

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 15, 2021, at 3:00 p.m. This meeting was held by electronic communication means using Zoom and a telephonic connection due to the COVID-19 state of emergency. This meeting was adjourned from March 10, 2021.

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 Vice-Chair, Ms. Price.

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

Ms. Price said the persons responsible for receiving public comment are the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County.

Ms. Price 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. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, thanked the Board for the opportunity for County staff to be present that afternoon for the second scheduled budget work session, with its focus being the capital budget. He said Ms. Nelsie Birch, CFO, along with Mr. Andy Bowman, would be talking about what they would be accomplishing that afternoon.

Mr. Andy Bowman, Chief of the Budget Division within the Department of Finance and Budget, said before getting into the agenda and content, he wanted to step back to look at where they were in the process as a whole. He said the Board would be back later that week for Work Session #3 on Thursday, March 18 to discuss Fire Rescue in more detail, and staff will then ask the Board to take action to propose a tax rate and budget for public hearing and advertisement.

Mr. Bowman said after that week, there was time set aside to go into more detail on some additional topics, as listed on the slide. He said he would briefly turn things over to the County's Chief Financial Officer, Ms. Nelsie Birch, for another update.

Ms. Nelsie Birch said as this was their first time together since the President signed into law the American Rescue Plan on Friday, March 12, she wanted to spend a few moments talking about how the County was on its way to receiving an infusion of funds via this plan. She said she would talk about the path forward for how decisions are to be made and to help the Board with some recommendations in figuring out how best to spend the funds that are coming their way.

Ms. Birch said the slide on the screen showed two work sessions that did not yet have an agenda set forward, March 29 and April 1. She said staff would like to bring back to the Board an option for discussion at the March 29 work session, to be dedicated to speaking about the American Rescue Plan. She said staff would hopefully know more at that point in time.

Ms. Birch said the current challenge is that she has been trying to monitor and figure out if there is additional information known that could help staff guide the Board on figuring out how best to spend the funds. She said what she is finding is that there is too much conflicting information, even from reputable sources.

Ms. Birch said at this point, she still does not know the amount of money the County will be receiving, although it is somewhere around \$21 million. She said she was not sure when they would be receiving it, though she knew it was over two different tranches of funding. She said she knows they have to spend it by December 31, 2024, but the details of what they can spend it on are what is making staff more cautious, as it is somewhat confusing, and they know more information will be coming over the next few weeks and months, much like the CARES CRF funding.

Ms. Birch said staff's thought was that they would give another two weeks or so to allow for some time for the federal government and state to determine how the County can use these funds, then come with a path forward and some options for consideration that the Board can entertain even prior to finalizing this budget, particularly if there are some impacts to the FY 22 budget related to the Board decides to do with that funding and the eligibility of that funding.

Ms. Birch said although she did not have much more additional information, she wanted the Board to know that staff is monitoring the situation and plans to come back to the Board in about two

weeks' time to have a work session like discussion about how the funds can be used to support economic recovery in the community. She offered to answer questions at that point or later, acknowledging there was a full agenda.

Mr. Bowman said the agenda for the day included designated time to hear from the School Board about their FY 22 funding request. He said after that, they would plan to discuss the Capital Budget and Debt Management chapters of the book. He said the Board had already heard and seen some information about the process that led up to the CIP Advisory Committee, and he would walk through to connect the story from where they were from the FY 21 adopted budget to where they are now. He said there would be a break, if the Board desired, and they would also finish up the Non-Departmental chapter to talk about strategic reserves and transfers, then wrap things up.

Mr. Bowman presented a slide of the work session process, noting this would be an interactive work session. He said staff would present some information and pause for as many Board questions and as much discussion as needed along the way. He said Budget staff will listen very closely for adjustments desired by the Board, items to be put on the list, and general questions that will need to be captured and reported back to the Board.

Mr. Bowman said he would pause for questions for the Board, then turn the meeting over to Mr. Graham Paige, School Board Chair.

Ms. McKeel said the slide indicated that "Board identifies items from the list for potential adjustments" and asked if that would happen that day.

Mr. Bowman replied that they would come back on Thursday, March 18 to review that list.

Ms. McKeel said she was wondering if this was talking about the proposal the Board was looking at currently, or about items that they may want to put on the list given the recovery act monies.

Mr. Bowman apologized that this was not clear. He said they will identify those items that afternoon, then discuss the recovery act on Thursday as part of the Board's proposed budget and revisit anything else identified.

Ms. McKeel asked if the Board could, then, put items on the list during the present work session.

Mr. Bowman replied yes.

Ms. Palmer said Ms. McKeel asked her question, and she thanked Mr. Bowman for answering it so well. She commented that this could be a rather extensive list, and she was sure the Board would have time to add to that list at a later date, after they hear more from Ms. Birch. She asked if this was correct.

Mr. Bowman replied. He said it may help to break this apart into two categories, one of which are those items that the Board would seek to change as part of the FY 22 proposed budget, where the Board would take action on Thursday. He said the second list would be if there are items in terms of how the additional federal funding may be utilized as part of a long-term picture of a multiyear plan, and this could be a separate list discussed in detail on March 29.

Mr. Graham Paige, School Board Chair, thanked the Board for setting aside this time to review the School Division's funding request for the 2021 schoolyear. He said he and School Board Vice Chair Katrina Callsen would present that afternoon, with staff on hand to help answer any questions the Board may have following the presentation.

Mr. Paige said the School Division's theme that year, "Stronger Than Before," is a statement of their belief that they are, in fact, a stronger School Division than they were a year ago. He said while they have faced many challenges over the past year, they have also learned a great deal and have honed skills that will continue to deliver benefits long after schools resume normal operations.

Mr. Paige said the School Division expanded and diversified their community engagement efforts and improved internet connectivity for families. He said they expanded professional learning opportunities for teachers, which resulted in enhanced instructional strategies and practices. He said they broadly collaborated to create plans and solutions, and they strengthened their community partnerships. He said in many ways, the past year has been very difficult, yet they moved forward with the confidence that they are stronger than before.

Mr. Paige said this year, Albemarle County Public Schools is serving over 13,500 students, with a staff of more than 2,500, including 1,342 teachers and another 1,172 classified employees. He said the diverse student body represents 95 birth countries and speak 75 different languages at home. He said nearly one-third of the students are economically disadvantaged, meaning their households meet the federal income eligibility guidelines of free or reduced-price school meals.

Mr. Paige said about 10% of the students are English Learners, also referred to as ELs. He said these are students whose first language is one other than English and are in a special program for learning English.

Mr. Paige said that over 12% of the students have a disability that qualifies them to receive

special education services, which are specifically designed to meet each student's instructional needs.

Mr. Paige said March 15 is the first day of Stage 4 of the "Return to School" plan. He said since November 9, they have spent 12 weeks in Stage 3, which offers a hybrid learning option to students in pre-K through third grade and provides full virtual instruction to all other students. He said that during Stage 3, the School Division has served 1,514 hybrid learners in pre-K through third grade and 11,357 virtual learners across all grades. He said that among those virtual learners, they provided in-person access to 972 students in grades 4-12, meaning those students came into the buildings to participate in virtual learning.

Mr. Paige said the Childhood Nutrition Team served an average of 7,758 meals each day through the School Division's three meal service programs, including on-site service to students who are learning in the buildings, with the school bus delivery program and pickup program that operates at seven locations across the County. He said school bus drivers travel an average of 14,109 miles each day to transport students and also to assist with meal delivery, spending nearly 20% of those miles delivering school meals to students. He said the School Division also operated its staff childcare program in Stage 3, which served 50 children of ACPS and Albemarle County employees.

Mr. Paige said on that day, March 15, the schools officially transitioned to Stage 4 of the "Return to School" plan, which increases face-to-face instruction time of students in pre-K through third grade from two to four days per week. He said it also offers two days per week of face-to-face instruction to students in grades 4-12. He said this means that in Stage 4, the schools are providing face-to-face instruction to 8,065 students which is 60% of the student body and five times the number of hybrid learners they were serving in Stage 3.

Mr. Paige said the Extended Day Enrichment Program has also reopened in Stage 4, offering spaces in the childcare program to 275 elementary students. He said there are currently 72 students on the program's waitlist.

Mr. Paige said for more than seven years, Albemarle County Public Schools has relied on the Horizon 2020 Strategic Plan to guide their actions and support their decision making and funding priorities. He said that past fall, the School Division began the process of creating a new strategic plan to carry them into the future.

Mr. Paige said the first step in this process is actively underway, which involves collaborating with a broad range of community members representing diverse personal identities, professional expertise, and life experiences to design their portrait of an ACPS learner. He said this portrait will guide the creation of a new strategic plan, which will provide all students with the educational experience that prepares them to be lifelong learners who will make positive contributions to society, both now and in the future. He said the School Board anticipates an initial review of the Division's new strategic plan in late May or early June.

Mr. Paige said that in partnership with the strategic plan, the equity mission guides the School Division's actions and supports their decision making. He said that as a Division, they have committed themselves to the pursuit of equity and inclusion. He said the work that supports their equity mission, such as their anti-racism policy and its portfolio of projects, is meant to pervade every aspect of the system to shift the way they do business, including their values, structures, and behaviors.

Mr. Paige said on a cyclical basis, and through a strategic approach, the School Division dedicates immense effort to identifying and prioritizing the needs of students, employees, and families, determining how best to meet those needs and ultimately deciding how to allocate funds to support high-quality teaching and learning for all.

Mr. Paige said the School Division's budget cycle, like so many things in their lives in the past year, has seen some changes. He said for starters, they aligned some of their processes with Local Government, a shift they found to be very effective. He said they also engaged their stakeholders (both internal and external) in new and different ways. He said they hosted virtual community events such as check-ins, forums, and community conversations, often around the topic of pandemic recovery. He said through those efforts, the School Division received a lot of valuable and constructive feedback aimed not just at pandemic recovery, but also toward rebuilding the school system.

Mr. Paige said that as a result of this process, the School Division is confident that the funding request they are presenting that day reflects the insights, ideas, and priorities of the community.

Mr. Paige said financially, there is good news: the revenue outlook is very positive. He said the School Division is projecting recurring revenues of \$205.8 million, which is an increase of \$12 million over the current fiscal year. He said the majority of that increase, at \$6.9 million, is a General Fund transfer from Local Government which, as the Board knows, is increasing in response to higher real estate assessments and other local tax revenues that, so far, have been impacted by COVID-19 less than anticipated.

Mr. Paige said the School Division wanted to take the opportunity to say how grateful they are to Albemarle County taxpayers, the majority of whom do not have children in the schools. He thanked the taxpayers for their invaluable support of public education in the County. He said they especially wanted to thank those families who chose to enroll their children in the schools and entrust the schools with their educational needs.

Mr. Paige said the anticipated increase in revenue also includes a significant hike in state revenues of \$5.2 million, largely due to the hold harmless provision for enrollment in the state's budget, as well as positive sales tax projections for next year.

Mr. Paige said that in the current fiscal year, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, the schools faced a \$5 million reduction in funds from the state, from \$57.8 million to \$52.8 million. He said in response, the School Division cuts its expenses that year by \$5 million. He said as it turns out, however, they have learned that state revenues will not be cut in FY 21 and that they will receive the full \$57.8 million this fiscal year. He said that budget to budget, the revenues from the state will be increasing by 9.9%, or \$5.2 million.

Mr. Paige said that with an anticipated increase of \$12 million in recurring revenues, he is presenting the Supervisors with a balanced funding request for FY 22 that includes \$12 million in new expenses. He added that since the presentation of the draft funding request, which was embedded in the FY 22 recommended budget, a few expended changes have been made, most notably to the compensation strategy. He said in the event that revenue or expenditure assumptions shift, the School Board has identified and prioritized areas to which they would allocate any additional funding. He said the goal would be to stay balanced throughout the process.

Ms. Katrina Callsen, School Board Vice Chair, said there is a \$12 million increase in recurring expenses, and over 70% of the \$12 million in increases next year represents an investment in the workforce by increasing compensation for all employees; teachers, classified staff, full-time, and part-time. She said the second-largest portion, at about a quarter of the increase, addresses restoring areas that were reduced last year on both the operational and instructional side. She said they are also including two new proposals that, together, account for just over 5.3% of the increase.

Ms. Callsen presented the primary drivers of the increase, by category. She noted this was not an exhaustive list, but these were the major ones. She said the School Board has held three budget work sessions in which they have reviewed each of these expense categories in detail. She said that afternoon, they would briefly address compensation, restoration, and the two Part 2 proposals. She said as always, one could review the full itemization of the expenditure changes, complete with explanations, in Section A of the budget book.

Ms. Callsen said one of the budget goals is to provide a salary plan that supports a competitive position and reflects market adjustments. She said in support of this goal, the School Division is committed to increasing its minimum wage to \$15 per hour and reinstating raises for all employees.

Ms. Callsen said the plan for increasing the minimum wage to \$15 per hour is structured in phases. She said in FY 22, they plan to implement Phase 1 at an estimated cost of \$2.8 million. She said Phase 2 raises the pay scale for both full-time and part-time regular employees, including those who are eligible for the Virginia Retirement System (VRS) and those who are not. She said it brings the VRS-eligible scale to a \$15 minimum hourly pay rate. She said Phase 1 funds decompression through a banding strategy. She noted that the cost is subject to change prior to budget adoption, as additional modeling of compression strategies is still underway.

Ms. Callsen said the recommendations do include an increase for all employees to a \$15 minimum hourly wage in a future phase.

Ms. Callsen said currently, 17.8% of the workforce earns less than \$15 per hour, and these are positions that provide essential services to schools, students, and staff. She said they are teaching assistants, custodians, special education assistants, transportation assistants, bus drivers (noting that there have been ads on the radio to try to recruit bus drivers, as this is a hard-to-fill position), office associates, and teachers and assistants in the Extended Day Enrichment Program, to name a few.

Ms. Callsen said raising the minimum wage demonstrates a significant and meaningful investment in employees. She said it is also a strategy that will help ACPS remain competitive with the local market and ensure they can recruit and retain high-quality staff.

Ms. Callsen said that in addition to the minimum wage increase, the School Division is also proposing a salary increase. She said just as raising the minimum wage is a worthwhile investment in the workforce, so are salary increases, and this is where the Supervisors will see the biggest change from the draft funding request. She said when the School Division was facing a significant drop in revenue as a result of the pandemic, their employees went without the raises they had planned to fund in the current school year. She said they went without yet went above and beyond in every capacity in order to meet the needs of the students during a very challenging time.

Ms. Callsen said the School Division now has the opportunity to deliver on those raises, a decision that not only reflects the shifting market and helps them remain competitive, but also allows them to show the employees how much they value them, and to do so in a meaningful way.

Ms. Callsen said the compensation strategy for FY 22 includes a 5% strategy increase for teachers and at least a 2% salary increase for classified staff. She said that as state revenues continue to shift, the School Division remains hopeful that they can further increase salaries for the classified staff. She said for reference, classified personnel include many on the list she just mentioned, such as bus drivers, custodians, teaching assistants, nurses, office staff, maintenance, and food service staff. She

said as part of the strategy, employees at the lower end of the pay scale would receive the classified salary increase on top of the minimum wage adjustment.

Ms. Callsen said the second category driving the increase is restoration. She said this budget request does not seek to simply restore all of the past cuts, and they are not doing that. She said they have identified the most strategic restoration areas to address in order to continue to improve and strengthen the School Division.

Ms. Callsen said she would first go over the enrollment projection. She said each year, FTE staffing is allocated to schools based on enrollment projections. She said next school year, there is a projected increase of more than 800 students over current enrollment, moving from the 13,208 to 14,046. She said looking at the budget-to-budget projection, however, they are actually realizing a decrease of nearly 200 students. She said they were projected at 14,236 and will be moving to 14,046.

Ms. Callsen said that when they discussed the impacts of the FY 22 budget in terms of expenditures, they are actually seeing a decrease in enrollment. She said in the current school year, FY 21, they made cuts in the projected staffing, meaning they increased the student-to-teacher ratios in order to reduce expenditures. She said that in FY 22, they are proposing to restore the student-to-teacher staffing ratios to original pre-COVID levels, as adopted in staffing standards. She said this restoration results in an FTE increase that offsets the budget-to-budget decrease in enrollment.

Ms. Callsen said that over time, special education enrollment has continued along a fairly predictable incline. She said this year, as a result of COVID-19, the School Division experienced a decrease in special education evaluations and referrals, with preschool enrollment suffering most significantly. She said that since October, however, preschool evaluations appear to be back on track and overall, enrollment in special education is increasing every month.

Ms. Callsen said that while enrollment remains stagnant from last year to this year, they anticipate that services will increase next year along normal levels, which will require an increase in special education staffing for FY 22.

Ms. Callsen said the School Division is currently serving 1,409 English Learners. She said they saw a slight dip this year due to COVID-19 and students who exited their monitor status. She said for monitor status, ELs are typically monitored for four years after they reach a WIDA level of 4.4, which indicates that they are proficient in English. She said by the end of this school year, they anticipate the number of ELs they serve will rise to 1,470 students, and they are projecting a slight increase in next year to 1,495.

Ms. Callsen said in summary, instructional restoration includes 8.1 FTEs for teachers and school staff, representing a restoration of student-to-teacher ratios, contingency staffing to address changes in enrollment, and one floating bookkeeper for the schools. She said for special education, they are funding five instructional FTEs and four FTEs for special education bus drivers and assistants. She said that in response to a growing English learner population, they are restoring four ESOL teaching positions and funding one additional FTE to accommodate new growth.

Ms. Callsen said the School Division has been quite conservative with restoration on the operational front, which includes restoring the full recurring transfer of \$500,000 to the Learning Resources Fund. She said this is an internal service fund within the special revenue funds that provides instructional staff with necessary and contemporary learning resources to support the implementation of curriculum framework. She said they also propose to restore only 6.5 of the 15 departmental FTEs they eliminated in FY 21. She said while this is a positive step forward, it is still less than half of the positions they had previously cut.

Ms. Callsen said the strategy leaves \$700,000 in operational cuts sustained in FY 21 that are not addressed in the FY 22 funding request.

Ms. Callsen said Mr. Paige would speak about proposals.

Mr. Paige said two proposals were included in the funding request that total \$640,000 in new funding. He said he thinks both of these proposals are bringing great excitement on the School Board.

Mr. Paige said the first proposal is for Student Safety Coaches. He said earlier that year, ACPS joined a growing number of school districts nationwide to increase trained staff to ensure a positive, safe school climate and provide basic security measures while minimizing the presence of law enforcement on campus. He said ACPS directed staff to develop an alternate program, promoting the mental health and emotional wellbeing of students. He said one of the primary reasons for this reevaluation was growing evidence that students of color are disproportionately impacted when it comes to disciplinary infractions that result in loss of instructional time and criminalization of behavioral issues.

Mr. Paige said the Student Safety Coaches will concentrate on establishing a safe educational environment while focusing on mental health, de-escalation, restorative justice, and safe physical interventions. He said their goal will lie in cultivating trusting relationships with students so that they can avert and mitigate behavioral issues.

Mr. Paige said the total budget for this proposal of \$551,000 is offset by eliminating the transfer for School Resource Officers, thereby reducing new funding needs to just over \$286,000.

Mr. Paige said the second new proposal, which is just as exciting to the School Board, is the equity expansion. He said the second proposal is to support effective implementation of the division's Equity Mission, including three FTEs to expand the team of Equity Specialists. He said this expansion will support the demand for Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) training and follow ups with the Office of Community Engagement, including delivery of the unique CRT Professional Development Plan and certification model.

Mr. Paige said demand for these services continues to grow, especially with the requirement effective in 2021 for all newly hired educators to complete a CRT micro-credential or certification. He said that by 2022, the division will introduce a plan to extend its professional development requirement to all instructional staff. He said with a total budget of \$354,000, the proposal also plans to provide oversight for implementation of anti-racism and other equity-related policy regulations.

Ms. Callsen said regarding one-time revenues and expenditures, due to unexpected funding from the state in the current year, the School Division is projecting an increase of \$5 million to the fund balance. She said they have some one-time monies at their disposal and some high-priority needs.

Ms. Callsen said the plan is to appropriate \$4.1 million of the fund balance for one-time expenditures in FY 22. She said the majority of the one-time monies will go toward funding learning recovery, and the remainder is allocated to transfers, contingencies, and reserves, as the School Division expects there may be programs to fund after the budget development process comes to a close.

Mr. Paige said that as a result of closing the schools last March in response to COVID-19, then reopening last fall through a very modified learning environment, there are some real academic learning loss concerns. He said this is an issue not just in Albemarle County, but across the state and nation.

Mr. Paige said that in January, ACPS assembled a Learning Recovery Steering Team composed of educators and staff who have focused on three primary areas: academic recovery, social/emotional learning recovery, and mental and physical health. He said the overarching purpose of this team is to identify, address, and monitor those areas of recovery for all students and to develop and coordinate a comprehensive range of strategies to support students, their families, educators, and support staff. He said the plan is to direct the majority of the fund balance allocation and nearly 70% of CARES funding to support learning recovery work.

Mr. Paige said informed so far by research, feedback from community conversations, and midyear review data, the Steering Team has identified a three-part process to address the adverse impacts of COVID-19 on learning. He said the first step is geared toward relief. He said this is where they currently are, and it involves ensuring that schools have the urgent resources they need to provide effective virtual and hybrid instruction. He said in the summer, they will begin implementing the recovery plan, which involves investing strategically in students and schools in order to begin making up lost ground.

Mr. Paige said recovery will carry into next schoolyear, during which they will launch the rebuilding part of the plan. He said rebuilding involves redesigning education to focus on three main things: nurturing the whole child, balancing cognitive with social/emotional skill development, and ensuring that every child has access to the conditions and resources needed to enhance their learning and development.

Mr. Paige said that as the budget development process moves forward, the Steering Team will continue to develop their recommendations. He said as they approach budget adoption in May, the School Division will determine the funding they will dedicate to learning resources. He said depending on the timing of funds, they may include CARES funding in the adopted budget. He said they have been allocated \$8.9 million in CARES funding, and they are dedicating \$6.1 million of that to learning recovery. He said additionally, they plan to allocate one-time monies from the fund balance to finance learning recovery efforts.

Mr. Paige said following budget appropriation, the hope is to see the Steering Team's initial plans come to fruition in the new fiscal year, including a summer program that is open to all students, expanding offerings for K-5 students beginning in the fall, and personalized learning plans supported by common assessments.

Mr. Paige said that since the Superintendent's funding request presentation on February 18, the School Board has held three budget work sessions as well as a public hearing on the budget. He said they will use the month of April to adjust the budget as needed, as the School Division receives more information regarding state revenues, and as they learn more about and make funding decisions to support learning recovery. He said they plan to wrap up the FY 22 budget cycle with budget adoption in mid-May.

Mr. Paige thanked the Board of Supervisors for their partnership, support, and time that afternoon and offered to answer any questions.

Ms. McKeel said she believed there was a reference to increasing the classified raise from 2% if additional monies appeared. She asked if this was correct.

Mr. Paige replied that this was true, and that Ms. Callsen had mentioned it.

Ms. McKeel said her question was based on commonality with Schools and County Government. She said she knows Dr. Haas and Mr. Richardson are working together very closely, and she assumed that the commonality would come into that proposal. She suggested that working together would be a good thing, as that has been the practice in the past.

Mr. Paige agreed. He said he was not sure whether the County is facing the same problems as ACPS in terms of being in competition with Charlottesville for bus drivers and other group of employees Ms. Callsen mentioned. He said they are trying to remember the commonality theme, but they are facing the problem of being in competition with Charlottesville and some of the surrounding areas. He said they have not forgotten about the commonality, but this may have been a roundabout answer for Ms. McKeel.

Ms. McKeel said this was okay, reiterating that commonality is always good. She said she is supportive of the Student Safety Coaches, but she needed further explanation of what that group may look like or how they are trained. She said she knew she would probably hear questions about it from the community.

Dr. Matt Haas, Superintendent, said he could answer the question. He thanked Mr. Richardson for their working relationship across organizations and for the opportunity to present to the Board of Supervisors. He said there has been an extensive amount of planning and research that has gone into the Student Safety Coaches, and the School Division will be doing significant training with these personnel they will be bringing on board.

Dr. Haas said there is a program at the Virginia Department of Education level for training School Safety Officers, and it is a certification that requires training in all sorts of areas such as crisis prevention, intervention, and de-escalation. He said it also looks at things like crime prevention through environmental design so that they will be qualified to do building inspections and be part of a Safety Management Team at the schools.

Dr. Haas said he would refer any Supervisors who would like more information about this to the School Board's most recent budget work session, where Mr. Kevin Kirst presented much more detail than what was presentation in the present session. He said the schools will do this in conjunction with enhancing several safety features at the schools where they have needed to catch up over time, such as camera systems, check-in systems at the front entrances to the schools, and moving to electronic keycards. He said he thinks there is an overall enhancement to be seen in the school system.

Ms. McKeel said this was great and helpful. She said Dr. Haas was saying, then, that the Supervisors could listen to Mr. Kirst's presentation on the podcast for more information.

Dr. Haas replied yes.

Ms. McKeel said she could send constituents to that as well.

Ms. Mallek said she knew that everyone was feeling excited about the rosy finances at that moment, but she wondered if any was being set aside in case the future does not stabilize as far as the way the community responds to changing health issues, etc. She said the two areas she would like any additional information on were Bright Stars and the after school program and if those would be safely continuing through the spring and fall, then expanding if possible.

Dr. Haas said he would ask Ms. Rosalyn Schmidt or Ms. Maya Kumazawa to talk about what the School Division is doing to make sure they are good stewards and are prepared for contingencies in the coming year. He said the schools are running the extended day program now and plan to continue to grow it. He said as part of the CARES recovery plan, they will use the one-time money to kickstart growing the EDEP program.

Dr. Haas said they had a robust proposal last year that they scrapped because of the financial picture to grow the EDEP program to use school funds to subsidize so that they could grow the enrollment of economically disadvantaged students. He said these students currently make up about a third of the school system population, as Mr. Paige pointed out earlier, and they make up about 10% of the after-school programming. He said the schools look to expand opportunities for those students to attend, using things like a lottery system instead of a first come, first served, which can often crowd out traditionally marginalized populations.

Dr. Haas said that in addition to that, they are looking at expanding the EDEP program to once again bring in pre-K children. He said prior to the changes to State Code that took place about five years ago, this created restrictions on having small class sizes, licensure requirements, and the like. He said they did have pre-K children attending the after-school program. He said these were not large numbers, but he believes the economic factor played a part. He said they do plan to return to offering pre-K in the EDEP as they move forward, which will be part of the CARES funding and recovery plan that they are currently fleshing out.

Ms. Maya Kumazawa stated that there are some contingencies planned in next year's budget. She said as they do every year, one contingency is that they do not fully staff all the schools. She said most of the budget, over 85%, is staffing, mostly at the schools, and they initially do not fully staff to the 100% budgeted levels until they are more aware of the financial situation and other factors, such as enrollment.

Ms. Kumazawa said in particular, for FY 22, they are also budgeting in FTEs for contingencies. She said that because they do not know how many students will show up, there are more uncertainties than other years. She said there is a contingency reserve due to the uncertainty of how students will show up that they could not spend and preserve. She said as they traditionally do, they plan to maintain a fund balance that can be dipped into if needed.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the three Equity Specialists will be giving PD for the CRTs training.

Dr. Haas replied yes.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said her second question regarded the learning recovery. She asked if there are plans for having summer school for either all students to make up for lost time, or for a portion of the students.

Dr. Haas asked if Ms. Debbie Collins could speak to that.

Ms. Collins replied yes. She said they plan to invite all students in that summer for learning recovery.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked how many days a week and how many hours a day this will be.

Ms. Collins replied that they are looking to have two sessions, morning and afternoon, that would be 3.5 hours each. She said they would be running for four weeks throughout July, five days a week.

Dr. Haas added for the public's information that the schools are currently putting out a Request for Proposal (RFP) from community partners that work with the students. He said they have been great partners with the school system over the years for field trips, with Triple C Camp and Wildrock being examples. He said the RFP was beginning that day to invite partners to make proposals to the school system so that programming can be provided for students in the summer that would be free of charge to the students' families, as one of the elements of recovery will be social/emotional wellbeing and physical activity.

Dr. Haas said there are some great partners, and one of them is the County's Parks and Recreation Department. He said the schools have had conversations with Mr. Bob Crickenburger and his staff, and the first words he heard from Mr. Crickenburger's department is that they are eager and excited to expand their offerings as much as they are able to work with the students. He said these programs would be offered at the school sites so that they can meet the students where they are.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she noticed Ms. Callsen noted something about enriched after daycare programs in the chatroom.

Mr. Paige clarified that EDEP stands for Extended Day Enrichment Program.

Ms. Price thanked Mr. Paige for clarifying what Ms. Callsen had typed into the chat; that the EDEP is the after-school care program.

Ms. Palmer said she was not quite clear on the explanation of what was happening in Phase 2 of raising the minimum wage to \$15 that is not happening in Phase 1.

Ms. Kumazawa said the current proposal for FY 22 is to move the full-time classified scale to a \$15 minimum. She said currently, in coordination with Local Government, there are two pay scales; one for part-time employees, and one for full-time employees. She said they are about five percentage points different from each other. She said the full-time scale would move to a minimum \$15 floor. She said the part-time scale would also move up, but not quite reach the \$15 in FY 22. She said they are proposing that in a future phase, Phase 2, they would bring the part-time scale up all the way to the \$15 as a minimum.

Ms. Palmer asked if part-time employees also get the 2%.

Ms. Kumazawa replied yes.

Ms. Palmer asked if this did not move them up to \$15.

Ms. Kumazawa replied that it gets them closer, but not quite to \$15.

Ms. Palmer recalled discussion about the 15 positions that were cut in Operations. She said clearly, when kids are not coming to school, the operations change. She asked if those positions were frozen, or if they were actually cut and if they were cut, to provide an example of one of those cut positions in Operations.

Ms. Kumazawa replied that they were not included in the FY 21 budget, and she did not know if there was a technical difference between freezing and cutting. She said she supposed freezing would mean they would be unfrozen in the future.

Ms. Palmer said what it would mean is that it was by attrition, where someone left and the

position was not filled, rather than the job being cut that year because of what had happened.

Ms. Kumazawa expressed she understood Ms. Palmer and said the positions were frozen. She said they identified positions that were not filled at the time, and they did not eliminate any people.

Ms. Palmer said this "cut" makes it sound like they were cut out rather than frozen. She said she had another question that may not be able to be answered, but she has asked it in past years from time to time. She said on the percentage of children with disabilities, 12.4%, she wanted to know if there is an average of what the peer communities have in percentage of children with disabilities.

Dr. Haas replied that this was a great question, and he wanted to also answer Ms. Palmer's other question further. He said the School Division tried to be creative in where they did some cutting. He said for example, they had started having their own Procurement Officer during FY 19-20 so that they could have a better interface with the Procurement Office and the County Office Building. He said they did actually cut that position from the budget, going into next year, but the Procurement Officer was a high school assistant principal who had come down to work with the schools, Ms. Kasaundra Blount. He said they asked her if she would go back and be a high school assistant principal, but she then won the job at Burley Middle School.

Dr. Haas said there were a couple of positions like this where because they have people who can be jacks of all trades and they try to have lots of learning opportunities for staff, they were able to be creative like that. He said Ms. Palmer's question was a good one, and he liked the way she explained cutting because he had not had it explained to him in that way before, and he now has a good explanation for that.

Dr. Haas said the national average for identifying special education students is 13%. He said when he started working for ACPS in 2004, they were closer to 16%. He said he thinks there has been a great deal of effort and work to bring down those identification rates because there is over-identification nationally, in the state, and locally.

Dr. Haas said one of the big pieces that has helped the School Division bring this down over time is the response to intervention process. He said many years ago, the way things would work was if there was an issue with the child's learning, and there was a gap, they would immediately go to a child study team, which was a premonition straight to an IEP, or special education.

Dr. Haas said that now, there is time in between the student getting a little bit behind and get going to the child study team, where a group meets and works on an intervention process. He said they use both school-based and curriculum-based assessments to track the students process and, in many cases, are able to head off that referral to the child study team for an IEP. He said they have been able to bring this down over time to where they are below the national average, and he is proud of that.

Mr. Gallaway said he understood what the Safety Coaches program is about. He asked if the actual dollar amount is a change year over year, or if this is the amount that was being put forward for School Resource Officers. He asked if this is the same amount that was used previously and if they are just going with a different program, or if the amount changed.

Ms. Kumazawa replied that the total budget is the \$500,000 that was shown on the slide. She said this is the total cost for the new program in FY 22. She said Mr. Gallaway may have seen a different number because the new funding is actually \$200,000 plus some amount when netting out the transfer to the SROs that are being eliminated.

Mr. Gallaway asked if the program itself, then, is a little bit more.

Ms. Kumazawa replied that the whole program is over \$500,000.

Mr. Gallaway asked if this was about \$200,000 or so over what was the previous program.

Ms. Kumazawa replied yes.

Mr. Gallaway apologized if he missed it, but Ms. McKeel brought up the 2% or 3% for the classified employees. He asked if the School Division has moved to 3% for the classified staff.

Mr. Paige replied that they have not. He said they will probably be looking at it later, in April or May, but it has not happened yet. He said they also realize the commonality factor. He said they are weighing all of those things, but it has not yet been put into the budget.

Mr. Gallaway asked if they were waiting to see what other monies may be there.

Mr. Paige replied yes.

Mr. Gallaway said he was pleased to see the equity pieces going in, with the effort being put there, as well as the piece they are doing to help those due to the past year to get kids caught up. He said he thinks this will be important, especially from a social and emotional standpoint, so he was very pleased to see that.

Ms. Price said she believed it was appropriate to express appreciation to everyone throughout the

County for all the work they have done through a most difficult time. She said to praise one group is not necessarily to exclude another group. She said they are talking about the school system, and commonality is an important aspect in terms of all of the County employees, whether they work directly for the County or for the school system, to know that they are all equally appreciated.

Ms. Price said they also recognize that market forces drive things, and there are certain segments of the employment population that they must target at various times in order to remain competitive in the marketplace for those specific categories of employees. She said she recognizes that there is a bit of a balance that must be undertaken to try to ensure that all employees know they are appreciated, recognized, and properly compensated, yet at the same time, ensuring that they meet those market forces so that they remain competitive across the board.

Ms. Price said with that as background, she also wanted to say she absolutely admires, respects, and is in awe of what the teachers have done this year. She said the closest observation she has is with a grandchild in first grade, and what she has seen his school and his teacher do over the course of the many changes that have taken place in the teaching formula, (in-person, remote, mixed, and now starting four days a week in-person), her hat is off to all of them. She said she thinks it is important for residents to appreciate that.

Ms. Price said she saw that in the state budget, the Governor has proposed and is enacting a 5% teacher and state employee pay raise. She asked if the state funding also helps ACPS to support the proposed 5% pay raise for the teachers, or if this is something that sounds good but ends up being an unfunded mandate for the County.

Dr. Haas replied that it actually helps, but he would have Ms. Kumazawa elaborate.

Ms. Kumazawa agreed that it does help. She said they do fund whatever salary proposal that the state is proposing, with the caveat that it does not fully fund any increase. She said it is not one-for-one, but is the partial offset of approximately 30% of the actual cost.

Ms. Price said this was helpful for the residents to understand; that it is not specifically County funding that goes into this proposal coming from the School Board, and there are funds that come from the state. She said another thing is that sometimes, they do have to target particular segments of the employment population in order to maintain those market forces.

Mr. Gallaway said he had a follow-up to the question Ms. Price just asked about the state pay raise. He asked Dr. Haas if the state has made any movement in covering additional FTEs relative to positions they have not covered in the past.

Dr. Haas asked Mr. Gallaway if he was referring to re-benchmarking and adding to the SOQ-funded positions.

Mr. Gallaway said yes.

Dr. Haas said that as usual, annually, there are considerations. He said there is a lot of debate around it, but he has not seen the outcome of those decisions yet. He said if the Board of Supervisors would like, the School Division can prepare information to elaborate on what was added to SOQ-funded positions. He said he did not believe this had been finalized yet, but he was not sure.

Mr. Gallaway said he would appreciate that. He said he knows Albemarle, rightfully so, goes beyond what is required of the state, and the state needs to move along further on that. He said he would be curious to see where they are.

Dr. Haas added that every school in Virginia exceeds the SOQ staffing. He said even the tiniest counties like Page County have to go above and beyond SOQ funding to meet the needs of the students and families.

Ms. Price thanked Mr. Paige, Ms. Callsen, Dr. Haas, and Ms. Kumazawa for the presentation and turned the meeting over to Mr. Bowman.

Mr. Bowman said they would next talk about the recommended capital budget and debt management. He said to talk about the recommended FY 22 Capital Budget and Debt Service, he needed to first tell the story about how they got there over the past year. He said there was nothing on the slide that the Board had not already seen, either through the CIP Advisory Committee's recommendation or some of the work that has come along the way, but as it had been a while since reviewing some of that content, he wanted to frame the process and the recommendation for how it all fits together.

Mr. Bowman said going back to May of 2020, when the FY 21 Capital Budget was adopted, this was in the early stages of the pandemic, and the County paused several capital projects and programs. He said this action was due to projected declining revenues and an uncertain economic situation, as well as an uncertain bond market. He said as has been noted before throughout every work session or other budget management check-ins they have had, they have been managing the FY 21 budget through a "3-6-6" timeframe, referring to the last three months of FY 20, the first six months of FY 21, and the last six months of FY 21.

Mr. Bowman said fast-forwarding from May to October 2020, there was a joint Board of

Supervisors and School Board meeting that was held on a couple of topics, including the capital budget. He said at the October 21 meeting, the boards agreed to a simplified capital budget process where the Capital Improvements Program Advisory Committee was charged to develop the capital proposal for the remainder of FY 21 and FY 22. He said for the public's information that the CIP Advisory Committee is made up of two Board of Supervisors members, two School Board members, a Planning Commissioner, and an appointed citizen representative.

Mr. Bowman said the CIP Advisory Committee met on November 24 and December 3 and reviewed projects that were paused or delayed in FY 21, or the projects that were originally planned for FY 22 before the financial impacts of the COVID pandemic were known. He said that recommendation is included in the FY 22 budget.

Mr. Bowman said the next slide listed the high-level assumptions that the Advisory Committee looked at before they prepared their prioritization. He said there were several assumptions that were revised from where they were prior to the pandemic. He said the first of the assumptions on the chart is that they now have a stabilized bond market. He said projects were primarily paused last year due to the instability of the bond market at the time they approved the budget. He said this has stabilized, and it is no longer a concern.

Mr. Bowman noted that this spring, the County plans to issue approximately \$83 million in borrowed proceeds in the current fiscal year (FY 21), and the first payment of that debt service will be in FY 22, as reflected in all the numbers in the budget process. He said this is a significant issuance, but they are still within all of the County's financial policies for debt management. He said this is due to the decisions that have been made in past years to delay borrowing when possible so that the debt can be paid off to retire and create that capacity, for which they will be in this position in the spring.

Mr. Bowman said the second major update was the interest rate assumption. He said interest rates are lower now than they were at the time prior to the pandemic, so working with their financial advisor, they were able to reduce their projected interest rates, resulting in a savings of around \$400,000 in future years.

Mr. Bowman said they have eliminated a potential tax increase, due to the Board's prior discussion in October. He clarified that the tax rate increase was due in the pre-pandemic budget, based on the prior Advisory Committee's work about a year ago.

Mr. Bowman said the final assumption is that the model for the capital budget that was prepared was modeled on 0% growth in FY 22. He said he was referring to the transfer from the General Fund to the Capital Fund. He said in the fall, this approach continued to be a cost revenue projection. He said at that time, they did not know the results of the Calendar Year 21 reassessment for real estate. He said they did not know what the results would be of the December tax collection, which is when a large chunk of the County's revenues are received from property taxes.

Mr. Bowman said consumer-driven revenues such as meals, sales, and transient occupancy taxes were more volatile in the fall, as the County was just getting additional data coming out of the pandemic. He said as they know now, the revenues are stabilizing, but are still below where they have been. He said this was a lot of data that they did not have at the time in the fall that drove them to consider a flat revenue growth for the General Fund in FY 22.

Mr. Bowman said that even with a flat transfer from the General Fund in FY 22 to the Capital Debt Program, the County is still able to move forward with notable projects in FY 22, pursuant to the CIP Advisory Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Bowman said he would move from the changes made on the revenue side to looking at the expenditures that were prioritized. He said staff presented 23 projects to the Advisory Committee that were either paused in FY 21 or scheduled to move forward in FY 22, which were looked at through the four lenses shown on the slide. He said the first of these lenses is "Strategic Plan and New Reality." He said this refers to the nine strategic priorities of the Board of Supervisors, but also reflects on the new reality of the pandemic that some projects, whether outdoor recreation or other things, changed their thinking in how they prepared prioritization for the Advisory Committee to consider.

Mr. Bowman said the second criteria was around affordability and taxpayer considerations, knowing that they there would not be a tax rate increase dedicated to capital based on the Board's direction in October.

Mr. Bowman said the third lens was around the ability to execute on capital projects. He said they spoke last week about the delicate balance between the capital program and operating budget, knowing that with many notable projects already underway and in the works, they have to balance this, yet at the same time, they a number of frozen positions and also have a lot of staff capacity directed to the response of the pandemic in support of the community and organization.

Mr. Bowman said the final lens looked at in this project and program criteria was the operational cost impact, knowing that with an uncertain financial outlook, for those items that may have higher operating costs, caution should be taken when prioritizing those.

Mr. Bowman said based on this initial criteria, staff prepared a recommendation for the Advisory Committee's recommendation. He said prior to that, going to the Advisory Committee, as part of a

November 18 meeting with the Board, this was an opportunity for the Board to provide feedback and questions for the representatives the Board has on the Advisory Committee. He said after the November 18 meeting, the committee met twice and put forward a recommendation that he would first talk through at a very high level, then go to what was included in FY 21 and FY 22.

Mr. Bowman said the next slide showed a number that is not always talked about much in the budget. He said it is a total picture of \$181 million, which refers to the current active projects in the capital budget as well as those that are being proposed to move forward in the FY 22 budget. He said the recommendation is built from the bottom up, as illustrated by the chart on the slide.

Mr. Bowman said in current projects and programs that were addressed in the FY 21 adopted budget, they are carrying forward from the prior year about \$90 million in those current active projects. He said no additional decisions need to be made on those, as the Board has already appropriated that funding.

Mr. Bowman said the next category was where the CIP Advisory Committee's and the Board of Supervisors' additional direction came into play where, in January, the Board appropriated \$34 million in projects that were previously paused and were able to be un-paused as the financial picture began to stabilize. He said this was noted on the chart in blue.

Mr. Bowman said finally, for the day's discussion, was the recommended FY 22 budget, shown in green, for a \$57 million capital budget that would be added to those items already approved, in gray and blue. He said on the next two slides, he would cover in more detail what makes up the blue and green pieces of the chart.

Mr. Bowman said the next slide was one that the Board had seen before, which listed the 23 projects that were prioritized. He said there are 12 that are moving forward either in FY 21 or FY 22. He said eight of the 12 projects have already been approved and appropriated in FY 21, which were listed as dollar amounts shown in the red box on the screen. He said he would not dwell on the slide too much, as those projects had already been approved, and the Board had seen the list before.

Mr. Bowman said he would move to the next slide to talk about FY 22, which moved the red box to the next column to the right. He said for the remaining four projects where there is additional funding in FY 22, they are additional funding for Economic Development Public-Private Partnerships (P3s), \$3 million in additional funding for the Transportation Leveraging Program, \$6.3 million for the Mountain View Expansion Site Improvements, and a trail head for the Moores Creek Trail that would make a connection into a greater trail network in the future.

Mr. Bowman said the CIP Advisory Committee's recommendation is not the only thing in FY 22, and the next slide showed everything that made up the \$57 million. He said the first was the Maintenance/Replacement and Ongoing Programs, and as is the case in capital budgets, the maintenance and replacement of existing assets were prioritized, which totals about \$20 million in FY 22. He noted that just like new projects, County staff scrubbed the numbers, working with departments in the School Division as well, as they talk about the lens of the ability to execute to ensure they are being fair and treating new projects as well as they are the current projects. He said the result of that was a \$20 million maintenance program for FY 22.

Mr. Bowman said in addition to maintenance and replacement, there are obligations that are included in the FY 22 budget. He said for example, there is the final year of The Senior Center at Belvedere contribution pursuant to the agreement that the Board of Supervisors adopted a few years ago, which is approximately \$500,000.

Mr. Bowman said a much larger dollar amount is from an agreement that the Board approved in the past, which is \$25.2 million in FY 22 that is the next phase of the Courts Complex for the General District Court Renovation and Addition Construction. He noted that the \$25 million is just the FY 22 portion, and not all of this will be spent in FY 22. He said this is just one piece of the total project, which totals \$44 million where funding is currently allocated and will continue through FY 24.

Mr. Bowman said listed on the slide were the four projects that were identified in the CIP Advisory Committee's recommendation and were not already moving forward in FY 21. He said the final note, with an asterisk on the slide, came after the CIP recommendation and refers to the North Garden ambulance equipment, of about \$500,000 total, which was discussed at last week's work session. He said there was additional time for Fire Rescue to talk about this on Thursday, March 18.

Mr. Bowman said at a high level, this walked the Board through how they got from the adopted budget in May 2020 to where they are today, the work shared with the Advisory Committee and their recommendation, and how this fits together into the FY 22 budget. He paused to take questions.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated the recap. She said the recommendation to the capital budget is a snapshot of where they are right now with their revenues and ability to fund capital projects. She said where she was going with this was that she is hopeful and looks forward to another discussion about capital projects or looking at the possibility that they may be receiving other one-time funds based on the federal government's recovery act. She said this would be a different discussion.

Mr. Bowman said they could speak to that at the work session on March 29.

Ms. McKeel said she did have some things that she wanted to talk about at that point, but she did not want to distract where they are today because she understands they have agreed to fund these priorities. She said this discussion, then, would be coming up on March 29.

Mr. Bowman said this was correct, adding that prior to that, as staff learns more, there may be some categories of expenditures that are eligible or better fits for that funding. He said he did not want to speculate too much because he receives new information and guidance about every hour. He said this will certainly be a consideration for the future.

Ms. McKeel said she is very interested in looking at some projects that would address some of the equity concerns prospectively. She said they would then have that discussion on March 29.

Ms. Palmer said she was thinking exactly along the same lines as Ms. McKeel. She said she agrees with Ms. McKeel that they do not want to distract from these things that were on the screen, which had been well thought out and agreed to. She said she did wonder, however, if depending on the time situation, it would be a good idea for Board members to let other staff and Board members know what they are thinking about. She said she was sure everyone had their list, as she certainly did.

Ms. Palmer said she would love for someone to correct her, but apparently, not only are they going to get the approximately \$20 million that Ms. Birch was talking about earlier, but the state is also getting a significant amount of money in addition for broadband, wastewater and water treatment facilities. She said if anyone could speak to that at some point, she would like to know if this would be included in the discussion on March 29.

Ms. Birch said part of the challenge is that there are not only the funds that are going to come to them directly, much like CARES CRF, but they are trying to understand all the other buckets of funding and the impact in the community. She said as she looks at the current \$21 million, one of the provisions she saw in one of the items that was provided to the County was that infrastructure investments were for water, sewer, and broadband, and this would be part of their funding.

Ms. Birch said what they want to make sure they can understand and prepare for on March 29 is what other funding is out there for those same items, and if this is it in terms of infrastructure investments and all they are allowed to fund as part of this funding that they are getting from the state. She said this is what staff is trying to get answers for so that the Board can use this to make decisions about where to fund. She asked Mr. Bowman if he had anything to add.

Mr. Bowman said the primary focus of the March 29 work session will be the funds that the County receives itself. He said they have to keep a very watchful eye on all the impacts happening elsewhere, such as the state. He said from some preliminary information, he understands that transit will also receive some of this funding as well, which will impact CAT and JAUNT. He said there is a work session about some of that information on March 22, but depending on how much information is out there, there may be some follow-up they have to do, as was the case last year as CARES funding was being realized. He said he had some déjà vu in terms of some of the work sessions they had a year ago.

Ms. Palmer said for water and wastewater, she was curious if this is going to include stormwater infrastructure for the aging infrastructure in the urban area. She said it did not sound like it, but she had not read everything, so she did not know if it includes water quality.

Ms. Palmer said for the Board's consideration, they do not usually think about water and wastewater treatment because ACSA and RWSA take care of that. She said if they did not get CARES money directly or indirectly before, however, one thing that the Board may want to think about in the equity realm is that there is a lot of aging infrastructure in the water treatment plants, and they have significant costs associated with that in the form of an increase in water prices over the next several years. She said to help with some of those shovel-ready projects, the Board may want to consider something like that.

Mr. Bowman said he was not sure about some of the specifics around stormwater infrastructure, but he could make a note of that and bring it back to the Board on March 29.

Mr. Gallaway said he knew they would be discussing a list and potential items to be put on the list for expenditures, but he believed as they all know, that looking at the capital projects that are improved, especially the school projects, they are still playing catch-up from past issues with the CIP in trying to accommodate the demand or growth seen in the schools.

Mr. Gallaway said he understood that the pandemic has changed some things, but he expects in four, five, or ten years out, especially in the northern feeder pattern, as development continues in the Development Area, the question will be where they will find seats for students when they are back to a normal type of situation, especially with elementary school students. He said there are obviously land applications coming, and people are concerned.

Mr. Gallaway said he thinks everyone there had been around long enough to know how the redistricting has played out from Woodbrook to Hollymead to Baker-Butler, then a Woodbrook expansion on the heels of a Greer and Agnor Hurt expansion.

Mr. Gallaway said if the growth continues in the Growth Area, while he sees projects, and rightfully so, for Crozet and Mountain View, he is afraid there will be a coming concern for elementary

school seats up 29 North that has to be on discussion at some point. He said if they will be considering dollars going into the CIP, he expects this will have to play into the conversation to accommodate that future growth.

Ms. Price said she had a question for Mr. Richardson. She said the Supervisors are all receiving inquiries from constituents about particular projects they would like to see in the CIP. She said as she understands it, in addition to the funding for the actual project, there are at least two other substantial considerations that they have to take into account. She said one is County staff capacity to manage the project and then, once completed, the other is the operating expenses and staff for that. She asked if she was correct on that, or if other things need to be taken into consideration when making CIP decisions.

Mr. Richardson replied no. He said this was exactly right. He said it is about the ability to execute internally, and every project is different in terms of how they look at what the capacity impact will be on the staff.

Mr. Richardson said a good example of an operational impact is the Southern Albemarle Convenience Center, where staff can look at the Ivy Convenience Center and determine that it is about \$1.1 million of one-time money in order to get this built and ready to open. He said they are going to use a placeholder number for ongoing costs of about \$400,000 per year of continuous operating money, which is a stream of money they would have to take from the General Fund on a year-to-year basis if this convenience center were to be used in the same way that the one in Ivy is used.

Mr. Richardson said these are some of the things staff tries to look at in trying to balance between the Capital Fund and the General Fund. He said if Ms. Price goes back to a prior meeting where they looked at the nine strategic goals in tandem, underneath that was the "Quality Government Operations" bar. He said this looks at the strategic plan and all capital investments, and they are looking for a balance across those nine areas. He said they also have to look at the underpinning of that on a day-to-day basis of the work that is required inside the organization in order to get that done. He said Ms. Price captured this in her statement.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley pointed out that while she did agree with Ms. McKeel in looking forward to March 29 about additional funds, they also have to make sure that they do not enter into anything too soon where they may find out a month or so later that they could have used "Funding X" instead of "Funding Y," and "Y" would have been much more flexible. She said she thinks it is very important for Ms. Birch and everyone to find out exactly what monies they will be getting in what pots of categories. She said she does not want to fund something out of "Category X" when it could have been funded out of "Category Y," and "Y" could have been used for something else.

Ms. Price announced that it was just after 4:30 p.m. and recommended taking a brief recess.

Mr. Bowman said there were some slides on capital remaining that he could finish before the recess.

Ms. Price apologized, as she thought Mr. Bowman was finished.

Mr. Bowman said the next slide was a reminder that on Wednesday, March 17, there will be an appropriation request coming before the Board that is related to capital, based on the Board's action on February 17 to provide funding from the CIP Advancing Strategic Priorities Reserve and from the Pandemic Reserve to support broadband, the Southern Albemarle Convenience Center, and the Reas Ford/Earlsville Road planning.

Mr. Bowman said the next slide showed the recommended adjustment to the FY 22 Capital Budget. He said he would have Mr. Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive, speak to this.

Mr. Walker said this tied in nicely to some of the conversations the Board was just having with regard to the organization's capacity to deliver on opportunities to complete capital projects. He said this is a proposal that would have been included in the County Executive's recommended budget, had they got it in time. He said since they were at this point, he wanted to bring it to the Board's attention.

Mr. Walker said this is a Principal Planner for Transportation position, which is currently frozen in the General Fund and has been left vacant for the balance of the year due to the promotion of Mr. Kevin McDermott to the Planning Manager position. He said this is one of the 19 frozen positions the Board has heard staff talk about a number of times.

Mr. Walker said he would not go through each of the bullets on the slide, as the Board could read these themselves and as he believes the Board understands the complexity of the environment staff works in, in their relationship with VDOT. He said the Board understands how well the County recently scored with respect to the Smart Scale projects and how much they are putting into Revenue Sharing. He said what they really need is more of an ability on the local side to be able to manage that work, which is work that Mr. McDermott has done to a degree. He said now, with the vacancy, they hope to fill it.

Mr. Walker said the change that has come is that staff has determined their ability to justify using capital funding rather than General Fund funding for this position, which is 100% supportive of capital projects related to transportation. He offered to answer questions, adding that the bullets on the slide spoke for themselves in terms of the value of the position.

Ms. McKeel said she is very supportive of this position, and she thinks it is needed in the County. She asked if Mr. Walker mentioned this is being paid for through the Capital Improvement Program.

Mr. Walker replied that the proposal is that instead of funding the position from the General Fund, they would fund it from the capital budget. He said for example, they fund a good deal of the support through FES through the F&B Division because they have direct support for the capital program. He said this would fall into that category of position.

Ms. McKeel said this was helpful, though it was unusual in her mind to have a position like this funded through the CIP. She asked if it would live there.

Mr. Walker replied that it would just be funded there. He said it would still live in Community Development and be part of the Transportation group, working with Mr. McDermott and Mr. Daniel Butch on the CDD side and coordinating heavily with Mr. Jack Kelsey and others on the FES side.

Ms. McKeel asked if there was not a sunset clause and if the intent is to have the funding live in the CIP.

Mr. Walker replied that the expectation is that with the way the state provides its funding to support transportation improvement projects, and with the complexity where the County does not own or maintain its own roads, it would be appropriately funding out of the capital budget, ongoing, rather than the General Fund. He said if for some reason, all the money dried up for transportation improvements in the County, they may have to reconsider, though he believes this is unlikely.

Ms. McKeel agreed. She said this was very helpful.

Ms. Mallek said to pile on to Ms. McKeel's question, there was no outside revenue source. She said it is the same source of money but is coming out of a different bucket. She said it is still all local tax revenue the County is having to raise for this. She said that even though it is being paid for out of the capital budget, it is still local dollars.

Mr. Walker confirmed this was correct.

Ms. Mallek said she had a question for which someone may need to let her know when it is appropriate to be answered. She said someone asked her that day what the Business Optimization Fund was, and she was having trouble explaining it. She said she wanted to make sure she has the right information and asked for someone to update the Board on this in writing or in a meeting.

Mr. Bowman said they could do this after the break.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she agrees with funding this much-needed position.

Ms. Palmer said she had a question about the appropriations the Board would be making that Wednesday, March 17. She said clearly, the whole Board (herself included) supported the \$3 million for broadband affordability and access. She asked if given there is a pot of money coming from the state for broadband, and the County does not have a lot of information, it would be of any value to hold off until March 29 to approve the \$3 million for that particular item, in light of a considerable amount of funds coming from the state for this. She asked what the fungibility of this is once the Board puts this money into the broadband affordability and access.

Ms. Birch said this was a good point in terms of the fungibility if the state does not allow the County to supplant the funding that they have already provided. She said it is a good question and point that staff should think through because broadband is certainly an area where it will be eligible to be funded. She said there is no discrepancy in any of the things she is reading, so Ms. Palmer's point was well-taken. She said the issue is the County's ability to start some projects and to move forward with some of the things the Board heard about last week. She said it could be a very wise move for them to delay the vote of that \$3 million.

Ms. Birch asked Mr. Bowman if there was anything else to consider related to this.

Mr. Bowman said he believed there was an additional piece that Mr. Trevor Henry, Assistant County Executive, spoke to in that with a portion of that \$3 million, if the Board is comfortable moving forward with the Broadband Office in FY 22, they could actually work to start that office, the affordability fund, and some of the components earlier. He said he did not know whether the funding from the federal government or the state would create funding to offset those position. He said from what he read, it tends to be more infrastructure-related, though he was not sure.

Mr. Bowman said assuming the Board is comfortable moving in FY 22 to get some of the wheels in motion for the staffing, whether it is state funding or local funding, the staff would be needed to implement the elements of that program.

Ms. Palmer asked if there is value in staff considering this further. She said they were talking a week of difference, essentially, and so she was just asking the question. She said she was not trying to postpone starting that office by any stretch of the imagination, and she was sure that no one on the Board wanted to postpone that. She said she was just wondering about the need to think through it a little more.

Ms. Birch said staff would absolutely take that point. She asked Mr. Bowman if this was on the agenda for Wednesday.

Mr. Bowman said yes.

Ms. Birch said staff would work through that with the County Executive's Office. She asked if Mr. Richardson or Mr. Henry wanted to speak on that.

Mr. Bowman said since Mr. Henry is on the Broadband Authority, they would need to follow up with him at a separate time. He said there could not be three members of the Albemarle Broadband Authority (ABBA) there, logistically speaking, and they would need to call the ABBA to order to continue this participation on broadband. He said it would be more appropriate to have that at a later time to make sure they are following all open meeting procedures.

Ms. Palmer suggested staff think through it and let the Board know what they think.

Mr. Bowman said they would come to the Board with a recommendation on Wednesday, should they modify the agenda accordingly.

Mr. Gallaway said if it was useful knowing it was coming back, and not to belabor Ms. Palmer's point, he believed there was some merit in doing the delay. He said if the \$260,000 or \$300,000 was going to be put in that year to get the office up and running, and they were going to backfill the \$300,000 back in to keep it at \$3 million, if they did not want to delay or if waiting until the end of the month was a big delay, that portion could at least come forward if needed. He said this could be an additional option.

Mr. Gallaway said he is supportive of the Transportation position. He asked how many positions they fund out of the CIP.

Mr. Walker said this was a good question that he could not answer in the moment. He said a number of the project managers in the PFD Division of FES are, as well as a position or two in Finance. He said he would get this information out to the whole Board.

Mr. Bowman said he would get that number to the Board. He said the three components would be this Transportation position, if approved, 3.5 positions in Finance & Budget, and the entirety of the Facilities, Planning, and Construction division.

Ms. Price said she appreciated Ms. Palmer's question about broadband. She said that candidly, she believes it is as if the County cannot put enough money into broadband expansion and support. She said she remains somewhat uncertain as to why certain positions are funded out of the CIP rather than taking that money and putting it into the general operating budget, then funding them from there.

Ms. Price said in addition to simply listing those positions, she wondered if it would be possible to get her more of an explanation as to the reason for the funding source. She noted this was not in any way to imply that she does not support those positions. She said she simply wanted to better understand why they are funded out of a CIP budget rather than out of the regular General Fund.

Recess. The Board recessed its meeting at 4:45 p.m. and reconvened at 4:56 p.m.

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

Mr. Bowman said Transfers and Reserves was referring to the Non-Departmental chapter of the book. He said the largest parts of this chapter were discussed last Wednesday, March 10, including Revenue Sharing payments to the City, transfers from the General Fund to School Fund and to Capital and Debt Funds. He said he would spend time that afternoon talking about other reserves and transfers that are funded with one-time money. He said these were notably found on pages 139 and 142 of the budget book. He said specifically, he had comments on four items and that after those four items, he would pause for any Board questions or comments.

Mr. Bowman said the slide on the screen was a reference slide that was included the prior week in the County Executive's presentation to the Board. He said the chart on the right side of the slide was a pyramid that frames how staff makes recommendations for the Board's consideration using the one-time funding that is available. He said the chart refers to that the County is meeting and ensuring its financial foundation, looking into the economic outlook in supporting the community as the Board chooses its priorities, and looking at workforce stabilization.

Mr. Bowman said the FY 22 recommended budget includes \$600,000 provided for the Climate Action Pool. He clarified that this funding, if the Board is comfortable with it, is recommended to be appropriated in the current fiscal year (FY 21) after the budget is adopted.

Mr. Bowman said for perspective of how this \$600,000 fits into the current Climate Action funding, the Department of Facilities and Environmental Services, in its annual operating budget, has ongoing money of \$100,000 that supports efforts such as LEAP's Home Energy Audit Program, as well as the Charlottesville Climate Collaboration (C3) for their Home Energy and Better Business Challenges. He said this is ongoing every year.

Mr. Bowman said in addition to that, in FY 21, there is \$250,000 that was budgeted to support low-income housing weatherization and efforts to move forward on that initiative. He noted that the \$250,000 does not meet all the demand that exists for this, but it was one example of how the funding was beginning to be put to use already.

Mr. Bowman said in addition to that \$250,000 of one-time money, there was another \$500,000 approved for general Climate Action implementation funds. He said currently, a portion of that funding is being used to support electric vehicle chargers at County Office Buildings, and this is currently underway.

Mr. Bowman said beyond that, the Climate Action Plan identifies a long list of potential uses of funds. He said the \$600,000 would augment those efforts that are currently underway, plus the leftover from the \$500,000.

Mr. Bowman said the slide on the screen enforced the process that is led by the Department of Facilities and Environmental Services for future resource commitments related to the Climate Action Pool, [inaudible] prioritization matrix. He said FES identifies projects and how they align with the Climate Action Plan. He said they determine the uses of those funds and implement them as appropriate. He said the \$600,000 is in addition to what is already funded, and it fits into both current efforts and those that will be defined in the future in the context of the Climate Action Plan.

Mr. Bowman said \$600,000 will go to the Housing Fund and like the Climate Action funding, this is recommended to be appropriated in FY 21 after adoption of the FY 22 budget. He said this funding would be added to the current Housing Fund reserve, along with the proffer funding the County has received in the last year. He said all of this, in combination with the \$600,000, the additional proffer funding, and fund balance would create a reserve of just over \$1.9 million to support housing initiatives that are one-time costs which support the County's strategic and housing goals.

Mr. Bowman said the slide showed a four-step process that would be carried out in the coming months with the Board of Supervisors to utilize that funding. He said Step 1 is to adopt the Housing Policy, with the reserve being in place to move something forward prior to the next budget process. He said Step 2 would be drafting the RFP and evaluation tool, as led by Dr. Stacey Pethia, who has been very involved with the Board in these housing discussions. He said the evaluation would occur and then, the Board could approve the use of the specific funding later in the calendar year. He said this will put the funding in place for when those ideas are ready to be actualized.

Mr. Bowman said finally, with regarding to the Housing Fund, in addition to the \$1.9 million in reserves, and what is reserved to support the performance agreement between the County, the Economic Development Authority, and Habitat for Humanity, that is about \$1.7 million, which supports the Southwood community project.

Mr. Bowman said the next slide referred to the Strategic Priority Support Reserve that is included in the operating budget. He said this reserve was created in FY 18 and has been primarily used in the past to support the implementation of Strategic Plan initiatives. He said this was mainly in the Department of Community Development (CDD) to support their work program. He said the department is largely involved in many of the Board's nine strategic priorities and in recent months, the Community Development Department has been discussing with the Board a Comprehensive Plan update and how to best accomplish that. He said this discussing will continue in the coming month in the context of the work program, which will come back to the Board in April or May.

Mr. Bowman said this funding of \$655,000 is intended to provide a one-time contractual support to augment CDD staff as they work on the Comprehensive Plan update, any subsequent Zoning-related work, and spotlight initiatives in the coming years. He said the slide on the screen showed four steps, with fiscal years denoted, as the \$655,000 currently in reserves will be spent out over the next four years (FY 21, 22, 23, and 24) as each phase of the project moves to the next.

Mr. Bowman said he would have Ms. Kristy Shifflett, Director of the Project Management Office, would speak to the Business Process Optimization Reserve that Ms. Mallek had a question about earlier.

Ms. Kristy Shifflett, Director of the Project Management Office, said she would talk about what the Business Process Optimization (BPO) Reserve does and what this year's request is about. She said BPO is a reserve that was created a couple of years ago to fund one-time organizational needs as they emerge and are defined in order to optimize performance. She said this reserve has provided project management, technology solutions, workforce training, and business process improvement to departments, with a focus on improving customer service.

Ms. Shifflett said one example was the County's new website. She said many would recall that there was a 20-year-old system that required a lot of maintenance and resources and limited the County's ability to meet modern service delivery. She said the website needed replacing, but it also required project management, training, and staff support to accomplish this effort. She said the BPO Reserve provided funding for that initiative. She said that because they were able to have focused resources on the project, they were able to launch the new website and improve mobile access to the community and partners, as well as modernize web capabilities, even while they were managing the pandemic response.

Ms. Shifflett said the BPO program is where funds are reserved for non-departmental organizational efforts to assess the foundational systems that drive the organization and service delivery.

Ms. Shifflett said in this year's budget, they are aligning their systems and process improvement again with work that enables them to see how they can and should be working differently to drive performance. She said this budget recommends contributing \$3.1 million in one-time funding to further this multiyear work. She said in FY 21, they have begun building a roadmap on how they might replace a Community Development system as well as an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) effort in order to update business systems for the modern workplace.

Ms. Shifflett said they understand this is a large undertaking, but the technology in these areas is aging and limited. She said the lift of this work is why there is a multiyear approach.

Ms. Shifflett said as an example, the intake in Community Development is automated and does have the ability to take those types of requests, but it does not integrate with the CountyView system. She said thus, someone is currently manually putting that information in. She said this is the type of work that they hope to overcome and accomplish with this effort.

Ms. Shifflett said the purpose behind the redesign work is to add value to internal and external customers, reduce delays between Local Government departments, offer standardization, and promote compliance to ultimately provide excellent performance to the community. She said as seen in FY 22, it is also to assist with the upcoming Strategic Plan update and also to integrate equity into the program and project design using data, and to continue their work to formally assess their internal structure. She said there is money identified for staff support for the new community value.

Ms. Shifflett said lastly, in FY 23, they will continue to the next phase to support the system design, procurement, and hopefully project launch. She offered to answer questions.

Mr. Bowman said Ms. Birch had something to add before moving on to questions.

Ms. Birch said this was a great overview, but she wanted to spend a moment to highlight this piece of the program for the Board. She said the last several slides were staff's response to being resilient, which is part of the nomenclature they are using for this budget, which is about how they go from where they were through a pandemic and then transition into a new reality. She said the question is how they make sure they do not lose their focus, nor their ability to drive outcomes that the Board wants to see.

Ms. Birch said staff spent considerable time over the last few weeks showing the Board how out of all the obligations they had, they only had about \$2 million to support the things that they needed to do in Local Government on the General Fund side. She said this is an area where they are being strategic to use one-time sources of funding, which came from prior year positive budgetary variance, to support and transition them to the future they are trying to get to.

Ms. Birch said between housing and Climate Action, the CDD work, and the BPO Reserve and the things it will accomplish, this shows the Board how one-time funding, though not being built into the base, is being used to catapult the County into the future where they want to go. She said she wanted to spend a moment to stress that this was done intentionally as they looked at funding priorities in FY 22, when there were some limited ongoing revenues.

Ms. McKeel said on the previous presentation, she was thrilled to see spot blight listed, as she has been talking about that and dealing with it within her community. She said she believed many of the other Supervisors have been doing this, too.

Ms. McKeel said in terms of the presentation in front of the Board, the BPO process is necessary, and she is thrilled to see the County is doing this. She said their systems have to support their work and not make the work more difficult. She said they should not have to be using workarounds to get their work done.

Ms. McKeel said while resiliency is critical, as they are going through the process and doing this work, she would also encourage them to think about redundancy. She said now is the time to think about putting in place redundancy in some of these systems where appropriate, as this is critically important.

Ms. McKeel said she is very much in favor of this and looks forward to all the work. She said continuous improvement is critically important, and she is glad to see they are moving this forward.

Ms. Mallek said she agreed with all of Ms. McKeel's comments, but she had some questions. She said in terms of the Climate Action notes on the low-income weatherization that the County has already been funding, one of the wonderful benefits of that County funding that has been shared with LEAP is that it allows them to complete a job. She said for example, there are places in Southwood where Dominion was paying for a part of it, such as a new heat pump, but they did not pay for the leaky roof or drainage. She said having the ability to do a more thorough weatherization project while the various contractors were at a property has made so much of a difference, and so she is glad to see this is something that would be considered to go forward.

Ms. Mallek said there is a long list of staff-generated projects for Climate Action, and she was checking to make sure that the list of projects is coming to the Board so they can add their projects to it as well, at some point in the future.

Ms. Mallek said with regard to the \$655,000 in strategic priorities support, many of the projects listed there sound as if they are things that the most experienced staff need to be working on. She said she looks forward to the discussion in a month or so, or whenever they get to it, about what the right order of things is. She said each Supervisor may have a different view. She wondered if the slide showing the process for the \$655,000 was the right order of things, or if they should be working on getting their zoning updated first, since this is what they have been talking about since Mr. Kamptner's interviews many years ago, before he became County Attorney, and how important that is to finish. She said this will be for a future discussion.

Ms. Mallek said she had a question about the BPO. She asked if it would include something as rudimentary, but also incredibly useful, as an idea she had heard floated several years ago about getting the County inspectors to be equipped with iPads so that they can get their assignments and enter their data in one place instead of having to scribble on notepads when out inspecting a project, then having to transfer everything when they get back to the office. She said this may or may not be something that is germane to this particular discussion, but she hopes it is still on the list of things to happen.

Ms. Mallek said she would have more to discuss at the end of the meeting when they get to other questions.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she agreed with much of what was said.

Ms. Palmer said perhaps it was in the budget book and she missed it, but she wanted to know if someone could send her a more detailed breakdown of where the \$3.1 million is expected to go. She said it was not that she was objecting to it in any way whatsoever, but she wanted to more clearly see how they arrived at that figure.

Ms. Palmer said to echo what Ms. Mallek said, as she looks at the optimization of procedures, she thinks back to the County Attorney telling the Board that they have 1980s code that needs to be rewritten. She said there is a wonderfully progressive Comprehensive Plan that got overhauled in 2014 and 2015 with a great effort from staff, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors, and she would like to see the County Code updated. She said she knows this will take quite a lot of time from the County Attorney's Office and Community Development, but as she looks at the capital improvements money for Community Development, she cannot help but think of the need to update the County Code.

Ms. Price said she looked forward to the conversation about looking for a different source of regular funding for an affordable housing trust fund, but she recognizes this is a different conversation for another time.

Mr. Bowman said he would present some wrap-up slides, the first of which was a summary of any follow-up items on the list. He asked the Board to correct him if he missed anything. He said he heard that day that in terms of a budget adjustment to FY 22, this was not discussed, though there is a clear desire from several Board members about having a discussion on March 29 around the additional federal and/or state funding and how that may fit into the broader capital picture and other use of one-time funding.

Mr. Bowman said he would skip the School Division questions, as he was sure the division was addressing that.

Mr. Bowman said there were several questions around getting clarity on state funding for broadband and wastewater, both in terms of the dollar amounts and how that funding will be received, and whether that includes broader stormwater infrastructure. He said that on Wednesday, March 17, they will look at the recommendation for the appropriation for broadband and what would be the options or the recommended way to proceed with that.

Mr. Bowman said they will get clarity about the number of positions funded in the capital budget rather than in the General Fund, as well as the rationale for that. He said there will be a look at a list of future projects related to Climate Action and for the Board's involvement. He said there was a question about BPO funding and how that ties into the work around inspectors and iPads to do field work. He said they will get further detail on the breakdown of the \$3.1 million, and they will address the last question about the County Code.

Mr. Bowman asked if he missed anything or if there were other questions from the Board.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was piggybacking on another Supervisor's suggestion regarding laptops for the inspectors. She said it would seem to her that this would cut down on a lot of person hours to be able to have a tablet where they could write everything down, then upload it.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Assistant County Executive, said this was a great question from Ms. Mallek on the memory of that, and it does tie into the work that has been done through BPO funding and the Project Management Office, along with the Information Technology Department. He said in the fall, they went live with a mobile inspection app on tablets for CDD Engineering. He said this is live now and is being spread to other parts of the organization that do similar work. He said he has asked IT to give him a more formal update, which he would share with the Board. He said this is a great connection to the work they are trying to do which will be more efficient and effective and will ultimately save them more time and dollars.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said this was good news, and she had another follow-up question on Zoning and using extra money they may have to make sure that zoning revisions are put in place.

Ms. Price asked Ms. Jodie Filardo, Director of Community Development, if she had anything to add to the previous topic.

Ms. Filardo said Mr. Henry was exactly right that they did deploy tablets to the Engineering Inspector Team. She said it is likely they may pause any further deployment on that at the moment because those deployments have to be tightly coupled to the software they utilize. She said they do not want to spend a lot of money connecting an additional set of tablets to a system that is aging. She said through the ERP process, they are trying to consider how to time these various projects to make best use of County funds so that they are not throwing good money after bad.

Ms. Filardo said as for zoning, she is excited to hear everyone be supportive of redoing zoning. She said they in CDD certainly are, too, and she know the County Attorney's Office has shared that they are, also. She said they intend to lead with Comprehensive Plan updates before they update zoning because if they do it the other way around, they will have to come back and update zoning again after the Comprehensive Plan update. She said this is another one of those projects where the timing and integration of these projects is critical.

Mr. Bowman said his final comment was a preview of the work session for Thursday, March 18. He said he wanted to clarify expectations to the Board. He said the first two work sessions have largely been information and questions to be answered, but on Thursday, there will be two actions that the Board will be asked to take.

Mr. Bowman said they will start the meeting by reviewing Fire Rescue and presenting the list of items. He said the Board will be asked to finalize a tax rate "cap" for advertisement. He said he would go into more detail on Thursday on what this means, but essentially, the advertised tax rate can only be changed downwards, so if the Board were to advertise the current rate of 85.4 cents, the Board can still change that when it comes time to set the tax rate, but they cannot increase it further from when it was advertised.

Mr. Bowman said the second distinction he would make on the proposed budget is that at that point, nothing is final, and the Board can continue to amend that as they receive public feedback or have additional questions and ideas.

Mr. Bowman said the final slide showed what was ahead. He said they discussed the March 29 meeting, and this would be changed from "if needed" to a discussion around the additional federal funding. He said other than that, there were no changes to future meetings at that time. He said this concluded his presentation.

Ms. McKeel said when Mr. Bowman talked about the list, his audio was breaking up a little, and she wondered if he was referring to the list of projects that the Board would suggest if they are to receive more federal funding or flow-through dollars.

Mr. Bowman clarified that there was one list before that day and now, there were two lists. He said the list he referred to Thursday was really for those items that impact the Board's consideration of a proposed budget, based on what will be advertised at public hearing.

Ms. Bowman said the second list, which he could tell was probably moving more to the forefront of the Board's minds, is the use of the \$21 million or so, or however it shakes out with all the different funding sources, and what are the ways this would be utilized in terms of the process to plan out how the funding is utilized, both in FY 21 all the way through the end of that timeline that the federal government sets. He said he would always welcome feedback from the Board, but he does not believe this is as timely as it is on Thursday when they discuss it in terms of March 29.

Ms. McKeel said this was great, adding that she appreciated all the work on the informative presentations that day.

Ms. Mallek agreed that this had been informative. She said she finally found her notes about the question she was trying to find before, and she asked if she could leave this with Mr. Bowman to farm out to Mr. Tim Padalino, or someone else.

Ms. Mallek said she discussed over the past several months trying to get information, which she then saw in some chapter of the budget, perhaps Parks and Recreation, about a grant which the County made to the Planning District Commission of \$200,000 a couple of years ago, which has not been developed, spent, or otherwise planned. She said she wanted to make sure that they took this opportunity during the budget to get their hands around that and find out what is going on, and if they need to retrieve it and do something themselves because the PDC has had two years. She said she would leave this thought for others to get back to the Board on.

Ms. Mallek said everything else on her wrap-up is based on the second list that Ms. McKeel was speaking about, which was for March 29. She said she knew everyone would be thinking about that.

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

Ms. Mallek announced that her townhall would be on March 23, and she would appreciate

citizens of the White Hall District listening in and asking questions.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley announced that her townhall would be on March 22. She said the presentation that afternoon was informative and that she looked forward to the work session on March 18.

Ms. Palmer said she and Ms. Price would be having their townhall with the 5th and Avon CAC the evening of Thursday, March 18. She said on Friday, March 19, she will be the guest speaker for the Yancey Community Advisory meeting as a townhall to talk about the budget for Southern Albemarle. She noted all of these meetings can be found on the Albemarle County Calendar.

Mr. Gallaway thanked Ms. Price for taking over the proceedings that day.

Ms. Price reiterated that the townhall for the 5th and Avon CAC would be done with Ms. Palmer, where the CAC business would be addressed and then, the budget.

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

There was none.

Agenda Item No. 5. Adjourn.

At 5:29 p.m., Ms. Price adjourned the Board meeting to March 17, 2021 at 1:00 p.m., which would be an electronic meeting held pursuant to Ordinance No. 20-A(16), “An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster.” She said information on how to participate in the meeting will be posted on the Albemarle County website on the Board of Supervisors homepage.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date 02/15/2023
Initials CKB