

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia was held on April 24, 2024 at 6:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium, Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jim Andrews, Mr. Ned Gallaway, Ms. Beatrice (Bea) J.S. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, and Mr. Michael Pruitt.

ABSENT: None.

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

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the Chair, Mr. Jim Andrews.

Mr. Andrews said two Albemarle County Police Department staff were present at the meeting to provide their services, Master Police Officer Paul Quillon and Officer Andy Muncy.

Agenda Item No. 2 **Public Hearing: Real Property Tax for Calendar Year 2024 Tax Rates.** To receive comments on Proposed Tax Rates for Calendar Year 2024.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that per Virginia Code § 58.1-3321, the governing body of the county, city or town must conduct a public hearing on the real property tax rate, and agree upon the necessary tax rate, when any annual reassessment of real property by a county, city, or town would result in an increase of one percent or more in total real property tax levied.

The County of Albemarle proposes to adopt a tax rate of \$0.854 per \$100 of assessed value for calendar year 2024. Total assessed value of real property, excluding additional assessments due to new construction or improvements to property, exceeds last calendar year's total assessed value of real property by 4.07 percent. Individual property taxes may, however, change at a percentage greater than or less than the above percentage.

The budget impact of the proposed tax rates is included in the Board of Supervisors' FY 25 Proposed Budget. The FY 25 Budget is scheduled for adoption and appropriation on May 1, 2024, after a series of public hearings and engagement.

Staff recommends that the Board hold the public hearing and defer action until May 1, 2024, at which time the Board will consider a resolution adopting the Calendar Year 2024 Real Property Tax Rates. A proposed resolution is attached as Attachment A.

Mr. Jacob Sumner, Chief Financial Officer, said that tonight they would conduct three public hearings: the 2024 Real Property Tax Rate, the Personal Property Tax Rate for 2024, and a public hearing on the Transient Occupancy Tax. He said that they would present one comprehensive report covering all three tax rates before returning it to the Chair for the public hearings. He stated that no Board action was required today since all tax-related actions will occur during the May 1, 2024, Board meeting, and that tonight was just the public hearings.

Mr. Sumner said that he had shown the first slide multiple times during their budget discussions this year to highlight that even though they budget annually, decisions made in one year impact the following year's budget. He said that last year's decisions were part of the budget narrative for this year, and the choices the Board made for FY25 would be the driver for FY26.

Mr. Sumner said that focusing on the general fund, the proposed general fund budget amounted to \$438 million. He said that although the public hearings tonight focused on tax rates and revenues, he wanted to bring attention to how the proposed revenue increase impacted the expenditure side of the budget.

Mr. Sumner said that as compared to last year's budget, the main areas where they suggested allocating new revenues in FY25 included \$13 million to Schools according to their funding formula, \$9.3 million to workforce and customer service for salary adjustments, healthcare costs, and the implementation of the community development system, additional funding for partner agencies and transportation costs with MicroCAT and CAT (Charlottesville Area Transit), and \$2.4 million invested in safety and well-being through operational costs for the General District Court building, and additional firefighters to support ambulances in the Berkmar area, and 24/7 staffing needs at North Garden. He said that there was an investment for an expansion of the HART (Human Services Alternative Response Team) team, as well as additional Sheriff's deputies and police officers.

Mr. Sumner said that the primary focus would be on the general fund revenues. He reiterated that the total amount of general fund revenues was \$438 million. He said that in the displayed slide, there were four main tax rates established by the Board, and the proposed budget was balanced on these rates. He said that during the meeting, there would be public hearings held on three out of the four rates, which were real property, personal property, and transient occupancy.

Mr. Sumner said that regarding the first public hearing, which was regarding the real estate tax

rate, the current rate was \$0.854 cents for each \$100 of assessed value. He explained that a single penny on the tax rate equated to roughly \$2.9 million in collectible tax revenue. He said that if the Board decided to adopt a tax rate one penny lower than the advertised rate, they would have to reduce expenses by \$2.9 million.

Mr. Sumner said that the advertised rate of \$0.854 was a cap; the Board could only approve a rate at or below the advertised figure. He said that the 2024 real estate reassessment showed an increase of 4.07%. He mentioned that as part of the legal advertisement, there was a reduced or effective tax rate. He said that this effective rate was the tax rate they would need to set to maintain the same level of real estate income due to reassessment adjustments. He said that it was around \$0.03 less or \$0.821 per \$100 of assessed value.

Mr. Sumner said that the second public hearing focused on the personal property and machinery and tools tax rate. He said that the proposed tax rate was \$3.96 per \$100 of assessed value, which was a \$0.54 increase and would generate approximately \$4.5 million. He explained that since this tax was a shared revenue, it was divided among capital and debt, Public Schools, and County Government operations. He said that the revenue split for the additional revenue generated was displayed in the chart located at the bottom of the screen.

Mr. Sumner said that the final public hearing of the night was for the transient occupancy tax. He said that this tax applied to overnight stays at hotels and B&Bs (bed and breakfasts). He said that the proposed budget contained a rate increase, going from 8% to 9%, which would generate roughly \$900,000 in additional revenue. He said that this tax was also a shared revenue source and followed the same funding allocation formula.

Mr. Sumner said that the next few slides would be a reminder of the adjustments made to the budget since the County Executive's Recommended Budget and the Board's Proposed Budget. He said that he would review the technical updates prior to discussing the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) and general fund budget highlights, focusing on areas updated by the proposed tax rates being considered tonight.

Mr. Sumner said that in the slide provided, staff had listed the technical adjustments proposed through this point in the budget process. He said that during the previous week's proposed budget hearing, he covered the specifics of the adjustments, excluding one, which was an updated technical adjustment regarding the Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail (ACRJ).

Mr. Sumner said that similarly to other regional partners, following receipt of preliminary estimates from ACRJ, their staff refined their budget. He said that due to certain budget adjustments in the interim, the County's contribution amount was decreased by \$114,000, which they incorporated as a technical update on this slide.

Mr. Sumner said that during the previous week's proposed budget hearing, they discussed updates to the capital budget. He said that the slide displayed the overall changes for FY25, including the removal of the funding for the Blue Ridge Area Food Bank and the RSWA (Rivanna Solid Waste Authority) budget adjustment related to the annual contribution to the Ivy Landfill Remediation Project.

Mr. Sumner said that they also included the movement of Earlysville and Seminole Trail volunteer fire stations to community capital requests from FY27 to FY25. He said that lastly, the \$538,000 figure on the revenue portion of this slide represented the sum of money allocated through the shared revenue funding formula to the capital budget, all of which were based on the proposed tax rates they would discuss later.

Mr. Sumner said that the next slide served as a summary, so he would spend only a brief moment on it. He said that the revenue generated from the proposed tax rate increase for personal property and transient occupancy totaled \$5.4 million. He said that based on the shared revenue funding formula, \$2.9 million of that amount was allocated to Public Schools and \$538,000 was allocated to capital and debt.

Mr. Sumner said that the remaining \$1.9 million was allocated to Local Government expenditures, and with that they looked to fund additional firefighters in Berkmar and address the 24/7 staffing needs at North Garden. He said that it would also fund the expansion of the HART team and also the addition of a sheriff deputy and a police officer. He said that they had included operational efficiencies and reserve for contingencies to balance out Local Government expenditures.

Mr. Sumner informed the Board that they had seen the next slide before, but he wanted to bring it back one more time to highlight one thing on the slide. He explained that the 19 FTEs (Full-Time Equivalent) added to the budget for the North Garden support, the Berkmar ambulance, and the HART team expansion were only for one half of the fiscal year. He said that this was due to the timing of hiring staff and the required training for these teams.

Mr. Sumner said that since the FY25 funding was only for a partial year, it was important to acknowledge the full-year costs of these positions in FY26. He said the ongoing costs increased from \$800,000 in FY25 to \$2 million in FY26. He pointed out that while there was \$830,000 identified as one-time reserve for contingencies in FY25, they were committing to ongoing service efficiencies of \$250,000 in FY25 and increasing to \$500,000 in FY26 to balance out these ongoing costs.

Mr. Sumner said that before turning the discussion back over to the Board for questions and holding the public hearings, he asked the County Executive if he had anything to add on anything they had covered thus far.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that during FY24, they artificially balanced their budget by lowering expenses, resulting in a \$4.9 million capacity. He said that they moved \$4.9 million of ongoing funds into the capital fund, helping with capital debt and funding capital projects. He said that this was a split of \$3 million from Schools and \$2 million from Local Government. He said that it required considerable effort to separate the funds and decide not to spend all of their ongoing revenue.

Mr. Richardson said that they were considering their obligations for FY25. He said that additionally, they benefited from a two-year partnership with Virginia Tech and Dr. Cheryl Bailey, who had predicted a slight economic downturn. He said that while it did not happen rapidly, it happened over 12 to 18 months, which landed them into FY25.

Mr. Richardson said that the yellow box on the slide was a \$5 million head start they had over this year's budget. He said that out of that amount, \$3 million was allocated to Schools, and \$2 million to Local Government. He said that they managed to pull that money out of the capital and start the process this year ahead by \$5 million. He thanked the Schools for following their example and recommendation. He said that he believed that the Schools faced a tough and challenging budget process, and they needed that.

Mr. Richardson said that if they applied the same concept to FY26 and examined their obligations, they would notice that they were more in FY26 compared to FY25.

Mr. Richardson said that they had seen the assessment and revenue growth returning to what they observed in more normal times. He said that Dr. Bailey and her team would come back in the fall.

Mr. Richardson advised the Board to consider when assessing their fund balances, contingencies, and current status, to try to create another capacity level that they might need in FY26. He said they had identified the revenue related to tax rate considerations. He said that if they were looking for additional revenue, he suggested exercising caution and keeping in mind factors beyond those previously discussed. He reminded them about the anticipated obligations in FY26.

Mr. Richardson said that concerning the Board's decision-making process, he pointed out that the state budget had not been finalized yet. He said that there was still uncertainty regarding this matter and they hoped for favorable outcomes in Richmond for Local Government, Schools, and the City and County communities.

Mr. Richardson said that he had set aside a modest compensation amount for his staff for the upcoming year, and they would discuss further compensation considerations in the fall. He said that they would also gain more knowledge about the SAFER (Staffing for Adequate Firefighters and Emergency Response) grant in the fall, which would affect FY26 and FY27 obligations. He urged the Board to reflect on the previous year's strategy while thinking through the FY26 considerations.

Mr. Gallaway asked if compensation for staff beyond mid-year was considered as part of the strategic priorities.

Mr. Richardson said that staff was currently analyzing potential adjustments to pay plans according to market conditions and Local Government compensation studies that had been recently completed across the region.

Mr. Gallaway said that the County had performed their own compensation study which went into last year's strategic planning and budget process. He said that getting them up to market was important, but he would like for their compensation to get ahead of the market. He said that to achieve this goal, continuous efforts from the Board and future budget allocations would be necessary.

Ms. Mallek asked if the \$4.9 million in the yellow box was established in the budget.

Mr. Sumner said that those funds were ongoing revenues, which were now in the general fund for FY25.

Ms. Mallek asked if they had not done the same for FY25 going forward as they had done last year.

Mr. Sumner said that they had carried out a very similar exercise, but it was under a different title. He said that they had not moved it into capital, but they had a reserve for contingencies amount. He stated that it was a very similar strategy to move it into a reserve or different location, but it was essentially a reserve for the future.

Ms. Mallek asked if it could be used for capital if necessary.

Mr. Sumner said that it was up to the Board's discretion. He said that a vast majority of those contingencies were one-time funding rather than ongoing.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if staff could give an overview for the reasoning behind staffing North

Garden 24/7 for the community's understanding.

Mr. Richardson said that the North Garden Volunteer Fire Department had provided data to County staff that indicated their volunteer base was aging. He stated that there was a high number of volunteers over the age of 70 who responded to a high number of calls within a one-year period. He said that the department had communicated that that was not a sustainable model, so they requested further assistance from the County.

Mr. Richardson said that staff worked collaboratively with Deputy Fire Chief David Puckett's team to create a strategy that included application for a SAFER grant. He said that they were successful in receiving SAFER grants over the years, and if they were successful, federal funds would pay for additional staffing at the North Garden station, and over several years the County would assume responsibility for funding those positions as the federal funds were depleted.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that it was important that the County support their dedicated volunteers. She asked if staff could provide information regarding the additional HART team that was proposed to be funded in the upcoming fiscal year.

Mr. Richardson said that the HART team was composed of a police officer, a firefighter, and a Department of Social Services (DSS) social worker. He said that this interdisciplinary group was on call to respond to calls to the Emergency Communications Center (ECC) that were identified as a mental health crisis.

Mr. Richardson stated that their current team had been in operation for approximately nine months and the data collected indicated that the team had been enormously successful in assisting community members experiencing mental health crises as well as freeing up firefighters and police in the field to do other things. He said that the Board had supported creation of a second HART team to provide a significantly greater amount of coverage and further address the issues in their community. He said that the interdisciplinary approach had allowed for better assistance to those in crisis.

Mr. Andrews opened the public hearing for the real property tax rate.

Ms. Emily Dreyfus said that she resided at 1221 Swan Lake Drive. She said that she was unsure of the magisterial district she resided in because she moved to the address fairly recently but thought that she was a resident of the Samuel Miller District. She said that she supported tax increases overall because she believed in improved human services.

Ms. Dreyfus said that in her capacity as an employee of the Legal Aid Justice Center and a current collaborator with the Public Housing Association of Residents, she had encountered numerous low-income individuals facing considerable challenges. She said that these challenges included allocating over 50% of their income towards rent payments. She recalled that federal funds previously allocated for emergency assistance had diminished significantly.

Ms. Dreyfus said that she did not recall the exact number, but she knew that the previous County funding for emergency relief amounted to approximately \$2 million, which had now reduced substantially. She said that the escalation in rent burdens could be attributed to the rapid increase in community prices. She requested the Board members to consider investing in the future to prevent displacement and homelessness among residents while improving family stability.

Mr. Andrews closed the public hearing and brought the matter back before the Board for additional comments.

Mr. Gallaway said that he revisited the sheet Mr. Lynch had sent concerning their neighborhoods and property rates. He said that after examining it more closely, he found that there had been a considerable rise in townhome values. He said that certain neighborhoods were over the average, whereas others were below it, albeit with a minor decline.

Mr. Pruitt said that he agreed that the assessments had affected neighborhoods in a highly significant way. He acknowledged that they had observed the trailing edge impacting the town of Scottsville, which was why there had been such substantial increases this year, when previously during the main spike that everyone else saw. He emphasized the importance of remembering how these affected their localities differently. He noted that the public speaker Ms. Dreyfus was a resident of the Scottsville District.

Ms. Mallek said that in the Crozet area, townhouses were being marketed similarly to single-family homes. She said that this was likely why the values were increasing so quickly.

Agenda Item No. 3. **Public Hearing: Calendar Year 2024 Personal Property Tax Rate.** To receive public comment on its proposed increase in the tax rate from \$3.42 per \$100 of assessed value to \$3.96 per \$100 of assessed value, on all classes of property subject to taxation by the County pursuant to Chapter 15, Article 8 of the County Code, including tangible personal property; tangible personal property employed in a trade or business that is not otherwise classified as machinery and tools; merchants' capital; short-term rental property, with an original cost of less than \$500; and machinery and tools, as

enabled by Title 58.1, Chapter 35 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, to be effective on and after January 1, 2024.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that pursuant to Chapter 15, Article 8 of the County Code as enabled by Title 58.1, Chapter 35 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, the County of Albemarle imposes a tax on tangible personal property.

Pursuant to direction at the Board of Supervisors' March 27 budget work session, the County of Albemarle proposes to adopt an increase in the tax rate from \$3.42 per \$100 of assessed value to \$3.96 per \$100 of assessed value, on all classes of property subject to taxation by the County, including tangible personal property; tangible personal property employed in a trade or business that is not otherwise classified as machinery and tools; merchants' capital; short-term rental property, with an original cost of less than \$500; and machinery and tools, to be effective on and after January 1, 2024.

The proposed change to the personal property tax rate is projected to generate \$4,509,275 in revenue for FY 25. Pending Board of Supervisors adoption and appropriation, the funding would be allocated according to the County's Allocation of Shared Revenue as defined in the Board of Supervisor's Financial Management Policies, which would be as follows:

- 1) 10% or \$450,928 to the Debt and Capital Funds 54% or \$2,435,008 to the Public School Operations Fund
- 2) 36% or \$1,623,339 to the General Fund for County Government Operations

Staff recommends that the Board hold the public hearing and defer action until May 1, 2024, at which time the Board will consider a resolution adopting the Calendar Year 2024 Tax Rates. A proposed resolution is attached as Attachment A.

Mr. Andrews opened the public hearing for the CY24 personal property tax rate. Seeing no speakers, he closed the public hearing.

Ms. Mallek expressed her appreciation of staff for keeping the decreases in value in line with the increases in this tax rate.

Mr. Andrews said that he noticed that in the budget breakdown, public safety still represented 15% despite being a slightly increased amount due to the change in personal property tax and the TOT. He said that this had been updated and showed that it was a very small fraction. He said that 1% of their budget equated to \$4.38 million, and this addition resulted in less than 1% to the Schools and less than 0.5% to the rest.

Mr. Andrews pointed out that when comparing the numbers from before, the administration section had decreased. He said that some rounding might have occurred at this level. He expressed his appreciation for the attention to detail in creating this finely tuned budget and that the tax rates were designed to accommodate these adjustments.

Agenda Item No. 4. **Public Hearing to Consider the Adoption of Ordinance to Amend County Code Chapter 15, Taxation related to Article 9, Transient Occupancy Tax.** To receive public comment on its intent to adopt an ordinance to amend County Code Chapter 15, Taxation. The proposed ordinance would amend County Code § 15-901, Transient occupancy tax imposed; amount, to increase the tax from eight percent to nine percent of the amount charged for the use or possession of rooms or spaces in hotels, motels, boarding houses, travel campgrounds, and other facilities offering guest rooms, as enabled by Virginia Code §§ 58.1-3819 and 58.1-3826, to be effective on and after July 1, 2024.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that during the 2020 General Assembly session, Virginia counties were granted authority in Virginia Code § 58.1-3819 to increase the taxation amount for the transient occupancy. Under the legislation, the limit on the transient occupancy tax was removed.

Attachment A provides a summary of the proposed amendment to County Code Chapter 15, Taxation, regarding transient occupancy tax. The proposal would increase the rate from 8% to 9%, effective July 1, 2024. Pursuant to direction at the Board of Supervisors' March 25 budget work session, a public hearing would be planned for April 24, 2024 and action requested on May 1, 2024.

The proposed ordinance is projected to generate \$871,992 in revenue for FY 25. Pending Board of Supervisors adoption and appropriation, the funding would be allocated according to the County's Allocation of Shared Revenue as defined in the Board of Supervisor's Financial Management Policies, which would be as follows:

- a) 10% or \$87,199 to the Debt and Capital Funds
- b) 54% or \$470,876 to the Public School Operations Fund
- c) 36% or \$313,917 to the General Fund for County Government Operations

This budget impact is included in the Board of Supervisors' FY 25 Proposed Budget. The FY 25 Budget is scheduled for adoption and appropriation on May 1, 2024, after a series of public hearings and engagement.

Staff recommends that the Board hold the public hearing and defer action until May 1, 2024, at

which time the Board will consider the attached proposed ordinance (Attachment A).

Mr. Andrews opened the public hearing for the adoption of an ordinance to amend County Code Chapter 15, Taxation related to Article 9, Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT).

Ms. McKeel said that this was an endeavor to diversify their revenue stream, aiming to reduce reliance on real estate property taxes. She said that while it seemed that it hadn't made a huge difference, she considered it important effort to have people that came to the community to visit as tourists, who were using their services and driving on their roads, contribute towards that usage. She asked if Mr. Richardson could address this item as well.

Mr. Richardson said that last week, during the Board's recognition of Emergency Communications Center (ECC) 911 Telecommunicator Month, they discussed their daytime peak population growth. He said that several ECC staff members attended the meeting and shared insights on staffing for peak demand. He said that in Albemarle County and Charlottesville, peak load demand occurred in the middle of the day, while the nighttime population consisted of residential taxpayers. He said that there were approximately 150,000 residents during nighttime hours. He pointed out that peak load demand during the daytime could increase by up to 100,000 people.

Mr. Richardson said that Ms. Mallek asked how the telecommunicator staff would handle this growth, as they currently had around 60 employees. He said that the infrastructure would need modernization and expansion, requiring a partnership between the City, UVA, and the County. He said that there was a number of those things in their community that existed today where as a destination community, they grew significantly from nighttime population to daytime population.

Mr. Richardson said that the TOT was earmarked for people who were coming and staying for short-term stays in their hotels. He said that this was part of being a destination community, the things that they had to offer in their community. He said that they were just beginning to study this and think through what the tax burden was and how it affected the diversity.

Mr. Richardson said that Mr. Bowman's and Mr. Sumner's team had put together some statistics for the Board looking at the breakdown of that. He said that they tracked that over a period of time and aimed to lessen the burden on the residential property taxpayer, especially during the day when that population increased and their infrastructure began to sag, and it stressed their ability for service delivery in some key areas.

Mr. Richardson emphasized that they must continue to keep an eye on this issue. He said that he wanted the Board to know that they were looking at it and that they wanted to provide them with good, meaningful data across the community. He said that this data could inform strategies for the future, their legislative agenda ask for the future, and partnership discussions with the City and key partner entities like the university.

Ms. McKeel said that there were both commuters and tourists who came into the County during the day, and they both affected their infrastructure. She said that the TOT addressed the tourists. She said that she appreciated staff looking into diversifying their tax bases in this way so that those who lived in apartments and owned property in the community were not bearing the full burden.

Ms. Mallek said that she appreciated the efforts to diversity and hoped that they would continue to make more progress getting business revenue as well to help decrease the burden on residential taxpayers.

Mr. Andrews closed the public hearing. He said that they were deferring action until May 1, at which time the Board would consider the rates, and he brought the matter back before the Board for additional comments.

Mr. Pruitt said that he knew he had been the squeaky wheel on many parts of the budget, but he had not been critical of their proposed revenue structure involving various tax sources. He said that he wanted to express his gratitude towards staff for preparing a thoughtful presentation and providing them with well-thought-out numbers to consider.

Mr. Pruitt acknowledged that the personal property tax figure they arrived at was not arbitrary, but rather the result of careful consideration and finding a balance everyone sought. He said that although he still held some fundamental differences in philosophy, he appreciated the clarification given on the factors affecting them in FY26. He said that maintaining the reserve contingency made sense to him despite his ongoing disagreements.

Ms. McKeel said that she recalled that when she was on the Board ten years ago, they were bracing themselves for a large number of retirements in the volunteer fire departments and the necessity to shift from a volunteer base to paid firefighters. She said that today they were seeing the effects of that change on their budget. She expressed her appreciation to staff for their creative approaches to the changes in fire staffing and moderating it so it was a manageable expense.

Ms. Mallek thanked Deputy Chief Puckett and other Fire staff for their work over the last ten years to build a significantly stronger combined system. She said that it had allowed Albemarle County's system

to defy the general trend of losing volunteers, as they had maintained a thriving volunteer force. She said that there were millions of dollars in preventative expenses these volunteers provided, along with their dedication to the community and the service they provided. She expressed her gratitude to those volunteers and to the Board for supporting the two stations this year as well as another station last year.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was so grateful to see such positive changes in their fire departments, primarily due to the leadership of staff and the Board. She said that the Board had gotten them to an excellent point where they were all working together, and this budget was exemplary of what had been done. She said that this budget was meeting the needs of the community, and it was important to recognize that. She commended staff and her colleagues for their creative thinking and problem-solving to best serve the community with the most effective budgeting. She said that the Board and staff were addressing the community's needs with the budget in a thoughtful manner to guarantee they fulfilled their responsibilities.

Mr. Andrews noted that their public hearings had been relatively quiet that night. He reminded everyone that before these hearings, there had been approximately 13 hours of budget meetings, which likely had increased to 15 hours by this time. He said that they had also organized seven public town halls, received numerous emails and phone calls from constituents, and participated in various press interviews and opportunities for public feedback. He said that these outreach efforts had taken place over several months. He expressed gratitude for the ongoing engagement and relief that they had reached that point without any surprises. He said that the thorough preparation had proven beneficial.

Agenda Item No. 5. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Gallaway said that they had held their Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) meeting this afternoon, and the long-range transportation plan was almost complete. He said that the public had until May 21 to provide input or make comments on the plan. He advised visiting the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) website for more information. He asked his fellow board members to review the final draft, as it was currently in its basic final draft. He encouraged them to share any comments or questions.

Mr. Gallaway expressed his gratitude to the staff, the Police Department, and the Fire Department for hosting them at the Public Safety Operations Center tour that day. He said that he found it remarkable to witness the transformation from the previous state of the facility to its current condition. He said that he learned about the operational efficiencies gained from centralizing operations happening there and the additional space available, which he thought was impressive. He congratulated everyone involved in making this project successful and thanked them for allowing him to visit and observe the progress.

Ms. McKeel said that the tour conducted today was indeed wonderful, and having relief for the 5th Street Station was truly remarkable. She said that she remembered laughing during the tour as she recalled an incident when a photograph of her vehicle parked on the grass was published in a local newspaper, and she was criticized for it. She said that this happened because there was insufficient parking available, and she needed to park on the grass in order to attend an event at the 5th Street Station.

Ms. McKeel said that this took place almost ten years ago. She said that they were struggling to maintain the forensic unit, as well as the Police and Fire Rescue units, along with their vehicles. She said that the new facility had significantly improved the presence of both the Fire Department and the Police in a population center, which was really nice for them; they no longer had to travel back and forth as often. She said that the Facilities team had truly done an outstanding job with this facility.

Ms. Mallek said that her viewpoint on the tour earlier in the morning had been shaped by ten years of work on the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) leading from the evidence garage section, tracing back to when Chief Sellers handed over his position to Chief Lantz. She said that it enabled better management of vehicles requiring preservation for evidence collection purposes.

Ms. Mallek said that witnessing this in person brought her immense joy as they visited the service bay. She said that Chief Todd Richardson from Earlsville praised Chip Walker, the Operations Manager for the Fire Department, for the capability to upfit the new brush trucks on site. She said that it led to a reduced amount of time and cost compared to sending them elsewhere. She said that apparently, there were four trucks undergoing modification. She said that they would still be waiting for the first truck to join a distant queue for completion if they had not implemented this change. She said that it was undoubtedly more efficient, and they had gained valuable insights from the COVID-19 pandemic concerning supply chains and adjustments to operations for procuring essential parts for things. She said that the tour was an excellent way to commence the day, and she was deeply appreciative of the property owner's cooperation and generosity.

Ms. Mallek said that furthermore, regarding the long-range transportation plan, the vision list consisted of potential projects, while the constrained list included those deemed feasible within their budget for the next 20 years, targeting 2050. She requested everyone to review the draft and offer feedback through the survey or directly to Christine through the survey. She emphasized that they needed to make it as good as they could while meeting federal standards.

Ms. Mallek said that she learned two minor points at the MPO, including two online resources.

She said that one resource is called On the Map, a feature of the Census Department. She explained that one could access it by searching "Census On the Map" on Google. She said that it was a very large database where users could learn about demographics and various topics and manipulate filters. She said that the second resource was the Virginia Hazard Mitigation Plan, which Sean Nelson at VDOT mentioned was one of his go-to tools on his desk all the time. She described it as a great resource with a wealth of background information.

Ms. Mallek said that she had been working and attending fewer meetings but still keeping up with the American Farmland Trust Advisory Committee. She said that she finally managed to join a meeting today and received an update on the toolkit for development, titled "Planning for Agriculture in Virginia." She said that this toolkit explored numerous ways to strengthen the success and productivity of agriculture in all its forms, from small truck gardens to large commodities and forestry. She said that it addressed the balance between various needs, such as solar energy, while ensuring they could continue feeding their population.

Ms. Mallek said that Steven Burson, head of the VDACS (Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services) under the Department of Agriculture in Virginia and their state representative on the board, oversaw this project. She mentioned that many counties with agriculture coordinators or directors were involved, making it a diverse and fascinating collaboration. She expressed her anticipation to share the toolkit draft once it was ready.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that Stony Point Volunteer Fire Department had greatly benefited from the construction of the new facility in Fashion Square, as it allowed them to build a brush truck in-house. She said that consequently, the Stony Point Volunteer Fire Department, despite having fewer emergency calls as other departments, utilized their newly built brush truck to assist in all areas across Albemarle County. She said that she considered this development to be advantageous.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that secondly, during the CAC (Community Advisory Committee) meeting on Monday evening, there was a presentation delivered by the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA). She said that she recommended that the other Board members should try to obtain this presentation for their respective CAC's. She said that the presentation covered various topics related to water usage and management, and she praised the RWSA for their effective engagement strategies throughout the session.

Agenda Item No. 6. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There was none.

Agenda Item No. 7. Adjourn to May 1, 2024, 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 6:56 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to May 1, 2024 at 1:00 p.m. in 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: 08/06/2025
Initials: CKB