

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 9, 2022 at 3:00 p.m. This meeting was held by electronic communication means using Zoom and a telephonic connection, due to the COVID-19 state of emergency.

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

ABSENT: None.

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

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by the Chair, Ms. Donna Price.

Ms. Price said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(16), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." She said that the opportunities for the public to access and participate in the electronic meeting were posted on the Albemarle County website, on the Board of Supervisors' homepage, and on the Albemarle County calendar. He stated that participation included the opportunity to comment on those matters for which comments from the public would be received.

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session: FY2023 Operating and Capital Budget.

Mr. Andy Bowman, Chief of Budget, introduced the staff who would be helping him present that day and thanked them for their assistance. He presented the budget timeline to the Board and said everything would culminate in the adoption of the tax rate and Fiscal Year 2023 Budget at the Board's May 4th meeting. He said there would be no action requested from the Board at that day's work session. He said on March 14, the School Board chair would present and the CIP program would be discussed before the Board. He said no action was requested from the Board at the March 14 work session.

Mr. Bowman noted that at the March 17 meeting, the Board would be requested to propose a tax rate and a budget for advertisement. He said the budget could be amended beyond March 17, and the tax rate could be amended as well. He said the advertised tax rate selected by the Board on March 17 was a cap on the rate. He explained by example that if the Board advertised a rate of 85.4¢, the Board could adopt a rate of 85.4¢ or lower but not higher. He said March 14th would be the first time the Board would need to take action on anything.

Mr. Bowman explained the process for the budget work session meetings. He said there would be several points throughout the presentation for questions and comments from the Board as they work through the chapters of the budget document. He said for questions that were not immediately answerable or that required more information, the answers would be provided by email to the Board, and the questions and answers would be posted on the County's website for transparency with the public. He said staff would maintain a list of potential changes to the budget. He said if the Board felt adjustments were needed, staff would note those changes. He said requests for general information regarding processes, services, specifications, or other inquiries would be consolidated and responded to accordingly.

Mr. Bowman said he would begin with comments to elaborate on the County Executive's proposed budget. He said he would next cover the general fund revenues and expenditures in the functional areas and all the funds in the budget. He explained the general fund was the primary operating fund of the County. He said the school fund was the primary fund for school operations. He said capital and debt funds provided services for those projects and there were special revenue funds which referred to grants and outside funding the County may receive. He mentioned there were typically state or federal restrictions on the use of the grant funds.

Mr. Bowman said staff had received questions regarding the total budget increase of all funds by 21%. He explained the first driver of the revenue increase was the general fund local tax revenue. He said local tax revenue received into the general fund increase by \$49 million, or 18%, compared to the FY22 adopted budget. He noted that when the budget was adopted in May 2021, the County began to see a dramatic economic recovery and saw strong performance through the first two quarters of FY22.

Mr. Bowman said \$22 million in tax revenue was appropriated in December 2021 to move forward with projects that would have been otherwise recommended in the FY23 budget. He said of the 18% growth, under half was improvement reflected in December 2021, and the rest came forward in the revenue growth projected for FY23. He said state revenues were up \$11 million, or 12%, and were largely earmarked as support from the state for public school operations and capital projects.

Mr. Bowman said federal revenues were received through grants and other special revenue funds. He said federal revenues increased by \$15 million, or 67%, primarily due to \$12 million in American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding planned to be spent in FY23. He said the funding was an anomaly and was not projected to be in the FY24 budget.

Mr. Bowman said the CIP fund was based on when funds for projects were appropriated. He said in the case of FY23, there was a large, recommended appropriation where bond proceeds funded

projects like the increased capacity for high schools and the final phase of the courts' modernization project. He said other funds would be explained in detail at later work sessions.

Ms. McKeel asked if Mr. Bowman had sent a copy of the presentation to the supervisors.

Mr. Bowman said he had sent a copy of the presentation to the supervisors.

Mr. Bowman said the total general fund revenues were \$368.2 million. He said general property taxes contributed the most revenue followed by other local taxes and revenue, state funds, federal funds, and transfers. He noted federal revenue did not include ARPA funding—ARPA funds were accounted for separately. He noted state and federal funding made up about 9% of the total funds.

Mr. Bowman said the FY23 budget was balanced on a proposed real property tax rate of \$0.854 per \$100 of assessed value; the same rate as calendar year 2021. He explained that each penny on the tax rate generated \$2.3 million in estimated collectible tax revenues. He said the Board could raise or lower the rate and subsequently raise or lower the budget revenues.

Mr. Bowman said the "lowered" or "effective" tax rate was equal to \$0.788 per \$100 of assessed value. He said the term "lowered tax rate" was part of the Virginia code requirements for advertising the tax code for a public hearing. He said the lowered rate reflected what the proposed tax rate for FY23 would be in order to receive the same amount of tax dollars as was in the FY22 budget. He said the rate was based on the change in value of the reassessment and did not include changes due to new construction, new parcels, or land use status. He explained with an 8.4% total reassessment increase, if the percentage increase were removed from \$0.854, it would equal \$0.788.

Mr. Bowman noted that the tax relief program for the elderly and disabled was reported as an expenditure in the non-departmental chapter. He said the program totaled \$1.5 million—a 16% increase from the FY22 adopted budget. He said the increase in funding to the program reflected direction from the Board received on February 16 to update the program requirements.

Mr. Bowman said the personal property tax rate applied to individual vehicles, motorcycles, boats, business tangible personal property, and machinery and tools. He said the tax rate was first created in 1991 and later revised in 1993. He said the rate had not changed since 1993. He explained for calendar year 2022, there was a 26% average annual increase for personal property vehicle valuations. He said the increase was believed to be caused by the ripple effects of the pandemic—supply chain and material shortage issues. He noted there had been a large spike in vehicle valuations, particularly used vehicles. He said vehicles were an asset expected to depreciate over time. He said staff had concluded that reducing the personal property tax rate would be the best way to address the increase and would bring the rate in line with projected revenue from the fall. He said reducing the personal property rate would reduce an otherwise large and unexpected bill for individuals and businesses. He said the value of a penny on the personal property rate was approximately \$107,000.

Mr. Bowman said the County Executive commented that there was no perfect mix of revenues for a locality, but there were two ends of a spectrum. He said at one end of the spectrum were destination communities who were able to leverage spending from those who visited the community to generate revenues to support local services. He said at the other end of the spectrum were bedroom communities which relied on the community itself to generate revenues to fund services.

Mr. Bowman said the more diversified the revenue sources, the more resilient the budget would be in the long-term. He said in FY07, 60% of general fund revenue came from real property tax revenue, and by FY22, real property tax made up 68.5% of the revenues. He said real estate assessment growth had outpaced other revenue areas.

Mr. Bowman said the Board had worked at the state level to give the County greater taxing authority to reduce the reliance on property taxes. He said the Board had been given authority and had enacted a cigarette tax effective on January 1, and a plastic bag tax was being considered. He mentioned there was additional taxing authority for transient occupancy taxes and food and beverage taxes.

Mr. Bowman said the authority to increase the rates for transient occupancy taxes and food and beverage taxes was granted by the General Assembly during the 2020 session. He said two rate changes were recommended to match the City's rates. He said the change was to recognize that thousands of people visited the community for vacations, sporting events, weddings, and to experience its natural and historic resources. He said the County was a regional hub for commercial activity. He said increases in the tax rate for transient occupancy taxes and food and beverage taxes would make incremental progress to shift revenues from the people who live in the County and to people who visited.

Mr. Bowman said the graph displayed the food and beverage tax and transient occupancy tax revenues by quarter from the start of FY18 to the end of the second quarter of FY22. He said the full impacts from the pandemic were first seen in the fourth quarter of FY20. He said since the fourth quarter of FY20, the revenues had been on an increasing trend through the second quarter of FY22. He said the first two quarters of FY22 exceeded the performance of FY20 in the quarter-over-quarter comparisons.

Mr. Bowman compared the food and beverage and transient occupancy tax rates to the City and other localities. He said the County tax rates were 4% for food and beverage and 5% for transient occupancy.

Mr. Bowman said the cigarette tax went into effect on January 1, 2022. He said FY23 would be the first full year of the cigarette tax and revenue would total \$1.2 million in revenue. He said the revenue would be allocated amongst the schools and the CIP using a local tax sharing formula. He said County government recommended to allocate its portion of the funds to the community response team, the operating costs for the streetsweeper, and the administrative costs for the regional program that the County participates in to administer the tax.

Mr. Bowman said the plastic bag tax would generate approximately \$20,000 in revenue for a half-year. He said the tax was proposed to be effective on January 1, 2023. He said the state restricted the use of the tax revenue to environmental cleanup programs, pollution and litter mitigation programs, educational programs on environmental waste reduction, and providing reusable bags to recipients of SNAP and WIC benefits. He said the tax had been implemented in other Virginia localities on January 1, so the County would analyze data from those localities over the coming year to understand on a per-establishment basis how to improve revenue figures. He said the data was limited and challenging to predict.

Mr. Bowman said several Board members had requested more information regarding the state revenue assumptions. He said the recommended budget included a total of \$25.6 million from state sources – 7% of the general fund revenues. He said personal property tax relief was the largest category of state funds. He explained the state provided funding to the County which appeared as a credit on rate payer's personal property tax relief. He said the funding had been static since the late 2000s, and there was no risk the figure would change based on signaling from the state.

Mr. Bowman said the second largest category of state funds was the reimbursement received from the Department of Social Services programs. He said many of the programs were implemented on a reimbursement basis, whether it be the staff who provide the program or reimbursement for the direct services that are provided to the community and reimbursed later. He said there were no signals from the state that the \$4 million in funding would change.

Mr. Bowman said, moving on to the next category, the state provided \$2.7 million to support the operating budgets of the constitutional officers and registrar. He mentioned the state funding did not fully fund operational costs. He said the funding was determined from a formula. He said the state compensation board or state electoral board provided funding to those operations and the County further subsidized the services.

Mr. Bowman said, based on the House of Delegates and Senate's budgets, the County was comfortable that the revenue projection aligned with the current assumptions for the state budget. He said there could be variants in the projections.

Mr. Bowman said the fourth category the state provided funds for was \$2.7 million for public safety support particularly for the police department and fire rescue department. He said the County budget matched the House of Delegates budget which assumed level funding. He said the Senate budget included an increase in funding for police departments through House Bill (HB) 599. He said HB599 was not considered in the recommended County budget. He said the amount to be distributed to the County and the amount to be incorporated was to be determined.

Mr. Bowman said a remaining \$1.2 million was received from other state sources, such as the vehicle rental tax which went to the state and was remitted back to the County. He said there were no changes expected for that revenue source. He said a number of bills were introduced at the beginning of session addressing revenue authority, but many had failed or had been tabled.

Mr. Bowman said the County continued to work with its partners to evaluate the state budget as it progressed through its final phases. He said there were impacts outside of the general fund. He said the most notable bill, the grocery tax, reflected different approaches at the state and local level. He said the intent was to hold localities harmless. He said there was a proposal to hold localities harmless for the education funding by diverting funding from transportation. He said it would fill holes in the education budget, but it would impact money coming directly to the County and the funding the County received from VDOT.

Mr. Bowman said the school system would discuss its revenue picture and operating budget on March 14. He said school capital funding was included in the Senate budget and the governor's recommended budget. He said there was approximately \$3.6 million in school construction funding that the County government had accounted for. He said the House had not included the \$3.6 million in funding in its bill. He said the uses of the \$3.6 million would be discussed on Monday.

Ms. McKeel asked how the timing of the state budget process affected the timing of the County's budget process.

Mr. Bowman said the schedule for the state budget expected the budget to be adopted in late April. He said the governor would adopt the budget and state agencies and administrative functions would communicate the funding details. He said the state did not always meet its budget timeline. He said updates could be provided to the Board regarding areas of risk related to the budget.

Ms. McKeel said the administrative costs referenced on slide 17 of Mr. Bowman's presentation referred to the administrative costs for the program that the County shared with other localities.

Mr. Bowman said the administrative costs were about \$70,000 that went to the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission to pay for the County's share of the overall partnership.

Ms. Mallek said on page 11, it mentioned each penny on the tax rate was equal to \$2.38 million. She asked if the math and basis for the figure could be explained.

Mr. Bowman said calculations were listed on page 51 for the total amount of revenue the County was projected to receive. He said the calculations were based on the known reassessments, the reassessment projected for the next year, and other assumptions made regarding revenue collections. He said for real estate, the collected revenue was expected to be between \$197-198 million, which divided by \$0.854 generated the number of \$2.38 million per penny. He said as property values increased and the total number of parcels increased the collected revenues increased.

Ms. Mallek said she understood reducing the tax for personal vehicles this year. She asked if County staff were treating it as an equalized tax rate for that category. She asked how the citizens would be informed that this was a one-time change and that the Board would readjust the tax rate back in the future. She said she was surprised to hear that the rates had not really been changed since 1993.

Mr. Bowman said an equalized rate had not been done for personal property. He said, comparing this budget to the previous year, there was a 13% increase in personal property revenue budget-to-budget. He said in November the County was projecting that revenue would grow about 4.5% to 5% in FY22 and then another 4.5% to 5% in FY23. He said staff edited the budget to bring the revenue down to a level that would be comparable to what it was projected to be in the fall.

Mr. Bowman said in terms of the next year's budget, it was difficult to determine the path forward because the used-car market was unpredictable. He said the Board would decide the best approach forward after weighing all the aspects, such as real estate information, comparisons to reassessments, other revenue supplies, and the needs and expenditures of the community.

Ms. Mallek said she was a firm believer and strong support of reusable, strong, fabric bags because they could carry heavy loads. She said the grand majority of reusable bags were also made of plastic. She hoped that the County would be diligent to use real fabric reusable bags instead of plastic-based bags. She said the County would be greenwashing its efforts otherwise.

Mr. Gallaway asked what the dollar amount cost to the County was to adjust the personal property tax rate to \$3.42.

Mr. Bowman said the impact of the rate change was about \$12 million. He said he would provide the exact figure to the Board in a follow-up to the meeting.

Mr. Gallaway said the rate adjustment from \$4.28 to \$3.42 cost the County \$12 million dollars. He asked what adjustment to the real estate property tax rate would generate the same dollar impact.

Mr. Richardson said a real estate tax rate adjustment of \$0.05 would equal about \$12 million.

Mr. Gallaway said he supported the personal property tax rate adjustment. He said the vehicle reassessment values were an anomaly, and he did not know if it would stop increasing by next year. He said the average increase was 26%, and some cars had increased by 40% to 50% in cost over the previous year. He said it was a significant change and who could know when the prices would start to come back down. He asked if there were case studies to show the impacts of the rate adjustment on the average car owner. He asked if examples were available for or what the average tax bill would be based on the average car value.

Mr. Bowman said he did not have examples at the moment, but he could prepare materials. He said while the calculations for real estate values were simple because they were similar regardless of home value, the calculations for personal property tax were not. He said state funding applied differently to different car values and types. He said examples could be provided for cars of particular types and values.

Mr. Gallaway said it would be helpful for the constituents to have the examples. He said the tax on vehicles was a tax most people saw. He said the tax on real estate was often handled differently, unless they own their home outright, but it feels a little different to come down to the county office building and write a check. He said it was important for the change to be explained to individuals, especially if their personal property tax bill doubled from one year to the next.

Mr. Galaway asked if the \$3.6 million for the schools and CIP from the state was included or excluded from the budget.

Mr. Bowman said the \$3.6 million from the state was factored into the CIP and would be discussed on Monday.

Mr. Gallaway asked if a backup plan was needed in case the funds from the state were to change.

Mr. Bowman said Mr. Gallaway was correct.

Mr. Andrews thanked Mr. Galaway for his questions and his comparison that the \$12 million cost to the county was equivalent to a potential \$0.05 decrease in the tax rate for real estate. He requested more information about relief programs and processes for personal property taxes compared to real estate tax relief programs. He asked if occupancy rates had recovered the same as the occupancy tax revenues. He asked whether the RSWA would be a beneficiary of revenue from the plastic bag tax. He noted there were payments in lieu of taxes for state and federal landowners, and the projected increases in payments were smaller than the increase in reassessments.

Ms. Price said she supported the personal property tax reduction because it provided equitable relief. She supported reducing the percentage of revenues from real estate taxes. She supported increasing the transient occupancy tax by 3% and the meals tax by 2%. She said when she travelled, she did not consider the transient occupancy tax. She said a 2% increase was not substantial for the meals tax.

Mr. Bowman clarified the follow-up items. He said Mr. Gallaway had asked about scenarios for personal property tax impacts. He said Mr. Andrews had requested data on occupancy rates and an explanation about the payments in lieu of taxes. He said there were longer term follow-up items regarding the plastic bag tax asked for by Ms. Mallek and Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Andrews mentioned he wanted more information comparing the personal property and real estate tax relief programs.

Ms. Price said some of the dollars from taxes such as the transient occupancy tax were dedicated to the CACVB. She said the ability to use the transient occupancy revenue to encourage visitors to the community was beneficial.

Mr. Bowman said the budget process began with the strategic plan which included nine priorities and quality government operations. He said the County was in the final year of its strategic plan and was looking to prepare a new strategic plan as part of FY23. He said the County was guided by principles of ensuring its financial foundation, securing the economic outlook, and workforce stabilization.

Mr. Bowman said general fund expenditures totaled \$368.2 million because a balanced budget was required by law. He said the largest portion of the general fund was the transfer of funds to the school division. He said the second largest expenditures was public safety, and the third largest expenditure category was transfers to capital and debt, about \$36 million.

Mr. Bowman said there was a notable increase in fuel prices that had been factored into the budget. He noted the projection was prior to the current fuel price increases. He said the price needed to be monitored as a budget management issue because neither the fuel prices nor the duration of the increase could be accurately predicted.

Mr. Bowman said the rate of vehicle replacements was increasing over the previous year. He said in FY21, the County suspended all non-public safety vehicle replacements and dramatically reduced the number of public safety vehicle replacements. He said the County had gradually built back to a responsible asset management program.

Mr. Bowman said in FY22, public safety vehicle replacements had been reinstated to pre-pandemic levels and minimal non-public safety vehicle replacements were completed. He said in FY23, the County continued to return to a more normal fleet level. He said if the County did not start to return to a normal fleet, it would face higher maintenance costs, increased down time, and decreased vehicle reliability. He said the increased vehicle maintenance was phased in with one-time funding.

Mr. Bowman said \$2.8 million had been included to fund a 4% salary increase effective on July 1 for County employees. He said there was an additional \$1.5 million to begin to implement a mid-year salary study that was approved in December. He said the new County human resources office would undertake the study later in the year. He said the intent of the funding was to position the Board and organization to move forward at the right time. He said \$1.3 million was included to reflect a 6% health insurance premium increase, and there was a \$0.7 million dollar increase from the Virginia Retirement System (VRS). He said the state determined the rates, and the cost increase was mandated.

Mr. Bowman said in December during the mid-year update, the County Executive presented a strategy to provide a mid-year adjustment to FY22, the 6% market adjustment, and to include an additional adjustment in FY23 along with additional market analyses and the establishment of a new human resources office. He said the final goal would be to put the County in a position to implement the results of the compensation study.

Mr. Bowman said 7% of the County government positions were unfilled. He said the 7% did not include positions that were approved and not yet filled from the December budget update. He said from FY13 to FY20, by mid-year, 3% to 5% of positions were unfilled. He said 7% of the workforce equaled about 18 to 36 positions above the usual turnover. He said the positions were vacant and the services had to be provided by the existing staff. He said over the years, the data was examined to determine where the staffing impacts were felt. He said the recruitment and retention issues were widespread and not the result of any particular department. He said the issue was more widespread than previous years.

Mr. Bowman said the retirement numbers from the beginning of FY22 to date were greater than the retirements during FY21 and FY20. He said the number was expected to grow by the end of the fiscal

year. He said the County had a plan to evaluate compensation and to position the Board for future implementation. He said the County was not immune to workforce changes. He said in the County Executive's presentation in February, it was noted there were many positions slated to begin mid-year. He said the County was simultaneously recruiting and retaining the existing workforce as well as filling positions to enhance the services called for in the FY23 budget.

Ms. McKeel said she supported the salary study. She asked if Mr. Bowman could clarify what market adjustments were for the public.

Mr. Bowman said the market adjustment term was used to distinguish the raise from merit increases. He said part of the distinction was to communicate the salary adjustment was across the organization. He said the County had a competitive labor market, competing with local organizations and other localities throughout the state.

Ms. Mia Coltrane, Director of Human Resources, said the County looked for a skillset that was desired across similar localities in similar financial situations. She said as bonuses and stipends were added to these positions to attract talent, the County had to be competitive. She said there a huge challenge in the technical skills or technical areas such as engineering.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated the comparison of the job vacancy numbers. She said the vacancies were significant.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked Ms. Coltrane to clarify the engineering problems.

Ms. Coltrane said the workforce issues were experienced in the technical areas and in the departments that required a specific expertise as well as across the organization.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the retirements were occurring in a particular department.

Ms. Coltrane said the retirements were occurring across the organization.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if a majority of the retirements were in the technical field.

Ms. Coltrane said in the technical fields and the fields that required higher levels of certification, potential employees received higher offers from other organizations than what the County offered.

Mr. Gallaway said the job vacancy rate put the County in a crisis mode. He noted the rate was 18 to 36 positions above the usual turnover, and retention was not yet addressed because the compensation study needed to be completed. He said there needed to be urgency around the issue. He asked if staff had any comments.

Ms. Coltrane said the new recruiter began on Monday. She said the task was to get an idea of the needs of the departments. She said there were staffing issues from public safety departments to the HR department due to job competition. She said having a dedicated recruiter to address the challenges would be beneficial.

Mr. Gallaway said if the County did not get ahead of the necessary changes and retention became a problem, then retention on top of recruitment challenges would cause an issue. He asked where the 6% adjustment along with the 4% adjustment put the County in respect to inflation.

Ms. Coltrane said it was hard to say. She said when compared to the competition, such as similarly situated localities, other departments offered entry level bonuses, stipends, sign-on bonuses, and certification bonuses, so it was hard to determine how the County compared.

Mr. Gallaway noted that the compensation study was necessary.

Ms. Coltrane said the County needed to first determine a baseline.

Mr. Gallaway asked Mr. Bowman to confirm the cost of the compensation study.

Mr. Bowman said the study was assumed to cost \$0.5 million. He said the assumption was prepared by examining the cost of past compensation studies, the number of employees, and the number of adjustments. He said staff would be connected with the HR team to better inform the discussions. He said without a baseline, it was difficult to know where the County needed to adjust. He said the goal was to position the Board to move forward sooner rather than wait for the next budget process to implement a project.

Mr. Gallaway said the \$500,000 was a placeholder value.

Mr. Bowman said Mr. Gallaway was correct.

Mr. Gallaway said the \$1 million included for workforce stabilization did not include the \$500,000 for the compensation study.

Mr. Bowman said Mr. Gallaway was correct. He said there was a total of \$1.5 million, of which \$500,000 was ongoing funding and \$1 million was one-time funding. He said the funds would be

deployed to support workforce stabilization as part of the strategy from the compensation study.

Mr. Gallaway said the \$1 million for workforce stabilization was funded from one-time moneys. He asked for more information regarding what the money would be spent on.

Mr. Bowman said during the five-year planning process in December, staff shared an audit on what the year-end fund balance looked like. He said approximately \$13.2 million was allocated, and four areas of investment were considered: the capital fund, the housing fund, economic development, and workforce stabilization. He said staff did not want to be prescriptive to certain solutions, it provided the flexibility to move forward when the results of the compensation study were received.

Mr. Gallaway said the County could potentially offer a signing bonus. He asked if the funding would come from the workforce stabilization funding.

Mr. Bowman said that could be an option, but staff would look to the compensation study for recommendations.

Mr. Gallaway said he wanted to ensure that the one-time funds were used for one-time expenses.

Mr. Bowman said that would be part of the considerations.

Mr. Gallaway asked for the cost of a 1% raise for staff.

Mr. Bowman said the cost was approximately \$700,000, including the impacts and benefits—the compensation and benefits such as retirement.

Mr. Gallaway asked if staff was encountering issues related to vehicle availability when it replaced its fleet. He wanted to know if there were supply chain issues.

Mr. Bowman said there were supply chain issues. He said vehicles were ordered the previous summer at the start of the budget process, and some had not arrived or had arrived recently. He said the situation would be monitored closely.

Mr. Gallaway said he presumed there was a cost buffer in the funding for vehicle replacements.

Mr. Bowman said part of the approach for the non-public safety fleet was that it was easing back into a replacement plan, but it wanted to provide flexibility to FES as it managed the non-public safety fleet. He said the budget gave FES the flexibility to respond to changes in terms of the price and type of vehicle depending on the need.

Mr. Gallaway noted the fuel reimbursement figures of \$100,000. He said he presumed the moneys added for operational cost would be added to the fuel reimbursement fund.

Mr. Bowman said he would discuss the details of the proposal during the public safety section.

Mr. Gallaway asked if there was a fuel reserve.

Mr. Bowman said there was a time when the County managed a separate fuel reserve, but some of the reserves had been collapsed into larger contingencies, and rather than have a reserve for every situation, there was one larger reserve to address the need.

Mr. Gallaway said if fuel doubled in price, then the contingency reserve would be used.

Mr. Andrews asked Mr. Bowman to clarify the relation between the 18 to 36 vacant positions and the 3%, 5%, and 7% vacancy rates.

Mr. Bowman said there were approximately 900 FTEs in the FY23 recommended budget. He explained that 1% of 900 was 9, so the 18 to 36 vacant positions represented anywhere from 2% (9 multiplied by 2) to 4% (9 multiplied by 4). He said 2% and 4% were used because they represented the difference between 7% and 5% (2%), and 7% and 3% (4%).

Mr. Andrews said there were unfilled positions approved as part of the prior budget.

Mr. Bowman added that the County budgeted for the electrician through the budget process, knowing that it would never be 100% staffed throughout the year. He said the County did not assume 100% staffing during the budget process—it budgeted based on 2/3 of its experience so that it was not overbudgeting but also allowing flexibility. He said turnover and salary lapses were part of running an operating budget.

Ms. Nelsie Birch, Chief Financial Officer, said she wanted to clarify the response to Mr. Gallaway's question regarding the use of the \$1 million for workforce stabilization and the implementation of the class and compensation study for one-time needs. She said there could be a situation where the County received the results of the class and compensation study and needed to put an infusion of dollars into people who were in a specific category of positions.

Ms. Birch said workforce stabilization would be an ongoing cost, but the \$1 million in one-time

funding would help smooth retention. She said the \$1 million was to help the County understand that there would be an expense, but the County did not know the extent of the expense until the study was completed. She said the County needed to be prepared for the results so that any decision that had to be made could be paid for fully if it would be an ongoing cost. She said she wanted to make the distinction so that the Board understood that there could be ongoing costs associated with workforce stabilization.

Mr. Gallaway said the alternative approach would be to rather than take one-time funds designated for workforce stabilization, the County could take operating money from somewhere and not use the money so it would be available for workforce stabilization. He said \$1 million could be made available for operating costs, or \$1 million could be used one-time and then planned for in the future.

Ms. Birch said Mr. Gallaway was correct.

Mr. Bowman said there was ongoing funding for the Yancey Community Center grant. He explained the Yancey coordinator position was funded with one-time money for three years. He said the County would take on the cost of the position for FY23 if it was successful as part of its long-range financial plan. He said the position was in the Yancey Community Center, and part of the work was the related to the center itself and the on-the-ground connections to individuals and organizations.

Mr. Bowman said because of the workload associate with the comprehensive plan, two three-year temporary engagement coordinators were proposed to support the committees and neighborhood development teams. He said the model of the Yancey coordinator would be used to build relationships with individuals and the community organizations in other parts of the County.

Mr. Bowman said in the Board of Supervisor's budget, there was a position for a boards and commissions coordinator. He noted there were over 50 boards and commissions that had open seats for community member appointments. He said the budget recommended providing a dedicated administrative support position to ensure community members had a good experience from application, employment, and training.

Mr. Bowman said it would be the first year of the County government HR department. He said the change was already set in motion to provide the positions and operating costs for County government policies. He said there were three changes for the Department of Finance and Budget. He said one position was paid for via the capital improvements plan. He said the reason was because the position was for a senior procurement specialist who would provide support primarily to the school capital program. He said the position would support the normal school maintenance replacement projects, which began with three schools over the next five years, and the growing capital needs. He said the position was about providing a dedicated resource to move the capital program forward.

Mr. Bowman said the budget proposed to hire three accountants. He said a revenue analyst was proposed to observe and improve revenue analysis functions. He noted that the Department of Finance and Budget was thinking differently about how it managed across offices and departments. He said the position would support revenue analysis across multiple functions in the department.

Mr. Bowman said two positions were proposed relating to information technology. He said one position began during the pandemic and was funded from the pandemic reserve. He said the position provided audio and visual support during hybrid and virtual meetings. He said there was a systems engineer position to manage devices and the strain on the networks. He said the positions were designed to support the efforts of the County.

Mr. Bowman said the Voter Registration and Elections department had a fully funded budget request. He said most departments were steady year to year, but the Voter Registration and Elections department's needs changed based on the election cycle. He noted that with fewer primaries and a forecasted lower turnout than the prior year, this was a down year. He said staff was in regular communication with the registrar and monitored the state requirements for elections. He said if there was a supplemental procreation that was needed, he wanted the County to be able to respond and provide fair elections.

Ms. McKeel said she supported the new positions. She asked for clarification regarding how many agencies the County represented as a fiscal agent. She noted the County used to be the fiscal agent of the Albemarle County Regional Jail (ACRJ), but now the jail was its own agent.

Ms. Birch said the County supported about nine groups where it was the fiscal agent. She said one of the groups used to be ACRJ. She said the County was evaluating the existing fiscal agent relationships, such as the Blue Ridge Juvenal Detention Center (BRJDC). She said ACRJ also supported some of the financial services, procurement, and technology needs of BRJDC. She said the MOU was being updated to clearly define the needs of the BRJDC.

Ms. Birch said the County provided services for ECC, and they were beginning to discuss the support needed from the County. She said the County was determining how best to support the agencies that relied on it. She said staff was actively engaged in conversations with its partners. She said there were many entities that might receive a grant but could not receive the grant themselves—it had to be passed through a local government. She said the County was adding administrative costs to recoup the costs of processing grants and to be clear about responsibilities. She said agreements would be drafted with existing partners. She said previously, the agreements had been less formal.

Mr. Jacob Sumner said the basis for the analysis was in the cost allocation plan, which was an annual process. He said it helped the County have an understanding of the administrative costs to provide services to the departments. He said conversations were being had with partners and MOUs were being updated as the relationships moved forward.

Ms. McKeel asked for more clarity regarding the duties of the neighborhood and community engagement specialist positions. She said there was the boards and commissions position, which she supported, and she wanted more clarity.

Ms. Emily Kilroy, Director of Communications and Public Engagement, said the idea around the neighborhood and engagement coordinator positions was that the staff working on the Comprehensive Plan, estimated to be a three-year endeavor, was the same team that supported the seven CACs. She said in order for the team to focus on the work of the Comprehensive Plan, there was a need to staff the team differently.

Ms. Kilroy explained temporary positions were proposed to be in alignment with the timeline of the Comprehensive Plan process to support the needs of the CACs. She said the work required to support the CACs, from preparation before meetings to debriefing after meetings, was a little shy of two full-time positions.

Ms. Kilroy said the Yancey coordinator position had been in place for several years. She noted part of the job was running the center itself such as programming for the center and ensuring tenants need were met. She said the real benefit in the position was the community connections the County had on the ground in southern Albemarle. She said the two temporary positions would focus on other parts of the County to build similar connection across the community.

Ms. McKeel said her CAC had lost a staff person, and it had caused challenges. She asked for more information regarding the boards and commissions position.

Ms. Coltrane said she felt she had come up with a good draft that would support the boards and commissions that performed a lot of those administrative duties, and this person would be a liaison to the approximately 55 boards and commissions, bringing everything together in a sense of coordinating, making sure training was done, paperwork was done, and anything in that strain. She said she looked at other localities that had similarly situated positions and combined pieces and different components, looked at the County's salary structure and current classification system of jobs that were similarly situated as well, and then came up with a working draft that said that this position would be a one stop shop for all things administrative when it came to boards and commissions.

Ms. McKeel said she was extremely supportive of this, because of all of their boards and commissions. She said this job was not going to include going out and recruiting people, but it was more about supporting the boards and commissions and keeping the process organized and having a person to be able to turn to for help.

Ms. Coltrane said yes, that was what this position was.

Ms. McKeel said there was a study a few years ago about how to support their boards and commissions' work better, and that particular study recommended a staff person to help with that, so they were following what that recommendation was. She said she was very supportive of the creation of positions such as this one.

Ms. Mallek said in 2009, they had a 15%, 75-person reduction in staff, and they were crawling their way back to that level as needs were increasing in every department. She said she had a similar question regarding the boards and commissions position, and she assumed at one time going forward there would be a formal discussion about this. She said while they talked about it individually and briefly many months ago, they had not had a general discussion about it.

Ms. Mallek said she had also heard there would be general recruitment of people at the CACs and she was glad to know that would not be a part of it, because she thought it deserved a more organic approach to have it happen at the CAC level than to have someone from downtown doing recruitment. She said she was looking forward to seeing the draft job description. She said her main question for a future discussion was what department the job should be classified. She said if the task was coordinating with executive staff, doing something like updating the website, then that was not a Board clerk job, it was an executive job. She said she looked forward to learning more about this new position.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said Ms. Mallek was speaking about the boards and commissions position being able to update the website, and someone like that should be able to do that, so she agreed that should be clarified. She said keeping that whole process up to date and current was extremely important. She said she also read somewhere that it was to recruit, and she was glad to hear it was not going to be a recruitment position, but that it would be to keep everything organized, so she was interested in seeing how that worked. She said she would like to see what positions, boards, or commissions needed to change meeting schedules or composition. She said she did not understand the CAPE position at all, and she was glad it was going to be helping the CACs and going out for community engagement. She asked if the two people being recruited would be up to date with the CACs as they worked through the comprehensive plan process.

Ms. Kilroy said that several years ago, the CACs were staffed out of what was then called

“Community Relations,” which was what CAPE was taking the place of. She said a couple of years ago, they were shifted over to Community Development. She said this was sort of a backfill to allow the neighborhood planning team to focus on the comprehensive plan, so these positions helped backfill the need for staff support for the CACs. She said right now, the CACs had staff presentations from across organizations, and not solely from Community Development. She said they recognized that there was a lot of Community Development time that went into the areas of interest that the members serving had.

Ms. Kilroy said the staffed liaisons would continue to work with staff across the organization to prepare presentations, updates, and things to keep the CACs engaged with what was going on in the County. She said some of the time when they were not specifically working with the committee, they would be connecting back to the organization through the work of the CAPE office to determine what the things were that people needed to know about and what the best way to share that information was, and then facilitate an update from Parks and from Transportation at the interest of the group. She said she hoped it would not feel different just by shifting it from CDD into CAPE, and that the staff working in those positions would perform the same functions they had over the past several years.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if a CAC wanted an update on a development that was coming in, the CAPE person would get that information from staff and then make a presentation to the CAC.

Ms. Kilroy said it would depend. She said if it were a specific development application, they would still have the reviewer from Community Development to come do that. She said the CACs had been the venue for community meetings for special use permits and rezoning applications before the County, and the staff person who was assigned to that application would be part of the community meeting at the CAC. She said they expected that to continue, so it was more of the roles that Ms. Falkenstein, Ms. Accardi, Ms. Kanellopoulos, and various others had served to make sure there was an agenda, make sure everyone knew where the meetings were, making sure the rooms were reserved, and working before the meeting to make sure the presenters were prepared, and after the meeting if there were questions that staff not present at the meeting could answer, they would make sure those responses went out. She said it was a lot of coordinating and planning to make sure the staff CAC meetings remained effective.

Mr. Gallaway said he had a question for Mr. Bowman. He said the Board of Supervisors had the 91-889 deduction, but it was a combination of the cost of the annual audit that was being moved with Finance and Budget plus the increase of the public hearing advertisement cost, and that difference was \$34,111 and in the finance budget it said 125 or 126 was being moved from the Board of Supervisors budget to Finance and Budget. He asked if the \$34,111 was just public hearing cost increases, or if it was a combination of some other increases associated with the public hearings.

Mr. Bowman said they could get back to him with an answer. He said he did not see the \$34,111 that Mr. Gallaway referred to.

Mr. Gallaway said he took the 126 in the finance budget on page 89, subtracted \$91,889, and that was the difference he got. He said he may have done that incorrectly. He said where he saw a deduction in one place and where it was moved to and the numbers did not match, he would like to understand. He said it was clearly a decrease in the Supervisors' budget because the cost for the audit was moving, but there was also an increase in there somewhere, so he was trying to understand what that increase was. He said the figure he got for the increase was \$34,111. He asked if the cost of hybrid and virtual meetings was classified under the operating of Board of Supervisors or IT.

Mr. Bowman said it would be under the Information Technology budget. He said it currently was in a couple of departments, but Information Technology would be the long-term home for where that cost would be.

Mr. Gallaway said they were pulling apart local government HR and school HR. He said the assumed the operating cost budget line for local government moving forward was based on operations so far, but since it was a new approach, he wanted to ask if they were certain what the operating costs for that local government HR side were, and if not, they always had reserves and other places to turn if they were a little off. He said he wanted to make sure that was set up and had the resources to do what needed to be done, especially in year one.

Ms. Coltrane said they looked at individual salaries and what would potentially bring those individuals in per area per position. She said that was their first and foremost research. She said they worked with their existing HR department to look at expenditures that local government was using in order to get a baseline of what was being spent currently. She said once they got into the first year, they could assess for subsequent years on if they needed to increase or decrease in certain areas, but they had to get a baseline, so they started off with just the salaries for staff first and then went along with what they already had in place from an operating standpoint with just local government now.

Mr. Gallaway said on page 89 for the revenue analyst position, and the three accountant positions, the sentence that existed there said “these positions will improve the revenue analysis function and provide organizational readiness and advance to the core systems modernization project.” He said he thought he understood what that meant but would like an explanation of what the positions would be doing.

Ms. Birch said that revenue analysis was something that, before she came into her position, was done by an economist in Finance and Budget. She said that position was moved to Community

Development, and that person had since left. She said that function failed to be absorbed with the people on the team. She said the economic piece, which they were now looking at partnering with an outside entity to help with the analysis of, was helping project future revenues. She said when they went through the last two years since Mr. Bowman had been part of the Department of Budget and Finance, working with the County Assessor, and Jian Linn, Chief of Revenue Administration and her team, there needed to be someone who was cultivating and using the revenue data all year long, so they did not have to pick it up when they got into budget season and figure it out. She said they were at that place where revenues were difficult to project and they needed someone on all the time. She said that was the revenue analysis piece, and that was being cobbled together as Mr. Bowman as the lead and other people involved, but they realized that one person needed to be responsible for all of that work.

Ms. Birch said the second piece was related to the three accountants. She said this was to prepare them for the systems modernization. She said in her time there, they had looked at a lot of things. She said Ms. McKeel had asked for their support of external partners and what that had done for them, and that was one area where they had looked at their capacity. She said the other area where they had looked at their capacity was in their accounting function. She said their current number of four accountants was not an ample amount of a County this size and complexity as they were about to launch a new system and wanted to make sure it was fully integrated and they had the appropriate backfill.

Ms. Birch said the vision was that they were using and would onboard these accountants to run the day-to-day accounting as they used their subject matter experts to help develop the future state of their new financial system, and once that was developed and fully implemented, the full complement would handle all of the accounting functions in the future state. She said six accountants, even with the new system, would be a good complement. She asked Mr. Gallaway if she was able to explain the distinction between the two and how they supported the efforts moving forward.

Mr. Gallaway said she explained it very well. He said when and how they projected revenues was very important. He said his first year on the Board, the timing of when revenue projections were done, because there was some subjectivity into a revenue projection, was important for them to stay on top of year-round, not just as needed when a budget conversation came up. He said in the Finance and Budget, on page 89, there was a \$42,000 increase in payroll services. He said anytime that was seen, he knew it was covered by savings elsewhere, because the new payroll services would allow them to be a little bit more efficient than before. He said it was easy to look at a budget of their size and skip over a \$42,000 increase, but he would like to know if it was truly an increase or if it was offset somehow. He said he did not need an in-depth answer right now, but he wanted to know that their department tracked as this type of increase went up, it was offset somewhere else, even if it was not matched to the dollar.

Ms. Birch said she believed she and Mr. Gallaway had this discussion at some point in the past. She said she did not want to mislead the Board when it came to the core systems modernization and where they were as an organization. She said one of the areas they were focused on were not efficiency gains that they would see where they were making that investment and would see dramatic efficiencies, partly because of the complexity and the things they had not necessarily focused on in the organization would now get the focus they had not been able to in the past. She said she had worked hard to look at all the areas they were responsible for and making sure they were fully complying with federal law, state law, and local laws. She said they were not doing it at the level they would in the future, but the system allowed them to see things and focus on what the areas of issue were. She said right now, because it was so manual, it was hard for them to see where the issues were. She said in a system that allowed them to see things from beginning to end, all in one system, then they could triage it differently. She said the goal would be to do exactly what Mr. Gallaway said. She said they were starting to look at performance measures, were beginning to track things like ADP implementation with payroll and see things they were never able to see in the old system about efficiency, effectiveness of pay and all the metrics that they would want to have. She said she wanted to be careful that this was not all for efficiency. She said they would get efficiency over time as they developed, trained, and built their teams. She said they would not see it at the moment with the investments they were making.

Mr. Gallaway said they would be watching it and telling that story over time.

Ms. Price said she was glad Mr. Washburn was present with regard to the election allocation. She said they were waiting for the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals to determine whether they were going to have a House of Delegates election this year. She said it was anticipated that by the end of the month a decision would come out, and if they did, they were looking at likely a primary in August and possibly a runoff, so she would ask that some calculation be made as to what those expenses might be if they did have to have an election. She apologized for skipping over Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Andrews said he did not have much to add on the core systems modernization, because the other Supervisors' comments had been great. He said the difference between efficiency and efficacy was what was being driven at there, and he thought that was great. He said he was going to make a comment about redistricting, so he thought Chair Price's comments would be helpful on that.

Ms. Price said she wanted to remind the Supervisors they had used 2/3 of their time and had only gone through 1/3 of their outline. She said they wanted to make sure they got their substance done but should watch the time.

Mr. Bowman said they would now look at the judicial function area. He said that section included the budgets for the three elected constitutional officers that were fully funded, as well as courts operations. He said he had no further comments on that chapter, but he wanted to thank their

constitutional officers for being present as they had been waiting on the call just for their partnership throughout the budget process.

Mr. Gallaway said he wanted to recognize that there were some programs being implemented through their Commonwealth Attorney's Office that helped offset capacity at the jail, speaking more to support services, which he saw as cost avoidance. He said that was recognized and appreciated, so he just wanted to offer that out to Mr. Angelo.

Mr. Bowman said the next section was public safety. He said the budget included two new police officer positions to help strengthen the squad-based policing model to foster deeper coordination and relationships with the community. He said they had the budget-neutral change where they were converting a part-time Victim Witness Program position to regular full-time. He said their office had challenged departments for those positions where they had temporary or part-time employees but there was. Demonstrated long-term need to look at the conversion of these employees and to find a way in their current budget to reprioritize funding to address those needs. He said it was not a budget impact but it did convert the position.

Mr. Bowman said the contributions to public safety agencies were largely based upon the shares of the regional agreement. He said the change in the Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail was about that funding agreement and the other changes that happened in their budget with the state, rather than a decrease in service. He said there were a few notable changes with the Fire Rescue Department. He said the first was with the Pantops Public Safety Station, which included funding to operate the fire engine there 24/7, which was currently operating weekdays in the daytime. He said that would further support the fire rescue service there in the County's development area. He said in the long-term, it would further reduce their reliance on the City of Charlottesville for calls east of the City.

Mr. Bowman said the County currently had a City Fire contract that for FY23 had an estimated cost of \$240k, and it was due to be renegotiated in the near future. He said putting these resources in place would be meeting FY23, but in the long-term would provide an offset to the costs, whatever they may be, when it was renegotiated, and it also would provide that service in the development area itself rather than responding for a more distant location.

Mr. Bowman said the second item noted in the Fire Rescue Department was about the fire rescue system, which was the \$100,000 Volunteer Fuel Reimbursement Program. He said it would be a new program with a \$100,000 budget to be an attempt to make volunteering more affordable to members, providing direct reimbursement to members based on pre-established requirements in terms of their service to the community. He said there was an increase in Fire Rescue related to the community response team, but he would discuss that during the chapter on health and welfare, because it was more of a health and welfare issue than a public safety initiative.

Mr. Bowman said for the Volunteer Fire Rescue stations, there was a Board-approved volunteer funding policy that guided funding recommendations. He said there was an increase in contribution amounts for operating expenses to volunteer stations totaling \$143,140, consistent with the volunteer funding policy. He said they also included funding for one-time costs to volunteer stations in an increase of \$83,300. He said he would pause to allow for any questions.

Ms. Mallek said the Pantops station was once imagined as a true mutual aid organization in partnership with the City once it was fully staffed, so she was looking forward to seeing its future.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said they were all supportive of public safety and the fire departments. She wanted to ask Chief Eggleston if the volunteer fire rescue contributions were also tied to ensuring the volunteers had the proper certifications with the fire department.

Mr. Eggleston said if Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley recalled from last year's discussion, there was a need to involve themselves more in determining the strength of the Volunteer Fire Department, in terms of their staffing and training availability. He said it was a phased approach, and they were rolling out the staffing plan now, so at a moment's notice they would know what everyone's staffing situation would be, and they centralized a lot of their training records so they had a good idea of those records, but it was a continuous project, so he anticipated that throughout the year they would have a much clearer picture of their training.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said the residents would want to know that they were being serviced by a fire department that had all of the necessary requirements and certifications.

Mr. Eggleston said they had a training division that did a large majority of all the training of the volunteers in the County, and they had those certificates and training records in house. He said when someone chose to get their training completed outside of the County, it was more difficult to obtain because it had to be forwarded to the County from that individual, so that was where they were focusing their efforts.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that person should be able to supply that before they volunteered.

Mr. Eggleston said that was correct.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the two positions for the police department in FY23 were police officer positions. He asked if the seven-and-a-half prior were the same police officer positions.

Mr. Bowman said he believed that was correct. He said he believed that eight officers were added in December, four of which were overhires; then there was a part-time position that was moved from the police department and a part-time position that was moved from Fire Rescue to create a public safety public information officer in Community Engagement. He said there were eight officers, four of which were overhires.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the number of officers per capita in the County could be provided.

Mr. Bowman said that could be provided as a follow-up. He said they historically had a 1:3 ratio.

Mr. Gallaway said he would like to know how the supply chain affected their ability to get equipment and if they had any issues with that.

Mr. Andrews said he would like to learn more about the differences between the various fire rescue locations and their budgets sometime in the future.

Ms. Price said she was supportive of the Volunteer Fuel Reimbursement Program. She said volunteerism had been a special challenge as of late, and it was not anticipated to be getting better, so that program was something that showed their volunteers that the County supported them was greatly appreciated.

Mr. Bowman told Ms. Price that there was a scheduled break but he would defer to the Chair on that item.

Ms. Price asked Mr. Bowman if he had an anticipated amount of time for the remainder of his presentation.

Mr. Bowman said he had 15 slides more, and if they did not cover the last chapter of the day, the non-departmental chapter, he did not think it would be problematic to be picked up another day.

Ms. Price asked the Supervisors if anyone would like to take a break. Seeing none, she asked Mr. Bowman to continue.

Mr. Bowman said the public works functional area was primarily made of Facilities and Environmental Services, included the contribution to the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority and some other public works agencies. He said the notable changes in this area were related to urban service delivery. He said there was a program for entrance corridor vegetation and right of way management, which was about better maintaining their existing spaces and using that process as they worked on new things in the development area. He said this was a program they had budgeted to begin in the middle of the year of FY23 in order to include a right-of-way program manager and also the contractual costs associated with that position.

Mr. Bowman said they had included the funding to operate the anticipated streetsweeper for the streetsweeper program for mid-year FY23. He said that under the theme of quality government operations, they had tried to identify and build posture of what their level of themed services was. He said they had funded that temporarily from the pandemic reserve, and going forward had an operating budget line of what that cleaning protocol would be in the future. He said they also would be converting a temporary position to a full-time position for the role of Physical Security Specialist. He said that was a budget neutral position based on the Facilities and Environmental Services Department, reprioritizing their funding to make up that difference in the total cost. He said finally he would note the contribution to public works agencies, the main highlight being the contribution to RSWA. He said the other contribution was the County's operating impact of the capital project from the Southern Convenience Center they were anticipating on opening in mid-year FY23.

Ms. McKeel said she was thrilled to see the urban service delivery. She said there was a difference in the way the development areas looked; some were well-maintained, and others needed help. She said as they looked at implementing this program, they should look first at the areas that were most in need of maintenance. She said the streetsweeper program would help their pedestrians and cyclists a lot. She said she was looking forward to seeing the Southern Convenience Center coming online, and the southern part of the County would be thrilled to see it finally realized.

Ms. Mallek said she knew there was ordinance work to be done first, but hopefully by this time next year, they would have a waiver program or collaborative program to get snow off the sidewalks.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she looked forward to the streetsweeper program.

Mr. Gallaway applauded the direction they were going with the vegetation and right of way management and the streetsweeper program. He said he was looking forward to seeing the logistics of the Entrance Corridor Vegetation and Right of Way Management Program, and he would appreciate more information about it.

Mr. Bowman said they would provide that as a follow-up.

Ms. Price said she was impressed with the urban service delivery. She said it was important to make a good first impression with people who came to their community, and the streetsweeper program

was a safety issue as well as for appearance. She asked what the estimated opening date was for the Southern Convenience Center.

Mr. Bowman said he would ask the Director of Facilities and Environmental Services, Lance Stewart, if he could provide the latest information.

Mr. Stewart said they originally hoped they would be able to open it in the fall, and he believed the construction schedule was on a timeline to accommodate that, but they anticipated supply chain issues with some key elements, including the trash compactors that would collect the tag-a-bag program, as well as the containers that collected the recyclables. He said everything made from steel or that had a chip in it was taking longer to get, just like cars were. He said they were moving forward and Rivanna was placing those orders on their behalf, but the opening of the facility was probably going to be in December of January.

Mr. Bowman said the next functional area to be discussed was Health and Welfare. He said the largest part of the Health and Welfare chapter was the Department of Social Services. He said also included was a wide variety of partnerships in the community. He said some were larger relationships between the state and local governments with the Health Department, Region Ten, and the Community Services Board, along with some other agencies he would discuss in a moment. He said in the Department of Social Services, the Community Response Team was an effort led by Social Services, with a police officer, firefighter, EMT, and social worker working to respond to calls from individuals in crisis. He said depending on the details of the call, the team would adapt the response to best meet the critical needs of the person to ensure the safety of all parties involved. He said the response team would then work to support the individual beyond the immediate crisis through support of connections to community partners to meet their needs.

Mr. Bowman said the program responded to troubling growth in mental health calls for service that had unique needs. He said it also served to preserve their fire rescue and police resources when an urgent medical or criminal matter was not part of the situation. He said the funding for this program would come from a portion of the cigarette tax revenue that took effect in January. He said beyond that, he would highlight some additions around the theme of quality government operations in the Department of Social Services. He said there were three eligibility workers dedicated to the benefits program, which included Medicaid, Supplemental Nutrition and Assistance Program, and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, refugee cash and refugee medical assistance.

Mr. Bowman said he wanted to note that these positions in Social Services were partially funded by state and federal funding. He said finally, there was a housing financial analyst that would provide accounting and financial reporting for their housing program. He said in addition to local funding, there was often state or federal with the unique requirements that they would be responsive to. He said outside of the department, there were Health and Welfare contributions. He said as part of their fully funding the health department's request, it allowed a health worker at Yancey Community Center to go from part-time employment to full-time to provide services further than they were able to right now.

Mr. Bowman said the Agency Budget Review Team was a group of volunteers who were led by John Freeman, who was present for the meeting. He said Mr. Freeman was the retired Assistant Director of Social Services and had been leading this process for the past few years. He said they received 43 program applications that were reviewed and evaluated based on a set of criteria based on their performance and how they aligned to the County's human services goals. He said the ABRT turned those evaluations into a rating for the programs and provided those to the Department of Finance and Budget. He said they assigned funding recommendations to those programs based on the ratings.

Mr. Bowman said some agencies had multiple programs in them. He said exemplary programs were provided with a salary increase of 4% of the FY22 funding, solid programs received level funding, and poor programs received a 25% funding reduction. He said in addition to existing programs, there was funding recommended for new programs that had scored as exemplary, and the programs funded for the first time were listed on the slide.

Ms. McKeel said Social Services was one of the departments hurt the most by the pandemic, and she knew they had been working hard through the challenges. She said the ABRT review process required a lot of detailed work, which she wanted to express her appreciation for. Ms. McKeel said the mental health response team that would be created through this budget was very necessary and a great move forward. She said she would like to discuss with staff and Supervisors in the future as to how that team could be used to assist the County with dealing with panhandlers, many of whom fell into this category, as well as signage they may be able to create with their community partners.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she applauded the County's efforts to look at a different approach to mental health problems, and she thought it would be very successful in trying to help people.

Mr. Gallaway said there had been times where the departmental request did not make it into the recommended budget. He said he thought a lot of those requests had made it in this time, but he wanted to know if there were any things that did not make it in, such as extra positions, that the Board should be aware of. He said in this department, past reports had noted that there was a percent of the budget that remained unspent, but he thought this department should use every dollar available, so he wanted to make sure they were providing the resources necessary for the service delivery.

Mr. Bowman said for the particular request, they could provide that among the packet of

information that would be given as a follow-up to the Board, and also would publish on the website. He said it would likely be part of future Board discussions.

Mr. Gallaway said the positions recommended, such as the Housing Financial Analyst, he was glad to see included. He said he wanted to make sure they took care of what they needed to in this department.

Mr. Andrews said he was very supportive of the Community Response Team. He said that some of the positions were partially offset by state and federal revenue, and he hoped that was consistent with a trend that was being encouraged everywhere. He said he applauded the challenge of reviewing the ABRT requests, and he would like to understand that process a little bit better down the road.

Ms. Price said she was uncertain about part of the process. She said on page 139 of their materials, when discussing the process, she understood that the ABRT team reviewed and rated the applications, and then recommendations for funding amounts were made in the context of the overall County budget development process. She said she understood what that was saying but was not sure about some of the applications. She said she noticed on page 138 of their materials, there were several entities listed with a single listing, but in the appendix, starting on page 141, a number of those entities were listed more than once. She said she had a hard time correlating a single entry on a budget amount with two entries on the ABRT review process.

Ms. Price said she understood for the programs funded for FY22, as shown on slide 42, they had exemplary, solid, and poor ratings, yet there were other entities that may have gotten one of those ratings and had not been recommended for funding. She said she understood that was related to how the funding tied into the County's overall budget process, she would however like to understand a little better how those determinations were made. She said an answer was not needed today, but sometime soon.

Mr. Bowman said that for the interest of time, he would incorporate all of these questions into the list of follow-ups. He said a quick answer would be, on page 138 with the table, it was about all the agency programs in total. He said they could break it down by program, such as the free clinic, which conducted multiple programs, and evaluate those on each individual merit. He said he appreciated and understood the feedback that they should tie how the funding recommendation tied to a particular program, particularly if one had multiple programs. He said there were other changes being factored in as well, so this feedback would be taken and be a part of the overall response.

Ms. Mallek said on the charts, she saw "REC-ADP," and she always thought that was the ratio of where the differences were, but she was unsure.

Mr. Bowman thanked her for the feedback, because if Board members had these questions, others in the community read this even less often, so they would probably have those questions as well. He said what that referred to was a recommended budget in FY23 minus what was adopted in FY22. He said for example, on page 138, the Albemarle Housing Improvement Program was funded for FY22 at \$412,000, they were recommended to be funded at approximately \$428,000, so that was a recommended-to-be-adopted increase of \$15,000, or 4%.

Ms. Mallek said her method of understanding was to look for places where there were big changes first. She thanked Mr. Bowman.

Mr. Bowman said the Jefferson Madison Regional Library was the largest funding share of the Parks, Recreation, and Culture chapter, followed by the Department of Parks and Recreation itself, the Charlottesville Albemarle Conventions and Visitors Bureau, as well as some other agency contributions. He said the notable changes under quality government operations were that they included an increase to a planned return to a full season of programming for the Summer Swim and Summer Camp Programs. He said that had not been the case over the last two summers due to the pandemic, and this budget adjustment allowed it to be possible.

Mr. Bowman said the second adjustment was an increase to begin to phase in what was called the Eastern District Maintenance Crew. He said this was in the anticipation that Biscuit Run Park came online in the future, there would be additional operating impact, and rather than bring all the staff on at once, and recognizing that there may be needs in that area beyond that one park, this would bring in one position per year and seek to phase those additional positions in as the park went online. He said there were some budget neutral changes that were highlighted; Parks and Recreation had reprioritized funding to convert a temporary trail maintenance position to regular full-time, and they increased the Community Center Supervisor by 0.25 FTE.

Mr. Bowman said the Jefferson Madison Regional Library was included as a part of this chapter, and the JMRL was now paying a \$15 wage similar to the County's recently approved \$15 minimum wage implementation, and in addition to that, one of the main budget drivers included increased bookmobile services out in the community. He said the Charlottesville Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau funding was based on a regional agreement and was calculated from the prior year's Transient Occupancy Tax revenues, and there was a slight decrease based on that regional agreement calculation.

Mr. Bowman said separate from ABRT, there were organizations in the community where the human services criteria were not a good fit for them, and they were also providing services. He said a few years ago, staff developed a staff-led process with criteria specific to those, and they partnered with the Community and Public Engagement Office, the Office of Equity and Inclusion, Parks and Recreation staff,

and Economic and Development staff to evaluate the agencies based on those criteria, followed by funding recommendations.

Mr. Bowman said these agencies were much smaller than the other agencies, the budget was in total approximately \$50k-\$60k. He said there were 10 applications received from staff, and the funding recommendations were for four new programs and increases to five, which were noted on the slide shown. He said there were some agencies that had received funding in the past that did not request funding again, so part of those savings was being reprogrammed to cover those increases.

Ms. McKeel said they had 13 parks in the County, and the vast majority were in the rural areas, and inaccessible to many people. She said they had one small pocket park in an urban area, Charlotte Humphris Park, which was essentially a great walking park, but it was very small. She said there was also Darden Towe Park, which was accessible to many people. She said they should keep in mind how many parks were still inaccessible to the people who lived in her own district, but also in the older, urban neighborhoods.

Ms. Mallek said they should keep in mind when urban properties were in transition, as other communities sometimes grabbed those locations instead of allowing them to move into higher density in order to create those very accessible places. She said the County had been lucky to have donations of rural places donated to them, but it took a much more active role to get ownership of some of the more urban and higher priced properties. She said she hoped that as they went back to the full summer programs that Parks and Recreation was considering running their lifesaving training in house, because last year the community agency last year decided not to and it left a lot of their young lifeguards trying to get training in other locations.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was in favor of these. She said she wanted to know how much the bookmobile services would be impacted due to gas prices.

Mr. Bowman said they would follow up with library staff to get an answer to that question.

Mr. Gallaway said he would like to have a summary description of the middle school sports program sent out to remind himself what that encompassed. He said he assumed the increase of \$69,222 was because of the limited offerings over the last couple of years in comparison.

Mr. Bowman said that was correct. He said when they built last year's budget, it was not anticipated what normal programming would be. He said it was returning to a more pre-pandemic level.

Mr. Gallaway said along with the summary description of the middle school sports program, he would like to see the itemized expenditures for the summer programs.

Mr. Andrews said this was a very important area with regard to quality of life, and he would like to see it supported. He said he was confused about the \$69,222, and he assumed that was the difference between the local revenue sources. He said there was a dramatic difference from FY21 that he noticed, and he would like to understand that better. He said he looked forward to their future discussion around capital budgets for the parks.

Ms. Price said they learned through the course of the pandemic the importance of their parks, recreation, and cultural opportunities. She said one of the first slides today mentioned that outdoor recreation, parks, and amenities only comprises 3% of the County's budget, and she looked forward to their March 23rd discussion on the matter.

Mr. Bowman thanked the Board for their feedback on things where things may have not been clear or needed more detail. He said due to the lengthy report and the multiple authors, they had to make judgements about how much to summarize, so he appreciated the feedback on the information presented.

Mr. Bowman said the next section was the chapter of community development. He said that he would first clarify that this was called an organizational area based on some state reporting categories. He said community development was the only area that had the same name as the organizational area. He said the community development budget included the Community Development Department, which was the largest portion, the Economic Development Services, transit agencies, and other community development agencies. He said the notable changes for urban service delivery were that there was a new position of Property Maintenance Inspector to be added and some related operating costs for the Annual Remediation Fund. He said that would be to prioritize addressing building and blight violations.

Mr. Bowman said under the category of quality government operations, there was a Management Analyst II position, the II was the classification of the position. He said one position was supporting the department's financial management and analysis functions. He said it was not budget neutral, but they converted the Geographic Information Systems Technician from a temporary position to a full-time position due to the demand and overall need for those services. He said they included a combination of projects under the category of strategic use of one-time funds. He said it was common in the annual budget process, as Community Development worked through the plan that would be discussed with the Board in the near future, to have some of those costs that come and go, whether related to master plans or other projects, and related to the Board's strategic priorities.

Mr. Bowman said in more detail, that included funding for the next phase of the form-based code,

which they called Phase II, and related to one of the Board's strategic priorities in the Rio-29 area. He said they also were including some local funding for transportation project studies to do some more in-depth staff work on the front end, so that as they pursued future transportation projects, they would be much better scoped out. He said they included what they were calling a Community Development Fee Simplification Study, which looked at and updated their internal processes and streamlining to reduce complexity for both staff and customers to make it a more efficient process. He said they had added some consultant services for the next phase of the Stream Health Initiative, and that was strictly for restoration and mitigation efforts for the streams.

Mr. Bowman said the other parts of the chapter included in the Economic Development Office a \$5M transfer to the Economic Development Fund recommended for FY22. He said they highlighted this because it could be a change by Board in the context of the total County budget. He said it was part of the year-end funding that they discussed two hours ago about what funding they had left over from FY21 and how the Board would invest that strategically. He said the purpose of that fund was not tied to specific projects right now, but the intent was to position the Board to be able to move forward as opportunities arose to match state or federal grants so they could deliver those opportunities in a timely manner.

Mr. Bowman said they had included flat funding for Charlottesville Area Transit, which was based upon a proposal that CAT staff put together last year about how they would leverage ARPA and CARES Act funding to improve their services and what that path looked like in the future. He said related to CAT was a microtransit reserve. He said the Board heard in January about the County's match for a microtransit demonstration grant, that if successful, would begin in the middle of FY23 and primarily would serve Route 29 and Pantops areas. He said there was an increase in funding to Jaunt for the County's share of existing services.

Mr. Bowman said they also had funding for the Regional Transit Partnership, which he would note included what the Board heard in January about the funding for the County's share of the transit governance study. He said the final item in this chapter was for other community development agencies, which included funding for the Regional Housing Partnership, the County's share of which was administered by the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission. He said it was due to the demands and staffing required to support the growth of the committee and the activities occurring. He said it was similar to how the Regional Transit Partnership had evolved over the past few years as a regional workgroup with the TJPDC doing the administrative work.

Ms. McKeel said all of these were worthwhile programs to fund, and she was glad they had a budget that could be used to target these items.

Ms. Mallek said she supported all of these different things, especially having the money in Economic Development so it would be available when something came up. She asked if the work had been done to provide the ordinance in order to provide the Urban Service Delivery position be able to carry something out, or if it were someone who would go and look without an ordinance to get the work done. She said the permitting processes should become more simplified. She asked if there was a report from CAT about how they had taken on their service deficits.

Mr. Bowman asked Ms. Filardo if she would like to discuss this now or provide it as a follow-up.

Ms. Filardo said she would be happy to answer. She said in the interest of the hour, she would ask Chair Price if she should give a verbal answer or provide a written one.

Ms. Price said if she could answer it quickly, it would be fine, but if she would prefer to do a written response, it would be equally fine.

Ms. Filardo said the intention for stream health was to figure out what the ordinance needed to have in it next year, and to follow on with any enforcement requests for support should it be needed in a subsequent budget year.

Ms. Mallek said in writing, perhaps she could answer that same question focused on the Property Maintenance Inspector, which is what she was asking about.

Mr. Gallaway said he would like to request at some point during the budget work sessions they spend more time on community development. He said they needed to know the whole story of how this budget attacked the things they needed to do, such as the positions they put in mid-year last year and what they were putting in for the current fiscal year, because he felt that community development was an intersection of a lot of things they had discussed as being critical for the County. He said when they thought of compensation, workload, and quality of life, he thought of the Community Development Department and what was asked of their staff.

Mr. Gallaway said he would like to know if they were doing what was necessary to advance what they needed to for this department and for the Board. He said he would like to carve out some time in a work session to hear that whole story of why things were designated as they were. He said if they were going to have a conversation about if they were doing enough to further their agenda and provide the level of service needed for the things trying to come through the County. He said he hoped there was some concurrence about that so that they could discuss those items if they needed to add resources here.

Mr. Walker addressed Chair Price and said he wanted to acknowledge that staff would be more than happy to have that conversation if and when it fit into their budget schedule. He said some of this discussion would happen at their next Board meeting with the Community Development Work Program. He said if that fit into their schedule, they would be delighted to engage around all of these many pieces, with respect to the resources needed to do the work and the work being asked of from the Department.

Mr. Gallaway asked what the total FTEs were in the Economic Development Office.

Mr. Walker said there were a total of four authorized with one vacancy, so only three currently.

Mr. Gallaway said he wanted to make sure that department had all it needed as well, because it generated revenues for them and lightened the burden for taxpayers. He said the Small Area Plan came to mind and some of the other things that related to Housing Albemarle; they needed to make sure they had the FTEs to support the plan and vision they were trying to achieve. He said that could perhaps be part of that later conversation about community development.

Mr. Andrews said he thought this did deserve a lot more conversation due to the importance of this area. He said there was a \$50,000 increase for computer software and licenses, so there was a lot of modernization happening as a part of this process for the services that could be provided.

Ms. Price emphasized that the Community Development Department had a noticeable personnel shortage during the pandemic. She said she appreciated that the Community Development Department helped assist with compliance and not punishment when it came to the applicants in the Community Development Department. She said with regard to the blighted properties that were attracting nuisances, she fully supported the maintenance inspector position to bring those properties into compliance, because they were a danger.

Mr. Bowman said the final chapter was the non-departmental chapter. He said much of this was not the general fund but the transfers that were occurring elsewhere. He said this chapter included the revenue payment to the City of Charlottesville, which would have an increase of about \$133k next year based on the formula. He said the two major transfers that he had highlighted earlier as being the first and third biggest parts of the general fund; there was a \$26M increase to the ongoing transfer to the public schools, and a \$5.7M increase to the ongoing transfer to the capital projects and debt service.

Mr. Bowman said as he noted for the general fund earlier, the school division and the capital program had already received a portion of these, with the revenue update in December. He said that was in comparison from where they were at the adopted budget of July 1. He said a portion of that increase, approximately \$10M, already occurred in December. He said it was a bit of an unusual year that they had for budget comparisons because of their mid-year update. He said in addition to those ongoing transfers, there was the strategic investment of one-time funding, which included \$4.1M as a one-time transfer to the Capital Improvements Program, recommended to take place in FY22. He said that funding helped support projects that were funded in FY23-FY27 that he would discuss momentarily.

Mr. Bowman said there was also a \$3.1M transfer to the Housing Fund recommended for FY22, which was a reserve that positioned the Board for addressing needs as they continued work on affordable housing policies and strategies. He said there was time scheduled to discuss housing further at the March 30th work session.

Mr. Bowman said he wanted to take a moment to explore core systems modernization. He said it was something they put in the non-departmental chapter because it touched so many of their departments, both internal and external. He said the technology systems they used across the County government were disjointed, antiquated, and did not allow the community to interact with the government as expected. He said over the next few years, they were working on new financial systems, new human resources, new community development systems, and other related systems that were about enhancing the customer and employee experience. He said it not only improved their relationships with customers who they interacted with, but also provided them with a better position for recruitment and retention for employees, because the systems were operational and easier to train on.

Mr. Bowman said the Board would hear about this again on Monday because there was a capital component to this project. He said it was not only about the funding it took to pull it off, but the positions in terms of what the gaps were that needed to be filled to make the systems work in the future. He said they included a reserve for space, for storage for police and fire rescue. He said it was a placeholder for a solution to be determined later about overall County space solutions with a focus on public safety.

Mr. Gallaway asked what the current balance was in the Board's strategic reserve.

Mr. Bowman asked if he was referring to the capital budget reserve.

Mr. Gallaway said a few years ago they set aside a new reserve for Board strategic priorities.

Mr. Bowman said there was one within the capital budget, and it had been used to fund projects like the Rheas Ford intersection and other initiatives, which was about \$1.8M.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the funding was going to the strategic priority support.

Mr. Bowman said a year ago at this time, working on the comprehensive plan update with

Community Development, they included \$665k to support that work over the next couple of years, so that funding was a priority, and they would be carrying that forward from year to year as they continued their work. He said this year they took a different approach, and he had spoken about some of the one-time studies, specifically called out funding in the Community Development Department, so that was steady money that had been used in the past was going there. He said the separate \$1.8M reserve in the capital budget was there for future use.

Mr. Gallaway said he knew the business process optimization was linked to what he discussed earlier with CDD and the Finance and Budget. He said he was looking forward to how that DPO reserve would help them in community development specifically.

Mr. Bowman said his final slide was the schedule ahead. He said they would meet again on March 14, Monday, and would begin to hear from the school board about their proposed funding request and spend the rest of the time on the Capital Improvements Plan, which included County government and school projects. He said it would be related to what the Board heard in December about the CIP Advisory Committee, which some of the Board members directly participated in. He said they would begin picking things up again on March 17th. He thanked the Board for their continued attention to a lot of information, and there were a lot of questions they were sending outside of the meetings, and they were working their best to respond to those. He asked them to let staff know how to be of best support in the coming weeks.

Ms. Mallek said there used to be a chart that showed positions not funded through their organization, so if that were available, she would like it to be shared with the Supervisors. She said she would like a copy of the Parks and Recreation needs assessment but could not find it on the website.

Mr. Bowman said they could provide both of those.

Agenda Item No. 3. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There were no reports or matters to discuss.

Agenda Item No. 4. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Richardson said he had no report for the Board today.

Agenda Item No. 5. Closed Meeting.

At 6:03 p.m., Mr. Andrews **moved** that the Board go into Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia:

- Under Subsection (1):
 1. To discuss and consider appointments of the County Attorney's successor upon his pending retirement.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 6. **Certify Closed Meeting.**

At 6:16 p.m., Mr. Andrews **moved** that the Board of Supervisors certify by a recorded vote that, to the best of each supervisor's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting, were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 7. Adjourn to March 14, 2022, 3:00 p.m., electronic meeting pursuant to Ordinance No. 20-A(16).

At 6:18 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to March 14, 2022 at 3:00 p.m., which would be an electronic meeting held pursuant to Ordinance No. 20-A(16), “An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster.” Information on how to participate in the meeting will be posted on the Albemarle County website Board of Supervisors homepage.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date 10/18/2023
Initials CKB