

A special joint meeting of the Board of Supervisors and Economic Development Authority of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on August 14, 2024, at 5:30 p.m., Room 241, Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia, 22902. This meeting was called by the Chair, Mr. Jim Andrews, to allow a quorum of Board members to convene an open meeting to consider, discuss, and take action on the following: to allow a quorum of Board members to convene an open meeting for the purpose of participating in a joint meeting with the Economic Development Authority, including (1) Call to Order; (2) Resolution Confirming the Declaration of a Local Emergency; (3) Welcoming Remarks; (4) Rivanna Futures Project Update; (5) Discussion of the Economic Development Strategic Plan; (6) Discussion of the Memorandum of Understanding between Albemarle County and the Economic Development Authority; (7) Wrap up; and (8) Adjournment.

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

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

COUNTY OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeff Richardson; Deputy County Executive, Trevor Henry; County Attorney, Steve Rosenberg; Senior Deputy County Attorney, Richard DeLoria; Economic Development Director, Emily Kilroy; Deputy Director of Economic Development, J.T. Newberry, and Clerk, Claudette Borgersen.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order.

Ms. McKeel called the August 14, 2024, joint meeting of the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors and the Economic Development Authority to order at 5:29 p.m. and said that a quorum was present.

Ms. McKeel said that a motion was required to permit Mr. Andrews to participate in the meeting remotely.

Mr. Andrews stated that he was currently located in Sorrento, Main on personal business.

Ms. McKeel requested a motion.

Ms. Mallek **moved** the Board of Supervisors to permit Mr. Andrews to participate in the meeting remotely. 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, and Mr. Pruitt.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Long called the Economic Development Authority's joint meeting with the Board of Supervisors to order.

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

NAYS: None.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. Resolution Confirming the Declaration of a Local Emergency.

Ms. McKeel said that, unless there were questions, she would appreciate a motion for the Resolution Confirming the Declaration of a Local Emergency.

Ms. Mallek **moved** the Board of Supervisors to adopt the Resolution Confirming the Declaration of a Local Emergency. Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

---

Agenda Item No. 3. Welcoming Remarks.

The Board of Supervisors, EDA Members, and staff present at the table introduced themselves. Ms. McKeel introduced the following Albemarle County Police Officers in attendance: Lieutenant Angela Jamerson and Master Police Officer Chip Riley.

Mr. Richardson said that Andrew Sides, who was the DAC (Defense Affairs Committee) program manager, was present as well. He said that Mr. Sides had taken over for Ms. Lettie Bien.

Ms. Kilroy said that when they reached the Rivanna Futures update, Daniel Hyer from Line and Grade would be present to assist with any questions that they might have.

Ms. McKeel said that the meeting provided them with an opportunity to come together, share information, and provide direction. She said that they aimed to update the MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) to better align with the County's Economic Development Strategic Plan, Project ENABLE. She said that key elements of their successes included public-private partnerships and prioritizing

workforce development. She said that through collaborations, they were able to leverage resources, expertise, and innovation, while driving sustainable economic growth, diversifying their tax base, and creating career opportunities for their residents.

Mr. Long said that from the EDA's perspective, what he hoped to achieve was clear directions so that the EDA could effectively contribute to the County's economic development. He said that it was essential that they worked in partnership with the Board of Supervisors to ensure that they were fulfilling their expectations.

---

Agenda Item No. 4. **Presentation:** Rivanna Futures Project Update.

Ms. Emily Kilroy, Interim Economic Development Director, said that they had been working on conceptual engineering work with support from Line and Grade. She said that this would be an opportunity to catch everyone up on the latest information on the Rivanna Futures project. She said that the bulk of their time would be spent on the other two items: the Economic Development Strategic Plan update and the MOU. She said that they were seeking input from everyone to help guide their early work on the strategic plan update. She said that they had also teed up some topics for discussion on the MOU.

Mr. Henry said that he had a few slides to present that were key to sharing the latest work as they continued the site evaluation and preparation process. He said the Intelligence and National Security Innovation Acceleration Campus was a concept that had been seen by both boards. He said that this concept originated from work led by the State Veteran and Defense Affairs Office in 2014. He said that they conducted listening tours throughout the state and analyzed opportunities, which resulted in the campus expansion concept.

Mr. Henry said that this concept included expanding work within the agencies through public-private partnerships. He said that the County had acquired the land, and they had been working with academic partners and other partners to move the work of their defense and national security agencies forward. He said that this concept led to the County's acquisition. He said that they had been advised throughout this process by the Director of NGIA (National Ground Intelligence Agency), a former retired Vice Admiral, who had led a lot of the work in St. Louis and had been supporting their work.

Mr. Henry said that they were planning to visit St. Louis, to learn more about their campus. He said that they were meeting with the St. Louis geospatial ecosystem, and they would include the DOD, locality representatives, and their economic development team to listen, learn, and share their concepts.

Mr. Henry said that this acquisition was made to support the existing Rivanna Station, a significant economic generator for their region, to support the 3,000 employees that work there every day, and to ensure that any expansion would be done collaboratively, without affecting existing missions or creating encroachment concerns.

Mr. Henry said that getting site control was key to moving the project forward. He said that they had moved onto site readiness. He said that the discussion now centered on site readiness. He said that Mr. Newberry would explain some of the concepts that transformed the project into a tangible plan based on the land's characteristics and its capacity. He said that it represented new initiatives that the Board and the EDA would encounter for the first time.

Mr. Henry said that it was informed by the state's feedback on their funding request, emphasizing the need for a reasonable planning effort that would enable a phased development of the site. He said that this work was still conceptual, but it provided them with more ideas of where to direct their efforts and the opportunities to design to support that.

Mr. Newberry said that the purpose of his presentation was to set the stage for the conversation on the conceptual engineering study, provide a brief recap of the work they had done since acquiring the property, and offer some context for the boards as they reviewed the specific elements of the study. He said that this tool they saw on the screen was information that both bodies had seen before.

Mr. Newberry said that it was the state's rubric for site readiness, a tiering system that ranged from Tier 1, representing raw land with little to no information about the viability of a property for commercial or industrial development, to Tier 5, which would be a shovel-ready project, where an end user could expect to be able to use the property based on the construction timeline of the particular structures that they need.

Mr. Newberry said that they aimed to show this to provide context, as well as to note that they were still conducting a stream delineation study that would continue for another month. He said that this information was critical for the state to recognize the County's property as fully Tier 3 and for any grant applications they submitted to accelerate and escalate the current level of readiness. He said that their focus had been on elevating the County's property to a Tier 4 level of readiness, which would give confidence that an end-user could be operational within a 12-to-18-month period.

Mr. Newberry said that he would briefly touch on the rezoning and special use permit before delving into the conceptual engineering information. He said that on June 12, the Board of Supervisors had approved a rezoning and a special use permit for 172 acres of the County's property within the Development Area, rezoned to Light Industry with a special use permit for office. He said that staff believed this was the appropriate zoning district and entitlement for the types of future users they

anticipated.

Mr. Newberry said that this approval was subject to one proffer related to vehicle trips, as the property was currently only served by one way in and out, Boulders Road. He said that approval of a site plan for any development expecting greater than 5,000 vehicle trips would require a traffic study. He said that staff was excited to have received this rezoning approval, as it allowed them to be minimally eligible to apply for grant funding to continue their site readiness activities.

Mr. Newberry said that the red dashed line indicated the boundaries of the 172 acres that were rezoned for Light Industry. He said that the dashed yellow line indicated the roughly 60 acres within the Development Area but not included in the rezoning action on June 12. He said that the numbers, 1, 2, and 3, outlined in black, was the existing 75 acres of Rivanna Station. He said that St. Louis was home to the NGIA. He said that the other two intelligence agencies located locally were the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) and the National Ground Intelligence Center (NGIC).

Mr. Newberry said that the hatched area, labeled 4, was approximately 15 acres and was a privately held office building, referred to as Boulders One. He said that this building was currently occupied by contractors who were directly supporting the missions at Rivanna Station. He said that the solid black line around the outer edge encompassed the entire 462 acres acquired by the County.

Ms. Kilroy said that the conceptual engineering study aimed to identify the most appropriate areas for development based on the land's topography, streams, and natural areas. She said that the land massing diagram did not fill the rezoned area but focused on the large land masses suitable for development over the considered time horizon. She said that they had identified three land masses totaling over 100 acres.

Ms. Kilroy said that the study analyzed phasing and divided the large masses into blocks. She said that the block-level diagrams had color shading indicating a time horizon which helped them visualize what could be a reasonable phase one over the next five years, then the next six to eight years out they would look at bringing other blocks on line, and considering the green areas for a potential phase three.

Ms. Kilroy said that the focus was on maximizing the parcels that would become available with minimal infrastructure additions. She said that phase one included adding approximately 650 feet of road and a couple thousand feet of water and sewer pipes. She said that this concept was not necessarily what would happen, but it helped them develop their understanding and envision what was possible. She said that it was about taking the art of the possible and looking at what could be engineered to be out there.

Ms. Kilroy said that page 9 served as a roadmap for phase one, showing building sizes and the parking requirements for office use under the County's code. She said that it also estimated the infrastructure needs and the rough order of magnitude of those costs. She said that this information could guide them as they moved forward with phase one, focusing on achievable chunks of development.

Ms. Kilroy said that one key area of feedback from stakeholders at Rivanna Station was the resiliency and security of the site. She said that currently, there was only one road in and out of the existing uses, which was the connection of Boulders Road at Route 29. She said that envisioning the flow through the road and the site was crucial. She said that their Comprehensive Plan showed Boulders Road looping back to Route 29, which could create some important resiliency.

Ms. Kilroy said that the loop road added an additional layer of resiliency, and they could also consider what potential emergency access up to Watts Passage might look like over time. She said that they were currently preparing for the Virginia Business Ready Sites program, a grant program by the Virginia Economic Development Partnership to help localities prepare sites for business. She said that they were also identifying other state and federal funding that might be applicable. She said that with this plan in place, they aimed to be strategic about going after the right grant funding, rather than trying to bring in funding that may not drive them forward meaningfully.

Mr. Gallaway asked for more information about the Tier 4 phasing. He said that currently, these were not at Tier 4 or Tier 3. He asked if, by starting with those, it meant that they aimed to achieve that tier upon completion.

Ms. Kilroy said that she would allow Mr. Hyer to start.

Mr. Daniel Hyer, Line and Grade, said that he had been working on the project for about 18 months. He said that they were currently conducting preliminary jurisdictional determination work on the natural resources on the property. He said that this would complete the Tier 3 requirements for the site. He said that this work was nearing completion, although there would be some further discussions with the Army Corps as they finalized their report.

Mr. Hyer said that Tier 4 indicated that within 12 to 18 months, they would have a shovel-ready site. He said that some sites, such as Block A, could be accessed immediately on the existing Boulders Road, and the only roadblock to having that shovel-ready was an approved site plan, which could be done in 12 to 18 months. He said that Block B could also be accessed from Boulders Road, and some sites could potentially be accessed with the existing infrastructure if there was an access management agreement with the adjacent property owner. He said that they were at the threshold of Tier 4 as soon as

the preliminary jurisdictional determination work was completed.

Mr. Gallaway said that Tier 4 seemed so distant, even three or four months ago. He said that Tier 4 was critical to reach. He said that if someone saw Tier 3 or Tier 2, it was very different from Tier 4. He said that Tier 5 was a different animal, but it did not apply here. He said that he was surprised to see so many Tier 4s on the list and wondered about the timeline to reach it. He said that it appeared they were already advancing through Tier 3 and preparing for Tier 4.

Ms. Kilroy said that the rezoning was critical, and the special use permit that the Board acted upon in June was also critical for being able to achieve the Tier 4 status once the small outstanding Tier 3 elements were in place.

Ms. Mallek asked for more background on what the stream delineation study entailed. She said that she was very concerned about encroachment on stream buffers, and she wanted to ensure that the study's details were very granular to avoid any future issues.

Mr. Hyer said that currently, the preliminary jurisdictional determination process involved several environmental scientists who surveyed the area. He said that they were trained to identify the start and end points of natural features. He said that the surveyors flagged these areas, and they would return to survey the area to understand their location within their digital ecosystem. He said that the findings were validated by the Army Corps staff. He said that once completed, they would have a detailed understanding of these resources and how to respect them in their work.

Ms. Mallek asked if the surveying would consider the previous nine weeks of drought. She said that every perennial stream on her property had been dry since June 1.

Mr. Hyer said that although his knowledge in environmental science was limited, he understood that it was not solely about the presence of water. He said that it was also about the presence of specific types of grasses and vegetation, as well as the soil components. He said that water, in this context, was almost like a distraction, because they were looking for other cues of soil and vegetation and other things. He said that he did not believe it would have any negative effect on the work.

Ms. Mallek said that as a general philosophy, she hoped that their efforts would reflect a sustainable effort. She said that when they visited St. Louis, she hoped they would be able to learn from them about what they had done in this regard. She said that this was an opportunity for them to truly do it right and demonstrate what could be achieved if they tried, instead of simply saying it was too much and they would not try.

Mr. Pruitt asked how frequently they engaged federal stakeholders during their conceptual development process. He said that this was particularly relevant when considering the conceptual access drawings, where he noticed that there may be potential concerns from federal stakeholders regarding Boulders Road Extended or the emergency vehicle access connection point. He said that he had observed similar situations at other locations where site occupants had condemned roads because they did not want to staff that ECP. He said that he wanted to ensure that they incorporated these stakeholders' into their process. He said that there were probable several other security concerns with the site. He asked how the County's and Line and Grade's processes worked through those concerns.

Ms. Kilroy said that staff maintained regular communication with the federal agencies and their leadership. She said that the County was now the property manager for the primary parking lot for their employees. She said that this relationship helped them understand the day-to-day operational needs. She said that at the leadership level, they discussed potential future developments.

Ms. Kilroy said that the vision for this expansion originated from a study conducted by the state Veterans and Defense Affairs group in the mid-2010s. She said that this study explored opportunities for expansion and formed the foundation of their vision. She said that they collaborated with Line and Grade to further develop this vision, which includes extending Boulders Road. She said that traffic flow issues were a daily concern for staff. She said that as they progressed, they would continue to engage with stakeholders to ensure open dialogue and address their concerns.

Mr. Henry said that it was also about working with the right representatives from Rivanna Station as well as Fort Belvoir. He said that he and Mr. Richardson had dinner a few years ago with the former installation commander who had just been relieved. He said that during that dinner, the former installation commander emphasized that the most significant thing they could do for them was to extend and connect the road. He said that for them, resiliency was critically important.

Mr. Henry said that part of their trip to St. Louis was to better understand how to move forward with the master planning effort for the campus to ensure they had the appropriate input at the right levels. He said that this was also future work that they had in front of them. He said that a few weeks ago, Ms. Kilroy and Mr. Newberry conducted a tour of their property. He said that there was engagement and partnership at a level he had never seen before, and he believed it was the acquisition of the property that prompted this.

Ms. Mallek said that one historical footnote to that was back in the 2014 environmental study, there was continual mention of moving the guard house to Route 29 so that the whole fence line perimeter would not have to be continually interrupted when people were going between the parking lot and the output parcel. She said that this was incredibly important and showed the long-term interest.

Ms. Mallek said that back in 2014, there were also discussions among the various stakeholders about the size of the application. She said that one of the leaders in the Army suggested that they should stop cutting themselves off and go for the whole thing. She said that it had been a wild 10 years getting to where they were today, but at least they had the ability to do the whole thing if they could manage it.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked whether the area outlined in yellow would be available for future rezoning.

Ms. Kilroy said that currently, the focus had been on the redlined area. She said that this focus was driven by the land's contours, existing development, and the location of Boulders Road on the property. She said that this was the rationale for focusing there first when they submitted the application for rezoning. She said that there was no plan at this time to consider the yellow area, but it was noted on the diagram to show that there was additional development area land as part of the County's holding.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked why they had not requested to rezone the whole area.

Ms. Kilroy said that they had been working at speed on the application, and they wanted to focus on the area that was most likely to be developed quickly.

Mr. Henry said that in the picture, there appeared to be a significant amount of buildable space. He said that when they toured the site, there was a dirt road running along the fence line. He said that there was not much buildable area along that spine. He said that they focused on what they believed would have the most build-ability. He said that there was a question asked about whether the County would be willing to extend the fence line with their partners at the federal level. He said that all options were on the table. He said that this would make it easier to expand for perimeter and access from the existing site. He said that he thought it was important to note that they had that option, and they knew what its designation was, and they would continue to evaluate what that should be.

Mr. Gallaway said that he noticed legislative priority on one of the slides. He said that the state had stripped economic development support from the budget. He said that for two governors, despite political differences, there was consistent support for economic development. He said that they had made adjustments and relocated funds, but the commitment had remained steadfast. He said that it was a problem regardless of Rivanna Futures. He said that he had made several comments about this project, and while he was fully supportive, it was important that it did not monopolize the attention and resources of every other economic development activity. He said that as they awaited the legislative packet, similar to their past experiences with education funding, they must be assertive in their expectations for economic development funding, particularly given the timeline for funding.

Mr. Richardson said that he wanted to emphasize the staff's efforts at Rivanna Station. He said that Mr. Pruitt asked an excellent question, and as someone with a military background, Mr. Pruitt understood the confidentiality and the extensive work that occurred both outside and inside the fence line. He said that much of their work was classified, and none of the County staff had security clearance.

Mr. Richardson said that the work done by Mr. Henry, Ms. Kilroy, Mr. Newberry, and the entire team extended beyond this group. He said that their collaboration with Line and Grade and the attention given to Rivanna Station staff was commendable. He said that if they had representatives from Rivanna Station in leadership positions present today, their positive attitude and morale would be evident. He said that it would make no sense for them, as a local government, to work closely with the DOD intelligence agencies.

Mr. Richardson said that they had made progress in their collaboration with state and federal officials, taking steps towards full development of the site. He said that this understanding came from Mr. Pruitt, who had a background that allowed him to comprehend the workings of these agencies. He said that they must meet them where they are, and they had done so.

---

Agenda Item No. 5. **Discussion Item:** Economic Development Strategic Plan.

Ms. Kilroy said that the Rivanna Futures project was the largest economic development project the County had ever undertaken, but it was not the only economic development effort they had going on. She said that the packet included a copy of the 2018 EDA (Economic Development Authority) Strategic Plan, Project ENABLE. She said that it also included a short summary of the goals of the plan. She said that the goals had been a focal point of the County's work over the past several years.

Ms. Kilroy said that she had been before both bodies over the past couple of months to discuss the process and the schedule for the plan update. She said that currently, the RFQ (Request for Quotation) for vendor selection had closed, and they had received proposals. She said that they would continue to work that process to have a vendor in place to support the work ahead, and they hoped to be back next summer with a final draft for consideration by both bodies.

Ms. Kilroy said that the goal for the meeting was to get some early feedback and dialogue between the two bodies and direction to staff on some of the top priority areas. She said that they would dedicate the remainder of their time to addressing three questions. She said that the first question was: What are some of the strengths? She said that if they were a new member of the EDA or the Board, they should think about their perspective as a representative for their district and as a valued member of their

community. She said that they should consider what strengths they had observed over the past five years in terms of economic development.

Ms. Mallek said that she would like to share that the success she had experienced and heard from constituents was due to the fact that the plan was developed in collaboration with the broader community and respected the focus on where the focus was going to be. She said that it was not about welcoming all warehouses but actually helping their own businesses to grow, spinoffs to launch, and employees to get strengthened and trained. She said that it was about highlighting the support for things in the Rural Area as well as the Development Area. She said that these were key strengths that she hoped they would continue to have.

Ms. Johnson said that one of the aspects that had impressed her greatly was the thought process behind the decisions made. She said that many of them had put in a tremendous amount of effort into this. She said that the team had demonstrated a strong commitment to justifying their decisions, as seen in the defense study, which highlighted the economic benefits. She said that this approach went beyond simply stating that an idea was great; it involved a thorough examination of whether it was the best use of taxpayers' money and provided a solid justification for it.

Mr. Long said that the business retention and expansion efforts, particularly those led by the Economic Development Office (EDO) staff, had been commendable. He said that they had actively engaged with various businesses, understanding their needs, and worked collaboratively to encourage growth. He said that the programs that had secured funding for businesses, both new and existing, had been a significant strength. He said that their readiness for business, as demonstrated through initiatives like Rivanna Futures, had been another area where they had excelled.

Mr. Long said that the delay in their return to this discussion may have been attributed to the way they had adapted during the COVID-19 pandemic. He said that the office had collaborated with other entities to secure funds, develop plans, and support businesses, including restaurants in serving customers outdoors. He said that these adaptive measures had been crucial in navigating the challenges.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that to her, it was innovation and thinking outside the box, and she heard this from many people. She said that taxpayers had expressed concerns about spending a significant amount of money on Rivanna Station. She said that these investments were essential because they generated revenue for the County. She said that educating the public about the EDA and its contributions was important. She said that many businesses were aware of the EDA's importance and the benefits it provided. She said that she commended the County and the EDA for their forward-thinking approach, including for Rivanna Futures, and their efforts to accommodate Albemarle County's future needs.

Mr. Andrews said that there were discussions about Project ENABLE, specifically with Southwood and Brookdale. He said that he was trying to understand the relationship between these projects and affordable housing, as it was relevant to some comments he had received.

Mr. Newberry said that a significant portion of the EDA's support for these projects came from thinking creatively and exploring how the EDA could assist other major County initiatives, such as affordable housing. He said that Brookdale was an infrastructure TIF (Tax Increment Financing) project, and it was the first time, to his knowledge, that they had been involved in supporting the infrastructure needed for an affordable housing project. He said that the EDA processed payments for Southwood, and they worked closely with the housing office in processing those payments and utilizing their special powers to pay those entities that were doing this great work, and the EDA was enabled to make those kinds of payments.

Mr. Andrews said that one of the strengths was that they had the EDA, which had the ability to exercise its special powers. He said that he would like to learn how they could better utilize those powers.

Mr. Storm said that one observation he had made was the thoroughness and the outside-the-box thinking, as exemplified by Southwood. He said that the Albemarle Business Campus on the south side had gained access to some land to develop a roundabout at the intersection with Old Lynchburg Road. He said that this piece of the Economic Development Agreement would not only enable businesses located there to thrive but would also enhance the quality of life for residents in Southwood. He said that this access to land would facilitate the pursuit of a traffic roundabout through SMART SCALE, creating a cohesive improvement in both the business and life environments in that part of the County.

Ms. Johnson said that some of the strategic thinking had been very sound in this matter. For instance, the project of a lab to support all the wineries was a significant step. She said that there was no such lab in their region. She said that this facility was essential for the wineries to test and prepare their products for the market. She said that supporting this lab in Crozet was not only beneficial for the small business lab but also for the entire wine region agriculturally. She said that this was a smart move because it made it easier to do business, which in turn encouraged more business, and made for a nice business environment. She said this was just one example of the many strategic decisions that had been made.

Mr. Pruitt said that during his master's thesis, he had focused on communities similar to theirs, specifically mid-sized cities in the Appalachian South. He said that one of the most pervasive issues in these communities was the influence of non-local capital, which drove the workforce and created boom-bust cycles. He said that they led to a sense of systematic underinvestment in their community. He said that when he observed companies announcing expansions, he noticed an unusual amount of actual

capital that had a real stake in the community.

Mr. Pruitt said that this was a business or economic development environment that encouraged active participation and investment in the community. He said that he was unsure of what exactly incentivized this behavior, but he believed that identifying and harnessing this factor was critical. He said that doing so would ensure sustained investment in their human resources, environmental resources, and community resources.

Ms. McKeel asked for a quick review of the target industries they currently had. She said that she had heard concerns from the community that they had not revisited these industries.

Mr. Newberry said that the community conducted its first target industry study in 2012 through the TJPDC (Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission). He said that they hired a consultant to examine the existing industries and used a location quotient to determine the relative concentration of these industries compared to other communities. He said that this analysis helped identify sectors that were over-represented in the community, indicating strengths that could be built upon.

Mr. Newberry said that the original data from 2012 was validated in 2017 through the Go Virginia process, which conducted a growth and diversification plan every two years to assess the region's industries and investment opportunities. He said that in 2017, 2019, 2021, and 2023, the Region 9 growth and diversification plan largely reflected the findings presented from Project ENABLE. He said that individual communities, such as the City of Charlottesville, had identified clean tech as an opportunity based on the presence of environmental companies within their jurisdiction. He said that over the past 10 to 12 years, this approach had remained consistent.

Ms. Kilroy said that one of the benefits of understanding the target industries and how they could use them to grow their economic development work was that it helps both the public and private sectors understand what the workforce is skilled at. She said that this analysis, which was used to develop these sectors or target industries, aided in identifying strengths and opportunities. She said that it also facilitated informed discussions about whether Albemarle was a suitable fit for a particular opportunity. She said that this data was instrumental in having a well-informed conversation.

Ms. Mallek said that this presented a great opportunity to establish partnerships with the state and federal workforce system. She said that by anticipating the skill gaps in their employees' skill sets, they could seek funding for training opportunities from both state and federal sources. She said that this proactive approach would be beneficial as they collaborated with local businesses looking to expand or individuals returning to the area seeking to establish new businesses. She said that she hoped they would remain vigilant in seeking these partnerships.

Ms. McKeel said that when considering target industries, it was important to recognize how organizations and governments could easily spread themselves thin. She said that she was questioning whether they should be looking at all of them or if it would be more beneficial to focus on a select few. She said that focusing on certain industries allowed for more in-depth work. She said that they still validated these industries for their community, which was great.

Ms. Mallek said that when she looked at the list of the ten successes, they covered all of those industries. She said that to her, this meant she did not want to close the door on anything because she could not predict who would come.

Mr. Newberry said that he wanted to credit organizations like CvilleBioHub, CBIC (Charlottesville Business Innovation Council), and the Defense Affairs Committee (DAC), which were focused on helping to support their target industries. He said that it was truly commendable that they had such partnerships in place so that they did not have to tackle everything on their own. He said that they could maximize these partnership opportunities.

Mr. Long said that in terms of their focus for the next five years, he believed they should consider greater support for the entrepreneurial ecosystem. He said that he had more knowledge in this area, particularly regarding angel network groups that invested in companies and funding. He said that they had a number of individual groups that actively worked on these initiatives. He proposed that they contemplate whether a larger investment was necessary to provide accelerators, startup spaces, and other resources to encourage these companies to remain, grow, and invest locally.

Mr. Long said that there was a concern that companies may grow and leave, taking venture capital with them. He said that however, this risk may not be as significant as it once was. He emphasized the importance of consistent investment in these organizations to enable them to grow internally and then expand into the spaces they had. He said that this would be a topic of discussion, as it was important to commit to a sustainable investment strategy rather than sporadic funding.

Ms. Mallek asked about the specific role of County investment in the 20 lab spaces at Biohub.

Mr. Newberry said that the EDA provided a commitment to allocate \$100,000 annually for three years in order to secure a \$4 million investment from the state for that specific project. He said that they collaborated with various partners to achieve this goal.

Mr. Long clarified that those funds were appropriated by the Board of Supervisors to the EDA.

Mr. Gallaway said that he believed this situation highlighted the strength of their efforts in economic development over the next five years. He said that the fact that they had been actively engaged in economic development, which was not always the case, was commendable. He said that when he observed Mr. Newberry, Ms. Kilroy, and Mr. Henry work the room and interact with directors from other counties and industries, it demonstrated the effectiveness of their team's work.

Mr. Gallaway said that if they were to conduct a survey asking how the government interacts with the community, economic development would undoubtedly be a strong answer. He said that the Biohub project, which Mr. Newberry mentioned, was made possible through partnerships with different partners. He said that without these relationships, the project may have been possible, but it would have been less likely and possibly happen without County involvement.

Mr. Gallaway said that this situation often arose when a supervisor ran for office and was asked about partnerships with the City. He said that economic development served as an excellent example of a strong partnership they had with the City. He said that when he saw the Greene County's economic development representative, it was evident that there was a genuine connection being established. He said that it was important to recognize that economic development extended beyond their County borders.

Mr. Gallaway said that the opportunity to the next five years was how they used the network they had built to continue expansion and growth even beyond TJPDC's six counties and into the rest of Region 9. He said that there may be businesses located in Albemarle, but not all the workers were located in Albemarle. He said that the report of where the workers were going was showing that the EDA must take into account the complexities of how businesses and workers were moving, otherwise they would have nowhere to go.

Mr. Gallaway said that it was not something that could be encapsulated in a report or a simple statement, but the successes that had been achieved demonstrated that the right relationships had been established within the community and the region. He said that they should give congratulations to the team for that. He said that the question was now how do they build upon this dynamic to take it to the next level, similar to Project ENABLE 2.0.

Mr. Long said that he was not sure if the members of the Board of Supervisors were aware of this, but they had a joint meeting with the Charlottesville Economic Development Authority that summer. He said that they planned to get reports from some organizations, and they decided to have a meeting instead of those organizations doing it twice. He said that it was not a meeting like this where they were discussing things, but it was an opportunity that just happened. He said that they were fortunate to have a date that worked for them. He said that he believed they enjoyed doing this, and he thought it was part of their relationship.

Ms. McKeel said that she would like to revisit their initial presentation on Rivanna Futures and how it, along with the conceptual engineering and design work, informed their Strategic Plan and priorities for the next five years. She said that it was essential to consider how this endeavor shaped their work.

Mr. Pruitt said that as they continued their discussion on opportunity areas, he would like to revisit a point that he had mentioned repeatedly during the campaign. He said that he expressed his concern that their economic development and education departments may not always be as collaborative as they could be. He said that they were heavily investing in career technical education in the County. He said that they were developing a high school model that emphasized career technical education, with specific designated career training paths.

Mr. Pruitt said that however, it was not clear to him if they were using this focus as a means to engage with private sector partners. He said that ideally, he would like to see the formation of ecosystems with their educational institutions as anchors, creating deliberate partnerships and pathways. He said that he would like to see these educational initiatives not just as a part of partnership negotiations, but as a key component in siting agreements.

Ms. McKeel said that she recalled that during her last meeting as the EDA liaison, the EDA had a discussion about how to ensure that high schools, PVCC (Piedmont Virginia Community College), and the University, along with education and workforce development, were given due consideration. She said that this was critical to the work they were doing. She said that there was an extensive discussion among the EDA members about that issue.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that he would like to bring up a couple of points. He said that the Board of Supervisors had recently approved their Chief Operating Officer, Kristy Shifflett, who was present that evening. He said that she would now be serving on the PVCC Board. He said that one of the reasons they were very deliberate in considering her as a candidate was her role in supervising Human Resources, IT, strategic planning, and the embedded goal of workforce stabilization in their strategic planning, which involved workforce development.

Mr. Richardson said that they were intentional in approaching the Board, recognizing the need for PVCC to be a closer partner, and PVCC wanted to be. He said that the University would be part of the upcoming meeting of the Board of Supervisors and the City Council, where infrastructure work would be discussed. He said that workforce and better collaboration between the City, County, and University could also be a topic of focus for future discussions.



Ms. McKeel said that the County high schools were currently exploring career pathways. She said that their collaboration with them could be critical. She said that their new center model was centered around career pathways, and she believed that they should be working closely with Albemarle County Public Schools (ACPS) as well.

Mr. Richardson said that when they visited St. Louis the next day, that model had partnerships with 11 universities. He said that they were very excited about going there to learn about the Intelligence Campus. He said that he specifically wanted to discuss the partnership with the universities.

Ms. McKeel said that they truly wanted to ensure that children graduating from ACPS had the opportunity to attend PVCC, and that there were clear career pathways for them. She said that it was essential that they had the option to work within their community, without the need to leave. She said that they must establish career pathways for children who had completed high school, PVCC, or college degrees.

Ms. Mallek said that they also kept mentioning this because they were not getting where they needed to go. She said that other communities in their region were using the state training staff of the Workforce Center, where they had already prepared work and were bringing it into schools to do the classroom work. She said that this approach eliminated the need for additional full-time equivalent staff at the local, middle school, or high school level. She said that ACPS had not been receptive to this idea, but she hoped they would become more open to it. She said that five other jurisdictions were already benefiting from these federally funded staff who were consistently doing this work every day, without having to create it from scratch.

Ms. McKeel said that she believed that was a significant aspect of what their center model was accomplishing, especially Center II.

Ms. Mallek said that there was a broad base of students who needed this opportunity.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would like to add one more thought to their discussion on this matter. He said that when he had spoken with their peers and partners in the Schools about the center model, they occasionally expressed concern that enrollment in these centers was not meeting their expectations. He said it was challenging for him not to consider the possibility that it was demanding too much of a student to take a chance on an opportunity in a very specialized field of education when there was no guarantee of employment afterwards.

Mr. Pruitt said that as they contemplated the role of the EDA and their position as Board Supervisors, they needed to ensure there was a sense of certainty that if students pursued these educational paths, there should be a local employer, an employment partner, and a private sector opportunity waiting for them. He said he was not sure if they were providing that kind of assurance. He said that he wanted to stress the importance of addressing this issue when they discussed education. He asked what they were doing to actually fulfill that promise.

Mr. Storm said that one of the things they had demonstrated over the past few years was their ability to approve developments that were not solely residential. He said that Southwood had commercial activities, and the Albemarle Business Campus had both residential and business components, ensuring that jobs were located where people lived. He said that this approach allowed them to encourage thoughtful development throughout the Growth Area.

Mr. Storm said that it was not just in Crozet or the south side of Fifth Street and Avon Street Extended, where there was such a demand for people to live. He said that they were thoughtful about these developments, providing not only residential opportunities but also employment opportunities and spaces for entrepreneurs, such as startup spaces or commercial kitchens. He said that he believed this approach was a great opportunity for the next five years.

Mr. Pruitt said that he had been contemplating the same point. He said that they strategically allocated economic engines within residential areas. He said that he understood that their efforts to engage in these endeavors had resulted in numerous vacant, commercially zoned properties in those areas. He said that this issue was evident in Montclair, where a small portion of a neighboring development, intended for commercial use, had not matured over its 10-year span.

Mr. Pruitt said that this situation was a significant factor in the failure of the Scottsville Tire Factory. He said that when considering potential opportunity areas, he was curious about what additional measures they needed to implement to ensure the success of these models. He said that merely zoning these areas and creating scenarios and preconditions had not been enough in their current market.

Ms. Mallek said that one thing to consider was the oversaturation of that zoning, which was evident from the four significant rezonings that occurred between 2004 and 2008, resulting in 200,000 square feet of commercial opportunity. She said that the market had not been able to keep up with this expansion.

---

Agenda Item No. 6. **Discussion Item:** Memorandum of Understanding between Albemarle County and the Economic Development Authority.

Ms. Kilroy said that the final topic on the agenda was the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

between the Economic Development Authority (EDA) and the Board of Supervisors. She said that this document was last updated in 2017 and actually called out in it that when the County adopted its Economic Development Strategic Plan, the MOU should be revisited. She said that in tandem with the new strategic plan, a revised MOU could be a nice way to ensure that the MOU aligns with the future vision of the County's economic development strategy.

Ms. Kilroy said that there was not a redlined MOU in the packet, but they wanted to get a sense of direction, a sense of interest by the Board and the EDA on whether and how to tackle the items that they prepared for everyone in advance of the meeting. She said that one of the items in the packet was a memo that gave some background on each of the seven items for consideration. She said that the goal was to hear from the EDA and the Board on whether these items should be the focus of their attention.

Ms. Kilroy said that if there was general support for these topics, feedback on specific parameters would be beneficial. She said that the intention at the end of this discussion was to gauge the room's consensus. She said that this feedback would guide the staff in drafting a first redlined version of a revised MOU. She said that subsequently, they would collaborate with each body to refine this draft, aiming to reach a new MOU that would be adopted within the next several months.

Ms. McKeel asked if the bullet points were developed by the EDA.

Ms. Kilroy said that was correct, with that exception of the final item which originated from staff.

Ms. McKeel said that the final point mirrored processes they already had in place.

Ms. Kilroy said that staff's intent was to go through these topics step by step and hear thoughts, concerns, and questions that people would like to share, as well as seek better clarity from the EDA or staff on what those might entail. She said that in front of everyone was a copy of the memo for reference.

Mr. Long said that the first bullet point encapsulated their previous conversations. He said that he felt that some of this was more of an administrative process. He said that often, they received grant requests, and the EDA had to return to the Board to confirm if they could allocate funds for these requests. He said that the Board then approved, and the EDA informed them that they could now fund the grant.

Mr. Long said that his question was whether they could use the EDA as a broader tool for supporting these initiatives. He said that instead of the usual back-and-forth, they could allocate a specific budget to the EDA to decide on granting smaller amounts, such as \$10,000 or \$20,000, without further Board approval. He said that this approach would streamline the process, focusing on smaller dollar amounts rather than future funding.

Ms. McKeel said that what she was hearing was some flexibility in speed. She said that as a liaison, she had observed that the process could be quite cumbersome and time-consuming.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley clarified that when he mentioned that the Board would provide a pot of money, he was referring to the grant that would be received. She said that the grants were processed through the EDA, not through the Board.

Mr. Long said that at present, frequently, organizations would approach the EDA, requesting funds. He said that they would respond that they believed this was a good idea. He said that they would then need to take this matter to the Board for the appropriation of funds, and subsequently, often return to the EDA.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked what the source of funding would be. She asked if it would be the grant funding or if it would be coming from the Board.

Mr. Long said that for instance, the Board may allocate \$100,000 for a specific purpose. He said that they could focus on a more narrowly defined area, such as allocating funds for a particular initiative. He said that in such cases, the EDA would have the discretion to decide on the amount, say \$25,000, to support that initiative. He said that this approach would eliminate the need for the EDA to seek approval from the Board for each specific request.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was supportive of streamlining the process. She said that she was still confused about the grant funding that originated from an external source.

Mr. Long said that he was referring to a request from another party for funding.

Mr. Newberry said that the EDA was often asked to pledge a funding match in order for an organization to submit an application for funding from another source.

Ms. Kilroy said that a significant number of state programs required local support, and thus, they believed the mechanism would involve establishing a fund. She said that the source of the funds for these local funds would be the Economic Opportunity Fund.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley clarified that it would be used by the EDA in order for applicants to receive grants.

Mr. Gallaway said that he was fully supportive of this item. He said that they had a strategic plan that provided direction. He said that they also had a Board liaison who reviewed and processed all of that information. He said that it was then presented to the Board in financial reports. He said that he did not understand why this information had to be presented to them again. He said that this MOU was established during his campaign years, and he was surprised that he did not recall it.

Mr. Gallaway said that it was perplexing that some of the initiatives the EDA was proposing were not already in place. He said that he was willing to support these initiatives, as the Board did not have the capacity to oversee every aspect of the work in the County.

Mr. Gallaway said that they had discussed partnerships and entrepreneurialism. He said that the EDA had to file conflicts of interest with the state, and that all issues of transparency and ethical conduct were covered. He said that the appointed liaison would be responsible to red flag any concerns they had. He said that regarding the item referring to consideration by the Board for the EDA to exercise its special powers under state code, he was fully supportive and wondered why they were not already doing that. He said that he did not need to rubber-stamp every single decision the EDA was doing as a supervisor.

Ms. McKeel said that she agreed with Mr. Gallaway completely. She said that as the person whose signature was on this MOU from years ago, when they started the EDA office, they began by taking small steps. She said that it was time to move forward. She said that they wanted the EDA, the community, and the Board to get a sense of what the EDA could and would do and get a comfort level.

Mr. Gallaway said that he believed that was spot-on. He said that the history of the EDA's work meant that the Board could not get in the way of the progress and work of the EDA.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she agreed.

Ms. Mallek said that she was happy with the VJIP (Virginia Jobs Investment Program) and the AFID (Agriculture and Forestry Industries Development). She said that the Governor's Opportunity Fund, due to the significant awards, which could amount to several hundred thousand dollars, fell into a different category for her regarding the need for more process. She said that since the late 90s, business people had emphasized the need for speed, as everything was moving rapidly. She said that she believed that rushing things could lead to mistakes, which is why she had been cautious to avoid them. She said that although there had only been a few instances where they had invested heavily and the business had relocated to the City, she wanted to prevent that from happening again.

Ms. Mallek said that while she greatly respected and admired the efforts of the EDA team, she believed it was important to continue some of those middle-sized steps. She said that she was more cautious than others when it came to the special powers associated with owning land, as she was aware of the trouble other communities had faced in this regard. She said that she had heard numerous stories that she knew would not occur here because they were vigilant and doing a better job. She said that she was more cautious than others.

Mr. Gallaway said that he did not understand how they would be giving up oversight.

Ms. McKeel said that she was interested in pursuing the special powers of the EDA under state code. She said that it could be greatly beneficial.

Mr. Gallaway said that he understood Ms. Mallek's concerns. He said that mistakes had already occurred, and the Board had been involved. He said that perhaps the experts on the EDA could assist them in avoiding some of these mistakes. He said that the goal was to maintain the Board's control, authority, and oversight, even when granting certain requests to the EDA. He said that they still owned it, and the responsibility remained with them. He said that they allocated funds to the EDA manually, just as they did with other departments. He said that they had control over that.

Mr. Gallaway said that while nothing was perfect, they could adapt to changes, such as when a company moved out of the County. He said that they could not always predict or prevent these events, but they could hope for a replacement. He said that the issue arose when they did not have spaces for them. He said that if they had all the spaces and the company was leaving, it would be a different situation. He said that if they did not have a place for them, then it was problematic.

Ms. McKeel said that she agreed with Mr. Gallaway. She said that the EDA members were not rushing into any decisions without proper consideration. She said that Willowtree served as a good example. She said that when they first started and signed off on the MOU, they had an agreement with the City's EDA to partner with them.

Ms. McKeel said that their goal was to ensure that when businesses outgrew their space in the City, they would notify them so that they could consider the possibility of relocating them to the County, and vice versa. She said that they needed to be partners in all of this because they were a community. She said that keeping a business in their community was beneficial. She said that if a business outgrew its space in the City, hopefully, it would come to the County, or vice versa.

Mr. Pruitt said that he agreed with the points made by Ms. McKeel and Mr. Gallaway. He said that he entered the meeting with some reservations. He said that he considered the nature of elected bodies and appointed bodies composed of industry experts. He said that there was an inherent tension between these two types of bodies due to their differing goals. He said that elected bodies tended to prioritize

equity, while appointed bodies focused on growth. He said that this tension could not be ignored. He said that they, as the Board, still owned this.

Mr. Pruitt said that the direction given by the Board was based on a qualitative interpretation of standing documents that they had previously approved and was more of an art than a science. He said that he wanted to understand how the directors on the EDA interpreted this direction. He said that he was specifically interested in knowing what their checklist looked like when considering their direction.

Ms. McKeel said that there were some examples of the City using special powers.

Mr. Long said that his view was that the MOU should be broader, but the Board had the discretion to narrow it down. He said that the Board would provide funds and specify what they wanted to be done. He said that this approach could be as flexible or as specific as desired. He said that at the EDA meetings, he had heard that people wanted to contribute and participate, and he thought it was essential to determine how they could best utilize their expertise, whether it was in workforce development or other areas, and let the group decide.

Mr. Long said that ultimately, the supervisors had to decide how much direction they wished to provide. He said that this decision-making process was relevant to the City of Charlottesville. He said that he had represented the City of Charlottesville's Economic Development Authority during the development of the NGIC building and the Charlottesville Pavilion. He said that in both instances, the City had provided or leased land to the EDA, which then negotiated with private parties.

Mr. Long said that the EDA's broader negotiating power meant it did not have to adhere to the same restrictions as other entities. He said that they did not have to take the highest bidder and flexibility existed in the negotiations. He said that the EDA could negotiate a deal to allow the property to be developed in a better way. He said that this was something the Board of Supervisors might not be able to do. He said that in such cases, the City Council provided direction to the EDA, indicating what they wanted to be done.

Mr. Long said that in the case of NGIC, the City aimed to retain an employer downtown. He said that they managed to secure certain terms and invest their own funds to develop the space. He said that this example illustrated how the EDA could facilitate development of projects such as Rivanna Futures by preparing land, constructing buildings, and making decisions that were aimed at attracting the desired population. He said that it was essential to create this Tier 4 space to encourage development, as without it, no one would come.

Ms. McKeel said that these special powers to EDAs were enumerated in state code, so they were commonly used.

Ms. Johnson said that when something was presented, she did not consider the Board of Supervisors' perspective when something was presented to the EDA. She said that one aspect that people may not understand is the exceptional staff behind the economic development and the entire organization. She said that the work they did before any meetings was truly impressive. She said that when staff presented something to the EDA, they assured them that it aligned with the Board's plan and explained how it fit.

Ms. Johnson said that for instance, Ms. McKeel and Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley had attended the meetings, and staff did not present anything that was not already in line with the Board's vision. She said that when they received a proposal, they evaluated its economic impact, job creation, cost, investment, and the number of people it would benefit. She said that for example, with the lab space or the mobile pasteurization truck for honey producers, staff had conducted extensive research to ensure these initiatives would reduce business costs and reach more people. She said that their focus was on the overall economic impact, not the specifics of the proposal.

Mr. Gallaway said that it was a great point. He said that it was indeed a thick document, as it encompassed strategic planning and budget programming, and Project ENABLE. He said that it involved multiple departments, and Mr. Richardson deserved a lot of credit for making this organization high-performing over the past seven years. He said that this had allowed the Board to have faith and confidence in the people working under these constraints. He said that it was essential to ensure that no one went outside of balance. He said that this did not necessarily require a Board vote, as staff were responsible for this type of work, and the EDA members were aware of it.

Mr. Long said that to Ms. Mallek's point, it was a legitimate concern because it had happened in other places where the EDA had gone off and done a bunch of things without the Board being aware. He said that the fact that everyone was tied in together and knew what was going on would prevent that from occurring in their work.

Mr. Gallaway said that if there were Board liaisons present in those cases, they were not doing their jobs correctly.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that one of her concerns was that, as a Board, they would have to lease land to the lowest bidder. She said that, however, in speaking with Ms. Kilroy, she learned that they could actually give a piece of land to the EDA, and even if they were not the lowest bidder, they may have a better plan for it. She said that she was particularly thinking of Rivanna Futures and the possibility of working with other entities, as the Board was constrained. She said that she had complete faith in the

ability of the EDA and their liaisons to make this work.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she saw it as eliminating some of the excess steps that the Board currently imposed on them. She said that as a Board, they had the power to change things or reel things back in if necessary. She said that the 2017 MOU was quite outdated, and they should perhaps consider updating them more frequently. She said that she was fully supportive of what they were considering here.

Mr. Gallaway said that he would like to clarify that his intention was not to confuse anything he had said as the objective being the speed of turning something around. He said that while it was important to have the ability to react and turn things around quickly, that was not the primary focus. He said that their expertise and the knowledge of their people were of greater significance.

Mr. Gallaway said that if the Board did not have this matter on their agenda, it could potentially free up capacity in other areas, such as the CDD (Community Development Department), which was before the Board more frequently. He said that this was not a citizen advisory committee, but a specific type of authority. He said that they must have trust in this appointed authority. He asked if Mr. Andrews would like to provide his thoughts on this matter.

Mr. Andrews said that he was listening and appreciating the points being made. He said that he agreed that at least limited appropriated funds should be allocated, recognizing that larger projects still needed to come before the Board. He said that he had some questions about later bullet points, such as the clarification of the EDA's involvement in public-private partnerships in supporting local entrepreneurial ecosystems. He said that he saw these as different from what was currently happening. He said that he was looking forward to hearing more about these points as they clarified them.

Mr. Long said that he would like to address Mr. Andrews' point by mentioning two important aspects that they had discussed earlier: workforce and housing. He said that these were not decisions that they could make today, but they were within the EDA's purview. He said that although they currently lacked a housing authority, the EDA could potentially serve as the housing authority for funding purposes.

Mr. Long said that the Board needed to decide whether they wanted the EDA to spend its time and resources towards housing-related projects. He said that similarly, the Board needed to consider whether they wanted the EDO to focus on workforce development. He said that these were not merely MOU issues, but rather strategic decisions that would shape the direction of the EDA.

Mr. Gallaway said that upon reviewing the workforce development item, he found it to be the one that required the most attention. He said that it seemed to need a dedicated work session between the two boards because they could not resolve it today. He said that he believed the efforts they had seen over the past seven years in addressing business attraction had been validating. He said that while the business attraction item appeared to be progressing well, he believed the workforce development issue may just be more challenging to address.

Mr. Gallaway said that it was pointed out that the responsibility for workforce development fell under Project ENABLE, which indicated that they would depend on outside partners to handle this aspect. He said that this raised the question of whether they should be concerned about it or not. He said that if they chose to address it, they needed to determine their course of action. He said that this issue warranted a more extensive discussion.

Ms. Kilroy said that one element of the workforce development piece was that some Economic Development Offices provided services, and their practice in the County had been to support partners who did that work directly. She said that she believed the earlier conversation they had regarding workforce and education was centered around aligning educational opportunities available for students in K-16. She said that this was a form of workforce development, as it involved being a connector to help link job opportunities with educational upskilling. She said that service delivery was another area of focus, as well as collaborating with partners to deliver these services. She said that the Board should consider whether it was more beneficial to focus on all of these areas or prioritize one over the others.

Mr. Pruitt asked whether any of the roles mentioned were also duplicative with the workforce development initiatives that Human Services oversaw. He said that he understood that they operated the career center. He said that he was unsure about the value addition and potential process duplication when these roles were not being carried out elsewhere in the County. He said that he was aware that individuals performed these roles, and he said that he was open to being corrected if his understanding was incorrect.

Mr. Pruitt said that he was under the impression that many of these roles were currently managed by Human Services. He said that he was concerned about the potential overlap of the EDA's role in workforce development with other services, such as housing, and he was worried about the possibility of these roles being duplicated. He said that he requested more information on the value-add and deconfliction measures in place to prevent such duplication.

Ms. Johnson said that as they considered affordable housing and workforce development, they often thought of professions such as doctors or those with high degrees. She said that there was a significant need for laborers as well. She said that labor-intensive jobs, such as operating an excavator or a forklift, were essential for business growth. She said that there were many people who could potentially work these jobs. She said that affordable housing could also provide a workforce that was in close

proximity to businesses that required their specific skill sets.

Ms. Johnson said that this connection could contribute to the growth of both housing and workforce development. She said that there was a link between affordable housing and workforce development. She said that people needed a place to live where they could raise their families and send their children to good schools. She said that she believed that there was a tie-in between these two areas.

Mr. Pruitt said that he assumed the next stage deliverable resulting from this meeting would be drafting a first version of a MOU. He asked if it would be prudent to ask Mr. Richard DeLoria, Senior Assistant County Attorney, if there were specific things they needed clarity on to proceed with the next phase.

Mr. DeLoria said that he would defer to Ms. Kilroy to provide that information.

Ms. Kilroy said that the good news was that the next step would be to draft a document. She said that she had heard there was interest in a future potential MOU draft. She said that they all had the necessary information to begin working on that. She said that unless she saw anything different, she believed their next step would be to collaborate with the Attorney's Office to prepare a revised MOU. She said that this would be a first draft. She said that they had covered a lot of big picture direction, which could be challenging to translate into a legal document. She said that they had ample opportunity to work through getting to the correct framing.

Mr. Long suggested an interim step that they could consider. He said that instead of trying to draft the actual agreement at this point, perhaps they could come up with a document of bullet points or a term sheet. He said that this term sheet would outline the things they believed should be included in the MOU and the things that may require further discussion. He said that the boards could discuss the matters separately and ensure that everyone agreed to the potential terms before drafting the document.

Mr. Gallaway said that he believed that was prudent in order for everyone to voice their opinions on the terms.

Ms. McKeel said that they could always discuss the information with staff and ask questions prior to their decision-making.

Mr. Long said that he would like to address the issue of business attraction. He said that the initial version of Project ENABLE focused on developing local businesses, and that going out and finding businesses and bringing them back to the community was discouraged. He said that while it may make sense to focus on target industries, he believed that the EDA and the EDO should proactively reach out to potential businesses, rather than merely responding to those who expressed interest.

Ms. Kilroy said that in the 2017 MOU, business attraction was listed as one of the five activities that the EDA could work on. She said that the Economic Development Strategic Plan did not mention this activity area. She said that as Mr. Long pointed out, the first goal of Project ENABLE was to retain and grow local businesses, but business attraction was not included in that document. She said that this led to a perception that business attraction should not be an activity for the EDA and the office staff to work on. She said that considering the discussions on Rivanna Futures and the opportunities it presented for the County, it would be beneficial to receive direction from the Board regarding their interest in business attraction efforts. She said that perhaps focusing on specific target industries or one or two of them, rather than all of them, could be a more effective approach.

Ms. McKeel said especially as they looked at Rivanna Futures. She said that perhaps Mr. Richardson and Mr. Henry would return from their trip to St. Louis with further information in this regard. She said that in order for Rivanna Futures to reach its full potential, they must consider that.

Mr. Andrews said that he was comfortable with everything proposed thus far.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding service delivery for the workforce, and taking that into economic development, the state was allocating \$3 million annually to the local workforce center. She said that if these programs did not meet the business needs of their community, this funding could cease. She said that she hoped that people would think about more collaboration rather than duplicating existing efforts.

Ms. Mallek said that the County was contributing \$300,000 to the local funding, which was a collective effort from all the counties. She said that this was not a huge amount, but it was essential to be aware that the Federal pass-through, specifically the WIOA (Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act) money, would not continue if the locality was not perceived in its training and education, particularly by the governor and the next year's administration. She said that they were emphasizing the need for school departments to get involved with technical training.

Ms. Mallek said that she believed that the County or the EDO needed to focus on attracting businesses in target industries with appropriate safeguards. She said that the previous County support for Rivanna Futures was based on the defense sector, which may not be suitable for other industries. She said that she appreciated the idea of bullet points to consider as there was a lot to think about.

---

Agenda Item No. 7. Wrap Up.

Ms. Kilroy said that these conversations, though challenging, had provided them with several themes that would guide them in the right direction. She said that they had laid a strong foundation for the upcoming work on the Economic Development Strategic Plan and the MOU. She said that over the next few days, they would work to pull those things together and begin drafting a term sheet to assist them with the MOU.

Ms. Kilroy said that on the Economic Development Strategic Plan, this was just a preliminary meeting with them all. She said that she anticipated being back before them both at several points over the next year to ensure that the Board and the Authority were provided with the necessary guidance and direction for that work that would help guide the work that staff would do over a reasonable time horizon.

Ms. McKeel said that she believed that the one thing they had not mentioned was the last bullet, but she believed that had been part of their process. She said that she could not imagine there would be much pushback on the administrative fee. She said that they might need more information on how that would work. She said that this was a common occurrence in their processes. She clarified that this was an internal fee that the EDA paid to the County.

Agenda Item No. 8. Adjourn to August 21, 2024, 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 7:40 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to August 21, 2024, 1:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA, 22902. Mr. Andrews said information on how to participate in the meeting would be posted on the Albemarle County website Board of Supervisors home page and on the Albemarle County calendar.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date: 08/20/2025
Initials: CKB