

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on December 18, 2017, at 6:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. This meeting was adjourned from December 13, 2017.

PRESENT: Mr. Norman G. Dill, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer, Mr. Rick Randolph, and Mr. Brad Sheffield.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeff Richardson, County Attorney, Greg Kamptner, Clerk, Claudette Borgersen, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. McKeel.

Ms. McKeel introduced the presiding security officer, Officer Chip Riley, and County staff on the dais.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. **Government Operations/Courts Relocation Opportunities Analysis - Consultant Recommendation Public Hearing.** To receive public comment on the Government Operations/Courts Relocation Opportunities Analysis – Final Report.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that Albemarle County has been engaged for some time in a thorough analysis and assessment of the County's future court needs and the best way to meet those needs. The Board of Supervisors discussed five potential options last October 24, 2016 and took public comment. The court expansion project reflects a major investment of County funds and is the most expensive project in the County's current Capital Improvement Program plan; therefore, the Board is particularly interested in ensuring all options have been properly vetted and giving County taxpayers an opportunity to review the identified options and provide comment.

There are two Courts options primarily remaining in consideration.

- Option 1: Renovation of the existing downtown courts complex for the Circuit Court and expansion of the General District Court on the Levy Opera House parcel, which is co-owned by the County and City of Charlottesville.
- Option 5: Build a new General District Court, Circuit Court and associated functions on a parcel in Albemarle County's designated development area, presumptive location identified as the Rio Road/Route 29 area.

The Board established in its November 2, 2016 resolution that the Courts project, in any scenario, must ensure the fair and equitable administration of justice. The Board also directed staff to investigate the potential to which this project could promote its highest strategic priorities of urban development, redevelopment and revitalization. The Board additionally directed staff to further analyze the extent to which Option 5 would be sufficient to encourage a developer to enter a public/private partnership (P3) integrating the Courthouse and/or County Office Building as part of or adjacent to a larger mixed-use development.

At the December 14, 2016 Board meeting, staff presented a proposed process for moving forward with the exploration of a P3 to relocate the courts and/or County administration to a site in Albemarle County. At the conclusion of the presentation, the Board directed staff to proceed as proposed. Staff then developed a Request for Proposal (RFP) and proceeded with the solicitation process to contract with a Development Services Advisor during the spring; an RFP review committee selected and contracted with Stantec Consulting Services in June 2017. The consulting team has worked with the Board to develop decision-making criteria, presented Program Analysis information on the County Office Building and Courts options that will feed into the Fiscal Impact Model and the National Center of State Courts consultant reviewed the findings of the Adjacency Impact study of impacts associated with potentially separating County Courts from City Courts at the downtown location. At the Board Dec 13th work session, Stantec consultants presented an initial report on the costs, fiscal impacts, cost benefit analysis and any updates to the previously submitted Program Analysis Documents and Adjacency Study report along with overall recommendations and next steps proposal.

The deliverables of the Developer Advisory work are:

- 1) Review data related to Option 1 with a specific focus on understanding the adjacencies of the County Courts to the City Courts and impacts of separating.
- 2) Analyze the feasibility, cost, benefits and other impacts of Option 5, with the following sub-options:
  - Court House Complex Only
  - County Office Administrative Building Only
  - Combined facility

The purpose of today's work session is to provide the public an opportunity for comment and feedback on the Consultant report presented to the Board on Dec 13th (see attached).

There are no budget impacts at this time.

Receive the public comment and feedback prior to the Board Action item meeting scheduled for Dec 20th; also provide input to staff on any questions and/or any additional information requested for the action item meeting.

---

Ms. McKeel referenced a timeline for the courts project, as shown on a screen, including the history of the project, the Board's actions along the way, as well as options going forward. She stated that the timeline began in 2011 with a courts expansion study, and in 2014 and 2016, new Supervisors joined the Board, with Ned Galloway to join in January 2018. Ms. McKeel stated that there were ongoing meetings with the Board and City Council in a joint steering committee from 2014 and 2016, and both localities' staffs negotiated together from 2012 to 2016. She referenced a slide showing developments in 2017, beginning in June with the Stantec/Greystone development advisory analysis, presented to the Board in November and December. She reported that upcoming activities include this public hearing on the analysis, with the Board providing direction on next steps on December 20, with options possibly including due diligence on a public-private partnership and renewed negotiations with the City.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Director of Facilities and Environmental Services, addressed the Board and stated that he had been managing this process since earlier in the summer. Mr. Henry said the purpose of this meeting is to receive public comment on the advisory report from Stantec, which was issued and presented by company officials a week earlier, and he presented a slide of options reflected in the report. Mr. Henry stated that Option 1 includes renovation of the court for two Circuit Court sets and the Circuit Court Clerk's Office and renovation of the Levy property across the street, which is co-owned by the City and County. He noted that this option anticipated participation with the City with their General District Court and Clerk. Mr. Henry reported that Option 2 is still downtown, but is a reduced footprint whereby Levy would be County only. He said that Option 3 relocates the County's Circuit and General District Courts to another location, which would also include relocation of the Commonwealth's Attorney and associated space, presumably in the Rio/Route 29 area. Mr. Henry reported that Option 4 would include relocation of COB-McIntire staff and Department of Social Services staff from COB-5<sup>th</sup> Street to the new location, and would also include renovation and construction of the courts downtown. He stated that both the courts and County Office Building would be relocated under Option 5.

Ms. McKeel outlined the protocol for public speakers.

Mr. Dill explained time limits for speakers and read the names of those who signed up to speak, electronically and in person.

Ms. Jalane Schmidt, a City resident, addressed the Board and stated that she feels it would be a disaster to move the courts. Ms. Schmidt stated that she does a lot of court support for both plaintiffs and defendants, and moving the courts would compromise their ability, as well as that of their attorneys, as they would have to travel up and down Route 29 to participate in trials and hearings. She emphasized that she hopes this can be worked out with the City.

Mr. Harvey Wilcox of the Samuel Miller District addressed the Board and urged them to wrap the project up, as the Stantec report reaches one sensible conclusion: to leave the courts where they are in Court Square, modernize them, and negotiate parking with the City, as well as renovating the Levy building. Mr. Wilcox said the building may offer prospects for some standalone negotiation on another site, but the courts are too small and have too many visitors, who will not spend more than \$10 a day each. He stated that he hopes the Board will not accept Stantec's offer to study the project further by discussing it with individual developers or owners, as this would risk worsening the County's position, with litigation already likely. Mr. Wilcox said the Board inherited the project and did not grow up with it, and he encourages them to leave it alone.

Ms. Kat Maybury, a City resident, addressed the Board and stated that she is a member of Indivisible Charlottesville, an organization with 5,000 members devoted to opposing the Trump agenda, defending democracy, and holding elected officials in the County accountable. Ms. Maybury stated that over the last year, they have learned that fundamental to opposing the Trump agenda is standing up for racial and social justice. She said that people have raised very serious concerns about moving the County courts away from their downtown Charlottesville location, which would seem to have a detrimental effect that is disproportionate to poor people and people of color. Ms. Maybury noted that public defenders have indicated they would need to reduce their caseloads if the courts are moved, which means people would be incarcerated longer because they may not get the type of representation from services like Legal Aid.

Mr. Madison Spencer, a resident of the Whitehall District, addressed the Board and said he is excited to read the Stantec report, which confirms what many had already concluded regarding the economic value of retaining the courts downtown. Mr. Spencer said there are likely other schemes worth considering, but regardless of that he wants to emphasize the risks of a public-private partnership strategy that links a cornerstone of democracy with a development deal. He stated that it is difficult to estimate how many retail entities like this would be bankrupt in the coming year, and shopping has been entirely transformed with companies like Amazon. Mr. Spencer said that stock in companies like Simon, which manages malls, are being shorted by Wall Street in anticipation that they will not last. He stated that he sees no value in a P3 arrangement with something as impermanent as shopping, with a future that cannot be predicted. Mr. Spencer emphasized that the courts deserve to be part of the community with some sense of permanence and should be maintained in Court Square.

Mr. Ned Slaughter of the Jack Jouett District addressed the Board and stated that he had listened to the Stantec report the previous week, which he feels represents the County's success in pursuing due diligence with the courts project, as the report resulted in making the decision so much easier. Mr. Slaughter said that as the report pointed out, developers hate uncertainty, and attempting to move the courts, with strong opposition and the possibility of litigation, would result in uncertainty. He stated that using the County Office Building as the public anchor for the development, it would not create uncertainty and would likely provide the best possible situation as to whether P3 could or could not work. Mr. Slaughter urged the Board to leave the courts downtown and authorize renegotiation with the City immediately.

Mr. Scott Goodman of the Jack Jouett District addressed the Board, stating that he has been a lawyer downtown for 40 years and emphasizing that his concern is why they should move forward with a new project at all, given that the current courthouse structure is adequate with the exception of moving prisoners, which would not require \$30 million. Mr. Goodman stated that there are two courtrooms, with investment made for the second courtroom in the front of the courthouse building, and that courtroom sits empty because there is only one judge. He said that increasing capacity could be solved if necessary by starting court at 8:30 a.m. instead of 9:00 a.m., as surrounding localities do. Mr. Goodman stated that numbers of caseloads are actually going down, with marijuana cases that had previously accounted for hundreds of cases now decreasing. He said that prosecution for people caught driving on a suspended license are also decreasing, and mental health and drug court dockets will reduce the number of trials taking place. Mr. Goodman stated that a room could be made available for court services like probating wills, perhaps in the County Office Building, which has ample parking. He said that similar localities combine courts, and that would be an easy way to solve these issues and save money.

Mr. Tom Olivier of the Samuel Miller District addressed the Board on behalf of Advocates for a Sustainable Albemarle Population (ASAP), which has also viewed Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville as two parts of a single community. Mr. Olivier stated that they believe it is better for everyone if the two localities remain closely tied, despite recurring contentious episodes. He said that moving the courts and the COB to a location in suburban Albemarle County will surely undermine City/County ties. Mr. Olivier said that ASAP is mystified that economic development is being used as justification for a proposed court move, as Albemarle already enjoys a robust economy and moving the courts would require millions of dollars in expenditures that might be better off spent on workforce and other needs. He stated that the very idea that the justice system might be entangled with economic development also causes concern, noting the controversy with private prison contracts. Mr. Olivier said that the P3s could reduce relocation costs and have been used widely to finance highway projects in Virginia and elsewhere, but frequently end up in bankruptcy with great unforeseen costs to the governments that are involved. He noted that he would leave links to articles by Randy Saltzman on highway P3s. Mr. Olivier said that at previous public hearings, the Board heard from the legal community and support services staff on the hardships that relocating County courts would have on low income residents with limited transportation, and asked if the Board is willing to disregard the stresses relocation would cause on these individuals. Mr. Olivier also asked if the County is prepared for litigation if they move the courts without a referendum, and ASAP urges them not to move the courts.

Ms. Jean Hiatt, a Charlottesville resident, stated that she is a board member of Preservation Piedmont, which is committed to supporting historic preservation in central Virginia, with members from both the City and County, as well as from adjacent counties. Ms. Hiatt said their goal is not only historic preservation of structures, but preservation of the fabric of the community, and they support keeping the General District Court and Clerk's Office in the Court Square area. She stated that Court Square has the unique status of being a place used by three U.S. Presidents who were significant to the history of the nation and region. Ms. Hiatt said that Court Square today provides continuity with the past, and the area is walkable for the legal community and others whose work involves travel between the courts in the course of a normal workday. She stated that Preservation Piedmont is concerned for those who must attend court and for those who must attend public transportation to get there, and Charlottesville is an important transportation hub that facilitates access to the courts. Ms. Hiatt said that future parking and other associated court needs can continue to be accommodated in the downtown area because of the variety of surface parking lots on other parcels, where redevelopment and structured parking could occur without major effects to significant historic resources. She stated that Preservation Piedmont would encourage the City to support the necessary parking for the courts. Ms. Hiatt said that County land acquisition, building rehab, and civic improvements adjacent to Court Square had been planned and implemented for years, to make continued judicial-related expansion possible. She stated that the recent Stantec study demonstrates that staying in Court Square is economically viable.

Ms. Palma Pustilnik of the Rio District addressed the Board and stated that she is an attorney at Central Virginia Legal Aid Society. She stated that she is before the Board to speak about the importance of keeping the state courts located in the vicinity of Court Square, which is not about the convenience of attorneys, as private attorneys bill for their time and will get paid regardless. She said that clients will pay more for those services, but that is not this issue, and Legal Aid attorneys get paid regardless of the number of cases they have. Ms. Pustilnik stated that this issue is about access to justice, and she represents the least empowered, survivors of domestic and sexual violence, and the more clients she can represent on a given day, the more they combat this issue. She relayed a story of a County resident who obtained a restraining order against her husband, who repeatedly violated the order, and said that she worked with commonwealth's attorneys in both jurisdictions to obtain his convictions, as well as obtaining new protection orders for her. Ms. Pustilnik indicated that she also represented this client in civil matters relating to the domestic violence, custody, and child support proceedings. She said that in intervening

years, this client has completed her education, obtained a managerial position, and purchased a home in the County.

Mr. Rex Linville of the Piedmont Environmental Council and resident of the Samuel Miller District addressed the Board and said that PEC staff had been present at the Board's December 6 meeting to share comments regarding the move from downtown to a separate County location, so he would not reiterate those. Mr. Linville stated that one of the reasons given for the move is to spur economic growth in the Route 29 area, but the Stantec analysis demonstrated extremely limited economic development opportunities resulting from the proposed move. He emphasized that moving the courts could consume growth area land that could be used to generate growth area revenue from new tax paying businesses that could be located there, and Stantec essentially concluded the same. Mr. Linville stated that PEC's vision for the region includes a strong and historic urban core that is central, interconnected, and sits within a protected rural landscape where agriculture and forestry dominate. He said they believe that moving the courts would splinter the community physically and metaphorically in a way that will have a detrimental impact on this vision. Mr. Linville urged the Board to move forward with a commitment to 250 years of shared past, as well as a commitment to 250 years of a shared future, by keeping the courts in downtown Charlottesville. He stated that this decision would require work, compromise, and collaboration, but the community would be stronger for it.

Mr. William Orr of the Scottsville District addressed the Board and stated that he recently had to access the Court Clerk's Office and had a terrible time finding a parking place, with the situation just getting worse. Mr. Orr said that he discussed this with Mr. Randolph, who told him that Ms. McKeel had come up with the idea of consolidating the courts and moving them into the County Office Building, then shifting some of the existing COB offices to other properties. Mr. Orr stated that this is a terrific idea, as it will provide a lot more parking for the County and the School Board office could move over to Burley Middle School. He said that Community Development could use Murray High School. He said that his three children went to Stone Robinson and then were bused into Burley for middle school and attended Monticello or Albemarle. Mr. Orr stated that it would be wonderful if Burley and Walton could be in a middle school that is near the high school, as the other middle schools are, on land the County already owns across from Monticello High School.

Ms. Liz Murtagh addressed the Board and stated that she is the public defender for Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville. Ms. Murtagh said that when she was before the Board the previous week, she had forgotten to express how intertwined the City and County courts are. She stated that she serves on the Board of two therapeutic courts: the drug court, which they are familiar with; and a newly forming behavioral health docket, which will provide services for those with mental illness. Ms. Murtagh said that this will divert them from jail and provide treatment services for them, and the group has filed a petition with the Virginia Supreme Court for approval, with a goal of starting in early 2018. She stated that the drug court has been very successful, and their hope is that the mental health docket will be also. Ms. Murtagh noted that both dockets currently meet within the City Circuit Court for drug court, but the mental health docket would meet in the City General District Court. She pointed out that both prosecutors, the public defender, mental health treatment specialists, and the criminal justice planner for the City would come together and work collaboratively.

Ms. Christine Osheim of the Jack Jouett District addressed the Board and stated that she thinks the courts should stay downtown. Ms. Osheim stated that she has a business in Woolen Mills in the County and is a recovering alcoholic, and there is a lot of distress and suffering related to the August incidents in the City. She said that the relocation of the courts would cost a lot of money and would disrupt people who need it, and any change that creates financial distress is negative. Ms. Osheim added that having the courts stay where they are will help people financially and psychologically.

Mr. Evan Mayo addressed the Board and stated that he is a County resident and an attorney who has worked downtown for the past three years. Mr. Mayo stated that having read the Stantec report, he feels there is no viable basis for relocating the courts, and it will cost \$10-15 million in additional capital costs, \$800 thousand in additional operational costs, and the loss of 5 to 10 acres of prime development real estate that will be lost to the project if the courts are relocated to that area. He requested that the Board stop pursuing the relocation option and instead pursue a final agreement with the City to resolve the parking proposal, as well as finalizing the new baseline option for the courts to be located downtown.

Ms. Rachel Horvath of the Scottsville District addressed the Board and stated that she is an attorney and is wholeheartedly in support of keeping the courthouses downtown. Ms. Horvath said that it will be a disaster to move the courts from downtown, and she urged the Board to listen to people like Ms. Pustilnik and Ms. Murtagh, who use the courts and provide invaluable services to the underserved in the community who cannot afford to travel and go up Route 29. She added that it would be detrimental for them to cut back on services because they have to travel between two courts. Ms. Horvath stated that at least nine of her neighbors in Foxcroft have reached out to Mr. Randolph, expressing their opposition to moving the courthouses, and she asked that they not ignore those voices and those of people who use the courts frequently. She said she has heard there are many people who support moving the courthouses, but she has not seen or talked to them, nor had they been present at any of the Board meetings. Ms. Horvath urged the Board not to move the courthouses.

Mr. John Martin of the Whitehall District addressed the Board and emphasized that the City of Charlottesville is part of his world. Mr. Martin stated that after reviewing the Stantec report, he did not see any reason for a continuing expenditure of funds in pursuit of a concept of relocation of County courts from the City to an unspecified commercial site in the County. He emphasized that discussions with the City should resume with respect to the necessary improvement of the current court facilities in historic

Court Square, which represents shared City/County historic heritage that belongs to future generations, and which current generations are duty-bound to preserve and not destroy.

Mr. Lewis Martin addressed the Board and stated that he is a City resident but was born in the County, and with the exception of two years in the Army has been in both localities for his entire life. Mr. Martin noted that his brother is a resident of the Rivanna Magisterial District. He stated that he had spoken to the Board in October as a member of the Bar Association. Mr. Martin said his family has been in the area for five generations, and citizens always win when the City and County cooperate and collaborate, with the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court being a good example, located in one building with one clerk. He stated that the Commonwealth's Attorney and Clerk of the Court, among others, are in favor of keeping the courts here and use them daily. Mr. Martin said there are a total of seven courts in Charlottesville, and only two of them are County courts. He stated that attorneys would not be moving their offices, as the Federal Court, City General District and Circuit Courts, and Juvenile Court would not be moving. Mr. Martin urged the County to continue collaborating with the City, and said that the Charlottesville-Albemarle Bar Association would be their best friend in helping them get the hundred parking spaces.

Mr. Pete Craddock addressed the Board and stated that he is a resident of the Scottsville Magisterial District, noting that the Charlottesville regional political center has been the Albemarle County Courthouse since 1762. He stated that the original Albemarle County courthouse of 1803 served as a community church known as "the Common Temple" by Thomas Jefferson when he, James Madison, and James Monroe used to congregate on Court Square. Mr. Craddock stated that the courthouse was registered in the 1973 National Register of Historic Places and has been in the Charlottesville-Albemarle Court Historic District since 1982, with a Stonewall Jackson world-renowned sculpture by Charles Keck. Mr. Craddock stated that court-affiliated individuals have urged the Board to keep the court downtown, and said the County Office Building location keeps people from outlying areas from dealing with Route 29. He urged the Board to not be like City Council and instead listen to their constituents, by keeping the courts and County Office Building downtown.

Ms. Peggy Gilges of the Jack Jouett District addressed the Board and stated that she is a champion of reuse and finds that older things are imbued with character and workmanship not found in brand new things. Ms. Gilges showed the Board a commemorative plate from 1962 honoring the 200<sup>th</sup> birthday of Charlottesville, which shows the gems of Charlottesville around the border, including the Albemarle County seat. She stated that these are important parts of the localities' shared history, and although they have different governments, most residents perceive themselves as belonging to both the City and the County. Ms. Gilges commented that a new courthouse is unlikely to match the significance of the old one, because it is essentially for their function to remain in Court Square. She added that she hopes Charlottesville and Albemarle together would be going strong for their 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary, and she knows that is the Board's hope as well.

There being no further speakers, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Mr. Henry asked if there are any additional questions that the Board would like staff to return with prior to their meeting on Wednesday, and said he already planned to bring back some clarifications stemming from previous questions.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the decline in caseloads, as that had been addressed previously in other materials, and he wonders if staff had gathered information related to that. Mr. Henry stated that staff has tracked that and it may be more appropriate for him to bring that back on Wednesday, but in one of the studies that Mosley had done in the fall, there was information gathered on caseload trends. He stated that they were trending down, but the original study done in 2010 indicates that they are exceeding one court set now, and as the consultants indicate, there is a need for two court sets each.

Mr. Sheffield asked for clarification that the information Mr. Henry is referring to is from 2010. Mr. Henry responded that the original information was from 2010, but that had been updated with a sequence of analyses done by Mosley and as recently as the program analysis done by Stantec.

Ms. Palmer stated that one of the issues is that it is hard to predict the future given changes in technology and the potential to use online and video services. Mr. Henry responded that the trends do not make an assumption on what might happen in the future, but one of the challenges in predicting ahead 10 to 20 years is taking into account the technology impacts. He stated that what was projected in the study was how they are using courts now and how that might continue forward, although there had been discussions since 2010 as to how technology might change that space need, and he would turn to the consultants for input on that.

Ms. Palmer commented that she had been confused about trying to get a handle on what is needed for the future with respect to technology changes, and in the beginning there was some question as to whether changes need to be made at the General Assembly level to allow the courts to practice differently. She said this is not necessarily needed for their December 20 meeting, but she would like more information on it. Mr. Henry responded that he would have to look it up specifically.

Ms. McKeel agreed that they could consider this later.

Ms. Mallek said that anecdotally, it is hard to predict when one major institution moves from the City to the County and carries an enormous caseload with it, and that makes their jobs harder.

Mr. Dill stated that he would like to hear more about the empty court sets not being used, as mentioned by Mr. Goodman. Mr. Henry responded that he thinks that room is a hearing room that was renovated, and he understands that it has been used for mediation and other purposes, but perhaps not court. He stated that he would bring back an answer for Wednesday.

Ms. Palmer commented that it is the case that they need another judge in order to have a district court. Mr. Henry confirmed this.

Ms. Mallek stated that she thought they had already been awarded the other judge. Mr. Henry replied that he does not have this information, but would ask.

Ms. Palmer stated that she had heard the term "criminal justice planner" from Liz Murtagh at this public hearing, and she did not recall hearing about this when they did the adjacency study. Mr. Henry responded that he was not aware of this position, but he would ask.

Ms. Palmer thanked the public speakers for coming out and for offering such good comments. She stated that she has expressed previously that she is not interested in moving the courts out of Court Square, and she hopes they do not do that. Ms. Palmer stated her appreciation for the work put in to try to educate her and others on this matter.

---

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

Ms. Mallek stated that at the suggestion of local veterans' associations, the Board of Supervisors has placed a boxwood wreath on the soldiers' monument in the COB front yard for the holiday season, and she would like for agencies to include the Board in such occasions in the future. She also mentioned that two police officers were on the radio this week talking about public safety issues this season, as there had been a tremendous increase in the numbers of auto thefts, triple the usual level, with large numbers of thefts of items from vehicles. Ms. Mallek stated that some of these thefts resulted from people leaving their keys in cars.

---

Mr. Sheffield stated that prior to him taking office in 2013, his truck was broken into while parked behind his house, and his iPad was stolen but his Christmas presents were not.

---

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

There was no report.

---

Agenda Item No. 5. Closed Meeting.

At 7:05 p.m., Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board go into a Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia, under Subsection (8), to consult with and be briefed by legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice relating to an agreement to which the County is a party and which pertains to a County-supported public body. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, and Mr. Randolph.

NAYS: None.

---

Agenda Item No. 6. Certify Closed Meeting.

At 7:37 p.m., Mr. Randolph **moved** that the Board certify by a recorded vote that to the best of each Supervisor's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempt from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, and Mr. Randolph.

NAYS: None.

---

Mr. Dill **moved** to authorize the Chair of the Board to send an amended letter to the City of Charlottesville and the Charlottesville-Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau regarding the CACVB agreement. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Dill, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, and Mr. Randolph.

NAYS: None.

---

Agenda Item No. 7. Adjourn to December 20, 2017, 12:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

December 18, 2017 (Adjourned Meeting)  
(Page 7)

With no further business to come before the Board, at 7:39 p.m., Ms. McKeel adjourned the meeting to December 20, 2017 at 12:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium.

---

Chairman

Approved by Board
-------------------

Date: 3/07/2018
-----------------

Initials: CKB
---------------