

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on November 4, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. in Lane Auditorium and Room 241 on the Second Floor of the Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

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

ABSENT: None.

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

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by the Chair, Ms. Donna Price.

Ms. Price stated that Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley had requested to participate remotely in accordance with applicable Board Rules of Procedure, Rule 8(B)(1)(b), enacted pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act and stated that she was unable to attend the meeting in person due a medical condition. She asked Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley to state her location.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was currently located in Keswick, Virginia.

Ms. Price **moved** to allow Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley to participate remotely. Mr. Andrews **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Gallaway, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Mr. Andrews, and Ms. Price.

NAYS: None.

ABSTENTIONS: Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley.

Ms. Price introduced Albemarle County Police Officers Ben Chisom and Steve McCall.

Agenda Item No. 2. **Discussion Item:** Ranked Choice Voting.

Delegate Sally Hudson said that they had had some opportunities to discuss this in one-on-one conversations but that this was their first chance to have a shared discussion. She said that she was looking forward to providing a framework and then addressing their questions because her goal was to hand over the conversation to them fairly quickly so that they could focus on the aspects of this topic that interested them most. She said that ranked-choice voting (RCV) was an election reform being adopted across the country, on both coasts and everywhere in between.

Delegate Hudson said that it was a practical solution that encouraged greater participation in their elections from both candidates and voters while also ensuring that they promoted and elected consensus builders who were invested in bringing people together for effective governing. She said that this had been her motivation for being passionate about this topic for several years now and that she was excited for them to discuss it in their community so that they might consider its adoption.

Delegate Hudson said that in her experience, RCV questions could be categorized into two main groups. She said the first group consisted of general questions that anyone new to the topic might encounter, such as what RCV was, how it worked, where it had been used, how has that gone, what have people liked about it, and what were people's concerns with it. She said that there was a separate set of questions more specific to Virginia and Albemarle County regarding implementation, which could be discussed once the more general questions were answered. She said that she believes those coming to this conversation have some exposure to these broad questions, but that she would first review the more general questions before focusing on the more specific issues.

Delegate Hudson said that in a ranked-choice election, voters ranked candidates from their most preferred choice to their least preferred choice. She provided an example from Maine, which had been using RCV statewide since 2018. She said that this example was their general election ballot from November 2020, specifically for the presidential election. She said that familiar names like President Joe Biden and Vice President Kamala Harris appeared alongside US Senate candidates and their respective representatives in the US House.

Delegate Hudson said that sometimes, a ranked-choice election was similar to traditional elections they were accustomed to. She said that sometimes, only two candidates ran, making the options simple. She said that the candidate chosen as their first preference determined their second preference, resulting in a simple election process. She said that when more than two candidates ran, RCV became significant. She said that when filling out a ranked-choice ballot, instead of voting for just one candidate, they could rank candidates in order of preference: their first choice, second choice, third choice, and so forth.

Delegate Hudson said that they could rank as many or as few candidates as desired. She said that although filling out the entire ballot was not mandatory, doing so ensured that their vote would be counted and their voice would be heard, even if their preferred candidate could not win. She said that in order to understand how a ranked-choice ballot was counted, they could examine voting data from an

election in Payson City, Utah, one of the 22 cities in Utah that now used RCV. She said that Utah had fully embraced RCV, which was particularly popular in the state.

Delegate Hudson said that the data provided was from a City Council race held three years earlier, where three candidates were running for an open seat. She said that in the first round, a candidate named Linda Carter received 60% of the votes, which represented 60% of the first-choice votes, and the election was over. She said that in that case, a ranked-choice election is quite simple: the person who received the most votes also received majority support from their community. She said that if nobody won a majority in the first ballot, then they conducted what was called an instant runoff and they identify the candidate who had majority support from the broader electorate.

Delegate Hudson said that an example of a recent ranked-choice election, she considered a special election that occurred earlier that fall in Alaska. She said that in this instance, second and third choice votes proved crucial. She said that Alaska had an open seat in the US Congress, which was filled through a RCV system in a special election in August. She said that there were three candidates running: Mary Peltola, Sarah Palin, and Nick Begich. In the first round of voting, Mary Peltola received close to 40% of the votes but did not achieve a majority. She said that to determine majority support from the broader community, an instant runoff election was held.

Delegate Hudson said that the candidate with the lowest vote count in the first round, which was Nick Begich, was eliminated. She said that his supporters' votes were then transferred to their second choice. She said that by examining all ballots cast for Mr. Begich, they discovered that while most of his supporters preferred candidate Palin, a significant portion preferred Peltola. She said that therefore, Peltola was the majority winner in the last round of voting, securing her election to the US Congress. She said that she became the first Native American to serve Alaska in the US House. She said that this demonstrated how RCV operated. She said that if someone garners broad support in the initial ballot, the election concludes immediately.

Delegate Hudson said that if there was no majority support candidate in the first round, one would examine the second-choice votes as a tiebreaker. She said that in that sense, a ranked-choice or instant-runoff election was similar to traditional runoff elections held in the south for years. She said that instead of requiring everyone to return to the polls for another ballot to determine the winner in a head-to-head final race, one simply asks voters during their initial vote whom they would prefer as their second choice in case of a runoff. She said that computers had facilitated this process, enabling them to enjoy all the benefits of a runoff election in determining community consensus without incurring additional costs or experiencing lower voter turnout that often accompany repeat elections.

Ms. Price asked if there was a round two for the most recent example.

Delegate Hudson said that there were write-ins cast by 1% of the population, and those write-in votes also had their votes transferred to the next round.

Ms. Price said that in instances where there was a very small number of write-ins, it was unlikely to affect the ultimate outcome; thus, one would promptly proceed to round three.

Delegate Hudson said that just as in a traditional election, write-ins existed but typically did not significantly impact the results.

Ms. McKeel asked if the majority in these cases referred to 51% or 50.1% or another number.

Delegate Hudson said that a majority would be 50% plus one more vote. She explained that RCV became increasingly significant as the field expanded. She noted that in the wide fields commonly observed in presidential primaries, where candidates from both Democratic and Republican parties often numbered four, five, six, seven, or nine at once, the possibility of someone winning an election with 20% to 30% of the vote was substantial. She said that RCV offered an organized method for identifying a unifying candidate regardless of the number of candidates on the ballot.

Ms. Price said that if she understood correctly, in RCV, as long as her first choice candidate remained in the running, she kept her first vote there. She said that it was only when her candidate fell out that her second or potentially third or fourth choice would then be counted.

Delegate Hudson said exactly. She said as long as their first-choice candidate was still in the race, nobody looked at their second or third votes. She said it only became relevant when they needed a back-up plan because it turned out that their first-choice candidate was not popular among their fellow-voters. She said that RCV made the process less like gambling because voters did not have to think about who everybody else was voting for to tell the ballot who their favorite was. She said that many people appreciated RCV because it eliminated the feeling among voters that they might be wasting their vote by voting for the person they really liked in favor of someone who they thought they could win. She explained that RCV solved the tension by ensuring that if it turned out that their favorite candidate was not as popular among their peers, they could still have their voice heard in the final vote.

Delegate Hudson said that due to these reasons, RCV had gained popularity throughout the United States. She said that the map on the slide illustrated where RCV was currently being used. She said that Maine and Alaska, represented by purple states, had adopted RCV statewide. She said that the purple dots indicated cities that had implemented RCV. She said that Utah had fully embraced RCV, as evident by the numerous dots in the state. She said that the Bay Area cities of San Francisco, Oakland,

and Berkeley also used RCV.

Delegate Hudson said that near the Twin Cities, there was a cluster of five cities that had adopted this system: Minneapolis, St. Paul, Bloomington, Santa Fe, and Las Cruces. She said that last year, New York City, the largest city in the country, had also adopted RCV. She said that it was crucial to acknowledge that if the County were to explore RCV adoption, they would not be forging new ground. She said that, although this was relatively new to Virginia, RCV had been battle-tested in cities of various sizes across the United States.

Delegate Hudson said that in the southern region, one could observe a group of states in navy blue, where RCV had been employed for military and overseas voters for quite some time. She said that these southern states had long conducted runoff elections and required an efficient method for allowing troops stationed overseas to participate in a relatively tight turnaround runoff election. She said that consequently, Louisiana, Mississippi, and their neighboring states had been sending ranked-choice ballots to active-duty service members overseas for some time, preventing them from having to ship two rounds of ballots across the ocean.

Delegate Hudson said that this demonstrated that ranked-choice technology had been utilized in numerous ways and various locations.

Delegate Hudson said that in Virginia, they were in salmon-colored pink because RCV was previously legal only in party primary elections, conventions, and firehouse primaries that might be familiar to them. She said that both Republicans and Democrats had exercised their legal authority to use RCV in party-run primaries. She said that in 2021, Republicans nominated their statewide candidates for office using ranked-choice ballots for positions such as governor, lieutenant governor, and attorney general. She said that this year, RCV was also employed in the 10th and 11th congressional districts in northern Virginia.

Delegate Hudson said that Democrats had been slower to adopt this method, but Arlington County Democrats have used RCV internally for nominating County Board candidates for several years. She said that Steven Knotts, the GOP chairman in the 11th district and the person in charge of running this process in the party-run primary this spring, expressed a positive impression of the system. She stated that he said that the main takeaway for him was that the system works.

Delegate Hudson said that using RCV in party-run primaries came with a disadvantage, which was that they could not utilize formal state resources such as polling places, election hardware, or election staff. She said that they must conduct the process ad hoc by hand, often counting votes in hotel conference rooms. She said that in 2020, the General Assembly passed a bill that authorized local governing bodies in Virginia to adopt RCV for use in their primaries and general elections. She said that ELECT (Virginia Department of Elections) had since gone through the process of adopting supporting regulations, which included ballot standards that govern the conduct of RCV elections.

Delegate Hudson said that over the previous 6 months or so, there had been an active work group of ELECT staff, representatives from the Virginia Electoral Board Association (VEBA), local registrars from interested localities, and General Assembly members like herself to continue discussing the technical implementation details. She said that the current focus of discussions within this group was presenting clearer information to adopting localities regarding software costs and vendors. She said that this was something that the work group had been working on and would return to after the election rush for election officials who were attempting to publish a menu of potential costs for the Board and others who were considering local adoption.

Delegate Hudson said that progress seemed to be moving swiftly. She said that from her personal experience, ELECT had been highly responsive and energetic in addressing this issue. She said that it had been great to have their partnership in this work. She said that of others who might be considering, Arlington County was the furthest along in this process. She said that for the past six weeks, they had invited public comment regarding adopting an ordinance to use RCV in their elections for the following year. She said that the Board intended to initiate formal debate and discussion about this matter in the coming month.

Delegate Hudson said that Charlottesville City Councilors had expressed their intention to begin having this conversation in November. She said that they, like the County, had been preoccupied with other matters recently but were now focusing on this issue in earnest after the election staff had completed their current rush. She said that she would be happy to discuss the specific requirements if they were interested in moving forward. She said that procedurally, it was relatively simple. She said that the local governing body would have to pass an ordinance by majority vote to authorize the use of RCV in local elections.

Delegate Hudson said that it would be up to them whether that ordinance could include primaries, general elections, or both. She said that the state code was flexible on that matter. She said that the draft ordinance, at least the one from Arlington that she has seen, was fairly basic. She said that there were not many technical requirements at the ordinance level.

Delegate Hudson said that the technical investments fell into three categories: hardware and then two different kinds of software. She said that Albemarle County used Unison voting systems, which are already RCV capable in terms of their physical construction. She said that all modern voting system hardware was. She said that of the 133 localities in Virginia, only one locality had hardware that was not

currently RCV capable. She said that all major vendors were incorporating this as their default at that point.

Delegate Hudson said that besides the physical machinery, one needed at least two different kinds of software. She said that one of them was the software that scanned the ballots and recognized a grid ballot as different from a single column ballot. She mentioned that the County would need to update its ballot scanning software if it wanted to use RCV next year.

Delegate Hudson emphasized that all ballot scanning software was also moving toward being RCV capable by default. She said that if an upgrade was necessary in the future, the software required for RCV compatibility would likely be the one they needed to purchase within the next five years or three years, depending on their upgrade cycle. She said that the decision of when to implement this upgrade was up to them. She compared this situation to the upgrades their phone pushed every six months. She said that the software was moving in this direction whether they wanted it or not; it was their choice whether to use these features.

Delegate Hudson said that in addition to ballot scanning software, she mentioned that there was tabulation software that counted first and second choices while eliminating the last-place candidate. She said that fortunately, this software was available for free through a remarkable organization called the Ranked Choice Voting Resource Center, which was comprised of exceptional election administrators supporting RCV adoption nationwide. She said that the financial costs of RCV adoption would be deferred to Lauren Eddy, General Registrar and Director of Elections, to ensure that they received the most recent accurate numbers.

Delegate Hudson said that this was because Lauren had been actively involved in conversations with vendors. She mentioned that her memory from the conversation they had with the Electoral Board in September or August was that the ballot tabulation software cost was in the low five figures, such as \$10,000 or \$15,000. She said that the tabulation software was free and open source. She noted that due to concerns raised, the original legislation passed in 2020 included a backstop that would have required localities to cover any costs incurred by the state for upgrading its systems to support an RCV election.

Delegate Hudson said that the state had since learned that these potential costs were minimal and did not anticipate needing to pass any of the costs of adoption for ELECT's internal systems onto localities. She said that the locality would bear the costs of upgrading its machinery to RCV. She said that there would be no coordination costs incurred to prepare ELECT for this change. She said that ELECT was currently updating its statewide systems to be RCV capable in case Virginia ever decided to use RCV statewide like Maine and Alaska. She said that this was a two-plus-year project that could proceed in parallel to potential local adoption without imposing costs on their shoulders.

Delegate Hudson said that the next question was what might a timeline for Albemarle adopting RCV look like. She said that to her knowledge, there were no known technical barriers to Albemarle using RCV in a 2023 fall election in terms of software, availability, and costs. She said that the candidates and parties would likely prefer knowing the rules earlier rather than later so that they can consider whether or not they want to run under those rules. She said that in most jurisdictions that had adopted RCV for local elections, they eliminated party primaries entirely because party primaries typically served to winnow the field. She said that RCV solved this problem, so it was no issue to have three or four people run at the same time.

Delegate Hudson said that many places, especially in Utah, perceived the ability to shorten the length of the campaign cycle and reduce costs for candidates and the electorate as benefits of RCV. She said that the system enabled everyone to run simultaneously in an election cycle that more closely resembled current school board elections and less like the two-stage primary-general process of federal or state offices. She said that if they aimed to maintain a similar timeline to Arlington County's approach, they allowed six weeks for public comment.

Delegate Hudson acknowledged that if they were planning this for 2023, it did become somewhat challenging in terms of providing a couple of months for the public to consider this matter and having everything finalized before spring candidates emerged. She said that the positive aspect was that if they were considering adoption and the parties were inclined to forgo a primary, the situation became easier if they made that decision. She said that they could inform them in January or February, and they would discover that they had more time, not less.

Mr. Gallaway said that he stated a few weeks earlier that he was quite uneducated regarding RCV. He said that he found it crucial to begin understanding what it is about. He said that the explanation of how the second choice goes to the other candidate was particularly helpful in his comprehension. He said that his first question was, not being well-versed in this topic, what were the criticisms of RCV. He said that he was unable to play devil's advocate due to his insufficient knowledge of the subject matter. He asked what the other side of the argument was.

Delegate Hudson said that the document, the RCV FAQ that she attempted to share earlier in the fall, aimed to address the most common questions. She said that the first question people asked was whether voters understood this system and if they found it clear. She said that to assess this objectively, they could examine exit polls. She said that they could ask voters who had participated in RCV jurisdictions whether they understood the process, liked it, and would prefer it in future elections. She mentioned that the New America Foundation had conducted independent research on this topic, which demonstrated that exit polls consistently showed positive responses.

Delegate Hudson said that another objective measure as to whether voters understood it was that many jurisdictions held ranked-choice and traditional elections simultaneously. She said that for instance, when voting for the mayor of Oakland, voters might participate in ranked-choice local elections and gubernatorial elections and presidential elections on the same ballot. She said that they could compare error rates between the two methods. She said that they found that there was no significant difference between the rates. She said that there were always rates of overvotes. She mentioned that there was a small set of people who mis-bubble in every election.

Delegate Hudson said that the rate of overvotes between the ranked-choice and traditional sections of the ballots did not differ. She said that some people did not read or follow instructions, but this did not vary depending on whether they were casting a ranked-choice ballot. She said that the good news was that the ballot scanning software was designed to reject ballots that were bubbled incorrectly. She said that when people inserted the ballot and saw the happy American flag indicating that they had completed their duty, the software could check for that as well.

Delegate Hudson said that if they were concerned that people might not understand RCV and may be functionally disenfranchised, the two best pieces of evidence they had to address this question suggested that it was not a major concern, provided that communities invested in appropriate education. She said that if they had gathered 100 voters today and provided them with a ranked-choice ballot, they would likely have some questions.

Delegate Hudson said that best practices had been developed by communities across the country regarding good ballot design. She said that these practices ensured that instructions were clear, graphics were intuitive, and the language used to train staff was easily understandable. She said that in the communities that excelled at implementing RCV, they actively engaged broader civic institutions such as schools and local businesses in promoting RCV.

Delegate Hudson said that one example she liked was Fair Vote Minnesota in the Twin Cities, which had been operating for over a decade. She said that this non-profit advocacy organization collaborates closely with the restaurant community to facilitate practice sessions using ranked-choice ballots in an apolitical context, such as at ice cream shops where patrons can select their favorite flavor. She said that in the absence of that option, her backup choice is chocolate, and if the sole offering at this baseball game is vanilla ice cream, she still wants ice cream.

Delegate Hudson said that in Minnesota, they had an annual festival called Best of the Wurst, and they used ranked-choice ballots to pick the winner of the festival. She said that the concept was to make it enjoyable and apolitical, encouraging a large number of people to participate and generate community excitement around the event. She said that people often ask the follow-up question was about what this does to candidates and whether it affects how they run.

Delegate Hudson said that the significant impact of RCV was that it aligns candidates and voters' incentives by giving candidates a reason to coalition build. She said that it encouraged candidates to engage with everyone, not just their base. She said that one of the most powerful pieces of evidence for this comes from a video featuring the first female mayor of Minneapolis who discusses her experience running in her first ranked-choice election.

Delegate Hudson played the video for the Board.

Delegate Hudson said that what made this choice particularly attractive was that it enabled candidates to identify what they have in common, and then try to distinguish themselves based on substantial differences. She said that in Maine, candidates for governor would now appear together in ads, requesting voters to rank them in order of preference. She said that they would campaign together, emphasizing that they want to be their first choice or their second choice, depending on the voter's preference. She said that this approach allowed candidates to highlight their shared issues while also distinguishing themselves based on their unique perspectives.

Mr. Gallaway said that three of them who recently ran for the Board did so uncontested, including himself. He said that this could potentially be beneficial in terms of participation, as more people might feel encouraged to participate if they believed they had a chance. He said that the animosity of running a contested campaign may also disappear, potentially attracting more individuals. He said that there might be factors contributing to this that warrant further exploration.

Delegate Hudson said that the adoption of ranked-choice voting had led to significant changes in political representation. She said that one question that arises was how RCV affected historically underrepresented candidates and candidate diversity. She said that in communities that had implemented RCV, they consistently observed a broader range of individuals deciding to engage as candidates in politics, particularly those who had experienced the harshest forms of negative campaigning in the past. She said that this increased candidate representation subsequently encourages voter engagement, as more individuals find candidates who resonate with their specific concerns or perspectives within the community. She said that there was a positive feedback loop between candidate and voter engagement.

Mr. Andrews said that Mr. Gallaway brought up the point he intended to make. He said that the fact that he had won the election, and he was the sole candidate meant that it would not have made much of a difference in that regard. He said that he believed that this was an essential point in that people's decision to run as candidates could be influenced by RCV just as much as the electorate's ability to

choose among candidates. He said that he appreciated their acknowledging this issue.

Ms. McKeel said that she believed that they were all considering this particular issue since they had discussed how they could best ensure that their Board better represented the community. She said that Delegate Hudson's presentation suggested that the data would reveal that they could potentially achieve greater diversity within their Board, as it would likely inspire more individuals to apply for positions.

Delegate Hudson said that New York City's 51-member city council, which represented 10 million people, was quite remarkable and could be considered similar to a small state legislature. She said that prior to adopting RCV, they had never had more than approximately 18 women council members. She said that the year after implementing RCV, they experienced their first majority women city council in their history, with the majority being women of color. She said that this provided a significant opportunity for diversifying what was arguably the most diverse representative body in the country.

Ms. McKeel said that she was uncertain about the best way to phrase this question; however, she would like to inquire if there was any data available regarding the impact of this phenomenon on campaign financing or external influence on monetary contributions. She said that although they had not observed significant effects in their specific campaigns, she was curious if there was any data regarding groups that had experienced such impacts.

Delegate Hudson said that she did not know the answer immediately, but if there was such a case, it would likely be found in these resources from the New America Foundation since they had attempted to consolidate information. She said that consistently, candidates argued that RCV reduced negativity because negative campaigns stood out in stark contrast during ranked-choice elections.

Delegate Hudson said that consequently, if someone were to air drop extreme mailers from an outside advocacy organization, voters would be more likely to notice this in a ranked-choice election. She said that in communities that had used RCV to eliminate long primary parties followed by low turnout general elections, it also lowered the financial cost for candidates. She said that as a result, potential candidates considering running for office may be more inclined to participate if they do not have to raise funds for two separate elections.

Ms. McKeel said that it was evident that at times, and she was not speaking necessarily just locally, but one could see extremely wealthy individuals who could self-finance. She said that she was trying to figure that out.

Ms. McKeel said that she had one more question. She said that it may be a little harder to answer, but they had heard the concern in their community, not a widespread concern, but some concern about the cost. She said that she wanted to understand better where the General Assembly stood on the funding because, in her terms as an elected official, she had to say many times the General Assembly had said something, and then at the end of the day or another year later, that was not what happened. She said that she was just being honest and trying to figure out the funding.

Delegate Hudson said that she would show where she believed the initial concern about costs originated. She said that shown on the current slide was the bill that passed in 2020, and at that time, the General Assembly had not yet allocated funding for the state's upgrade of its statewide voter registration system, VERIS. She said that VERIS was also where results got reported and served as the main software headquarters for everything that ELECT did. She said that there were concerns at the time because ELECT had not yet thoroughly researched RCV, and there was a possibility of conflicts between local adoption of RCV and their need to update their systems.

Delegate Hudson said that their request, they included a provision in the initial bill that stated that any costs incurred by the Department of Elections related to changes in technology necessary for RCV shall be charged to the localities exercising the option to proceed with RCV. She said that what they had since learned in the time since was that no such technological changes were required.

Delegate Hudson said that ELECT would make changes to VERIS over the next two years, which would position them to potentially support a statewide ranked-choice election. She said that at a local level, they could handle results reporting without needing to go through VERIS. She said that they were not counting on the word of the General Assembly that they would continue adequately funding a state agency because she also shared concerns about those promises. She said that rather, since the bill was passed, ELECT had learned that the costs they were worried they would have to cover did not exist.

Ms. McKeel asked if there was a stipulation in the law that specified they must have a certain length of public comment period.

Delegate Hudson said that it was not specified.

Ms. Mallek asked if vendors had already been certified and were in place to handle this, because in the past, getting the machinery certified was a hang-up for many years.

Delegate Hudson said that she understood that for Unisyn, they were on track with the certification timeline if they wanted to adopt it in 2023. She said that she would love for Ms. Eddy and ELECT to address this directly in the materials they were preparing formally.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she had one question regarding her explanation. She asked if there were four candidates and the fourth one was a write-in candidate, would the process proceed by taking those write-ins, placing them for the second round, considering them for first, second, and third choice, and ultimately declaring the winner based on majority votes in that round. She asked if this was correct.

Delegate Hudson said that write-in candidates receive treatment similar to other candidates in that their votes would be tallied up. She said that if they are in last place, they would be eliminated.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that in such a scenario where the write-in was the fourth candidate, the votes would be distributed to the third person.

Delegate Hudson said exactly. She said that if someone had a first-choice candidate who was on the ballot, their second choice could be a write-in, and their third choice could be someone declared on the ballot. She said that in all these cases, their names would be treated as if they had been there from the start.

Ms. Price said that using every option or bubble in the voting process ensures that their voice was heard, especially if their preferred candidate was eliminated. She said that she was in full support of this approach. She said that she was not an election denier nor a conspiracy theorist. She said that she had served as an election official for 10 years in two different jurisdictions across five different precincts, and she had confidence in the electoral system.

Delegate Hudson said that there was a question that Jim Nicks from the City Electoral Board had posed to her early in this process, and there were resources available that she would be happy to discuss in more detail later regarding how to conduct standard risk-limiting audits for ranked-choice elections. She said that these audits involved selecting a random subsample and identifying whether or not they matched the results.

Delegate Hudson said that the experts at the Ranked Choice Voting Resource Center were invaluable in this regard. She said that they were highly knowledgeable and responsive. She said that she was certain that if they would like them to join their next meeting or speak with them individually, they would be more than happy to delve into the specifics of election hardware. She said they were attorneys and tech-savvy individuals. She said that her knowledge about this topic was limited, and she would recommend reaching out to them for further information.

Ms. Price said that she would offer to the Board that if they decided to proceed with this, it would be very beneficial as a part of their process helping the public understand that this was not a significant risk.

Agenda Item No. 3. Adjourn to 10:00 a.m., Room 241.

At 9:46 a.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to 10:00 a.m. in Room 241 on the Second Floor of the Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order.

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

ABSENT: None.

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

LEGISLATORS PRESENT: Senator Creigh Deeds of the 25th District; Delegate Sally Hudson of the 57th District; Delegate Chris Runion of the 25th District (remote); and Delegate Robert Bell of the 58th District.

Ms. Price called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. in Room 241 of the Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902. Ms. Price stated that Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley had requested to participate remotely in accordance with applicable Board Rules of Procedure, Rule 8(B)(1)(b), enacted pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act and stated that she was unable to attend the meeting in person due a medical condition.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley stated that she was located in Keswick, Virginia.

Ms. Price **moved** to allow Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley to participate remotely. Mr. Andrews **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Gallaway, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Mr. Andrews, and Ms. Price.

NAYS: None.

ABSTENTIONS: Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley.

Agenda Item No. 2. Welcome and Introductions.

Ms. Price announced the legislative delegation members in attendance: Senator Creigh Deeds, Delegate Rob Bell, Delegate Sally Hudson, and Delegate Chris Runyon. She noted that Delegate Runyon was participating remotely.

Ms. Price introduced Albemarle County Police Officers present at the meeting, Officers Ben Chisom and Steve McCall.

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

Mr. David Blount, Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission Legislative Liaison, said that he was grateful for the opportunity to address everyone that morning. He said that he would spend a few minutes discussing the primary focus of the draft legislative program for the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) region and its priorities. He said that these priorities would be up for approval in various jurisdictions this November, specifically during their meeting on November 16, 2022.

Mr. Blount said that the three top priorities for this year included public education funding, which remained a significant issue across all localities in the region; this involved state support for K-12 education and specifically requesting that the state fully fund its share of the realistic cost of the standards of quality (SOQs). He said that this position had been in the regional program for several years. He said that what was new this year was requesting more flexibility in the use of state funding when state compensation increases for school employees were awarded. He said that there was also a new statement encouraging state support for adequate pipeline programs for teachers, particularly in critical shortage areas, and some emphasis on supporting funding and policies that assist localities in addressing challenges in hiring school bus drivers, which would resonate with some of the work that was going on with the County School Board.

Mr. Blount said that the second priority position related to budgets and funding. He said that he called this issue perennial: they supported increased state aid, did not want unfunded mandates, and supported the preservation of local revenue authority. He said that this position statement encompassed all of these items. He said that what was new in this position this year was some specific language urging the preservation of the local option sales tax. He said that as they knew, that had been somewhat in the crosshairs during the past General Assembly session during the discussion about eliminating the tax on sales tax on groceries.

Mr. Blount said that the third priority statement related to broadband expansion. He said that they were not proposing anything new in this statement this year. He said that this was a general statement in support of state and federal efforts for expanding broadband access to unserved areas. He said that as they knew, they were very grateful at TJPDC that this had happened in terms of a lot of money that had been put forward, ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funding running through the state, and TJPDC working in collaboration with Firefly Broadband to expand broadband access across 13 counties in the greater central Virginia area. He emphasized the importance of continuing these efforts in that area.

Mr. Blount said that he would like to point out a few other positions outside of the priorities that were part of the ongoing legislative position statements being addressed. He said that one was to add some specific language to support and acknowledge the school construction assistance programs that were enacted during the past General Assembly session, and that they were maintaining the statement that was introduced into the program last year in support of local governments having the authority to enact the one-cent sales tax for school construction.

Mr. Blount said that secondly, he would like to draw attention to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). He said that they had some legislation in the past year that provided additional flexibility. He said that the TJPDC met last night and endorsed a letter that they would be sending out to various legislators and local representatives, requesting further flexibility and authority, particularly concerning holding electronic meetings. He said that Mr. Gallaway could address this matter.

Mr. Blount said that finally, there was new language in the position statement on housing, aiming to emphasize local authority and incentives in providing housing benefits. He said that these were the main highlights of the draft legislative program for the region.

Senator Creigh Deeds said that Albemarle County's broadband connection rate was likely one of the highest in the country for broadband. He said that Firefly, which was based in the area, had surpassed the initial efforts of BARC (BARC Electric Cooperative), the first cooperative in the state to tackle broadband expansion. He said that Firefly now served as a role model for other cooperatives in the region. He said that in fact, they manage work for other cooperatives throughout the Commonwealth. He said that Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville had been fortunate to benefit from Firefly's services.

Senator Deeds mentioned that legislation had been requested to grant the County and the City the ability to hold a referendum to increase the sales tax. He said that he believed that they would

encounter the same obstacles they faced previously, which would require them to find alternative ways to overcome them. He said that the presence of obstacles does not imply that they should not attempt to work around them. He said that they should strive to do so.

Senator Deeds said that he was certainly interested in the remaining challenges in public education funding due to the Governor's proposal of a tax cut that nearly equaled the amount of funding required for the Commonwealth to provide 100% of the funding for SOQs. He said that as a result, they would face the basic challenge of budgeting. He said that ultimately, it would be challenging to reach some compromise in order to achieve progress.

Delegate Rob Bell said that the parts of the County that he represented had regular constituent concerns regarding their provision of services through CenturyLink. He said that most of them had tried various approaches simply to provide the service that people believed they had already paid for. He said that regarding the agenda described, one of the more exciting aspects would be to offer an alternative option. He said that one of the issues had been that there had not been other options for people in those areas; they were stuck with this or nothing. He said that this had always been the trade-off, and this would hopefully be improved by offering some alternatives. He thanked them for including this in the package.

Delegate Sally Hudson said that she would discuss the aspects regarding fully funding the SOQs and then broadband. She said that Senator Deeds was correct in making the point about the holes in the SOQs being comparable in size to the tax cut package that the governor was proposing. She said that this amounted to approximately \$400 million annually. She said that she believed they had a significant responsibility to educate the public about where this revenue was coming from and why it was misguided to consider cutting those taxes.

Delegate Hudson said that the majority of the unexpected growth in state-level revenue was derived from taxes stemming from investments. She said that over the past two years, there had been a significant increase of 75% in growth coming from taxes generated by personal investments such as dividends and IRAs, among others. She also said that corporate profit tax contributed to a smaller portion of their state budget. That is the money that came back to Virginia because they were a good place to do business.

Delegate Hudson said that if they were considering attracting businesses that valued an educated workforce and sound housing and transportation, they must, when tax revenues came in, invest them back into Virginia in the characteristics that made this an attractive place to live and work and to run a business. She said that she thought it was misguided for the governor to use messaging around unanticipated revenue that suggested Virginians were being overtaxed and that money should be returned to taxpayers.

Delegate Hudson said that this money was coming in because corporate profits were soaring, and payouts to investors were rising in tandem; this was money they should be investing back into various areas that had been neglected, such as their teachers and construction. She said that she believed that it was their responsibility to develop powerful, proactive messaging to counteract the narrative regarding where that revenue came from.

Delegate Hudson said that briefly addressing the broadband issue, she believed that they all shared excitement regarding the expansion they had witnessed. She said that she was aware that certain areas within the County had experienced unexpected departures of their internet service providers. She said that she was certain that constituents had made everyone aware of this issue. She said that one of the lessons she learned during this process was that the State Corporation Commission (SCC) did not possess authority over broadband as a utility, despite its significant expansion into a vital utility for any family, which was internet access.

Delegate Hudson said that consequently, she was collaborating with a colleague to explore ways of granting the SCC appropriate oversight over broadband. She said that this would enable them to have the full range of consumer protection tools that they currently had for other utilities like water and electric. She said that broadband had become as essential as water and electric, yet they lacked a strong framework in Virginia for addressing consumer protection for broadband customers. She said that therefore, they must begin considering at an institutional level how they could adequately regulate broadband.

Delegate Chris Runion said that he shared the appreciation regarding the significant resources being put into broadband. He said that the portion of Albemarle that he represented had expressed concerns regarding delays or slowness in implementation. He said that they were extremely concerned about this issue. He said that he understood their frustration, as everything seemed to be slower than desired in this environment. He said that he did see progress being made. He said that the beam pullout was indeed a setback, affecting approximately 1,300 constituents in the 25th District negatively.

Delegate Runion said that there was some movement forward that may help some of those affected. He said that Ms. Hudson's comment regarding the era in which broadband has gained increased attention and the debate over whether it should be regulated as a utility or at what appropriate level had been noted. He said that they anticipated engaging in discussions that would provide their constituents with fair treatment and contribute to economic growth. He said that he concurred with Delegate Bell's concern regarding quality issues of current providers. He said that they would continue to address these concerns moving forward.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was very interested in broadband and wanted to bring everyone up to date. She said that she recently spoke with the presidents of CVEC (Central Virginia Electric Cooperative), Firefly, and Dominion. She said that it appeared that Albemarle would not be fully fibered until the end of 2025. She said that they hoped it would be completed before then, but that was their current estimate. She said that she was overall supportive of the TJPDC's priorities as presented.

Mr. Gallaway said that addressing the virtual meeting and electronic participation when they went through their packet. He said that he was very disappointed to hear the news regarding the SOQ issues in education.

Mr. Andrews said that he was in support of the TJPDC's program and priorities. He said that the unanticipated revenues referenced earlier were from taxes on dividends that looked like a shock when reporting the number of losses for this year. He said that they should change that picture.

Ms. McKeel said that she agreed with the disappointment regarding the SOQ funding issue. She said that in relation to what Ms. Hudson mentioned earlier, one of the factors that attracted businesses to Virginia was its high-quality education system for employees. She said that therefore, it was crucial for Virginia to maintain its high-quality public education system.

Ms. McKeel said that regarding the reference to the SCC, she wanted to ask about some information she saw recently that indicated they had not been operating very strongly because they had been experiencing some membership shortages. She said that she would like to confirm if this issue has been resolved or if there is any update on its current status.

Delegate Hudson said that there were three commissioners, or judges, and there was currently a vacant seat. She said that the General Assembly failed to complete the one task they returned to accomplish in the summer, which was to fill that seat.

Ms. McKeel said that if they were not operating and they had an empty seat, then when they tried to get them to help, they were unable to do so. She asked what the picture of that was.

Senator Deeds said that discussions regarding filling that slot had continued. He said that it was inexcusable that they were unable to devise a solution. He said that there should have been numerous individuals available. He said that they lived in a world where compromise was necessary for these matters. He said that Democrats cannot always have their way, nor can Republicans. He said that they were not successful in doing so during the past year. He said that their efforts spanned from January to September; however, ultimately, they failed.

Ms. McKeel said that over the years, she had referred constituents to the SCC to report issues. She asked if the body continued to meet.

Senator Deeds said that the SCC continued to function, fulfilling its responsibilities. He said that primarily, the work of the commission was carried out by its staff. He said that currently, there were three judges who made the decisions. He said that in case of a tie vote, there was no one to break the deadlock. He said that there were no tie votes this year.

Ms. McKeel said that she remained very concerned and hoped that it was resolved quickly.

Ms. Mallek said that she was certainly for the continual need to fix the budget.

Ms. Mallek said she guessed it was legislative authority that the SCC could be given to better regulate the kinds of communication company issues that they have been having for 15 years. She said that only when CenturyLink was getting ready to sell all its assets did the locality have any ability to say anything. She said she thought they were very successful; they went down with a large stack of complaints and multiple people testified across the region. She said she hoped that the conditions that were put on the sale would give them a little bit of recourse, but she was horrified to learn that they really had no authority to do much for them, except for the declared utilities. She said she hoped they would think about ways that they could expand the authorities to non-utility communication companies because their constituents are all being taken to the cleaners. She said that what was now the end of 2025 was previously the end of 2022.

Ms. Mallek said that, from the workforce point of view on the SOQs, what they heard the most was from employers who said they couldn't find employees who had the basic skills, and that they would train them, but they must have the basic skills. She said that she supported the certificate programs and no longer requiring a bachelor's degree as a minimum. She said that continuing funding for those would be very important.

Ms. Price said that she would like to follow up regarding the internet situation. She said that she was one of the constituents who recently lost Shentel Beam and had to switch to CenturyLink, Lumen, and Brightspeed, which may now be called Apollo. She said that she consistently experienced internet buffering and signal loss issues. She said that she often relied on her cell phone hotspot instead of Brightspeed due to its unreliability. She said that as a result, she was unable to efficiently complete tasks while waiting for reactions. She said that her download speed was 1.4 Mbps, and her upload speed 0.4 Mbps if she was lucky.

Ms. Price then said that she would like to commend Gary Wood of CVEC and Firefly. She said

that she had attended a presentation approximately two years ago and was so impressed when he discussed how he offered to the internet providers to use his poles, and they agreed, provided they could make a significant profit from it. They said they would not provide service to those living far out. She said that Mr. Wood emphasized that no customer would be left behind. She said that this was what they had been doing. She said that Albemarle County faced a significant issue, as many residents lived in areas such as hollows and valleys where the required pass-by distance was beyond 650 feet.

Ms. Price said that in numerous instances, including her own residence, the distance from the main road to the property was over 2,500 feet. She said that this was very common in Albemarle County. She said that they not only needed the attitude that Mr. Woods had demonstrated to ensure that no customer was left behind but also needed to guarantee affordability for connectivity where those pass-bys occurred. She said that she concurred with the disappointment that 2022, if they were lucky, would be replaced by 2025. She said that she thanked everyone for their attention.

Senator Deeds asked how far Firefly would travel down the driveway with that charge.

Ms. Price said that she received information that they aimed to be very supportive of going beyond the 650 feet that had previously been. She said that previously, there was no additional cost for connection up to 650 feet. She said that if one exceeded 650 feet, they did not pay the difference; they paid the full connection cost instead. She said that such practices were unaffordable. She said that they should treat internet access similarly to electricity. She said that the 1936 Rural Electrification Act served as a model for addressing this issue on both national and state levels, as they could not operate without essential services like water, electricity, and internet.

Delegate Hudson said that in response to Ms. Mallek's point, these companies have been operating with federal and state funding and minimal oversight.

Mr. Blount said that he was reviewing the application for the body 2022 grant. He said that he believed Firefly had stated their goal as up to 2,500 feet.

Agenda Item No. 4. Albemarle County 2023 Legislative Priorities.

Mr. Steve Rosenberg, County Attorney, said that he would like to extend his greetings to the members of the Board and the local delegation of the General Assembly. He said that he had been serving as the County Attorney for the past three months, so he was new to the position. He said that he would like to express his gratitude to the members of the delegation for participating in today's meeting. He said that for the County, he would proceed by reviewing the legislative priorities of the Board of Supervisors for the upcoming 2023 session. He said that initially, he would like to recap the Board's process for the development of its priorities.

Mr. Rosenberg said that on June 15, the Board looked back at its 2022 efforts and the legislation that was enacted in response to those efforts and the legislation that failed. He said that they then began discussing possible priorities for 2023. He said that in September, the Board continued its discussion of priorities. He said that on October 19, the Board adopted its priorities for the 2023 session, along with some legislative positions and policy statements. He said that he himself was educated in the process regarding the distinction between these two. He said that they would cover seven legislative priorities that were the Board's primary initiatives for the upcoming session.

Mr. Rosenberg said that there was also a separate set of positions and policy statements that had been adopted by the Board, as in previous years, which were of no less importance but had a broader scope, that set forth the Board's views on various subjects that may be the subject of legislation spearheaded by others during the session.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the members of the delegation had received a four-page 2023 legislative priorities document, which would be the focus of his remarks for the next 10 minutes or so.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the first three priorities would be familiar to them because they were returning from the 2022 session; however, he would not spend much time on these, and would review them at a high level. He said that the remaining four priorities were new and were the focus of the Board's efforts for the first time this year.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the three carryover priorities from the 2022 session included enabling civil penalties in lieu of criminal punishment for violations of local ordinances. He said that last session, Delegate Hudson carried House Bill 627, which failed in committee. He said that the Board continued to desire this authority to transition from criminal punishment to civil penalties for certain violations of County ordinances.

Mr. Rosenberg provided some concrete examples, such as prohibitions on smoking in certain public places, unlawful destruction of trees, curfews for minors, and destroying or failing to return library books. He said that these were examples of ordinances that were currently punishable as crimes and could be transitioned to a civil penalty scheme.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the next priority, returning from 2022, was to expand the County's authority to use photo speed monitoring devices. He said that two bills were introduced during the

previous session: House Bill 630 carried by Delegate Hudson, and House Bill 747 carried by Delegate Bell, both of which failed in committee.

Mr. Rosenberg said that he would not delve too deeply into this matter except to draw attention to the rationale for the Board's inclusion of this priority in its package. He said that they had emphasized the additional safety that would be afforded by law enforcement officers who were often required to run radar on dangerous and winding segments of roads in the County without any sort of shoulder with drop-offs. He said that this tool, subject to all of the other requirements anticipated as part of a photo monitoring program, would provide additional protection to their law enforcement officers in enforcing current speed regulations in the County.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the third returning priority from the previous session was to require agricultural buildings used by the public to be subject to minimum safety standards. He said that this piece of legislation was adopted by the General Assembly last year, Senate Bill 400, which he believed Senator Hanger led the way on. He said that he would like to express appreciation to Delegates Hudson and Runion and Senator Deeds for their support of this legislation. He said that to assess the current status of this legislation, it required that the Board of Housing and Community Development (BHCD) promulgate safety regulations for what are called agritourism event buildings. He said that this was the newly defined term in the state code.

Mr. Rosenberg said that an agritourism event building was one located on property where farming operations or agritourism took place, which was primarily used for holding events and entertainment gatherings open to the public, 300 people or less. He said that the legislation established an agritourism event structure technical advisory committee to assist the BHCD in its administration of the new requirements. He said that this committee had actually organized and met but none of the required regulations had yet been drafted because the legislation included a reenactment clause. He said that in order to be effective, this approach must be adopted again during the upcoming session. He said that for this reason, the Board requested continued support for this particular priority.

Mr. Rosenberg said that moving on to the four new priorities of the Board, some of which may have sounded familiar from Mr. Blount's remarks concerning the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) legislative program, the first priority was to grant the County taxing authority for school division capital projects. He said that this would involve an amendment to Title 58.1 to make Albemarle eligible to levy an additional 1% retail sales tax for funding school division capital projects.

Mr. Rosenberg said that there were two approaches here: one was to open this authority up to all localities in the state; the other being specific legislation to add Albemarle County to the nine other counties that already had this authority. He said that these counties included Charlotte, Gloucester, Halifax, Henry, Mecklenburg, Northampton, Patrick, Pittsylvania, and the city of Danville. He said that there were two distinct approaches there. He mentioned that Senator Deeds had already noted that there is a requirement for a referendum.

Mr. Rosenberg said that if this legislation were enacted, authorizing the County to exercise the authority to impose an additional retail sales tax, it would require approval by the voters in a referendum. He added that this approval would only be valid for a period of 20 years.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the second new priority was to change the eligibility requirements for the Virginia Business Ready Sites Program (VBRSP). He explained that this was a program of the Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP), which provides both site characterization and site development grants to localities for industrial sites located in those localities.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the County currently participated in the site characterization grant program but was limited in its ability to participate in the developed site development grant program due to the absence of contiguous developable parcels of 100 acres or more located in the County. He said that the Board's proposal was to reduce the minimum site acreage from 100 contiguous developable acres to 50 contiguous developable acres.

Mr. Rosenberg said that there were alternatives that could be implemented either on a statewide basis or by adding GO Virginia Region 9, in which the County was located, to the list of other regions where the lower threshold is already applicable, such as GO Virginia regions 1 and 2. He said there was precedent for a 50-acre threshold. He mentioned that one reason for the lower acre threshold in those two regions was the topography of those regions. He said that he would suggest that the same topographical challenges present in regions 1 & 2 also existed in Albemarle County.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the County was doing what it could by utilizing site characterization grants. He also said that it was currently collaborating with the University of Virginia Foundation in an effort to obtain a site development grant from VEDP for the University's North Fork Discovery Park, which was the only eligible site in the County under the current guidelines.

Delegate Bell asked if there were sites in mind that would fit the new guidelines but did not fit the old. He asked if staff could generally describe parts of the County or where they would be located.

Mr. Rosenberg said that he did not have details regarding the location within the County; however, they had consulted with the County's Economic Development Office (EDO), and this proposed change would be significant. He said that there were existing parcels that would qualify under a lower threshold.

Delegate Bell said that he would ask staff if they could provide them with details of the five parcels. He asked if those of them who had been around for some time and could recall various proposals made and the County's reactions to them could share what kind of projects they would be seeking for a 50-acre or 100-acre parcel. He said that this information would help them better understand what people might be interested in and whether they could either encourage or discourage them accurately.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that Project ENABLE was the economic development strategic plan, which had been adopted in October of 2017. He said that the plan was now five years old, and Mr. Roger Johnson, who was the County's Economic Development Director and had been with the County for four years, had been working diligently on it. He said that they had a small and nimble team focusing on Albemarle County, where their primary focus was supporting businesses and industries already present in the area to sustain and grow those companies.

Mr. Richardson said that in the fall of 2022, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Project ENABLE strategic plan with the full support of a joint session involving the Planning Commission and the Economic Development Authority (EDA) Board. He said that this was supported unanimously by all three boards. He said that over these five years, the team had employed a scalpel approach across Albemarle County to support the community and adhere to the strategic plan. He said that Mr. Rosenberg discussed the Board's recent approval of the 2024 – 2029 strategic plan.

Mr. Richardson said that in adopting this strategic plan, the Board supported the recommendation to update their economic development plan, Project ENABLE, to ensure alignment with Albemarle County's goals for the next five years. He said that he could confirm that in the past year, they had collaborated with several existing businesses and companies in their County, working diligently to identify suitable land for their growth expansion. He said that this had proven to be a significant challenge in Albemarle County. He said that Ms. McKeel was a member of the EDA, so she may be able to provide some more perspective.

Ms. McKeel said that Mr. Richardson had captured the concept well. She said that an example was Willowtree, which was located in the City and had run out of space, planning to leave the area. She said that they were able to provide them with an alternative site in the County to prevent losing their business. She said that while they could discuss more examples if time permitted, she could also provide additional information to Mr. Bell, should he require it regarding this matter.

Mr. Bell said that his question was more basic. He asked if there were sites that would be considered prime or if there were some that did not meet expectations in terms of a business looking to relocate. He said that he was thinking of the discrete group of businesses already present in that area. He said that he vaguely knew what Willowtree did as a company. He asked if that would be a suitable example of something they would want to see if someone else was considering moving their business to Albemarle. He said that it would be something Albemarle would see as attractive if they started talking to the boards they talked about.

Mr. Gallaway said that as they examined the Albemarle Business Campus, currently under development on Fifth Street Extended, they anticipated that it would attract new industries, primarily in the medical and pharmaceutical sectors. He said that while Project ENABLE was about supporting businesses that were currently in the County and helping them grow, the industries they were trying to bring into the County could be contained in a small area that they did not need 100 acres for.

Ms. McKeel said that they had been trying to partner with UVA to keep entrepreneurs coming out of UVA in the area rather than losing them. She said that one example of local businesses engaged in this type of work was situated in the former Comdial building. She said that many people were unaware that manufacturing took place there; but it is multiple manufacturing groups. She said that Northrop Grumman was another example of a company already involved in this industry. She said that these were the types of industries they aimed to support.

Delegate Bell said that he understood the concept better with the information provided.

Ms. Price said that primarily what they were focusing on were STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) industries, not iron and steel or large warehouse-type operations. She said that they were a highly educated, predominantly technical area, aiming to attract technology, biotechnology, and engineering businesses that were prevalent in the new age. She said that as mentioned earlier, they did not necessarily need 100 acres for this purpose. She said that if they could secure 50 acres that suited their topography, it would enable them to better position themselves to both retain existing businesses and attract new ones.

Delegate Hudson asked Mr. Blount if he had had this conversation with their companions in Planning District 6 and 7. She said that if she was just a neutral party as a legislator, and they were trying to make the case that the Blue Ridge did not stop at Amherst but there were localities that stretched down the mountains, it would be more equitable to try to team up with the localities on either side of the Blue Ridge and argue that they had been left out. She said that if this was truly about topography, they stopped halfway down the mountain range, and they should be working to build a broader coalition.

Mr. Blount said that he did float this with some of his colleagues in Augusta County and got an indication of some possible interest.

Senator Deeds said that this was especially timely because he had recently read an article about what Virginia lacked compared to other states, which were large sites ready for business. He said that the article provided examples of Virginia losing automobile manufacturers to South Carolina and Mississippi. He said that this made perfect sense, as it was just a question of whether they were ready for one of those types of businesses. He said that they had mentioned they had some partnerships with the university, but this would allow them to generate more space to house those industries.

Delegate Bell said that presumably, Mr. Blount interacted outside the circles that the rest of them did; therefore, this would have already occurred if there were not some reason why it might not. He said that they were inquiring about adding funds to a fixed pot of money specifically for preserving resources for megasites rather than smaller ones. He said that he was wondering what concerns or opposition might exist regarding this idea. He said that he could think of only one concern, which was that perhaps they were attempting to preserve funds for larger sites.

Mr. Blount said that his understanding was that there was initially only a small amount of funding available for site development, approximately \$5 or \$10 million, until the recent increase approved by the General Assembly. He said that upon examining the budget language, there appeared to be an emphasis given by VEDP on considering megasites, which were over 1,000 acres.

Mr. Blount said that Virginia had recently ranked at the top in terms of business site readiness; however, one deficiency was identified in sites above 250 acres. He said that his sense was that VEDP was focusing more on these larger sites; however, they had allowed for exceptions in topographically challenged areas where sufficient acreage could not be assembled for development.

Mr. Rosenberg said that there were two remaining priorities that were part of the Board's initiatives included amending the FOIA. He said that the desire was to make more permissive the current provisions related to electronic meetings. He said that as proposed, the changes would grant all Virginia localities the authority to hold all meetings of public bodies virtually, without limitations on the number of meetings that could be held virtually.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the rationale behind this was that virtual meetings, born of the pandemic, had led to increased public participation and made it easier for bodies, including advisory boards and commissions, to provide input to city councils and boards of supervisors. He said that the amended legislation included guard rails that should provide safeguards and protections to ensure that these meetings were conducted openly, transparently, and in a way that maximized public participation and input.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the current restrictions precluded virtual meetings by city and town councils, boards of supervisors, school boards, planning commissions, architectural review boards, and zoning appeals boards. He said that those particular bodies, except in limited circumstances or emergencies, may not conduct electronic meetings or meet virtually. He said that individual members may do so under certain circumstances, but the entire body may not. He said that the proposal would expand to permit those bodies to meet electronically.

Mr. Rosenberg said that current restrictions limited authorized bodies to conduct no more than two virtual meetings per year or 25%, whichever was greater. He said that they also could not hold consecutive virtual meetings. He said that for instance, community advisory committees may meet virtually, but if they did so once, they could not meet virtually again next time. He said that electronic meetings made it easier for members of the public and of these bodies to participate. He said that this proposal would broaden the authority exercised by bodies that could not currently conduct their meetings virtually and eliminate the restriction on the number of virtual meetings that may be held annually.

Delegate Hudson said that she would love to hear their reflections on this topic because it was an area where she was still undecided. She said that she was aware that all of them took civic engagement very seriously and had given considerable thought to this matter. She said that during her one General Assembly session on Zoom, she experienced significant difficulties. She said that there was something seriously lost from the inability to engage with people who could grab her in the hallway. She said that perhaps that was more important in the fast-paced environment of the General Assembly, as they all operated in a saner manner than they did.

Delegate Hudson said that she was still forming her opinions about this matter. She said that she was less concerned about the ongoing governance of this body, where they all were serious servants, but she did worry about the impact of increased access to virtual meetings on people who were less intentionally accessible to their constituents in county boards across the Commonwealth.

Mr. Gallaway said that the pandemic demonstrated that the FOIA and the notice of giving notice of meetings could be adhered to effectively during virtual meetings. He said that if there were boards that might engage in nefarious activities, they would likely do so even during in-person meetings. He said that virtual meetings allowed for greater participation not just for those who wanted to interact with those who legislate but also for those who could legislate or wanted to legislate. He said that Virginia had a long tradition of part-time legislators, and virtual meetings embraced this tradition and enabled more people to participate.

Mr. Gallaway said that as someone who worked full-time, virtual meetings had shown that they not only facilitated Board meetings but also enabled him to do his job more effectively. He said he thought

that there were those who did not participate because they had full-time jobs because of the physical demands of being in a certain place at a certain time. He said that each locality must decide whether to hold virtual meetings. He said that he did not believe their Board would choose to meet virtually. He said that he believed that their citizen advisory committees and some of those, they would figure that out, but each locality should be trusted to figure that out for themselves and be held accountable by their voters for their decisions.

Mr. Gallaway said that this was the authority that local governments in Virginia consistently requested, to figure things out on their own. He said that while the what and the why of this issue may be debated, he argued that what had changed since the beginning of the pandemic was the who. He said that last night at the TJPDC, there was a rare consensus among Greene County, Louisa County, Nelson County, Fluvanna County, Albemarle County, and the City of Charlottesville regarding this particular issue.

Mr. Gallaway said that no one was nitpicking details. He said that they stated that this approach was easier and more effective for legislators and easier and more effective for those they served. He said that this simply made good sense. He said that as the current Chair of the TJPDC, when he saw all the counties and participants nodding in agreement on something, he was reminded that this was not a partisan issue.

Mr. Gallaway said that believed that Supervisor Barlow in Louisa County, who may have differing political views from him, had inspired him for the next week to address his Board regarding this topic. He said that for citizen participation, legislator participation, and opening up opportunities for those who wished to engage in either, in his opinion, this demonstrated that Virginia took part-time legislators seriously by providing them with useful tools to embrace that tradition.

Mr. Andrews said that in the past, increased broadband access had facilitated more effective public participation in government activities. He said that according to his data, online platforms like Zoom enabled better public observation of committee proceedings and interaction. He said that when forced to hold meetings in person, it became challenging to provide all committees with the necessary internet resources for public participation. He said that he strongly supported the shift toward virtual meetings that allowed the public to watch and contribute if necessary. He said that he believed that their ability to control their local environment was very different than the state legislature's.

Ms. McKeel said that she completely agreed with what those two individuals had just stated. She said that instead of repeating their points, she would provide an example. She said that they currently had an open position on a board they worked closely with, but it was not an advisory board. She said that she had contacted two potential minority applicants whom she hoped would apply. She said that, although they expressed their interest, they could not apply due to the Board meetings being held on Wednesday mornings in the middle of the day, and their inability to leave their jobs for it. She said that this presented a barrier for them. She said that if they had the option of virtual meetings or electronic participation, she believed they could increase their participation and potentially open up these boards, commissions, and committees to more diverse representation.

Ms. Mallek said that two more instances illustrated this point. She said that seniors or individuals of any age who cannot drive at night have been entirely precluded from participating in their evening events. She said that the public hearings, when people would anticipate wanting to engage more, and their advisory committees, would also benefit from this expansion and getting those ideas. She said that she understood the perspective regarding the General Assembly and its appearance of being odd or uncomfortable when everyone is in their glass boxes.

Ms. Mallek said that for someone who has been commuting to Richmond against the sun and rush hour traffic for 25 years to catch them in the hall, it was spectacular to be able to multitask at home while waiting for three hours for the committee to address the item she wished to discuss. She said that even if she did not get the chance to sign up, or if she signed up but they did not reach her due to numerous other participants, she had had the opportunity to submit her comments on the docket and contribute in that manner.

Delegate Hudson said, to Mr. Gallaway's point, the body that is going to do the nefarious thing would be the General Assembly.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she agreed that it was very important for other bodies, not necessarily the Board of Supervisors, as she liked to meet in person, but other committees, to have the ability to meet virtually due to the driving distances some people had to cover. She said that she was also part of the Historic Preservation Committee, which had not met for four or five months due to difficulty in achieving a quorum. She said that if they had the option of virtual meetings, they might have been able to achieve a quorum.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that the Police Foundation Committee, which she was also part of, met every other month. She said that she believed that being able to meet virtually was crucial for this committee and all her community advisory committees that had requested virtual meetings because they didn't have a problem during the pandemic in getting a quorum and being able to listen to everybody. She agreed with Mr. Gallaway that each entity or locality should decide for themselves what was best.

Ms. Price said that she agreed with all points raised, with two exceptions. She said that she believed that elected bodies should be required to hold in-person meetings and offer a hybrid option for

their constituencies. She said that the school boards and boards of supervisors should be required to meet but provide a hybrid option for residents who cannot attend in person can participate virtually. She said that she believed that localities had an obligation to provide open sites such as libraries for residents without internet access at home. She said that allowing all meetings to go virtual without offering alternative participation methods would eliminate opportunities for those with slow internet speeds who could barely connect.

Ms. Price said that mandating that all committees, councils, and boards meet in person may exclude individuals with job or family obligations that prevented them from attending. She said that she had a fundamental concern regarding allowing elected bodies to conduct meetings entirely virtually, regardless of if they might do so nefariously. She said that she believed that the hybrid method they employed was highly effective. She said that it enabled people to attend in person or participate remotely from home.

Ms. Price said that as elected officials, they had a duty to be physically present before their constituents when they meet. She said that other committees and everything should be able to meet virtually. She said that they should offer an opportunity for those without reliable internet access. She said that they should not require localities to provide the hybrid option for all committees due to the resource obligations necessary for personnel, financial, and facilities. She said that a combination of both approaches would be the most suitable solution.

Mr. Gallaway said that it would be beneficial for each locality to have their representatives engage in that discussion. He said that if they did not possess the authority to initiate it, they could not have that debate among themselves regarding what they believed was best for their constituents.

Delegate Bell said that they sometimes said that they aimed to legislate bills rather than ideas. He said that this was the reason he was taking all these notes. He said that this proposal would enable entirely virtual meetings, but this was different from what Ms. Price was discussing. He said that some of what she was saying addressed some of the same reservations he was writing down about. He said that it was one thing to say they wanted public participation; it was another to say there should be a way to watch and contribute rather than making the meeting itself virtual.

Delegate Bell noted that there was no place for those who wanted to see it in person or for whom the internet did not work. He said that some of their late meetings could be challenging. He said that while the idea of libraries staying open to provide screens for someone in Scottsville to watch was a big deal, he understood what was being said. He shared some of the reservations Ms. Hudson expressed and that Ms. Price mentioned regarding the ultimate meeting not having a designated location for viewing.

Delegate Bell said that while this format may be convenient for 95% of people and potentially easier, many might prefer attending via screen. He said that he agreed with Ms. Hudson's observation that fully virtual meetings were not 95% or even 75% as effective as in-person meetings; they resulted in a noticeable decline in the quality of work produced. He said that it was evident when they were not physically present in the same location but rather scattered throughout Virginia in their basements.

Delegate Bell said that it was not simply the fact that he was not receiving the votes he desired; it was actually due to the lack of conversations, amendments, and efforts to improve bills before they became law that contributed to the situation that year. He said that there were many reasons, but a significant part was that one could not easily collaborate.

Ms. Price said that she offered as a possibility a library. She said that during the pandemic, when schools were closed, hot spots were set up in various locations around the County where people could go. She said that they could not provide a perfect mechanism for every resident. She said that she believed they should provide an opportunity for residents, whether it be virtual or in person.

Senator Deeds said that this was a topic in which there would be people in both parties on both sides of the issue. He said that, in the Senate, they did not meet virtually all the time. He said they benefited from two things in that session. He said they were put in the same position as everybody else in a virtual world; they could appear, they could testify.

Senator Deeds said the second thing was, regardless of where they were from, they didn't have to get up extremely early or spend the night before in Richmond to appear before their state legislature, and they have tried to save that element where people can appear before a committee on Zoom to participate and have input. He said he thought it would be difficult for people who are working at noon to participate by Zoom, unless on their lunch hour. He said he was sympathetic and wanted to think about it more.

Mr. Gallaway said that he did not want them to think that in-person meetings were perfect either. He said that they had this idea that meeting in person resolved all these other issues that they were saying were reservations with the virtual. He said that they should take the best of both approaches and allow each locality to determine what worked best for them.

Ms. McKeel said that their residents and their voters would hold them accountable.

Senator Deeds said that he agreed that if elected officials did not allow the public to participate, they would be voted out.

Delegate Runion said that he would like to offer that he concurred with the comments of his colleagues for the most part. He said that he believed that their perspective should be considered from the citizens' point of view. He said that he was supportive of allowing them multiple avenues for communication and engagement. He said that an all-virtual meeting may provide opportunities for participation but that he thought it was essential to define the participation.

Delegate Runion said that while observing was easily achievable, engaging was quite challenging. He said that he thought that the live option should be the default, and their system should allow for citizens to have a virtual option as well. He said that from a legislative perspective, it had to be live; virtual legislation was not where this Commonwealth was in his opinion. He said that he found it to be ineffective and chilling on their republic.

Delegate Hudson said that she would like to express her gratitude to Mr. Gallaway. She said that this issue to her was similar to how Mr. Gallaway had approached their earlier conversation about ranked choice voting. She said that she appreciated that many people had thought deeply about this issue, but she had not yet invested the same time. She said that she was grateful for all the participants taking the time to share their rich and nuanced perspectives; she found it valuable.

Mr. Rosenberg said that before moving on to the last one, he would like to share his perspective based on 25 years of experience in the public sector, primarily in local government, both in cities and counties, urban and rural settings. He said that when Mr. Bell was discussing the floor proceedings in the House of Delegates and their contribution to the legislative process, he had observed that what occurs at the General Assembly was different from what occurs at local board meetings or city council meetings, where there was a stronger focus on conducting business, almost entirely at the dais from the moment the gavel hits until it was time to adjourn, with less opportunity for off-the-side conversations among lawmakers. He said that he would like to note this distinction for its relevance.

Delegate Bell said that they had been discussing this topic, which was one of multiple items. He said that during the first 20 minutes of their discussion, they focused on the poor internet service in certain areas of the County. He said that during the COVID-19 pandemic, they provided solutions for families with school-aged children to access facilities through multiple processes. He said that he thought that having this tool was beneficial, as it allowed people to testify remotely. He said that they had all experienced in Richmond the same things that Ms. Mallek and Ms. McKeel mentioned.

Delegate Bell said that it was indeed convenient to inform someone that they might have to wait for a couple of hours but could do so from their kitchen. He said that it enabled them to testify. He said that allowing them to watch online had also proven to be more useful than they initially thought five or ten years ago. He said that it was regarding the last step, which was that for the entire meeting, if someone did not have access, they could neither participate nor watch, which at this point, he had reservations about.

Mr. Rosenberg said that moving on to the last priority identified by the Board, this was in the land use arena. He said that it was a proposal to allow for the expiration of special exceptions for short-term rentals in certain circumstances. He said that this was a proposed amendment to Chapter 22 of Title 15.2 that would allow the County to regulate short-term rentals by authorizing the County to provide for the expiration of a special exception for short-term rental in certain circumstances. He said that this would require the adoption of a local ordinance by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Rosenberg said that presently, special exceptions and special use permits ran with the land. He said that when they were granted by the governing body, the Board of Supervisors in this case, each successive property owner was entitled to the same right that came to exist as a result of the Board's land use approval. He said that this particular proposal arose from a concern regarding the continued acquisition of residential properties in the County by businesses for their operation as short-term rentals.

Mr. Rosenberg said that as proposed, the amendment would authorize the County to provide for the expiration of a special exception or a special use permit for a short-term rental upon the occurrence of one of the following events: a change of ownership of the property, a change in the owner of the business, the transfer of majority control of a business entity, a change in possession, a change in the operation or management of a facility, or the passage of a specific period of time. He said that this would result in a firm expiration date.

Mr. Rosenberg said that currently, several localities, including the cities of Hampton, Norfolk, and Richmond, had this kind of authority in situations where they were considering a special exception or a special use permit relating to retail alcoholic beverage control licenses. He said that if there was a specific land use involving the sale of alcoholic beverages in these three localities, they may impose certain conditions on a special exception or special use permit.

Mr. Rosenberg said that these conditions ensured that the permit did not run with the land indefinitely but expired after one of the specified events occurred. He said that the limitation was intended to address the increasing acquisition of these properties for short-term rental purposes by business entities rather than private individuals.

Delegate Bell asked how they would get these in the first place. He asked if it was a complex process involving numerous discussions with County officials and substantial legal expenses or through a more straightforward procedure, such as checking a box.

Mr. Rosenberg said that most of them were handled administratively as a matter of by-right use,

but in a circumstance where the owner of the property was not an individual, where the owner of the property was, for example, a corporation or a limited liability company, or if the private owner of the property was unable to satisfy a requirement that the owner be present and residing on the property during the short-term rental stay use, and where for one reason or another that requirement could not be satisfied, then a special exception was required.

Mr. Rosenberg said that in certain limited circumstances presently, a special exception was required. He said that one of those was where the property was owned by the business entity, and it was not because it was owned by the business entity as it was presently established, but because the business entity could not establish the presence of the individual owner because the business entity was not an individual.

Delegate Bell asked if there was a sunset on the use when granted.

Mr. Rosenberg said no, and that was what posed the issue.

Delegate Bell asked if this proposal would apply to those that had already been approved.

Mr. Rosenberg said no. He said that this would apply prospectively only to new applicants in the future.

Delegate Bell asked if they could not currently put limitations on those going forward.

Mr. Rosenberg said that they had some questions about the authority to impose the requirements now. He said that this legislation would eliminate those questions.

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

Senator Deeds said that he believed that most of his questions have been addressed. He said that he had concerns about special legislation. He said that it would be much more convenient if there were already an existing list or if they could find a way to get this last item accomplished. He said that he understood their intentions, but he was simply worried about the process of passing something like this. He said that special legislation that highlighted a specific county required a supermajority vote. He said that it was very challenging.

Delegate Bell said that he had no further questions and appreciated the information provided by everyone.

Delegate Hudson said that she appreciated their answers to all of her questions along the way. She said that she particularly hoped for an opportunity for a conversation among the delegation about both local taxing authority for school division capital projects and also photo speed monitoring devices. She said that they had some members of committees that were charged with acting on that legislation.

Delegate Hudson said that she understood that the hour was drawing late, but she hoped that there was no one who would object to continuing the conversation about those topics because they had many relevant parties present. She said that she had become fully persuaded that the solution for back road speeding would include speed monitoring. She said that she did not know what option C was, so she hoped they could continue discussing that one.

Delegate Runion said that he appreciated having this opportunity and attending virtually, which was very convenient for him. He said that he recognized the values when appropriate. He said that he would like to express his gratitude for their well-organized, concise approach. He said that their focused list had been narrowed down, which he appreciated greatly. He said that this organization allowed them to concentrate on matters essential to the Commonwealth. He said that although they may not agree on everything, they now had a good, organized starting point.

Ms. McKeel asked if there was any further information that should be shared with the legislators.

Mr. Richardson said that he understood that they had already sent or were in the process of sending Project ENABLE to all of their email inboxes. He said that this was a concise strategic economic development plan for their review. He said that they had not yet updated it, but it would provide a better understanding of their focus. He said that regarding Delegate Bell's request, they would follow up with some parcels that may fit the 50 versus 100 criteria. He said that he would collaborate with their economic development folks to ensure this.

Ms. McKeel said that she would simply add that if anyone had any interest in visiting some of the sites they considered significant, not empty sites, but those actively engaged in the work they had discussed, she asked that they contact them. She said that they would be happy to arrange tours for them.

Mr. Gallaway said that he would include businesses they had successfully retained as well as businesses they had lost.

Ms. Mallek said that the short-term rental ordinance they adopted was based on individual

homeowners being able to earn additional income by renting out their properties for full weekends separately. She said that they did not anticipate that this would become a target for Real Estate Investment Trusts, as many other communities across the country had not anticipated this either. She said that in more rural counties in Virginia, she recently read about significant purchases of empty properties by distant investors.

Ms. Mallek said that this was a cause for concern for communities, as they were losing their identity. She said that some smaller communities that faced higher risks than theirs had also experienced this issue. She said that she appreciated any assistance they could provide in addressing this matter. She said that in other places she had lived, land use and special permits were granted to the property owners themselves. She said that this was much safer for everyone involved and did not have the zone and flip, which was the popular feature that people enjoyed in Virginia.

Ms. Mallek said that in the past three of the last 10 years, they had experienced the highest number of highway fatalities in the Commonwealth. She said that this was not by population but by everyone. She said that this was horrifying. She said that many of them had driven these roads and other places where these fatalities had occurred, and it had almost universally been extremely high speed. She said that the extremely high speed has been the main factor, along with no seatbelts, for road safety concerns.

Ms. Mallek said that with 14,000 miles of roads, there was no way that their dedicated police officers could possibly control that. She said that speeding was discussed at the VACo (Virginia Association of Counties) Board meeting in August, where excessive speeding throughout the Commonwealth was a significant issue. She said that they, as representatives of their constituents, had consistently addressed this concern during town hall meetings.

Ms. Mallek said that she was very excited about the target industries, especially because they had repurposed the old telephone manufacturing building. She said that they believed in reusing existing buildings. She added that the research group was thriving at State Farm. She said that this is their niche, and they were working hard on job diversification and career ladder opportunities for their people. She said that this initiative aimed to strengthen their tax base. She said that attending the state legislative sessions was enjoyable, but she found it challenging to catch people due to the lengthy committee meetings and the busy schedules of the delegates.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was supportive of all the legislative priorities, especially the implementation of photo speed cameras. She said that she would provide some statistics regarding traffic accidents in Albemarle: year-to-date crashes totaled 3,000, with 12 fatalities, only two of which occurred on interstate highways. She said that the remaining 10 fatalities happened within their own roads. She said that seven of these 11 crashes, one of which included two fatalities, were on rural roads.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that the photo speed cameras, supported by their Police Department, would free up staff, and would offer a safer solution to traffic problems along rural roads. She said they would reduce the risk of danger for officers and violators alike. She said that there was no way for them to stop someone and enforce speeding along their rural roads. She noted that this issue was occurring quite frequently. She said that she would be contacting them all and seeing them all.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that he had hoped that this would continue. She said that they did need third-party monitoring because if they did not have third-party monitoring, then the entire cost burden would fall upon their Police Department. She said that they currently were 29 officers short. She said that hiring additional officers would be very costly; they would not be able to do it. She said that they needed third-party-operated photo speed cameras. She said that these had proven effective in reducing traffic speeds in Europe and other places, and she hoped that they would support them on this item.

Ms. Price said that the civil penalties would be optional. It would not require that the minor issues be handled through civil penalties but would allow localities to identify the differentiation between individuals who simply may not be able to afford correcting their zoning deficiencies as opposed to those who were frequent fliers and were just ignoring the rules.

Ms. Price said that in Albemarle County, they look at the short-term rentals as the collateral use of a primary residence. What they were fearful of, and what they were seeing around the country, was that private residences were being turned into commercial entities. She said that, in some locations, over 35% of detached single-family homes were owned by corporations who were renting them out, which was affecting home ownership. She said that Albemarle County had had a substantial issue with the affordability of the homes in the County. She said that they wanted the opportunity to maintain these homestays as a collateral use rather than turning a primary residence into principally an income-producing property, which made the housing shortage worse in the County.

Ms. Price said that she offered a thought for consideration for the General Assembly; that some of the intransigent issues they were dealing with, that perhaps ranked choice voting might help them to reach a resolution.

Agenda Item No. 6. Adjourn to November 16, 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 11:29 a.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to November 4, 2022, 2:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium,

November 4, 2022 (Adjourned Meeting)
(Page 20)

Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA. Ms. Price said information on how to participate in the meeting would be posted on the Albemarle County website Board of Supervisors home page and on the Albemarle County calendar.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date: 09/18/2024
Initials:CKB