

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on September 20, 2023, at 2:30 p.m. in Lane Auditorium on the Second Floor of the Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

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

ABSENT: None.

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 1:00 p.m. by the Vice-Chair, Mr. Jim Andrews.

Mr. Andrews noted the presence of a quorum but also noted that he was not the usual Chair for these meetings, as Chair Price was unable to attend due to illness. He said they would begin by considering admitting Chair Price to participate remotely. He said that due to a personal condition in accordance with Section 2.2-3708.3 of the Code of Virginia and applicable Board Rules of Procedure, rule number 8(B)(1)(a), enacted pursuant to the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, Ms. Price had requested to participate remotely. He asked Ms. Price to state her location and reason for requesting to participate remotely.

Ms. Price said that she was unable to attend due to a personal medical condition. She stated her current location to be her home in the Scottsville Magisterial District.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **moved** to allow Ms. Price to participate remotely as she was not able to attend in person due to a medical condition.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ABSTENTIONS: Ms. Price.

Mr. Andrews said Albemarle County Police Officers Andy Muncy and Dana Reeves were present at the meeting to provide their services.

Agenda Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance.
Agenda Item No. 3. Moment of Silence.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Mr. Gallaway requested to pull the minutes of January 19, 2022 from the consent agenda.

Mr. Andrews asked if there was a motion to adopt the final agenda.

Ms. McKeel **moved** to adopt the final agenda as amended.

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

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

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 5. Brief Announcements by Board Members.

Ms. McKeel said that it was wonderful to be back in the United States. She said that she had traveled to Spain and Portugal, but it was always great to get home. She said that she wanted to remind the Board, because they had talked about this before, and just to let everyone else know, that the Chamber of Commerce was sponsoring the Eggs and Issues Legislative Breakfast. She said that the breakfast would be held on Wednesday, September 27, from 8:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m., at the Centre at Belvedere. She said that the keynote speaker would be Dr. Bob Holsworth, whom she thought many folks were familiar with as he was a political analyst in Virginia. She added that there would be other local speakers as well. She encouraged everyone to attend and RSVP on the Chamber's website.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she attended the September 10 tribute for those firefighters and personnel who were lost in 9/11 along with Chair Price. She said that it was a very moving event where all the firefighters climbed 70 flights of steps with gear to honor those that were lost. She said that she did not have gear on, but Ms. Price was the first one to finish the 70 flights and ring the bell, and it was a moment of pride for them. She said that she herself only managed to do 35; they could not all be good. She said that it was a very wonderful event, it was really great seeing Abby Stumpf and her sister there,

and quite a few people participated. She said that it was very moving to see how fit the firefighters were also.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that last Saturday was Seize the Day, which was an event that took place every year in honor of the military veterans. She said they had Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force veterans and their families. She said that it took place at Walnut Park and Trevor Henry was there as the keynote speaker and gave a heartfelt speech. She said that if one was ever in his office, she suggested asking him about the picture hanging on his wall with six handsome men from World War II. They were all siblings, and he had a moving story about them.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that on Saturday there was a Pride event in Charlottesville attended by hundreds of people. She said that it was a very fun event for everyone. She said that another business was opening up and there would be a soft opening for the Southwest Mountain Vineyard on September 30th. She said that the Loop de'Ville Trail would take place on Saturday, starting at 8:30 a.m. from the Rivanna River Company. She said that it was a very nice 20-mile loop around the City of Charlottesville, and there was a fun party afterwards at the Rivanna River Company. She encouraged the public to attend, and the public could find out more information at loopdeville.org.

Ms. Mallek said that also at Seize the Day was the Coast Guard. She said that she went to college across the street from the academy, so she had lots of lifelong friends there. She said that for the public, this afternoon, the Comprehensive Planning staff of Albemarle County was available in the lobby right outside for the next several hours to receive any comments and answer questions from anybody in attendance about the next round of work on the AC44 Comprehensive Plan Review.

Ms. Mallek said that the ribbon cutting at the new Workforce campus, the Career Innovation Campus, which was located at 943 and 944 Glenwood Station, had representatives of state administration as well as all the partner agencies who worked together seamlessly to assist job seekers and people wanting to have a new career, a different career, or improve their job skills in a current career, as well as working with businesses who needed to upskill their own current employees or expand. She added that it was very successful, with a large turnout for the gathering and tours of the new facilities as well.

Ms. Mallek said that one of the people there at the tables outside were members from the USDA (U.S. Department of Agriculture) research project who had been working on gathering information about discrimination against minority farmers, which had occurred by the USDA over the last 80 years. This was something she had begun to learn a lot about 10 years ago and there was a lot of information to be gathered and learned in order to figure out how to move forward on that. There were Lunch and Learns every Wednesday, and she left this information with the Clerk so that people could contact her, and she would be glad to give information by email or phone.

Ms. Mallek said that tomorrow afternoon from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. was the second edition of the public hearing for the VDOT bundle number 2, which had five different roundabout and traffic improvement projects in Albemarle County. She said that there was a very well attended first meeting at the Armory on the previous afternoon, and she encouraged everybody to come out and look at all the maps. She said that there were many things about which VDOT needed information, input from neighbors, and also in order to stage some of the work, especially at the one in Crozet, there were lots of technical things that needed to be ironed out and they were looking for information that will help them do that.

Ms. Mallek said that Exit 107 Park and Ride had been recently approved as one of the SMART SCALE projects, and there would be information in the newspaper soon about how to submit comments on that. She said that it was a cumbersome process so she suggested that if people wanted to find out more, they should contact her because this letter was all she had so far, but they were gathering information about the possibility of how to submit comments and the possibility of a public meeting. She said that it was not guaranteed that there would be a public meeting; there would only be one if there was sufficient interest and concern. She said she thought that most folks who had learned about this project were really excited to have it happen so they could leave their car at Exit 107 and jump on either the Afton Express to get downtown or to have a ride share carpool.

Ms. Mallek said that at the last Veterans Affairs Committee meeting with NACo (National Association of Counties), a representative of the Veterans Association talked about new eligibility criteria for people who were damaged with the toxic burn pits, which was called the PACT (Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxins) Act. She said that it took two years too long to get it passed through Congress but it was now in full swing and there were many different eligibility requirements. She said that even if people did not qualify originally, they were asked to please go back to the VA (Veterans Affairs) and submit again because there was a whole new outreach and describing which areas were being added to the list of presumptive and also non-presumptive exposure stations. She said that it was very technical, but the most important thing that people needed to understand was to reach out to the VA and sign up again in the next couple of months in order to not miss this opportunity to be able to get retroactive coverage for at least a year.

Ms. Mallek said that at the Climate Committee for the Local Government Advisory Committee for the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency), there was a wonderful presentation from Fort Collins, Colorado about what their climate program was all about, and her takeaway was that they came to the realization that climate was not a math problem, it was a people problem. She said that many jurisdictions, and perhaps theirs in some ways, had spent a lot of time talking about the structure and

how to weatherize the structure and fix the transit, but needed to perhaps have a better focus on the people who lived in the house, because it really would help to bring more people into the program.

Mr. Gallaway said that he wanted to remind everyone that the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) had a meeting with their workshop on the SMART SCALE items today. He said that he advised all Board members and staff to watch the video once it posted so they could be aware of what was discussed regarding the SMART SCALE items. He believed that they were just having a work session today and action would come later, but he recommended staying ahead of any changes by watching the presentation.

Mr. Andrews said that Ms. Price had sent some announcements, and he was going to read them. There was a well aware reception at Yancey Community Center tomorrow morning 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. He said that Ms. Price would be meeting later with Scottsville Town representatives and VDOT on September 26. He said that also mentioned earlier was the Chamber of Commerce event on September 27, Eggs and Issues at the Center. He said that there was a Rivanna River Basin meeting on September 28 in Lane Auditorium from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. He said that the Chamber of Commerce meeting in Scottsville would take place on September 28 from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Andrews said that for his own announcements, he appreciated the mention of the VDOT design public hearings with the second tomorrow at the Center from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. He said that he wanted to acknowledge and thought they would hear more later about Engage Albemarle, which opened up to review and comments on the draft environmental stewardship goals and objectives. He said that more information of course can be found at [Engage.Albemarle.org](https://engage.albemarle.org).

Mr. Andrews said that Resilient Together, a collaboration of UVA, Charlottesville, and Albemarle County, had been underway because climate change did not recognize geographic or political boundaries. He said that there was an open house at the Carver Recreation Center on Tuesday, September 26 from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. He said that upcoming on September 30 from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. was Community Day at Simpson Park across from the Yancey Community Center in Esmont.

Mr. Andrews said that the hazardous waste collection at Ivy was continuing. He said that this Friday and Saturday were for household hazardous waste, followed by mattresses and furniture on September 30, appliances on October 7, and tires on October 14. He said that early voting started this Friday, continued weekdays and Saturdays through November 4, followed by the regular election on November 7.

Ms. McKeel said that they needed to be careful regarding water since most of Albemarle County was in a drought and had already been declared as such.

Agenda Item No. 6. Proclamations and Recognitions.

Item No. 6.a. Virginia Association of Counties Achievement Award.

Mr. Gage Harter, Virginia Association of Counties (VACo), said that VACo had been in existence since 1934 to serve and support their efforts as County officials and staff. He said that VACo supported them in numerous ways, first and foremost through advocacy efforts. He stated that the Board was aware of their lobbyist team and how top-notch they were. He said that they supported the County through education, membership services, and help with communications efforts. He said that in 2003, VACo established the Achievement Award program which recognized counties that had adopted innovative approaches to challenges.

Mr. Harter said that he was proud to present Albemarle County with an Achievement Award. He noted that this year's program had been competitive, with 135 entries and only 33 winners selected from among them. He said that it was the 21st year of the program and that only 25% of entrants took home a plaque. He congratulated Albemarle on winning the award and noted that this was the County's eighth achievement award since 2003, with much success in the last few years, having won in 2016, 2018, 2021, and now 2023. He encouraged the County to continue their good work.

Ms. Serena Gruia, Public Engagement Coordinator, thanked her team. She said that these days, people often think about engagement in terms of views, clicks, and shares, but at the heart of it all was a relationship. She said that when they hosted pop-ups, she wrote "Let's get engaged" on a big sign to invite people to stop by. She said that this step was important as it brought more people into a conversation and helped them understand what local government is and does, and into a relationship. They get engaged.

Ms. Gruia thanked VACo for awarding the innovation creativity and design of this project. She said that it was particularly important to acknowledge creativity and design within the local government realm because it shined a light on the depth of talent that bureaucracy was not always acknowledged for. She said that Albemarle County local government was innovative and creative. She gave thanks to the organizational leadership, particularly Emily Kilroy, for opening the opportunity to have big ideas.

Ms. Gruia said that during the pandemic, she loaded up her minivan with tables, chairs, information kits, and boxes of masks and sanitizer, and posted up in parking lots around the County. She said that she knew that some people were not receiving information about the latest guidance, services, and support, so she brought it out into the community. One day Ms. Kilroy asked her if the sky was the limit with what she could do to think of ways to expand the engagement efforts. She said that now she

knew the sky was not the limit but was a great starting point for creative ideas.

Ms. Gruia said that here where she got to thank the unsung heroes of this project. She said that being an innovative project, the Let's Talk Van was a square peg trying to fit into a matrix of round holes. She said that she worked with multiple County staff to bring the van to Albemarle County. She said that they were a couple of years into this project, and they had been to parks, parking lots, festivals, farmers markets, country stores, and County schools. She said that they had met thousands of people and had had hundreds of conversations.

Ms. Gruia said that the big idea of creating more opportunities for community involvement in local government had resulted in increased organizational collaboration, partnerships, and enjoyment. She said that she liked to say come for the bubbles, buttons, and snow cones, and stay for the conversations, learning, and community. She invited everyone to this Sunday's pop-up at the Loop de'Ville event at Woolen Mills where they could meet with the AC44 team and Resilient Together team onsite to share information about those two very important community projects.

Ms. McKeel said that she wanted to thank the whole team for this great idea. She said that they knew how big they were in Albemarle County with 750 square miles. She said that this was a way to get to the community and in those locations that they often did not touch. She said that she read somewhere there were 50 pop-ups in 30 locations. She said that was really incredible over the last period of time. She thanked staff for their teamwork and their work to make this happen.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she must thank Ms. Gruia and her team. She said that they were at Seas the Day and it was really nice, and they gave out snow cones. She said that it was very impressive because it seemed like they covered so many locations. She said that it was one way to communicate with people in a friendly manner, where people felt comfortable making comments and talking and asking questions. She commended everyone all for that.

Ms. Mallek said that this was a whole new world, and they had been nimble and created new ways to find people, because even five and 10 years ago at Thursdays in the Square, she would have people coming by and seeing her all the time, and now people were much more busy and working three jobs, some of them were much more able to interact online and therefore get their information that way. She said that having those face-to-face conversations was so incredibly important to be able to make real connections with folks and have them feel valued in what they were saying. She said that she was so grateful that these big ideas were allowed to be launched, and there were so many micro communities in the 750 square miles and most of those folks had never come down here to a meeting. She said that this was really a great step forward and gave thanks to staff for having the idea.

Mr. Gallaway said that he agreed with everything that had been said. He gave his congratulations to the staff for all their effort in helping to bring some positive attention to Albemarle. He said that about a year ago, he had happened upon one of the pop-ups but it was right when everything was breaking up so all the people who were manning the pop-up were all kind of starting to scatter.

Mr. Gallaway said that the thing that he remembered was talking to Ms. Kilroy afterwards, and in addition to being fun for the public, it seemed to be fun for the staff. He said that even though everyone was leaving, the staff was not just checking out. He had said that the staff had a good time interacting with people and that it was just as important for the staff to be able to engage that way as the day-to-day operations are. He gave his congratulations again and said that the Board appreciated all of the staff's efforts.

Mr. Andrews said that he would add his congratulations. He said that he loved the Let's Talk Albemarle van. He said that it was highly visible, ubiquitous, interactive, with people writing on the side of the van, hopefully not in permanent marker. He said that he always felt like it was staffed by people who were really engaged in the work. He said that it was not as if it was just a little PR team out there; these were the staff who were doing things every day for the County. He said that he really appreciated it and the snow cones.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that there had been so much positive energy that came from this team. He said that Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley talked about the friendliness of how they outreached, and it was a labor of love. He said that these folks worked really hard. He said that he saw them at events on nights and weekends a lot. He said that there had been a common thread with these folks. He said that they had families, and they had small kids. He said that they did have fun, as Mr. Gallaway stated. He said that he was really proud of what they did. He said that they were a real important part of the Strategic Plan. He said that, as Ms. Mallek said, it was a big County and there were lots of little communities. He said that he really appreciated the leadership. He said that it really said something about the quality of the team when moms and dads came, so he really appreciated them being here.

A photograph was taken of Ms. Gruia holding the VACo award, along with her team, the Board, and Mr. Harter.

Agenda Item No. 7. From the Public: Matters on the Agenda but Not Listed for Public Hearing or on Matters Previously Considered by the Board or Matters that are Pending Before the Board.

Mr. Peter Krebs, Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC), said that the PEC was extremely

excited about the microtransit program, and they were going to learn more about it during the meeting. He said that were willing, the PEC would like to help get the word out once all of the information was available.

Mr. Krebs said that he received a copy of a letter that Mr. Richardson sent to the Genan Foundation about their support for the PEC's efforts to connect Biscuit Run to Southwood, Hickory Street, and the surrounding neighborhoods, acknowledging their support but also being really strong in the commitment from the County to work on that effort. He said that indeed, he had been hearing that FES (Facilities and Environmental Services) and Parks and Recreation, and the necessary parties were actually working with some enthusiasm about this. He said that this was great news and thanked Albemarle County for this.

Mr. Krebs said that he wanted to echo what Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley had said about the Loop de'Ville Trail Fest, which was happening that weekend. He said that the event was kicking off from the Rivanna River Company, and he would be leading a walk around the full Rivanna Trail Loop starting at 8:30 a.m., so he asked the public to come join him for that.

Mr. Krebs said that he had been watching the weather forecast very carefully and it may come down to a morning of decision that would factor in safety as well as the steadfast commitment to protect the trail from its users. He said that if the trail was incredibly muddy, they did not want people walking on it, and they would make a determination Saturday morning. He said that the Sunday events at the Wool Factory were happening all morning and those were going to happen pretty much rain or shine, and there will be some shorter walks.

Mr. Krebs said that they had heard about the Engage Albemarle van being there but also there was going to be a series of what they were calling Lightning Trail Talks, which would be about 20 different speakers, including both City and County staff talking about the many cool things happening in the community. He said that the talks would specifically focus on ways that residents could get involved. He said that one of the things he said was being done really well in the community was working together as governments, organizations, and even businesses, all fueled by resident energy, sweat, equity, and passion. He expressed his hope to see everyone there and encouraged them to visit www.loopdeville.org for more information.

residents could get involved. He said that one of the things he said was being done really well in the community was working together as governments, organizations, and even businesses, all fueled by resident energy, sweat, equity, and passion. He expressed his hope to see everyone there and encouraged them to visit www.loopdeville.org for more information.

Mr. Joe Fore, Chair of the Crozet Community Advisory Committee (CCAC) and White Hall District resident, said that his main purpose for being there was to urge County staff and the Board of Supervisors to include some critical Crozet area infrastructure projects in the upcoming budget and capital plan. He said that at the community meetings for the CCAC, they regularly heard neighbors' concerns about the rapid pace of development in Crozet. He acknowledged that it might be tempting to dismiss some of those Crozet concerns about new development as mere NIMBYism; however, he stated that there was a broader context for their concerns.

Mr. Fore said that Crozet had grown more and faster than any other part of the County over the past decade, without many of the critical infrastructure investments promised in multiple master plans. The Eastern Avenue Connector project, postponed due to growing costs, was once again delayed. He said that busy roads surrounding Crozet Park lacked sidewalks or shared use paths, forcing families to choose between driving a few hundred yards for baseball practice or taking their chances walking on busy streets. He said that additionally, the faded sign along Old Trail Avenue proclaimed it as the future site of an Albemarle Community Park has been there for 15 years.

Mr. Fore said that to help correct those gaps, the new capital budget should address four critical priorities from the Crozet Master Plan. He said that first, finding a solution to the Eastern Avenue budget shortfall or funding a viable alternative, such as the possible Dunvegan Lane connection from Park Road to Crozet Avenue or another alternative that could alleviate traffic. He said that second, funding key sidewalk priority projects near and around Crozet Park, especially those along the heavily used roads of Park Road and Hilltop. He said that they were critical for neighbors to try and get into the park. He said that third, building the shared use path along Three Notch'd Road, which would help connect the eastern neighborhoods into the more pedestrian friendly areas along Park Ridge Road. He said that finally, fully developing phase one of Western Park. He said that by funding those key projects, he had said that the County could help support the current and future residents of the Crozet growth area just as the master plan envisioned.

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

Ms. Mallek **moved** to approve the consent agenda as amended.

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

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

NAYS: None.

Item No. 8.1. Approval of Minutes: January 12, January 19, February 2, February 16, and February 23, 2022.

Mr. Jim Andrews had read the minutes of January 12, 2022, and found them to be in order.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley had read the minutes of February 2, 2022, and found them to be in order.

Ms. Mallek had read the minutes of February 16, 2022, and found them to be in order.

Ms. McKeel had read the minutes of February 23, 2022, and found them to be in order.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved the minutes of January 12, February 2, February 16, and February 23, 2022.

Item No. 8.2. Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods Grant Resubmission.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that in October 2022, Albemarle County staff applied for planning funds through the US Department of Transportation Reconnecting Communities Pilot grant program. This discretionary grant program is dedicated to reconnecting communities that have experienced negative safety, mobility, accessibility, and/or economic impacts due to transportation infrastructure. Program funding supports planning grants and capital construction grants to restore community connectivity through the removal, retrofitting, mitigation, or replacement of eligible transportation infrastructure facilities.

Though Albemarle County's 2022 application was unsuccessful, staff learned in a debrief with Federal staff that the application had scored very highly; Federal staff noted minor points of improvement for the application if the County chose to resubmit.

In 2023, the US Department of Transportation has combined the Reconnecting Communities Pilot (RCP) and Neighborhood Access and Equity (NAE) programs into a single Notice of Funding Opportunity. This new funding opportunity is referred to as the Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods (RCN) program.

Staff has revised the previous RCP application and is prepared to submit a RCN planning grant application for approximately \$300,000. Like the 2022 RCP request, this funding would support a corridor study for US 29 (and the surrounding neighborhoods) from Hydraulic Road to Hilton Heights Road. The corridor study would feature a strong public engagement component.

The purpose of the corridor study would be to identify solutions to any negative impacts of US 29 on the safety, mobility, and overall well-being of Albemarle County residents, especially vulnerable road users and those who live in the neighborhoods adjacent to this section of US 29. This purpose is consistent with the goals identified in the Places 29 Master Plan.

Future funding would be needed to design and construct any proposed solutions identified in the corridor study.

This application would also be submitted with support from the City of Charlottesville, which borders the study area.

RCN planning grants must identify non-federal funds for 20% cost-sharing. In-kind donations may be used as part or all of the non-federal share.

The 20% cost-share for this project would be entirely in-kind, including staff time from the County Community Development and Communications & Public Engagement departments, as well as staff time from the City of Charlottesville Transportation Planning Manager.

Staff recommends that the Board endorse the Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods grant application by adopting the attached proposed Resolution (Attachment A).

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the resolution as presented in Attachment A to endorse the Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods grant application:

**RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR THE ALBEMARLE COUNTY
RECONNECTING COMMUNITIES AND NEIGHBORHOODS GRANT APPLICATION**

WHEREAS, Objective Six of the Transportation Chapter of the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan prioritizes continuing "to provide safe, effective, and improved urban roads in the Development Areas while recognizing that multimodal opportunities help to improve road functions;"

WHEREAS, the Albemarle County Places 29 Master Plan identifies US 29 as a "strong spine" connecting the Northern Development Areas of Albemarle County, but clarifies that "this spine" also acts as a major impediment to connectivity for any travel mode other than the auto, which needs to be

overcome in the long range planning for the area;

WHEREAS, the County of Albemarle desires to submit an application for a planning grant from the Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods discretionary grant program to fund the completion of a corridor study for US 29 (and the adjacent neighborhoods) from Hydraulic Road to Hilton Heights Road;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby supports the submittal of the Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods discretionary grant program application on behalf of Albemarle County to fund a corridor study for US 29 (and the adjacent neighborhoods) from Hydraulic Road to Hilton Heights Road.

Item No. 8.3. Reappointment of Jacob Sumner as the County of Albemarle's Proxy for JAUNT.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board reappointed Jacob Sumner as the County of Albemarle's proxy for Jaunt.



434.298.3184
www.rldejaunt.org
104 Keystone Place
Charlottesville, VA 22902

**APPOINTMENT OF PROXY
TO ACT AT MEETINGS
OF THE SHAREHOLDERS OF JAUNT, INC.**

The undersigned jurisdiction, being a shareholder of Jaunt, Inc. ("Jaunt"), hereby appoints Jacob Sumner to act as its proxy at the annual meeting and any special meetings of the shareholders of Jaunt upon all such matters as may come before the shareholders, including without limitation the election of directors. This proxy is revocable at any time by the shareholder.

This appointment shall be valid for the following term (select one):

☒ For twelve months from the date of this appointment.

☐ Until the end of their term in office, including any renewals thereof.

City/County of Albemarle

By: Claudette H. Borge

Title: Clerk to the Board of Supervisors

Date: September 20, 2023

Item No. 8.4. VDOT Monthly Report (September) 2023, **was received for information.**

Agenda Item No. 9. **Action Item:** SE202300024 3585 Stockton Road Homestay.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that The applicant is requesting a special exception for a homestay at 3585 Stockton Road.

Number of Guest Sleeping Spaces. Pursuant to County Code § 18-5.1.48(d), the applicant is requesting a modification of County Code 18-5.1.48(c)(1)(iii) to increase the number of guest rooms used for sleeping with a homestay use from two to three.

Please see Attachment A for full details of staff's analysis and recommendations.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment G) to approve the special exception.

Ms. Lea Brumfield, Senior Planner II, said that the special exception presented was at 3585 Stockton Road, east of Batesville off of Taylor's Gap Road. She said that parcel was 2.01 acres and was located in a small rural neighborhood. She said that the applicant was requesting a special exception to increase the number of guest sleeping spaces from two to three for a homestay use.

Ms. Brumfield said that as this parcel was a rural areas parcel less than five acres in size, it was permitted by right to rent out up to two guest sleeping spaces within the single-family dwelling that met primary structure setbacks, and it did not permit unhosted stays. She said that if this special exception was approved, the owner of the property would then apply for a homestay zoning clearance. She said that during that process, the dwelling used for the homestay would be inspected for building and fire safety, and the owners would send a notice to their neighbors providing contact information for their responsible agent who would be contacted in case of any disturbance or any emergencies related to the homestays.

Ms. Brumfield said that additionally, the homestay was required to provide parking onsite at the rate of one parking space per guest bedroom. She said that on the slide was an aerial photograph of the property showing the parking to the left of the building. She said that she did want to note that they had received a letter from the abutting northern neighbor whose home was located approximately 160 or 170 feet from the applicant's dwelling. She said that although there was fairly dense vegetation between the two dwellings, the letter had expressed concern about the homestay and asserted that the owner who was currently doing unpermitted homestays did not currently remain onsite during the rentals of the property.

Ms. Brumfield said that during the staff site visit, they did note that the home was currently only set up with three sleeping spaces, which would not provide additional sleeping space for the owner if they were renting three bedrooms at that time. She said that looking at the photo of the house, it could be seen that the dwelling was a split level. She said that the intended plan for the homestay as expressed to staff was that the three bedrooms on the top floor would be used for the homestay and the basement bedroom would be used for the owner's use.

Ms. Brumfield said that when they visited, all three bedrooms on the top floor were currently not set up for sleeping; only two were set up for sleeping and the third was used as a closet and dressing room, but the owner had asserted that she would be onsite and would set up the third bedroom on the top floor for guests. She said that also of note was that the setup of the house did not currently need to meet homestay regulations. She said that the County had previously approved homestay special exceptions for buildings that were not even built yet, and those were obviously not in compliance if they were not even built yet.

Ms. Brumfield said that the homestay would need to come into compliance with all of the guest bedrooms and advertising as a hosted listing at the time of the zoning homestay clearance approval. She said that at that point, they would either approve it based on it coming into compliance or deny it based on it not being in compliance. She said that like any homestay, there was a complaint process for the short-term rental registry, which was that if they received a complaint after the zoning clearance was approved, the code compliance officers launched an investigation.

Ms. Brumfield said that if the applicant was found to be in violation of the regulations, they would receive a strike on the short-term rental registry. She said that if there were three strikes on the registry, then the property owner was removed from the registry and was no longer eligible for any homestay rentals at this location. She said that the registry did not apply until the homestay clearance was approved.

Ms. Brumfield said that due to the nature of a special exception which run with the land, they had analyzed the use based on the property itself and the use in the greater context of the neighborhood. She said that as such, they reviewed it as a land use decision. She said that the general use of a three-guest room homestay with adequate parking onsite did not propose any adverse impacts to the surrounding neighborhood, public health, safety, or welfare. She said that the special exception was consistent in size and in use with the Comprehensive Plan and the surrounding neighborhood. She said that staff recommended approval of the homestay special exception, SE202300024 at 3585 Stockton Road.

Ms. McKeel said that she would like to see the picture of the house with the parking again. She said she was trying to figure out what it looked like. She said that they had the driveway and asked if there was a turnaround pictured.

Ms. Brumfield said that it was a graveled turnaround with parking for at least two cars.

Ms. McKeel asked if everyone would have to back out.

Ms. Brumfield said that when staff visited, they had pulled into that and backed into the driveway in front of the house, so they had done like a V-kind of turnaround.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that it would require some sort of action to enter and exit the area, as it was not designed for multiple vehicles.

Ms. Brumfield said that she had not seen any parking issues here on the site.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she had a concern because given the neighbors' concerns, staff had concerns regarding future compliance. She said that it seemed to her that this was something that might be problematic. She said that in the picture shown of the building, she wanted to know if the basement was located on the lower right.

Ms. Brumfield said yes, it was a split-level house.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that it was a split-level house with three bedrooms, two bedrooms and a closet on the first floor, and the basement. She asked how the basement was equipped, and if there was a kitchen.

Ms. Brumfield said that there was a rec-room space, with a bedroom and a bathroom at the back.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that it was on the lower floor, but had no kitchen, yet it was described as the living quarters of the owners.

Ms. Brumfield said that for clarification, the three bedrooms on the top floor were all of legal bedroom size, with one being smaller than the others.

Ms. Mallek said that she had difficulty wrapping her brain around how the fact that this had been an unauthorized use did not interact with the compliance process. She asked if she understood correctly that the way the registry was being interpreted was that there were no consequences for somebody who had been carrying on without participating in the rules and regulations of the County.

Ms. Brumfield said that because it was not on the registry, it was a normal notice of violation, which was how the process commenced. She said that it was a normal zoning violation, and they issued letters instructing them to come into compliance. She said that they required them to submit applications, but the short-term rental registry, which had the three strikes, did not apply until they were on the registry. She said that they could not give strikes to someone who was not registered, so that registry was when they agreed to follow all the rules from this point forward and then if they did not, that was when the three strikes came into play.

Ms. Mallek said that they did not get a strike prior to operating without a license and not being on the registry. She said that this act of seeking forgiveness instead of requesting permission had been a significant cause of issues for years, not only in Albemarle but also elsewhere.

Mr. Andy Herrick, Deputy County Attorney, noted that it was not a violation of the registry ordinance, but rather a violation of the Zoning Ordinance and that it was a use not permitted. He said that it was not that they were getting off scot-free, but rather a violation of a different ordinance.

Ms. Lisa Green, Manager of Code Compliance, said that this was in violation of a different section of the ordinance, which they were pursuing at this time. She said that however, if a special use or exception had been granted, it would have initiated the process for them to become compliant as they would then apply for a homestay permit which would allow them to operate legally.

Ms. Mallek asked if they were able to submit an application for joining the registry and complete their application for the two bedroom, which they could do by right, but it had not happened.

Ms. Green said that was correct.

Mr. Gallaway said that he had seen something in a letter where they were advertising events up to 99 people, but he had wanted to confirm if it was accurate.

Ms. Brumfield said that she thought it had been a box that had been checked on the listing, and that it had been just like the standard number. She said that there had not been any explicit mention of events.

Mr. Gallaway said that regarding the homestay ordinance, they were not in the registry, but if they were a valid homestay use and in the registry, then there would have been no events. He said that it was only the six individuals in this case who were allowed to participate.

Ms. Brumfield said that there were no events. She said that was one of the things that would have been reviewed during the zoning clearance process, which included listing and advertising what had actually been permitted. She said that the permit allowed for only three bedrooms and onsite hosted stays, but not any events.

Mr. Gallaway asked if they had a legal homestay use and they hit the three strikes, would that eliminate just that owner. He said that when they approve these, that the property got the use. He asked if the three strikes would just hit the current owner but would stay with the property.

Ms. Brumfield said that if a new owner moved in who was going to be running the homestay legally, they were perfectly compliant, and they would have been permitted to run that homestay. She said that they could have applied for an application for a homestay zoning clearance, become approved,

and then done that.

Mr. Herrick said that the special exception runs with the land, but the registry was owner-specific.

Mr. Gallaway asked if it would be within the authority of the Supervisors if they approved a special use permit to state that an applicant who had not been in compliance prior and as part of the special use permit they would not allow three strikes, they would allow one strike.

Mr. Herrick said that it would not be consistent with what the state law provided regarding the rental registry. He said the state law provided for three strikes, so if there were problems with the special exception or if there were problems with complying with the special exception, that would be up to Ms. Green and her team to enforce.

Mr. Andrews said that there had been some questions that Ms. Price had asked him, but he wanted her to be present to acknowledge. He said that his understanding was that Ms. Price was concerned about a list of noncompliance issues and the number of them, as well as when they were identified, and how the process went.

Ms. Brumfield said that the zoning violation had been logged on August 15, and that was when they contacted the applicant on that date. She said that they actually received the application in May, then checked on it in August as part of their review process because they had not heard from the applicant, and that was when they reached out and said their application was still pending. She explained that the applicant had apparently submitted the application without the County reaching out to them.

Mr. Andrews asked if the issues were identified after the application came in.

Ms. Green said that they had identified this property as part of their search as part of the homestay program and then reached out to the applicant who was advertising without proper zoning approval, which was not uncommon in their experience. She said that was when the process started of back-and-forth communication and an application came in, and they identified it as listing a whole house, something staff told them they could not do. She said that the result of this was the special exception for doing three bedrooms.

Mr. Andrews asked if they had identified non-compliance with the whole house issue, or just the non-registration issue, or both.

Ms. Green said that the issue was whether they were operating the homestay at all or advertising it, then they had been in violation because they did not have the necessary approvals and an approved application.

Mr. Andrews asked if the consequences of any violations to date were still yet to be determined.

Ms. Green said that compliance was typically the goal with many violations. She said that the County worked with property owners and for the most part it had been a responsive applicant. She said that it was just about getting applications in and permits. She said that at one point the applicant was unsure if they were going to have three rooms or not, and the applicant was waiting on her son to move to college so she could stay in the basement apartment while the rentals were happening. She said that she did think they had rentals at some point, and that was how they got the complaint and looked at the register or found them advertising without an application or a permit.

Ms. Price asked if anyone could determine the number of times there might have been noncompliance.

Ms. Green asked if Ms. Price was asking how many times the property had been rented out without an approved permit.

Ms. Price said yes.

Ms. Green said that she did not have that information.

Ms. Price said that she appreciated the focus of County staff on compliance rather than punishment, but she remained concerned about the lack of consequences for property owners who did not comply and were given a clean slate.

Mr. Andrews said that he wanted to ensure everyone knew that they were dealing with a request for three bedrooms rather than a by-right application for two bedrooms. He said that he understood the comment that it was not uncommon for an application to come in that was not in compliance because it was not yet in operation. He said that however, he saw this as slightly different because it was in operation but not in compliance. He said that as far as he knew, even with the rules for by-right, there were three being opened up for rent.

Mr. Gallaway asked if a denial of the special use permit would prevent them from reapplying for it in the future.

Mr. Herrick said that there would be a one-year waiting period for substantially the same proposal. He said that to supplement his response to Mr. Gallaway's earlier question, even though there

was not the ability to put a condition on allowing for an automatic revocation upon one strike, the Board did have had the ability after a public hearing to revoke a special exception. He said that there would need to be a public hearing and there would need to be a finding that there was a violation of the existing conditions. He said that the Board did have the power under the County Code to revoke special exceptions after a public hearing.

Mr. Gallaway asked if that would be the property.

Mr. Herrick said yes, that would be the property.

Ms. McKeel said that they had an existing ordinance in place allowing for the rental of two rooms, but she was not convinced that three rooms were necessary in this case.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she agreed with Ms. McKeel. She said that she thought that by right two bedrooms would be applicable in this situation. She said that it very much concerned her that they said that they would be living in the basement that had no kitchen. She said that if someone was renting it out for a week and they were living down there without a kitchen, it made it seem like they may or may not be there.

Ms. Mallek said that she did not support expanding the room numbers because by-right meant that they still had to follow all the regulations that existed. She said that she would support the SE (special exception) being denied and perhaps if they had a clean slate for a year operating, then they could come back when the time expired and try again. She said that however, it was up to them to exhibit the right kind of cooperation and following the rules.

Mr. Gallaway said that he had thought the specific question of whether or not having three bedrooms on this location would be okay and he was comfortable with that. He said that however, what gave him pause here was that this homestay ordinance had been in place long enough that people should know that this was part of it. He said that if there was a way to mitigate that, if there was a violation, they would lose the ability, but it sounded like to be able to get in compliance and prove oneself for the year on the current two bedrooms was the way to go. He said that then, if compliance was there, the special use permit may have a better shot down the road.

Ms. Mallek asked if this was a special exception and if they would need to obtain a special permit.

Mr. Gallaway said that it was a special exception on this.

Ms. Price said that she concurred with the comments of the other Supervisors.

Mr. Andrews said that he was unsure how they would proceed since he did not see support for this motion.

Mr. Andrews **moved** that the Board deny the special exception for the reasons as shown in the staff report.

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

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

Mr. Gallaway said that the comment about being far enough along with the homestay ordinance in place that folks understand that they had to get their act together, that noncompliance, the history of compliance prior to their application, if they were out there just running roughshod, was going to influence how folks vote. He said that it was important for him to say that because he was often in favor of a homestay special exception, but people just could not be going willy-nilly and expect that they were just going to give a blind eye to that.

Mr. Herrick said that the applicant could still apply for a zoning clearance for a two-bedroom homestay at this point. He said that even after the Board's vote today, the applicant still had the opportunity to come in and apply for a zoning clearance, but it would be for a two-bedroom homestay.

Mr. Andrews said that that was his understanding.

Ms. Mallek said that that was her understanding, with the registry and everything else.

Agenda Item No. 10. **Presentation:** Albemarle Micro-transit Program Update.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that Micro-transit is a relatively new transit mode being implemented across the country. The service is an on-demand, technology-enabled solution that offers real-time trip requests and dynamically routed vehicles. Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) received a demonstration grant from the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) regarding a CAT micro-transit implementation for two zones: US 29 North and Pantops. The zones were determined through a previous study: the Albemarle County Transit Expansion Study,

facilitated by the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC). Attachment A provides an excerpt from a presentation on the Transit Expansion Study, which describes the proposed service.

Following a competitive procurement process, the contract was awarded to VIA (River North Transit LCC) to operate the service.

The Director of CAT, Garland Williams, and representatives from VIA will present an update on the Albemarle County Micro-Transit Program, including information on how the service will operate, the proposed marketing plan for the service, and general timelines for implementation.

The Board of Supervisors previously committed funding to support this micro-transit demonstration grant. No additional funding from Albemarle County is requested currently.

Staff recommends the Board receive the update and provide feedback to the presentation team.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Deputy County Executive, said that the last time they were in front of the Board was in January, talking about the procurement process for this work. He said that the agenda included a presentation by the Charlottesville Area Transit (CAT) partner and turnkey operator for the microtransit partner, Via. He said that Mr. Williams would be introduced in a minute to talk a little bit about Via, then they would present.

Mr. Henry said that their goal today was to bring the Board up to speed on where they were in the implementation, how they would be marketing this, and then key dates and the road map for launch. He said that it was very exciting that they were on the cusp of bringing the service to the community. He said that Mr. Garland Williams, Director of CAT, had been a great partner to the County, that Abby Stumpf and Kevin McDermott had been very involved in this process from the original study through the procurement process, and then the Via team was there today, Jake Bortz and Alejandro Miranda, and would be doing part of the presentation.

Mr. Henry said that he wanted to remind the Board that the County funded a study several years ago in partnership with CAT and TJPDC (Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission) around microtransit. He said that they evaluated three areas, including the two that were moved forward, which were 29 North and Pantops. He said that in January 2021, they presented to the Board the results of the study and a recommendation for application to DRPT (Department of Rail and Public Transportation). He said that the application was approved for a pilot program of which they had nearly \$2 million, called a demonstration grant, and the County certainly had skin in the game and just under \$400 thousand as a local match. He said that all that work had been funded, with CAT as the program manager to run the program.

Mr. Henry said that presented to the Board earlier this year in January were the recommendations on how to move this project forward, which included a recommendation for a procurement for either a turnkey or a partial turnkey partner that would be wrapped up under and branded through CAT. He said that the Board approved it and they moved forward with a Request For Proposal (RFP) process that resulted in four qualified vendors, three of them nationally, that provided proposals and responses. He said that he had a team between the County and CAT that did multiple reviews, interviewed each of the applicants, and worked through a really diligent process to come with a strong recommendation.

Mr. Henry said that the work since the summer had been between CAT and Via to get the contract executed along with the Community Engagement folks and CAPE (Community and Public Engagement Office) and Mr. McDermott in Community Development in order to turn this into an executable plan.

Mr. Garland Williams, Director of CAT, stated that it was a pleasure to be before the Board to state that they were ready. He had been working diligently to get the microtransit project up and running. He said that the procurement process was quite extensive. He said that Mr. Henry mentioned that they went through a pretty long and detailed process, during which time four vendors were evaluated, three of them being national and one local.

Mr. Williams said that they had selected a turnkey that they believed had already added value and they were going to discuss this further. He said that he would steal a little bit of their thunder by revealing that there were two areas chosen for the project: the 29 North corridor and the Pantops corridor. He said that Via had come on board and analyzed the situation, concluding that with the available vehicles they would supply, they could make connections not only within the two areas but also between them. He said that it meant that someone in Pantops could travel to the 29 North corridor, and from there, he could go to Pantops. He said that it was a great improvement to this model, and that it would not cost them anything extra.

Mr. Jake Bortz, Via Partnership Lead, said that he and the team were very excited about the microtransit service launch in Albemarle County. He said that he would present a little bit more about it today and then answer any questions they might have about the presentation, what the service might look like, or the company operations. He said that as indicated on the slide, they were a global company, they had launched and continued to either operate themselves or provide software for agencies or communities themselves.

Mr. Bortz said that they had six services shown on the next slide, and these consisted of services they provided software for in cities or agencies operate the services themselves, and that included microtransit, so similar to what they were doing with CAT and Albemarle County. He said that they had a service starting with Greater Richmond Transit in Richmond, and of course hopefully in a little less than a month they would have CAT up here as well.

Mr. Bortz said that microtransit could be a bit of a buzzword, and a lot of different companies and agencies had seen its usage in various ways. He said that he would share some information about how Via saw it and specifically for the residents of Albemarle County. He said that he would explain how this program could be successful and increase mobility for all the residents living in and around these service corridors. The number one way that he had seen microtransit bringing value to Albemarle County was filling gaps where the fixed route network did not reach. He said that there was an extensive fixed route network, but there were still areas where folks lived far away from the closest bus station and could use a way to get to that bus station or to the train station to make those longer haul trips.

Mr. Bortz said that the next piece was to complement those fixed routes with first-last mile solutions, so in addition to providing transit to and from those bus stops, also provide full trips for people that were going to areas that were not well served by existing transit.

Mr. Bortz said that the third piece, and sometimes, this was not what they were doing with CAT, but oftentimes they had seen there were fixed routes that just did not have a lot of ridership, were not going to places where people used it, were not serving a need for the community, and sometimes he had seen micro-transit actually be a more efficient usage for public transit.

Mr. Bortz said that lastly, it would increase mobility for all folks in and around on the service zones that they covered. He said that oftentimes these were older adults who did not drive, folks with disabilities, people who were lower income and did not have a vehicle, or people who preferred not to use one, and so for all of these cases, building off the study that Mr. Henry mentioned, he felt that this was a very successful proposal for Charlottesville and people of Albemarle County, and would really improve mobility for all folks in the County.

Mr. Bortz said that he would show a little preview of what they would actually be getting with the turnkey solution. He said that a turnkey could mean a lot of different things to a lot of different people, but with the Via solution and what they were providing to CAT and the County, they would receive the microtransit software and all of the operational expertise and guidance. He said that on the slide, there was a mock-up on the left, and the rider apps were on the left, where it said MicroCat that would be the rider facing application, which they would go into a little bit later, and there also was a driver app for all drivers to see where they were picking folks up and be directed to the nearest pick-up and drop-off space.

Mr. Bortz said that there was also an administrative console where they would get all of their data and reporting capabilities to improve and analyze the service over time. He said that in addition to the software, their operational expertise, which came from operating over 50 services all across the world and over 40 in the U.S., came with the marketing team's expertise.

Mr. Bortz said that marketing was a big focus, and they knew there could be a challenge in starting a new service under the same brand of a transit agency. He said that he worked in concert with CAT and the County to develop a really strong marketing branding and PR (public relations) plan in order to bring this to light as soon as possible, make sure people know about the service, how to use it, and most importantly, what use cases it would serve.

Mr. Bortz said that in addition to that, they would bring in the drivers, the vehicles, and were actually completing driver registration for the service in the coming weeks. He said that they would then conduct driver onboarding to make sure that drivers understood the lay of the land in the County, knew their way around, and were fully qualified and ready to go on launch day. He said that they would also include a dispatch and customer service on behalf of riders in the County, so if anyone had any issues or complaints or concerns, they would always be on hand to answer those and deal with them in a timely manner.

Mr. Bortz said that they talked quite a bit about the actual service zones or corridors they were serving, the US 29 North zone and the Pantops zone, so he could definitely take any questions on these zones further on, but those were the two zones they were starting on. He said that in the study put together by the TJPDC in concert with Foursquare Planning Company, there was another zone called Monticello, which of course the Board was familiar with, and that was a potential area for expansion if the service was deemed successful. He had said there was demand from folks in that area as well.

Mr. Bortz said that before handing off to his colleague Mr. Alejandro Miranda to take them through the marketing plan and how exactly they were going to get the service up and running in just a little bit over a month from now, he wanted to show exactly what the rider experience would look like when booking a ride. He said that if it looked rather simple to them, that was certainly by design. He said they wanted to make the booking experience and tracking as easy and seamless as possible for all riders so it might look similar to an Uber or a Lyft app that they may have used previously. He said that that again had been by design, because he had known folks were familiar with that type of interface.

Mr. Bortz said that a user could either tap on the screen or put in their pick-up address or it could take their current location and automatically input that, select where they wanted to go. He said that assuming that it was in one zone or in the other zone, and a ride that they would want to serve, they

would receive a proposal. He said that they could accept the proposal, which of course would be fare free at the launch of the program, with flexibility later down the line to introduce a fare if and as needed. He said that it then gave them the vehicle, what the ETA was, and showed the vehicle coming toward them and exactly where to look for the vehicle, what color the vehicle was, the name of the driver, etc., just to make sure that they were in fact getting in the right car.

Mr. Alejandro Miranda, Via Launch Lead, said that he had been at Via for close to four years. He said that he had worked personally on around 40 deployments of Via's technology across the United States. He said that his involvement in this project was that he would be the project manager from now until the launch of the service. He said that they would then be transitioning over the service to an operating team who would be managing the service in perpetuity. He said that before they began on this next slide, he wanted to say that on behalf of himself and his team, they were very excited to put another dot on the map in Virginia. He said that he thought this was the start of a long relationship between Via, the County, and CAT.

Mr. Miranda said that he would begin by discussing how they were going to approach the marketing of the service in a little bit more detail. He said that they would adhere to four main marketing principles as they communicated the service to County residents. He said that the first one was going to be convenience. He said that the MicroCAT service would be a convenient service that made it easier to travel within the zones, but also, and most importantly, to connect to the existing public transit system in the County and in both the Pantops and the US 29 corridor.

Mr. Miranda said that it would be an accessible service that helped people get to and from work, shopping appointments, errands, and really gave them flexibility to use the service for whatever they needed within the zones. As mentioned earlier, it also allowed them to travel across both of the zones. He said that it would be an affordable service. He said that residents could enjoy zero fare service around these two service zones, at least for the beginning of the service, and they would remain a little bit flexible in terms of introducing fares in the future.

Mr. Miranda said that lastly, like Mr. Bortz showed in the last slide, it was a very easy-to-use app. He said that for residents who did not have a smartphone and cannot use the app, they could also call in. He said that every single functionality that they could perform in the app can also be performed with one of the support agents. He said that they were more than happy to help anybody create an account, book rides, and pretty much do whatever they could do in the app through a phone call.

Mr. Miranda showed a slide of the four main channels of marketing they wanted to work closely with both CAT and the County on. He said that the first was to launch a thorough and broad awareness campaign through paid social advertisements, mainly on Instagram, Facebook, and other social media platforms. He said that they would continuously drive optimization of engagement through a website they were going to create for the County, which was one of the main four pillars of how to put the word out there.

Mr. Miranda said that the second, and perhaps the most important one, was that they were going to work really closely with community centers and local community organizers to really get the word out for the communities that needed the service the most. He said that they were more than happy to work with Community Action Committees that the County oversees and try to get to senior centers, the hospital, and other locations where they thought the service would benefit residents the most.

Mr. Miranda said that they had also planned to utilize the existing methods of communication that the County and CAT possessed, including email newsletters, print locations where posters could be placed in the mall, for example, which was a significant transit location on the US 29 corridor, and other places with an existing website and set of communications that they could take advantage of to promote this new service.

Mr. Miranda said that finally, they would start doing some outreach to local press in order to ensure coverage both in print and digitally during the launch and after it.

Mr. Miranda said the next slide was all about the launch process from now until October 30, which was their planned launch date. He said that on the left side of the slide, there were different work streams that the team was working on, and at the top were four distinct stages of the launch process. He said that the purpose of the slide was not only to give visibility but also to provide a quick update for the Board and let them know where Via stood on the project itself.

Mr. Miranda said that they had finished the kickoff stage where they aligned with both CAT and the County on the service design and tech setup. He said that they were already working on the technological environment that was going to power the app that they saw. He said that they were aligned on the brand which he was going to show on the last slide and the next slide of his presentation. He said that from an operating standpoint, they had sourced Toyota hybrid Sienna's, both wheelchair accessible and non-wheelchair accessible, that were going to be used in their service. He said that they also started in the process of finalizing driver acquisition.

Mr. Miranda said that the next stage was implementation, which would be when they actually created the rider app and the backend technology to support the program and finalize all of that. He said that they were going to work on not only building the brand, which was finalized, but also starting to work on the execution of their marketing strategy as discussed. He said that finally, they were going to finalize the driver acquisition process and procure and in-fleet the vehicles.

Mr. Miranda said that the third stage, which was going to finish on October 20, was perhaps the most important stage, the testing phase. He said that that was when they made sure that they were doing quality assurance and that the launch that they were about to put out to the community was in perfect shape before it went live. He said that on all three verticals, they were going to do a lot of testing specifically on the technology but also make sure that the operations were buttoned up before they go live.

Mr. Miranda said that the last phase, which one could think about as the first stage, was the launch of the service on October 30. He said that this was when the service would truly begin. He said that not only were they going to ensure that the service was at 100% when it launched, but they were also planning to work closely with both the County and CAT to analyze data, make improvements, and be as flexible as possible in adjusting to any changes or needs of the community. He said that they wanted to launch a successful service while remaining open to making necessary adjustments along the way.

Mr. Miranda said that the last slide showed the brand that the team, the County's team, and also the CAT's team had been working really hard on. He said that on the top left, they could see the service logo and the service name, which was going to be MicroCAT. He said that on the slide was an illustrative image of the Toyota vehicle with a vehicle wrap, and the app was on both on the right and also behind the vehicle.

Mr. Miranda said that they could see the look and feel of the application. He said that finally, behind the car was going to be an example of one of the posters and one of the marketing collateral that he had created for the County that they would also help distribute.

Ms. McKeel said that she was very supportive of this project. She said that there was a school in the community named Via, so it was possible that there may be some confusion over the name. She asked if the interface was going to be an app, but there was also the opportunity for people to call in, and that phone call would be answered by someone here and not in Shanghai or Bangladesh.

Mr. Bortz said that there would always be a call center open and ready for any rider to call in. He said that the call center folks were employees of Via and were fully trained in the MicroCAT service, so they knew the service zone, the locations people would be asking about, and they were also sensitivity trained to communicate with elderly individuals, folks with disabilities, and relay trained for folks who were hard of hearing. He said that it was a U.S.-based call center, not in Charlottesville, but they had a few locations around the U.S., and they would be based stateside, not internationally.

Ms. McKeel said that she had been hoping they would say that they would be based with Mr. Williams over at CAT somehow or another, but they would not. She had asked if the drivers were hired locally or were they bringing drivers in from the outside.

Mr. Miranda said that they had been hiring locally. He said that he was not certain whether they had noticed the advertisements that they had been running for the past month.

Ms. McKeel asked if there had been success with finding drivers. She said that Mr. Williams indicated that that was correct.

Mr. Miranda said that he wanted to take advantage of the opportunity to say that they were also more than happy to send a quick description of the role to anybody here who might want to share it around. He said that he thought that they got a lot of success from internal job boards that could be shared around and could trigger more drivers to apply.

Ms. McKeel asked if a resident could call and request a trip to the Stonefield Mall or a specific store, or they could request a connection to one of the CAT stops or the transfer station, so it was all an option.

Mr. Williams said that all of those options were available. He said that the transfer station downtown was technically not an option because it was outside of the zone. He said that what it would do was direct the user to the nearest bus stop in order to make a connection to downtown. He said that that part of the app, however, they were working through. He said that they did not want to slow anything down as they approached the launch. He said that in the original version, when they launched this service, they saw all of the MicroCAT positions and the CAT, however, they would not be able to do the CAT connection, but they were working on that issue and hoped to have that up in 60 days.

Ms. McKeel said that for clarity, if someone lived on Pantops, they could request a trip to 29 North somewhere. She said that that had been an addition that she had not expected, and it had been really good.

Mr. Williams said that was correct. He said that at the start, they were discussing point-to-point connections when the service was being considered, making one walk to the nearest corner. He said that the turnkey professional had stated that they believed it would be safer and better for all of the riders if they opted for a curb-to-curb model, which was an enhancement they provided for us. He said that in this case, they found it easy as there were not enough curbs or sidewalks available, so it was safer to pick them up from the curb or residence.

Ms. McKeel said that by "curb-to-curb" service, it meant picking up passengers right at their

doorstep even if there was not an actual curb. She said that she had a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting and wanted to know if someone could come and explain the process for the CACs so they could spread the word about what was happening.

Mr. Miranda said that he was more than happy to attend virtual meetings. He said that they were not based locally, but he was generally on the ground here for a few weeks before leading up to launch and also during launch. He said that if they could schedule those meetings then, that would be great. He said that in addition to that, he also had copies of materials and information pamphlets that he could send over that he could distribute to both committees and also just individuals who were part of them.

Ms. McKeel said that there had been joint CAC meetings in the past, and she thought it would be a good idea to consider how that might work.

Mr. Williams said that in the event that they were not available, he would be there.

Ms. McKeel stated that it would have been beneficial if Mr. Williams had been there since she was familiar with it inside and out. She asked what was the relationship between this interface and JAUNT. She said that JAUNT was recognized in the community for providing ADA services as well as commuter services, like to Buckingham.

Mr. Williams said that JAUNT had a consultant right now, and they were looking at some of their service model. He said that JAUNT had reached out to them about potentially partnering in the future with being able to display in the app all of the locations of JAUNT's vehicles and their vehicles. He said that they did not want to slow this process down, but as they worked through this, there was a possibility probably at the six-month mark.

Mr. Williams said that they wanted to ensure that the citizens and residents of Albemarle in these zones were aware of the MicroCAT product first and foremost. He said that once they had worked out any kinks and were operating at a high efficiency, it was probably the most appropriate time to start having a conversation about opening platforms where it was more universal.

Mr. Williams said that they had not wanted someone to open the app based on rushing through this and it had looked like they had 80 MicroCAT vehicles out there. He said that was not what this was. He said that he wanted to make sure that individuals understood what they were trying to get accomplished in connecting the two zones first and foremost. He said that they would have some real numbers on how people were using the service, and they hoped to make any tweaks they needed before they talked about bringing any other provider onto the platforms.

Ms. McKeel said that what she wanted people to understand was that they could use the app and call MicroCAT to go places, however, if they had been using JAUNT, that was not going away.

Mr. Williams confirmed that it would not go away. He said that the MicroCAT project was specifically for those two zones. He said that if someone was using JAUNT for their ADA purposes, they would still follow the same process and call JAUNT for ADA rides.

Ms. McKeel said that it had been helpful, and she knew that Ms. Price would be disappointed because she had wanted the name to be Kitten.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that KittyCAT would have been really cute, but it did not win either. She said that Ms. McKeel had asked a number of questions, so she did not have to repeat those. She said that she wanted to know if the app service would be available in Spanish because there were many Spanish-speaking residents in both Pantops and the Route 29 North area.

Mr. Miranda said yes.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked to see page 9 of the document. She said that there were two shades of green shown on the left side, a darker green and a lighter green. She asked if those colors were both within the MicroCAT zone.

Mr. Bortz said that he understood how that could be confusing. He said that there was an internal service planning and design tool that they used to kind of help draw the zones, and that was the system's version of telling them that Hollymead was its own area, but it was just kind of a back shading in that entire zone. He said that the full outline on the outside was the full zone, and Hollymead was within that green outline. He said that the top piece at the Piney Mountain was included.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that if someone lived in Pantops and wanted to visit a friend in Hollymead, the service would provide transportation door to door.

Mr. Williams said yes, and that the addition of the new feature was great as it eliminated the need for passengers to go through the hassle of getting onto MicroCAT, transferring to a local bus, and then entering another zone.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she could not tell if Fashion Square or another shopping area was inside or outside the green area. She asked if it was not within the green area, but if they went from Pantops on the way to 29 North, for example, would they drop them off. She asked if Stonefield was not in the green area, would they drop them off at Stonefield or not. She asked if they could only be dropped

off in the green area.

Mr. Williams said that they had been really focusing on the zones that were outlined, but they had already made a couple of exceptions. He said that the Fashion Square Mall was technically not in the zone, but they were going to use it as a connection point because it also connected to CAT fixed route services. He said that it was already kind of enhanced and modified a little bit to take advantage of that. He said that they would not be making tremendous modifications, but they had already tweaked around the edges a little bit.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if Stonefield was not included.

Mr. Williams said that Stonefield was in the zone.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she had been extremely excited to bring her two CACs, which were 29 North and Pantops together, and maybe anyone else who touches. She said that would be great to have one big CAC meeting just to cover this. She said that she would offer to host it in Pantops if anyone wanted to join them. She said that maybe they could get together on that, and that would be very nice. She said that she was really excited about this because there were a lot of residents who were going to be very excited, and she thought this would be very successful.

Ms. Mallek said that there was an all-CAC meeting in this building on October 17, a Tuesday. She said that there may be a portion of the evening when people could do that, but it would depend on Ms. Kilroy and all those other folks. She said that someone made a comment about how they were building the software. She asked if that did not mean that they were using established software that was already in use in the other 50 sites. She said that she did not want to be the beta.

Mr. Miranda said that they were not building the software; instead, they were customizing the existing software to meet their mapping requirements, including the routing of the City itself and various locations. He said that it was still the same software used everywhere else.

Ms. Mallek said that she wanted to know if there were any details about the security protocol for the Human Resources Department's hiring of drivers. She said that a main worry for people was about whose vehicle they were getting into.

Mr. Miranda said that drivers would have to go through a couple of checks before they could start driving for their service. He said that the first check was both a criminal and driver history background check that met the TNC (Transportation Network Companies) requirements from the state of Virginia as well as some more strict requirements that they had internally for all their drivers. He said that in addition, they were also going to run FDA-compliant drug testing on all drivers before they started driving for the service but also in case of an accident. He said that after that, they would provide very thorough trainings on how the software worked and sensibility trainings around non-discrimination and accessibility.

Ms. Mallek said that she was a little uncertain about the map. She asked if on the east of Route 29 in the left-hand picture, if that included going up as far as Boulders Road, or was Boulders Road in the brown. She said that where it said Piney Mountain there, it looked as if they were going up to the North Fork Research Park, but it was unclear.

Mr. Williams said that Mr. Henry indicated yes.

Ms. Mallek said that it would go up to Boulders Road. She said that was spectacular.

Mr. Gallaway asked how many vehicles would be in operation.

Mr. Miranda replied that there would be six vehicles.

Mr. Gallaway asked if all of them were wheelchair compliant.

Mr. Miranda said that there had been both wheelchair and non-wheelchair compliant vehicles. He said that they were going to have two to three wheelchair compliant vehicles, and the rest of them would be non-wheelchair compliant. He said that the app was designed to filter out the non-wheelchair compliant vehicles for passengers who required a wheelchair so that they would not run into a situation where someone needed a wheelchair but then a vehicle that was non-wheelchair compliant would pick them up.

Mr. Gallaway said that during the pilot time period when there were riders participating, he wanted to know how they got feedback from the live participants while they were participating.

Mr. Miranda said that there were two main sources of feedback. He said the first one was very quantitative. He said that after everybody finished a trip on the app, they submitted stars, one to five, plus commentary that could be written. He said they also had prompts that were created. He said that if somebody put a negative review, they could indicate with one of the prompts that they had pre-created why the review was negative. He said that was aggregated and presented to both the County and the City on a monthly basis in the reporting. He said that it was also accessible at a faster cadence, but he could review that later.

Mr. Miranda said that in addition to that, they also ran surveys for more qualitative research into

where else in the City they would like to see the service operate, what they liked the least about the service, and what they liked the most about the service. He said that questions like that were distributed to the residents and users of the app on a quarterly basis.

Mr. Miranda said that apart from that, they also relied on asking questions to the customer support line. He said they identified the main reasons why people were calling, if there were any common topics, and if there were questions for CAT and the County that they want to address. He said that those were the main points of feedback that they received.

Mr. Gallaway said that regarding reporting, they must have collected and gathered trip data so that they could have started to see movement patterns.

Mr. Miranda stated that it was one of the most significant advantages that all of the information would be available to both Albemarle County and the City.

Mr. Gallaway said that he had been thrilled to hear about the curb-to-curb service. He said that it made this even easier for people to work, especially considering areas such as Woodbrook to Kroger, which he had brought up before. He said his CAC had been pestering him about when the start date would be, so he thought they would be happy to participate in the presentation. He said they wanted to know when it was go time, so he was glad that they were approaching the time.

Mr. Andrews said that he noticed that with six cars, there had previously been an allocation of four cars to the Rio 29 area, 29 North, and to Pantops. He said that he was not sure how that was going to affect timing for trips and the difficulty of keeping the routes open and how much time it takes to get between the two. He said that he wondered if that affected the numbers. He asked how much they had looked into that. He said that he understood it was to be seen when it was launched how it actually worked out.

Mr. Miranda said that he thought the plans had been different in the sense that there was going to be one vehicle at all times dedicated to each of the zones. He explained that they had kept one vehicle there, but then the rest of the vehicles, because they did not have enough data in terms of what demand patterns were going to look like on each of the zones, had been untagged or unregistered to one of the zones. He said that they could just free flow based on demand and requests from riders.

Mr. Miranda said that they were then going to use that data to inform how many vehicles they needed on one of the zones at each time of day, how that changed per day of the week and hour of the day and then make adjustments as needed. He said that the plan for now was that they were going to have at least one in each of the zones that was going to be permanently there for all the hours of the service. He said that more vehicles online that could travel across both of the zones to serve those areas.

Mr. Gallaway said that when discussing hitting the stars for the rider, he would hope that the drivers would be encouraging them to do so before they left at the destination. He said they should just say, this was a pilot program, their feedback was very important, could they go ahead and complete that in the last minute of their trip so that they could get an idea for it. He said that it was going to be incredibly helpful to them down the road to hear from actual riders. He said that anything they could do to enhance participation was good.

Ms. Mallek asked if there were opportunities in any of their other communities to collaborate with industries or employers to assist individuals who finished their shifts after the buses stopped running for the night.

Mr. Miranda said that they did a lot of that. He said that they had identified a few employer destinations that were going to be high ridership locations here. He said that at launch, they normally just launched the service and learned from the data. He said that soon after, they were going to start analyzing all of the requests coming in from certain employment centers. He said they encouraged CAT and clients around the country to reach out to these locations and share data with them, like the amount of people from their office using the service. He said that in some cases, they had even received funding from big employment centers to fund the services because it was a great kind of employment shuttle to work every day.

Ms. Mallek said that it was also a good employment retention tool.

Ms. McKeel stated that what they had not mentioned were the instances when it was functioning. She said that it appeared in her report since she observed it, but perhaps that ought to be emphasized for the general public.

Mr. Miranda said that it operated from Monday to Saturday, 6.30 a.m. through 9 p.m.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she wanted to ask Mr. Williams if it was possible to get a better map. She said that Pantops was a large area, but she could not see the delineation of streets, and the same thing with the 29 North area. She said that having a better map would be helpful.

Mr. Henry said that there had been a great deal of opportunity for engagement with Northrop Grumman, Rivanna Station, the Airport, North Fork, Sentara, and the senior centers. He said this would be a wildly successful program and he could not wait until October for the launch. He said that in working on the RFP through CAT, he believed it was important to have some level of energy-efficient vehicles. He

said that Via offered to use the Toyota Sienna hybrid as a step toward climate action planning. He said this was another indication of the partnerships they were developing here.

Ms. McKeel said that she would just suggest to Mr. Henry and Mr. Williams that this would make a great agenda item for the Regional Transit Partnership (RTP). She said that they might be interested in hearing about this.

Ms. Mallek said that the other thing that had popped into her brain was having conferences. She said that people came to Darden or SEI (Senior Executive Institute) to be able to have them have that flexibility and know about the pilot and program. She said that for people who were out of town, they really benefited from someone who knew their way around, and they did not have to spend a lot of time trying to figure out how to get somewhere.

Non-Agenda Item. **Recess.** The Board recessed its meeting at 2:53 p.m. and reconvened at 3:15 p.m.

Agenda Item No.11. **Work Session:** Legislative Priorities and Legislative Positions and Policy Statements.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that each year, the Board considers and approves a set of legislative priorities to pursue in the upcoming General Assembly session. The Board then meets with the County's local delegation from the General Assembly to discuss these priorities and submits them to the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC), the Virginia Association of Counties (VACo), and the Virginia Municipal League (VML).

During its work session on June 21, 2023, the Board of Supervisors reviewed its prior year's legislative priorities and discussed its 2024 legislative priorities. On September 20, 2022, the Board will have a second opportunity to consider its priorities.

During its work session, the Board of Supervisors will review proposed legislative priorities (Attachment A), as well as proposed legislative positions and policy statements (Attachment B). The attached documents have been highlighted to reflect proposed revisions, in comparison to the Board's 2023 initiatives, including:

- the deletion of minimum safety standards for agricultural buildings, which was addressed in legislation enacted by the General Assembly during its 2022 and 2023 sessions;
- the deletion of change to eligibility requirements for the Virginia Business Ready Sites Program, a legislative initiative no longer supported by the Office of Economic Development; and
- the insertion of the County's Rivanna Futures project.

Board members may also wish to focus their discussion on emerging opportunities to support policies and positions of other localities in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

David Blount, Deputy Director of TJPDC, will also participate in the presentation to the Board.

Final action on the Board's Legislative Priorities and Legislative Positions and Policy Statements is scheduled for the Board's meeting on October 18, 2023.

There are no specific, identifiable budget impacts.

Staff recommends that the Board review potential legislative priorities and legislative positions and policy statements, identify those that have Board support, and direct staff to finalize the 2024 legislative priorities and positions and policy statements for Board consideration on October 18, 2023.

Ms. Emily Kilroy, Assistant to the County Executive, presented the information for the work session on the 2024 legislative priorities and legislative positions and policy statements. She said that there were a lot of folks in the room who would provide support. She said that the work session was the second of three for the Board's 2024 Legislative Priorities and Policy Statements. She thanked David Blount with the TJPDC (Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission), Steve Rosenberg, County Attorney, James Douglas, Paralegal, and Andy Herrick, Deputy County Attorney, in the County Attorney's Office, as well as that whole team for their work to prepare for the work session.

Ms. Kilroy said that Andy Herrick and David Blount were there to support the Q&A and discussion and that she would present the slides. She said the work session was structured as two sections, so there would be a pause between topics. She said the first topic was Attachment A. She said that Attachment A was a marked up legislative priorities, and Attachment B was a marked up positions and policy statements. She said that both of these had been updated as a starting place for the discussion, but by no means did they represent an end point. She said that they could make plenty of changes between now and when they hope to have the adoption of the package in October.

Ms. Kilroy said that staff requested direction from the Board on both documents, then the County Attorney's Office would begin their work to prepare for the October 18 Board meeting. She said that

before they dug into the work sessions, she wanted to establish some common language. She said that in previous years, the Board had used both of the tools that they were talking about, the priorities and the positions and policy statements, a little bit differently.

Ms. Kilroy said that the priorities document, Attachment A, was a document focused on specific needs requested to be met through legislative action by the General Assembly or the Governor. She said that it was used by the Board to communicate with the local delegation about local priorities for legislation and or delegated authority. She said that these were what the Board communicated with the local delegation as the highest priorities for consideration by the state-level elected officials. She said that in Virginia, as they knew, the Dillon Rule meant that localities only had the authority that had been expressly delegated by the state. She said that the hope was that the local delegation would pick up the legislative priorities and introduce legislation for consideration by the General Assembly, or request line funding from the state budget to support those priorities.

Ms. Kilroy said that in Attachment B, they had the legislative positions and policy statements. She said that there was another tool. She said that these were broad statements regarding direction or support for policy areas which could be addressed through legislation or other means including studies undertaken by the Commonwealth or funding. She said that these were areas where the Board had interest but did not necessarily have an articulated policy position in mind. She said that they were used a lot during the legislative session, and staff used it to respond to inquiries from the local delegation to inform their decision making. She said that for example, a legislator would call and ask for Albemarle County's position on a bill under consideration in three hours.

Ms. Kilroy said that they would do their best to look at policy statements that the Board had adopted, whether that be this actual document, the Comprehensive Plan, or other positions that the Board had taken to try to be as supportive as they could be. She said that it was not always with a straight position of support or nonsupport but also articulating some of the positive and negative aspects of what was being considered from the perspective of the Board of Supervisors. She said that this was something they used to determine if the Board had time to fully consider this, how did it match up to their position as articulated in Attachment B.

Ms. Kilroy said that they would first focus on the legislative priorities. She said that last time they discussed this subject, staff shared recommendations for how to approach the 2024 session. She said that they discerned during their discussion in June that there were some different thoughts on the best way to proceed this year. She said the Chair initiated a poll to understand the Supervisors' level of interest in the 2023 priorities that staff brought forward last year, and they used that to form three approaches that they were bringing forward for the Board's discussion at this meeting. She said that the hope was to land the approach for 2024, and then they can work out the specifics in time for their meeting on October 18.

Ms. Kilroy said that they shared some of this at the last meeting on this topic in June. She said that there were seven legislative priorities the Board moved forward in 2023. She said that all of them were introduced, which was unusual for Albemarle County to have 100% being introduced as bills. She said five did not proceed out of committee, and those were the first five shown on the screen. She said the change in eligibility requirements for the Virginia business-ready sites program actually passed both the House of Delegates and the Senate, but it was ultimately vetoed by the governor. She said that the final one on that list, require minimum safety standards in agricultural buildings used by the public, proceeded with partial language from what the Board was seeking. She said that it was signed by the governor.

Ms. Kilroy said that one approach for 2024 would be to update the language in the 2023 priorities for the current slate, and then making a few adjustments to the seven from last year. She suggested removing the Virginia business-ready sites program item because the County's interest in seeing the minimum acreage reduced was driven by site availability in Albemarle County. She said that the Board's action to accept a contract for the land adjacent to Rivanna Station really changed the County's position with respect to land available for site readiness projects. She said another change suggested was to remove further pursuit of the agricultural building items because it had been partly successful, not fully successful, and it had only just become effective in July. She said there had not been a lot of time for understanding what the impact would be.

Ms. Kilroy said they were calling this the updated carryforward, where they would bring forward the five that did not have any movement in 2023 and adding a sixth, which was state support for Rivanna Futures. She said that this would replace the Virginia business-ready sites item. She said that this was the approach that the County typically pursued with the General Assembly, and it was certainly something that they could do. She said that staff was seeking the Board's consensus on whether to pursue this approach. She said that on the handout, the legislative priorities were numbered based on the polling feedback that Chair Price undertook.

Ms. Kilroy said that the next approach was the focused legislative priorities. She said that this would involve paring back the volume of priorities in favor of building relationships with their new delegation and to focus on state partnerships to deliver the vision for Rivanna Futures. She said that if they pursued this, staff had spent some time flushing out what that might look like, and she would discuss those.

Ms. Kilroy said that she would not touch on the positions and policy statements because that would be the subject of their next discussion.

Ms. Kilroy said that they would want to pursue state support for Rivanna Futures, and that it was a substantial project for staff. She said they had met with potential state, federal, and academic partners to turn the vision into reality to establish an intelligence and national security innovation hub adjacent to Rivanna Station. She said that they wanted to talk about opportunities to partner with neighboring jurisdictions in areas that would have a mutual benefit or lend support to a priority that would be meaningful to a neighboring jurisdiction.

Ms. Kilroy said that the highest-ranking item in the polling exercise was the taxing authority for school capital projects, otherwise known as the one-cent for schools tax. She said it would enable enacting an additional sales tax penny dedicated to school capital construction. She said that this appeared to be a priority of the Board. She said that it was a priority of the City of Charlottesville, and that it also had a lot of support from localities across the Commonwealth.

Ms. Kilroy said the Board could also consider as one of the regional priorities extending line of duty benefits to private police departments. She said this was a priority for Nelson County because officer Chris Wagner was killed in the line of duty responding to a call for service in June. She said that after his death, the family learned that officers of private police departments were not covered by line of duty benefits. She explained that Officer Wagner was a police officer with the private Wintergreen Police Department.

Ms. Kilroy said that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors was seeking support for State authority to allow private police departments to offer line of duty benefits. She said that those benefits were paid by the private police department into a program much like an insurance type program. She said that the cost would not be borne by the locality, and while Albemarle County did not have a private police department, this was an opportunity to lend support to Nelson.

Ms. Kilroy said that the other area that they spoke about in June was topical opportunities. She said that other jurisdictions in the Commonwealth had priorities that aligned with Albemarle.

Ms. Kilroy said that looking at the priorities of the Board's Strategic Plan, one was to support a recent study by the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) on the community service boards. She said that this was a comprehensive report which identified several action areas, and one was funding. She said that the funding was at least partially addressed by the state budget adopted earlier in the month. She said that the others were training, performance measures, standard operating procedures, and additional funding. She said that the Board could express support for full implementation of the CSB study.

Ms. Kilroy said that another area was a forthcoming report from the Virginia Department of Fire Programs, expected to be published on October 1. She said that it was anticipated to identify a growing need for state support for fire and EMS (Emergency Management Services) staffing in the wake of growing needs, and in many areas of the Commonwealth, a shrinking pool of volunteers that could provide 24/7 service. She said there were a lot of fire and EMS departments responding across jurisdictional lines, so the report was expected to reveal some opportunities for state support in that area. She said that it was anticipated that there would be widespread support for that, and that staff believed that Albemarle County would be able to appreciate benefits if such a program were successful.

Ms. Kilroy said that this second approach altogether would be supplemented by focused connections with their local delegation as they are elected in November.

Ms. Kilroy said the third approach was a blend of the first two. She said that the idea was to focus primarily on the top two priorities, Rivanna Futures support and the one-cent for schools sales tax taxing authority. She said it then shifted priorities three through six from legislative priorities to the positions and policy statements document.

Ms. McKeel said that three combined some of the items that she would be interested in. She said the Community Service Board, which was Region 10 for the County, and it was critical. She said that the amount of money in the budget compared to what the JLARC study recommended was minuscule. She said the JLARC study came out in December, so it was time to act on that right now. She said that it could make a big difference for Region 10 and mental health issues. She said that the fire and the EMS study had not yet been completed.

Ms. Kilroy said that it was being circulating internally within the state, and they were planning to publish it for the public on October 1.

Ms. McKeel said that she was happy to consider that option but wondered if it might be more beneficial to review the study next year after it had been completed and its findings were known.

Ms. Kilroy said that they could definitely do that. She said that they wanted to bring it forward because it would be published between this work session and when the Board finalized it on October 18. She said staff wanted to know if there was interest by the Board in considering that once all the details were available.

Ms. McKeel said that she was not against it completely, but she said they would know what they were supporting after the study was out. She said that the line of duty benefits for private police departments, she did not know what exactly it referred to. She said she saw the benefit, and she thought

supporting Nelson would be a good idea. She said that she liked the Rivanna Futures. She said the taxing authority was great to have. She said she was leaning toward approach three.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she agreed with Ms. McKeel. She said she did not know what some of those were either. She said that for the fire and EMS study, it may be more beneficial to wait a year. She said she could go either way, now or later. She noted that volunteerism was declining, and they needed assistance. She asked if all-virtual meetings were for Supervisors or CAC members. She noted that when virtual meetings stopped, she did not like it, but now that she was back, she loved it. She said that as long as there was the option of being able to do Zoom.

Mr. Andy Herrick, Deputy County Attorney, said that under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, all public bodies in the state could meet virtually except for five local bodies that had been specifically named, one of which was the Board of Supervisors. He said that under state law, CACs could already meet all virtually. He said that it was just that the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, School Board, Architectural Review Board and Board of Equalization could not meet all virtually. He said that what the County suggested doing last year was to make it such that all public bodies, including those five local bodies, could meet all virtually. He said that was one of the legislative priorities last year. He said that was what they were floating as an idea for the Board's consideration again this year.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley clarified that right now, everyone could meet virtually except for those five entities that were mentioned.

Mr. Herrick said that under FOIA, yes.

Ms. Kilroy said that the all-virtual meetings for those other bodies were limited in number per year, and there could not be two in a row.

Mr. Herrick said that it was correct. He noted that what was a little unusual was the fact that state law specifically named those five local bodies and stated that no all-virtual meetings could be held by them. He said that anybody else could hold such meetings as long as they followed the state's rules. He said those five specific local bodies were excluded from even the ability of having an all-virtual meeting.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that there would come a time when having all-virtual meetings might be necessary, particularly during weather-related or emergency situations, especially because there is a cap on the number and frequency. She said that she agreed with approach three.

Ms. Mallek said that she was in favor of approach three because she was not willing to let go of anything. She said that regarding number one, Rivanna Station, the taxing authority was fine. She said she would have proposed that they bring up the photo-speed monitoring as a higher priority because there were many jurisdictions already doing this without benefit of state law. She noted they were all using the Wytheville Common Contract. She said she did not know why they felt they had to get more. She said that they needed to keep that on the front burner because of the impact it would have on public safety. She said it would bring changes in driver behavior that they were not achieving. She said she would propose that number three be put back onto the original list. She recommended that they keep going and not postpone the EMS study because of the momentum gained by the release of information. She said that there had been two years of work, and lots of counties interacted. She noted that County staff had already sent in lots of information to VACo.

Ms. McKeel asked if Ms. Mallek could provide more information on the use of photo-speed monitoring in localities.

Ms. Mallek said that Blue Line had contracts all over Virginia, and there were several other companies that did as well. She said that in the VML (Virginia Municipal League) magazine, they were advertising in there as well. She said she did not have any idea how they were different, and there must have been some technicality of why they did not qualify. She said that was why she wanted to make sure that they kept that particular agenda item on their list.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she agreed with that and wondered if cities were allowed to do so.

Mr. David Blount, TJPDC, said the current authorization for speed cameras, which was enacted in 2020, was currently limited to school zones and construction zones.

Ms. Mallek said that it was even more important to keep it on the list so they could get their dangerous roads incorporated into the authority.

Ms. Kilroy said that the legislative priority had been focused around enabling authority for secondary roadways. She said that there were certain instances where the state code did allow photo-speed monitoring, but the legislative priority in the past had been around further increasing what type of roadways and areas of the County would be able to use those.

Ms. Mallek said that Hydraulic was a secondary road, so there were parts that would not be covered in the school zone.

Mr. Gallaway said that he did not disagree with removing the site readiness item from the packet. He said that it would not necessarily change their position, since once Rivanna Futures was full speed ahead, the rest of their sites were still in the state they had been in. He said that it would still be pertinent

to them when that site was built out because they will still have to go back to the preexisting issue. He said that they should still be helpful to the counties and lend support in any way they can to continue pressing on that matter. He said that he was not sure if it made practical sense, and he was unsure about the veto process and what happened. He suggested that they could table it instead.

Ms. Mallek said that there were certain industries that would not be a good fit for Rivanna Station, which was why she wanted to ensure that their efforts to attract those businesses continued. She said that the administration was very much in favor of mega sites, 500-acre to 1,000-acre sites, and it did not want any dilution of the funding to go to smaller ones.

Mr. Gallaway said that he had been fine with approach three. He said that if they wanted to take the all-virtual one off, he had been the one who had really pushed for that. He said that the realist in him knew that somebody would continue to press this, and if they lend their support to those that are, it may free up bandwidth.

Mr. Gallaway said that at the Rio 29 CAC (Community Advisory Committee) meeting on August 24, there had been a long-range transportation plan presentation. He said that as part of that, they had been getting feedback. He said the reaction from the folks around the table had been fascinating to him about VDOT funding. He said that they were looking at a systemic approach, and he believed that they should be looking at funding in a bigger way than just car travel.

Mr. Gallaway said that hearing citizen feedback come through the County on an item like that did not rise to a priority level, but it may change the way that they wrote it, not just the same writing that they have seen in every single packet that they have ever read in every locality that they went to. He said that on one hand, the County had to play by the rules to get the money, but that they should be able to be critical of how they were going about it. He said that they had picked up on the staffing issue, about how SMART SCALE raised the money for the funding, but did not raise the staff to deal with the workload. He said that even though the Supervisors had been handling all the local transportation planning and submitting applications, the bigger policy picture was in the state. He said that this could be an opportunity in writing to emphasize that call it out.

Ms. Price said that she supported option three. She wanted them to continue working toward the Virginia business-ready sites at the smaller level, but it was clear that the current governor was opposed to that. She said they should keep it on the back burner until there was a change in administration, then they could pursue that again.

Ms. Price said she remained opposed to elected bodies engaging in all-virtual meetings. She said that her law practice, which was a very niche market, had moved almost exclusively to all-virtual meetings, and they were simply not as effective as when they had the opportunity to appear in person. She said that as elected officials, they had an obligation to be present in front of their constituency. She said that for the line of duty benefits for private police forces, she was supportive of that provided that eligibility, employment, training, supervision, and accountability were at a level comparable to governmental police forces.

Mr. Andrews said that he agreed with approach three. He said that if the fire EMS study was coming October 1, then they needed to see it, but that gave them time to respond and bring this forward. He said there was a serious need for the staffing issues that they faced in the County. He said they could postpone the business-ready sites. He said there was competition for funding, and now they were in a situation where they could benefit from the larger program funding.

Mr. Andrews said that working with others was a continuing theme identified here. He said he did not want to have them proposing things where they knew it was a nonstarter with the governor and the majority of the legislature. He said their new delegation would want to hear from them. He said that building relationships based on these items and looking for coordination with other jurisdictions made him more receptive to the line of duty benefits, VACo, and JLARC. He noted that with respect to their legislative priorities, photo speed, and others, if there was an interest from others that they could work with, he wanted to make sure they tried to get that forward if there was a chance.

Ms. Kilroy summarized that it seemed that approach three had strong support from the Board of Supervisors with a couple of small tweaks. She said the VBRSP (Virginia Business Ready Sites Program) eligibility change may not seem realistic at the time, but it could be and very well may be a priority of the Board ongoing. She said they could come back on October 18 with that item included as a position and policy statement. She said the other item staff wanted clarity on was the photo-speed monitoring. She said there had been some support for elevating it to a priority while others had supported keeping it as a position and policy statement.

Mr. Gallaway said that if they removed all-virtual meetings from the list, then items three through six would become three items. He said that he thought that it would not lose its gravitas by being the three priorities they were adding.

Mr. Andrews said that they were including that with the list of positions and policy statements, which was quite long.

Ms. Kilroy had said that it would be integrated into it.

Ms. Mallek said that they could place it in category three since it would undoubtedly affect others,

and other counties would collaborate with them.

Ms. Kilroy said that the three items that were on the screen in approach three, number three, would be integrated into the positions and policy statements, but they would be supportive on the momentum that was building through VACo and the work that Mr. Blount would be doing on the County's behalf during the session.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she had a question regarding the line of duty benefits for private police departments, and she supported it. She asked if that would go under number four, under the added legislative priorities. She inquired if photo speed cameras could replace it.

Ms. Kilroy said that number four was a mechanism. She said that number three was comprised of topics. She said they expected Nelson County's local representative would introduce legislation. She said that the County would not have needed to ask the state-level elected officials to introduce legislation, but they would be supportive by demonstrating support for Nelson County.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley stated that they could not have done that under section four, policy statements.

Ms. Kilroy said that they would, and that for all of those, they would be lending support to other efforts if the bills were introduced. She said they would be communicating to their representatives that these were items that the County had an interest in seeing be successful. She said they had not been asking them to patron a bill around that topic.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that it sounded like the County was not asking anyone to patron a bill.

Ms. Mallek said yes, they were, number one and number two.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked whether it mattered where everything went. She said that some people might prefer moving the photo-speed cameras to a higher priority because they believe it fell under number three, more important positions. She suggested that line of duty benefits could be included under policy, which they would definitely support Nelson.

Mr. Gallaway said that positions and policies were Albemarle County specific items that they would want to support. He said that if they wanted to support other localities, that was not necessarily a position or policy statement. He said they were lending support to the other effort. He said that they were going to hammer number one and number two at the table with legislators. He said they would then be able to discuss some regional topics that were important to voice their opinions on. He said that they would then have those positions and policy statements, with those listed in parenthesis they could call out as highlights of those positions and policy statements.

Ms. McKeel stated that the staff would be able to review it while processing requests in order to provide clarity on what they were supporting.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that they were eliminating all-virtual meetings for bandwidth purposes, but it might be something that came up on its own.

Mr. Gallaway said that he believed they were only agreeing to remove that particular thing.

Ms. Kilroy said that the positions and policy statements, because they were not asking for patron level support, that could be a thick document. She said that there was no downside to having a longer positions and policy statements document.

Ms. McKeel said that if that came up, and it was in their policy statements, it would give them all the ability to support it.

Mr. Andrews said that the 55th included the northern half of Nelson County, so there was joint representation there when it came to those issues.

Ms. Mallek said that she would ask one more time if there was anyone else who would support putting the photo effort as the new number three. She said that it seemed like everything that was currently three would go to four in order for them to look for someone to help carry it or to co-sponsor it with somebody else, because she thought that was the only way they were going to make any progress on that issue was to have it be one of the very few. She said they were not asking for six things, so she did not think they had to limit themselves to two things.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she agreed.

Ms. McKeel said that she did not have a problem doing that, but that they had been asking for that for decades, and that she did not think it was going to happen until the flavor of the General Assembly changed.

Mr. Andrews said that Chair Price indicated a thumbs up. He said he would like to have one of their people sponsor it if possible.

Mr. Gallaway said that it would make them explain themselves, as there were new people who

would have to stake a claim and back it up. He said that another person who was not new would have to explain why the last one was so watered down.

Ms. Kilroy said that staff would prepare for October 18 with approach three, with the photo-speed-monitoring devices added as a third priority. She said that as the positions and policy statements appeared in their packet, they were all together. She said they would create a separate header to indicate the higher priority items. She said they could put civil penalties, special exceptions for short-term rentals, all-virtual meetings, and the line of duty benefits as areas where the County would like to see some progress for 2024.

Board members acknowledged consensus with that proposal.

Ms. Kilroy said there was not really a downside to having the policy and positions statement be a longer document. She said that it had been a powerful tool for staff to be highly responsive to state-level representatives who were often making a lot of decisions quickly. She said that staff found a lot of benefit during that time of year in having this document available. She said that it had been detailed in Attachment B in their packet, and it had been updated. She said that the edits here were updates.

Ms. Kilroy said that staff took the Strategic Plan goals and the positions and policy statements, and they looked for areas where there was no representation of topics closely aligned with the Strategic Plan. She said there were two items around community-based behavioral health services. She said that those were more specific call-outs related to the CSB study by JLARC. She said that there was one on permanent supportive housing support, and one for sustained state financial support to localities for emergency management and community resilience efforts. She said they found alignment with the line of duty benefits item. She said that those were the edits that they put forward in the Board's packet, and asked whether the Board would like to discuss any of those, or other areas where the Board would like to see staff put a flag in the ground as they used this document heading into the 2024 General Assembly session.

Ms. McKeel said that she was happy with it.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if they could provide more information about permanent supportive housing and other types of supportive housing.

Ms. Kilroy said that supportive housing, permanent supportive housing, and other supportive housing would help individuals experiencing long-term homelessness. She said that had been a statewide interest that would benefit from state-level funding. She noted it would free up local resources for the County could address temporary needs.

Ms. Stacey Pethia, Assistant Director of Housing, said that permanent supportive housing was targeted toward persons experiencing chronic homelessness. She said that it provided an opportunity to move them directly from the street into housing, which then allowed them to get the supportive services they needed. She said supportive housing could also be used to serve persons with mental or physical disabilities, allowing them to live independently within the community instead of being sent off to an institution. She said they were able to live within the community with the supportive services they needed. She said that there had been talk at the state level about altering the state's low-income housing tax credit and creating a tax credit program within the state itself to provide funding for permanent supportive housing. She said that any type of legislation that would enable the County to more easily provide permanent supportive housing opportunities was what this was really targeted to.

Ms. Mallek said that she had seen the success of The Crossings across the street, which was funded cooperatively with the County and the City a number of years ago. She said that the impact on the residents had been spectacular. She said that she appreciated the things that were added, and the pipeline credentialing issue. She said there would be some support, and this perhaps could be folded into an effort being pushed by the administration in Richmond regarding increasing apprenticeships. She said she had attended a meeting last week in Richmond about that. She said they were pushing very hard to get that spun up, and that the County may be able to ride the coattails for that as well.

Mr. Gallaway said that he was good with all of the additions, and that he had previously made his comments about the transportation item.

Ms. Price said that she was good with it.

Mr. Andrews said that he was good with these, and that he especially liked what was added and thought it was very appropriate, and that he hoped they would find support because they were high priorities. He said that he noticed in some of the existing priorities with land use, that there were some things that they as a County might need to do some work themselves on.

Ms. Kilroy said that staff would return before the Board, joined by the County Attorney, on October 18. She said that at the meeting, those legislative priorities and the legislative positions and policy statements would be finalized. She said that another version of attachments A and B would be provided based on the discussion today. She said they were getting started on scheduling the legislative forum, and that it would be highly dependent on the outcome of the November election.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that Abbey Stumpf and her team at CAPE (Office of Communications and Public Engagement) did an excellent job of getting them ready for this every month. He said that the Resilient Together launch supported goal 1 in their Strategic Plan. He said that it was about designing programs and services that promote an equitably engaged and climate resilient community. He said that Resilient Together was a County, City, and UVA collaborative project to identify opportunities and design strategies to build community resilience to a changing climate.

Mr. Richardson said that the planning effort would take two years and would result in complementary plans for each jurisdiction to support each other, and recognize the similarities, differences, and unique needs of all of their jurisdictions. He said that the community open house kickoff was Tuesday, September 26 from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. at Carver Recreation Center. He said that they had more information at <engage.albemarle.org/resilient-together>. He said that the Board received a link in the Monday night weekly report from Ms. Kilroy about Gabe who was on Community Connections.

Mr. Richardson said the next item was about the Albemarle County Police Department (ACPD) and the Police Foundation partnership, which supported goal 1, nurturing a safe and healthy community; goal 2, designing programs and services that made them more equitably engaged and resilient; and goal 6, recruiting, retaining, and engaging public servants who provided quality service to their citizens and advanced the County's mission.

Mr. Richardson said that the Board had supported this strong relationship for a number of years. He said that it allowed the ACPD to identify needs to support its staff and how the Foundation could fulfill those needs. He said that there were numerous ACPD events throughout the year that were organized and promoted with the support from the Foundation. He said events included National Night Out, Trunk or Tree, and Community Day at Simpson Park. He said that Putt-Putt with the Police was the Foundation's highest profile event for the year. He said there were 900 attendees at this event in August. He said that the event invited community engagement opportunities with their officers through playing mini golf, which had been a tradition for the last seven years.

Mr. Richardson said that the Foundation provided programs to support police officers, including housing assistance programs to help officers with down payments, closing costs, and rental grants. He said the programs resulted in a 20% increase in the number of officers living within the County over the last 18 months. He said that in addition, there were continuing education programs to fund supplemental officer training beyond what was required. He said that the ACPD Heroes, the Foundation partnered with UVA, private attorneys, and notaries to provide basic estate training documents for officers.

Mr. Richardson said that the next slide highlighted some of the people in the organization, supporting goal 6 to recruit, retain, and engage public servants who provide quality government services. He said that Ms. Kanellopoulos had recently completed a leadership development program sponsored by the Virginia chapter of the American Planning Association. He said that it was a six-month course that covered topics such as leadership values, mindset, emotional intelligence, negotiation, diversity and inclusion. He said that they shadowed and interviewed a leader they admired to see what skills and techniques they could integrate into their own leadership toolkits. He said that Ms. Kanellopoulos was a critical leader with the AC44 work.

Mr. Richardson said that Firefighter Suzanne Herndon, supporting goal 1.1, supporting community safety through highly-response services, had been with the Fire Department for 18 years, and she organized the rowing for responders event. He said that she rowed for 24 hours straight to raise funds for awareness for first responder mental health. He said that it was the third year that she had done this, during which they collectively rowed 802,535 meters during the 24-hour period. He said that she organized the 911 Memorial Stair climb and partnered with other fire rescue agencies to do the stair climb in remembrance of the lives lost on 9/11. He said that she completed her Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) instructor certification which equipped first responders with necessary skills in the field to appropriately respond to psychiatric related crises.

Mr. Richardson said that the Child Care Expo was held recently, and it was organized by the Department of Social Services (DSS). He said it showcased programs in our County for goal 1, to nurture a safe and healthy community while enhancing and developing human service initiatives to assist the community with existing resources. He said that on September 9 at COB-5 (5th Street County Office Building), this event was designed as a one-stop shop to help people start their own childcare business and help existing businesses with resources. He said that the area was experiencing a shortage of childcare services. He said staff from Fire Rescue, Social Services, partner organizations like Community Investment Collaborative, Child Care Aware, and Ready Kids were onsite to discuss the requirements for running a childcare business. He said the event had 59 attendees, and 33 individuals completed CPR and first aid certification at the event.

Mr. Richardson said that the 21-day equity challenge was launched, and it was related to goal two, design programs and services that promotes an equitable, engaged and climate resilient community. He said it was a campaign led by the Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI) to inspire the community to imagine and realize a more inclusive and equitable world. He said resources were posted on a website, including articles, videos and key locations to visit. He said the challenge included content from partner agencies, including Cultivate Charlottesville, Blue Ridge Health District, as well as materials curated by OEI. He said that during the 21 days of the challenge, the web page had a total of 700 visitors, of which 126 took some sort of action by reading the content, answering and reflecting on questions, or downloading worksheets. He noted that the website launched on August 15.

Mr. Richardson said that there was a one-day conference held at North Fork with the support of UVA. He said that a total of 148 out of the 175 participants who were invited were able to attend. He said it was a full day training that included information on psychological safety. He said there was a certified teacher from UVA who came and talked about why it was important, and how to develop strategies and create psychological safety in the organization. He said the conference attendees discussed goal setting and performance management expectations. He said that moving forward, these conferences will be held four times a year. He said people were put in different groups aimed at getting people from different departments to learn about each other's work and build networking opportunities.

Mr. Richardson said that the Fire Department had been awarded a \$7.1 million FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) grant to hire, train, and deploy 30 full-time firefighters. He said this was their third grant. He said that 14 of the 30 grant-funded positions would be used to implement 24/7 coverage in the southern portion of the County. He stated that 16 positions would staff a ladder truck that would be based at Monticello Station. He said this unit would be staffed and specially trained with personnel to address more complex incidents that arise in the community, including water and technical rescues throughout the County.

Mr. Richardson said that a recruitment campaign was held in August with over 100 applications received. He said that training for these 30 positions would begin in early Calendar Year 2024. He emphasized that pulling down federal money into the local fund offset the cost for public safety positions over several years. He said it allowed the County to plan over several years for the full cost of these positions.

Mr. Richardson said that the street sweeper had been introduced to the community, which supported goal one of nurturing a safe and healthy community. He said a media event and ceremonial drive past JABA (Jefferson Area Board for Aging) were held to celebrate the launch and naming of the new street sweeper, which began its service on August 21. He said that data had been coming soon on the pounds of debris that had been collected on the streets in the urban ring. He said the County had received complaints from cyclists about how the roads were not kept and how that posed a danger. He said that the street sweeper diverted debris that otherwise would go into the stormwater and water system. He said the street sweeper was operating Monday through Friday from 3 to 11 a.m.

Mr. Richardson said that Seize the Day was about supporting goal two, to design programs and services to promote an equitable engaged in climate resilient community. He said the event provided a free fun day for veterans, active duty and active reserve guard, and their families in Charlottesville. He said the Let's Talk Van had 92 visitors during the event.

Mr. Richardson shared a slide that pictured Ms. Ann Wall, the new Deputy County Executive. He said she was currently the city manager of Greenville, North Carolina, and she was selected because of her depth of experience that aligned with the County. He said she had a commitment for leading high performance local government. He noted that Greenville did a lot of work with East Carolina University, a regional hospital and university about the size of University of Virginia. He said she will be starting the position on December 4 and will begin her orientation soon after. He said that once she arrived, she would ask to spend some time with each supervisor to learn more about the districts.

Ms. McKeel said that it really showed a lot of hard work and really good work for their community. She said that organizing a meeting with the Supervisors four times a year was a huge undertaking, and that it was great work for the employees.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that this was a fine example of everything they had done.

Ms. Mallek said that the word had gotten out about what a great place this was to work. She said that the hundred applications were unheard of in a long time. She said she had received comments about how much nicer it was to walk along the streets, to cross the street, and to bicycle in the downtown area after the street sweeper went through Crozet.

Mr. Gallaway said that he did not know about the Police Foundation providing housing assistance.

Ms. Price said that she appreciated the work the County had done to work with FEMA and the Police Foundation.

Mr. Andrews said that congratulations were in order for Mr. Richardson, who had just returned from teaching outside of the County.

Mr. Richardson said that the Board had been gracious enough to let him go to UNC School of Government two times in the fall, one day in September and one day in November. He said that Ms. Shifflett, from Performance and Strategic Planning, had accompanied him last November, and she spent a full day there. He said she was examining some of the programs that they have that they offer to out-of-state local governments. He said that one example was their economic development certification program, which she recently attended, and he thought it was at least a one-week school. They said that they always kept their eyes open for opportunities, and they looked inside the state of Virginia first, like Virginia Tech or the University of Virginia.

Agenda Item No.12. Closed Meeting.

At 4:31 p.m., Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **moved** the Board go into a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia:

- under subsection (3), to discuss or consider the acquisition of real property for transportation improvements, a public purpose, in the Jack Jouett, White Hall and Rio magisterial districts, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the County.

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

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

Agenda Item No.13. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 6:00 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, Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, and Ms. Price.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 15. From the Public: Matters on the Agenda but Not Listed for Public Hearing or on Matters Previously Considered by the Board or Matters that are Pending Before the Board.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 16. **Public Hearing: Proposed Lease of a Portion of Walnut Creek Park to Verizon Wireless.** To receive public comment on a proposed lease of approximately 2,500 square feet of ground space at Walnut Creek Park (Parcel ID 10000-00-00-03500), along with associated easements, to Celco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that Celco Partnership, doing business as Verizon Wireless, is requesting that the County lease ground space to it at Walnut Creek Park for a potential monopole wireless services tower, in the location shown on Attachment A. Virginia Code § 15.2-1800 requires a public hearing prior to the leasing of County owned property.

In order for a monopole wireless services tower to be constructed in this location, the Board would need to approve a lease for the ground space and, separately, approve a special use permit for the tower itself. The sole subject of this public hearing is the proposed leasing of the property.

Staff has negotiated the terms of a proposed land lease (Attachment B) of the tower site on County-owned property. The proposed land lease would have a term of 5-25 years (at the tenant's option), at a rental rate of \$12,000 per year, to be increased by 2% annually. The County would also realize 25% of the rental revenue received by Verizon Wireless on any of its sublease(s) of the premises. As presently drafted, the lease does not restrict the design of the proposed facility. The County would have continued use of portions of the leased premises or ground space immediately adjacent to the leased premises (that did not interfere with Verizon's ground equipment area) for the County's emergency services and/or school communications purposes, at no cost to the County.

Concurrent with (but separate from) this item, Community Development staff has been reviewing Verizon Wireless's special use permit application. If a lease were approved, a separate public hearing for the proposed special use permit would be held. If the special use permit application were not approved, Verizon would have the right to cancel the lease.

If the lease were approved, the County would realize a one-time signing bonus of \$2,000, followed by a minimum of \$12,000 in rental revenue (increasing by 2% annually) for 5-25 years. The County would also realize 25% of the rental revenue received by Verizon Wireless on any of its sublease(s) of the premises. There would be no cost to the County for the tower site construction or ongoing maintenance.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment C) authorizing the County Executive to execute a lease of approximately 2,500 square feet of land at Walnut Creek Park, once approved by the County Attorney as to form and substance.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that Abbey Stumpf and her team at CAPE (Office of Communications and Public Engagement) did an excellent job of getting them ready for this every month. He said that the Resilient Together launch supported goal 1 in their Strategic Plan. He said that it was about designing programs and services that promote an equitably engaged and climate resilient community. He said that Resilient Together was a County, City, and UVA collaborative project to identify opportunities and design strategies to build community resilience to a changing climate.

Mr. Richardson said that the planning effort would take two years and would result in complementary plans for each jurisdiction to support each other, and recognize the similarities, differences, and unique needs of all of their jurisdictions. He said that the community open house kickoff was Tuesday, September 26 from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. at Carver Recreation Center. He said that they had more information at <engage.albemarle.org/resilient-together>. He said that the Board received a link in the Monday night weekly report from Ms. Kilroy about Gabe who was on Community Connections.

Mr. Richardson said the next item was about the Albemarle County Police Department (ACPD) and the Police Foundation partnership, which supported goal 1, nurturing a safe and healthy community; goal 2, designing programs and services that made them more equitably engaged and resilient; and goal 6, recruiting, retaining, and engaging public servants who provided quality service to their citizens and advanced the County's mission.

Mr. Richardson said that the Board had supported this strong relationship for a number of years. He said that it allowed the ACPD to identify needs to support its staff and how the Foundation could fulfill those needs. He said that there were numerous ACPD events throughout the year that were organized and promoted with the support from the Foundation. He said events included National Night Out, Trunk or Tree, and Community Day at Simpson Park. He said that Putt-Putt with the Police was the Foundation's highest profile event for the year. He said there were 900 attendees at this event in August. He said that the event invited community engagement opportunities with their officers through playing mini golf, which had been a tradition for the last seven years.

Mr. Richardson said that the Foundation provided programs to support police officers, including housing assistance programs to help officers with down payments, closing costs, and rental grants. He said the programs resulted in a 20% increase in the number of officers living within the County over the last 18 months. He said that in addition, there were continuing education programs to fund supplemental officer training beyond what was required. He said that the ACPD Heroes, the Foundation partnered with UVA, private attorneys, and notaries to provide basic estate training documents for officers.

Mr. Richardson said that the next slide highlighted some of the people in the organization, supporting goal 6 to recruit, retain, and engage public servants who provide quality government services. He said that Ms. Kanellopoulos had recently completed a leadership development program sponsored by the Virginia chapter of the American Planning Association. He said that it was a six-month course that covered topics such as leadership values, mindset, emotional intelligence, negotiation, diversity and inclusion. He said that they shadowed and interviewed a leader they admired to see what skills and techniques they could integrate into their own leadership toolkits. He said that Ms. Kanellopoulos was a critical leader with the AC44 work.

Mr. Richardson said that Firefighter Suzanne Herndon, supporting goal 1.1, supporting community safety through highly-response services, had been with the Fire Department for 18 years, and she organized the rowing for responders event. He said that she rowed for 24 hours straight to raise funds for awareness for first responder mental health. He said that it was the third year that she had done this, during which they collectively rowed 802,535 meters during the 24-hour period. He said that she organized the 911 Memorial Stair climb and partnered with other fire rescue agencies to do the stair climb in remembrance of the lives lost on 9/11. He said that she completed her Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) instructor certification which equipped first responders with necessary skills in the field to appropriately respond to psychiatric related crises.

Mr. Richardson said that the Child Care Expo was held recently, and it was organized by the Department of Social Services (DSS). He said it showcased programs in our County for goal 1, to nurture a safe and healthy community while enhancing and developing human service initiatives to assist the community with existing resources. He said that on September 9 at COB-5 (5th Street County Office Building), this event was designed as a one-stop shop to help people start their own childcare business and help existing businesses with resources. He said that the area was experiencing a shortage of childcare services. He said staff from Fire Rescue, Social Services, partner organizations like Community Investment Collaborative, Child Care Aware, and Ready Kids were onsite to discuss the requirements for running a childcare business. He said the event had 59 attendees, and 33 individuals completed CPR and first aid certification at the event.

Mr. Richardson said that the 21-day equity challenge was launched, and it was related to goal two, design programs and services that promotes an equitable, engaged and climate resilient community. He said it was a campaign led by the Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI) to inspire the community to imagine and realize a more inclusive and equitable world. He said resources were posted on a website, including articles, videos and key locations to visit. He said the challenge included content from partner agencies, including Cultivate Charlottesville, Blue Ridge Health District, as well as materials curated by OEI. He said that during the 21 days of the challenge, the web page had a total of 700 visitors, of which 126 took some sort of action by reading the content, answering and reflecting on questions, or downloading worksheets. He noted that the website launched on August 15.

Mr. Richardson said that there was a one-day conference held at North Fork with the support of UVA. He said that a total of 148 out of the 175 participants who were invited were able to attend. He said it was a full day training that included information on psychological safety. He said there was a certified teacher from UVA who came and talked about why it was important, and how to develop strategies and create psychological safety in the organization. He said the conference attendees discussed goal setting and performance management expectations. He said that moving forward, these conferences will be held four times a year. He said people were put in different groups aimed at getting people from different departments to learn about each other's work and build networking opportunities.

Mr. Richardson said that the Fire Department had been awarded a \$7.1 million FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) grant to hire, train, and deploy 30 full-time firefighters. He said this was their third grant. He said that 14 of the 30 grant-funded positions would be used to implement 24/7 coverage in the southern portion of the County. He stated that 16 positions would staff a ladder truck that would be based at Monticello Station. He said this unit would be staffed and specially trained with personnel to address more complex incidents that arise in the community, including water and technical rescues throughout the County.

Mr. Richardson said that a recruitment campaign was held in August with over 100 applications received. He said that training for these 30 positions would begin in early Calendar Year 2024. He emphasized that pulling down federal money into the local fund offset the cost for public safety positions over several years. He said it allowed the County to plan over several years for the full cost of these positions.

Mr. Richardson said that the street sweeper had been introduced to the community, which supported goal one of nurturing a safe and healthy community. He said a media event and ceremonial drive past JABA (Jefferson Area Board for Aging) were held to celebrate the launch and naming of the new street sweeper, which began its service on August 21. He said that data had been coming soon on the pounds of debris that had been collected on the streets in the urban ring. He said the County had received complaints from cyclists about how the roads were not kept and how that posed a danger. He said that the street sweeper diverted debris that otherwise would go into the stormwater and water system. He said the street sweeper was operating Monday through Friday from 3 to 11 a.m.

Mr. Richardson said that Seize the Day was about supporting goal two, to design programs and services to promote an equitable engaged in climate resilient community. He said the event provided a free fun day for veterans, active duty and active reserve guard, and their families in Charlottesville. He said the Let's Talk Van had 92 visitors during the event.

Mr. Richardson shared a slide that pictured Ms. Ann Wall, the new Deputy County Executive. He said she was currently the city manager of Greenville, North Carolina, and she was selected because of her depth of experience that aligned with the County. He said she had a commitment for leading high performance local government. He noted that Greenville did a lot of work with East Carolina University, a regional hospital and university about the size of University of Virginia. He said she will be starting the position on December 4 and will begin her orientation soon after. He said that once she arrived, she would ask to spend some time with each supervisor to learn more about the districts.

Ms. McKeel said that it really showed a lot of hard work and really good work for their community. She said that organizing a meeting with the Supervisors four times a year was a huge undertaking, and that it was great work for the employees.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that this was a fine example of everything they had done.

Ms. Mallek said that the word had gotten out about what a great place this was to work. She said that the hundred applications were unheard of in a long time. She said she had received comments about how much nicer it was to walk along the streets, to cross the street, and to bicycle in the downtown area after the street sweeper went through Crozet.

Mr. Gallaway said that he did not know about the Police Foundation providing housing assistance.

Ms. Price said that she appreciated the work the County had done to work with FEMA and the Police Foundation.

Mr. Andrews said that congratulations were in order for Mr. Richardson, who had just returned from teaching outside of the County.

Mr. Richardson said that the Board had been gracious enough to let him go to UNC School of Government two times in the fall, one day in September and one day in November. He said that Ms. Shifflett, from Performance and Strategic Planning, had accompanied him last November, and she spent a full day there. He said she was examining some of the programs that they have that they offer to out-of-state local governments. He said that one example was their economic development certification program, which she recently attended, and he thought it was at least a one-week school. They said that they always kept their eyes open for opportunities, and they looked inside the state of Virginia first, like Virginia Tech or the University of Virginia.

Mr. Andrews opened the public hearing.

Mr. Tim Collins, Red Hill, said he lived with his wife across the street from where the tower was proposed to be. He said it was about 1,000 feet away from their house, and they had a clear shot out of their front window, which affected them. He said that with the Telecommunications Act, Congress intended for state and local authorities to retain the right to treat facilities that created visual impacts or safety concerns differently to the extent permitted under applicable zoning requirements. He said that while state and local authorities may not altogether preclude the siting of telecom towers, they may still respect the siting of such towers from places that would result in significant adverse environmental or aesthetic impacts. He said that previously, this came up in the Planning Commission, and it was shot down 5 to 1.

Mr. Collins said that they had been trying to bend the rules in order to put up a tower in rural Albemarle, specifically within a park. He said the proposal and assessment did not accurately portray the situation. He said they wanted everyone to think that the tower would be hidden behind a maintenance shack and some trees. He said that they had conducted a balloon test without informing all of the nearby residents, and they had done it during the summer when the leaves were up. He said it did indeed partially hide the tower from view, but for only half of the year. He said that the rest of the time, it would have been sticking out as you drove by.

Mr. Collins said that it was noted there were no objections from the community, but he did not think there had been an opportunity to object. He said he did not think they had even received a letter. He said that the facility would be about 500 feet from and the property of their neighbors across the street, who did not want it. He said the spot where they wanted to put up the tower was a very scenic and unique area of the park. He said it was a high point at the beginning of a ridge with a large meadow and a long view, perhaps even the best sunset in the entire park.

Mr. Collins said that the foundation of parks was to remain havens for natural, undisturbed landscapes for people to enjoy. He said that as technology continued to infiltrate, it is more important than ever to protect these places while they still can. He said it would be a dangerous precedent to bend fundamental park missions in the name of progress. He said that the rules are in place for exactly this reason. He said people go to parks to escape into natural landscapes. He said that if they had it Verizon's way, it would cheapen the values of our County parks.

Mr. Collins said that on paper, it may look like the tower was hidden behind the shed, but he said that it was actually a big middle finger in the sky, more than twice the height of the trees. He said that it would not leave people at peace with a quiet sunset on the hill, but just another view dominated by the progress of man. He said there were not many places left where one can go without seeing a tower. He suggested that alternatives should be explored because they had not been. He said one possibility might be to co-locate on another tower. He said another option could be to use large Dominion power lines about a mile away.

Ms. Eliza Evans, North Garden, said she lived directly across from Walnut Creek entrance. She said her parents were the ones who lived right across from Mr. Collins and would actually be closest to the tower. She said the field where the tower was proposed to be built was called Bailey Field. She said her father had been an artist, and he liked to paint up there. She said Dominion just bought by eminent domain three houses a mile up the road. She said two of their friends had to sell their houses to Dominion. She said she had Verizon and had fine cell service in the park already. She noted she ran every day, and her Pandora never went out. She said she could stream her stuff. She said there were some dead zones in their area.

Ms. Evans said she thought that the Dominion site would be much better than Bailey Field. She said that Bailey Field had been land that used to belong to her family. She said her great uncles had sold it to the park. She said it was a great place to pick blackberries right where they were going to put the tower. She said she was against it, and a lot of people in the neighborhood were also against it. She said they had not been notified about this meeting at all. She noted that Mr. Collins found out about it from the County website. She said they had not gotten any notification about this meeting or the last one. She said the sign that they had notifying the public of the development could not be read because it was peeling. She said that nobody knew that this was happening. She said there were better options, and she believed that the park was too special for a cell phone tower.

Mr. Andrews, hearing no further questions from Supervisors, said that he would close the public hearing.

Mr. Gallaway asked if Mr. Andrews was asking if Supervisors had questions of staff.

Mr. Andrews said that was correct.

Mr. Gallaway said that he had a question. He asked if the nature of that lease agreement required the neighbor notification like an SUP would.

Mr. Herrick said that this public hearing did not. He said there were different neighbor notification requirements for special use permit hearings, but not for a proposed lease of public property. He said that notice requirements included advertisement in the paper, and the County had met that requirement.

Mr. Andrews said that even if they approved this, it would all come back during the next permit process, which would require notices, other procedures, and another public hearing with signs out front.

Mr. Herrick said that was correct.

Mr. Gallaway said that the design and nature of the tower could be considered as part of the lease. He said that the special use permit was about putting the tower in the particular area.

Mr. Herrick said that was correct. He said that it was about authorizing the special use permit to actually install the tower as Verizon proposed it.

Mr. Gallaway said that all of the physical things they could do could be addressed during that process.

Mr. Herrick said not all of them. He said that the special use permit was required for Verizon to install the tower. He said that there were limitations on what the Board could request from the provider during that phase.

Mr. Gallaway said that in the past they had tower applications without the lease agreement part. He said the design, the setoffs, and the pole had all been discussed as part of the process.

Mr. Herrick said that was right, but there were still limitations on what actions they could take.

Mr. Gallaway said the type of antenna they were putting up, how far it was from the pole, and all those details would be worked out in the special use permit.

Mr. Herrick said that it had been addressed in the County Code. He said that to the extent that Verizon wished to have standoffs greater than what the County ordinance would allow, they would need to come and ask the Board for permission to have the greater standoffs. He said the Board would have the ability to approve or deny at that stage.

Mr. Andrews asked if there was a height at which it would not have to return to the Board.

Mr. Herrick said that he did not believe so. He said that this was a Tier 2 site which required a special use permit at any height. He said that if it had been a tree top tower that was only no greater than 10 feet above the tallest reference tree, then that would not have required Board approval. He said that once it exceeded the 10 feet above the tallest reference tree, it would have required a special use permit.

Mr. Andrews, hearing no further questions from Supervisors, closed the public hearing, and brought the matter back to the Board for discussion.

Ms. McKeel stated that she was in favor of approving this resolution to enact the lease, and she concurred with the staff's suggestion.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was in favor of approving this lease because she considered it a health and safety issue. She said there was a huge park there, and she wanted to ensure that everyone who visited it remained safe. She said she believed having cell phone coverage would come in handy during emergencies.

Ms. Mallek said that what had been missing in the map that she had been shown was the overlay of the park boundary, because there had been no way to understand what the various colors meant without the overlay of how the park fit in. She asked if it was within the role of the hearing that the design would be stipulated by the applicant. She asked if it would be something that could be recorded and carried forward.

Mr. Herrick said that it could be. He said that as the lease was currently worded, there were no restrictions on the design. He said there would be restrictions on the design imposed by the County ordinance, but they would not be imposed by the proposed lease at that point.

Ms. Mallek said that if they had been going to do anything different than the 18-inch standoff, they would have had to put that in as a request at another time. She said that if they requested the change, then the Board would get to act on it.

Mr. Herrick said that was correct. He said that they had both the County lease, and they had the wireless County ordinance. He said that at that point, the proposed tower would have been subject to both. He said it would have to meet the standards of both. He said that in the lease, the lease itself did not have any design constraints in it. He noted that it did not take away from the fact that the County ordinance still had certain design constraints, standoffs for instance, which would apply if and when this came back before the Board as a special use permit.

Ms. Mallek said that she had felt better if this had been shielded. She said the image that had been supplied of it being out in the middle of the field had not complied with their ordinance. She said their public safety had sufficient communication by radio. She said she preferred that it come back as a treetop tower, then she would be in favor of the lease.

Mr. Gallaway said that they should approach the matter from the perspective of the lease

agreement rather than focusing on the elements of the special use permit at this time. He stated that he was in favor of approving it, even if the special use permit were to be denied later on, as there would be no recourse for the County on that. He said that they could iron out any other details related to the special use permit process once the lease agreement had been finalized.

Mr. Andrews said he would read the comments from Chair Price.

Ms. Price said that while she was not in support of the towers cluttering the landscape, whenever the local government approved development of property, either on County land or on private land, which resulted in the presence of thousands of people, it had an obligation to provide reasonable, safe, and effective communication services, particularly if emergency services would be required. She stated that radio communications may cover the entirety of the park, but that required an injured party or messenger acting on behalf of that injured party to locate a radio operator.

Ms. Price said that requiring that as an alternative to immediate emergency communication services via cell phone, was an insufficient alternative. She stated safety must take precedence over aesthetics. She said Ralph Waldo Emerson once wrote that a foolish consistency was the hobgoblin of little minds adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divides. She said that his point was that only small-minded people refused to rethink their prior beliefs. She said that she supported the application.

Mr. Andrews said that at that moment, he had been examining the lease agreement rather than focusing on the special exception heights and other things. He said it was inefficient to have to do things this way, and he felt that they needed to take this seriously as a step forward. He expressed his support for their current course of action.

Mr. Andrews, hearing no other comments from the Board, said that he would like to make the motion as the Samuel Miller District Supervisor.

Mr. Andrews **moved** the Board adopt the Resolution (Attachment C) authorizing the County Executive to execute the lease for approximately 2,500 square feet of land at Walnut Creek Park.

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

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

NAYS: Ms. Mallek.

RESOLUTION TO LEASE SPACE AT WALNUT CREEK PARK TO VERIZON WIRELESS

WHEREAS, the Board finds that it is in the best interest of the County to lease approximately 2,500 square feet of land (and associated easements) at the Walnut Creek Park, to Cellco Partnership (doing business as Verizon Wireless);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, hereby authorizes the County Executive to execute a lease of approximately 2,500 square feet of land (and associated easements) at the Walnut Creek Park, to Cellco Partnership (doing business as Verizon Wireless), along with any necessary related documents, once approved by the County Attorney as to form and substance.

Mr. Henry said that this was a unique process given the perspective of the Board as a landowner and trying to keep a line between a special use permit consideration as opposed to the lease consideration. He said they would move forward with the next step.

Mr. Gallaway said that Mr. Herrick had mentioned that the abutting neighbors would have received notice for the special use permit. He said that for those who wanted to be notified beyond being an abutting neighbor, there was a way to do that.

Mr. Herrick said that Mr. Bill Fritz in CDD (Community Development Department) compiled lists of interested parties, and staff could take down the list of those who had comments and ensure that Mr. Fritz had those. He noted that the neighbors who commented at the Planning Commission were not abutting neighbors, so they may not have received notice that way. He said he believed that Mr. Fritz and CDD were very good about adding folks to lists of interested parties.

Agenda Item No. 17. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda

Ms. McKeel said that the County Executive should be aware that there was a high probability of a shutdown in Washington within the next few months.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said yes.

Ms. McKeel said that it would flow down to the state government and then eventually reach them. She said she was sure that staff was already considering it and making plans for it.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she had been in attendance at the Minority Business Alliance event, which was a wonderful event. She said she thought Mr. Richardson would ensure all Supervisors received an invitation for it next year. She said J.T. Newberry was there, and Jesse Perkins was there. She noted that Sam Sanders from Charlottesville attended.

Ms. Mallek said that the Moormans River had no water flowing in it for three weeks. She said there was ongoing discussion about trying to figure out a way to help revive it with a very small amount of the reservoir that was not being released at that time. She said the South Fork Reservoir had not been spilling for over a week, and it could go down feet a day with regular use. She said she beseeched everyone in the community, both well users in the rural area as well as urban users on the water system, to be very careful. She said they did not need to revisit the business shutdowns and the potential of not being able to keep the University running if they ran out of water. She said that the weekend may bring them something useful. She said that one tenth of an inch in seven weeks in the western northern part of the County was just not enough.

Mr. Gallaway said the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) meeting was held earlier this month, and they provided information about the Blue Ridge Regional Cigarette Tax Board for FY23. He said that in Albemarle, total packs sold were almost 2.5 million, and they were second to Augusta County which beat them by about 300,000 packs. He said Charlottesville was at a million packs. He said that between Charlottesville and Albemarle, there were 3.5 million packs of cigarettes sold in the region.

Mr. Gallaway said that the allocation by jurisdiction for FY23 was \$952,000, which took into account the fees paid to administer to the regional board. He said that Augusta had a lower tax rate than Albemarle and Charlottesville, and there were two other jurisdictions with lower tax rates. He said that Augusta was one of the lower ones, but the rest in the region were at about the same tax rate. He said the presentation with other figures was available on the TJPDC website.

Ms. McKeel said that all the smokers should be careful about flicking their cigarettes out the window and dumping their ashtrays because it was so dry. She said they had a lot of roadside small brush fires because of cigarette butts. She noted it did not take a lot to get out of control.

Mr. Andrews said that he had attended the most recent meeting of the Albemarle County Board of Elections at Chair Price's request and recommendation. He said the topic of his brief discussion with the General Registrar, Laura Nettie, was about what it would take to implement Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) in the County. He said that much of the discussion focused on opinions about RCV. He noted he had been told that it was affordable. He said no figures were given as to cost, and there were a lot of details to be worked out related to timing, procedures, and readiness. He said that there were questions remaining about certification of third-party tabulation software, a handbook chapter at the state level, Board of Elections, guidelines for taking hand counted ballots overseas, and unscanned ballots.

Mr. Andrews said that there had been an offer to meet with the Board in furtherance of the statutory language, which stated that the decision to conduct an election by ranked choice voting shall be made in consultation with the local electoral Board and general registrar by a majority vote of the Board of Supervisors. He said this was something for future discussion. He said that the local Board of Elections needed to put their proposed budget for 2025 into the state by December of 2023, and there was not actually state funding for local implementations of RCV. He said that there would be an education campaign that they would have to take on.

Ms. Mallek asked for clarification about the state funding.

Mr. Andrews said that there was no state funding, so they would be on their own for that part. He said that it was one of the details that needed to be worked out, and if it changed, and if he heard differently, he would let them know

Agenda Item No. 18. Adjourn to October 4, 2023, 1:00 p.m. Lane Auditorium.

At 6:57 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to October 4, 2023, 1:00 p.m. Lane Auditorium, Second Floor of the Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902. Opportunities for the public to access and participate in this meeting are posted on the Albemarle County website on the Board of Supervisors home page and on the Albemarle County calendar. Participation will include the opportunity to comment on those matters for which comments from the public will be received.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date 04/16/2025
Initials CKB