

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 10, 2021, at 3:00 p.m. This meeting was adjourned from March 3, 2020.

PRESENT: Mr. Ned Gallaway, Ms. Beatrice (Bea) J. S. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer, and Ms. Donna P. Price.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeffrey B. Richardson, Deputy County Executive, Doug Walker, County Attorney, Greg Kamptner, Clerk, Claudette K. Borgersen, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m., by the Chair, Mr. Gallaway.

Mr. Gallaway said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(16), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster."

Mr. Gallaway said the persons responsible for receiving public comment are the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County.

Mr. Gallaway said the opportunities for the public to access and participate in the electronic meeting are posted on the Albemarle County website, on the Board of Supervisors homepage and on the Albemarle County calendar.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** FY 2021-2022 Operating and Capital Budget.

Mr. Andy Bowman, Chief of Budget of the Budget Division within the Department of Finance and Budget said he would be walking through most of the presentation, but other staff would introduce themselves along the way as well.

Mr. Bowman thanked the staff of the Budget Division. He said it was a notable day since a year ago from the next day, they were completing the transit work session for the FY 21 budget. He said in his mind, this was the last normal Board meeting they had at that time. He said after that, the auditorium was spaced out, and then virtual meetings were held.

Mr. Bowman thanked everyone, adding that it had been a challenging year for all. He said that so much of the strategic thinking, analytical care, and thoughtfulness in their approach to manage the financial situation went to Ms. Laura Vinzant, Ms. Tia Mitchell, Ms. Heather Taylor, and Ms. Kim Gardner, and he wanted to thank them for helping them get to this point.

Mr. Bowman said the slide on the screen set the stage for all of the work that would happen over the coming weeks and months. He said today's work session would be the first on the FY 22 budget, and they would primarily focus on the high-level overview of the General Fund revenue and General Fund expenditures.

Mr. Bowman said on Monday, March 15, the School Board would be meeting with the Supervisors to discuss the School Board's request, and the capital budget and debt service would also be discussed in more detail. He said at that time, they will also continue anything they may not finish that day on General Government operations.

Mr. Bowman said the intent for these two work sessions is to cover a lot of material relatively quickly. He said March 18 is an important milestone for the Board in its process, as the Board will be asked to propose a tax rate and a budget for advertisement and public hearing. He said although these are not final decisions, this is a milestone that will continue the public process on the FY 22 budget.

Mr. Bowman said on March 18, they will also spend time talking about Fire Rescue in more detail. He said after going through these high-level overviews in the first work sessions, they will have much more time as needed to get more in depth on topics. He said the March 22 work session discussion, if needed, can continue into March 29, or they can find more time.

Mr. Bowman said they have identified a few items to discuss on March 22 which include the cigarette tax options, another transit work session (primarily with JAUNT on their budget request), and the Electoral Board's request to meet with the Board about some of their budget work.

Mr. Bowman said more topics will be identified as directed by the Board of Supervisors as they go through the work sessions, but what he outlined was what the next week and beyond would look like.

Mr. Bowman said the process for the work sessions is to round in what they have done in the past, with feedback from the Board that has worked well in the past. He said this will be a very interactive approach. He said staff will present some information and then allow time for Board discussion and dialogue, adding that as much of this as possible will be allowed. He said his comments on the chapters would likely be very brief but could be longer to explain complex topics and changes in the budget.

Mr. Bowman said all the Budget staff were on the call, and they were listening for feedback from

the Board for two particular things. He said the first was a list of potential adjustments. He said if there is an item in the budget that the Board seeks to add to, remove, or modify in some way, the magic words staff was looking for was to have "Item X be added to the list for discussion." He said staff will gather all of these items for the list and bring them back as a package at the March 18 work session.

Mr. Bowman said if there were general questions, whether about how something works operationally, about a historical revenue expense, or whatever that may be, staff will respond to those as they have been doing to date.

Mr. Bowman said they were working toward the March 18 work session, where the Board will propose a budget and tax rate for advertisement and further public input.

Mr. Bowman presented the agenda for the day, noting that it contained many topics which were essentially the budget chapters. He said some will be very quick, but they will also want to slow down on topics such as broadband or North Garden's volunteers funding request, as those will be more substantial parts of the County Executive's recommended budget.

Mr. Bowman noted that on the agenda that was previously released, toward the end of the day was an item that is now called "Intro to Reserves and Transfers," which is in the Non-Departmental section of the chapter. He said this would be slightly different, and they would likely do an introduction to that item that day and save some of it for the next time, given the material they had to go through.

Mr. Bowman said at the end of the day, they would pause and wrap up to make sure to capture all follow-up items. He paused to take any questions from the Board about the process and heard none.

Mr. Bowman said he would begin with some high-level slides to frame the total County budget. He said the first of these slides was one taken from the County Executive's budget presentation. He said staff has been talking for the past year about managing the budget with a "3-6-6" framework. He said this meant the fourth quarter of FY 20, the first half of FY 21, and the last half of FY 21, respectively.

Mr. Bowman said they were now adding a "12" to the "3-6-6." He said FY 22 will be a transitional budget. He said although the economy is stabilizing, it has not stabilized. He said the community is adapting as circumstances change and as people are impacted by the pandemic in very different ways. He said the organization itself is transforming in the future.

Mr. Bowman said even though this is a transitional budget, staff had to reflect in making recommendations those things they can do to build a bridge now to make sure they are an even more resilient organization and community when they reach the other side of their future.

Mr. Bowman presented another slide, noting the Board had seen it before. He said every year, as staff makes budget recommendations, it is by the Board's Strategic Plan, as represented by the nine boxes to the left of the slide, which contained objectives that are ongoing in the current year and will continue in the upcoming fiscal year. He said that "Quality Government Operations," as shown on the bottom line, underpins all of this.

Mr. Bowman said another framework staff uses for its decision making is a graphic they share with the Board about the strategic use of one-time funding. He said there is some one-time funding available based on their approach in the last quarter of FY 20, where they hit the brakes on spending at the start of the pandemic. He said this has provided an opportunity to do some one-time support for projects in both the current year and upcoming year, and this would be discussed in more detail in the work sessions.

Mr. Bowman said his final overview slide showed the total budget number, at \$466 million. He said this includes the Local Government General Fund budget, the School Fund budget, capital budget, grants and pass-through monies, and every dollar that the Board appropriates. He said the total budget year to year is an increase of 17%. He said the total budget year to year can be a challenging point as a reference. He said for example, with the nature of the capital budget and debt service, due to the timing of projects and timing of borrowings when debt service is paid off, there is usually some fluctuation there.

Mr. Bowman said that of the 17% increase in the total budget, about \$46 million (or 64% of the total increase) is due to the year-to-year change they are seeing in the capital budget. He said at the start of the FY 20 budget, many capital projects were put on hold. He said some of those have been restarted, which plays into this as well.

Mr. Bowman said they would be focusing mostly on the General Fund that day, which is a much more meaningful point for year-to-year comparisons. He said it is the fund where all tax revenue is received, and it is the primary ongoing funding source for the School Fund and the capital and debt program. He said it also does not include some of the pass-through grants that may vary year to year. He said the General Fund is increasing by 4.8% over the FY 21 adopted budget.

Mr. Bowman noted he would be transitioning another level down from the County Executive's presentation overview into what the FY 22 revenue picture looked like. He said this starts on page 33 of the budget document if the Board wanted to follow along.

Mr. Bowman said the first chart showed what the County's total revenues are by funding source. He said as usual, the light bluish-gray piece of the chart represented general property taxes, which

continue to be the majority of revenues. He said this includes both real and personal property taxes. He said in total, they make up 68% of General Fund revenues.

Mr. Bowman said in the upper-left quadrant, the yellow and green pieces of the chart make up state and federal revenue, which only make up about 10% of the total County revenues that support local government. He said the School Division also receives state revenue, but this is received directly to the School Fund and does not pass through the General Fund.

Mr. Bowman said there were two things he wanted to share in continuing to monitor the revenue picture, which are both related to state and federal revenues. He said he did not have an update on dollars, and staff will continue to keep the Board updated as they know more.

Mr. Bowman said first, there is now a state budget that has been approved by the General Assembly and is going to the Governor. He said this was not the case when staff finalized the recommended budget. He said they are currently going through a process to determine if any revenue updates need to be made from the state budget, as the state's revenue picture looks rosier than it did earlier in the process.

Mr. Bowman said they know that for most state revenues, which go to things such as supporting the Department of Social Services and other obligated aid, these do not appear to have changed, but staff is still doing their homework to make sure they have all this covered and will report back to the Board at a future work session as they better understand those impacts.

Mr. Bowman said the second item staff is watching very closely is related to the federal government. He said this changes daily as right before the present meeting, there was an update from CFO Ms. Nelsie Birch that legislation had passed the House, which is the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 that has been in development in recent weeks. He said it seems that every day, staff learns a little more about it.

Mr. Bowman said this act, in his mind, is almost another round of the CARES funds that were received in the last calendar year. He said in the last 24 hours, he had seen three different pieces of information suggesting different things, so staff is watching this very closely to make sure they understand what potential exact amount of funding will be received, what the compliance standards and other requirements would be, and what the timing would be. He said from some of the preliminary information, he understood that while the initial CARES deadline was a very short timeframe, this may be more flexible. He said he hesitated to say anything with certainty because Ms. Birch may learn something even more recent from the news.

Mr. Bowman said staff would share more with the Board as they learn more, but he wanted to be clear that the County Executive's recommended budget does not include any revenue that would come from the federal government from this. He said this act would be an additive to the County's current fiscal claim.

Mr. Bowman said real estate was mentioned as being the majority of the County's tax revenues. He said real estate property taxes are calculated at a current rate of 85.4 cents per \$100 of assessed value, which is the same rate as Calendar Year 20. He said the County Executive's budget does not include a rate increase in the recommended budget.

Mr. Bowman said real estate revenues are expected to generate \$173 million, or about 55% of the General Fund revenues. He said for perspective, every penny on the real estate tax rate yields \$2.1 million in estimated collected real estate tax revenues. He said this means that if the Board were to consider either adding or reducing the tax rate by a penny, every penny would add or reduce the revenues by \$2.1 million.

Mr. Bowman said the fourth bullet on the slide was referring to the "lowered" or "effective" tax rate. He said to define what this means, the "lowered" tax rate is the rate at which the County would receive the same amount of tax revenue in Calendar Year 21 as they did in Calendar Year 20. He said this calculation is based on the change in the reassessment value. He said as the Board had heard from Mr. Peter Lynch, County Assessor, in January, there was a total positive reassessment of 1.4%, which is the difference of 84.2 to 85.4. He said this will also be part of the public advertisement when the Board takes action on the proposed rate on Thursday, March 18.

Mr. Bowman said the "lowered" tax rate does not include changes in revenues due to new construction, new parcel creation, or a change in a property's land use. He said it only speaks to the real estate reassessment.

Mr. Bowman said the Tax Relief for the Elderly and Disabled Program continues. He said this is an expenditure that is included in the non-departmental section of the chapter and has a total of \$1.3 million, which is a 7% increase from the FY 21 adopted budget. He said this reflects the trend they have seen in recent years, with about a 7% growth in utilization of that program.

Mr. Bowman said he would not go through many numbers, charts, and graphs through the revenues, but he would ground the Board in what the FY 22 revenue project looks like. He said staff gave the Board some information on February 17 during its Second Quarter Financial Report, and the main takeaway for him from that report was that in total, the pandemic's impacts on County revenues have not been as significant as were projected in April 2020. He said at that time, they were about a

month or so into the pandemic, which was the timeframe they had to prepare the FY 21 revised budget that the Board adopted. He said staff did a lot of scenario modeling at that time in terms of high, medium, and low impacts both in FY 20 and FY 21.

Mr. Bowman said now that staff has all the data from about nine months after that time, it is looking much more favorable than anticipated. He said their FY 21 projection is about 2.5% above the FY 21 adopted budget. He said to be clear, this was in total, and there are certainly revenues that were impacted by the pandemic, with some being even worse than staff had thought they would be when looking at the line item or category level. He said in total, as the staff learns more and more, the impacts have not been as significant.

Mr. Bowman said the FY 21 projection almost becomes the new base for what happens in FY 22. He said the FY 22 recommended ongoing revenues are 4.7% above the FY 21 adopted budget. He said to be clear, this does not mean that staff is projecting that the economy will take off next year and experience 5% growth. He said this reflects the FY 21 projection of 2.5%, and another modest growth of about 2.2% that would occur in FY 22. He said staff has gone back and done multiyear trend analyses through good times and bad times over the last 15 years or so to get a sense of where they are and what revenues they know are impacted by the pandemic, or not. He said this is a very high-level summary of where they are.

Mr. Bowman said he talked before about this being a transitional budget. He said that on January 20, the Board heard from Mr. Lynch about the real estate projections and also heard from Mr. Steve Allshouse in the Community Development Department about consumer-driven revenues being relatively volatile. He said although there is uncertainty, he could share that while not stabilized, they are stabilizing, but they have not returned to pre-pandemic levels.

Mr. Bowman said he had one chart to slow down on and explain, noting that the Board had seen a different version of it before. He said he believed the chart would illustrate his previous point that while they were stabilizing, they have not stabilized to pre-pandemic levels. He said this chart looks at actual sales, meals, and transient occupancy taxes by month for the last three years, from July to June, working from left to right.

Mr. Bowman noted that the taxes on this slide were the bulk of the consumer-driven revenues, and they are the ones that are typically more volatile based on the economy and consumer-driven habits. He said the green line on the chart was FY 19, which was the baseline as there was no pandemic in FY 19. He said the blue line was FY 20 and explained that going through FY 20, they were consistently and significantly outperforming FY 19 through the first three quarters. He said this changed very dramatically in the last quarter with the onset of the pandemic, which impacted the revenues significantly when going into April, May, and June.

Mr. Bowman said a third line on the chart was an orange line representing FY 21. He said as the year has gone on, the orange line is getting closer to the green line and actually just barely exceeded it in two of the last three months. He said they were still below the blue line and have not gone back to the strong economy they had had in the last three to four years, but they are in a much stronger place than they were nine months ago and six months ago.

Mr. Bowman said that while this is encouraging, staff is also being very cautious in their approach. He said they know they are not out of the woods yet, and they are still below where they were in FY 21. He said from talking to staff in Revenue Administration and people at the Convention and Visitors Bureau, it is reasonable to expect that March and April still may have business operation impacts from the winter months, when there was a higher number of virus cases as well as colder weather. He said there are also other revenues they will get some key data points, such as business licenses and other economic indicators that staff typically finds out about in the March-May timeline.

Mr. Bowman said while the chart was encouraging about the revenues, staff continues to watch it very closely as there is more to come.

Mr. Bowman said that before pausing for questions, the final slide he would share on revenues is about the use of fund balance, found on page 46 of the budget. He said after the FY 20 audit, the County had an unassigned fund balance above policy levels of \$7.5 million. He said this amount is recommended to be allocated in FY 21 and FY 22 based on the prioritization shown on the right side of the slide, which he shared before. He said this includes supporting the County's financial foundation, the economic outlook, and the community during this turbulent time. He said it also includes workforce stabilization, which was discussed at a joint Board meeting in January with the School Board.

Mr. Bowman said page 46 has a list of those items, and he would not be going through them in detail because they are expenditures that are being supported with one-time money. He said they would spend time later that day and the following Monday talking about those reserves, such as the Climate Action funding, support for the Housing Fund, Business Process Optimization and support for the Community Development work plan, as well as some other items.

Mr. Bowman paused for any questions from the Board on revenues and heard none. He thanked Mr. Peter Lynch (County Assessor) and Ms. Jian Lin (Chief of Revenue Administration), noting that both of their teams are actively involved. He said this is a big team effort both in the Department of Finance and Budget and throughout the organization.

Mr. Bowman said he would talk at a very high level about the General Fund expenditure overview before going into the chapters and getting into more specifics about the departments and changes. He said the chart of expenditures could be found on page 47 of the budget, adding that this was shown in the County Executive's presentation. He said this chart includes the major categories of General Fund expenditures.

Mr. Bowman said as is the case almost every year, the largest piece of the General Fund is the local transfer to the School Division, which totals \$141 million and was shown in dark blue on the chart. He said the second largest category, which is the case in most years as well, is public safety, shown in orange. He said the third largest category is the transfer to capital and debt, shown in dark brown and totaling \$30.5 million. He said health and welfare is \$22.5 million, shown in green.

Mr. Bowman said he would hit on a few points that impact not just one, but all departments and is about workforce stabilization efforts. He said the FY 22 budget includes a \$15 minimum wage and inflation compression at the bottom part of the pay scale. He said the total impact of this in FY 22 is projected to be \$280,000.

Mr. Bowman said they also include a 2% market adjustment for local government, which includes the public safety plan as well as classified employees and has a total impact of \$1.2 million. He said this includes the impacts to benefits as well.

Mr. Bowman said the final category of workforce stabilization is the health insurance employer share. He said this actually increased about \$75,000, but there are a couple of things happening there. He said staff is projecting rate increases in Plan Year 21, which is Calendar Year 21 because the plan year ties with the calendar year, not the fiscal year. He said there is an additional rate increase they are projecting in Plan Year 21 based on the work they are doing with Senior Healthcare Analyst, Ms. Lara Andrade, who the Board met at the January joint board meeting.

Mr. Bowman said there are rate increases as part of the management of that fund. He said staff feels it is responsible to have the one-month holiday in FY 22 as they manage the fund balance in the healthcare fund. He said the net result of those two changes yield a \$75,000 increase for health. He said there will also be no health insurance cost increase to employees in FY 22.

Mr. Bowman said his final slide on expenditures related to workforce is about the position changes, which are found on page 54 of the budget document. He said the chart on the slide had been shown in the County Executive's budget presentation and is one that many look for every year. He highlighted that while there is a net increase of 10 positions listed, which they would discuss later that afternoon, this comes at the same time that the County continues to freeze 19 vacant positions in the organization. He said those positions were frozen as they became vacant over the course of the past 12 months. He said staff feels that until the economy has stabilized, it is prudent to keep those positions frozen in FY 22.

Mr. Bowman said those 19 positions were listed on page 54, and he urged the Board to keep in mind that this roster was just a snapshot of the recommended budget. He said this list will continue to change in the weeks and months ahead, as there will be new vacancies that occur through attrition and will subsequently be classified as "frozen." He said there are some vacancies from the frozen list that would be reprioritized and filled as the operational circumstances reveal the need to do so.

Mr. Bowman said to give a couple of examples of how this works, not long ago, there was executive action where the Climate Action position that had been frozen in the Department of Facilities and Environmental Services was approved to be filled. He said the process is currently underway to actively recruit for that position.

Mr. Bowman said as another example, there were several vacancies in the Bright Stars and Family Support Program, which is led by the Department of Social Services. He said that as those vacancies began to accumulate and were frozen, it was determined that Social Services' ability to support that program would be compromised if some of those positions were not filled. He said accordingly, some of those vacancies were allowed to be filled to help stabilize the program, but a portion of positions do remain frozen to help manage the financial side of the pandemic. He said this is a very delicate balance that they are trying to navigate.

Mr. Bowman said that in very general terms, vacant positions are being authorized to fill for those that are directly related to public safety. He said firefighter and paramedic positions are approved be filled. He said similarly, in the Department of Social Services for child and family welfare, whether this is Child Protective Services, Adult Protective Services, and foster care positions, those positions are also being filled.

Mr. Bowman said the County is also filling Building Code and Permitting positions and Inspections in Community Development as part of the strategy to support the local economy and the business environment to keep things moving.

Mr. Bowman said periodic updates will continue to be provided to the Board as the list of positions continues to be managed as part of the financial pandemic response.

Mr. Bowman concluded his high-level comments on General Fund expenditures and paused for questions from the Board.

Ms. Palmer asked how the minimum wage increase and the 2% increase in salaries dovetail. She asked if the minimum wage is going up, with the 2% then going on top of that, or if they interact otherwise.

Mr. Bowman said he would ask HR staff on the call to chime in to clarify if needed, but the first thing that would be applied would be the \$15 minimum wage. He said after that, they would then apply the 2%. He said the reason this is done is to avoid compression issues.

Ms. Palmer recalled they had discussed how raising the minimum wage would cause compression, so she needed a reminder of how far up they were dealing with the compression. She asked if they were going all the way up.

Mr. Bowman replied that this would be bottom third of the positions of the pay scale, which was about Pay Grade 11 or 12. He noted that Ms. Lorna Gerome was nodding in agreement.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Bowman to repeat his reply.

Mr. Bowman replied that the compression would be an impact for about the bottom third of the pay scale, and it does not go all the way to the top. He said this is about Pay Grade 4 or 5, up through Pay Grade 11.

Ms. Palmer said the lowest pay, then, would be \$15 per hour, plus the 2% on top of that.

Mr. Bowman replied yes.

Ms. Palmer said she suspected that with the frozen positions, the Board would talk about that when they get to those departments. She said she knew they were all thinking about the stimulus money as well, so it was difficult not to talk about that.

Ms. McKeel said she was trying to figure out for all employees if the compression works at those levels that Mr. Bowman mentioned, if they would still experience compression in the steps that are outside of where it is being addressed.

Mr. Bowman replied that there would certainly be some compression impacts, but it was somewhat feathered. He said if one is close to \$15 per hour, and people behind them are getting bumped up, one would receive a greater benefit of compression than if they were impacted but further from \$15 per hour. He said when getting to the middle and upper parts of the pay scale, one is not impacted at all.

Ms. McKeel said this answered her question, as this was her assumption and she simply needed confirmation.

Ms. Price said with regard to the slide showing the two positions for Family Preservation DSS funded by the state, she wanted to know if there was a period of time that this funding is expected to continue for.

Mr. Bowman replied yes. He said assuming the General Assembly budget is adopted (which he believes is very likely as this is part of the Governor's budget), and assuming this is 100% state funded in FY 22, it would be funded 15.5% locally when FY 23 begins. He said he believed this impact is \$28,000 but that he would fact-check himself as he would be speaking to this later during discussion of the Department of Social Services budget.

Ms. Price said after this year, then, they would only be partially funded, and the remainder of that would be funded by the County. She asked if the year after, they would then be funded 0% from the state, making them 100% funded by the County.

Mr. Bowman replied that his understanding was that it would continue to be the 15.5%. He said all of the positions in Social Services are reimbursed via a varying complex rate structure, and as best he knows, the 15% local match would continue to go into the foreseeable future.

Ms. Price said that from FY 23 onward, then, the County would be picking up the 84.5% for each year.

Mr. Bowman replied that in FY 23, the County would expect to continue to pay 15.5% of the total cost.

Ms. Price asked if the County, then, would be paying 15.5%.

Mr. Bowman replied yes.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked Mr. Bowman if he could go back to Slide 17. She asked what the planned one-month holiday was.

Mr. Bowman replied that essentially, for one month, the employers and employees would not make a contribution to the healthcare fund. He said this would be a one-time savings for them.

Mr. Bowman moved on to the Administration functional area. He said he would not be going over all the details, but he did want to acknowledge that in terms of the Voter Registration and Elections budget, there will discussion with the Electoral Board targeted for March 22 for a future work session. He said Mr. Jake Washburne, Registrar, has been in regular contact with the Budget Division and other County staff regarding space, equipment, technology, and operational budget needs, given the experience and what they have learned from the first round of early and expanded absentee voting. He said staff is working to address this request in FY 22, and there will also likely be a reappropriation in FY 21 to support some of the technology needs.

Mr. Bowman thanked Mr. Washburne for continuing to stay in close contact. He said Mr. Washburne gets a lot of information from the state, which has changed several times over the last year, and he is very quick to communicate this to staff.

Mr. Bowman paused on the Administration slide, adding that if there were any questions on broadband, those could be held for Mr. Henry later. He clarified that broadband is included as part of the Executive Leadership category, which was the dark blue piece of the chart shown.

Ms. Mallek asked if they would be going into details that day about the projected layout of the Broadband Office or if this would be done in the future.

Mr. Bowman replied that they would be discussing it that day.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the voter registration will vary depending on the year. She said for example, they needed all kinds of preparation and money to be able to deal with the huge influx of voters, which was great. She said she did not see that for every year, perhaps in a presidential year, and in the coming year (with the House of Delegates), but she wondered if this would vary from election year to election year.

Mr. Bowman said Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley was correct that there is a variance year to year based on the number of elections there will be, and also based on whether there is a presidential election with high turnouts. He said this is actually playing out in this year's budget. He said in talking with the Registrar, there will potentially be an additional primary from the usual. He said although a presidential primary would not be covered by the County's costs, other primaries would be. He said one of their strategic uses of one-time funding would be to provide it in the event that a second primary is needed, knowing that there typically will not be two primaries. He said staff will stay in close contact with Mr. Washburne, should that change.

Mr. Bowman said Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley was correct that much of the electoral budget depends on where they are in the election cycle.

Mr. Gallaway said as the Board turns to the discussion on broadband, Mr. Bucky Walsh from the Albemarle Broadband Authority (ABBA) was present, so they needed to convene the ABBA.

At 3:39 p.m., Mr. Walsh stated that because there was a FOIA quorum for the ABBA, and because the ABBA had adjourned their last meeting on February 24 to the present date and time, he would convene the ABBA to meet.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Assistant County Executive, thanked Mr. Walsh for joining the meeting to facilitate the FOIA component of having multiple ABBA board members discussing broadband that day. He said he also appreciated Mr. Walsh's willingness to answer questions that would likely come up throughout the presentation.

Mr. Henry also acknowledged Mr. Mike Culp, Director of Information Technology, who also serves as Chief Administration Officer on the ABBA. He expressed that Mr. Culp is a tremendous resource to the County in the role he has played in the past few years. He noted that Ms. Price and Ms. Palmer are the Board of Supervisors members on the ABBA.

Mr. Henry said there were a handful of slides he would go through at a pace that he believed he could get the information out, then answer the Board's questions at the end. He invited Mr. Walsh, Mr. Culp, Ms. Price, and Ms. Palmer to help support his presentation with clarifications and answers.

Mr. Henry said the first slide was starting the group where they had last left the conversation around broadband. He said on February 17, there had been a work session to look at potential uses of some one-time Strategic Priority Reserve funding, along with Pandemic Reserve funding, and broadband had been one of the key items that was discussed that day. He said some of what he would present had been presented on February 17, but it provides the framework for citizens who may be watching and that of the overall recommendation, which will help the Board move through the process.

Mr. Henry said after a good discussion on February 17, the action the Board took was to approve a recommendation of \$3 million from the one-time funding sources to be appropriated by the Board on March 17. He said the use of this will primarily be around supporting the infrastructure, with a small caveat which they would discuss. He said was starting the Board from the landing point they had arrived a few weeks ago.

Mr. Henry said the slide on the screen was one the Board had previously seen, with Ms. Palmer

and Ms. Price seeing it for the third time, but with it also being helpful for the discussion. He said this was to highlight the recent history of broadband in Albemarle County. He said the ABBA was created in the fall of 2017, with some one-time funding provided that carried the work of broadband since 2018 to present.

Mr. Henry said they all experienced the “tsunami” of internet need that occurred over the past year, and everyone has been in that mode since a year ago. He said what they have learned is that even members of the community who live in areas where they thought they had adequate broadband learned from the pandemic that it was really not adequate when there are multiple people working and learning from home.

Mr. Henry said this has challenged the current infrastructure in the County, never mind the many square miles of the County that still have no coverage. He said he knows from seeing emails that there has been a strong stream of work requests coming into the Board and County staff around broadband. He said in terms of the housing market, he has heard a realtor say that now, broadband access is as important as anything else. He said it is about “location, location, location,” plus being able to connect because of how the nation, region, and locality has learned to work.

Mr. Henry said the broadband program had exceeded the County’s ability to support it, even prior to the pandemic, from a staffing perspective, and so the work that has come about since a year ago has only intensified critical needs. He said there are now many opportunities to do meaningful work. He said with the programs offered at the federal, state, and local levels, it is the County’s responsibility (and a stated strategic priority of the Board) to prioritize this work as best they can. He said this is reflected on page 60 of the budget document. He said there is a lot of work and opportunities ahead to make a significant difference.

Mr. Henry presented a slide that referred to Mr. Doug Walker’s analogy of the “three legs of the stool.” He said he would talk about each, pausing for a moment as he goes over the next few slides. He said the program that was recommended was the infrastructure component to continue to push into the areas that have no access; a new program around affordability support for both rural and urban areas; and creating an office to help to professionally manage this work and to connect with opportunities that the County has not even been able to uncover, but are out there, to try to advance this at a pace that staff believes the Board and the community want.

Mr. Henry said he would pause on each of the components, noting that since the Board spent a great deal of time discussing the first component at the last work session, he would not go into as much depth. He said this was about continuing to partner with the federal funding opportunities, state funding opportunities, and internet service providers to (ISPs) leverage those to push the expansion into the Rural Areas, primarily as those are the areas do not have the ability to connect at this point.

Mr. Henry said that with the execution of the Rural Digital Opportunity Fund and with the state funding initiative for 2021 (for which they were awaiting word on), there is still an estimated 7,500 County locations that need fiber access.

Mr. Henry said there is still an opportunity with the funding that the Board approved a month ago to try to do some direct funding to accelerate this work. He added there may be opportunities to continue to triage with some fixed wireless to get them to where he thinks they want to be as a community and County on infrastructure in the ground.

Mr. Henry said the second component of this program is the affordability program. He said this is a work in progress, which he tried to communicate in February but perhaps did not do as good of a job as he needed to. He said this is a program in development that could be meaningful, and there are multiple components to it. He said there is the ability to pay for broadband in those areas that could connect, but do not have the ability to afford it. He said there are other parts of the County where broadband is in the pipeline, running down the street, but there are small clusters of homes that live a certain distance from those streets that are not able to connect due to the ISPs’ modeling.

Mr. Henry said the third bullet on the screen spoke to the point that community members of fixed income, multiple students at home, seniors with telehealth needs, or those isolated from family and friends deserve high-quality, high-speed broadband. He said at times, the ability to obtain this one-time connection cost is outside of the affordable range, and part of the program addresses this piece as much as the other. He said he believes the creation of dedicated broadband resources will help to allow for expansion of the opportunities that currently do not exist.

Mr. Henry said there are two components to the affordability program. He said there is what he calls the near-term program, which leverages the existing work that occurred in the fall and continues to occur in support of the pandemic response. He said over the past three weeks, there were meetings held within Social Services and the Office of Equity and Inclusion, as well as with the Pathways program and the United Way on how the County could bring some immediate one-time funding (to hopefully be approved in one week) to add onto the existing model to provide help to those experiencing issues making their payments for broadband. He said this is for those who are out of work, have multiple students at home, and the like.

Mr. Henry said he believes this program is getting into a good place. He said in terms of details, there were “I’s” to dot and “T’s” to cross with procurement and other elements, but this would move forward sooner rather than later, assuming funding is in place.

Mr. Henry said this was helping to inform the second half of the program, which is the longer-term program for this kind of funding and County support. He said Mr. Mike Culp has suggesting teeing up a cross-functional team that includes public schools. He said there is a great partnership between Mr. Culp and Ms. Christine Diggs, with the programs being well-connected in the past and with them continuing to do so in the future. He said Social Services, Equity and Inclusion, Communications and Public Engagement (CAPE), and partners will take a look at the needs post-pandemic, which would hopefully be months from now.

Mr. Henry said that by the fall, and certainly by the end of the year, tying into what Mr. Bowman presented on the budget, the hope is that this program gets to a steadier state. He said it may look slightly different at that point, and what he would suggest is in giving this team an opportunity to work together, they would like to bring back a program design and recommendation to the Board sometime in late spring to early summer. He said they are looking through a post-pandemic lens at what this program would be and that use of the Equity Atlas may help to inform what the County structure might look like.

Mr. Henry said there are existing programs that include a voucher program from schools, where 1,200 Kajeets have been issued for Wi-Fi hotspots, and there could be a way to help extend that program. He said Nelson County has a fiber in the home loan program, and he would love to take a look at that to see if there are things Albemarle County can do to mimic some of the best practices of neighboring communities. He said the feds are rolling out a program called the Emergency Broadband Benefit Program for which the County will have to help community members understand what that means and apply. He said there are many good opportunities that involve work to sort out the details.

Mr. Henry said this work is complex and requires strong leadership, great technical acumen, planning, executing, and working across departmental and jurisdictional bounds to effectively move the County to completing its digital access goals. He said coordination between departments is critical for future broadband success.

Mr. Henry said that due to the size and changing demographics of the County, he believes this recommendation of creating an office and providing professional management will serve as a force multiplier on their effectiveness. He said there are partnerships now with five ISPs, VDOT, and four electrical utilities. He said the County is spread across 720 square miles that is a combination of both Development and Rural Areas represented by the Board members. He said they live in the complexity of trying to govern and support in a community that has a true dichotomy and distinct needs and challenges between who people are and where they live. He said broadband faces that same challenge.

Mr. Henry said having the right focus and dedicated resources will help the County move forward as needed in this area. He said proposed in the budget are two FTEs (a director and an analyst) that will be part of the County Executive leadership team, in their own office. He said this office will be modeled after the Office of Equity and Inclusion, which is now in its third year and continues to do tremendous work for the community.

Mr. Henry said there is also money set aside in the project management wing of the Facilities and Environmental Services department (Facilities Planning and Construction) to help provide construction management expertise and oversight for these very projects they are working on with the ISPs that will help with communication, problem solving, anticipating problems, etc.

Mr. Henry said the slide on the screen was his attempt to visually represent the differentiation of some of the responsibilities. He said at the February meeting, Ms. Palmer asked if there were job descriptions yet for the broadband office. He said at a high level, they know the work and how they want to divide it, but they do not want to get ahead of themselves in any way doing that kind of work until the Board has vetted this and until it looks as though it will move forward.

Mr. Henry said that generally, he was trying to show that there is a strong leadership and partnering need that will be managed by the director, strong connection to the ABBA, leadership across the County from all departments, school partners, ECC partners, etc. He said the director will steadily direct all of this work at that level.

Mr. Henry said the addition of an operations administrator will help with setting up purchase orders, taking care of billing, taking citizen requests, responding, tracking data and metrics, capturing and tracking action items at all the various broadband meetings, and supporting the ABBA in administration of the meetings. He said the slide was trying to differentiate between the roles while showing their comprehensiveness.

Mr. Henry said he believes that with this kind of focus, the County will be able to tap into opportunities that they have not had the bandwidth to do. He said Mr. Culp mentioned that week that there are some potential grant possibilities with AARP that the County has not been able to connect with before, for example, and those types of opportunities will only continue.

Mr. Henry said the FY 22 budget is recommending a recurring funding line of \$536,376, which covers two components: the Broadband Office cost of personnel and office requirements; and the programmed number of \$250,000 for the access and affordability program, which requires some work sessions with the Board. He said at the end of the day, they will land a program they can execute with the strong approval of both the ABBA and the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Henry said there is a \$350,000 one-time request that ties to part of the recommendation, noting that the budget book is somewhat confusing about this because it references FY 21 funding. He said backing up to three weeks earlier, the Board approved \$3 million to support broadband. He said the request is that if over a period of work sessions vetting the process, the Board is supportive of the creation of a Broadband Office and the affordability program recurring funding, they will then take \$350,000 of the FY 21 that will be approved next week and use that to get started right away. He said this \$350,000 is to shore it back up to a total of \$3 million.

Mr. Henry said the slide on the screen showed that if they work through the process and the County Executive recommended budget then turns into the Board's recommended budget, then heads into public hearing and adoption, and if the program makes it through the vetting process and has the Board's approval to move forward for FY 22, the request is to take \$350,000 of the FY 21 one-time money and use it to start up the office, hire the FTEs, and to help augment the short-term program to support the pandemic response and help with other existing community programs for assistance with rent and other utilities.

Mr. Henry said he had hopefully provided enough depth for understanding the programs. He said there are three components, with the affordability component being a work in progress as far as a long-term vision. He said the County will partner with organizations and bring this back through the ABBA to the Board for work sessions to land this where it is acceptable.

Mr. Henry said he believed Ms. Mallek had some questions on one of the goals that was in the budget book. He replied that these are a work in progress, and he would like to work with both the Board and the ABBA to help better define true SMART goals as they relate to broadband in the community so that the County can be held accountable and clear on what the organizational goals are.

Mr. Henry paused for questions from the Board.

Ms. Palmer commented that she is extremely supportive of this and was glad to hear Mr. Henry had a plan to get this going in another week. She said she thinks this is greatly needed, given the news that day that the federal government is giving a considerable amount of money to broadband infrastructure. She thanked Mr. Henry for all the work.

Ms. McKeel said when they were talking about affordability and access, she wanted to be sure they were talking about targeted areas for both Rural and Development Areas. She said although it may be hard to believe, there are access issues in the urban ring. She said she wanted to make sure that was not lost, as it is almost counterintuitive.

Mr. Henry agreed. He said what he learned as the schools went to remote learning was that they did some overlays of areas of the County where students did not have access, and there was a surprising number of students that were in the Development Areas who could not afford it. He said the voucher program was created to help solve that. He said the driver to create the affordability component of the program for both the Development and Rural Areas. He said he would bring this back to the Board to go through and develop recommendations on metrics.

Ms. McKeel said there are also access problems in the Development Area due solely to the topography. She added she is very supportive of the program, and she especially likes the idea of taking this to the next level and modeling a Broadband Office to move them to the next step.

Ms. Mallek asked everyone if they could hear her speaking through her microphone.

Mr. Henry said yes.

Ms. Mallek said the reason she asked was because two minutes earlier, she was accessing wireless on her laptop, and Mr. Culp just brought her a cable, which solved her microphone issue. She said this was instructive to her about how fiber is so important, and the County has to keep plugging away as much as they can to get quality service to people.

Ms. Mallek said she had many questions written down but would start by stating that she is very supportive of this extra effort the County is proposing to be able to do more for their citizens. She said there are overworked individuals who have been trying to carry this work for the last three to five years and have only been able to do so much with only having 24 hours in the day. She said Mr. Culp and his staff have been helpful in trying to run mediation services between individual residents and the ISPs who treat them so badly. She said she looks forward to seeing a level of the County step up, as other counties have, to do this.

Ms. Mallek asked if in any of the money categories that Mr. Henry listed thus far, there is an ability to use some of it for opportunities with Dominion and Firefly that could become available to expand further on the fiber work that CVEC (Central Virginia Electric Cooperative) is doing. She said she knew there was a meeting the following morning with Dominion about that, but she wanted to know if they were budgeting a little or considering some of that activity for some of the "quick" money.

Mr. Henry asked Mr. Culp and Mr. Walsh if they could respond.

Mr. Mike Culp, IT Director, said he was sure Mr. Walsh would verify his answer. He said they are indeed meeting with Firefly frequently to work through a potential partnership similar to the one that has

been announced with Louisa. He said the meeting that Friday, hosted by the TJPDC (Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission), will further detail what the availability of the partnership will include. He said there is a very high likelihood that some of the new funding that will be available March 17 may be leveraged to help with that sort of partnership.

Ms. Mallek said in trying to distinguish among the three funding categories, it sounded like the affordability program would involve where there is an existing hookup, but one cannot afford to hook up and they need financial help to do so, which is a money category. She said another may or may not be a money category, which is helping with the physical hookup when people are further from the main roads, or they are the 15-20 houses left out between existing ISP projects (which the County has been paying for through the providers). She asked if she was correct in her analysis of what she had heard that day.

Mr. Culp replied yes. He said it is a great analysis of how the County is going to help, either through a loan or a direct fund process, to build areas that the ISPs either have not expressed interest in or cannot turn the ROI (return on investment) together. He said the County will help make this possible, adding that this is especially true for the longer driveways for homes in less populous areas, or regions where there are not as many people but where the homes have been there for a while. He said there is a need to build to those homes to make it equitable, so it is a real equity question that the new affordability program will help to address.

Ms. Mallek agreed it is an equity question, as there are older residents just beyond the stop point where tens of thousands of dollars was paid for by the neighbors in a fancy subdivision for fiber, and the old-timers next door say, "What about me?" She said they feel deprived because they see their neighbors with gigabytes of data, and they cannot even get dial-up.

Ms. Mallek said she is grateful the County is starting to move in the right direction and that it gives County dollars more reliability rather than giving it to others and having to take the crumbs they give. She said she is also grateful there is an oversight role that FES is planning in so that the County will not be turning money over to people and having no control over what they do. She said the County learned the hard way, over many years of Streetscape I in Crozet where the contractor left for nine months and did not come back, how important it is to have tight leashes on the County's contracts to make sure that people fulfill the work.

Ms. Mallek said she had a question not to spend time on that day, but to think about. She said as she was reading the packet for that day and reading the goals to be considered in the future, the point about the cellphone drop zones is that there are tens of thousands of them, and so she would ask not to put their sights on curing that problem in five years. She said this is not her first priority, which is doing all the other things they talked about.

Ms. Price expressed her appreciation for Mr. Henry, Mr. Culp, and Mr. Walsh, as well as others that work with the ABBA, for the work they do. She said the timing of the Broadband Office could not be better. She said she thinks they can anticipate increased funding coming from a variety of sources, particularly from the federal government.

Ms. Price said to be able to split the work that Mr. Culp has been doing both as the County's IT Director and the Administrative Officer for the ABBA will be to the benefit both of Mr. Culp personally in terms of not having both those responsibilities, but also for the County to have this office as they work to improve the connectivity of their decaying urban and Development Area, expanding the rural coverage, and enclosing the last mile in those gapped areas in the County.

Ms. Price said she fully supports the program, adding that if they can find any other money anywhere else, this will be a great place to put it.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said this is something she is extremely supportive of, and she agreed with Ms. Price that if they can find additional monies, this would be great. She said this is something that is a health and safety issue, and it needs to go to every single resident. She asked Mr. Culp if he wanted to discuss the Middle Mile program, as everyone may benefit from hearing about it, as it closes many gaps. She added that there was pending legislation that perhaps Governor Northam would be signing.

Mr. Culp said the Middle Mile program Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley referenced is the discussion topic for the TJPDC meeting with Dominion, CVEC, and Rappahannock Electric to talk about how the progression of building out fiber connectivity to the substations for each electrical utility, which will help to make the electrical grid more modern. He said the same mileage of fiber can be used by ISPs to help them get to the internet itself. He said the County is working in partnership with Firefly Fiber Broadband to make sure that the middle mile is utilized for more than just taking care of electrical substations. He said it goes all the way to the meter so that the fiber connectivity is provided to the home, with an ISP (in this case, Firefly) providing the service.

Mr. Culp said this is very exciting, and the legislation that is on the books to be signed into law allows Dominion to do that. He said before, it was murky, but it is now more designated that they can do this through the pilot program, which has been extended and made permanent. He said this is a great success to get this far, and he thinks it will yield tremendous benefit going forward.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said the legislation is due to be signed would also address any residents out in the Rural Areas that have something like Starlink but would still be eligible for fiber. She explained that prior to this, if someone had something like a satellite dish, they would be considered served and the ISPs

would not be able to come in. She said this legislation cleans this up. She asked Mr. Culp to let her know when the legislation passes.

Mr. Gallaway asked Mr. Henry if of the \$536,000, with \$250,000 being the affordability support, if there was a rough estimate as to what the two employees would cost, as well as the operating costs. He asked if this would be \$150,000 or \$200,000 for employees, approximately.

Mr. Henry asked Mr. Bowman if it was about \$200,000 or so, as he did not have the number in front of him.

Mr. Bowman replied that in FY 22, the total Broadband Office cost is around \$536,000, \$250,000 of which is the affordability support. He said the remainder of about \$280,000 or so would include all of the salaries, benefits, and related operating costs to provide the service for those two positions.

Mr. Gallaway said he was trying to get an idea of the operating costs versus the people. He expressed that by saying this, it sounded as if they were spending almost \$300,000 for two employees. He asked what the operating costs are that are associated with bringing those two staff on.

Mr. Bowman replied that it would be the basic cost for any employees such as telecommunications; basic materials and supplies; startup costs to get them computers or whatever other devices they may need; and travel, training, and education as part of professional development for those employees. He said the bulk of those costs would be personnel and salary benefits.

Mr. Gallaway said he was not asking his question very well. He said while he appreciated understanding what the operating costs are, he would like a ballpark number of what that cost is.

Mr. Bowman replied that he did not have this information off the top of his head, but he could give it to Mr. Gallaway as a follow-up.

Mr. Gallaway said he wanted to make sure he understood correctly that the \$350,000 will get to a total of \$3 million, noting that he saw where the \$350,000 would be used. He asked if another \$350,000 was going in to shore it back up to \$3 million or if he had not tracked that correctly.

Mr. Henry replied that Mr. Gallaway did track this correctly. He pulled up the slide with the funding breakdown request, pointing out the \$286,000 and \$250,000 numbers. He said there is \$350,000 in FY 22 that comes from a one-time source that would help shore up to get back to \$3 million.

Mr. Gallaway asked if they were getting to \$3 million, spending \$350,000, and then sourcing \$350,000 back to get it back to \$3 million.

Mr. Henry replied that this was correct.

Mr. Gallaway said in terms of the goal of addressing dead spots with wireless, he sometimes feels like it is not a matter of broadband or wireless, as he thinks these are two different components. He said broadband deals with download speed and data capacity, but when they are talking about mobility around the County and trying not to have someone stranded with no access to communicate, this is where the wireless capacity comes in.

Mr. Gallaway said he understands what people mean when they say they do not want wireless to be the solution, or to be an alternative to broadband in the home for data support, especially if someone is working from home or has high needs from that standpoint, but the two-year goal does seem appropriate. He said there are many dead spots, and they are not even necessarily in the areas one would think.

Mr. Henry said he appreciated the feedback, questions, and support from the Board. He asked if they could have Mr. Walsh adjourn the ABBA.

Mr. Bowman said before doing so, he could answer Mr. Gallaway's question about the operating costs. He said the total operating costs was about \$27,000, rounded up. He said the one cost he did not mention is that there would be some contractual support as part of this office, if needed, to leverage expertise, whether that be through some of their programming. He said with all the other costs, this total is about \$27,000.

Mr. Gallaway thanked Mr. Bowman and asked Mr. Walsh to adjourn.

At 4:21 p.m., Mr. Walsh adjourned the Albemarle Broadband Authority's meeting.

Mr. Bowman moved onto the Judicial functional area of the budget. He said this area is made up of three elected constitutional officers (Sheriff, Commonwealth Attorney, and Clerk of Circuit Court) as well as the other operational support that goes to the court system. He said he did not have any detailed comments on this functional area, as there were no major changes involved such as there were for broadband and for Fire Rescue and Police. He paused for any Board comments or discussion.

Ms. Mallek said the packet said that the Clerk of Circuit Court's budget is being cut by \$524,000 due to the change in recordation taxes. She asked where the replacement money is coming from.

Mr. Bowman clarified that the Circuit Court's funding request is funded as recommended for their total expenditures, which are \$930,000. He said he could see what Ms. Mallek was referring to in the document, and this refers to the revenues that are related to that operation. He said it is actually a significant change that he would highlight.

Mr. Bowman said that after the County adopted the FY 21 budget in May, the state budget followed and was adopted later in the fiscal year. He said it was a very significant change where prior to this year, the County received an allocation from the state of recordation tax revenue that totaled about \$580,000. He said the state action, which they did not know because it did not happen until after adoption, was to take that funding from Albemarle and other localities and redirect it to transportation needs in the Hampton Roads area. He said this was a net impact to the County of a loss of revenue of \$580,000.

Mr. Bowman said it is reported in the budget under the Clerk of Circuit Court, as this is the area where recordation taxes come in. He said this is more of a revenue impact rather than an expenditure impact to the Clerk of Circuit Court.

Mr. Bowman said the Board may have questions about the local government legislation efforts across the state, as they have been working to reinstate this as part of the state budget. He said to date, at least in the General Assembly's budget, those efforts have not yet been successful.

Ms. Mallek said she still did not understand what the Clerk of Circuit Court was living on if the money is gone.

Mr. Bowman replied that they are essentially being funded by the state revenue they receive from the Compensation Board, with General Fund revenues making up the rest.

Ms. Mallek asked if they plan to do the same thing next year in order to make up for the state.

Mr. Bowman replied yes.

Ms. Mallek said she was still confused, but she would stop her questions about it.

Mr. Bowman said if it would help, essentially, the net local cost of operating that department is going up about \$540,000 because they lost that state revenue to help support that operation in the General Fund.

Ms. Mallek said this is a big hit.

Mr. Bowman agreed. He thanked the constitutional officers who had joined that portion of the call.

Mr. Bowman moved on to Public Safety. He said he would spend more time discussing North Garden's supplemental staffing request in more depth. He said before doing so, he would note that Public Safety is made up of the pieces of the chart that was shown on the screen: the Police Department; Fire Rescue system; and other public safety agencies, including the regional jail, Emergency Communication Center, and the Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention Center.

Mr. Bowman noted that in the Police Department, as discussed in the County Executive's presentation, there is a shift in how the School Division is providing security in the coming year. He said in the past, there were five employees working as School Resource Officers in the schools. He said when they are not in the schools, they were supporting the department through other programs. He said because of the school change in how that will be provided, there are 2.5 FTEs, which is about 5,000 hours of staff time, that are being reprogrammed to support the Control Division, where they will then provide their experience as part of the department's Geo-Policing work.

Mr. Bowman said he did not have any further comments about the police or other agencies, but he would talk about Fire Rescue in a moment. He said this could be a good time to pause for questions about agencies other than Fire Rescue.

Ms. McKeel said she knew there was some discussion about creating a team so that the police do not have to respond by themselves to many of the mental health calls. She asked Mr. Bowman if there was anything in the budget around that initiative.

Mr. Bowman said this was correct. He said if there were any operational updates, he would ask Chief Lance to speak to that, but there was otherwise nothing in the budget for it.

Ms. McKeel said she believed this was still a work in progress, and it is an important initiative. She said currently, the budget rollout is likely premature with where that planning is.

Mr. Bowman said he would talk about the North Garden Volunteer Fire Company's supplemental staffing request. He said the recommended budget for FY 22 includes \$435,000 for this request. He said the map on the slide showed the southwestern portion of the County highlighted in blue, which is North Garden's first-due response area. He said currently, there are no County staff there, as they are entirely volunteer.

Mr. Bowman said the County received a letter from North Garden in the fall requesting supplemental staffing during the weekday daytime, which is Monday through Friday, 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. He said at other times, such as nights and weekends, the volunteer station would staff then.

Mr. Bowman said the request for supplemental staffing is a total of five FTEs who would serve as firefighters/paramedics, and they would staff the fire engine and ambulance. He said it takes five FTEs to run an engine, which represents three FTEs based on standards to staffing the engine when in service, but they need a total of five because they have to allow for the leave of those personnel working 12-hour-plus shifts, and for the other training and requirements they have throughout the year to make sure they have five FTEs to get three people to an engine, 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Mr. Bowman said in addition to North Garden's request for the supplemental staffing, they are also requesting an ambulance to be added to their station. He said there is currently not an ambulance in service there, but their request is consistent with the model that was put in about a year ago, and they are striving to get that as the current staff added in the FY 21 budget are now working their way through Recruit School and the Paramedics School. He said because have volunteers primarily at rural stations, including East Rivanna, Stony Point, and Earlysville would be cross-staffed with an engine and an ambulance, and depending on the call type, those personnel would take the apparatus out into the field as appropriate.

Mr. Bowman said currently, when there is an EMS call from the North Garden area, that response is coming from either the Western Albemarle Rescue Squad in the western part of the County; or from the Development Area, likely from the Ivy Fire Rescue Station or Monticello Fire Rescue Station from the western and southern part of the county, respectively; or the ambulance near Scottsville that provides Southern Albemarle coverage.

Mr. Bowman said this continues to follow the model from last year of providing support in the Rural Areas, and it also has the benefit of keeping those apparatus in the Development Areas, where the call volume is much higher.

Mr. Bowman said including an ambulance at North Garden will help because as one can imagine from looking at the map, those response times tend to be longer, as well as the transport time to get to the hospital because they have more distance to cover than some of the other stations. He said this was some of the logical rationale coming from North Garden as to why they had that staffing model for the engine and the ambulance.

Mr. Bowman said the ambulance and related equipment is included in the capital budget, at approximately \$400,000. He said the General Fund amount for \$435,000 covers the personnel and other related operating costs.

Mr. Bowman said in terms of a timeline, these personnel would be hired in September of 2021. He said this is September rather than July 1 due to the timing of the Recruit School and the training schedule currently in place. He said those staff would then go through the Training Academy and full Recruit School, then subsequently to Paramedics School to ensure there are personnel in the field to be able to run the ambulance throughout the entire system. He said they would then go through the normal routine process to be released into the field.

Mr. Bowman said the actual staffing is still about 18 months away, with the service being in place in the fall of 2022. He said this is similar to where they were a year ago, when they talked about the supplemental staffing being put in place. He said they will fortunately be able to do some of that more quickly this year with a shorter Recruit School. He said the positions approved in FY 21 are still in the works to staff at Crozet Fire, Pantops Public Safety Station (for the engine), and to put supplemental staffing in place for the Ivy and Pantops 24-7 ambulances.

Mr. Bowman said there is one additional component to this request for North Garden which, to be clear, is not at North Garden's request. He said this is to put a position in the Fire Rescue Department's Training Division. He clarified that this serves both the personnel in the department as well as the volunteers throughout the system. He said this support includes the initial onboarding of the personnel, whether career staff or volunteers, and all of the ongoing continued education requirements and certification.

Mr. Bowman said the need for this training position is not specific to North Garden's request itself. He said this is really about getting to a tipping point for the service changes that have been taking place systemwide over the past three to four years. He said for perspective, the last time there was an employee added in the Training Division, it was an EMS instructor primarily focused on volunteer support as part of FY 19 budget.

Mr. Bowman said in the last four budgets, they have seen requests or communications for volunteers, and they have added a total of 32 FTEs in the field: five for the Southern Albemarle 24-7 EMS coverage, 22 between a combination of local EMS cost recovery and federal FEMA grant funding to support Crozet Fire supplemental staffing to support the change in CARS in the Development Area, and to support the Pantops engine weekdays during the daytime. He said now, there are an additional five FTEs at the request of North Garden, which is how they get to the 32 FTEs over the course of four years.

Mr. Bowman said that in addition to the staffing, there has been an effort that has been publicized for the Fire Rescue Department's diversity initiative. He said now, instead of recruiting people who have

certain certifications at the front door, they will have a program where people can be fully trained up if they do not have any prior experience as a firefighter. He said they will take a person from scratch and go up through the certifications as part of the department's diversity efforts. He said the impact is that it creates a longer training school and a need for more people in the system who support training.

Mr. Bowman said thus, this training component is not particular to North Garden's request, but a result of looking at the ratio and requirements in the entire system and the support needed for the Training Division. He said as part of the staffing, now is the time to make training an integral success as part of these system transitions and add staff into the Training Division.

Mr. Bowman said there may be questions about other things in the Fire Rescue session, and the March 18 work session will dive into that in more detail. He offered to answer any questions, adding that they could flag any matters they could talk more about on March 18.

Ms. Palmer asked if there will be an ability to get some staff in North Garden for some time prior to the fall of 2022.

Mr. Bowman replied that he would ask Chief Eggleston to speak to how they are working through the Recruit Schools.

Chief Dan Eggleston said that at that point, unless they were to reassign personnel from an existing station, the fall of 2022 is the earliest they could begin staffing North Garden during the daytime.

Ms. Palmer asked Chief Eggleston what the average response times currently are (closer to the Nelson County line).

Chief Eggleston replied that there was a look at the response time data from North Garden, and it does exceed the coverage standards that were adopted several years ago. He said he did not know what those are off the top of his head, but they are exceeding what is determined as an appropriate level for the Rural Area.

Ms. Palmer said she would have to then get that data from Chief Eggleston at a later time. She said for a later discussion, she wanted to bring up that since they are looking at staffing the facility with County employees, while the building is in very good shape (as the volunteers have kept it up very well), it is not handicapped accessible. She said she would like to talk about this at some point as they are looking at staffing and gearing up for that particular site.

Chief Eggleston said he just went through his notes and that the 90th percentile response time in the North Garden area is 22 minutes, which is above the standards of coverage.

Ms. McKeel said she knows that the County has hired many Fire Rescue personnel, and she asked if 32 over the past four years is what Mr. Bowman had said.

Mr. Bowman replied yes.

Ms. McKeel said this is a lot. She was not saying they were not needed, as she was in favor of it, but she remembered the Board talking six or seven years ago and seeing this coming on the horizon. She said the 32 over four years has been very gradual.

Ms. McKeel said she did not have any specific questions, but she wanted to compliment all the fire departments, chiefs, staff, and volunteers, notably Chief Eggleston and his staff for working to get the problems with coverage solved. She said she understands how challenging it is, as they are in a different world with volunteers these days. She said people cannot leave their jobs as easily, and there is a different landscape.

Ms. Mallek said most of her questions would perhaps be better addressed on March 18. She said she has been looking very carefully at the budget and wanted to know if there was any mention of funding for bringing back staff at the Earlsyville Fire Station. She said it was over two years ago the Board was told in a meeting with Mr. Tom LaBelle, Chief David Puckett, and Chief Eggleston that this was temporary to move the day staff away, who had been there for more than 25 years and had run hundreds of calls per year. She said since January 6, there has been no one at the station except for on February 22. She said the neighbors are calling on a regular basis and reporting when there are no cars there, and people are getting very concerned.

Ms. Mallek said she looked very carefully to try to find mention of this in the budget, and it is important to the whole region. She said the presentation mentioned pulling Fire Rescue station staff away from the urban ring into the more rural area. She said Station 12 was built years ago to serve Route 29 North and Rivanna Station, and they cannot be running out to Boonesville three times a day without disabling the service in the core.

Ms. Mallek said someone also mentioned transportation time to the hospital. She said it is already an hour from Boonesville, and one cannot add an extra 20-30 minutes to get someone from CARS or Berkmar if they do not have someone halfway there already with the ambulance that is already onsite and has been for several years at Station 4. She said she looks forward to having more information about that the next time the Board and staff get together.

Mr. Bowman said he would be prepared to discuss that on March 18.

Mr. Gallaway said he wanted to understand the detail between the narrative and the chart on pages 86 and 87 of the budget. He asked if the decrease of \$16,675 was specific to Seminole Trail and Earlysville. He said he presumed that the negative, in red, was a portion of the \$2,175 and the \$6,200.

Mr. Bowman replied yes. He said earlier in the current fiscal year, in October, those stations approached the County about how they felt it would be a more efficient and better use of the medical supplies being stocked to be consolidated and managed by the Fire Rescue Department. He said they are still essentially providing EMS supplies to the stations but rather than providing contributions to those stations, it is done centrally through the Fire Rescue Department.

Mr. Gallaway asked if this was why the request in the recommended option is not tracking on that chart.

Mr. Bowman replied that two things would happen to Seminole Trail in the current year. He said they had an adopted budget of \$293,000, and they then reallocated the EMS supplies, but there was also some one-time funding that was approved as a supplemental appropriation to complete some work for a waterline replacement that was a continuation of the project from several years ago. He said looking at the FY 21 projected budget for Seminole Trail, they are actually above the adopted budget based on the appropriations the Board has already approved.

Mr. Bowman said that when they look to FY 22 for Seminole Trail, they are funded at \$287,000. He said this is a decrease of \$6,200, and this would reflect the reallocation of those EMS supplies to the Fire Rescue Department. He said if the station had any one-time requests for equipment, this would vary, but they will provide a very detailed breakdown by station in terms of what was provided as one-time last year versus one-time this year.

Mr. Bowman said the same is true for Earlysville. He said there is a FY 21 projection of \$182,000. He said this is less than \$187,000 and reflects the allocation that has taken place in the current year. He said they also have the impact of that reallocation in FY 22, as well as some one-time costs that were requested that were funded and some that were not. He said he would provide full details for the volunteers based on questions that were received before the meeting in terms of those one-time costs of what was funded versus what was not.

Ms. Mallek said on page 87, at the sixth bullet down, there is a change, with volunteer funding being cut because there has been some inexplicable reduction in operations for the paid staff. She said this is a proposed new process, and she would like to understand more about that on March 18. She said she read it four times and could not understand what it says, and she did not know how to answer people when they ask her about it.

Mr. Bowman said he could speak to that immediately and then follow up in more detail on March 18. He said when they were looking at the pandemic back in the fall, they were trying to analyze what they could do to have a simplified process. He said this was true in many departments where they held the line on expenditures, as well as for the capital budget process where, based on the Board's direction in October, they did not do a full-blown five-year CIP, but looked at the coming year ahead and those projects that they paused. He said this has extended to the volunteer process as well.

Mr. Bowman said he met with the Fire and EMS Board in October to walk through the financial picture and the "why" for much of that. He said they agreed on a simplified process for their day-to-day operations, and this includes what they fund for building utilities, maintenance, communications, supplies, meals, administrative expenses, training, uniforms, and everything provided to the volunteers.

Mr. Bowman said for a simplified process and to also give them some relief, as they are living in the pandemic as well, the County would provide a recommendation for their baseline operations that would be comparable to that of Fire Rescue, and this would include what happens in the department based on the decisions that were made a year ago, as there were some changes in Fire Rescue based on the impact of the 10 positions, ambulances, and the FY 22 positions that were discussed.

Mr. Bowman said in going through the budget for Fire Rescue, there was actually a decrease in operating and capital expenses of about \$40,000. He said staff wants to be supportive of all community partners, including volunteer Fire Rescue, and they did not feel it was appropriate to reduce their operations. He said they recommended level funding operations for FY 22. He said when going to FY 23, they plan to do a more comprehensive process. He said this was one component of where they started for level operating costs.

Mr. Bowman said the second reason for how they got to a decrease went back to Mr. Gallaway's question. He said they reallocated about \$17,000 from Seminole Trail and Earlysville for the EMS supplies, which are now being funded through the Fire Rescue Department rather than those two volunteer stations.

Mr. Bowman said the remainder of the decrease is due to one-time costs that, per the volunteer funding policy approved by the Board, are considered on a case-by-case basis. He said because those are one-time costs, it is natural for that to vary year to year.

Mr. Bowman said for example, for Western Albemarle Rescue Squad in FY 21, the County

identified they had a request for a large number of defibrillators that needed to be replaced in the ballpark of \$100,000. He said the County recommended and the Board approved funding then. He said in the upcoming fiscal year, they do not have to replace any defibrillators, but they do have some other equipment needs recommended for funding. He said the total amount of that one-time equipment is less than it was in the prior year.

Mr. Bowman said some stations do not have one-time requests at all. He said East Rivanna did not have any, and their request is down \$15,000. He said this reflects no one-time equipment, but level funding operations based on the methodology described. He said he would walk the Board through the stations and report on where they stand in terms of ongoing operations, what was funded last year as one-time, and what will be funded this year. He said he wanted to talk through the process of developing the funding recommendations for the stations in case that generated any follow-up questions.

Ms. Mallek said there was still no explanation of the \$16,000 decrease at Earlysville from year to year, but she would look forward to discussing it on March 18.

Mr. Bowman said while they were looking at the summary level of detail in the budget document, they could certainly get into more detail at every station to explain what was happening.

Ms. Mallek said it would be especially helpful for the chiefs to actually get feedback from someone in the staff about which parts of their budget requests were not funded and the rationale behind that. She said all the chiefs are told is, "Here's your amount." She said when people like herself ask them questions, they do not have any information.

Mr. Bowman said that before moving on, while they spent time talking about North Garden's request, he had not heard any other questions about the Fire Rescue system. He said they would dive into more detail on that next week.

---

**Recess.** The Board recessed its meeting at 4:53 p.m. and reconvened at 5:02 p.m.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** FY 2021-2022 Operating and Capital Budget.

Mr. Bowman noted he had received feedback about his voice sounding garbled and asked the Board to let him know if he needed to repeat anything.

Mr. Bowman said they would next cover the Public Works chapter, starting on page 91 of the budget. He said the Public Works functional area is made up of the Department of Facilities and Environmental Services and the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority. He said he did not have any detailed comments and would pause for Board questions on this functional area.

Ms. Palmer said she had one question and a comment. She said if anyone from Public Works was on the line, she wanted to thank them for adding in their goals to the County's role in provision of solid waste management services, and for also pointing out very specifically their goals of protecting local waterways and other natural resources. She said this was a change in the goals from last year in the printing on the front page.

Ms. Palmer said last year, the Board was told that a number of projects were paused from the FY 2020 budget and going forward, there was some drainage infrastructure, maintenance and repair program in the urban area, and the mandated TMDL program. She asked if any of that money was coming back into this budget, going forward.

Mr. Bowman replied that on Monday, March 15, they would talk about the capital budget. He said he could not recall from memory where this ended up on the CIP list, whether it was under FY 21 or FY 22, or at all. He said he could address that on Monday or send an email in advance.

Mr. Bowman asked Senior Budget Analyst Ms. Tia Mitchell, who oversees the capital program, to speak to Ms. Palmer's question.

Ms. Mitchell said that as part of the January appropriation to add back projects midyear in FY 21, there was \$330,000 added back for the drainage infrastructure, and \$810,000 added back for the water quality mandated TMDL program. She said this funding is now available and ready to be used.

Mr. Bowman said he would next move onto the Health and Welfare functional area, starting on page 99 of the budget. He said the largest area of the Health and Welfare area is the Department of Social Services, shown in the light color on the presented chart. He said it also includes the transfer to the Bright Stars program, transfer to the CSA (Children Services Act) Fund, and funding for the Health Department, Region Ten, and other state human services agencies, as well as what they call the Agency Budget Review Team process, which he would speak in more detail on.

Mr. Bowman said earlier, a question from Ms. Price's resulted in discussion on the two Family Preservation workers, which are included in the Department of Social Services. He said that in FY 22, the local cost would be \$0 and in FY 23, it would be approximately a \$28,000 local cost. He said in FY 24, it would be \$28,000, plus whatever increases they have in personnel at that time, which will likely be more incremental. He said all of this is subject to future decisions by the state but as of now, this is the

information known.

Mr. Bowman noted at a high level that the Health Department's request is fully funded. He said in addition to continuing to support their existing services, there is additional funding to support the part-time Community Health Worker position that was added in FY 21 at the Yancey Community Center Clinic that serves Southern Albemarle. He said in FY 21, it was a half-time position. He said this another \$16,000 or so that increases those hours to be closer to full-time, though it will still be a part-time position.

Mr. Bowman said the only other comments he had for Health and Welfare would be about the Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT) process. He said this is being led by Mr. John Freeman for the second year in a row. He said Mr. Freeman is also a retired Assistant Director of Social Services, and he was involved in the ABRT process in years prior.

Mr. Bowman said there is also significant staff report by Ms. Siri Russell, Director of the Office of Equity and Inclusion; Dr. Stacey Pethia, Housing Planner in Community Development; and Ms. Phyllis Savides, Director of Social Services. He said they, along with community volunteers, hold a process where they review 32 agency applications. He said the review is much bigger than the agencies because some agencies have multiple programs that are reviewed.

Mr. Bowman said they go through a process and criteria that they communicate out to the agencies in the fall to educate them on what the County is looking for, how their performance fares, and how it ties into the County's human services goals. He said that throughout the fall and early winter, they prepare evaluations of those programs. He said they then take those evaluations, and the Budget Division turns those into funding recommendations.

Mr. Bowman said to summarize how those recommendations play out in FY 22, if one is an agency in FY 21 who is funded and is rated either "exemplary" or "solid," they are recommended to have the same level of funding in FY 22. He said if one is an agency who is funded in FY 21 and rated "fair" or lower, they are recommended to be funded at 50% of the FY 21, with the remaining 50% being held in contingency. He said the contingency funding can be released midyear based on reporting and performance requirements.

Mr. Bowman said for the two agencies listed on the screen (Charlottesville Free Clinic and PACEM), they will be funded half of the amount throughout the year, and if their performance improves through the year, staff recommends releasing those contingencies earmarked for those two agencies.

Mr. Bowman said in addition to those agencies, there are three new agencies who are recommended to be funded. He said they scored "exemplary" and strongly tie in with some of the Pandemic Response funding, whether it be access to food or to childcare. He said there is recommended one-time funding of \$10,000 each for the Local Food Hub, Meals on Wheels, and the Piedmont Family YMCA.

Mr. Bowman said the total recommended funding for all ABRT agencies is \$1.7 million. He said he would pause for questions on the ABRT process or on anything else from the Health and Welfare chapter.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciates the process. She said she could not recall if it was the second or third year of the County doing it on their own after separating from the City.

Mr. Bowman said it would be the third year.

Ms. McKeel said every year, the County has managed to become smoother and more agile, and they do a great job. She said she appreciates the hard work, as there are many agency applications, and it is great that the team is willing to do this for the County. She said she could only imagine what the budget work would be if the Board of Supervisors were having to do this work. She said it is a little different this year versus last, but she thinks they are making a lot of progress with a good review of all of the agencies.

Ms. Mallek said she was a little confused, as there still seemed to be some arts agencies that were still in the ABRT instead of shifting over. She said they did not need to talk about it that day, as she had sent in many questions about these things. She said her major question that needed to be addressed was about why there was such a lower funding for OAR (\$200,000 lower).

Mr. Bowman said he could speak to that.

Ms. Mallek said she read it over and tried to find something that was not being continued, but she could not find it.

Mr. Bowman said that for OAR, there is a change in the process this year. He said it was not a change in funding for those programs, but a change in where it is reported. He apologized for this not being clear in the document, noting that this would be clearer next year as the changes happen. He said this actually applies to two agencies, with the Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for Housing being the other one.

Mr. Bowman said that the ABRT looked at the Criminal Justice program plan for OAR (Offender Aid and Restoration) and felt that when looking at this more administrative position, it was not a good fit

for the criteria in the ABRT process. He said the \$21,414 is recommended for funding, but it is reported in other Health and Welfare agencies that are a part of the ABRT category. He said looking at page 107, in the third line down for "OAR Criminal Justice Plan and Program," there is an increase of \$21,000. He said the funding essentially moved from one place to another, and he apologized that it was not clear in the document.

Ms. Mallek said it had looked like much more than that, but since she could not put her finger on it at that moment, she would send her question to Mr. Bowman again. She asked if there was information on the reasons why they are funding more City agencies now.

Mr. Bowman said he knew there was a question he received about Live Arts, specifically in the Arts and Cultural agencies, which he would talk about momentarily. He said generally speaking, part of the evaluation process is whether it is Arts and Cultural or the ABRT. He said one of the key things they look for is the number of people they are serving and whether they are County or City.

Ms. Mallek said these dollars are small compared to many others, but she was not sure that County taxpayers funding City programs is what they are trying to achieve.

Mr. Bowman said this certainly was not the intent of this process, but if there are questions about specific agencies, those can be discussed. He said he would discuss the question about Live Arts that came in via email in a moment.

Ms. Price said she was impressed with Mr. Bowman's instant recall of data and would piggyback on what Ms. McKeel said. She said while her comment may generally apply to all the volunteers who help around the County, specifically with regard to the ABRT process, she loves that it helps to depoliticize many of the considerations that factors in, and she thinks it provides a much more objective and unbiased approach. She said she is extremely appreciative of the work everyone has done.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley thanked the volunteers and said she liked all the programs that continued to be funded.

Mr. Bowman thanked Mr. John Freeman, who was on the call, and asked him if he wanted to add anything to the conversation.

Mr. Freeman thanked the Board for its support of this process. He said for the many hours that the volunteers spend, he thinks they do an admirable job of giving thorough consideration to these applications. He said he appreciates that the County continues to support the nonprofits that serve the human services community in this way.

Ms. Mallek said on page 39 of the ABRT book, it says under OAR there is a \$283,000 decrease. She said this is what she had asked about and not the \$6,000 that was mentioned. She said it would be helpful if someone could provide information on that later.

Mr. Bowman said he would be sure to find that.

Ms. Mallek said this is an absolutely essential agency.

Mr. Bowman said if there were no other comments on Health and Welfare, he would move on to Parks, Recreation, and Culture. He said Parks, Recreation, and Culture is made up of the Jefferson-Madison Regional Library, Parks and Recreation Department, Charlottesville-Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau, and some other small arts and cultural agencies which he would speak about.

Mr. Bowman noted that in the Parks and Recreation Department, last summer with the pandemic, there were no summer swims or other special activities that occurred. He said staff is still in the process of evaluating what this summer would look like, but to provide some flexibility, they have funded a one-time reserve of about \$158,000 that can provide some flexibility for whatever level of programming this looks like as they learn more about the impacts of the pandemic and what staffing opportunities may be during the summer. He said although this provides some flexibility with one-time money, to know exactly what this will look like will be a question for the future.

Mr. Bowman said Arts and Cultural Agencies is a process that is separate from the ABRT process and is actually based on the Board's feedback from several years ago. He said the criteria used to evaluate human services agencies really needs to be different from arts and cultural agencies. He said those applications are reviewed by a different group of County staff, and the process is led by the Director of Equity and Inclusion, Ms. Siri Russell. He thanked the staff of CAPE, Parks and Recreation, and Economic Development for participating in this review.

Mr. Bowman said the total funding for these agencies is \$53,000 in FY 22. He said the team recommended continuing funding for those agencies that received funding in FY 21 and are requesting funding in FY 22, with a couple of exceptions. He said there is a decrease for the second year in a row for Chihamba, the African American cultural arts festival. He said the County is providing new support at \$2,500 each to the Charlottesville Symphony Society, The Front Porch, Live Arts, and Sin Barreras.

Mr. Bowman said to Ms. Mallek's question on Live Arts, an evaluation is done to track who participates in their programs and buys tickets, and he believed the number that Ms. Russell recently sent him was that 63% of the participants are reasonably allocated to the County. He said this is why there is

an agency in the City that was evaluated, as it also serves County residents.

Mr. Bowman said another example is the Paramount Theater. He said there is a \$2,500 support for them, as they provide services to County school-aged kids, including those who are in the Bright Stars and Family Support Program. He said this is some of the rationale behind having County funding for a facility located in the City.

Mr. Bowman paused to take questions on Arts and Cultural Agencies, or on anything else within Parks and Recreation and Culture.

Ms. Palmer asked if there would be a more detailed discussion on parks at a later time, or if they were only talking about the cultural agencies.

Mr. Bowman asked Ms. Palmer to ask her questions about parks now.

Ms. Palmer said she is concerned about the frozen positions as they go forward. She said the Board had been told that it would require more staff to open up Biscuit Run, and she was wondering where this was, given that Biscuit Run might hopefully be moved along quickly.

Mr. Bowman replied that in FY 22, there will not be an operating impact to Biscuit Run, but FY 23 would be the earliest that this would happen.

Ms. Palmer asked what the employee needs would be for the parks for FY 23 if Biscuit Run were to be opened.

Mr. Bowman said Ms. Mitchell was trying to retrieve this information and if she could not find it now, she could outline that during the capital budget meeting on Monday, March 15.

Mr. Bob Crickenberger replied that with Phase 1A, the majority of staff are more part-time than they are FTEs. He said they would move forward with that, then move to request FTEs. He said Phase 1A includes the park entrance and trailhead parking, and there are not many operational impacts related to that.

Ms. Palmer asked what the Superintendent of Parks is.

Mr. Crickenberger replied that Superintendent of Parks is a staff position that manages and oversees the entire Maintenance Division for all districts and those personnel.

Ms. Palmer asked when the County last had a Superintendent of Parks.

Mr. Crickenberger replied that in April, Mr. Matt Smith (who had over 40 years of service with the County) retired and now, there is an interim Superintendent, Mr. Jim Barber.

Ms. Palmer asked if Mr. Barber is a full-time employee.

Mr. Crickenberger replied that Mr. Barber is, indeed, full-time. He said Mr. Barber came up through the ranks and is doing a fabulous job.

Ms. Palmer said she would save her remaining questions until Monday.

Ms. McKeel said she had a question about Parks and Recreation. She asked where the funding for the Ambassador Program falls and if there is a plan to continue to fund that program.

Mr. Bowman replied that in FY 21, the program started, and it is operated under Facilities and Environmental Services. He said it was funded with CARES funding, and as CARES funding expired, the Board created a reserve in December called the Pandemic Reserve. He said this reserve continues to support those operations.

Mr. Bowman said as far as the planning for that reserve, looking at ongoing operations that will extend as the pandemic goes on, the FY 22 recommended budget does not include funding, and it is really through the Parks Department to continue that program. He said this would be provided as they monitor the Pandemic Reserve and how this plays out over time, so it may be the case that they reappropriate a balance in FY 21 from the reserves to FY 22 to provide for those programs.

Ms. McKeel said this has been a very successful and popular program, and she thanked Mr. Bowman for the information.

Ms. Price said she appreciated the contingency fund of the \$157,000 for the parks this summer. She said she thinks it is important for residents to understand, however, that just because funding may be there, it is different from having the people available to actually hire. She said she would expect the Parks Department is fast approaching the time where they have to make decisions about hiring people, and they may not reach the herd immunity that is bantered about until mid-summer, at which they may have the money but not be able to find the people.

Ms. Price said she wanted to acknowledge the complexities of what the Parks Department is having to deal with in terms of preparing to be able to hire people, but they do not know whether those

individuals will be available when they reach the time they actually could. She said she is hopeful that this summer will show an ability to improve the staffing for Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Bowman moved on to the Community Development functional area. He clarified that Community Development is the only functional area where a department shares that name. He said this was not just the Community Development Department but also includes Economic Development services, agencies that are transit-related, and other community development agencies.

Mr. Bowman said he did not have any comments on this functional area, but he would note a couple of things. He said on March 22, he did plan to get more into depth on transit. He said this would include CAT, JAUNT, and the Regional Transit Partnership (RTP). He said two Board members (Ms. McKeel and Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley) saw at the last RTP meeting a lengthy, detailed presentation about some of the data that CAT has now, which is informing CAT's decisions on how they move forward. He said they would likely have some of that as part of the presentation.

Mr. Bowman said they look to FY 22 as a transition year, and so one thing he wanted to comment on that was mentioned at previous sessions was that in FY 21, there are two studies taking place through the RTP. He said one of those is a longer-term Regional Transit Vision Plan. He said the other is funded in FY 21 and is looking at Albemarle-specific transit services. He said they will be looking at what comes from that report heading into FY 23 and beyond to see what recommendations and future transit decisions this will include.

Mr. Bowman paused to take any Board questions and comments on Community Development.

Ms. McKeel said she would have some questions and comments when they talk about transit. She thanked Mr. Bowman for clarifying the two transit studies.

Ms. Mallek recalled that when the Board was talking about the Water Protection Ordinance (WPO) and the possible changes that could be made to provide improvements in water quality and less erosion, one of the elements was dependent upon having extra staff for investigation. She said she could not find this on the frozen position list and wanted to know if there was any information mentioned that she had not been able to find on expansion of staff for WPO. She said she could leave this question for Mr. Bowman for a future answer.

Mr. Bowman said this was an operational question and asked Ms. Amelia McCulley, Deputy Director of Community Development, if she wished to speak to that.

Ms. McCulley replied that the staff resource devoted to the phase of the WPO work that decreased the threshold that is the trigger is the phase of work that the County has not yet resourced. She said this is not related to frozen positions but is related to new positions. She said staff will come back to the Board after they have had a chance to get past the current phase, which does not involve the need for more staffing, and evaluate where they are with revenues.

Ms. Mallek said it was then not just the funding of the position, but there seemed to be more study work that had to be done. She said she thought they had already done it.

Ms. McCulley apologized if her answer was confusing. She said staff does not need to study further, but the study is to determine the right time because it involves additional resources that they do not currently have.

Ms. Mallek thanked Ms. McCulley for the answer, adding that she could not wait.

Ms. Price commented that as they come out of the pandemic to whatever the new normal is going to be, she understands that the Economic Development Office has been relatively new in Albemarle County, and she anticipated that they may have some additional needs depending on what the new normal in the economic area is. She said this is an area where she could clearly see additional support becoming necessary.

Mr. Gallaway noted there was a part of the Finance section about leases, and this was the same with Economic Development in terms of the change in capital outlay due to the space not needing to be leased.

Mr. Bowman said this was correct.

Mr. Gallaway asked if this is a year-by-year consideration. He said it is understood why they do not need it, as they have space now and can work from home. He said moving forward, however, knowing they had these space concerns in the past, while they may not operate under exactly what they had in the past, they will probably not continue to operate exactly the way they have been over the past year. He asked if thought has been given to this in terms for the cost for that and for the other department, either for capital needs or having some contingency money if space needs come back into play.

Mr. Bowman replied that prior to the pandemic, there was a longer-term assessment of County space needs. He said this has evolved as the pandemic has gone on. He said staff feels it is agreeable at this time to end the leases they had for two spaces, for Finance and Budget and Economic Development, and it would be better to proceed in the future as they learn about the space needs and

what the telework environment looks like in the longer term. He said there may be more to come in the future, but for FY 22, staff felt it was prudent to end those leases and bring those facilities back to the County Office Building, or to continue teleworking.

Mr. Gallaway said he thinks they will be keeping a careful eye on the election setup at COB 5th as well.

Mr. Bowman added that Mr. Lance Stewart, Director of Facilities and Environmental Services, has been in regular contact with the Registrar's Office to make sure they are meeting space needs for upcoming elections.

Mr. Bowman said he would move on to the Non-Departmental functional area, which begins on page 131 of the budget. He said this was a slight change in the agenda, as they had planned to talk about Non-Departmental another time. He said due to the volume of information covered that day and some of the meaningful uses of one-time money that is in this chapter, staff thought they would split this into two to talk about some of it that day, and then some of it on Monday. He said it was presently 5:35 p.m., so he believed they would be able to go through this information and finish the meeting on time.

Mr. Bowman said first, he wanted to talk about the Revenue Sharing payment to the City of Charlottesville, which is discussed on pages 132-133 of the budget. He said the chart on the screen showed what Revenue Sharing payments have been to the City for the last five years, including the coming year (FY 22). He said the orange line on the chart showed the average of what the payments have been over the past five years, and it is typical to have some fluctuation in this year to year. He said they have had years of both minimal increases and decreases.

Mr. Bowman said FY 22 would have a notable increase, with an increase of about \$823,000. He said the primary reason for that change in the formula is really about one component, which is the sales ratio. He said the sales ratio is how actual sales compare to the assessments of properties. He said what they have seen in the City's sales ratio, which is a number they get from the state, is that two years ago, there was a dramatic increase in the sales ratio based on historical trends. He said the way it works through the formula is that the City's sales ratio increased, which resulted in a change in the form of an increased transfer from the County to the City of that funding.

Mr. Bowman said with the timing of that, this is a number the County learns about in mid-January from the state, based on how their calculations and reporting work. He said this is the primary reason for the change from FY 21 to FY 22, with tax rates and total assessed values all going into the formula. He said the full calculation and history is contained in the budget document.

Mr. Bowman said his final slide in terms of content would be a good bridge from the present work session on the General Fund to Monday's discussion on the Capital Program and schools. He said this was a slide in the County Executive's presentation, but he would spend some time talking through it and allowing discussion, as he suspected there may be questions from the Board.

Mr. Bowman said the slide was titled, "Uneven Revenue Impacts," but it is really about what the local transfer is to the School Division, what the transfer is to capital and debt service for Local Government and the School Division, and what amount remains to support Local Government operations.

Mr. Bowman said much like the broader community that was discussed in Mr. Steve Allshouse's presentation from January and as the Board has observed on its own, the impacts of the pandemic have been very different (whether one is an individual, family, or business) from being relatively high to relatively low. He said this applies to the County's revenues as well. He said when they look at the revenues in total in terms of how they are performing in the pandemic, they have not been as significant in total as he shared earlier. He said when looking at the specifics, however, in terms of certain line items and what would be a shared revenue versus non-shared revenue, there does appear to be a different story that plays out.

Mr. Bowman said he would start by talking about the shared revenues one component at a time. He said the School Division has an increase of 6.2% over the FY 21 adopted budget, due primarily to \$11.9 million in new revenues above FY 21. He said this is made up of \$6.9 million in revenues from the local transfer, for all of the local tax revenue that goes into that formula. He said the schools had positive news from the state, resulting in an additional \$5 million as of the County Executive's recommended budget. He said just as the County is monitoring budget updates, the School Division is as well, and they will hear more about that on Monday. He said this number may change based on what they hear from schools on the state's share.

Mr. Bowman said it is positive news that the local tax revenues have not been impacted in total by the pandemic as much. He summarized that there is \$6.9 million from the local transfer, with additional state funding the schools are receiving.

Mr. Bowman said in terms of Local Government operations, the General Fund has gone up 4.7% over the FY 21 adopted budget for ongoing revenues, but there is a different story that is happening here. He said as they look at non-shared revenues, which are the revenues that come from things directly related to services (e.g., charges for services in Parks and Recreation or other departments, Community Development revenues, interest earnings, and other revenues from the state), the projections for FY 22 are actually less than the FY 18 actual that was received in those revenues.

Mr. Bowman said as they have seen that many pandemic impacts are relatively small in parts of the budget and the total scope of the General Fund, they are more pronounced in those items that are affecting general government. He said a good example of that goes back to Ms. Mallek's earlier question about the change in state recordation tax, which is not a shared revenue. He said the County is losing \$580,000 in FY 21 and FY 22 to support Local Government operations, which is a good portion, but is not the only thing that is impacting the revenue picture.

Mr. Bowman said he did not want to say it was all bad news, as they still do have relatively strong tax revenues. He said this is mitigated by what they are seeing in non-shared revenues when they look at obligations such as Revenue Sharing, prior obligations for decisions made in the past, employer healthcare needs, leaving the County with only about \$2 million in revenues before any other adjustments for FY 22. He said this is certainly better than where they thought they would be at the start of the pandemic and budget last April, but it does not provide as much flexibility as they have had in the prior three to four years when there was a stronger local economy.

Mr. Bowman said moving on to the Capital Program, which they would be discussing more in depth on Monday, it fully funds the CIP Advisory Committee's recommendations for projects (both those projects moving forward in FY 21 and those recommended to move in FY 22). He said this scenario was prepared in October and through December in this committee. He said an assumption was made of no revenue growth, based on what they knew at the time. He said they did not know the real estate assessment, nor the impact of December collections, nor the data that was seen in the most recent quarter in terms of how volatile revenues are performing (i.e., sales, meals, and transit occupancy taxes).

Mr. Bowman said in addition to the Capital Improvement Program recommendation, they still have those active, ongoing projects, some of which are substantial investments. He said there is the Courts Renovation Expansion underway, with additional funding that will be added in FY 22. He said there is ongoing work for Red Hill and Scottsville in the School Division as well as many other projects.

Mr. Bowman said the capital budget, with all this work, is a total of about \$181 million programmed between active projects and next year. He said it is balanced, with no revenue growth, and they can meet their debt service requirements. He said it also does not include the 1-cent tax rate increase that was contemplated for FY 22 prior to the pandemic.

Mr. Bowman said the capital budget is balanced, with no revenue growth projected from the General Fund. He said by formula, the Capital Fund this year would receive \$1.6 million. He said the recommended budget deviates from that formula as a proposal for the Board's consideration. He said the recommended budget includes a transfer of \$400,000 to the capital budget, and this is related to the ambulance and equipment for the North Garden request that was discussed earlier.

Mr. Bowman said this approach is recommended for two reasons. He said one is that they are supporting the CIP Advisory Committee's recommendations, and the other is that they know that capital projects rely on substantial staff support throughout the entire organization, outside of the project management function supported by the CIP in the Facilities and Environmental Services department. He said this is the division led by Mr. Blake Abplanalp. He said it relies on procurement and other services and expertise throughout the entire organization. He said staff feels their organizational capacity to take on additional active and proposed projects beyond the \$181 million is limited.

Mr. Bowman said they are proposing that instead of the \$1.6 million, they would send \$400,000 as an increase and allocate this to support North Garden's request for the ambulance and related equipment. He said there would be \$1.2 million that would be retained for Local Government, which would keep the School Division whole. He said there is no impact to the School Division transfer by this change, and they would receive \$6.9 million from local funding whether the County did this or not.

Mr. Bowman said this will keep the Capital Fund whole, as it funds the CIP Advisory Committee's recommendations, but it bridges the General Fund as a key support as they continue to monitor economic performance. He said this is a transitional year that allows them to meet compelling community needs such as broadband and the North Garden request. He said without the \$1.2 million going to support efforts such as that, there would be significant items they would have to remove from the recommended budget that are supporting Local Government that would not be possible without that reallocation.

Mr. Bowman said looking back at the relative need of this kind of delicate balance between the CIP (both capital and debt service) and where they are in the General Fund, staff puts out for the Board's consideration this change where they would allocate the \$1.6 million differently than would have been done in a normal year. He said they would talk in more detail about the CIP on Monday, as well as with the School Division in terms of what their picture looks like. He said this explains the rationale of why some of these things may be able to move forward in perhaps a more constrained environment in Local Government than where they had been in the last three to four years in a strong local economy.

Mr. Bowman paused for questions, noting that he wanted to end the day with this key point in the budget, that it reallocates the funding among the CIP versus operations.

Ms. Palmer asked if she was understanding correctly that there was no reason to put more money in the CIP because they do not have the staff to facilitate those projects.

Mr. Bowman clarified to say that to invest in equity and capital is always a good practice, and they would not want to discourage that. He said Ms. Palmer was correct, however, that if they were to add to

the \$181 million (which is an ambitious CIP and is not a bare-bones CIP as it was 10 years ago during the recession), they would be challenged as staff to further implement that without looking at some other core support to County operations.

Ms. Palmer said when they do talk about the CIP, then, they would know more about what the money is that is coming from the state and what they can use it for. She said some of that will be infrastructure. She said she was looking forward to that discussion and hearing what staff will have to say about the use of that money if there is significant staff issues with doing infrastructure projects.

Mr. Bowman said he will do this as a follow-up as he prepares more information both on the capital budget and the future federal funding.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated taking this slowly and carefully. She said she likes this approach and as Ms. Palmer pointed out, and as she would confirm, they need to get a better picture of the landscape and where they are with both the federal funds and state funds.

Ms. Mallek said expressed that while she was happy that they were being cautious and careful, she wondered if the remaining \$1.2 million would go into a capital reserve, rather than being used up in operations, just in case things go awry.

Mr. Bowman replied that the \$1.2 million is supporting the ongoing Local Government operations that are included in the FY 22 recommended budget.

Ms. Mallek said it was gone, then, at which she expressed her surprise.

Mr. Bowman said that without the \$1.2 million, they would need to remove \$1.2 million in expenditures from the General Fund.

Ms. Mallek said in 2010, the County took money out of the CIP, and it took 10 years to recover it. She said she was therefore nervous about doing this. She said this would be the primary discussion coming forward in a month or so, or whenever the Board decides to handle whatever they might have coming their way. She said there is certainly an unlimited supply of CIP projects.

Ms. Price said to follow up on that, the other alternative would be that they would have to look at either reducing funding to other things, or a tax increase. She said under the current situation, this appears to be the way to keep everything balanced without having to look at cutting funding elsewhere or raising revenues from a different source. She asked Mr. Bowman if this was a fair summation.

Mr. Bowman replied that it was. He asked Ms. Nelsie Birch, CFO, if she had anything to add.

Ms. Birch clarified for Ms. Mallek that it was not the intention that this would go away forever. She said the reason is that the economy will rebound. She said as Mr. Bowman was describing, the County was in a pickle that year because when they looked at the revenue growth, it was not growing as they needed it to support operations. She said part of the reason for this transitional budget and why they keep talking about that is that they needed to do things a little differently to get them over this hurdle to protect the things that they need to do that were not anticipated (such as the North Garden request) or that were not anticipated at this level (such as broadband).

Ms. Birch said there are several things the County will be doing once this budget is adopted, particularly in light of the new revenue that is coming from the federal government. She said related to the bond structure, some refinancing might yield some savings that would go directly into the Capital Program. She said looking at how they structure some of the capital projects in general can help provide the support to building more and supporting the Capital Program. She said she would not look at this as a permanent change.

Ms. Birch said Ms. Price was absolutely correct. She said if at this moment, the Board decided to make a change to the \$1.2 million, it will have to come from somewhere. She said it was a matter of either taking something away from the General Fund or adding some sort of revenue to it. She said this was built into the General Fund budget.

Ms. Price said she appreciated the additional explanation.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said he appreciated the additional minute or two to elaborate further on Ms. Birch's comments. He said he appreciated Ms. Mallek talking about how in 2010, the Capital Budget was stalled out and slammed. He said the County was reminded last year that while they needed to be cautious, they should try to strategically move forward. He said the economy is different than it was in 2010 during the national recession.

Mr. Richardson emphasized that with this said, they cannot have a \$181 million capital budget (which is big for the County) and not pay attention to the operational side of the house. He said they must take a look at capacity, workload, the stress that the departments are under, and the 19 frozen positions. He said he has to look at both the capital side and the operating side, and they are trying judiciously to move projects forward that will make the biggest impact in the community.

Mr. Richardson said they are not slamming down on the capital budget as they did in 2009. He said while he understands why they did, this is very different. He said he has to pay attention, however,

to the bottom bar under the nine Strategic Initiatives. He said they are trying judiciously to move as many of those initiatives forward as they can, but the bottom bar is "Quality Government Operations," which is where the County must continuously invest in its people and in its day-to-day operations so that they can continue to absorb the workload.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was very satisfied, and she thanked Mr. Richardson and Ms. Birch for their explanations. She said she likes the direction they are taking the County in and the fact that they are looking at all different angles to be able to give the County a balanced budget while also focusing on the community and making sure that operations are safe and sound.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she believed she was seeing a very measured, deliberate, considered budget. She said with what is upcoming, she continues to see the effect they have regarding the budget and how the County is using its monies in a good way for the community.

Mr. Gallaway said he agreed with the comments made.

Mr. Bowman said he would summarize the follow-ups he had heard that staff would respond to. He said he heard the following requests: information on the response times for North Garden for both Fire and EMS; additional information around the Earlysville daytime staffing in advance of March 18; full details, station by station, on the volunteers in terms of what was funded and how those amounts were arrived to; confirmation of Biscuit Run operating impacts; clarification on the OAR funding and ABRT book; and capital funding infrastructure and how this weaves into the capital discussion as they learn more from the federal government about what the funding will be.

Mr. Bowman said in terms of the list of items that need to be added, removed, or modified in the budget, he did not clearly hear anything, although he knew that a couple of Board members suggested consideration of additional funding for broadband, if it becomes available.

Ms. Mallek noted she did not have any new requests and that half of the questions she sent via email had been answered.

Ms. Price thanked Mr. Bowman and all the staff who helped put the budget together.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she continues to be impressed and proud of the County administrators and staff.

Mr. Bowman asked the Board to reach out to staff should additional questions come up. He said staff is there to support the Board, especially in the coming weeks as the Board weighs some large decisions. He said they would be back on Monday, March 15 to discuss the School Board's request and the capital budget, and to finish what they did not cover in the Non-Departmental chapter. He thanked the Board for their attention and time.

Mr. Gallaway thanked Mr. Bowman for covering so much material in an expeditious way.

---

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

Non-Agenda Item: Albemarle Commonwealth Attorney's BAMA Works Grant for a Restorative Justice Pilot Project.

Mr. Gallaway said Ms. Palmer had a request for a letter of support from the Commonwealth Attorney's Office seeking a BAMA Works grant for the Restorative Justice Diversion Project.

Ms. Palmer said she was contacted by Ms. Shannon Neal from the Commonwealth Attorney's Office, who had tremendous apologies for the last-minute request. She said Ms. Neal would like if the Board could send in a letter of support for the two-year pilot program for restorative justice. She said it is a small grant for \$9,000 to BAMA Works.

Ms. Palmer said Ms. Price sent an email suggesting that the Board spell out BAMA, but she did not know if that was possible. She said she always thought it was simply a BAMA grant, but if there were words that went along with B-A-M-A, she was fine with that.

Mr. Gallaway said if there were no objections, the letter had already been written and he simply needed to sign it.

Ms. Palmer **moved** that the Board approve a letter of support for the Commonwealth Attorney's Office for a BAMA grant for a two-year pilot program for restorative justice and for the Board Chair to sign the letter. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Mr. Gallaway said he would sign the letter now and it could go out right away. He asked if there were any other Board items not on the agenda.

Ms. McKeel pointed out that on Monday, March 15 at 6:30 p.m., she would hold a townhall in

combination with her Citizens Advisory Committee. She said all the townhalls were listed on the County website with more information, and Ms. Kilroy did a good job in posting those.

Ms. McKeel said she noticed that the Associated Press was reporting that 144 cities could lose their status as metro areas, and Albemarle is listed as a metro area, which could affect funding. She said she would be interested in hearing more about that at some point.

Mr. Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive, acknowledged that he was also recently made aware of that information. He said he and the Economic Development Director had a brief exchange earlier that day with an indication of their need to catch up quickly to understand what the implications are in order to advise the Board.

Ms. McKeel said she hoped there would not be ramifications for the County. She said regarding another topic, she had not realized there was a new tick discovered in Albemarle County that is a threat to cattle.

Ms. Palmer said she could send the information out that she received from the Health Department about it.

Ms. Mallek said she believed it is called the Longhorn tick. She said it sounds awful and scary.

Ms. Palmer mentioned the movement of animals and climate change.

Ms. McKeel said this was the first time it was detected in the Western Hemisphere, and she could send the Board an article about it.

Ms. Price said to follow up on Ms. McKeel's comment about townhalls, herself and Ms. Palmer would also be having their townhall on the budget in conjunction with the 5th and Avon CAC the following Thursday.

Ms. Mallek said she would save her list of items to address until the following week, adding that her townhall would take place on March 23.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said her two townhalls would be on March 11 and March 22.

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

Mr. Richardson said he did not have a formal report but would note that several budget townhalls were being held by Board members over the next several weeks. He said CAPE, the County Executive's Office, and the Finance and Budget team are tracking and supporting this. He said if Board members expect anyone else to come from any other department if they anticipate questions about a certain area, they should let he, Mr. Henry, or Mr. Walker know so that they can coordinate getting staff at those evening meetings.

Ms. McKeel said she usually coordinates with schools, and she asked if she should call CAPE about the Schools staff being present to answer questions about Schools budget.

Mr. Richardson said Superintendent Haas specially asked him in the past that when his staff is asked to come to meetings, this needs to go through his office. He said this is now it needs to be handled, and if staff from County departments are asked to come to these meetings, it needs to be coordinated through the County Executive's Office.

Ms. McKeel said there are often questions about the Schools budget.

Mr. Richardson said he respects that each of the Board members handles this differently, but if they have an inkling that they want a subject matter expert there from any area of County Government, they should let the County Executive's Office know so they can take care of that.

Agenda Item No. 5. Adjourn.

At 6:06 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to March 15, 2021, 3:00 p.m., an electronic meeting pursuant to Ordinance No. 20-A(16), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." Mr. Gallaway stated that information on how to participate in the meeting would be posted on the Albemarle County website's Board of Supervisors homepage.

Approved by Board
Date 03/01/2023
Initials CKB

Chair