 thousand or if the $60 thousand included the $40 thousand.

Mr. Bowman said that the plan was for about $60 thousand, but it was actually $40 thousand. He noted that several variables factored into the cost.

Mr. Bowman said that at this December 7 joint meeting, the School Board would discuss the $318 million needs-based request. He said that if they took the current-adopted CIP from FY24 to FY27 and updated the ACPS's portion for inflation, and if they included the year-five obligations for maintenance and replacement, and the construction of the school, then the total would be approximately $182 million. He said that the figure could change.

Mr. Bowman said that he had a couple more points on the use of the strategic plan placeholder, what the County's debt capacity may be, and how they may get other projects in the strategic plan that he would make later. He said that first would be an opportunity for ACPS to tell their story about the work they have been doing over the past few months and to give the Board of Supervisors an opportunity to engage with ACPS.

Ms. Maya Kumazawa, ACPS Director of Budget and Planning, stated that she would provide an overview of the long-range plan for ACPS. She stated that an adequate built environment was a critical resource to foster high-quality teaching and learning. She said that as the County continued to grow, several schools were out of space and many schools were aging. She stated that investments were needed to support the students. She noted that part of the presentation would focus on the financial matters identified in the letter from Chair Price to Chair Paige.

Ms. Kumazawa explained that all School Board work sessions began with their strategic plan. She said that they had expanded that practice for this joint meeting to include both strategic plans. She said they had identified the goals and strategies that each strategic plan would advance. She stated that the School Board adopted its strategic plan in 2021. She explained that the plan had three overarching goals—thriving students, affirming and empowering communities, and equitable and transformative resources. She noted that the capital plans are most directly related to the third goal.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that the Board of Supervisors recently adopted its strategic plan, and the fifth goal provided the most obvious connection between the two plans. She said that the School Board's strategic plan also advanced goals two, three of the Board's strategic plan.

Ms. Kumazawa said she would review how the School Board's request was developed. She said that the Long-Range Planning Advisory Committee (LRPAC) is comprised of members of the community appointed by the School Board and Superintendent. She explained that the LRPAC met about 12 times a year to develop CIP recommendations. She said that a comprehensive report was presented biannually, and updates were provided annually.

Ms. Kumazawa explained that the School Board received the recommendations and formally approved the requests. She said that she would refer to the 2021 LRPAC report throughout the presentation and provide updates to the report. She said that the capacity recommendations were built on several data sources, including historical trends, enrollment projections, development pipeline information as provided by the Community Development Department, and population forecasts.

Ms. Kumazawa explained that enrollment projections were a key data point, and they were used as a comparison to the available capacities in the school buildings. She noted that the figures were updated each year. She provided a graph that showed historical, budgeted, and projected enrollment. She said that before the pandemic, ACPS saw a steady increase in student enrollment, and they saw a decline for the 2020 – 2021 school year.

Ms. Kumazawa said that immediately following the decline, they began to see enrollment increases at a similar rate to pre-pandemic rates. She stated that they continued to project a steady increase over time. She stated that over the next 10 years, they expected to grow over 10%.

Ms. Kumazawa said that capacity and building conditions were considered in tandem in the analysis recommending increased square footage and renovations to existing areas. She stated that there were 77 trailer units in use division-wide, and over the next five years, they projected that more than half of the students would attend a school that was over 95% capacity. She stated that the metric was used to measure the success of their strategic plan.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that the newest schools in the County were built more than 20 years ago, and the oldest schools were built more than 80 years ago. She stated that the projects listed in the School Board's CIP request largely reflected the recommendations from the prior year, with the Lambs Lane campus recommendations added in. She said that the five-year request totaled $318 million, but the total may change based on inflationary assumptions and ongoing work with County staff.

Ms. Kumazawa said that she would provide updates on projects, including those requested by the Board of Supervisors. She said that a more detailed presentation of the request was provided at the October 27 School Board work session. She noted that High School Center 2 and Mountain View expansion projects were included in the FY23 capital budgets and were therefore not listed in the five-year CIP request which began in FY24.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that in terms of elementary school enrollment, there were three small schools, five medium schools, and five large schools. She presented a slide that showed the five-year projected enrollment and the current capacities of the elementary schools. She stated that two schools, Baker-Butler and Mountain View, each had projected enrollment of close to 800 students in the next five years, and each of their current capacities was less than 600 seats. She said those two elementary schools would be the focus of the first two project recommendations.

Ms. Kumazawa said that the Elementary School #1 project was to construct a 500-student capacity school in the Mountain View district. She explained the project was the result of a recommendation from a master plan study to address overcrowding at Mountain View Elementary. She said that if the project were approved, the design would begin in year 1, and construction would begin in year 2. She said that the cost would be approximately $44 million, and the school would be open to students in the fall of 2026.

Ms. Kumazawa said that the school had historically been over-capacity, and in recent years, temporary capacity relief had been provided in the form of trailer classrooms. She explained that in addition to the need for more instructional seats, there were needs for renovations. She stated that there were needs for expanded cafeteria space, improved outdoor spaces, and improved parent-drop-off areas. She stated that they were underway to provide some needed expansions at Mountain View with the current CIP, but a more permanent solution was required because enrollment was projected to increase steadily in this district.

Ms. Kumazawa explained that currently, there were 2,400 approved residential units in the pipeline, including Southwood Phase II. She explained that student yield rates varied depending on the type of housing and the cost of each of the units, but on average, the student yield in the district for a single-family home was about 14%.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that the next project recommended was a new elementary school in the north feeder pattern. She stated that there's a similar story at Baker-Butler with growing enrollment at an already-large school. She said that it was more complex in this area because Baker Butler was only one of several northern feeder pattern elementary schools. She noted that the Route 29 North corridor was the most dense and quickly growing development area and that there were over 8,000 residential units in the pipeline for the entire northern feeder pattern.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that they recommended that a redistricting study take place the following year to analyze the entire feeder pattern and then implement a partial or phased redistricting the following year. She said that immediate capacity relief would be provided to Baker-Butler and would fit within the available funding for building a second elementary in the latter part of the five-year CIP.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that the new school was recommended to be open to students in the fall of 2029. She said that the cost of the project was estimated to be over $50 million when they took into account the inflationary impacts of those later years. She said that the northern feeder pattern elementary schools included Agnor-Hurt, Baker-Butler, Broadus Wood, Greer, Hollymead, Stony Point, and Woodbrook.

Ms. Kumazawa showed a table with the projected enrollments at those schools, as well as the projected capacity conflicts. She said that overall, as a feeder pattern, capacity conflicts were not growing, and some schools had available seats. She said that given the geographic boundaries and the location of current student density, redistricting on its own would not mitigate the future capacity concerns, but it would be a reasonable intermediate solution.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that, given the funding constraints of not building two elementary schools immediately, they had proposed a staggered schedule. She stated that next year, the design for Elementary School #1 would begin, which would occur in parallel to the redistricting study of the northern feeder pattern. She said that the following year, they would implement that partial redistricting in the northern feeder pattern to address the overcrowding at Baker-Butler. She said that in year three, the school at Mountain View would open, and that the boundary would be split so that students would attend the current Mountain View Elementary School and the new Mountain View Elementary School.

Ms. Kumazawa explained that also in year three, the design would begin for Elementary School #2 in the northern feeder pattern. She said that the redistricting study for the northern feeder pattern would take into consideration both the near-term and long-term recommendation that would not move students more than one time. She said that they would also finalize the site location as part of the work.

Ms. Mallek asked what the 14% yield for single-family homes meant.

Ms. Kumazawa explained that it was the average ratio a consultant developed based on historical patterns. She explained that if a single-family unit were built, it would produce .14 students. She stated that the figure was average for the area.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that she would next discuss two more projects; the high school renovations and the Lambs Lane campus study improvements.

Ms. Kumazawa said that the Albemarle High School and Western Albemarle High School draft master plan was recently completed. She stated that the master study built upon a study done in 2017 called the High School Facility Planning Study. She stated that the study focused on improvements to align the division's design imperatives, such as transparency, sustainability, flexibility, and spaces built for student learning. She stated that feedback from stakeholder groups, including students, administrators, community members, and staff were used to identify and prioritize the projects recommended in the study. She said that they continued to solicit feedback.

Ms. Kumazawa said that the scope of the study's recommendations at the two schools included improvements to corridors, bathrooms, daylighting, ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) improvements, dining commons and plazas, an athletics wing classroom addition, improvements to collaboration zones, CTE (career and technical education) and maker space expansions, exterior window replacements, special education improvements, and performing arts space improvements.

Ms. Kumazawa presented a slide that showed the projects that could be achieved with the current level of CIP funding on the left and with the proposed CIP funding of $36 million that began in FY23 on the right. She stated that projects prioritized with the current level of funding for Albemarle High School included breezeway and hallway improvements and a level 2 corridor connection and classrooms. She said that at Western Albemarle High School, the prioritized projects included corridor improvements, outdoor learning spaces, commons improvements, window upgrades, and an athletic wing commons.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that the Lambs Lane master plan was completed in the summer, and it served as a guiding document for the Albemarle/Journey/Greer campus for the next 15 years or more. She stated that it incorporated input from students, staff, and the general public, and it considered several key components to ensure a comprehensive study. She said that the study considered security and safety measures, future growth patterns, land development opportunities, an improved sense of wayfinding and placemaking, and environmental factors.

Ms. Kumazawa said that a lens of equity was used in the study to ensure the entire community benefited from the proposed improvements. She said that the Lambs Lane improvements project was a new project recommended by the LRPAC. She noted that the entire master plan extended beyond a 10-year CIP, the proposed improvements were sequenced to ensure that the most immediate needs were met first and that tax dollars were spent wisely.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that the study identified traffic congestion as the biggest issue with the existing campus, and as a result, a proposed loop road would provide a second access point between Lambs Lane and Rio Road. She stated that the proposed loop road was the most urgent need. She said that in addition to alleviating traffic congestion, the loop road would provide a secondary route for emergency response vehicles. She said that the loop connector road would provide facilities and access ways for pedestrian and bicycle traffic, landscaping and green space, and improved stormwater management.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that to make way for the main loop road project, a relocation of the Albemarle High School field house would be necessary. She said that other five to 10-year recommendations included the reconfiguration of parking and bus loops, the creation of a central campus green athletic complex, and the relocation of the vehicle maintenance facility.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked for clarification regarding the Corridor #2 improvements at the high school.

Ms. Kumazawa explained that Corridor #2 improvements were to existing corridors.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the corridors would be larger or wider.

Ms. Rosalyn Schmitt, Chief Operating Officer, stated that there would be renovations of existing corridors. She noted that high school students did not use lockers anymore and that the corridors were narrow. She said that they were considering ways to repurpose a large amount of the circulation space for better gathering and instructional opportunities. She said that there would be a second-level corridor at Albemarle High School. She noted that the second level at the high school did not connect, that it was not a full loop, and that the project would connect the second floor, would add classroom space, and would improve circulation on a large scale.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that other requested projects, which would not be discussed in detail at that time, included middle school renovations, elementary school renovations, elevator additions, a new data center, and land acquisition for Elementary School #3. She stated that more details were available in the 2021 LRPAC report.

Ms. Kumazawa said that ongoing programs included maintenance and replacement programs. She stated that the CIP request included fully funding the planned transfer of project management responsibilities to the Building Services Department.

Ms. Kumazawa said that the facilities, maintenance, and replacement program had been significantly impacted by rising construction and labor costs and would continue to be impacted over the next five years. She stated that the school bus replacement program included a recommendation to purchase electric school buses as part of both boards' strategic plans. She said it also included was maintaining the network technology infrastructure and previously established life cycles.

Ms. Kumazawa presented a slide that showed the five-year CIP, along with the 10-year CIP. She stated that they included nine prioritized projects along with the ongoing programs. She said that in years six through 10, they anticipated continuing improvements as per the Lambs Lane campus study recommendations, a project to address high school capacity, implementation of a middle school study currently underway, and a third elementary school, in addition to administration and athletic spaces.

Ms. Kumazawa presented a slide tht showed the operating impacts of the CIP projects, including the current projects. She stated that over the next five years, they anticipated operating costs for High School Center #2 to begin in FY26, and new operating costs for Elementary School #1 to begin in FY27.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that the purpose of a five-year forecast was to ensure that the capital and operational decisions would ensure long-term financial sustainability and serve as a planning tool to guide and supplement the annual budgeting process. She said that about 68% of their revenues came from the transfer from the County, and about 27% of their revenues came from the state.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that in a typical year, there were six factors and decisions that drove their expenditure budgets. She said that they assumed increases to salaries to stay competitive in the market, increases in healthcare contributions to fully fund the healthcare fund, no changes to the class-size ratios, and increases in operational obligations and inflation. She said that they included the operational impacts of proposed CIP projects.

Ms. Kumazawa said that about 27% of their revenues in FY23 were budgeted to come from state revenues. She explained that there were various categories of state revenue sources, the most significant of which was the Standards of Quality (SOQs). She explained that SOQs prescribed a minimum standard that school divisions must abide by to receive the funding. She said that SOQ funding was generally provided by formula and was driven by the local ability to pay and projected student enrollment.

Ms. Kumazawa explained that in regard to the financial forecast for state funding, they assumed a constant local composite index (LCI), no major changes in funding formulas, growing enrollment, and increasing position costs for funded SOQ positions. She said that they anticipated significant costs in FY24 to address compensation and operational inflation. She said that they anticipated that in future years, compensation increases and inflationary increases would stabilize.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that in FY24, they were beginning with a funding gap of over $5 million, and the funding gap grew significantly in FY25 and FY26 due to slowing local revenue growth. She noted that the funding gap stabilized in FY27 and FY28.

Ms. Kumazawa said that the options the School Board had to balance its budget included increasing revenues, and the projections would be finalized over the coming months. She stated that in terms of expenditures, the School Board was able to limit new proposals including limiting July 1 pay increases. She stated that they would be able to reduce services, such as increasing class sizes.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that increasing the class-size ratio by 0.5 would result in a 15 to 16 FTE reduction. She stated that they would be able to reduce transfers that had not yet been placed to the capital replacement funds. She stated that they could reduce inflationary increases which would result in a reduction of services. She said that these were budget decisions that would need to be made during this and future budget development processes.

Mr. Gallaway asked if High School Center #2 would be staffed by entirely new staff or if there were fewer staff transfers there. He asked for more information as to why Center #2 was more expensive to open and operate when it had a lower enrollment capacity than the elementary school.

Ms. Kumazawa explained that the $1.3 million represented the administrative costs of staffing the new high school which had a different set of staffing standards than an elementary school. She said for example, while High School Center #2 would pull high school students along with regular teachers to that center, there would be additional costs, such as a counselor, a nurse, or an OA, that’s provided at the baseline for staff at High School Center #2.She said that the reason the Elementary School #2 costs were lower was that the elementary school standards were driven by projected enrollment. She said that they would add certain staff to the existing Mountain View as projected enrollment increased, and that staff would move over to the new Mountain View Elementary. She noted that there were differences in the staffing standards.

Mr. Gallaway clarified that Center #1 would be staffed with a nurse, counselor, and support services in the same way the high school was.

Ms. Kumazawa responded yes.

Mr. Gallaway asked if there was a principal for Center #1.

Ms. Kumazawa responded that there would be a director for each high school center.

Mr. Gallaway clarified that the differences represented higher administrative costs for high school operations compared to elementary school operations.

Ms. Kumazawa stated that there were transportation costs to get students to the center on an every-other-day basis.

Mr. Gallaway said it would be helpful for him to see a break-out of the numbers so he could see how they arrived at the number.

Ms. Kumazawa said the information could be provided.

Ms. McKeel requested more general information about how students would go to the high school centers and the scheduling.

Ms. Callsen noted that the enrollment would not be that different between the elementary school and Center #2.

Mr. Gallaway noted it would be approximately 400 students at the center.

Ms. Callsen said it would be about the same.

Ms. McKeel said that kind of information would be helpful so they could compare.

Mr. Gallaway noted that VDOT had a methodology of contingencies for the increase in traffic projects. He said in terms of the cost of the elementary school, it was difficult to look at construction-only costs versus any other costs such as land acquisition. He asked if there was a way to show an itemized breakdown of the total cost of the elementary school.

Mr. Gallaway said he needed more information to explain why the total cost for the elementary school was $40 million. He noted that the price was high, but he expected it to be higher, and he wanted a way to explain to constituents why the school cost what it did.

Ms. McKeel acknowledged that it was expensive to transport students to the high school centers. She said that discussions could be happening around local transit that could coincide with the current discussions.

Mr. Gallaway mentioned that Albemarle students dual enrolled at PVCC (Piedmont Virginia Community College) could end up spending more time at Monticello than at Albemarle. He noted that the program helped with capacity issues. He asked if there were other programs that helped with that fluidity amongst the high schools. He said the information would be useful when reviewing the cost of Center 2 and Center 3.

Ms. Price announced both boards would take a 10-minute recess.

Non-Agenda Item: Recess

The Board recessed its meeting at 2:03 p.m. and reconvened at 2:15 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 3. **Joint Work Session with the School Board:** Five-Year Financial Plan Work Session, *continued.*

Mr. Bowman explained that the next step was regarding the strategic plan placeholder that was included in the CIP. He said that this was undesignated during the prior budget process, knowing that the Board would adopt its strategic plan. He said that the placeholder fund was a total of $27 million and would stretch across projects achieving six strategic goals.

Mr. Bowman said that if staff were to add additional projects, there would be a number of considerations. He said that they would review the County's financial management policies and the County's debt capacity. He explained that the County performed a regular review of the financial policies which were most recently adopted, updated, and reaffirmed in September 2022.

Mr. Bowman said that they reviewed two key ratios when looking at the debt service capacity; outstanding debt to assessed values, and debt service as a percentage of the general fund and school fund revenues. He said that they had made the best estimates as to where the general fund and school fund would be within the next five years. He said that as they received the results from the December tax collection and the calendar year-end assessments, and other changes happening in the economy, there would be a better update to the figures.

Mr. Bowman said that one scenario they considered was using debt capacity to 8%. He said that if they went to 8%, there would be another $37 million that could be borrowed, but that debt capacity was not yet planned for.

Ms. Price asked Mr. Bowman to address whether there was a percentage of the general fund that would immediately affect the County's bond rating.

Ms. Nelsie Birch, Chief Financial Officer, stated that it was not just a metric that doesn't mean anything, the 10% represented less flexibility in the operating budget. She said that the higher they went, the more fixed their operating budget became. She said that 10% was where AAA/AAA/Aaa-rated entities performed. She said that 8% was a manageable level for the County and allowed them to maneuver changing economic conditions. She said that the current five-year plan assumed continued growth, just a slowing of economic growth. She said that the plan did not consider an economic decline, and if it happened, it would decrease the County's capacity, and that's why they wouldn't go to that 10%; they needed that flexibility in there.

Ms. Price asked if the current percentage was between 7% and 8%.

Mr. Bowman said that it was at that level in year 5 of their projection in the plan. He noted that the trend increased over time. He said that line increased as they got further into the plan as the courts and schools were constructed and funds were borrowed.

Ms. Price stated that the current plan demonstrated a limited amount of flexibility.

Mr. Bowman said yes.

Ms. Birch said that was why $37 million was the place the Board could choose to go if other funding was identified to pay for the debt service.

Ms. Price clarified that that would get them to 8%. She said that their projections were based on increasing revenues, and if there was a recession and a downturn, they would get above 8%. The idea is to never get to 10%. The closer they got to 8% or 10%, the less flexibility they would have for other projects.

Mr. Bowman said that a group of projects totaling $37 million could use pay-as-you-go funding. He explained that pay-as-you-go funding would allow the County to not borrow 100% of the funding for a project, and they would need one-time funding of $1.85 million to actualize the $37 million group of projects. He said that the annual debt service paid for the life of the bond would be more impactful.

Mr. Bowman said that the annual debt service payment on $37 million would be $3.13 million annually. He said that if they took out the general obligation to get a better rate, then the annual debt service payment would be $3.06 million for 20 years over the life of the bond.

Mr. Bowman said that the funding source would be a future discussion during the FY24 budget process. He said that debt capacity and related funding were not the only considerations, and they would need to consider future flexibility. He said that in the out years of the CIP, the third school would be constructed which would have debt service impacts past FY30.

Mr. Bowman said that there were related operating impacts of projects that were funded. He said that was for the ongoing debt service payment and operating new facilities. He said that they would also consider the County's ability to execute projects. He said they had to consider it as the CIP increased in size.

Ms. Birch said that a final decision would not be made at the work session. She said that the discussion was to inform Mr. Richardson, County Executive, who had to present a balanced budget to the Board of Supervisors in February. She said that the discussion would inform staff to be better prepared to address what the Board of Supervisors desired, recognizing the needs across the County, focusing on ACPS's needs at that time. She said that they did not yet know FY24 revenues, and the biggest revenue happened in January.

Ms. Birch said that they were using the prior year's projection and updating it accordingly. She said this starts the effort of deciding what to include in the FY24 operating budget and capital budget, then the next four years on a planning cycle for the capital program. She said that once the budgets were prepared by Dr. Haas, ACPS Superintendent, and Mr. Richardson in February, significant Board discussion and deliberation followed. She explained that the Board could refocus and redistribute revenues differently from Mr. Richardson's proposal, which would incorporate ACPS.

Ms. Birch said they would discuss Board strategies in the event they wanted to go higher with respect to how much was funded in the CIP. She said they would discuss additional funding sources in order to support additional capital expenditures. She said that the following four years of the CIP were mostly programmed and almost balanced. She said that they were making some modifications, and they had to incorporate planning for FY28.

Ms. Birch said that the next five years would be influenced by the 2023 reassessment. She said that the 10% was the indicator they were watching because it was the one they were reaching. She said that 10% represented the debt service as a percent of the operating budget, and they were watching that and where they would be able to have flexibility if the budget grew higher than expected. She said that the Board always had the option to increase the tax rate. She stated that they had effectively increased taxes in 2023 to the equivalent of 9.9 cents without increasing the tax rate.

Ms. Birch said that they had the opportunity to invest one-time funding. She said that they could take one-time funding from a positive budget variance and invest it into capital funding, which they have been pretty good at. She said that they were discussing ways to do things differently to save money so that they could fund other projects. She said that it took leadership, intention, analysis, and business understanding.

Ms. Birch noted that the School Board had the same ability despite having the 60:40 split and the 10%. She stated that there was an imbalance in the School Board's five-year operating plan. She said they could take creative action to provide savings and become more efficient. She said that they were looking for support from the General Assembly in the future for dedicated funding that could be used for school construction.

Ms. Osborne said that the CIP affected student outcomes, which was the School Board's main concern. She said that they wanted students to do well and for teachers and staff to have relief.

Ms. Alcaro noted that ACPS and the County needed new, ongoing, consistent, and sufficient revenue streams to fund the CIP. He mentioned that the LRPAC gave the School Board a figure of $106 million in needed renovations in the elementary, middle, and high schools. He said that they were provided $2 million a year for the first five years of the program.

Mr. Alcaro said that at $2 million a year, it would take 53 years to complete, or by 2075. He said that it would be his 123 birthday. He requested that the Board consider the issue of increasing funding for renovations. He said that by 2075, the average age of the schools, excluding the three to be built, would be 100 years old.

Ms. Acuff said that one of the reasons they went with the Center model in addition to renovating the high schools was because the overall cost was considerably lower than building a new high school. She said they had made a huge effort to economize in terms of capital costs.

Ms. Acuff noted that there was an advisory committee for environmental sustainability, and they were working to see how ACPS could make accommodations to the County's climate action plan. She stated that all of the climate-friendly actions taken so far, such as installing solar panels and a windmill, they had done with power purchasing agreements and without cash outlays, and they did LED lighting without cost. She said that with the new addition to Crozet Elementary, there were marginal cost efficiencies for doing geothermal energy rather than installing a new boiler.

Ms. Acuff said that there were three new schools to be constructed within the next five to seven years, and there were associated costs that were not built into the figures. She said they had to determine how committed the County was to the climate action plan. She said that it was cheaper to build a school that was not as efficient.

Ms. McKeel noted that Gabe Daly also sat on the climate committee.

Ms. Acuff said that they should consider how much they were willing to invest in the climate action plan. She noted that there were four electric buses to be delivered, and all had been granted because a school bus cost is about $100 thousand, and they had to replace three to five buses per year. She said that electric buses cost $300 thousand. She said that if they were serious about a climate action plan, then they had to discuss financing it.

Ms. Le said that it was part of an equitable component so that all of the high school students received a modern education.

Ms. Callsen said that the climate action plan was important and should be incorporated. She said that hallway structures related to safety, and the location of bathrooms could have an impact on the function of the school day. She said it was an important component of modernizing the buildings.

Ms. Acuff noted that the core building of Albemarle High School was opened in 1953, and it had a capacity of 800 students, and the hallways were only built to accommodate 800 students. She said now, there were 2,000 students. She explained that by removing the lockers, they would not be able to increase the floor size of the hallways, but they would be able to install benches or sitting spaces. She said that the centers needed to be built to provide more space.

Ms. Callsen said that she wanted to make the point that they had done thoughtful consideration around items like those.

Mr. Paige stated that the original idea for renovating the high schools was part of the center plan. He said that the goal was to build the centers and then renovate the existing high school buildings to allow all of the students to have a good education.

Ms. McKeel thanked the School Board for their hard work in navigating the pandemic.

Ms. McKeel noted that they discussed diversifying the revenue streams and doing things differently and being innovative. She said that the master planning was critical for the Lambs Lane campus. She noted that the Lambs Lane campus had about 25% of all students in ACPS. She said that the Board of Supervisors had received an email from County staff about how they could handle the roads differently. She said that the biggest starting point for work on the Lambs Lane campus was roads. She mentioned the loop through-road and surrounding roads. She noted how the area was congested and dangerous.

Ms. McKeel said that they should consider ways to use revenue sharing, SMART SCALE funding, or transportation funding to make the improvements happen. She said that the Board would first have to discuss the issue. She said that they had to do things differently. She said she agreed that renovations and modernizations changed outcomes for students. She noted that it also helped to recruit and retain teachers. She noted that the window installation at Greer was a positive aspect for students and teachers.

Ms. Mallek said that she graduated from Albemarle High School in 1967, and there were 1,600 students. She mentioned that she used to teach in a basement classroom for 15 years. She noted that federal funding to help with climate change may continue for a couple more years. She noted that transportation was an issue. She asked for more information about bus transportation and when there would be enough bus drivers to get the kids back on the buses.

Ms. Mallek said that they should monitor what the state budget would be, especially for the SOQs. She said that she looked forward to more details.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that they had to consider the School Board's priorities. She said there may be other opportunities, possibly through the state. She noted that the Board of Supervisors had priorities and had to have a balanced budget, as the School Board did. She said she looked forward to seeing exactly, in specific terms, what types of projects the School Board prioritized and wanted within their budget.

Mr. Gallaway said that he ran to be on the Board of Supervisors to get more resources for the school division. He said he's learned some things since he's been on the Board of Supervisors; that it is important to be on a sound, financial team and to follow sound, financial practices. He better understands why it is not as simple as raising taxes, and what it means to have a Triple A bond rating. He said he doesn't want anyone to think that the Board of Supervisors is not funding Schools because they are stingy. He said that he understood the baseline. He asked what the tax rate would be if they had to raise it to utilize the full $37 million.

Ms. Birch responded it would have to increase by 1.5 cents.

Mr. Bowman said that the $3 million of debt service would be a little over the value of 1 cent as of today. He said that the $1.85 million would be one-time funding. He said that they could provide exact values.

Mr. Gallaway clarified that it would have to be fully dedicated.

Mr. Bowman responded that it would have to be fully dedicated to the capital debt program; otherwise, it would go through the normal split.

Mr. Gallaway asked what the tax impact would be to fully fund the $318 million request. He asked how fully funding the request would impact the debt service utilization. He asked where that would put them on their chart for the 8% and the 10% relative to that ranking. He said the question becomes not what your political willingness was, but what your desire to follow a financial strategy. He said that if they could only raise revenues through tax increases, it would have to account for the CIP costs and the operational costs. He said that he needed to know the other options and how that impacted the debt service and the tax rate.

Mr. Gallaway clarified that the School Board's long-range plan differentiated between renovation and maintenance costs. He said that some of the renovations appeared to be HVAC cycles. He said if they are renovating a current bathroom, that probably should be maintenance, but if they are moving a bathroom, he thinks that would be a modernization. He said they could tighten up their CIP, but they needed to start getting some of their things that are thought of as renovations into a normal CIP cycle so they wouldn't get booted. He provided the COB-5 window-replacement project, which got delayed several times, as an example. He added that school bus replacement had not been in the CIP for some time, but that it is now, and that was a mind shift. He said that some items identified as renovations should be improvements done on a cycle. He said that they needed to change how they thought about maintenance and renovation items.

Mr. Gallaway said that any completed work on the LRPAC report should be sent to the Board of Supervisors. He said that many of the plans and recommendations in the long-range plan cited complete studies implemented. He said it would be helpful to have the completed studies.

Mr. Gallaway said that he had a good understanding of the elementary school capacity issues. He said that Baker-Butler was essentially reverse redistricting what was done in 2013. He said that he did not yet fully understand the strategy with the two elementary schools relative to the redistricting plan. He requested more information regarding the redistricting plan.

Mr. Gallaway said that both boards, the County Executive, and the Superintendent had work to do. He commended the relationship and partnership of the County Executive and the Superintendent because there were years that did not exist. He said that they had to address tremendously increasing costs. He said that they had to consider not using separate facilities for each of their needs. He asked if the proposed data center costs included technology and software costs or physical space.

Ms. Kumazawa responded that it was physical space.

Mr. Gallaway asked if it would be a new building.

Ms. Kumazawa responded that as recommended, it would be a new building. She said that they were looking for ways to pair the use with another project.

Mr. Gallaway said that costs would not go down if they don't do that. He noted that the Supervisors would receive a facilities study that would introduce next steps and recommendations about how to utilize their space. He said that the Berkmar space offered opportunities to rehouse uses. He said that collaborating on projects could offer cost savings. He noted that every single SMART SCALE application project had a 30% to 40% cost increase. He said that the County had to absorb the costs. He said he has to think there's something in trying to combine efforts to use a building that is able to house everything.

Mr. Gallaway noted that the effective tax rate increase was 6.6% and that they had not equalized the rate. He said that taxpayers were dealing with increased inflation costs and increased taxes. He noted that there were compensation studies for the County and ACPS. He said there was a CIP that they all wished they could fund. He said that they needed to consider the impact of increasing the tax rate on the residents. He said that the School Board needed to provide figures as to what the tax rate impacts would be. He said that if they were to increase the tax rate on top of already increasing values, then they had to be mindful of the circumstances.

Mr. Gallaway said that the 1% increase in sales tax would be dedicated to ACPS capital needs. He said several VACo members seemed to be in support. He said that the Board of Supervisors and School Board should heavily lobby the General Assembly to grant the authority. He said that they had to find revenues other than property tax.

Mr. Gallaway said that the cigarette tax was one type of thing, and the transient occupancy tax is trying to get the people who visit for a weekend and leave. He said we should not continually go back to the places where we live.

Mr. Andrews said that there was a lot to work on. He said that a big part was coming back with hard scenarios as to what would happen, how the projects would be funded, how debt service would be funded, the tax rate implications, and inflation scenarios. He noted that the packet included the annual economic outlook report for the County, which was substantial.

Mr. Andrews noted that construction cost contingencies saw large increases. He noted that there was a lot of uncertainty. He said that he supported schools, affordable housing, and climate resilience. He said that a sales tax increase would take further action after the General Assembly authorized the authority.

Mr. Andrews said that the Board of Supervisors was regularly brought development proposals. He said that feedback from ACPS was important during the development process regarding how they impacted schools. He said that he looked forward to future dialogue regarding the capacity impacts.

Ms. Price said that these meetings were important for County and ACPS staff and Board members, and also for the public, to give them a better understanding of the challenges that the County and ACPS face.

Ms. Price said she was focused on the capacity issues of the schools, and that she was equally focused on the capacity issues of the County financially. She said that Mountain View was in the Scottsville district. She said that they had to do something to improve the school capacity. She noted that the pandemic had been difficult for school boards. She said that in addition to COVID-19, the schools' openings and closings, and masks, they had to deal with fights against equity. She said that she was appreciative of what the County and ACPS had done to protect marginalized communities.

Ms. Price said that she was concerned that if they maxed out the debt to the capacity identified as sustainable, then they were like a household budget that was minimal monthly payment constrained and had no capacity for unexpected costs. She said that, although the acquisition cost of an electric bus was higher than that of a diesel bus, the operational costs for an electric bus were lower than that of a diesel bus. She asked for help to understand how to balance paying a higher cost up front for an item when the operational cost of that item was lower.

Ms. Price thanks Mr. Gallaway and Ms. McKeel, whose previous service on the School Board, provides the Board of Supervisors and the County valuable experience and insight into some of the challenges that they would not otherwise have.

Ms. Price said that she was listening to NPR and they were discussing additional state funding for school construction costs through a grant process, but she did not know any more details. She said she wanted to know from the School Board what the additional funding may be and how it tied into the County's competitiveness and ability to receive those funds.

Ms. Price said that besides other financial challenges the County faced, the economic forecast indicated that they should anticipate declining revenues in the short term.

Ms. McKeel said that when they were discussing salaries and compensation studies, they had to consider that every locality in the TJPDC was doing the same. She said that the Berkmar proffer was great because it ensured it was County and ACPS property, and that they should think about other pieces of property in a combined way and how they can use that piece of property together. She said that they had to remember that the economic forecast was not as strong. She noted there was a time when the state required localities to return funding. She said that the County had to be careful that it did not end up in a situation where it did not have the capacity to address future issues.

Ms. Mallek asked for more information about available ARPA and CARES (Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act) funding for ACPS, and whether there was any more of that planned for future things. She said that she remembered when maintenance items in the CIP were funded before other projects, and if that used all the money, that was all there was. She said that taking care of their buildings was a good plan. She said she would like more information in regard to the maintenance and renovations discussion.

Mr. Gallaway said that the economic outlook report was included in the packet. He encouraged people to read it. He said that it was critical for planning for the next five years. He said that they should be sharing their take-aways from the report. He said that the report had been shared at the regional housing partnership and with Delegate Sally Hudson.

Mr. Paige requested a pros and cons list for a tax referendum.

Mr. Bowman said he would discuss the item with the County Attorney to get up to speed. He explained that at times, referendums were required for certain revenues. He noted that the food and beverage tax at one time required a referendum, but was recently changed by the General Assembly.

Ms. McKeel requested that the School Board be sent the latest Orange Dot report. She explained that the report was specific to Albemarle and the community.

Mr. Paige adjourned the School Board at 3:33 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 4. Closed Meeting.

At 3:34 p.m. Mr. Andrews **moved** that the Board enter into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia:

- Under Subsection (1), to discuss and consider appointments to various boards and commissions including, without limitation, Albemarle Conservation Easement Authority, Architectural Review Board, Charlottesville-Albemarle Convention & Visitors Bureau (CACVB) Executive Board, Equalization Board, JAUNT Board, Natural Heritage Committee, Pantops Community Advisory Committee, Places 29 (North) Community Advisory Committee, Public Defender's Office Citizens Advisory Committee, Rivanna Solid Waste Authority, and Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority;

- Under Subsection (3), to discuss and consider the acquisition of real property in the Rivanna Magisterial District where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the County; and

- Under Subsection (5), to discuss the location of an industry in the northern part of the county where no previous announcement has been made of the industry's interest in locating its facilities in the community.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 5. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 5:08 p.m., Mr. Andrews **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. McKeel **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Agenda Item No. 6. Boards and Commissions:

a. Vacancies and Appointments.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **moved** to approve the following appointments:

- **Reappointed**, Mr. John Moore, Ms. Rose Emery, and Ms. Sherry Buttrick to the Albemarle Conservation Easement Authority with said terms to expire December 13, 2025.
- **Appointed**, Ms. Annie Izard to the Albemarle Conservation Easement Authority to fill an unexpired term ending December 13, 2023.
- **Reappointed**, Mr. Frank Stoner to the Architectural Review Board with said term to expire November 14, 2026.
- **Appointed**, Mr. John Wharton to the Charlottesville-Albemarle Convention & Visitors Bureau Executive Board, as the Tourism representative, with said term to expire September 30, 2024.
- **Reappointed**, Mr. Anthony Arsali as the Rivanna District representative, Mr. Bob Beard as the Samuel Miller District representative, and Mr. Evan Mayo as the Scottsville District representative to the Equalization Board with said terms to expire December 31, 2023.
- **Appointed**, Mr. Caetano de Campos to the JAUNT Board, with said term to expire September 30, 2025.

- **Appointed**, Ms. Meghan Sobbott to the Natural Heritage Committee with said term to expire September 30, 2025.
- **Appointed**, Ms. Judith Joyce, Mr. Henry Light, and Mr. Michael Fraser to the Pantops Community Advisory Committee with said terms to expire June 30, 2023.
- **Reappointed**, Ms. Marilyn Minrath, to the Public Defender's Office Citizens Advisory Committee with said term to expire December 31, 2025.
- **Recommended**, Mr. Mike Gaffney to Charlottesville City Council for reappointment to the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority and Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority as the joint City/County representative

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

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

Agenda Item No. 7. Adjourn to 6:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 5:10 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to December 7, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium, Second Floor of the Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

Chair

Approved by Board

Date: 11/06/2024

Initials: CKB