

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on December 13, 2023, at 1:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium on the Second Floor of the Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

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

ABSENT: None.

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

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

Ms. Price introduced the following Albemarle County Master Police Officers in attendance: Dana Reeves and Andy Muncy.

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

Agenda Item No. 4. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Ms. Price said that Agenda Item 8.3, the VDOT monthly report, had been removed from the consent agenda as it had not been received. She said that the draft report for Item 10, the FY23 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report and Audit results, was added to the online meeting materials on December 12, and it would be an action item requiring a vote for acceptance by the Board.

Ms. Price said that that she was not aware of any other proposed revisions, and that the floor was open for a motion

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

Mr. Andrews **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

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

Ms. McKeel said that she would like to emphasize the importance of everyone getting vaccinations. She said that the flu vaccine this year had an 85% effectiveness rate. She said there were numerous other effective vaccines available that would protect individuals from severe illnesses such as RSV (Respiratory Syncytial Virus) for those who were medically eligible to receive these vaccines.

Ms. McKeel said that she would like to inform everyone that they had launched the MicroCAT transit program. She said that MicroCAT currently operated six vans and functioned as a rideshare service serving 29 North in the Pantops area. She said they were handicap-accessible, and every ride was free. She said that so far, ridership had been learning about the program through word of mouth. She said that in the first week, there were 142 riders, and the following week, there were 364 riders. She said that the goal was to have 600 riders weekly. She said that their full marketing campaign would begin in earnest in January to help them reach their target.

Ms. Mallek said that she wanted to follow up on the end-of-year events for the Charlottesville Band. She said that the holiday concert took place last Saturday at the Paramount Theater. She said that in 2023, the band performed 10 concerts in their region, with four of the five venues being within the County: PVCC (Piedmont Virginia Community College), Monticello, the Center, and John Paul Jones Arena. She said they estimated that over 6,000 County residents attended these free concerts. She said that seven small ensembles played more than 30 performances, including events such as Special Olympics at Boar's Head, Concerts at the Colonnades, the Center, the Blake, and the Lodge at Old Trail.

Ms. Mallek said that last year, the band provided lesson scholarships to nine middle school band students in County schools, valued at \$1,200 each. She said that this year, they expanded the number of scholarships to 12, including nine County residents and three from other areas. She said that over 50% of the band performers come from the County. She said that the band was celebrating its 102nd year in January.

Ms. Mallek said she would like to invite everyone to attend the Wreaths Across America ceremony taking place at noon on Saturday. She said that wreaths will be placed in military cemeteries and memorials across the nation to commemorate veterans who were lost in service. She said the ceremony would begin at noon at Dogwood Memorial in McIntyre Park, and following the ceremony, they will proceed to the memorial in front of the County building, then to Oakley Memorial on Rio Road, and

finally to the VFW Memorial in Earlsville.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that last Friday, a group of Supervisors attended the groundbreaking ceremony for the Diana Paul Manning Biotechnic Center, located on the UVA's campus at the Fontaine Research Park. She said that this center would significantly contribute to the area's reputation as it focused on researching and addressing diseases, including those that have yet to be identified.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that the establishment of this center was inspired by Paul and Diane Manning's two sons, who suffered from visual impairment due to a rare disease. She said that their community would benefit from the center's advancements in DNA biotechnology for addressing future diseases. She said that it would serve as a research park center for their area, eliminating the need for residents to travel out of state for specialized care.

Mr. Gallaway said that Will Ritchie, a local business owner, had died. He said Mr. Ritchie had owned several restaurants in the area, and he had personal connections with a few individuals who were employed at his establishments. He said that Mr. Ritchie was highly respected by his employees. He said that his thoughts and prayers were with the family and all the employees who continued to work in the places he established and managed.

Ms. Price said that she and Ms. Mallek had attended the free holiday concert by the Charlottesville Band. She said that they lived in a community that offered an almost unlimited source of free, low-cost, readily available events to attend as individuals, couples, or families. She said that people should take advantage of these opportunities and enjoy what they had there.

Ms. Price said that regarding the Fontaine Research Park ground opening for the Manning Biotech research facility, she said it was closely tied to Rivanna Station Futures' development and the Project ENABLE initiative. She said it tied in with the type of industry they aimed to attract and establish there, focusing on technologically connected industries that represent the future.

Agenda Item No. 6. Proclamations and Recognitions.

Item No. 6.a. Recognition of Supervisor Donna Price.

Mr. Andrews said that he wanted to acknowledge and recognize that this was Chair Price's last meeting on the Board. He said that as vice-chair, it had been a special privilege to work with Ms. Price. He said that she took over as Chair as he came on board, and that she had been adept and masterful from the start, evidenced in how she masterfully chaired several recent joint Board meetings. He said that her public speaking had been impressive, and that she always had something to say that he wish he had said.

Ms. McKeel said that Ms. Price had been a wonderful member of the Board and an excellent chair. She said she wanted to express her appreciation and presented her with a card on behalf of the Board, which everyone had contributed to. She said she wanted to recognize Ms. Price's leadership as a Navy veteran, acknowledging her background and its impact on their meetings. She said she appreciated Ms. Price's connections and credibility, which made a lot of sense in the context of their organization.

Ms. McKeel said that in reflecting on this, the Navy's leadership competency model was defined through five competencies: accomplishing the mission, leading people, leading change, working with people, and resource stewardship. She said that she would like to acknowledge Ms. Price's leadership as a role model for everyone. She said that Ms. Price had set an example not only for their team but also for the LGBTQ+ community. She said that visible role models helped build bridges and break down barriers and misconceptions, inspiring others to be open about themselves and pursue their goals in any workplace.

Ms. Mallek said that from the perspective of a citizen, she appreciated how Ms. Price had truly represented all the different segments of their population, especially in the Scottsville District, but also across the County. She said she appreciated Ms. Price's calm leadership, and that her comments were always coherent and clear. She said that she had a plaque to present to Chair Price, which she read aloud.

Mr. Gallaway said that Robert Coles had written a book called The Call of Service, which is about idealism and people who answer that call. He said the book explored the methods they use and why they do it, among other things. He said that Ms. Price could have served as an example for the book. He said that as they approached December 21, he always reflected on the winter solstice. He thought about what people must have thought in prehistoric times when they saw it getting darker and darker, then saw it getting lighter again, and the joy and awe they must have had. He said that when he thought about serving on the Board with Ms. Price, two words came to mind: joy and awe.

Mr. Gallaway said that Ms. Price's retirement coincided with the return of light. He said that Ms. Price's service was an example to everyone who wished to serve in an elected capacity. He said that he appreciated Ms. Price as a colleague and friend, and he presented a plaque to Ms. Price for her dedicated service and leadership as a member of the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors from January 1 through December 31.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that this was a bittersweet time for Ms. Price. She said that Ms. Price was very happy to serve the County and the Board. She said that the improvement of the County and of the

Supervisors that Ms. Price always strived for had been a real benefit to all of them. She said that one thing that exemplified Ms. Price's character was her kindness to everyone. She said that what amazed her was that Ms. Price's competence and intelligence helped make progress on LGBTQ issues. She said that Ms. Price's representation of the Board was truly exemplified, and she presented a clock to Ms. Price.

Ms. Price said that when she retired from the Navy, the Navy band was accompanied by her three children who played instruments, making it a very emotional event. She said that exactly 20 years ago to the day, she went on terminal leave from the Navy. She said that that marked the end of her Navy career, just as this meeting marked the end of her term on the Board, even though it would not officially end for 17 days, eight hours, and 35 minutes. She said it was bittersweet because for 45 years, anytime she had left one job, it was to go to another one, but this really marked the end of it.

Ms. Price said that as she prepared for her retirement ceremony from the Navy, she pondered how to represent 25 years of service. She said she had a drawer full of t-shirts to remember, and she had kept three over the years. She said that in 1992, upon leaving the Philippines, one of the officers who worked alongside her gifted her a t-shirt featuring her entire family. She said that the shirt read "Price Family World Tour" and symbolized their ongoing global adventures. She said that the following summer, she would embark on a journey to Europe, walking the Camino de Santiago among other things.

Ms. Price said that she saved two other shirts from her time in the Navy: one commemorating her role as commanding officer of the legal service office and another marking her tenure as a judge within the trial judiciary. She said that as she departed Albemarle County, she would take with her an Albemarle County shirt.

Ms. Price said that there were four key players on this team, which they called Albemarle County, that she would like to recognize. She said that as they all worked toward the same objective, even when it may not be apparent, they were all part of a team. She said that the first players she wished to thank were the voters and community members. She said that she wanted to express her gratitude to those in the Scottsville Magisterial District who supported her during her campaign for office four years ago. She said she expressed gratitude to those who did not vote for her but have since found common ground.

Ms. Price said the second players she wanted to thank were the County staff. She said that staff was responsible for delivering services to the community, and were the unsung heroes. She said that the third group she wished to discuss were the current members of the Board. She said that when she was elected in 2019 and began her term in January 2020, they were thrust into a virtual world by March 2020. She said Chair Gallaway set the standard which she had hoped to come close to matching and had put the Board on an upward trend beyond what had been achieved previously. She said she wanted to acknowledge the years of service of Ms. McKeel and Ms. Mallek. She said she wanted to acknowledge the contributions of Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley and Mr. Andrews.

Ms. Price said she wanted to discuss the executive leadership, including Mr. Jeff Richardson and his team. She said she wanted to acknowledge the work done by the Clerk, Ms. Claudette Borgersen, and Senior Deputy Clerk Mr. Morris, and Ms. Grace Redden-Tamblin to make the meetings flow as smoothly as they did. She said that she wanted to focus specifically on Mr. Richardson. She said that Mr. Richardson brought the leadership that made their organization hum. She said that he was the glue that held it together. She said the community needed to understand that under their form of government, they, the supervisors, did one thing—they voted and set policy.

Ms. Price said that then they immediately handed it over to Mr. Richardson's County Executive leadership and his team, who executed it. She said that the County Attorney, Mr. Steve Rosenberg, and before that, Mr. Greg Kamptner, provided them with the legal guidance that ensured their compliance. She said that she left with mixed emotions but never thought after retiring from the Navy that she would have an experience of public service like she had with the County.

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

Mr. Dirk Nies, White Hall District, said that earlier that year, the Board addressed the issue of affordable housing for low-income elderly and disabled residents by expanding eligibility under the real estate tax relief program to Albemarle County homeowners who fell into this category. He said that the Board raised the caps for net income and net assets. He said that the enrollment period for this program had ended for the year. He said the actions had resulted in 19 homeowners qualifying for real estate tax relief who would not have qualified under the previous income and asset limits.

Mr. Nies said that 16 out of the 19 homeowners would not have qualified had the Board not raised the asset and income limits. He said that the County would award \$43,000 in tax relief to these 19 homeowners, equivalent to 0.02% of real estate tax revenues collected annually.

Mr. Nies said that he had previously recommended that the Board eliminate the net worth eligibility requirement entirely and base financial eligibility solely on income. He said if that was too great a step for the Board to take, he suggested establishing a separate reduced tax relief benefit schedule for elderly and disabled homeowners who qualified only under the income criteria. He said that if deemed necessary by the Board, it should implement a cap on the annual real estate tax relief awarded to income-only applicants. He said he had provided the Clerk with a suggested real estate tax relief benefit

schedule and cap.

Ms. Jane Kulow, Samuel Miller District, said that she currently served on the Board of the Friends of JMRL (Jefferson-Madison Regional Library). She said that over the past dozen years, it had been her privilege to speak to County supervisors about JMRL concerns. She said that County residents reaped wonderful benefits through support of the library. She said that in 2022, JMRL was named the Virginia Library Association's Library of the Year. She said that she was there to encourage them to include the renovations of the Central JMRL branch in the five-year CIP (Capital Improvement Plan).

Ms. Kulow said that as for the need, Central JMRL was an aging capital asset, with numerous major infrastructure needs. She said it had received only spot upgrades since its initial renovation 50 years ago. She said that modern library facilities, such as multiple-sized meeting rooms, were almost constantly available in Northside and Crozet branches. She said that residents should have access to updated and modern facilities in all branches. She said that they specifically requested central renovations in the library's recent strategic planning survey.

Ms. Kulow said the building was co-owned by the County and the City. She said County and City staff have acknowledged the need for major renovations for more than 20 years, while the request had been left off the approved CIP list. She said that in terms of timing, the most recent design assessment was completed eight years ago and cost estimates had doubled since. She said that renovation costs would only increase with each five-year plan.

Ms. Kulow said that all jurisdictions in the library system shared the value of regional cooperation. She said that the value of this particular shared asset between the County and the City meant that the capital costs were split. She said that the JMRL and the Friends of the Library were prepared to begin a significant fundraising campaign to assist with this project. She asked the Board to preserve one of the most important public buildings in their community and prepare it to provide the library service their residents expected and deserved for years to come. She said they needed the Board of Supervisors to identify this as a priority for the CIP.

Ms. Wanda Bruce, White Hall District, said that she was there to discuss affordable housing. She said that affordable housing could encompass various aspects. She said that where she lived had become less affordable due to excessive tax increases. She said that they were not requesting any funds or expenditure of tax dollars or investments in infrastructure or services. She said that as seniors, they merely asked that a smaller portion of their money, which they were attempting to save and allocate for retirement and semi-retirement, be taken. She said this would enable them to continue caring for their families and relatives residing in the Albemarle County area.

Ms. Bruce said that she and her husband were lifelong residents of the County and wished to remain part of the community in which they grew up and enjoy its culture continually. She said that they did not want high real estate taxes to force them and their relatives to leave the County in search of more affordable housing due to the significant increase in taxes over the past few years.

Ms. Bruce said that she and her husband lived on fixed incomes, with a small pension and no large family inheritance. She said that they struggled financially, not because of poor planning, but due to the exorbitant increases in their real estate taxes. She said she hoped that they would seriously consider basing tax relief for the elderly and disabled on their limited incomes rather than their net worth, which was what they had saved for this stage in their lives.

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

Ms. Price said that, unless there were other proposed amendments, the floor was open for a motion.

Mr. Andrews **moved** to approve the consent agenda as amended.

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

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

Item No. 8.1. Personnel Policy Revisions.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that Albemarle County ended the shared service Human Resources (HR) model in Fiscal Year 2023 (FY 23) and approved the formation of a Human Resources Department dedicated to local government operations. Foundational work in establishing a government-focused HR Department includes a full review and revision of all County Personnel Policies, which is now underway. During this review, staff identified opportunities to modernize existing Personnel Policies to align with changes in legislation and public sector best practices.

Under the County Code, personnel policies and amendments are adopted by the Board of

Supervisors.

Staff is proposing updates to the Personnel Policies listed below with a summary of the proposed changes for each. The policies have been renumbered, as indicated below, to improve ease of use and accessibility for all staff. These policies also utilize a new template, which will be used for all future proposed personnel policy updates in an effort to standardize these policies.

§P-4 Effect of Criminal Conviction or Arrest

Previously § P-05 Effect of Criminal Conviction or Arrest (Attachment A), the proposed changes include: added sections for Roles and Responsibilities and Definitions; removed administrative instructions and processes; added accountability for reporting criminal investigations; added provision for backfilling position in the event of extended administrative leave; added requirement for providing employee with reports and documents obtained and used in any adverse employment action.

§P-6 Standards of Conduct

Previously § P-25 Standards of Conduct (Attachment B), the proposed changes include: added sections for Roles and Responsibilities and Definitions; re-structured and categorized by type of behavior.

§P-7 Code of Ethics

Previously § P-27 Conflict of Interest, § P-28 Indebtedness to the County, and § P-33 Outside Employment by County Employees (Attachment C), the proposed changes include combined three former policies pertaining to ethics, conflict of interest, and integrity into one policy; inserted the informally adopted ethical requirements into a formal policy document to create accountability; added sections for Roles and Responsibilities and Definitions; added requirements for reporting fraud, waste, and abuse of county assets; added conflict of interest protocols for employment decisions.

§P-32 Employee Discipline

Previously § P-22 Employee Discipline (Attachment D), the proposed changes include: added sections for Roles and Responsibilities and Definitions; created structure for determining severity of policy violations to ensure fair and equitable discipline practices; standardized formal steps of progressive discipline; established types of behaviors and violations warranting immediate dismissal; added recordkeeping requirements.

There is no budget impact associated with the proposed adoption of these amendments.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the Resolution (Attachment E), to amend personnel policies § P-4, § P-6, § P-7, and § P-32.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the resolution as presented in Attachment E to amend the personnel policy revisions.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors may adopt Personnel Policies under Albemarle County Code §2-901; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to amend and re-number the following Policies: §P-5 Effect of Criminal Conviction or Arrest as §P-4 Effect of Criminal Conviction or Arrest, §P-25 Standards of Conduct as §P-6 Standards of Conduct, §P-27 Conflict of Interest, §P-28 Indebtedness to the County, and §P-33 Outside Employment by County Employees as §P-7 Code of Ethics, and §P-22 Employee Discipline as §P-32 Employee Discipline.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, hereby approves the renumbering and amendment to the County's Personnel Policies as set forth in the documents attached hereto..

Item No. 8.2. Appointment of County of Albemarle Representative to the Blue Ridge Cigarette Tax Board..

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that the Blue Ridge Cigarette Tax Board (BRCTB) was established pursuant to Code of Virginia § 58.1-3832 to assess, collect, and disburse the cigarette taxes levied by and for its member jurisdictions.

Current members of the BRCTB are the Counties of Albemarle, Augusta, Fluvanna, Greene, Madison, and Orange; the City of Charlottesville; and the Town of Madison. The Board is composed of one representative from each jurisdiction. This requested action is to formalize the appointed County representative on the BRCTB.

When the Blue Ridge Cigarette Tax Board was created, the Chief of Revenue Administration served as the County's representative by default, as that position participated in the creation of the BRCTB. The individual in the Chief of Revenue Administration role has changed and staff identified a need to formalize the County's process for selecting a representative to serve on the BRCTB. Staff is requesting approval from the Board of Supervisors to appoint, and authorize the County Executive to select a designee to serve as the County's representative on the Blue Ridge Cigarette Tax Board, for an indefinite tenure effective on and after December 13, 2023. The County Executive will designate the

Chief of Revenue Administration position for this role.

Staff does not anticipate a budget impact associated with the recommended Board action.

Staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors adopt the resolution (Attachment A), to appoint, and authorize the County Executive to select a designee, to serve as the County's representative on the Blue Ridge Cigarette Tax Board with all authority and obligations of a representative of the Tax Board..

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the resolution as presented in Attachment A to appoint, and authorize the County Executive to select a designee, to serve as the County's representative on the Blue Ridge Cigarette Tax Board with all authority and obligations of a representative of the Tax Board:

**RESOLUTION APPOINTING REPRESENTATIVE TO THE
BLUE RIDGE CIGARETTE TAX BOARD**

WHEREAS, the County of Albemarle, Virginia ("County") is a member of the Blue Ridge Cigarette Tax Board ("Tax Board"); and

WHEREAS, Section 2 of the Blue Ridge Cigarette Tax Agreement allows the County to appoint a representative on the Tax Board.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia that:

1. The County Executive shall serve as the County's representative on the Tax Board, at the pleasure of the Board of Supervisors, with all the authority and obligations of a representative on the Tax Board, for an indefinite tenure effective on and after December 13, 2023.

Item No. 8.3. VDOT Monthly Report (December) 2023.

This item was not received and was pulled from the agenda.

Agenda Item No. 9. Work Session: 5-Year Financial Planning.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that long-range financial planning is part of the County's adopted financial policies. The Five-Year Financial Plan includes a review of revenue trends and expenditures from the prior years' projections of revenues and expenditures, as well as future costs and the financing of the Capital Improvement Plan. A long-range financial plan is different from the annual budget in that it emphasizes where the County may be headed at the end of the plan rather than the coming fiscal year. This planning can provide a helpful framework to inform the annual budget to ensure funding recommendations are aligned with County priorities. It also provides a framework to illuminate discussion around questions such as:

- a) Are the County's operating and capital plans in alignment? For example, if the County starts constructing anew facility in the capital budget, is it able to open and operate it in a future operating budget - can the decisions being made today be afforded in future years?
- b) What long-term strategies or policies could be considered to change the long-term trajectory of the financial plan?

The Five-Year Financial Plan is the next step in the County's long-term financial planning process, where to date:

- On August 16, the Board approved the FY 25 operating and capital budget calendar
- On October 4, the Board received an Economic Outlook Report
- On November 15, the Board held the first Five-Year Financial Plan work session that focused on County Government services.
- On December 6, the Board held a joint Five-Year Financial Plan work session with the School Board.

Next, in accordance with the budget development schedule, prior to the annual budget process the Board will hold its final long-range financial planning work session to review information on December 13.

During this work session, staff will present and facilitate continued discussion on the Five-Year Financial Plan presented on November 15, 2023, to include Tax Relief for the Elderly and Disabled and workforce stabilization. The assumptions in the plan will continue to be updated in the annual budget development process and subsequent financial plans.

Long-range financial planning connects long-range fiscal planning with strategic priorities and provides an important context for the annual budget process.

Staff recommends that the Board share feedback and questions on the long-range Five-Year Financial Plan.

Mr. Andy Bowman, Interim Assistant Chief Financial Officer for Policy and Partnerships, said that this was the fifth long-term planning discussion they had had over the past couple of months. He said that they would focus more specifically on two programs: the Tax Relief for the Elderly and Disabled Program and a discussion around the Fire Rescue system. He said they would return before the Board on financial matters on February 21 when the County Executive would initiate the process for the recommended budget for FY25.

Mr. Bowman said that he would begin the presentation by focusing on the real estate tax relief program for the elderly and disabled. He said that there was no formal action required from the Board as this was not the first time the Board of Supervisors had discussed this topic, and it would not be the last. He said that they wanted to continue the conversation that the Board of Supervisors had in April when this program was last discussed. He said they would share an overview of the current program, the results of any changes made, and the participant data. He said that they would discuss with the Board some options for further revisions.

Mr. Bowman said that the Board did not need to make a decision on what that option may look like at this time, but staff was open to beginning to narrow down what some proposed ordinance changes could look like. He said that they would talk through those options and open it up for discussion.

Mr. Bowman said that the current criteria for the program required applicants to be at least 65 years old or have a medically determined total and permanent disability. He said that applicants must hold the title of the property, which could not be used as a business. He said that there were specific income and financial net worth requirements. He said that these criteria included income thresholds with relief percentages of 100%, 75%, or 50% based on income levels, and a net worth criteria. He said it was important to note that the applicant's dwelling and land up to 10 acres were excluded from the net worth calculation. He said that if someone owned 15 acres, they would be eligible, and the relief would be applied after exempting the net worth, the dwelling, and the first 10 acres excluded as part of that.

Mr. Bowman said that in the FY28 budget, the program totaled \$1.8 million. He said they would revise the figures based on changes in property values, policy updates from the Board, and fluctuations in the number of people involved in the program.

Mr. Bowman said that in April 2023, the Board of Supervisors approved two actions. He said that first, they increased the income criteria by updating it to 80% of the area median income (AMI) for a family of four. He said that this was the second year in a row that the Board made this update. He said that they increased the net worth criteria cap from \$200,000 to \$250,000. He said that the Board desired further discussion on these changes and their impacts, as well as the other considerations discussed during the meeting.

Mr. Bowman said there were now 17 newly eligible applicants, and the total impact was approximately \$40,000. He said that a little bit of that was due to the updated income, but most of this change was primarily due to adjustments in net worth criteria, and two of the applicants qualified based on both income and net worth. He said that most of the change was in the net worth category.

Mr. Bowman said when the criteria were expanded, more applicants became eligible. He said that in 2023, 94% of those who applied were deemed eligible, compared to 89% in 2022. He said that the average income of these applicants was \$32,000, and their average net worth was \$48,000. He said that within this range of participants, there was a variety of individual circumstances, but on average, they tended to be some of the most economically vulnerable people in the community.

Mr. Bowman said that another way to analyze that data was by categorizing it, and there were three bands of relief. He said that depending on one's net income, they can receive either 100, 75, or 50% relief. He said that approximately three-quarters of the individuals in the program were eligible for the 100% relief level. He said that if they considered the average countywide assessment of \$436,000 and the corresponding average tax bill of \$3,700, it became clear that these changes had a significant impact on the program's participants. He said that it was evident that the program was designed to primarily assist those well below the limits and the most economically vulnerable in their community.

Mr. Bowman said that four options for further revisions were initially discussed during the April Board meeting and were not mutually exclusive. He said that the Board may choose to prepare an ordinance that updated a combination of these, only one, or different options out there. He said that the Board could continue adjusting the annual income criteria, there could be a further revision to the net financial worth criteria, and a cap could be considered for property-specific caps or one that was program-wide.

Mr. Bowman said that if there was a desire to expand the program, it should be done with a basis that was reasonably understandable. He said that secondly, they needed to assess their organization's ability to implement changes in CY24, considering that their financial systems were dated. He said they must evaluate the impact of the current program participants. He said any actions taken should be grounded in prudent financial management.

Mr. Bowman said the first option was to maintain the approach of annually adjusting the income criteria. He said that what the Board of Supervisors had done over the past two years was benchmark this to 80% of the AMI for a family of four. He said this was based on the connection to the affordable housing

policy of that 80% figure. He said it also served as an objective measure that could be tracked and updated annually, making it reasonably understandable. He said that since this was already in place, it could be implemented in CY24 with minimal administrative impact on their financial systems.

Mr. Bowman said that when they updated the threshold, two things would occur. He said they would anticipate some new applicants becoming eligible, and they might also see individuals who initially received 50% or 75% of relief gradually moving up to a higher level of assistance over time. He said that based on recent experience with similar applicants, staff estimated that the budget impact of this change would be approximately an additional \$60,000 on top of the current \$1.8 million that was currently budgeted.

Mr. Bowman said that the second option related to a revision of the net financial worth criteria. He said that staff suggested raising the cap to \$305,000 due to inflation adjustments. He said that since they knew the fiscal impact of increasing from \$200,000 to \$250,000, staff proposed revising the net financial worth criteria cap to \$305,000 for the Board's consideration. He said this could be implemented in CY24. He said that based on current data, three applicants would immediately become eligible.

Mr. Bowman said that options C and D proposed caps different from the current program for the Board's consideration if they wished to explore those options further. He said that in previous years, the Board had considered various options for setting the tax bill cap. He said one such option was to use the median assessed value as the cap. He said that if this method were implemented in 2023, the maximum relief an individual could receive would be about \$3,700 if they qualified at 100% relief and would depend on their eligibility percentage. He said that since this option had not been implemented, the analysis of these considerations differed from those related to income and net worth.

Mr. Bowman said that when setting policy, adding criteria could increase precision in determining who a program supported but might also increase complexity and make it more difficult for those seeking benefits from the program to understand it. He said that staff could implement a property-specific cap in CY24. He said the other consideration was that setting the cap would limit access for individuals above the cap, including those currently in the program.

Mr. Bowman said the final option for the Board's consideration was a program-wide cap. He said that the option differed from the specific cap in that it involved setting a single cap for the entire program, which would then be shared among all eligible applicants within the program. He said that the same point regarding complexity applied here. He said that adding an additional criterion did create complexity, although it introduced a different type of uncertainty.

Mr. Bowman said that in addition to this program, there were some impacts on their processes for participants who were in the program when they had a program-wide cap. He said the first of these was that it would require a change in due dates for first-time applicants. He said that if one was a first-time applicant in the program, the deadline was in October. He said that in a program with a program-wide cap, they needed to know everyone who was eligible by April so that they could do the analysis before the tax bills went out. He said that this would leave less time for first-time applicants to apply in the current year where they were eligible.

Mr. Bowman said that the second impact on program participants related to the concept of certainty as well. He said that currently, when their staff in Finance and Budget determined someone's eligibility, they promptly followed up with a letter certifying the amount of relief they were eligible for. He said that individuals could then use this letter to work with their mortgage company and other financial planners as needed. He said that if there was a program-wide cap in place, people might be deemed eligible but could not receive certification for their relief amount due to the varying total number of eligible individuals under that cap.

Mr. Bowman said that as this was a more complex program, they were still studying with their vendors if it could be implemented in CY24. He said that while it was not impossible, they were not yet confident compared to the property-wide specific cap, and they could provide more information if the Board considered pursuing this route.

Mr. Bowman said that the other analysis, similar to many others, suggested that setting a cap may limit program access and reduce existing relief for individuals in the program. He said the budget impact of this would depend on the cap. He said that staff requested the Board's feedback on the options for a potential ordinance for CY24.

Ms. McKeel said that she believed that maintaining an approach of annually adjusting income criteria would probably be possible. She said she supported option A and requested more information about option B. She said she found options C and D overcomplicated and was not keen on pursuing them because she thought they might be difficult for the public to understand. She said she would consider options A or B.

Ms. Mallek said she agreed to continue doing A and supported option B as a minimum. She asked for clarification about the people who would lose eligibility under option C.

Mr. Bowman said that if they had someone at the \$4,000 line, that was the amount they currently received. He said that if they received 100% relief, they would obtain the full benefit of \$4,000. He said that under the current program, an individual with a \$4,000 tax bill would receive 100% relief if they qualified. He said if the Board were to maintain the program without changes, except for adding a cap that

the relief would not exceed the average tax bill, the tax bill would be approximately \$300. He said the individual would benefit from the \$3,700 based on the average and then have to pay a tax bill of \$300 for the portion previously receiving relief.

Ms. Mallek asked if the same thing would happen under options A or B. She said that one of the most significant factors, at a cosmic level, was the substantial increase in assessed value. She said that their constituents could not influence this change, as it was merely a reflection of market reality.

Mr. Bowman said that if they implemented A or B without any cap on property, individuals would be able to fully reap the benefits they were entitled to.

Ms. Mallek asked if that would change the eligibility pool.

Mr. Bowman said that if option A was implemented, it would result in a budget impact of approximately \$60,000 during FY25. He said if they chose option B, it would likely have an additional impact of around \$60,000 as well. He said that the combined effect of options A and B would be about \$120,000 on top of the current \$1.8 million program, in addition to any other changes that may arise due to reassessments and new qualifiers, regardless of the requirements.

Ms. Mallek said she was concerned about option D given the present market conditions. She said that one suggestion from citizens concerned people of extremely low income who either struggled to apply or did not apply because they could not manage the application process. She said they should consider people who did not have to file an income tax return. She said she supported options A and B, she needed more information about option C, and she did not support option D.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was not interested in pursuing options C and D. She said she did like options A and B. She asked whether the income and land criteria were inclusive or exclusive of each other.

Mr. Bowman said that they would be exclusive to each other. He said that one would go through the analysis and have an income and a net worth result.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if eligibility would be determined on one, the other, or both.

Mr. Bowman said that to be eligible, one would have to meet both criteria.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley reiterated that she supported Option A and said that it would be easy enough to do. She said that Option B worried her because even though somebody's income was not high, they may own a lot of property. She said that she did not think anyone expected to have a free ride and asked if 100% relief meant that the person had 100% no tax.

Mr. Bowman confirmed that it would depend on the size of the property; that the dwelling and the first 10 acres would be exempt, so if one was below that and qualified for 100% relief, that would be there. He said that if someone had more than 10 acres, there would still be some that would be subject to taxation.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was looking at A and B.

Mr. Andrews said that the employer he worked with for several decades introduced a program that allowed employees to choose between two retirement options. He said one option involved contributions going into a plan that provided a fixed benefit upon retirement, in the form of a specific amount of money per month. He said the other option involved contributions being directed toward an IRA or 401(k)-like plan, where the employee would own the accumulated funds and have control over their investment and withdrawal decisions. He said that these options were not considered to have different outcomes for employees at the time.

Mr. Andrews said that this program, as currently presented, penalized one over the other. He said that if one chose a program based on monthly income alone, they might have a relatively low income and qualify for assistance. He said that if one saved enough money so that they had a substantial savings to live off of in the future, they would not be eligible because their net worth was too high.

Mr. Bowman said that there were various paths to retirement. He said that for some individuals within a County of their size and those participating in the program, income criteria significantly impacted eligibility. He said that for others, net worth would be more impactful. He said that the Board faced the challenge of determining the appropriate balance between these factors, recognizing their existence.

Mr. Andrew said they should consider a combination of considering net worth differently based on income levels. He said he wished there was a way to recognize that people may be living either under a fixed income or a fixed asset producing their income. He said that in both cases, he believed that at some threshold, they deserved relief from their tax burden.

Mr. Bowman said that in 2019, the Board of Supervisors revised this program, changing the nine options for net worth relief to three. He said that just as there were three options for income, there were three options for net worth. He said that they simplified the program while expanding it. He said that if the Board felt that the income or net worth thresholds were not balanced, they could adjust them to a new threshold as needed. He said that staff aimed to ensure that both income and net worth benchmarks were

objective and updated annually to avoid the program going for years without an update.

Mr. Andrews said that instead of having both, he would like to have a way to look at either, but that it would probably be too complex. He said that the current approach was not entirely fair to someone who made a decision to go one way or another a long time ago in their retirement. He said that he was supportive of A and B. He said that he was in favor of C. He said that one aspect of this proposal's complexity was that the cap did not change who would be eligible to apply. He said people would still be encouraged to apply; it only changed the maximum benefit they could receive. He said that while it added some complexity, it did not alter eligibility or predictability because they could set the cap and people would know what that cap was. He said that if their tax bill exceeded this amount, they would be responsible for the portion greater than the cap. He said this might also free up their ability to provide relief to more individuals, as he was not interested in reducing the amount of tax relief they provided.

Mr. Andrews said that regarding D, while it introduced additional complexity and reduced predictability, which concerned him, its effectiveness depended on how predictable the adopted measure was for budgetary purposes. He said that if they began to tinker with this in a way that suggested uncertainty about the potential impact it may have, then he started to worry that they might need a cap. He said that if staff members became comfortable after conducting an analysis and gaining experience from the previous occasion, then the cap may be unnecessary.

Mr. Gallaway asked where the funds would come from if there was a program in place that exceeded their budget estimates.

Mr. Bowman said that they would likely seek that from the Board's reserve contingencies, which was something they set aside, usually at around \$600,000 in the budget, and managed throughout the year. He said that historically, in the absence of program changes, it was common for this group to grow about 8% a year. He said that they would make a projection, but sometimes they missed that. He said when they missed it, it was a matter of tens of thousands of dollars. He said when they began to look at more substantial changes, they opened up uncertainty. He said that now that they had two years of data on income changes and one year of net worth, their confidence had increased because they were learning from that history that they did not have before.

Mr. Gallaway said that just like in other areas, where they could not exactly say what the cost projection would be if something was over, if they went beyond, they always had reserves there for that reason. He said that he did not support D. He said that the relief needed to be predictable and that this was a critical component of it. He said year in and year out, what needed to be budgeted for could not change. He said they needed to make the decision and live with the cost.

Mr. Gallaway said that at a minimum, A and B should always be adjusted based on inflation and other factors. He said that in terms of the amounts for B, last budget they were concerned about how many people were going to become eligible. He said that he was hoping to have a greater impact with the program. He said that the net worth criteria should be, at a minimum, what staff proposed.

Mr. Gallaway said that upon examining other jurisdictions, it appeared that their net worth requirements were considerably higher than the County. He said he believed there was room for expansion in this area. He said that when considering the individuals affected by these policies and the average assessments of their properties, it seemed that only those who truly required relief would apply for it.

Mr. Gallaway said he was open to more discussion on C, but he was not interested in removing people who were currently eligible based on A and B. He said he was concerned option C would remove eligible participants. He said that he was hoping to have a bigger impact from the previous policy decision. He said that he thought that this relief was something that was important, and that it should help those who need it.

Ms. Price said she supported A and B. She said that she was open to more discussion on C. She said she did not support option D. She asked for information on the percent and total count of County residents who were disabled and who were elderly and disabled. She said that the 10-acre limitation raised concerns with her because she thought they should consider both acreage and development rights. She said that they needed to consider the acreage matching the landowner's ability to sell some of it off.

Ms. Price said she was curious about the level of funding from the County for affordable housing incentives. She said they could determine how many households they were helping through the affordable housing. She said that it was about getting people into housing and then looking at how many people they could help stay in their housing. She said that if they were building 300 or 400 affordable units, that would be helping 300 or 400 households, but they were not helping many people with tax relief. She said that it seemed that this bell curve was disproportionately skewed toward getting people into housing and not sufficiently helping people stay in housing under this program. She said she wanted to know how many people they were actually helping.

Ms. Price said that any couple whose social security income was above the average would not qualify for tax relief, and that she agreed with Mr. Gallaway's suggestion to raise the threshold to \$305,000, which accounted for inflation. She said that this adjustment may not be sufficient, and she was open to further discussions on increasing the threshold as needed. She said that she agreed with what Mr. Andrews said regarding C, that one makes a decision as they were getting to retire, not necessarily

appreciating how that might affect them down the road.

Ms. Price said that regarding the considerations of a program-wide cap, she had some real concerns, and she believed this aligned with Mr. Gallaway's comments about people being able to plan for what the program might provide. She said that she equated this situation to individuals nearing the end of their calendar year who were trying to determine how much money they could withdraw from retirement without adversely affecting their Medicare payments two years later due to an income-related Medicare adjustment amount. She said that if people knew the caps, then they knew how much money they could withdraw without having to pay more for Medicare.

Ms. Price said that if individuals were attempting to plan their finances for the year, they needed confidence that they could rely on these guidelines and still qualify for some form of tax relief, so they did not inadvertently jeopardize their coverage in the program. She said that people required reliability in the program; therefore, if they established a dollar cap and attracted more applicants, the \$1,500 in tax relief they initially expected to receive was now reduced to \$400. She said that this significantly disrupted their budget. She said she strongly supported options A and B, was open to learning more about option C, opposed option D, and expressed concern over implementing a cap that may lead to unexpected adjustments in eligibility.

Ms. Mallek said that she was grateful to hear others mention the connection to affordable housing and NOAH (naturally occurring affordable housing), and that it was important to recognize the increasing tax burden. She said that it appeared that some communities did not use net worth as a factor in determining eligibility.

Mr. Bowman said that was correct.

Ms. Mallek said that was a choice they must also consider. She said that several citizens had suggested, for simplicity's sake, that they should not use net worth at all. She said that they were working through various processes, but today they lacked information about the alternative of using only income and its projected impacts based on everything they had learned from their previous steps. She said she appreciated the requests for information regarding alternative approaches to affordable housing because it had become apparent during the affordable housing discussion last week.

Ms. Mallek said that in 2007, when the assessed values had increased by 15% per year for three consecutive years, Woodrow Keaton, an older resident along with his wife Rosie who lived until their high 90s, was advised by someone no longer working at the County to sell the five acres behind their property in order to pay their taxes. She said that Mr. Keaton, who was 95 years old at that time, became emotional as he explained that the land was where they kept their cow and garden, which were essential for their survival. She said this incident had a profound impact on her and had driven her to strive for better management of this issue ever since.

Mr. Andrews said that his concern was primarily with the net worth criteria, as someone might have saved that money specifically for retirement purposes. He said that when referring to B, he believed it could be raised or even eliminated, although this approach may be challenging. He said that this adjustment should be made in conjunction with something like option C, where tax relief was still provided up to a certain level.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked whether the increase in eligible participants was due to the County's affordable housing policy. She asked how residents were notified of the tax relief program and suggested finding better ways of educating eligible taxpayers.

Mr. Bowman said that there was a consensus from the Board to continue pursuing option A. He said that option B was the minimum requirement, but some Board members wanted to explore further possibilities. He said the majority of the Board expressed interest in examining option C in more detail, with the intention of not reducing the program but rather considering it alongside other changes and additional information. He said that option D was not supported by a majority of the Board in their comments. He said that they would address specific follow-ups on data to be brought back.

Mr. Bowman said that they would move on to the next work session topic, the Fire Rescue system. He said that in the executive summary, they addressed workforce stabilization, which pertained to a specific change in circumstances within the Fire Rescue system. He said that Chief Dan Eggleston was there to present. He said their department consisted of a combination of Fire Rescue and EMS (Emergency Management System) system, with Department of Fire Rescue staff worked alongside key volunteer stations throughout the County. He said the system had changed in recent years, and they had successfully obtained three FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) SAFER (Staffing for Adequate Firefighters and Emergency Response) Grants. He said that they were also considering what the program may look like beyond their scope.

Chief Dan Eggleston, Chief of Fire Rescue, said that Deputy Chief of Operations David Puckett was also present. He said that they would present the strategic outlook and needs assessment for Albemarle County Department of Fire Rescue (ACFR). He said that the report represented their ability to try to forecast the long-term needs in order to give an idea of what changes lay ahead for Fire Rescue.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that several years ago, they acknowledged the changing landscape of volunteerism in their country and its ongoing transformation. He said that their community had worked diligently to appreciate and support volunteerism, which had been crucial over the

decades for maintaining the current state of public safety and other areas as well. He said he did not wish for the Board to misinterpret this as an early budget discussion before knowing where their revenues were and before knowing where their competing needs were across all areas of their Strategic Plan and all departments with their operational needs. He said that the Board had requested a long-range plan several years ago.

Chief Eggleston said that they would begin with an overview of their operations and strategic direction, then examine their recent improvements and the challenges that lie ahead in their service delivery, and they would explore various strategic options available for consideration as they refined their multi-year financial plan. He said that the Board's input and guidance were vital to ensure they were well-prepared for the challenges and opportunities ahead.

Chief Eggleston said that regarding the Fire Rescue planning process, it primarily revolved around four key components. He said that they began by aligning their objectives with the County Strategic Plan, which established a direction for their operational priorities. He said the next step involved conducting a thorough assessment of their service performance against the Standards of Cover, a Board-adopted plan that was instrumental in defining the scope and level of services they provided. He said that they consistently tracked their service demands to understand how they influenced their capacity to respond to residents' needs. He said that a critical component of their planning process was workforce stabilization. He said that given their department's reliance on volunteer personnel, a decline in their numbers had a direct and adverse effect on their service capabilities.

Chief Eggleston said that this information, when aggregated, helped them develop a multi-year financial plan, which they believed was an integral part of their planning process. He said that it enabled them to project and strategize for the long term rather than on an annual basis. He said that this methodology had guided their planning for the last several years and looked forward to engaging in discussion with the Board about this today.

Chief Eggleston said that in the first part of their planning process, the connection with the County Strategic Plan was important. He said that they played a role in helping the County achieve many of those strategic goals. He said they were not just putting out fires and treating patients; they were focused on the long-term strategic priorities of the County to help ensure a safe and healthy community.

Chief Eggleston said that they were particularly focused on Goals 1, 2, and 6. He said that their primary objective, as stated in Goal 1, was to achieve a safe and healthy community.

Chief Eggleston said that for Goal 2, they viewed this as an investment in prevention and mitigation services to help build a resilient community, highlighting their roles of a community risk reduction and emergency management divisions within Fire Rescue.

Chief Eggleston said that in terms of Goal 6, firefighter and EMS providers, both career and volunteer, interacted with residents on a daily basis. He said that it remained vital to recruit and retain the very best because they were the face of the County.

Chief Eggleston said that in June 2019, the Board approved the Standards of Cover, which was a comprehensive strategy designed to detail their approach to responding to and mitigating emergencies. He said the plan encompassed thorough risk assessment, the allocation of resources, defined objectives for response times, and a method for evaluating their performance. He said that within the framework, they had established distinct response time goals tailored for both urban and Rural Areas.

Chief Eggleston said that their urban response time standard, eight minutes 90% of the time, was in alignment with other like-sized community standards. He said that it was worth mentioning that their Rural Area response time standard, when benchmarked against national standards and similar sized communities, was notably longer.

Chief Eggleston said that in terms of their main challenges in meeting service demands for the community, there had been a significant increase in the cost of service. He said that since 2020, they had seen a 21% increase, primarily driven by the urbanization of the County and aging population. He said that this increase was across the board for both fire and EMS emergencies. He said that at first, they believed growth was mainly related to EMS; however, it is now evident that it is across the board, which related to the density and urbanization of their communities.

Chief Eggleston said another issue they had encountered was unfunded state and federal mandates. He said these mandates were particularly relevant to EMS and challenged their ability to maintain. He said they anticipated being affected by a DEA regulation governing the management of narcotics. He said the regulation may necessitate hiring someone specifically to manage this program, which comes without any federal funding.

Chief Eggleston said they were dealing with supporting firefighters in the field. He said that since 2020, they had added 69 operational personnel and must evaluate their administration and training staff to adequately support both career and volunteer members. He said that they aimed to fulfill their commitment to providing ongoing and initial training required daily by their volunteer and career personnel. He said that in terms of trends related to call for service, one thing they were seeing was an increase in human service-type calls, such as mental health, residents without proper healthcare, and those suffering from addiction and social isolation. He said that at their recent ECC (Emergency Communications Center) regional meeting, it was revealed that the number of suicide-related calls had

almost reached the number of cardiac arrest calls.

Chief Eggleston said that he was pleased to report that their HARTS (Human Services Alternative Response Team) team was now operational. He said that this demonstrated how prevention efforts could benefit them in the long run. He said that these factors were placing a strain on their capacity and emphasizing the importance of investing in resources.

Chief Eggleston said that for workforce stabilization, the pressing challenge was the decline in volunteer fire and EMS personnel. He said that it was a national trend that was concerning not only for them but also for the safety of their community. He said that the decline in volunteers was hitting them hardest during evenings and weekends. He said that it was important to note that this decline in volunteers was not consistent across the County. He said some of their volunteer stations remained very strong and were getting stronger by the year, while others grappled with reduced volunteer numbers. He said this difference was a crucial aspect of their challenge, and they must consider it as they explored potential solutions.

Chief Eggleston said he wanted to discuss the deployment of career firefighters, which he believed was currently their best option to address the decline in volunteers. He said that this solution was not immediate. He said that they had made meaningful strides to diversify their department by recruiting those interested in the fire service but lacked the training and experience to come over as experienced firefighters. He said that it took them approximately 24 months to fully deploy career firefighters, which meant that they needed to plan well in advance to ensure no gaps in services existed.

Chief Eggleston said that in 2023 alone, the organization faced over 100 incidents of mandatory overtime. He said that this was a short-term solution for consistent and reliable coverage. He said that the abuse and overuse of mandatory overtime negatively impacted the physical, mental, and emotional well-being of staff members. He said that the strain on career staff and lack of volunteers made their challenges even harder, resulting in service reductions in some communities.

Chief Eggleston said that rural stations experienced reduced daily staffing levels, with only two personnel available to operate an ambulance. He said that while there was still a presence there, it provided no fire protection; it only offered EMS services. He said that the same issue occurred sometimes with their volunteer partners as well due to the limited availability of volunteers during nights and weekends. He said that if they did not have enough staff, the station was temporarily taken out of service. He said that they attempted to manage this situation on a daily basis, but it did impact their ability to deliver services effectively.

Chief Eggleston said that planning for supplemental career staff in such situations involved foresight and strategic investment. He said they must anticipate the need for additional staff well in advance, and this was one reason they had adopted a long-term planning process—to predict and prepare for these types of scenarios.

Mr. David Puckett, Deputy Chief of Operations, said that he would present the investments in Fire Rescue made since 2020 for the Board. He said that the dates were based on when the service was implemented, not necessarily when the funding was approved. He said that in 2020, there were five FTE staff members providing daytime staffing at Crozet Fire, and they also placed an ambulance at Stony Point Fire Department. He said the ambulance served as a resource, and the existing staff cross-staffed an engine and ambulance to provide additional service to that community.

Mr. Puckett said in 2021, they made several enhancements, including fire engine staffing at Pantops. He said that they expanded their services at Pantops and Ivy to 24/7 staffing, which had previously only been operational during daylight hours on weekdays. He said that similar to Stony Point, they added an ambulance to the East Rivanna station, allowing existing staff to cross-staff the ambulance and engine, providing additional service to that area. He said that they added a second battalion chief on a 24/7 basis to enhance supervisory coverage.

Mr. Puckett said that in 2023, they put staff in North Garden during daytime hours and added a fire engine and ambulance. He said that through a SAFER grant, they added additional personnel specifically to help address the service reductions they were experiencing in rural stations. He said that finally, they transitioned the Pantops fire engine to 24/7.

Mr. Puckett said that for 2025, there was a SAFER grant that would provide personnel to add a ladder company to the Monticello station and a 24/7 fire engine to the Scottsville station, formerly known as Station 17, which was previously the Scottsville Rescue.

Mr. Puckett said that out of these 69 positions, 50 were grant funded for the first three years, equating to approximately \$11 million in savings for the County.

Mr. Puckett said that considering the workforce challenges and increased call demand, the Board's investments had primarily focused on maintaining service levels. He said that he wanted to share some of the improvements they were able to make over the previous year. He said that Fire Rescue would be fully staffed when the recruit school started in January, and employee turnover in 2023 was the lowest it had been since they began recording it in 2016. He said that as a result, over the last quarter, there was a decrease in mandatory overtime and a decrease in service reductions due to career staff shortages. He said that they were optimistic that this trend would continue into 2024.

Mr. Puckett said that they were able to successfully transition to a no-cost mutual aid agreement with the City of Charlottesville. He said that the Board's investment in County resources allowed them to reach a more balanced model that was mutually beneficial.

Mr. Puckett said that from a service standpoint, they had achieved a 10% reduction in their ambulance response times countywide. He said that transitioning to urban ambulances being staffed 24/7 and adding ambulances to rural volunteer stations where existing career staff could cross-staff the ambulance and fire engine. He said there was an 8% reduction in fire engine response times due to additional staffing in Crozet, Pantops, and North Garden.

Mr. Puckett said that communities across Albemarle did not experience these improvements uniformly. He said that despite their investments, they were largely meeting their response time standards in Rural Areas but continued to fall short in Urban Areas.

Chief Eggleston said that he wanted to consider the options available for moving forward. He said that each choice had its own implications on their services to the community. He said that the first option was to reevaluate response models and how they react to this. He said they could evaluate and optimize the County's emergency response strategies, focusing on the distribution of assets and efforts to address the most critical needs. He said this may include prioritizing resources to areas with the highest demand or reevaluating their response time standards. He said that although they had explored some aspects of this before, it was worth discussing the components as they might be something they wanted to consider.

Chief Eggleston said their second option was to strive to maintain current service levels, which would mean increasing their staff at volunteer stations to compensate for any personnel loss. He said that in some cases of demand, they may add staff. He said that this was about maintaining what they had today but would require a greater investment even with the drop-off in volunteers.

Chief Eggleston said the third option was to maintain current service levels and include prevention and resiliency programs. He said that this involved maintaining their current service level and implementing prevention and resiliency programs that had a long-term impact on their community. He said the programs were key because they addressed the needs of their most vulnerable populations more effectively. He said by focusing on prevention and mitigation efforts, they were not only getting the right services to the right people but also looking at long-term cost avoidance.

Chief Eggleston said that these strategies could significantly reduce the need for 911 services in the future for low acuity calls. He said that approximately 20% of their calls were low acuity EMS calls. He said there could be a deferral to a much more proactive preventive type of program that was a lot less costly than an ambulance staffed 24/7. He said that this trend was emerging rapidly in the fire service, and he believed it was something they should explore. He said that it was about being proactive rather than reactive.

Chief Eggleston said that each of these options had merits and challenges, and their goal was to reach the best decision for the community's well-being and safety.

Chief Eggleston said that considering the five-year FTE forecast, he would like to present the Board with options 2 and 3 because option 1 was so variable in terms of its potential impact. He said that turning to their five-year forecast, the FTE forecast for option 2, maintaining services, their goal was to maintain what the community relied upon. He said that they were looking at 52 FTEs over a five-year period to address this critical factor. He said that they assumed a decline in volunteer numbers, leading to a 24 career staff model at some volunteer stations, not all. He said that to maintain reliable service and prepare for such changes, they must ensure that they were prepared for these shifts in staffing requirements. He said that they anticipated an increase in demand for specialty training and administrative staff to meet their service needs and regulatory requirements, particularly those related to pharmaceutical regulations.

Chief Eggleston said that the high volume of emergency calls at Medic 18 on Berkmar Road, which handled approximately 3,000 calls per year, placed a significant burden on their system. He said that one-third of the time, this unit experienced more than one emergency happening simultaneously in their area, requiring additional units to be pulled from other areas to respond. He said the situation had a system-wide impact and was vital to address by strengthening their team to ensure timely and effective responses to emergencies while avoiding strain on their system.

Chief Eggleston said that in terms of prevention and mitigation goals, in addition to the 52 FTEs, they proposed nine additional FTEs that focused on providing the right service to the right people. He said that integrating their Human Services and mobile integrated health care had already been accomplished with the HARTS team, resulting in some positive outcomes. He said that there was a significant overlap between their Human Services initiatives and the preventive mitigation efforts that Fire Rescue could contribute. He said that this integration served as a valuable asset to prevent emergencies from occurring in the first place while also providing essential support to vulnerable populations.

Chief Eggleston said that community outreach played a crucial role by fostering relationships and educating residents on resilience. He said that as the Urban Area growth continued, particularly with mid-rise buildings, fire protection engineering became increasingly critical. He said that they were not only expanding their team but also strategically enhancing their capabilities to ensure consistent and reliable service.

Ms. McKeel said that she truly appreciated the conversation. She said that they had seen this coming for a long time. She said that she believed that they were discussing Urban Areas, and she would like to know if this referred to Development Areas.

Chief Eggleston said that was correct.

Ms. McKeel asked if they were referring to underserved residents in the Urban Area.

Chief Eggleston said that it referred to both urban and Rural Areas. He said that it primarily concerned residents who lacked adequate access to healthcare or faced other challenges in obtaining necessary care. He said that often, they served as a last resort, addressing a wide range of difficulties. He said that through preventive measures, they could potentially connect these individuals with the resources they required.

Ms. McKeel said that she believed it was an excellent idea. She said that she knew there had been numerous requests for assistance in helping individuals rise from their beds or off the ground, which was precisely what the suggestion was addressing.

Chief Eggleston said that, yes, and some individuals may not have access to healthcare services. He said that they often relied on them to provide medical assistance during home visits.

Ms. McKeel said that they were currently reviewing the Comprehensive Plan, and it was stated that residents in Rural Areas should not anticipate the same level of service as those living in Urban Areas. She emphasized that they needed to ensure that their Comprehensive Plan aligned with their actual actions. She asked if this was made sense.

Chief Eggleston said yes. He said that they had a lot of discussion during the development of their Standards of Cover regarding Rural Area response times. He mentioned that currently, the response time was 20 minutes, which exceeded what he observed in other communities. He noted that their performance barely met the 20-minute standard for Rural Areas but failed to achieve it in Urban Areas. He said that the dispersion of their resources had resulted in insufficient responses for urban residents, contrary to their stated commitments.

Ms. McKeel said that it was a problem, and she mentioned it because it was timely as they were in the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan. She emphasized the importance of ensuring consistency between what they say to people that they can expect and what they actually receive. She said that she wanted to bring this issue to their attention. She said she appreciated the conversation.

Chief Eggleston said that he appreciated the comment. He said that it was certainly something they were focused on.

Ms. McKeel said that she went through the Comprehensive Plan approximately three or four years ago and underlined all the references to rural and Urban Areas. She noted that there was a considerable number of these references, so they must ensure that they are working toward matching them up.

Ms. Mallek said that she had taken thorough notes on the projected needs moving forward. She said that he mentioned requiring support for training, and she was aware that many volunteer agencies faced similar challenges. She said that they needed sufficient staff to release those that were waiting. She said that it was indeed a desirable problem to have 12 new EMTs eager to begin their duties. She said that she understood the variability among the stations, as one station may experience a challenging year followed by a successful one the next.

Ms. Mallek said that a really important goal for her was when a station could confidently state that they were doing well, had established strong connections, and had numerous individuals ready to work. She said that when individuals did not have adequate seating or sleeping arrangements, let alone the ability to complete homework, they became discouraged and left. She said that in Earlsville, for example, there was a significant distance from Ivy Farms to 29, and then around to the mountains where it took more than 21 minutes to reach Boonesville, even if the facility was fully staffed.

Ms. Mallek said that five years ago, they experienced an influx of people from NGIC (National Ground Intelligence Center) who wanted to join with the new ambulance that the station had acquired. She said that they eventually left due to the lack of available space. She acknowledged that there were ongoing projects but hoped for continuous progress in addressing this issue from a CIP perspective, as. She said that in the past, when they implemented CIP projects, their goal was to provide facilities that would support volunteers in Rural Areas. She said that these individuals were capable of sustaining themselves and providing essential services without having to bring in paid staff.

Ms. Mallek said that to achieve this, they needed to focus on the infrastructure aspect as well so that they did not lose another cohort of people from stations like theirs or others who were eager to contribute but just could not get in the door. She said that there had been a discussion about Station 8, which currently had two ambulances. She said that it seemed that additional ambulances and staff for each were required, as they had transferred one from another location.

Chief Eggleston said that they only had one there now.

Ms. Mallek said that was getting the first one there. She said that they faced a significant issue with the concurrency of calls, especially in Urban Areas. She noted that if someone was in the house, the response time would likely be around five minutes. She asked if addressing this problem was part of their plan, which they would discuss later in the presentation.

Chief Eggleston said that it might be a suitable subject for their upcoming budget meeting, as they intended to present some proposals.

Ms. Mallek said that she was looking forward to hearing suggestions regarding the dispersed resources issue. She said that she did not really understand what was meant by that. She said that from the perspective of the coverage situation, it was where the full-time staff was going. She said that Mr. Puckett mentioned that there were fewer incidents of pulling day staff, for example. She said that she wanted to know more about how successful this had been in terms of the number of staff members they had hired and released to maintain these operations.

Ms. Mallek said that rural residents had made significant efforts to maintain their independence without requiring assistance. She said that many people had mentioned that reducing speeding was a priority on country roads due to its impact on their lives. She acknowledged that this presented a challenge for the ACPD (Albemarle County Police Department), as it was difficult to achieve. She acknowledged that it was a long wait; she recalled when her hay truck was on fire, and it was the longest four minutes in her life, and it was lucky they got there so fast.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was concerned and unsure of the answer. She asked if Chief Eggleston could explain how long-term cost avoidance could be achieved through prevention strategies. She said that he had mentioned people without healthcare might call 911 when someone falls, especially if it was an elderly couple and one person cannot help the other. She asked whether there had been any talk about having discussions with their healthcare systems.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that the HARTS program was a wonderful program. She said that considering the healthcare system and independent facilities, she believed it was essential to determine whether senior living establishments first called 911 or had staff capable of assisting residents without requiring emergency services for incidents like falls. She said that it might be beneficial to educate independent living facilities on this matter. She said that on Pantops, they had it the most. She said that she was unsure how this issue would be resolved.

Chief Eggleston said that the Chief of Police was currently working on establishing a strong partnership with Fire Rescue, their Human Services division within the County, public health, and their university and Sentara health facilities. He said that he was exploring the possibility of forming a partnership with UVA to take advantage of telemedicine as an example of preventive medicine. He said that this would enable them to connect individuals with physicians or professionals for care. He said that the goal was to provide the right services to the right person, as the current default was 911, which often resulted in a mismatch of services. He said that they were willing to respond, but it would be more effective to prevent these situations in the first place.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that her other concern pertained to the response times. She said that the response times in both rural and Urban Areas had not been met, as he mentioned.

Chief Eggleston said that they had not been meeting the demand in the Urban Area at all, even after attempting to optimize operations through dispatch protocols as much as possible. He said that they had reached a point with the increased number of calls that the system was frequently operating at full capacity. He said that this often resulted in a domino effect where one unit was dispatched, followed by another, leading to significantly reduced response times.

Mr. Andrews said that he appreciated the improvements made in the North Garden service area and the response times in that rural part of the County. He said that he understood that while they knew the locations of their rural assets, it could be challenging to reach them due to the vastness of the country. He said that in the Urban Development Areas, however, the issue was not about reaching the location but rather finding available resources to send there since they were already occupied with other tasks. He said that they needed to boost their resources in these developed areas to address that. He stated that he fully supported their suggestions to achieve that.

Mr. Gallaway said that he did not intend his questions to be critical of any staff or department area; however, he believed some areas required more frank conversation. He asked if he could begin by asking a simple question first. He said that regarding the 100 instances of overtime, he inquired how many hours that amounted to in total.

Chief Eggleston said that it typically involves a 12-hour holdover. He said that in most cases, if someone called out sick and there was no one else available to work in their place, the manager may ask an employee who was about to leave for the day to stay for an additional 12 hours until a replacement could be found.

Mr. Gallaway said that there were a total of 100 incidents, with each incident requiring 12 hours of overtime payment. He explained that to calculate the total hours of overtime paid, one must multiply the number of incidents by the hours per incident: 100 incidents multiplied by 12 hours equaled 1200 hours of overtime paid.

Chief Eggleston said that it was instances where something could be longer than that. He asked if Mr. Puckett would say that they were mostly holdovers or if there was something else involved.

Mr. Puckett said occasionally, it might be slightly lower, but for planning purposes, multiplying 100 by 12 provided a reasonably accurate estimate.

Mr. Gallaway said that the conversation had been building about the Urban Area particularly focused on Rio 29 and limited resources. He noted that it appeared to involve staffing issues but seemed to encompass more than just staffing during calls. He mentioned that the capital needs were not being met, and although Pantops online was implemented to assist, it did not seem to be getting the job done. He asked if they were approaching a tipping point where another urban station might be necessary.

Chief Eggleston said that they were sufficiently equipped in terms of facilities. He said that what was required at Berkmar station was another ambulance to help answer those calls. He said that in concurrent situations, this would necessitate the involvement of Pantops and Ivey stations to answer. He said that when these stations were occupied, it affected the response times in their respective areas. He said that they had gotten the most calls they could out of that ambulance, which was about 3,000. He said they tried to optimize the turnaround time at the hospital and make it as quick as possible, but that was about all they could achieve with that ambulance.

Mr. Gallaway said that his question or thinking was similar to what they were attempting with their workforce stabilization and income. He said that they were not trying to catch up; rather, they aimed to get ahead of the situation. He said that if someone said they needed one, that might just be to catch up, and he assumed that they required at least two, and maybe more than that, to get ahead of it.

Chief Eggleston said that he was trying to be very prudent with the resources, considering that they had other competing needs within the County. He said that he thought that adding the resource would catch them up and believed it was a good start to then reevaluate after that resource was added. He said that he would like more than that, but he wanted to ensure that he was very prudent when it came to resources.

Mr. Gallaway said that they appreciated that but also emphasized the importance of informing people about the expected response times and managing their expectations accordingly. He said that if they could not meet these expectations, they must adjust them or provide the necessary resources for departments to achieve them. He said that this raised a question he believed the Board needed to discuss.

Chief Eggleston said that Mr. Gallaway was correct.

Mr. Gallaway said that he understood the preventive care aspect, including low acuity cases, and recalled Marta discussing this issue even before his tenure on the Board, which was over six years ago. He clarified that he was not necessarily directing his comments toward the Chief, and he would even pull Mr. Richardson into the conversation. He said that this intention was not to criticize any staff member; rather, it was a recurring issue that had arisen year after year.

Mr. Gallaway said that it was unclear who was supposed to be involved in addressing this matter, but they must take a proactive approach and determine the solutions, and work with their partners and do all that. The departments were currently overworked, and this issue is complex and there was not an easy answer. He emphasized that if they truly wanted to make a difference, they must identify the plan, its execution, and assign responsibilities for creating an impact.

Chief Eggleston said that he would love to provide his insight on the matter. He said that it was commendable that they had now established a Human Services Division within the County. He said that working with Ms. Dimock had been wonderful, and they were already discussing with her what that would look like. He said that this expansion would not only involve their public health agencies but also other community organizations, making it a truly collaborative effort.

Chief Eggleston said that in his view, this was a Human Services Fire Rescue endeavor in which they had a vested interest because it would help them manage their calls. He said that other stakeholders, such as the health department and public health agencies, would be involved, but he believed that the County should take the lead on this endeavor.

Mr. Gallaway said that if someone fell and they did not have a family member or a neighbor to check on them or a private service where they can press a button for assistance, the question was who they would call otherwise. He said that alternatives to 911 have been discussed for some time, but identifying an appropriate replacement remained a challenge. He said that in emergency situations, someone must address the question of who would respond if not the traditional 911 services. He said that this would require similar staffing levels, vehicles, and available time, as well as coordination of dispatch and other resources. He said that perhaps there were communities with established networks that they could study and adapt for their own use, either through budgetary measures or partnerships.

Mr. Gallaway said that they just needed to determine who would be responsible for implementing this change and put the strategic plan in place to make it happen. He said that to free up resources, staffing, and funds to address other issues, this approach seemed like a way to achieve cost avoidance and help them get there. He said that it appeared to be a worthwhile investment of time and effort to explore further. He said that he was unsure of who to look to. He noted that it was not as simple as

requesting additional personnel or resources, such as an engine or ambulance. He said that this was a more complex piece that spanned various jurisdictions, organizations, and departments. He said that until one person took responsibility and led the effort, it remained unclear how they could make progress.

Chief Eggleston said that today's discussion and guidance required clarification on whether the Board was interested in pursuing mitigation and prevention efforts. He said that if they were, staff could collaborate with Human Services and return to provide details on how this would be implemented in the future. He said that this approach aimed to reduce future calls and ensure that the right people got the right services. He said there were other benefits associated with this initiative, so he envisioned a joint presentation from both Human Services and Fire Rescue outlining these efforts.

Mr. Gallaway said that he would endorse that because someone must address the issue. He said that it could potentially improve response times and manage limited resources. He asked about the impact of this on transportation issues, particularly in Urban Areas where commuting to work and other places could be challenging due to infrastructure-related problems.

Chief Eggleston said that they had an impact on their work. He said that they had received great support from VDOT regarding their traffic preemption devices, which allowed them to change the traffic signal and proceed through the intersection more easily. He said that this had helped to reduce significantly. He said that on most occasions, it had minimal impact. He said that when examining their Standards of Coverage and the distribution of their fixed resources to stations, if they were staffed and had adequate personnel, he believed that they should be able to meet their response time standards, which was a good sign that indicated they did not need to build any new stations at this moment. He said that given the fact that they faced some challenges related to traffic with these devices in their new CAD (Computer-Aided Design) system, which helped them optimize routes, they could overcome most of those issues.

Mr. Gallaway said that the Urban Area was not shrinking, which meant they were under pressure to increase density within development areas for housing and other purposes. He said that with the acquisition of a large piece of land for economic development, such as North Fork and Rivanna Futures, there would be more than just an influx of housing units; employment centers would also be developed. He said that they must begin discussing these issues now to ensure they were prepared when these projects were implemented. He said that the need for additional facilities and staff in Urban Areas may become apparent as development continued.

Chief Eggleston said that was the reason they implemented a five-year forecasting method to anticipate future needs in the out-years. He said that although these figures may fluctuate significantly, they represented their best estimates at present. He said that the accuracy of these numbers was highly dependent on the confidence levels of their volunteer partners in their own forecasting abilities. He said that was said as a caveat to these numbers. He said that he understood that these numbers appeared large, but the intention was to provide insight into their thought processes.

Mr. Gallaway asked if Mr. Eggleston thought they would need a station in the next five years.

Chief Eggleston said that he did not think so.

Mr. Gallaway asked if they would need it in six to ten years.

Chief Eggleston said that it was possible, considering some of the hot spots they had considered. He said that one was Fifth Street, primarily due to its road network, and they hoped that VDOT could provide a road connector solution for them there, which might help alleviate the issue, but he acknowledged that it was still a hot spot. He mentioned that East Rio was another hot spot.

Ms. Price asked to see slide 20, referring to the Standards of Cover. She said that if she had correctly interpreted their comments, disregarding the percentage of time they actually met their objectives, the 21-minute response time in Rural Areas exceeded what similarly-sized populated counties were able to achieve. She asked what should that response time be based on if this was the norm.

Chief Eggleston said that he believed it was a good question; however, he did not currently have an answer for them. He said that it should be lower. He said they were barely meeting that now, so all they would end up doing was raising expectations. He said that he thought it was something they needed to look at.

Chief Eggleston said that he had previously discussed this matter with the Rural Area community, and they expressed their disapproval. He said that the Board members heard it as well, as people questioned why they paid the same taxes as in the Urban Area but were getting less service. He said he attempted to explain that their County was large, making it challenging to provide urban levels of service in the Rural Areas.

Ms. Price said that her point was that there was a difference between development and Rural Areas. She mentioned that it only took five minutes to drive down the gravel road to her house and she was not expecting an eight-minute response time. She said that her comment was that the 21-minute Rural Area response time, as she understood it, was too long anyway. She said that the first question she posed was what do they believe would be a reasonable response time for the Rural Area, and similarly, what do they believe would be the reasonable response time for the Development Area. She said that once they knew that, then they could calculate how many additional units of equipment were needed to

meet those standards based on the demand call number and volume frequency.

Ms. Price said that she would also like them to calculate into a budget the cost of the additional equipment and personnel required to achieve the desired response times within a reasonable timeframe. She said that the first thing they needed to determine was the appropriate response times. She said that they also had to figure out the additional equipment and personnel required to meet these response times.

Ms. Price said that if they referred to slide number 25, which listed the options for consideration, she understood that there were currently three options. She said that she suggested adding a fourth one. She said that with the first one, reevaluating their response models, they should always be doing that. She said that moving on to slide 27, which compared options 2 and 3, option 3 should be pursued at a minimum. She said that there should be the expectation that over time, option two also needed to, given the decreasing number of volunteers and the increasing population. She said that it would necessitate an increase in response times.

Ms. Price said that while the exact number of FTEs required was uncertain, it was clear that additional personnel would be necessary to address these challenges. She said that the fourth option was to add the additional equipment, which she would reference back to the first one. She said that all of that needed to be taken into consideration as they worked toward what the budget proposal would be.

Ms. Price said that if 69 FTEs they had been able to achieve through the SAFER grants was \$11 million, they could do the math and figure if it was nine plus 52 or if the nine was in the 52, they were probably looking at an additional \$10 million at least for personnel, plus the cost of the equipment plus the cost of the capital plan for additional building facilities that had to be built down the road. She said that she supported options 1 through 4.

Chief Eggleston said that in terms of her question concerning Rural Area response times, he proposed collecting the information and presenting it to the Board with a recommendation. He said that it would be beneficial to examine how other counties of similar size address their response standards. He noted that their primary challenge for the County was the vastness of it. He said that before they delved into specific numbers, he wanted to provide some context.

Ms. Price said that she appreciated that. She explained that for their community, which had experienced increasing property values, resulting in increased tax bills even without an increase in the tax rate, they had major expenses to face. She said that each time they came and said lower their taxes, it was necessary to ask what services they wanted to cut. She asked if they wanted to cut the ambulance service, the fire trucks, the police force, the schools, and the parks. She said that all of these things cost money, and they must be good stewards of it.

Ms. Mallek asked if increased highway accidents were contributing to the demand issue they were currently experiencing.

Chief Eggleston said that, yes, it had been adding to the call volume quite a bit, especially on rural roads that were now used instead of the highway and became very high-speed two-lane roads.

Ms. Mallek said that she was fully supportive of option 3 and option 2, as associated.

Ms. McKeel said that they would require that information as they updated the Comprehensive Plan in order to address the disconnects of the Comprehensive Plan.

Chief Eggleston said that it had been approximately five years since they last updated their Standards of Coverage. He said that now might be an opportune moment to revisit and revise them to some extent.

Ms. McKeel said that the SAFER grants, which were federal government grants from FEMA, were discussed. She said that in the Richmond Times-Dispatch that there was currently no funding available for state firefighting and EMS grants. She said that communities that have previously received these grants now faced a lack of financial support to fulfill them. She said that she was saying that at present, they did not have any state grants at risk.

Chief Eggleston said that they received an annual stipend from the state via the Department of Fire Programs, which was minimal, so a change in that would have minimal effect on their revenue.

Recess. The Board recessed its meeting at 3:41 p.m. and reconvened at 3:50 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 10. **Presentation:** Fiscal Year 2023 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) and Audit Results.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that each year, the Board of Supervisors is presented an audited Annual Comprehensive Financial Report for the Board's review and acceptance, in accordance with Virginia Code §15.2-2511.

At its meeting, the Board will be presented the recently completed Fiscal Year 2023 (FY 23)

Annual Comprehensive Financial Report. The Annual Comprehensive Financial Report contains a detailed accounting of the County's financial operations for the fiscal year.

Highlights of the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report include:

1. The Transmittal Letter to the Board and community, providing a summary of the County's geographic, demographic, economic, and financial features.
2. The Independent Auditor's Report, which states the auditor's opinion on the fair presentation of the County's respective financial position as of June 30, 2023.
3. The Management's Discussion and Analysis, providing a summary of the County's financial activity for the fiscal year.
4. A determination as to the County's FY 23 financial position's compliance with fund balance and debt policies.
5. Detailed information about the County's financial activity for the fiscal year, including statistical tables that provide historical economic and demographic information, as well as the auditor's Compliance Report.

The Annual Comprehensive Financial Report was presented to the Board's Audit Committee at its meeting on November 27, 2023, by Brown Edwards, the County's external auditing firm.

There is no budget impact related to the presentation and acceptance of the FY 23 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report.

Staff recommends that the Board accept the FY 23 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report.

Ms. Shenandra Usher, Assistant Chief Financial Officer for Operations, stated that she would be presenting the Fiscal Year 2023 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) and Audit Results.

Ms. Usher said that their general fund revenues experienced a lot of positive variances between budgeted amounts and collected revenues. She said that the current projection for real estate and personal property taxes was \$246 million, which represented a \$4.5 million, or 1.9% increase over the revised budget. She said that this increase could be attributed primarily to the net impact of the CY23 real estate assessment being greater than the projected reassessment in the FY23 revised budget. She said that as a result, they collected more than what was initially projected for CY23. She said that the variance also included factors such as actual collection rates, adjustments in values, and billings.

Ms. Usher said that business-driven taxes were projected at \$19.4 million. She said that this represented a 900,000 or 5.4% increase over the revised budget. She said that the primary reason for this was the rise in collections for business, professional, and occupational licenses, which were primarily based on businesses' gross receipts in CY22. She said that this trend increases in business, professional, and occupational licenses is based primarily on a business's gross receipts in the prior calendar year. She said that they observed a decline in FY21 due to the pandemic during CY20. She said that the recovery in CY21 led to stronger revenues in FY22. She noted that as economic activity, such as consumer spending and development activity, increased during this time, this trend has continued into FY23.

Ms. Usher said that consumer-driven taxes were projected to reach approximately \$53.2 million at the end of the year, representing a 3.4% increase or an additional \$1.7 million compared to the revised budget. She said that the primary reason for this was due to year-end trends in sales and transient occupancy taxes. She said that revenue exceeded projected increases in the revised budget due to continued strong growth at a slightly higher rate compared to recent history. Other local revenues were projected to end the year at \$15.7 million, which was 17.3% above the revised budget or \$2.3 million more. She said this was primarily due to Community Development Department fees based on developmental activity, increased revenue from County fines collected by Police, a loan repayment from community nonprofit partners, and increased interest earnings on investments.

Ms. Usher said that the presentation in the slide deck mirrored their annual comprehensive financial report. She explained that her reporting method was based on budgeted amounts compared to actual figures, focusing on revenue sources from the budget document as that is how they typically presented revenues for the Board. She asked if this was clear. She said that it was a combination of all of the things they saw listed on the slide, and the grand total was going to be the variance \$15.3 million. She asked if this was helpful. She said that state revenues were projected to end the year at \$28.3 million, which represented a shortfall of approximately \$900,000 or 3.2% compared to the revised budget. She said that this was mainly due to unrealized revenues because of corresponding preliminary actual expenditures in the Department of Social Services (DSS) and the Clerk of the Circuit Court.

Ms. Usher said that federal revenues were projected at \$8 million, which represented a shortfall of around \$300,000 or 3.6% compared to the revised budget. She said that this was primarily due to unrealized revenues during corresponding preliminary actual expenditures in DSS. She explained that it was primarily a timing issue, as they had the expenditures in one fiscal year and received the reimbursements in a different fiscal year.

Ms. Usher showed a new slide and said that for expenditures, they could see figures for their revised budget and actual expenditures for FY23, along with the variances.

Ms. Usher said that the total expenditure variance was \$24.4 million. She said that the primary reason for the larger variances was \$10.1 million in operating costs for items anticipated to be reappropriated from FY23 to FY24, pending review and approval. She said that there were \$1.8 million in departmental salary and benefit savings, mainly due to employee turnover and vacant positions. She said that there was \$9.6 million in School reserve funding within the education category. She said that there was \$895,000 in DSS and federal programs that were largely reimbursed by related revenue. She said that there were \$807,000 in savings from community partner agencies and other one-time programmatic savings.

Ms. Usher said that if they examined this by functional department, as listed on the slide, she would provide specific reasons for the larger variances displayed in the slide. She said that in the general government administration, there was a \$7.2 million variance consisting of salary savings and reserves reappropriated for FY24. She said that in health and welfare, the \$2.2 million variance resulted from DSS savings and ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) reserve programs not fully expended in FY23 but reappropriated for FY24.

Ms. Usher said in the education fund, there was a \$9.6 million variance related to how they accounted for their Schools reserve fund. She said that for Community Development, there was a \$1.8 million expenditure variance due to salary and benefit savings and funding allocated to Strategic Plan initiatives, such as AC44 and form code work, which had been reappropriated into the FY24 budget. She said that in contingencies, there was a \$1 million variance resulting from unused climate control pool reserve funding, reserve for contingency funds, and early retirement funds, many of which had also been reappropriated into FY24.

Ms. Usher said that the FY23 net change in fund balance revealed that revenues exceeded expenditures by \$39.7 million. She said that after accounting for transfers in and out, the net change in fund balance figure was \$17 million. She said that transfers included those from the ARPA reserve, Tourism Fund, Water Resources, and other minor sources. She said that the variance was due to the budget using a fund balance, which also appeared in the figure shown.

Ms. Usher said that transfers out consisted primarily of ongoing transfers to capital, debt service, water resources fund, School reserve fund, and a one-time transfer to the housing fund. She said that the variance was related to the transfer to the Schools reserve fund. She said that by adding their revenues exceeding their expenditures by \$39.7 million and their net change in fund balance of \$17 million to their beginning fund balance of \$74.2 million, they ended the year with a fund balance of \$91.3 million.

Ms. Usher said that in their fund balance, there were three different categories defined by GASB (Government Accounting Standards Board): non-spendable, committed, and unassigned. She said that in non-spendable, this included the balance of their inventory, prepaid, and net lease receivables. She noted the significant variance observed between FY23 and FY22 was primarily due to a prepaid invoice payment of \$1.2 million to VAcorp, the County's insurance carrier. She said that this explained the substantial increase from FY22 to FY23. She said that it was why there was a significant increase in non-spendable funds from FY22 to FY23.

Ms. Usher said that their committed funds were those that had already been approved by the Board for future use across all functional areas, including any conferences, reappropriations, and the Schools reserve fund balance. She said that unassigned funds were available for future use but did include the 10% fund balance reserve totaling \$48,105,234 or the 2% revenue stabilization reserve totaling \$9,621,047. She said that they should be aware that the report circulated to the Board was a draft and was currently undergoing quality control review with their new auditors, Brown Edwards. She said that the final report would be posted on the County's website upon completion.

Ms. Usher said that regarding their new auditors, she was pleased to announce that they had chosen Brown Edwards as their new auditing firm. She said that they were introduced at their spring audit committee meeting. She said that to provide background and context for those who may not be on the audit committee, she explained that they initiated an RFP (Request for Proposal) because they had been with their previous auditors for several years. She said that the contract was awarded to Brown Edwards. She said it was a regional firm headquartered in Roanoke, Virginia, and it was one of the leading firms in Virginia serving governmental and municipal entities.

Ms. Usher said that Brown Edwards was listed in Inside Public Accounting's Top 100 Public Accounting Firms by Net Revenue in 2022. She said that they had an operational initiative of providing five-star service quality standards, which include responsiveness, product quality, product delivery, ease of access to decision-makers, and professional attitudes of all team members. She said that they had personally experienced this quality of service firsthand in their partnership with their managing partner, Megan Argenbright, and their in-charge senior associate, Addison Roeschley. She said that at this time, she said she would like to turn the presentation over to Megan Argenbright to continue reporting their audit results.

Ms. Megan Argenbright, Brown Edwards, stated that she was a partner on the audit and was joined by Addison Roeschley to answer any questions. She said that this was their first year conducting the County's audit, and they were eager to ensure everything proceeded smoothly with the current plan

having a deadline of Friday. She said that if all went well, they would issue the report on time. She said that there were numerous deliverables associated with this deadline, including the draft report everyone had in hand. She said that she would discuss a few key points regarding it. She said that Ms. Usher had covered the numerical aspects, and she would focus on the high-level important audit results.

Ms. Argenbright said that the first of these was their audit opinion, which they would issue as an unmodified opinion, also known as a clean opinion, which was the one they wanted to get. She said that in relation to that, they also issued two compliance opinions: the first being a yellow book opinion, and the second pertaining to federal awards. She said that as they reviewed the draft report, there were several aspects to consider that she would like to highlight.

Ms. Argenbright said that the first was the transmittal letter, located at the beginning of the report. She said that it was written by the County and provided a high-level overview of mostly non-financial information regarding the activities occurring within the County. She said that if an outside individual sought to learn about Albemarle County, they would be advised to read their transmittal letter in their ACFR. She said that this document offered insight into the happenings, and what kind of place it was to live in Albemarle. She said that the next item was the management's discussion and analysis. She said that this section was where they should focus if they wished to see numbers. She said that number comparisons between the current year and the previous year, along with explanations of why changes occurred, would be included in the management's discussion and analysis. She said that this section was written by County staff.

Ms. Argenbright said that following that came their part, which consisted of their opinion on the financial statements. She said that the numbers presented were derived from the balance sheet and income statement. She said that there were approximately 60 pages of notes providing further information and detail about these figures. She said that without such explanations, they were just numbers, so by referring to the note disclosures, readers could gain a deeper understanding of the data.

Ms. Argenbright said that required supplementary information was included, focusing primarily on pension obligations, Other Post-employment Benefits (OPEB), and budget to actual documents. She said that there was no explanation there, just numbers. She said that after all that was the compliance section, which contained two letters, one of which addressed certain findings. She said that these findings were not surprising in a first-year audit, especially when transitioning from a previous auditor who had been involved for an extended period.

Ms. Argenbright said that one of those items was properly implementing the recently introduced GASB standard, GASB 84, which mandated reporting custodial funds in the ACFR. She said that these were funds held by the County for other entities while providing fiscal services for them. She said that the existence and disclosure of these funds were already known; however, their numerical representation had now been incorporated into the financials. She said that this included entities such as Darden Towe Park, ECC, among others that were not previously included in the ACFR.

Ms. Argenbright said that they had recommendations concerning capital assets and School grant management, and those were discussed in detail during the audit committee meeting held a couple of weeks ago. She said that they were required to conduct state compliance, as per the auditor of public accounts audit program, which involved examining various state-level departments' requirements.

Ms. Argenbright said that there were a couple of findings. One was for the Department of Social Services involving an outdated information security policy that required updating, along with security policies for each individual. She said that these changes were already underway. She said that the procedures for implementing these changes would be completed in June and July, with the results visible by December 13.

Ms. Argenbright said that the second item concerned the annual School report, which needed to be submitted to the state by September 15. She said that due to payroll transition issues, the report was not finished on time. She said that this created a compliance issue that required attention. She said that they also had a uniform guidance report, representing their opinion for federal awards. She said that any time federal awards exceeded \$750,000, a single audit was necessary. She said that no findings related to federal compliance were discovered during testing. She said that programs tested included SLFRF (ARPA), SPED (Special Ed), Title I, ESF (Education Stabilization Fund), and the SAFER grant.

Ms. Argenbright said that there were two items that they did not have in front of them because drafts had not been prepared yet. She said that she wanted to inform them that there were still two other deliverables planned. She said that one of these was the comments on internal control, and she had already discussed the findings that would be included in it. She said that the second one was the audit committee letter, which served as communication to those charged with governance, referring to the Board. She said that she would provide them with details about it.

Ms. Argenbright said that it was a fairly standard, boilerplate letter, and if they compared it year after year, even with different auditors, it would appear very similar because it was required communication, and they, as accountants, strived for precision and accuracy. She said that the letter mentioned that financial statements contained estimates. She said that not every number was an exact known number. She said that in finance and management they did their best with the information available to obtain the most accurate figures possible.

Ms. Argenbright said that there were some estimates and judgments involved in this process, not

the least of which was pension and other post-employment benefits (OPEB) liabilities. She said that actuaries were hired to calculate these numbers, as they were experts in this field. She mentioned that the audit covered corrected misstatements, uncorrected misstatements, and at the end of the letter was the management representation letter, which consisted of approximately seven pages of items.

Ms. Argenbright said that during their audit, they asked numerous questions to ensure all necessary information had been disclosed. She said that this letter was signed by management, confirming that they had provided all requested information honestly and to the best of their ability. She said that the past few weeks had been a whirlwind, and that they loved getting to know the County and understanding its operations. She said that they hoped to issue their findings by Friday.

Ms. McKeel said that she thought it was best practice to change audit firms. She expressed her pleasure with the decision not as a reflection of their former auditors. She thanked them for being there. She said that the School System had not submitted their annual report; however, they had by now.

Ms. Argenbright said that the last that she spoke to them was nearing completion.

Ms. McKeel asked if the issue had been resolved.

Ms. Argenbright said that it was being resolved, and they had continuous communication with VDOE (Virginia Department of Education) regarding its status.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if it was correct that there were no federal findings.

Ms. Argenbright replied that was correct.

Mr. Andrews said that he appreciated the feedback. He mentioned that he had reviewed some reports before the meeting, which provided an advantage; however, it was still beneficial. He stated that they did not have any federal findings at present, which was reassuring. He said that however, they had minor findings with the state. He said that there were identified deficiencies in their report, and he sought input on whether these issues arose due to changing auditors or if they were overlooked in the past because of communication challenges during the review process. He asked for clarification on this matter.

Ms. Argenbright said that one of the comments concerned fiduciary funds, which were other entities not previously included in the ACFR. She said that these entities did issue separate financial statements. She said that there was no misleading information because the financial statements were out there. She said that they should have been reported according to GASB 84 standard within the County's ACFR as specific numbers instead of just being disclosed. She noted that this was not misleading, and it was possible that the reports were not ready for issuance when the ACFR was prepared.

Mr. Andrews asked if that was because of new GASB requirements.

Ms. Argenbright said yes, new within the past two or three years.

Mr. Andrews asked if the other deficiencies were not necessarily new.

Ms. Argenbright said that was correct. She said that one was on capital assets, and she would say that the recommendation primarily stemmed from a turnover perspective, concerning the individuals responsible for managing projects. She said that when dealing with capital assets, there was an abundance of transactions to process, along with figuring out what projects were at what stage, and what needed to be recorded. She said that the person responsible for that had to pick up more due to increased turnover. She said they had worked with them to develop a strategy, which had already been implemented to ensure accurate reporting. Thus, she believed they should be very confident about this aspect.

Ms. Argenbright said that the other issue was School grants. She said that they had devised a plan to catch up, which was essential because it was extremely difficult to play catch-up once behind. She said that this involved completing current tasks while also addressing past due items. She said that School finance officials and she had discussed their plans for catching up on grant reimbursement requests. She said that hopefully this issue would not be present in the future. She said that she was much more confident that fiduciary activities and capital assets would be in a better state for the FY24 audit.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the Schools report had been submitted.

Mr. James Sumner, Chief Financial Officer, said that he would need to verify the information with the Schools and obtain confirmation that it had been done. He said that he would follow up with that.

Mr. Gallaway asked if it was a payroll transition or if there were payroll issues.

Mr. Sumner stated that during the previous fiscal year, they faced multiple challenges during the stabilization of their payroll transition to a new system and the implementation of a new HRIS. He said that this Human Resource Information System fed data into the payroll process. He said that with all project implementations, there was a stabilization period after going live. He said that difficulties in obtaining data and reports from the system were part of this stabilization phase. He said that several months had passed since October, and they were developing additional processes, resources, and

reports to ensure timely delivery of these reports and provide data for Schools and the DOE.

Ms. Price asked if Ms. Argenbright could clarify what a “finding” referred to.

Ms. Argenbright said that depending on what aspect she was discussing, it varied. She noted that compliance items, such as state compliance and federal compliance, were very specific with clear-cut requirements that asked whether or not a specific task was performed. She said that from the audit and internal control perspective, the process was less black and white because it involved a conversation about the existing processes and ways to improve them. She said that compliance focused on mandatory requirements, while internal control comments encouraged discussions about potential improvements in procedures.

Ms. Price said that a finding referred to something that has been identified which might not have been done 100% accurately. She asked if that was fair.

Ms. Argenbright said yes.

Ms. Price said that they mentioned there were no federal findings, so they did not have any issues in that regard. She said that for the areas where they did make a finding, she asked if there were any significant ones that needed to be discussed at this meeting or if there were more minor issues like the school report not being filed by September 15, which was being addressed. She said the same applied to grant processing. She asked how she would describe that as the bottom line of the report.

Ms. Argenbright said that she believed that the state compliance findings were primarily deadline-driven, so those were easily corrected, and they were aware that they were already in the process of being corrected. She said that they had discussed the three management letter comments extensively, and they had discussed them with the Finance team as well, and she did not think they required additional commentary here.

Ms. Price said the way that she would look at it, she was the patient, and Ms. Argenbright was the doctor. Ms. Price would go in for her physical, and the doctor would say that Ms. Price’s blood pressure was a little high, but it was not in the danger zone. The doctor would tell Ms. Price that maybe she should exercise a little more, but that she was in good health.

Ms. Argenbright said that she liked that analogy.

Ms. Price asked for confirmation that the books were good for Albemarle County.

Ms. Argenbright said yes.

Ms. Price said that she agreed with Ms. McKeel that sometimes it was helpful to have fresh eyes look at things to make sure that the County did not fall into complacency, and she thanked the audit team for the work they had done on this report.

Mr. Sumner said that the state code required that auditors must present financial statements to governing bodies. He said that he believed they had fulfilled this requirement today, but he would defer to either Ms. Argenbright or the County Attorney on whether they needed to take formal action to accept it or if simply presenting today was sufficient.

Mr. Steve Rosenberg, County Attorney, said that it was his understanding that formal action should be taken by the Board to accept the report.

Ms. Mallek asked whether it mattered that this was a draft that was still awaiting more information because she would rather have it complete.

Ms. McKeel said that this was advertised as information.

Mr. Rosenberg said that the fact that it was on the agenda as information was not of consequence. He said that if it was still in draft form, he believed it would be appropriate to wait until the final report was received before the Board formally accepted it.

Ms. Price asked if a special meeting would be required for the Board’s approval on the matter.

Mr. Rosenberg asked if the Board would continue to the next item so that he could investigate the issue in detail.

Ms. Price said that they would hold the matter in abeyance for any future action and move on to Item 11.

Agenda Item No. 11. **Presentation:** Rivanna Futures Update.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that on May 24, 2023, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution to authorize the acquisition of real property and related assets, approving the County’s acquisition of 462 acres of property located in the Rivanna Magisterial District at a purchase price of \$58 million, and authorizing the execution of an assignment and assumption

agreement, by which the County assumed obligations under a purchase agreement. The purchase agreement provides a 90-day feasibility study period, extendable with an additional deposit in 30-day increments. The County has extended the study period three times, with the last extension expiring on November 14, 2023.

On June 7 and August 2, 2023, the Board received updates on ongoing financing, due diligence, and partner engagement.

On June 21, 2023, the Board conducted a public hearing and adopted another resolution approving possible uses of the Rivanna Futures property, as the property has been denominated by the County, to include business and industry, in addition to public use and public facilities.

Staff has completed several critical activities since the last update of the Board, including review of title reports and surveys for the property to be acquired, review of the Rivanna Futures Due Diligence Report (Attachment A), review of a supplemental study of the condition of the dams onsite, and issuance of Bond Anticipation Notes totaling \$58.85 million to serve as interim financing for the acquisition of the property. In addition, the seller and the County have agreed to a proposed boundary line adjustment, affecting three parcels, in accordance with the purchase agreement. The boundary line adjustment has been approved by the Community Development Department. Attachment B shows the final parcel boundaries for acquisition. Further details will be shared during the presentation.

There is no budget impact associated with this project update.

Staff recommends the Board receive this presentation as a project update.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, introduced the Intelligence and National Security Innovation Acceleration Campus. He said that they were in the process of securing 462 acres around Rivanna Station on 29 North. He said that they would provide an update today on the work that had been continuing since the announcement in late May of the County's intention to purchase the property. He thanked the project's team for their diligent work thus far.

Mr. Richardson said that the bottom line today was that the due diligence was completed, and that their study revealed no major concerns for site development to their conceptual vision. He said they had closed on the bond anticipation note (BAN), and they were proceeding to close on the real property acquisition. He said they were developing good momentum in engagement at the state and federal levels.

Mr. Richardson said that they would go over five things at this meeting: their financing, due diligence work, economic development work, their partner engagement, and the legal aspects.

Mr. Sumner said that they were successful in issuing their BANs. He said that they closed on the issuance back in November. He said that as part of entering the public market, they received five bids, which was a good response and demonstrated the strength of their Triple Triple A rating and the creditworthiness of the County. He said that the lowest bidder offered a cost of 5.5%, which he referred to as their all-in true interest cost, a very favorable rate for a taxable note. He said that they borrowed a total of \$58.85 million. He said that it was issued in conjunction through the Economic Development Authority.

He said that he would remind the Board again that this anticipation note was a short-term maturity and had a five-year term on it with options to either extend or to revisit or to extend into a more permanent structure and refinancing that after they reach the five-year mark. He said that from a financing standpoint they were prepared to move forward. He said that with that, he turned the matter back over to the Chair and the Board, and he would be available to answer any questions on the financing.

Mr. Lance Stewart, Director of Facilities and Environmental Services, said that he would summarize the due diligence efforts, focusing on the outcomes rather than the process. He said that regarding ongoing facts or obligations, they were aware going into the project, as part of the land purchase, they would be purchasing two parking areas. He said that one was a large asphalt parking area outlined in blue on the left of their screen, and a smaller gravel lot with no improvements.

Mr. Stewart said that they needed to perform basic custodial maintenance on both parking lots, particularly the asphalt parking lot. He said that it meant cleaning, snow removal, ensuring that the lighting features were functioning properly, and generally maintaining the same level of care for the entire property. He said that they also had revenue from the parking leases combined, which was approximately \$346,000 per year, and that revenue would go into the general fund.

Mr. Stewart said that a major link was their relationship with the Rivanna Station occupants and how they would handle them on a regular basis moving forward as they managed these properties.

Mr. Stewart said that during their previous update, they had briefly discussed the condition of the two dams serving the two ponds. He said that they were low-hazard dams that had been neglected to some extent. He said that as a result, they sought additional opinions from a secondary engineer and a firm specializing in dam design and repair. He said that they used scuba gear to help examine the dams more thoroughly, as some issues were not visible from the water level.

Mr. Stewart said that based on their assessment, they estimated that addressing the various

deficiencies would cost approximately \$637,000, although this figure was not fully scoped or bid. He said that the work required varied in urgency with no immediate tasks necessary but acknowledging that they would need to address these issues in the coming years. He said that they appreciated that the sellers offered a \$100,000 credit from the purchase price to help cover their costs partially. He said that they had planned to develop a maintenance plan for the two dams as required by the state.

Mr. Stewart said that they mentioned previously the condition of the structures on the property, including two homes, a leased one that was vacated and an abandoned one. He said that there were a mobile home, several barns, and sheds, all in poor condition and potentially unsafe. He said that their initial steps would involve boarding up these facilities before eventually demolishing them for safety purposes.

Mr. Stewart said that during their first meeting, they mentioned the existence of a cemetery located next to the parking lot, visible in the upper picture among the large asphalt area. He said that to the north, within a copse of trees, there was a small family cemetery. He said that later, surveyors discovered another cemetery that both he and the property owners were unaware of. He said that it was situated on the far side of the property outside of the County's Development Area, near the abandoned mobile home. He said that both these properties must be maintained to ensure families of those interred there could access them in the future. He said that this would be considered during development planning. He said that they did not anticipate any significant challenges related to this requirement.

Mr. Stewart said that the County Attorney coordinated title and survey work, investing numerous hours in collaboration with surveyors and the title company. He said that they reviewed multiple exceptions but found none that would hinder development or future use of the property. He said it was common for older properties with limited ownership history to have many title exceptions, and they were grateful that none would cause issues for development.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that on slide 10 there were multiple dams referenced. She said that she wondered about the Greens Dam because the report mentioned it was within the project area and considered an impediment to fish passage. She said that this implied that the dam may prevent important migratory fish from reaching necessary feeding and breeding habitats. She said that she would like to know if this issue would be addressed through mitigation measures or if there were alternative solutions in case of dam overflow, such as the water flowing into the Rivanna River, which could potentially benefit the fish population.

Mr. Greg Harper, Chief of Environmental Services, said that he was not aware that fish passage was identified as an issue, and he expressed his surprise because the watershed upstream of that dam was quite small. He said that he could not imagine the ecological impacts being very severe that a fish could not run up and over the dam. He said that there were hundreds of dams and probably thousands of fish passage issues in the County; however, he did not see this as exceptional or a regulatory issue.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if Mr. Harper thought this was a concern.

Mr. Harper said no.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding underground storage tanks, she wanted to know if there was an ability to get more information from the seller in order to eliminate uncertainty of all these supposed others that may be out there that could pose a significant liability.

Mr. Stewart said that the seller was asked about underground storage tanks on the property and responded. He said that they had no knowledge of them prior to their ownership. He said that an environmental consultant thoroughly examined each area, and he said that they found no evidence suggesting significant leaks from any past underground tanks. He said that it was not currently a major concern.

Mr. J.T. Newberry, Assistant Director of Economic Development, said that he was excited to present an economic development perspective on the due diligence that had been completed thus far. He said that building upon the information provided by Mr. Stewart, with no non-starters identified, the focus shifted to the time and cost required for preparing the land for future development. He said that the objective was to transform the currently vacant land, as shown on the left-hand side of the screen, into a state ready for the vision guiding them through the due diligence process, displayed on the right-hand side of the screen.

Mr. Newberry said that County Executive Richardson had begun the presentation with a 3D image of this 2D representation provided by the state as an illustration of the potential future land adjacent to Rivanna Station. He said that considering site readiness led them to a familiar tool for both Board members and the public, where the state ranked readiness on a tiered system from one to five. He said that tier one was land that was raw, it was not publicly owned or optioned, it had little infrastructure, and it did not have the correct zoning or Comprehensive Plan designation. He said that this tier went all the way up to tier five, which most people would consider pad ready.

Mr. Newberry said that he wanted to spend a little time on the timeline and odds of success for each tier. He said that for tier one land, the state generally estimated a timeline of three to seven years and less than 10% chance of the land ultimately being able to accommodate that future vision whereas at tier five, the vision was only limited by the time of construction for the improvements associated with that vision and were generally given greater than 90% odds of success.

Mr. Newberry said that he would zoom in for a moment on the upper end of the tiering system to discuss their consulting engineers' estimates for tier four. He said that tier four was generally considered the level necessary to attract private sector investment and to be ready for projects that may come your way. He said that the Board was familiar with the fact that the Economic Development Office often responded to requests for information about the readiness of land in their community.

Mr. Newberry said that the particular graph displayed on the slide came from the land use build-out analysis conducted during phase one of the AC44 process. He said that they felt that tier four was the appropriate target for them, as it offered a level of success between 70% and 80%, with a timeline of 12 to 18 months. He said that before he discussed the specific costs from their engineers, he wanted to examine the economic impact and benefits of this project. He said that using his laser pointer again, he pointed out that the existing footprint of Rivanna Station was 75 acres, and the initial phase consisted of approximately 50 acres of development.

Mr. Newberry said that an in-depth analysis of the development, which encompassed 600,000 square feet, generated an annual economic impact of \$135 million, created approximately 873 jobs with a median wage of \$81,000. He said that it would result in about \$2 million in annual taxes for the state and around \$1 million for the County.

Mr. Newberry said that they did not stop at this initial vision alone. He said that they requested their engineers to explore further possibilities by conducting a test fit to maximize the Development Area. He said that they discovered an additional test fit that could potentially double the square footage from the original plan, bringing it to approximately 1.2 million square feet and would be situated on the eastern edge of the Rivanna Futures property.

Mr. Newberry said that moving forward to discuss the costs, achieving tier four level of readiness for the initial vision would require an investment of just over \$50 million. He said that this amount included all necessary Comprehensive Plan, rezoning, and master planning work. He said that it would include an extension of Boulders Road, as called for in the Comprehensive Plan now, and would be of great interest to the security of the existing station. He said that this would include clearing and grading, along with any necessary transportation studies for the future build-out of that phase.

Mr. Newberry said that, looking at the full potential, the additional loop road connecting to the Boulders Road extension was estimated at approximately \$23 million, while the additional clearing and grading for that space would cost an additional \$4 million. He said that in total, this future site readiness work amounted to about \$78 million.

Mr. Andrews said that if they could please go back to the previous slide, there was a section about transportation and Boulders Road. He noted that there was also a reference to other infrastructure, modern sewer, and said he did not know where that came into this readiness.

Mr. Newberry said that the study incorporated commentary from ACSA (Albemarle County Service Authority) and RWSA (Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority), stating that the current infrastructure could not support a full build-out as depicted. He said that they anticipated a phased approach and recognized that long-term plans for this area, situated within a Development Area, anticipated future development due to its location in a Development Area. He said that his understanding was that both ACSA and RWSA believed they could get there. He said that they could prioritize and de-prioritize projects as they understood the coming demand on the horizon to ensure adequate service for this region.

Mr. Gallaway said that he understood the rationale in of the tier four versus the tier five, and that in some ways, it appeared that tier four provided more flexibility since no pad was designated as "pad ready." He asked if there had been any conversation about taking parts of it to tier five.

Mr. Newberry said that he believed there was a portion of the area that was currently designated correctly in the Comprehensive Plan, immediately adjacent to the existing infrastructure, Boulders Road and immediately across the street from Rivanna Station. He said that if they were to pursue that, he believed that that would be the area where they would do that in the short term. He said that they must ensure flexibility by taking a step back and conducting comprehensive master planning before committing to a full tier five.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Deputy County Executive, said that he would discuss public engagement. He said that he had just a few slides to present, which they had seen before. He said that the first was their layered slide, discussing the different components of their work. He said that getting site control early on was deemed critical and essential for them to engage with the community and collaborate with state and federal entities to discuss this vision and move it forward. He said that thanks to their faith and trust, they were now at a stage where the team had done its due diligence, and they were ready to proceed.

Mr. Henry said that they believed that this site was buildable, as they could defend the existing function while also extending it through their work. He said that this was a long-term project, so they would be committed to it for years to come. He said that they had an opportunity to create a corridor similar to RTP (Regional Transit Partnership) around their defense and intelligence community, which was the vision. He said that various lanes of work were already underway, and they had anchored the site while engaging with their partners. He said that this collaboration would only intensify as they moved forward.

Mr. Henry said that regarding Mr. Gallaway's question about tier levels, he believed that this master planning work, which included input from the intelligence community and other national defense entities, would help them shape what that looked like so that they knew how to move forward with it. He said that another point mentioned briefly was that as property owners, they were now responsible for being good customer service stewards to the employees at Rivanna Station who parked in their parking lot. He said that they had truly engaged with Rivanna Station and Fort Belvoir in a way that he had not seen as a locality before. He said that they viewed them as a durable partner.

Mr. Henry said that the previous week, he attended an almost all-day meeting, which coincided with their legislative priorities. He said that he arrived from a meeting with emergency managers from Fort Belvoir and Rivanna Station, who were critically understaffed in some of their security areas. He said that as a result, they were working to ensure that they were partnered in a way that supported emergency management, emergency response, and that the necessary agreements were in place. He said that this was an example of what they had been doing as a locality to ensure that they maintained the faith and trust of those components while being there for the employees who were working there every day.

Mr. Henry said that this work would continue, and it represented a lane of work that was distinct from the economic development work they had discussed. He said that they had an opportunity to partner through intergovernmental support agreements. He said that this methodology allowed a locality to maintain the parking lot while Rivanna Station could leverage their contract, pay them for that work, and they would take over elements that relieved them of some of their responsibility. He said that they would be pursuing this as well, focusing on public works functions.

Mr. Henry expressed excitement about the work they were doing in both economic development and ensuring that they were a good partner to them. He said that they had talked about Secretary Crenshaw, and a lot of this work had been generated out of his office and efforts over the past decade. He said that he was leading the charge and advocating for this opportunity at the state level with his fellow secretariats. He said that they had briefed many secretary levels, and recently conducted a tour of Rivanna Station, which two Board members participated in. He said that they were continuing to work on it internally.

Mr. Henry said that in November and December, the Governor and Chief of Staff both received desk briefs about this opportunity. He said that they would likely be in front of them during the first quarter. He said that Mr. Richardson and he had presented at a General Assembly Military and Veterans Caucus previously. He thought he had done three of them, and they were already invited to present to that caucus again, probably in the February timeframe. He said that he was really excited about the work they were doing with the state to pursue funding opportunities either directly through the Governor or through the different buckets of funding traditionally found in transportation and commerce.

Mr. Henry said that the other thing on there that they saw was locally driven, state supported, federally shared, which was really a mantra from the Veteran Affairs Office. He said that the state had significantly supported this work through that office. He said that his main contact was military liaison Tom Crabbs. He said that some of them may have met him at a Defense Affairs Committee meeting. He said that through his office, they had access to resources that helped them envision this work and connect with their congressional delegation, specifically the Roosevelt and John Simmons. He said that that was a contract that was held by the state and was a key factor in enabling them to meet with Senator Warner just a week ago or two weeks ago. He said that that support would continue and would aid them as they engaged further.

Mr. Henry said that John's team included a former NGA (National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency) director, Vice Admiral retired Bob Sharp. He said that Admiral Sharp managed the implementation of NGA West in St. Louis, which had served as a model for this work. He said that Admiral Sharp had seen their work, helped with their vision, and advocated every chance he got with every intelligence community group he was part of. He said that last year, they had initiated several projects locally, and they had been fortunate to receive assistance from a statewide team led by Tom Crabbs' office and John Simmons.

Mr. Henry said that this team had facilitated meetings with Senator Warner, who chaired the Senate Intelligence Committee, which was an influential position. He said that through his interest in their work, he would help them connect with senior leadership of various intelligence community operations to identify needs and explore opportunities. He said that they anticipated briefing Senator Warner personally during the first quarter of the year, as well as engaging with Representative Spanberger, Representative Good, and Senator Kaine. He said that these interactions represented a significant portion of their external collaboration with state and federal partners.

Mr. Henry said that Mr. Newberry had discussed the Comprehensive Plan and zoning updates. He said that as landowners now, they needed to categorize them correctly to proceed with development. He said that master planning would be out of the gate, and with that, input from military partners and the intelligence community would be sought, as well as pursuing partnerships with state and federal academic institutions. He said that budget planning for both the remainder of the year and next year was underway to cover the costs associated with advancing the project.

Mr. Henry said that a core staff trip to NGA West in St. Louis was planned to assess the project firsthand, which involved 11 universities collaborating to create a campus setting that may have transferable applications to their work. He said that the outline did not encompass all of the work in the

future but aimed to give them a flavor of that. He said that the County Attorney would talk about the closing process. He said that it was a significant milestone and that there was much work ahead of them to transform this vision into reality.

Mr. Henry said that that the Board had his commitment to keep leaning in to do this work. He said that Mr. Barry Albrecht, Economic Development Director, brought valuable perspective to their work and would provide access to knowledge of funding availability at both federal and state levels. He expressed excitement about where they were and where they were heading but admitted that sometimes it kept him awake at night.

Mr. Steve Rosenberg, County Attorney, said that the situation may seem somewhat anticlimactic after what had been heard and seen on the slide. He said that he wanted to ensure that the Board understood that in his efforts, he had been greatly supported by a team. He mentioned Ben Emerson from the law firm of Sands Anderson, who was instrumental in helping them secure the contract to acquire the property initially. He said that although he was not involved for a long period, they invited him back to help finalize the process before closing. He also acknowledged Andy Herrick, Deputy County Attorney, and Richie Deloria, Senior Assistant County Attorney, who made significant contributions. He explained that they needed four lawyers because they were spending \$58 million of taxpayer funds to acquire 462 acres, and he thought it was important to ensure everything was done correctly.

Mr. Rosenberg said that Mr. Emerson, Mr. DeLoria, and he had worked very closely together over the course of the past few months, and that he felt very comfortable with the County moving forward at this point. He said that as indicated on the slide, they were in the homestretch. He said that the County Executive had signed documents on behalf of the County as he had been authorized to do by the resolution adopted by the Board last spring. He said that the title company had already updated the title examination so that they knew, as of December 2, that there was nothing new in the land records that would present an issue.

Mr. Rosenberg said that before the deed was presented to the Clerk's Office for recording, which was the formal transfer of the property from the seller to the County, the title would be updated one more time to ensure that there were no adverse matters of record that had been recorded in the land records that would present a problem to the County. He said he would not anticipate that they were going to find anything, but this was imminent. Within the next several days, he expected to be able to advise the Board that the closing had occurred.

Mr. Rosenberg said that after that, there would be some cleanup work post-closing. He said that they had some documents to finalize with the U.S. government, as they were a tenant on two of these parcels. He said that one parcel was used for parking and was paved, while the other was gravel and was used as a construction lay-down area for improvements being undertaken by the federal government on the installation. He said that as a result, the U.S. government became the County's tenant, and they had specific requirements regarding how they documented the change from one landlord to another.

Mr. Rosenberg said that they would finalize these documents, ensure that the title insurance policy was issued as committed by the title insurance company, and work with the County's risk manager, Laura Andrade, to report the property to VAcop, the County's insurance provider, for liability insurance purposes as soon as they took title to the property. He said that the difficult work had been done, and that there had been a flurry of activity in these last few days. He said that in the next several days, he expected to be able to inform them that the closing had taken place.

Mr. Henry said that that was the end of the presentation.

Ms. Price said that that concluded Item #11, and she asked the County Attorney if he had further information regarding Item 10, on accepting the draft report.

Mr. Rosenberg said that he had been communicating with Mr. Sumner and Ms. Borgersen. He said that with the help of Ms. Borgersen, they had gone back and seen what transpired last year. He said that the requirement in the state code was only that a presentation be made to the Board. He said that it had been the Board's practice to formally accept the report. He said that last year, for example, there was a similar pattern, where the final report was accepted by the Board in February. He said that there was a certification that was required to be made by the Chair of the Board and the County Executive jointly to the auditor of public accounts no later than December 15 of each year, that the report had been presented to the Board. He believed that without a vote, the Board Chair and the County Executive could make the certification that the financial report had been presented to the Board. He said that this was what occurred today. He said there was no need for a vote in order for that certification to be made. He said that if there was a desire to maintain consistency with prior practice, once the financial report was finalized, the Board could act to formally accept it, which could take place at the first regular meeting in January.

Ms. Price confirmed that the Supervisors had no further comments, and that they had no objection to the Chair and the County Executive certifying that the presentation had been made.

Agenda Item No.12. **Presentation:** From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Item No 12. a. Year in Review.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that he had a year in review presentation. He said that staff had made a video that was 18 minutes long and had been compiled with the assistance of their community and public engagement office, reaching out to every department in an effort to create a meaningful snapshot of the work represented within their organization. He said that the presentation served as an extension of the monthly County Executive report, where they had gone across every department and identified an achievement connected in some way to their Strategic Plan and the work of their organization.

Ms. Kilroy played the County Executive's Year in Review video. The video provided updates on various initiatives and successes, including the Rivanna Futures project, HART (Human Services Alternative Response Team), the Courts Construction project, the County's Triple Triple-A credit rating, Supervisor Training, the IT Project Tracker, Spring Community Recreational Programs, Phase Two of AC44 (Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan 2044), Traffic Town Halls, Career Center services, and a FEMA SAFER grant.

Ms. McKeel said that she had two suggestions. She asked if she could have a link to the video to share it with people who would be interested. She said she wanted to include it on her CAC (Community Advisory Committee) meeting agenda for January, as she believed it would be beneficial for the CAC members to see it. She said that the work the staff was doing, the outreach to the community, and the results were outstanding.

Ms. Mallek said that she also enjoyed it and would also like the link for her CAC meeting.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that it would be interesting for CACs to view, and she commended the staff and the organization on their work.

Mr. Andrews said that he agreed the CACs should view the video, and that it would be great for people to be aware of what the County does as the Board headed into the budget season.

Mr. Gallaway echoed the other Supervisors' comments and said that the Planning Commission should receive the presentation.

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

Agenda Item No.13. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Item No. 13.a. **Discussion:** Minutes of the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Price said they had faced challenges in catching up on the backlog of minutes. She said it had been a topic of discussion for some time. She said that throughout her work with several Supervisors and the Office of the Clerk, she had considered various factors that contributed to falling behind on the minutes. She said that these included personnel changes, gaps, and other demands. She said that she was confident that the Clerk's Office could maintain its current pace without further falling behind and would be able to handle the minutes as they moved forward. She said that they still needed to address the existing backlog.

Ms. Price said that she proposed having the Clerk's Office take responsibility for the minutes going forward while requesting a budget appropriation specifically for hiring someone to tackle the current backlog. She said this would enable the separate process to handle the backlog while the Clerk's Office continued its operations moving forward. She said that Ms. Golden from Golden Transcription Services was present in the audience to address any specific questions Supervisors may have regarding minute preparation.

Ms. McKeel said that she appreciated the proposal and was happy to concur with it; however, it was the second time within nine years that they had faced this backlog. She said that she was not blaming anyone, but circumstances had led them here. She said that the last time they had a backlog like this, it was publicized in the press and caused negative attention. She said that it was not ideal for their organization to be two years behind in approving minutes.

Ms. McKeel said that she was willing to agree with the proposal. She said she believed that their clerks and members should ensure they read and approved their minutes as promptly as possible. She said the responsibility lay with them, and if they found themselves falling behind again, they must address the issue accordingly. She said she was willing to try the proposal; however, this was not the first time they had found themselves in this situation.

Ms. McKeel said she hoped that they could overcome their current predicament. She said that sharing unapproved draft minutes with the public and media made her uneasy. She said that there were several reasons why she felt uncomfortable when they fell behind like this. She said that she had additional comments, including a suggestion of her own, but that she thought Ms. Price's suggestion was fine. She said that while reviewing the presented proposal, it seemed as though they were forced to choose between two options.

Ms. McKeel said that there was a middle ground where they could have verbatim records for

anything they voted on and for their public hearings, and they could also summarize less important items that were not as important for future reference. She said that less significant items could be included in summary form while retaining verbatim records for the important votes and public hearings. She said that this may not necessarily save time, and she was happy to spend more money if it solved the problem. She said that it was really more about transparency and allowing the public to easily read their approved minutes quickly.

Ms. Mallek said that she appreciated the proposal because it created a bridge and provided them with an opportunity to preserve what she believed were incredibly important to their posterity. She said that people could read as close to what really happened than a sentence summary for a five-page transcription. She said she supported this initiative.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she appreciated the suggestion as it brought them closer to their goal, which was to complete current minutes promptly and maintain this pace going forward. She said that this approach would eliminate draft minutes and replace them with actual minutes. She said they would address the backlog, which was very important. She said that she thought that this was a very good solution, and they should be able to avoid such issues in the future. She said if they noticed any delays or needed to implement additional measures, they should address them accordingly.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she wanted to point out that their Board meetings, since 2020, had become shorter. She said that this development may contribute to faster completion of minutes.

Mr. Andrews said that he supported the compromise of the two-tiered approach to get them back on track. He said he appreciated that they may need more of a real change in how they did this. He said that the issue was that it must ultimately save time and not be subject to too much external judgment where they were letting someone else make decisions for them about what was important. He said that this at least preserved the status quo and provided an opportunity for them to catch up.

Mr. Gallaway said that he had no problem with the suggestion regarding how to proceed. He said that it was a decision between verbatim and summary, as the requirement was to record the actions taken by the Board, not the verbatim nature of the meeting. He said that this additional workload did come at a cost, including more time and review. He said that they could prepare official minutes that were summarized and then create the verbatim version later as a policy. He said that by doing this, they could still release their official action minutes promptly, while allowing the Board to provide verbatim meeting minutes for posterity if desired.

Mr. Gallaway said that if there was a delay in providing the verbatim minutes, it would be acceptable, but at least the official action minutes would be available. He said that this approach could be discussed further in future conversations, and the Board could decide whether to bear the additional expense. He said that it was timely to conduct verbatim pieces. He said that he appreciated the idea of doing the action items; the public hearings could be verbatim and the action items could be verbatim.

Mr. Gallaway said that to meet state transparency requirements, one could list the meeting, the meeting participants, summarize the discussion, and provide both digital and later verbatim copies of the proceedings as it could be completed. He said that this way, the public can receive official minutes more promptly. He said he thought there was a way to get creative to achieve both, but at least get their official minutes out to the public in a faster way. He said that they would save that for another time.

Ms. Price said that it seemed there was a consensus that they would take the initial step of working with the Clerk to set a point in time from which they would focus on catching up on the backlog by requesting a budget item for additional funding.

Ms. Mallek said that they were taking on the responsibility of addressing both old and new minutes at the same time.

Ms. Price said yes.

Ms. McKeel asked if they knew what the budget request would be.

Ms. Price said that the budget request was unclear and needed to be determined based on the number of meetings and minutes to be prepared. She said that they would consider the cost of contracting. She said that summarizing minutes took time due to subjective evaluation of what should be included. She said that the Clerk would be able to draft a budget estimate.

Ms. Claudette Borgersen nodded her head in agreement.

Ms. McKeel suggested that the request return during the budget cycle.

Ms. Mallek said that a half-time FTE used to exist for this purpose.

Item No. 13.b. Other Matters from the Board.

Ms. Mallek said that the combined Council of Elected Officials and the Business Development Board for the Workforce Center held a quarterly meeting. She said that the budget had been reduced by 20% from the state this year. She said the state received all federal funding and decided how much to

keep in their own bucket. She said that they then determined what to do with the remaining funds. She said that this year, they decided to retain 20% more from localities, which was a significant blow for them.

Ms. Mallek said that many agencies, including counties in their region, had demonstrated the ability to do more with less. She said that there had been a 34% increase year-to-date in the number of people served at their new one-stop here in Charlottesville on Rio Road, as well as the satellite sites in Culpeper and different libraries around the community. She said that over 211 actual participants enrolled in WIOA (Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act)-funded programs for training that was highlighted by the Department of Social Services in the County Executive’s annual report video. She said that there was a 30% increase in job placements and long-term retention in those positions.

Ms. Mallek said that the County had the highest participant rate due to the center’s location. She said that over a thousand participants were in the County, with fewer numbers for smaller jurisdictions. She said the programs aimed to assist local residents, including young people obtaining their first job, elders transitioning from one job to another, or anyone seeking better skills.

Mr. Gallaway said that at the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) meeting earlier in the month, it was noted that surrounding counties were experiencing difficulties due to local composite index calculations, such as Nelson County. He said that in previous years, when this has come up on the County’s radar as an issue for Albemarle, it was not as significant an issue outside of Charlottesville and Albemarle. He said this was now affecting places like Nelson, where values had risen since the last calculation. He said that there may be an opportunity to collaborate on advocacy or lobbying efforts with other counties.

Ms. Price said that she expressed gratitude to her colleagues for their kind words and the opportunity to serve with them on the Board. She said that the official national anthem authorized by the U.S. Navy band was playing. She said she asked Mr. Richardson earlier today about the most significant baseball game he ever attended. She said that he shared his story of going to Atlanta Fulton County Stadium for jacket night, where the first 2,000 fans in attendance received a jacket. She said that he cost his father dinner that night but would have to share that part with them later.

Ms. Price said that for her, it was August 9, 1966; Sandy Koufax and Denny Lemaster’s game. She said that Sandy Koufax, often referred to as “the left arm of God,” played alongside Denny Lemaster in a memorable game. She said that it was a nine-inning, one-to-one game that was going into the bottom of the ninth when Eddie Matthews hit a walk-off home run, securing a 2-1 victory for the Braves. She said that despite striking out three times during the game, Matthews made a remarkable comeback in the final moments.

Ms. Price said that interestingly, six weeks later, Koufax would pitch his last game in the majors. She said that he was undoubtedly the best pitcher of his era, having been the youngest one admitted to the Hall of Fame and winning the Cy Young Award three times when it was only awarded once per year. She said that she had always admired him as one of those heroes who retired at the peak of their career rather than becoming an old has-been. She said that she hoped that she too could retire at the top of her game, avoiding the fate of a faded former success.

Agenda Item No.14. Closed Meeting.

There was no closed meeting held.

Agenda Item No.15. Certify Closed Meeting.

Agenda Item No. 16. Adjourn to January 3, 2024, 1:00 p.m. Lane Auditorium.

At 5:47 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to January 3, 2024, 1:00 p.m. Lane Auditorium. Opportunities for the public to access and participate in this meeting are posted on the Albemarle County website on the Board of Supervisors home page and on the Albemarle County calendar. Participation will include the opportunity to comment on those matters for which comments from the public will be received.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date: 05/21/25
Initials: CKB