

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 22, 2023, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 241 on the Second Floor of the Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

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

ABSENT: Mr. Ned Gallaway.

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

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

Ms. Price introduced the following Albemarle County Police Officers in attendance: Officer Jordan DeLange and Officer Jo Ann Steiff.

Ms. Price said they were amending the agenda so that a closed meeting could be held after the work session.

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session: FY 2024 Operating and Capital Budget.

- Transit.
- Updates from Prior Work Sessions.

Mr. Ryan Davidson, Deputy Chief of Budget, said that staff would not request any action from the Board today. He said that the meeting was for information, discussion, and some Board direction. He said that should any Board direction require additional work session, it would be scheduled at one of the "to be determined" work sessions in April, and any budget changes would be reflected in the budget resolution presented on May 3. He said that they would discuss proposed modifications to the scheduled work sessions at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Davidson said the session would focus on the transit-related services provided in the County. He said that following the presentation, there would be one staff recommended action related to the transit reserve for Jaunt. He said the work session would conclude with other Board follow-ups from previous work sessions.

Mr. Davidson said that transit tied into strategic plan objectives 3.4 and 4.4 which related to multimodal transportation planning and connectivity throughout the County.

Mr. Davidson said that they were projecting a nearly \$40 million change in projected general fund revenues from FY23. He said that the ACPS (Albemarle County Public Schools) allocation was determined by formula, and the School Board CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) and the Board CIP were discussed at the March 15 work session.

Mr. Davidson said that workforce stabilization would be the topic of the next work session. He said that the increase in the County's allocation to partner agencies had decreased to \$3.2 million from \$3.5 million. He said that the agencies they would be discussing that day represented about 44% of the \$3.2 million increase.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, clarified that they had requested the Board's authorization to put \$300 thousand into a contingency.

Mr. Davidson said that the County was part of a larger regional transit network. He said that the focus of the discussion would be on CAT (Charlottesville Area Transit) and Jaunt, but there were other regional partners, such as the Afton Express and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC). He said that the Regional Transit Partnership (RTP) was operated through the TJPDC, and it was created by the City, the County, and Jaunt to serve as an advisory board to local decision makers on transit related matters. He said that the County had supported recent RTP measures such as the Regional Transit Vision Plan and the Transit Governance Study.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if they knew when the governance study would be completed.

Ms. Christine Jacobs, Executive Director of the TJPDC, said it would be completed by December 2023.

Mr. Davidson said that CAT was a department of the City, and County services were provided through a partnership with the City and a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with CAT, with the County funding the proportional share for services that directly benefit County residents. He said that Jaunt was a separate public service corporation governed by multiple governmental entities, including Albemarle County. He said that CAT provided fixed route services to the County in the urban zone and oversaw the microtransit pilot program in the County. He said that requests for proposal (RFP) for the micro-transit program was released the past Friday.

Mr. Davidson said that Jaunt was contracted by CAT to provide the mandated Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) services related to fixed routes. He said that Jaunt provided rural and urban on-demand services.

Mr. Davidson said that today's work session was to discuss the FY24 budget request from these agencies, and not the larger service-level discussions. He said that staff planned to schedule a future work session for that discussion and welcomed feedback and questions to include for consideration at that future work session.

Mr. Davison said that \$175 thousand was proposed in FY24 for microtransit, and it represented the remainder of the County's \$450 thousand match for the related grant. He said that the budget contained smaller amounts to fund the ongoing operations of the RTP and Afton Express. He said that one area related to transit was the \$98 thousand in the budget for services related to the analysis of the County's transit system.

Mr. Davidson said that transit continued to increase in complexity, and the County did not have an employee who was a service-level subject-matter expert for transit. He said that the transit knowledge was currently spread across five or six people. He said that the investment would help them ensure the County had the expert knowledge to protect the County's funds and investments.

Ms. Nelsie Birch, CFO, said that they wanted to couple some initial recommendations and results from the consultant they planned to hire. She said that they would later discuss microtransit, and they wanted the analyst to provide recommendations about what to do after the pilot program is completed.

Ms. McKeel clarified that the consultant was technically a County FTE (full-time equivalent).

Ms. Birch said that they had initially discussed creating an FTE, but the issue was onboarding the right person with the necessary skillset, as they needed the high-level skillset immediately. She said that they settled on hiring a consulting company with the skillset to help the County. She said that moving forward, they could consider hiring an FTE.

Mr. Andrews clarified that the proposed consultant would be separate from the person hired to help navigate the microtransit grant process.

Ms. Birch said that they were separate. She said that the County needed an expert staff person who understood the County's needs and how to transition from a pilot program to the future.

Mr. Henry, Deputy County Executive, said that the consultant would review the comprehensive transit program for the County. He noted that the microtransit program would be launched late into the summer. He said that the consultant would inform the County how best to work with CAT and Jaunt and how best to use the County funds.

Mr. Davidson said that the costs were related to existing services, and the associated cost increases were not related to new services. He said that CAT was recommended to be funded at \$1.3 million in FY24, about a \$300 thousand increase. He said that in previous budget cycles, CAT provided staff with a five-year plan, and the increase was in line with the planned increases in the five-year plan. He noted that much of the increase associated with CAT was due to decreasing CARES (Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act) and ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funding and increasing reliance on local funding.

Mr. Davidson said that Jaunt was level-funded at \$2.3 million, which was included in the budget, along with \$1 million for a transit reserve dedicated to Jaunt. He said that the \$1 million reserve was based on an increase in funding requested by Jaunt. He said that staff wanted additional time to work with Jaunt to review the additional funding request because of the time frame and complexity of the request. He said that they received a one-time revenue from Jaunt of about \$549 thousand due to excess working capital above the fund balance policies set by the Jaunt Board.

Ms. McKeel clarified that the total Jaunt request was \$3.3 million.

Mr. Davidson said yes.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarification about the reserve fund.

Mr. Davidson explained that Jaunt's full request was approximately \$3.3 million. He said that staff decided, because of the timing and complexity, to level fund Jaunt until they were able to thoroughly review the full funding request. He said that the additional funding was placed in a reserve, and staff would return with a recommendation as to how to allocate the reserve.

Ms. Birch said that going forward, they had to assume that the one-time \$549 thousand revenue would not be a recurring revenue.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the \$1 million reserve could decrease once it was decided how to allocate the funding.

Ms. Birch said that the reserve was proposed because of a timing issue. She said that they would

make a recommendation that the \$1 million be disbursed to Jaunt to fully fund its request. She said that the Board would see the recommendation from staff for its final budget adoption.

Mr. Andrews asked where the \$549 thousand revenue was included in the budget book.

Mr. Davidson said on page 70 under recovered costs. He noted that the amount may not be specifically mentioned in the budget document because it was still under discussion with the Jaunt Board at the time.

Ms. Mallek noted that they received an email with the exact amount.

Mr. Garland Williams, Director of CAT (Charlottesville Area Transit), said that prior to the pandemic, CAT had 13 routes including the trolley, the span of service was 6 a.m. to 12 a.m., and four routes had limited Sunday service. He said that the accessible population at the time was about 62,000 people in the urban areas, of which 19,700 were a minority population, 4,500 were low-income, and 2,850 had no vehicle.

Mr. Williams said that they implemented services changes when the COVID-19 pandemic hit to ensure riders were kept safe. He said that they made no coverage changes, but in the evening, they ended service at 9 p.m. He said that in the past three months, they had increased the service time to 10:30 p.m. He said that they had reduced service on a number of routes, and they ended Sunday service. He noted that they sought to restart the Sunday service as part of the FY24 budget, which was part of their cost increase. He said that of the 13 routes, 9 touched the County. He said they planned to incorporate one of the Sunday routes into their regular operations. He said that they were looking to create a common trunkline where two routes would be layered to increase service frequency.

Mr. Williams said that they received 38.8% of their revenue from the federal government. He said that 25.9% of revenue came from the state in the form of operating assistance. He said that the City provided 23.6% of the funding, and the County provided 10.8%. He said that ridership performance was a major driver of state funding. He said that they expected the state portion of revenues to increase over the next three years as their ridership numbers increased.

Mr. Williams said that the service levels from each jurisdiction were the major expenditure factor. He said that converting temporary positions to full-time was an issue, but it allowed them to provide more reliable service. He said that fuel costs were a major expenditure. He said that a majority of CAT buses were diesel fueled, which had a high cost. He said that repairs and maintenance were a large expenditure. He noted that as vehicles aged, maintenance costs increased significantly.

Mr. Williams said that pay increases for drivers was a major driving point. He said that the pay increase was 21.3% for a majority of the workforce. He said that the City provided two pay increases in FY23 that affected all City employees. He said that to ensure they were competitive with other transit agencies in the area, they provided a 12.3% increase to provide a baseline \$21/hour pay.

Mr. Williams said that for FY24, they were focused on restoring pre-pandemic levels, including improved service on the Route 6 line. He said that there were low-income populations along the Route 6 line, so the City requested improved service on the route. He said that they wanted to improve the service model from 60 minutes to 30 minutes. He said that they would be hiring more operators and mechanics. He said that they would prioritize the microtransit service project, and they wanted to acquire better vehicles to improve reliability and frequency.

Mr. Williams said that a consultant provided recommendations regarding optimization which are reflected in the FY24 budget. He said that the Route 2 line would include a trunkline with an A/B pattern.

Mr. Williams said that federal revenues were \$2.8 million, and they were using about \$1.8 million of CARES and ARPA funds split between the City and County. He said that state operating funds had increased by about \$200 thousand to \$2.7 million. He said that they applied for a TRIP (Transportation Rural Improvement Program) grant which allowed them to go zero-fare.

Mr. Williams said that the funding for the TRIP grant decreased over four years after which the local jurisdictions would fund the cost. He said that the City allocated \$2.8 million, and the County allocation request was \$1.3 million, a \$50 thousand increase over the five-year forecast. He said that they received funding from UVA for purchase-service support for the trolley. He said that the advertising revenue was \$25 thousand, a decrease because advertising remained low due to the pandemic. He said that there was a passthrough cost to Jaunt because they provided the ADA service, and the total was almost \$2.3 million. He said that the total budget was \$14.2 million.

Ms. Birch clarified that the ADA services provided by Jaunt were contracted by CAT.

Mr. Williams said that the City had a fund that was used to help support transit in the region. He said that CAT delineated 75% of the funding to CAT urban system, and 25% went to the para-transit provider.

Mr. Williams showed a slide that set forth the FY24 expenditure assumptions. He said that their costs were divided into five categories: operations, administration, maintenance, marketing, and safety and security. He said that the majority of funding was dedicated to the operation category, about \$6.7 million, with the majority of that, or about \$5.6 million, for personnel costs. He said that the administration

category included the administration personnel costs of \$782 thousand and the Jaunt pass-through funding. He said the maintenance costs included maintenance staff and costs for parts and fuel. He said that the marketing budget was limited, and there was only one employee with full benefits. He said that the safety and security team was required, and that had a budget of \$253 thousand.

Mr. Williams said that they planned to improve service between UVA campus, UVA hospital, and the Route 29 corridor via bus routes 5 and 7, which had high ridership in the City and County portions. He said that the routes had 30-minute service frequency, and they looked to improve the service frequency and reliability. He said that they wanted to introduce cross-town service on the modified Route 8. He said that they proposed operating 30-minute or better service all day on routes 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, and the trolley, over half of the routes.

Mr. Williams said that they were expanding portions of routes 1, 3, and 10 with modifications that were addressed in the optimization study. He said that they proposed new coverage in the County along Mill Creek Drive to Monticello High School on Route 2B. He said that they were extending coverage on Route 5 to the UVA hospital. He said that they were targeting schools and medical facilities in their routes. He said that their goal was to provide 60-minute or better service on all routes. He noted that a 10-minute improvement required more vehicles and more drivers.

Mr. Williams said that the microtransit service would operate under CAT. He said that the service would operate from 6:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday – Saturday. He said that there had been discussion about adding a Sunday service or extending the hours of service. He noted that the grant only covered Monday – Saturday service. He said that the areas of service would be the Route 29 North zone and the Pantops zone.

Mr. Williams said that the microtransit service grant was \$1.94 million. He said that they applied for a demonstration grant of \$1.552 million, and the County's local match was \$388 thousand. He said that they proposed to use \$1.7 million on salaries and wages. He said that they allocated \$135 thousand for advertising, and about \$100 thousand for professional services and services and maintenance contracts.

Mr. Williams said that the funding request to the County two years ago was \$1.25 million, and now it was \$1.3 million.

Ms. Mallek asked if they had had success hiring new drivers to have buses running and whether there was a report to the County staff when they were unable to get a bus out.

Mr. Williams said that there was no report, but they could do that. He said that they were set to receive five cut-away vehicles to relieve some of the pressure, and they would receive six full size buses by November. He said that older vehicles were causing service reliability issues, and that when the new vehicles were received, they would hopefully increase their ridership numbers and reliability, and there would be no reports that they were not able to provide service.

Ms. Mallek asked if they were able to participate in electric vehicle grants.

Mr. Williams said that the City was in the process of working through the electrification study, and they were about 2/3 of the way through it. He said that a full-sized, 35-foot electric bus costs about \$1 million, which was about half of the cost of the buses they currently used, not counting the charging stations and other needed infrastructure improvements. He said that based on the travel range, CAT was not able to implement a full electric vehicle model. He said that CAT operates about 18 hours each day, and that the electric vehicles can only run 10-12 hours each day, so they would have to do a two for one. He said they did not have enough space for that, and riders do not want to wait 15 minutes for buses to charge en route. He said that they could bring more information to the Board.

Ms. Mallek asked if they worked with PVCC (Piedmont Virginia Community College) or other workforce centers to help train employees.

Mr. Williams responded that there was a program leader for the Go Driver program that left the City to work with UVA, and the program fell off after she left. He noted that they were trying to restart the program.

Mr. Juwhan Lee, Assistant Director of CAT, responded that they were trying to revive a program similar to the Go Driver program. He said that they were working through the details of a program between UVA Transit Service (UTS) and CAT. He said that they hoped to launch a program in the summer.

Mr. Henry responded that he and the Deputy City Manager met with the assistant to the PVCC president regarding developing a bus-driver program and a staff pipeline. He said that they were early in the process.

Ms. Mallek clarified that the expansion of the Mill Creek area service would require an expansion of a Jaunt route.

Mr. Williams responded that wherever there was fixed-route service, the ADA required accessible services within 3/4 miles. He said that wherever CAT expanded their service, Jaunt would automatically expand their reach for ADA purposes by 3/4 miles.

Ms. Mallek asked if the expansion would increase the amount of pass-through federal funding for Jaunt or if the County would incur the increased expenses.

Mr. Williams said that it would become a County expense.

Ms. McKeel asked where the increased ADA service costs to the County were in the budget.

Mr. Williams said that in most places, ADA was a local cost.

Ms. McKeel asked if the cost would be reflected in Jaunt's budget or CAT's budget.

Mr. Williams said that when they received federal funding for urban money, they had an agreement between Jaunt and the City that stipulated a 75/25 split of the funding. He said that the agreement would be reviewed within the next two years. He said that if CAT were bigger and were a capital model, the amount of money it would spend on ADA services would be restricted to no more than 10% of the funding.

Mr. Williams said that it was currently under an operating model which allowed them 25% of the funding. He said that if the population increased above 200,000, the funding model would switch to a capital model. He said that increasing competition in the service area would keep the numbers down.

Mr. Ted Rieck, CEO of Jaunt, said that the proposed increase in service was not increasing the geography of the service area. He noted that there was an increase in demand.

Ms. Mallek clarified that the 200,000-population limit referred to the populations of the City and the County.

Mr. Rieck said yes and that it was based on the census.

Ms. McKeel said that the CAT vehicles were old.

Mr. Williams said that they were required to keep the vehicles for 12 years and 500,000 miles. He said that they had 10 hybrid vehicles in the fleet—diesel and battery electric powered—which were the worst performing vehicles in their fleet. He said that all 10 vehicles had one set of batteries and 100,000, and they all had a second set of batteries. He said that they were in discussions with the federal government regarding large repair costs for some of the vehicles. He said that vehicles purchased with federal funding were expected to be used for 12 years and 500,000 miles, and the vehicles could not be replaced until they met the criteria.

Ms. McKeel noted that they planned to purchase different sized buses.

Mr. Williams said they did not. He said that they had requested the federal government for two expansion buses that were battery electric powered. He said that they wanted to test different models to determine which would perform better, and that they still had to do the 12-year and 500,000 miles.

Ms. McKeel said that she was interested in the school connection, and specifically high schools. She noted that high school students often used public transit in other communities, but not in this community. She said that with the challenge in bus drivers, it may be appealing and something they should look at.

Mr. Williams said that there were concerns about the safety of students riding public transport. He said that the buses were safe; that each bus had 11 high-definition cameras, and there were no blind spots on the bus. He said that the camera system was upgraded about two years ago. He said that the City school system increased walking zones. He said that they installed additional services along the route during peak periods to address potential overcrowding issues. He said that they had seen middle schoolers using the City buses, as well as parents getting their elementary school children to school. He said that there had been increases in drivers, but it was not enough to keep up with the demand.

Ms. McKeel noted that as ridership increased, federal funding increased, so it was beneficial for more students to ride the City bus, and the less vehicles there would be on the road.

Mr. Williams noted that the costs to the County and the City would decrease if ridership increased.

Ms. McKeel clarified that the specific network improvements on page 19 were included in the budget.

Mr. Williams said yes.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarification about the recommendations to right-size the post-pandemic service model.

Mr. Williams said that an optimization study was performed, and in May 2021, a report was given to City Council on the recommendations. He said that they would supply the Board with the recommendations.

Ms. McKeel asked when they believed the microtransit program would be online.

Mr. Williams said that they released the RFP on Friday, and he was meeting with the consulting team next week to discuss adjusting the schedule. He said that they were targeting early summer or fall. He said that they had to advertise the service or else they did not get the ridership to the magnitude they wanted.

Ms. McKeel asked about shelters and pads at the bus stops.

Mr. Williams said that they were proposing an ordinance. He said that they had requested \$324 thousand for amenity improvements, so CAT would have the funding. He said that coordination between three state agencies had caused delays: DGS (Department of General Services), VDOT (Virginia Department of Transportation), and DRPT (Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation). He said that they were considered under DRPT. He said that VDOT had a specific process to allow any sort of amenity in the public rights-of-way. He said that shelters had to undergo engineering and wind tests. He said that the DRPT was trying to reduce the red tape by getting different structure models approved.

Ms. McKeel noted that the County had included funding for shelters in the County.

Mr. Williams said that they would request a local match for shelters from the County.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley clarified that the pre-pandemic population of 62,500 was in reference to ridership. She asked what the current ridership population was.

Mr. Williams said that it had grown by about 12,000 to 74,000. He said that the population related to the number of people who were within 1/4 mile of their service.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if liquefied natural gas (LNG) or compressed natural gas (CNG) buses had been considered by CAT.

Mr. Williams said that he had many conversations with the City about introducing CNG vehicles, but there had been hesitancy to accept the model. He said that there were concerns about spillage of natural gas. He said that City Council was contemplating a request from advocacy groups to shut down the gas utility, and that if that happened, the fuel source of the CNG model would go away. He said that CNG was cheap, and the buses were reliable for 14 years.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she supported working with the schools to transport students. She asked whether they were working with the school districts to advertise the public transportation as an alternative transportation method.

Mr. Williams said that the messaging was coming from the school system.

Ms. Mallek noted that was for the City.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked about the work with the County schools.

Mr. Williams said that ACPS had not expressed interest in pursuing the public transit model.

Ms. McKeel said that they were interested in looking at it slowly because parents in the County were used to the school bus model.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley noted that Martha Jefferson Hospital was not mentioned in the network improvements.

Mr. Williams said that more services were added in the Pantops area. He said that Pantops was important to the model because the Route 10 line helped to connect to Martha Jefferson Hospital. He said that they were looking to add more weekend and evening hours.

Mr. Andrews asked if the Infrastructure Act had an impact on the vehicles.

Mr. Williams said that the Infrastructure Act was a funding mechanism that would allow them to purchase vehicles, perform facility improvements, and install the electrification infrastructure. He said that they had to show to the state and federal government that there was a transition plan on how it would be implemented and how it would work.

Ms. Price said she was pleased to see the improvements in the Mill Creek area, and she asked that Jaunt and CAT consider expanding service further to the upcoming developments south of Mill Creek.

Ms. McKeel suggested providing a bus route to ACRJ (Albemarle Charlottesville Regional Jail).

Mr. Williams said that part of the proposed improvements for Route 2 were to extend service to ACRJ. He said that once service was extended beyond 5th Street Station, there would be dedicated 30-minute service past ACRJ.

Mr. Richardson asked for clarification about ridership performance.

Mr. Williams said that he could send the information as a follow-up. He said that they tracked ridership monthly. He said that over the last three years, ridership had decreased, but it was now slowly increasing. He said that their data collection had become more accurate. He said that automatic passenger counters were installed on the buses. He said that they were at a reduced service model, but ridership was almost at pre-pandemic levels.

Ms. Birch said that, before turning the floor over to Jaunt, she wanted to talk about where the County has come in its relationship with Jaunt, and why the cost of service for the County has increased so much.

Ms. Birch said that there was an alarming audit finding from the FY20 audit of Jaunt. She said that VDRPT performed its own audit and identified concerns. She said that many of the concerns were related to Jaunt's fiduciary responsibility and misapplication of funds.

Ms. Birch said that the proposed contribution from the County had increased by almost 44% because decisions were previously made that masked the cost of those services to the County, because rural funding had been applied to urban services. She said that had been rectified under Ted Rieck's leadership, but they had to pay for this because they no longer using funds that they were not supposed to use for this service delivery. She said that Jaunt had worked to use ARPA and CARES funding to offset that over the past few years, but the County is seeing the increase this year.

Ms. Birch clarified that the County was not a fiscal agent of Jaunt, but they did provide significant funding. She said that an MOA was established which set forth the County expectations of Jaunt before the County released quarterly funding to Jaunt. She said that the County required Jaunt to provide quarterly reports, and there was increased engagement from staff.

Ms. Birch said that the Board established a financial subject-matter expert staff position for the Jaunt Board, served by Mr. Jacob Sumner, Assistant CFO for Policy and Partnerships. She said that Mr. Sumner provided a summary of the Jaunt meetings to the Board so that they would stay connected.

Mr. Ted Rieck, CEO of Jaunt, Inc., said that Jaunt served seven jurisdictions, five of which were stockholders. He said that the County was an original founding member of Jaunt, and the other four jurisdictions were Louisa, Nelson, and Fluvanna County, and the City. He said that they also served Green County and Buckingham County. He said that they spread the costs to provide reservation services, marketing and planning, and vehicle maintenance across all of the jurisdictions.

Mr. Rieck said that they received multiple funding sources. He said that they received federal, which included urban, which came through CAT, and rural, which was only for rural. He said that historically, they had used rural monies to fund urban operations for 10 to 20 years. He said that they were not allowed to mix urban and rural funds, but assets could be used across both situations if the bookkeeping was done correctly. He said that they received state funding which could be used in urban or rural settings. He said that they received local funding from the County and other jurisdictions, which were also flexible in that way.

Mr. Rieck said that there were three distinct services—rural services, ADA services, and urban non-ADA services. He said that they provided service 3/4 miles around the CAT service. He said they provided a commuter bus service to Crozet. He said that they had a redline bus that connected downtown UVA with points north. He said that there was a demand response service where people could book rides.

Mr. Rieck mentioned the \$1.8 million reserve. He said that there were two kinds of expenses: operational expenses for drivers and fuel, and capital expenses used to purchase vehicles, computer systems, and other items. He said that the changes in the budget were reflected in changes to operational and capital expenses, which were reflected in the \$1 million increase. He said that the budget had increased for numerous reasons. He said that there was increased demand as they came out of COVID. He said that they had to increase the cost of labor, and they provided their drivers a 20% pay increase one year ago. He said that they had to shift the federal funding model away from the urban non-ADA, and they did not have urban federal capital money to support the capital program.

Mr. Rieck said that because they operated a demand response system, the service levels were dependent on how many riders they took. He said that they projected a 17% increase for the ADA service in the present fiscal year, and they projected another 15% increase the following year. He said that rural services went up 17% this year and were projected to increase by 15% the next fiscal year, and non-ADA service was projected to increase by 31% this year, and another 23% next year. Overall, the ridership increase was projected to increase 18% in the current year, and another 16% next year.

Mr. Rieck said that one of the biggest metrics was service hours, which drove the labor costs, as well as miles and other costs.

Mr. Rieck said that the urban ADA service would cost about \$3 million to provide the service within the County, of which about \$2 million was the County contribution, and the remaining \$1 million would come from federal and state funds.

Mr. Rieck said that the rural demand response was different, and the County portion was about

40% of the cost, and the other 60% was from federal and state funds. He said that Jaunt received the funds directly, and they were allocated mostly based on service performance.

Mr. Rieck said that non-ADA urban service was mostly funded by the County. He said that they did not receive federal funding for the service. He said they allocated some state funding to the program.

Mr. Rieck said that the County funded a significant overall cost of services. He said that the County share of operating and capital was about \$2 million for the ADA area, \$643 thousand for the rural part of the County, and \$649 thousand for the urban area of the County, totaling about \$3 million.

Mr. Rieck said that the non-ADA service was driving costs. He said that the service had a role in the transit package, and it gave them multiple modes to serve the population. He said that the demand response service they provided was typically a first-level service to an area. He said that rural residents depended upon the service to get to urban areas. He said that the urban ADA service was required, and the non-ADA service in the urban area filled a demand gap. He said that they were not able to access federal funding to subsidize the service, so the cost was being shifted to the County.

Mr. Rieck said that they did not receive federal capital funding to purchase buses. He said that in order to maintain the fleet, the capital costs were shifted to the County and the City. He said that the minimum age replace for Jaunt vehicles was five years. He said that the average fleet age was 4.2 years.

Ms. Mallek clarified that buses coming from Buckingham could pick up more riders on its route.

Mr. Rieck said that was correct.

Ms. Mallek clarified that the Crozet connection was rural and was funded with rural monies.

Mr. Rieck said yes.

Ms. Mallek asked if there were possible federal revenue sources for urban ADA services.

Mr. Rieck responded that the issue with capital funding and urban funding was new, and this was the first year they encountered it. He said that previously, they had misused rural funding, and during the pandemic, they were able to use other funds. He said that they did not currently have a federal funding source for capital.

Ms. Mallek asked if there were other federal sources currently available.

Mr. Rieck said that Jaunt was not able to access the funds, and they were not legally able to apply for an urban grant, which had to be coordinated through CAT.

Ms. Mallek clarified that CAT could apply for the grants for Jaunt.

Mr. Rieck said yes. He said that there were some complications regarding who would own the equipment and how funding was passed through.

Ms. McKeel asked how the vehicles were fueled.

Mr. Rieck said that the vehicles were gasoline.

Ms. McKeel asked if they were considering other types of vehicles, such as electric vehicles, when they did replacements.

Mr. Rieck said that their consultant recommended battery electric buses as a next step. He said that there were range issues, especially in the rural areas. He said that they applied for an implementation grant from DRPT, and if they received the grant, they would study how to support electric buses in the rural areas.

Ms. McKeel noted that they could have a mix of electric and gasoline powered vehicles.

Mr. Rieck said that it was possible. He said that they believed the electric bus was feasible in the system. He said that there were certain locations in the counties where charging stations could be installed.

Ms. McKeel asked for clarification about fees for riders of Jaunt.

Mr. Rieck said that they were fare-free, as was implemented during the pandemic. He said that they did a study that indicated that it would cost more to process fares than what they received in fares. He said that they considered it too labor intensive to collect fares, and drivers would be required to do a reconciliation at the end of the day.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked for clarification about the urban non-ADA service.

Mr. Rieck explained that it was an area where they did not receive federal funding.

Mr. Andrews asked about ways to measure JABA (Jefferson Area Board for Aging) riders.

Mr. Rieck said that they would have to do an analysis to determine if riders were using the regular service instead of the agency. He said that they needed to start charging agencies the full hourly rate, and once they did, they would likely see more agencies leave.

Mr. Davidson said that staff was seeking the Board's direction per a recommendation to allocate the transit reserve to Jaunt to fully fund the FY24 request of \$3.3 million. He said that they did not require an action from the Board, but they did seek consensus. He said that if there were a consensus, the item would be included in the May 3 budget resolution.

Ms. McKeel clarified that the \$3.3 million included the transit reserve.

Mr. Davidson said yes.

Ms. Price noted that there was consensus from the Board to support the allocation.

The Board briefly recessed from 4:59 p.m. to 5:09 p.m.

Mr. Bowman said that there were three items to follow up from previous discussions with the Board. He said that he would provide an update to the Arts and Cultural Festival agency review process. He said that there was a process for arts and cultural agencies to apply to, and the applications were reviewed by a five-person team of County staff.

Mr. Bowman said that there were 13 scoring criteria and showed the list of them on the screen. He said that funding was recommended based on those criteria. He said that last week, they reviewed what was included in the FY24 recommended budget. He noted that the application process had to be reopened because some of the applications submitted on time were not reviewed by the County. He said that two agencies which were reviewed, the Hatton Ferry and Albemarle Charlottesville Historical Society, did not receive a recommendation for funding.

Ms. Mallek said that she would like to have another chance to discuss this information at a future meeting. She said that she hoped that the Board would have some reaction to the matrix and the criteria used. She explained that she was experiencing a mental block, because there used to be a process, and that process changed but they had never learned how it had changed in terms of how the applications were processed.

Ms. Mallek said that there may be different measures applied to these that she would like to learn more about and learn how the balance of services was done. She said that she wanted to make sure that the tax dollars were benefiting their citizens. She said that she hoped there would be time to understand how the different applicants were considered for each of the criteria.

Ms. Price asked if Ms. Mallek was asking for that discussion to be a part of this specific budget process or in terms of general or future budgeting.

Ms. Mallek said that she had originally asked three weeks ago for this matter to be taken up at a future meeting. She said that it was important that they took these up while it was current, otherwise they would be in the same situation next year when they had not made a decision or had any input from the Board about which of these items was most important. She said that she was trying to claw back to the information that they used to get about these organizations and be able to see when they were choosing someone new or someone out of the area, and why they were chosen.

Ms. Price said that what Ms. Mallek was asking for was potentially an in-depth analysis of the ABRT (Agency Budget Review Team) process.

Ms. Mallek said that she was asking for what the process was that led to the considerations presented. She said that no information was provided about the conversations of the staff group and recommendations from that. She said that she was not asking for an analysis of the entire ABRT process.

Mr. Bowman asked if Ms. Mallek's request was to receive the scoring of each agency that requested funding based on the criteria.

Ms. Mallek said that she had assumed there were already documents that existed as a part of this process, including analysis. She said that she would like to know what that entailed.

Ms. Emily Kilroy, Assistant to the County Executive, said that the team that did the arts and cultural review process had been using this criterion for the past several years and began with a solicitation of a letter from the arts and cultural agencies who wanted to apply for funding. She said that once those were in, the team assembled to review the criteria that they used last year. She said that they had used these criteria since 2020, and the team discussed if there was anything they wanted to change based on the strategic plan and other areas of need that were seen. She said that once the criteria to be used were agreed upon, everyone read the application letters and gave a score of 1 to 5 for each criterion.

Ms. Kilroy said that they took the total score and developed an average of the total score, and the team then reviewed the average scores, and the decisions made when individually scoring. She said that it gave people an opportunity to edit the scores based on that discussion, and then based on those

scores, they put together a funding recommendation forward to the Office of Finance and Budget. She said that the Office of Finance and Budget had accepted their recommendation this year. She said that every application was given a score for each of the points on the slide for a total score that would then be averaged across.

Ms. Kilroy said that the County departments included in the process were Parks and Recreation, CAPE (Office of Communication and Public Engagement), Economic Development Office, and the Office of Equity and Inclusion, and the average score was an attempt to balance out the different lenses of the staff who were evaluating the applications. She said that the contribution criteria items, typically a program would score well in one or two of those but not all four. She said that this process helped seek a balance of different goals that the different offices had for arts and cultural funding to be of benefit to the community.

Ms. Mallek asked if it was implied in the criteria items listed that there were agencies who provided services of the County that the County should normally hire people to do.

Ms. Kilroy said that that was not part of the criteria as it was spelled out. She said that they were looking broadly at service and at outcomes, so the criteria were looking for measurability of outcomes to ensure that data supported County residents were benefiting from the service. She said that for organizations that had a location outside of the County, they wanted to ensure that County residents were beneficiaries of those programs, because County dollars were given to those agencies from this program. She said that there are several points awarded for proving the service of County residents through data. She said that a very small program that was serving a lot of people would not score well on those points. She said that there had previously been a program that impacted few people, but the impact was very strong for an at-risk population, so it scored points in other areas compared to agencies that had a much larger service base.

Ms. Price asked if Ms. Mallek was asking staff to provide a general overview of how the scoring of each agency was done, or a discussion of each of the ones considered.

Ms. Mallek said that the introduction from Ms. Kilroy had been helpful. She said that she still did not have the necessary information to explain to applicants who did not qualify as to why they were not selected.

Ms. Kilroy said that there was an onboarding orientation offered by the Office of Finance and Budget when the application period opened. She said that people called her for information about what the County was looking for in an application, and people also called to follow up with them after the application period had ended in order to understand their scoring.

Ms. Mallek asked if a notice should be received that detailed that information.

Ms. Kilroy said that they did not automatically add that level of detail.

Mr. Bowman said after the budget was presented to the Board of Supervisors, the 60 or 70 agencies who had requested funding would be contacted about the process of the budget, the opportunities for public input, and provide contacts for questions. He said that some people would reach out to them to understand where their funding was, why they scored what they did, or what they could do better next time.

Mr. Bowman said that if the Board received any questions from the community, they would be happy to engage with whoever they needed to in order to understand the process. He said that many people took their feedback and applied again the following year. He said that at the beginning of the process, they explained what was looked for, and how the application was reviewed.

Mr. Bowman said that this was meant to be a starting point for the Board, knowing that these were the criteria, but this was also not a formula that would dictate how things should be. He said that they would assist the Board with providing more information, and their intent was to create a good starting point for the Board. He said that as they went into FY25, they would bring back any changes to the process in the late summer, and as part of that, they could add a designated time to say what the criteria were and if they matched what the Board was looking for. He said that during the current process, they could consider any additional information the Board would like.

Ms. Mallek said that she appreciated Mr. Bowman's suggestion for the future process, because she felt that she did not have adequate information at this time to make a decision on a specific question related to this.

Ms. McKeel said that the descriptions for each of the applications were included on page 154 of the budget book, and had information related to who was served by the service in the City and County. She said that independent judgments could be made as to which of the organizations should be included, but if organizations worked with staff, sometimes for multiple years, they could eventually receive funding. She said that she appreciated the process and would like to have a discussion about the criteria in the future, but the information as presented was satisfactory to her.

Ms. Mallek said that she had no concerns with the ABRT process at all, and there was no way that she would presume to interject herself in that. She said that she felt that there was arts and culture information that was missing, but not the actual criteria. She said that the scoring things in the book for

the ABRT was what was missing from this criterion. She said that she had previously asked for that information to be provided in a timely way. She said that she noticed that in the recommendation, there was no money for the Festival of the Book.

Ms. Mallek said that the Festival of the Book was an agency that went to every school in the County, compared to the film festival that did not have the same reach and had more adequate funding. She said that she would prefer having the funding be put toward an organization that did not have the endowment of the university behind it and paying for it, and the outreach of authors to adults and children was worth that funding.

Mr. Bowman said that the Festival of the Book had not requested anything this year.

Ms. McKeel said that she apologized for not understanding Ms. Mallek's specificity to the issue. She said that it was noted that the Festival of the Book had not requested funding.

Ms. Mallek said that she had heard a comment about it, but that it was not well-founded.

Ms. McKeel said that she was comfortable with the items as presented and would be open to considering additional items or changes to them over the summer.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked Mr. Bowman if people had been notified if they had not been successful.

Mr. Bowman said yes. He said that anyone who had requested funding was contacted, regardless of if funding was awarded or not.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that it was upon that agency to contact the County to find out more information or receive guidance to improve successful applications. She said it would take a lot of staff time to communicate that information out to all of the applicants.

Ms. Price said that it would be helpful for them to understand the totality of the evaluation process. She said that she did not want to politicize the decisions made as to what agencies received funding, but the Board should be aware and have input. She said that she did not want to see Board members mentioning specific entities and politicizing the staff's judgment. She said that a great benefit of the process used throughout would allow them to avoid the inundation of requests to Supervisors for particular pet projects and keep it as objective as possible.

Ms. McKeel said that it had been mentioned that at one point there would be a similar process for large organizations who sought funding from the County. She asked if there was some time over the summer when staff could present information related to that process and enable Board discussion of the future process.

Mr. Bowman said yes. He said that they could bring that information back with the total package.

Ms. Birch clarified that the first run of that process was done this year, and the recommendation was the Bennett Village contribution. She said that it would be part of the discussion this summer to talk about what they liked and what they wanted to change. She said that the three that would be discussed would be ABRT, recreation and culture, and the capital contribution.

Ms. McKeel said that would be a good part of the discussion to be had this summer.

Ms. Birch said yes.

Mr. Bowman said that the second item was an update on the tax relief for the elderly and disabled program. He said that he would review the information provided to the Board since the March 8 work session. He said that there were budget changes, income levels, and net worth, and he wanted to ensure that each part was discussed carefully. He said that the budget increase year-to-year for this program was \$240 thousand or 16%, with half of that number being attributed to normal trend projection. He said that the other half of the increase was due to the increase in net income level from \$75 thousand to just under \$84 thousand, or 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

Mr. Bowman said that if applied this year, they would see an impact of \$125 thousand of the \$240 thousand. He said that that amount was included in the budget, and that if the Board approved the ordinance on April 19, that could be provided. He said that based on 2022 applications, 95 applicants, 13% of the total applications of the program, would benefit from the increased income threshold. He said that at the lowest level of net income, there would be 100% relief, and the higher the income, the less relief was given.

Mr. Bowman said that the Board had asked what the impact would be of not only looking at income but at net worth as well, because both criteria were part of the qualification for the program. He said that very little data was available to assess this, because the County only had net worth and income for people who had applied for the program.

Mr. Bowman said that this information was learned as part of the application process rather than existing as data that could be accessed outside of it. He said that they could reasonably conclude some data and considerations. He said that they knew that based on 2022 data, there were nine applicants who

had applied but did not receive anything because they were over the net worth of \$200,000.

Mr. Bowman said that if they were to do an incremental increase of the net worth from \$200,000 up to \$250,000, eight of those nine applicants would be picked up with that new threshold. He said that the net worth of the program's applicants skewed toward the lower end, with 68% of applicants having a net worth of less than \$50,000, 84% had less than \$100,000 in net worth, and 95% were below \$150,000. He said that there were probably a lot of people who did not apply to that program because they had a net worth over \$200,000.

Mr. Bowman said that staff felt strongly that if the net worth were increased to \$250,000, it would generate more applications. He said that the best estimate was that with a \$250,000 threshold, an additional \$125,000 was required to fund that. He said that if approved, this would require additional revenue or expenditure adjustments in order for the budget to remain balanced. He said that alternatively, the Board could keep income levels the same and increase the net worth threshold with no total budget impact because those were estimated to be the same.

Ms. Birch clarified that this program, and why they were recommending in what would be presented to the Board on April 19, was the income level. She said that they had just adopted a policy change last year that allowed for that to move, and additionally, they were trying to figure out a way that they could tie the increase in assessed value and where they were headed with what they could do now.

Ms. Birch said that they decided to increase that to the AMI like the policy allowed. She said that the \$250,000 was a number that could be budget neutral in the event that the Board said that they should not move the income level, and that net worth was more valuable to the program recipients than income. She reiterated that this was to keep the balanced budget equal.

Mr. Bowman said that another measure that the Board could consider was that if they took the \$200,000 net worth level, that number originated in 2007 when the state put a cap on the net worth, and they also had a cap on the net income level, and if adjusted for inflation, \$200 thousand in January 2007 would be equivalent to about \$296 thousand in January of 2023. He said that recognizing that there were reasonable assumptions about what could be managed in the budget, they would expect that they would need to have an impact of \$250 thousand above the proposed budget.

Mr. Bowman said that if approved, they would have to look at additional revenue or expenditure adjustments in order for the budget to remain balanced. He said that there was no budget-neutral option for this item. He said that the next steps would be the public hearing and Board action on April 19, and if any direction or further information needed to be provided, they would work to perform analysis to see how they could support this issue.

Ms. Mallek said that the increase in assessments year over year had been of concern to her, and she believed that net worth was a larger problem than income, because COLA (cost of living adjustments) were around 3% for a lot of people living on social security, whereas there were no guardrails on what the assessments were doing due to market volatility. She said that it sounded like the inflation information from Mr. Bowman did a better job of capturing than messing with, based upon the previous assessment averages, that this was the far better thing. She said that this was why they had reserves for making these kinds of changes.

Ms. Price asked which item Ms. Mallek recommended.

Ms. Mallek said that she would like to increase the net worth based on the inflation model.

Ms. Price asked if Ms. Mallek was expressing preference for the net worth adjustment.

Ms. Mallek said yes, if they could only do one, she would rather do that.

Ms. Birch asked for clarification.

Ms. Mallek said that she supported the net worth increase in lieu of the net income increase.

Ms. McKeel said that they were used to the COLA going up about 2%, and that the increase was 8.7% this year, which was highly unusual. She said that the net worth was important, and she trusted Finance staff to make the correct decisions because they had the data. She asked if what was proposed was what was seen as the most meaningful.

Ms. Birch said that when the policy review was completed last year, they were focused on income and not on the net worth. She asked Mr. Sumner if he recalled the reason why they had focused on moving the income level.

Mr. Jacob Sumner, Assistant CFO for Policy and Partnerships, said that he did not recall why they only focused on the net income, but he did know that they were having a lot of conversations around AMI and housing, which naturally fit better with the net income. He said that there were strategies undertaken last year to simplify the ladder of relief, which before was more stratified and complicated than the 100%, 75%, 50% relief that was now proposed.

Ms. Birch said that it was reasonable for them to grow a relief program commensurate with something. She said that if they were growing the income, they were growing that with AMI, it made

sense to grow the \$200,000 relative to something, and it made sense to grow it relative to the inflationary cost.

Ms. Birch said that however, they did not know how many people would qualify, so it would not be until the process was underway that they would understand the impact on the budget. She said that if the Board wanted them to take this direction, they had to figure out how to pay for this during this year, and it was an ongoing impact that must be built in. She said that scenarios could be drawn once Board direction was given.

Ms. McKeel asked if they had to raise the rate every year based on inflation.

Ms. Birch said yes, but it would be in the context of affordability and would never be automatic. She said that they would evaluate the program and if they could afford it based on analyses and projections from a certain point in time. She said that the timing of this should happen every year so that if they wanted to do something different in the program, it would go through the public hearing process and the Board review as part of the budget process.

Ms. McKeel said that it was an unusual year with the 8.7% cost of living increase for social security, and they did not know the future of it.

Ms. Price asked what Ms. McKeel's preference was.

Ms. McKeel said that she had a preference for changing the net worth but was not completely decided.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she agreed that there should be review of the rate at this time every year in case they had to scale the program back due to the number of applicants.

Mr. Bowman said that the rate would need to be adjusted yearly because the Board must decide on the budget items each year.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if applications for this program had been received this year.

Ms. Birch said that the program closed on April 1.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if that was when it closed.

Ms. Birch said that it closed for new applicants in November, but existing applicants had a closing date of April 1.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that if they got an idea that it was growing exponentially then something would have to be done in the future. She asked what the proposed increased net worth would be.

Ms. Price said \$295,599.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked what net worth included for constituents.

Ms. Birch asked Ms. Jian Lin, Controller, to explain what was excluded from the net worth for this tax relief program.

Ms. Jian Lin, Controller, said that houses that were sole dwellings were excluded as assets, unless the house was over 10 acres. She said that those houses above 10 acres would have their assessment values included in the net assets.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked Ms. Lin to speak louder.

Ms. Birch said that the first 10 acres was excluded, but over 10 acres was included.

Ms. Mallek asked if a large house made a difference.

Ms. Lin said no. She said that if the house were the sole dwelling and was less than 10 acres and worth \$2 million, it would still be excluded.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if someone whose house was worth \$2 million on 9 acres, and the salary was below the cap then they could apply for the program.

Ms. Birch said that as long as her other assets were not above the maximum.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked what the other assets included.

Ms. Lin said stocks, loans, everything else.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked what the current cap on net worth was.

Ms. Birch said that it was currently \$200,000 and would go up to almost \$296,000.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if she would qualify if she had 9 acres, a \$2 million home, and she made less than \$295,000.

Ms. Birch said no, it would be less than \$75,000. She said that they also could not have more than \$200,000 in savings.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if net worth involved cars.

Ms. Lin said yes. She said that it included any assets, including retirement and IRA balances. If it is over \$200,000 currently, or if it goes to \$295,000.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she had no issues with using the net worth, but it should be revisited ever year.

Mr. Andrews said that he agreed that it should not be automatic. He asked how they could be assured that the net worth data was good. He said that income had tax returns.

Ms. Birch asked Ms. Lin what was done to validate assets.

Ms. Lin said that income tax returns, bank statements, retirement income, and investments were requested from applicants. She said that the information was researched as much as possible, but there was not really a system in place to fully know whether applicants were hiding anything.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if there was an ability to check into that and make people prove something more.

Ms. Lin said that it was stated in the code that if they discovered fraud, they could go back and reverse the decisions made.

Mr. Andrews said that there was no way to know if someone was committing fraud until they found it. He said that he was leaning toward the income because it was more verifiable information, but this issue made it apparent that they should look within the budget to find ways to help people who needed this relief. He said that he approved of increasing the income and the net worth as well if they felt comfortable doing that. He said that it meant there must be cuts or other ways to balance it, but he felt it was warranted for this particular program.

Ms. Price said that the net income was the more relevant one to look at rather than net worth. She said that increasing it as they were able to was important due to the social security cost of living increase of 8.7%, and the 80% AMI was used often in terms of affordability, but they were discussing elderly and disabled people. She said that if they looked at net worth, it may be fair to do something like nothing above the average cost of a house in Albemarle County so that people who had expensive houses and large properties would not benefit from this tax relief.

Ms. Price said that she believed that both income and net worth should be subject to increasing, but they could protect themselves as a County by putting a maximum amount that would be available. She said that if more people applied and were eligible, there may be a pro-rata share that each person could get, so that the County was not faced with an unlimited bill.

Ms. Price said that the net income was more relevant for this group of individuals than looking at net worth, and if they were looking at net worth, there should be some reasonable measure of capping, such as the mean average cost of a house. She said that the County should look at imposing a maximum amount that they would fund in a year, and if more people applied than they could afford, then a pro-rata share would be provided.

Ms. McKeel said that she agreed.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked what the pros and cons were of using net worth over net income.

Ms. Birch said that staff would come back prepared to discuss affordability on April 19 and what was possible. She said that she believed it should grow commensurate to something. She said that she liked what they had established, and they should make sure that they could afford to do that this year. She said that if not, they could set a cap in the budget for the program this year. She said that she would have to figure out what could be done budgetarily and administratively this year in preparation for the April 19 work session. She said that there were some additional logistics that must be worked through.

Ms. Mallek said that an absolute cap per individual was another way to look at limiting funds in an absolute way. She said that the only issue with having a cap on the category was concerning because people who had been in the program and who were impoverished may not get the funding that they needed the following year. She was told years before that this was one of those programs that the County stood behind, and if more people needed it, they found it and they did it. She said that the median house value could be researched by Mr. Lynch and used to create the cap, which would give them more predictability. She said that she was surprised to see how many applicants there were in the chart, the number of the applicants that did not qualify under the current program, and how many people were just above the cap and yet were suffering due to the increase in assessment values.

Ms. Birch said that they must also consider what the law allowed them to do when bringing together this information.

Ms. Mallek said that citizens had researched and benchmarked the net worth used by other localities that were often compared to Albemarle.

Ms. McKeel said that this must be made verifiable and simple so that staff did not spend so much time on the process.

Ms. Price asked if sufficient direction was given to staff.

Mr. Bowman said yes.

Mr. Richardson said that they would be discussing the tax relief program on April 19 before the public hearing for that. He said that being contingent on how the upcoming work session on workforce stabilization and some other items went, they could scratch the April 12 date and manufacture time on April 19.

Ms. McKeel said that she had no problem with that as it gave staff more time to work on the issue.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that Mr. Gallaway wanted to revisit the fields at Darden Towe as an issue.

Mr. Richardson said that there were three hours dedicated next Wednesday to workforce stabilization as well as other items, so they could keep two hours dedicated to workforce stabilization and one hour for discussion of parks and recreation, capital, and recommendations for Biscuit Run. He said that they may need until April 19 to bring back information if it was related to changes to infrastructure or Darden Towe.

Ms. Price asked if the Board approved of canceling the April 12 meeting. Hearing no objections, she moved on to the next item.

Agenda Item No. 3. Closed Meeting.

At 6:09 p.m., Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **moved** that the Board go into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia:

- under subsection (1) to discuss the assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salary, disciplining, or resignation of the County's Chief Financial Officer and the County's Director of Human Resources.

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

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

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 4. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 6:32 p.m., Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **moved** that the Board of Supervisors certify by a recorded vote that, to the best of each supervisor's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting, were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting.

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

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

NAYS: None.

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

There was none.

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

There was no report from the County Executive.

Agenda Item No. 7. Adjourn to March 24, 2023, 8:00 a.m., Omni Hotel, 212 Ridge McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA.

At 6:33 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to March 24, 2023, 8:00 a.m., Omni Hotel, 212 Ridge McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA for the Regional Housing Partnership Summit. Opportunities for the public to access and participate in this meeting are posted on the Albemarle County website on the Board of Supervisors home page and on the Albemarle County calendar. Participation will include the opportunity to comment on those matters for which comments from the public will be received.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date: 02/19/2025
Initials: CKB