

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 29, 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.

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

**ABSENT:** None.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** County Executive, Jeffrey B. Richardson; 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 3:00 p.m. by the Chair, Ms. Donna 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." She said that the opportunities for the public to access and participate in the electronic meeting were posted on the Albemarle County website, on the Board of Supervisors' homepage, and on the Albemarle County calendar. She stated that participation included the opportunity to comment on those matters for which comments from the public would be received.

Ms. Price noted that because Chair Gallaway was attending from his office in Richmond, she would be running the meeting in order to minimize any potential disruptions that may occur.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** Federal American Rescue Plan Funding.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said Ms. Nelsie Birch, Chief Financial Officer, would be walking the Board through the work session. He added that support staff from Finance and Budget were also present and that he appreciated their hard work leading up to that day to make sure they are prepared for a successful work session with the Board.

Ms. Nelsie Birch, Chief Financial Officer, said this was the Board's fifth budget work session, with one more work session on the books. She said there would be a moment to talk at the end about the April 1 work session that was identified as an as-needed session. She said the present session would help determine whether this was still needed or if it would be canceled.

Ms. Birch said it was exciting to bring forward the American Rescue Plan. She said they would talk about what they know and do not know, then get into how staff is responding to the information they had at the moment, as well as develop a framework for the Board for their consideration to direct staff's work to meet their planned milestones.

Ms. Birch presented what remained in the timeline. She said there were two more events occurring on April 28, and on May 5, which is the final approval of the budget.

Ms. Birch said the agenda for the day would include a good portion of time dedicated to the American Rescue Plan and the Board's recommended framework for that. She said depending on how quickly or lengthy this would go, there was a scheduled break, at about 4:00 p.m. She said after the break, they would pick up with a discussion related to priority projects that the Board has identified either through work sessions or through some one-on-one conversations with Mr. Richardson in order to develop the priorities for discussion that day. She said they would end with a meeting wrap-up and summary of next steps, noting that there were several, so it could take longer than the 15 minutes allotted.

Ms. Birch said the desired outcome for the day was to go over the basic information related to the American Rescue Plan (ARP). She said this was approved by the President a few weeks ago, on March 11. She said when the work session was set for this discussion, she was hopeful they would have much clearer guidance from the federal government and the Secretary of Finance in Virginia. She said unfortunately, they did not, but they did know enough in order to be able to have the discussion and talk about the recommended process for making decisions about how they will spend the funding, which includes a framework for the Board's consideration.

Ms. Birch said they would also be looking at how they can move forward on the identified projects that each Board member has provided to determine what is the best source of funding and timing for that as it relates to both the FY 22 budget and the finalization of that budget, which begins July 1, and also through the ARP funding they would be spending time that day talking about.

Ms. Birch said the slide on the screen served as a reminder that not quite a year ago, there had been another infusion of funding that came from the federal government through the CARES CRF process. She said the County local government side received a little over \$19 million with that CARES relief funding.

Ms. Birch said what was important to share with the Board and with anyone watching the meeting was that what is difficult about a new set of funding like this that does not come through one of the normal funding categories from the federal government is that the federal government has to develop guidance and compliance regulations. She said there was a series of these, as shown on the slide, that happened from the time the County received word that they were getting funding until the time that they thought they were going to have to spend the funding.

Ms. Birch said one of the key drivers for the CARES CRF funding was the quick timeline that the County had to spend the funds. She said December 30, 2020, was the time period that the federal government initially released as the time the County had to spend the funding.

Ms. Birch said that as the County and world were dealing with the chaos of the pandemic, they also had to scramble to figure out not only how they would spend these funds quickly, but also then work to develop guidelines and criteria based on the federal regulations that came down. She noted that the September-October timeframe was when they received the guidance from the federal government that clarified much of the confusion that had occurred about how this funding could be allocated and used. She said they were getting different opinions from the Office of Inspector General to the Treasury Department from the federal government, and much of that was clarified late in the fall.

Ms. Birch said the last piece of guidance the County received was on December 23, which said that they thought they needed the County to spend that in the next seven days, but they actually had another year to do so. She said for the County's purposes, they had already set forward their plan of attack for this, and the Board had approved the supplanting of some Public Safety pay that was completely allowed as part of the regulations for CARES CRF. She said this created a reserve of around \$7 million or so that they were able to use to help continue to support the COVID-19 pandemic response for the County, and it also did not tie their hands to the original December 30, 2020, deadline, which is now December 31 of 2021.

Ms. Birch said as the Board was well aware, staff has provided a few opportunities to go over the funding that was received and how they spent those funds, but the present work session was to talk about how difficult, in the context of the ARP, and how careful they need to be with respect to what this funding can and cannot be used for.

Ms. Birch said she and Mr. Richardson met with the Board the week prior, and one of the questions that had come about was related to the schools' funding. She said they worked with Schools leadership to develop the slide on the screen, noting that she removed all the acronyms because Schools received CARES funding with several different acronyms. She said the slide was about how they received it and the time period. She said that for their CARES funding, it was a little less than \$9 million. She said this has nothing to do with the new ARP funding, and it was just a reference point for the Board. She said it would become clearer when she would go into the others slides about the amount of funding that is coming to the community outside of the state and local contribution the County is receiving

Ms. Birch said she would talk about the American Rescue Plan. She said the slide showed a cascade of how the funding trickles down to the estimated \$21 million that the County of Albemarle will be receiving in local aid. She said they started with a bill that incorporated \$1.9 trillion that was signed into law on March 11. She said this slide was a cascade effect of how that money flows down to where they are and what they were discussing at present. She said \$350 billion that was earmarked for state and local governments as part of the State and Local Fiscal Aid bucket of money. She said there are other funding categories as well, and there are actually over 70, but for broad categorization, there are about six other funding categories that make up the other \$1.5 trillion. She said this was an opportunity for the Board to see the perspective of what the County is getting, \$21 million, versus what could be coming to the community.

Ms. Birch said going back to the left-hand side of the slide, the Board would see how the \$350 billion is divided up. She said the states receive a portion, with \$10 billion portion going to states for capital. She said there is \$20 billion going to non-states such as tribal government, territories, etc. She said the last bucket of money on the slide was \$130 billion to locals.

Ms. Birch said staff did get clarification in working with the Town Manager of Scottsville that unlike CARES CRF, where the County provided a portion of its funding to Scottsville because CARES CRF did not directly provide money to incorporated towns or cities within a county like Albemarle, what staff has come to understand is that the County will be receiving around \$21 million, and Scottsville is planned to receive about \$500,000, which is a considerable portion of their budget, about 75%. She said it is exciting news for the County's partners in Scottsville to help them plan and prepare for their own set of funding, start to stabilize the economy and do the things that this bill was intended to address.

Ms. Birch said she would go to a couple of slides that talk about what is known and what is not, and one area that she was being more careful in her reading of how they can spend this as it relates to

infrastructure is that in her opinion, there is confusion, and she has conflicting information about infrastructure investments.

Ms. Birch said regarding the \$10 billion that goes to states for capital, reading the bill and looking at many of the entities that are responding and providing overview about the bill and its intent, it is confusing that if the infrastructure investments, specifically water, sewer, and broadband were called out, if this would be part of the local funding the County can spend, or if it is part of the \$10 billion. She said staff is being careful now until they get direct clarification, which would provide some more flexibility in the event that they are able to use their funding for broader infrastructure investments outside or inclusive of water, sewer, and broadband.

Ms. Birch said she would share what was known as of that day about ARP funding. She said there was about \$130 billion that was provided to cities and counties, and this was split evenly. She said cities were largely allocated based on the CDBG formula that cities are very familiar with providing to the federal government. She said for counties like Albemarle, this is done by population.

Ms. Birch said the County is expected to receive two payments, with one sometime between March 11, when it was enacted, to May 11. She said she heard they may receive it sooner, but she was not quite sure. She said with the CRF CARES funding, they had not known the amount they were getting, nor the timing of that until it showed up from the state into the County's bank account through an Electronic Funds Transfer. She said this is what she expected to happen this time as well. She said the way the legislation was worded was that the County would then get the second half one year later, which would be May 11, 2021.

Ms. Birch said there were four categories that were called out in the act for eligible uses, and the first was consistent with CARES CRF, which was helping to continue to respond to the COVID-19 public health emergency.

Ms. Birch said the next three categories were essential workers premium pay, revenue losses, and economic recovery. She said economic recovery was worded similarly to CARES CRF, but revenue losses and essential workers premium pay are two things that staff will be monitoring for clarification on what is allowed and how. She said particularly, an essential worker's premium pay needs to be defined, and they need to have a clearer understanding of how and what that would look like.

Ms. Birch said clarification was needed on how revenue losses would need to be calculated. She said staff wants to make sure they are understanding and calculating this appropriately. She said they do have their own version that the Budget Division has worked up related to what they think their revenue loss might be and how it might be seen by the federal government, and she would share more of that on the slides regarding framework.

Ms. Birch said there are three clear restrictions for the funding. She said the first one is related to offsetting tax rates. She said if there is a planned tax increase, for instance, the funding cannot be used to offset that, nor can it be used to delay a tax increase. She said most notably, it cannot be deposited to help offset any pension challenges. She said those two items really did not impact Albemarle as they relate to their financial plan and where they currently sit.

Ms. Birch said the last restriction is that the funding must be used by December 31, 2024. She said this is FY 25 for the County, and they are now developing FY 22. She said this is really three fiscal years where the County has an opportunity to be more careful and strategic and work within the compliance of what the federal government says is allowable, which is a very different place than where they were with CARES CRF, when they had to spend it very quickly, and it was trickling in how and what they could spend it on.

Ms. Birch said the next slide showed what staff did not yet have exact information on, but they expect to know. She said she was hopeful they would know by the time they come back to the Board on this topic. She said she has seen a couple of different calculations for the exact amount of funding, anywhere between \$21.2 million and \$21.4 million. She said it is somewhere around the \$21 million amount. She said as far as an actual timeline, she has not received word on when they should expect to receive the funding.

Ms. Birch said as she mentioned at the outset, in terms of eligible uses, staff does not yet have the guidance they need to make sure they are spending the money as intended by the bill. She said the two big pieces for them in the present discussion were related to revenue losses and how they are calculated, meaning they could use the funding from ARP to offset any revenue losses that they have in the budget, which provides some flexibility to the Board to be able to use that funding differently.

Ms. Birch said the infrastructure piece is unclear, though it is absolutely understood that broadband in particular is all over the \$1.9 trillion. She said specifically, what piece of that could be used and if it was broader than water, sewer, and broadband infrastructure was unclear.

Ms. Birch said the next slide showed four slices of the broader \$1.5 trillion. She noted that this was not part of the \$350 billion that the County's funding comes from. She said this was just a portion of the \$1.5 trillion. She said the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA), International City/County Management Association, National Association for Counties, and US Conference of Mayors all have their own way of slicing this \$1.9 trillion. She said for Albemarle County's purposes, staff is using GFOA's data because it is always easier for finance professionals to see how others are doing across the country as they look at accounting.

Ms. Birch pointed out to the Board that these were areas where they have some time, and they do not have to spend the money in six to nine months as CARES CRF was originally intended. She said they have a moment to start looking at how the funding outside of what they are going to receive for state and local aid will trickle down into the community.

Ms. Birch said part of what she mentioned earlier was about schools. She said staff has been in contact with Schools, and they do not yet know how much they plan to receive in direct aid for items such as school reopening, summer after-school and extended learning programming, and technology support for remote learning. She said that from a magnitude perspective, it is a bigger pot of money than what CARES had been. She said Schools had received about \$8.9 million, and while they do not know at this point how much they are going to get, a safe bet is that it will probably be somewhere around this amount.

Ms. Birch said Schools are a community partner staff is looking at to see what and how the funding is coming to them, and how local government staff can help prepare the Board where the local government funds can either leverage for greater outcomes, or perhaps they can redirect those funds to something else if they think it is being handled by another pot of money.

Ms. Birch said the middle of the slide showed support of lower-income residents, noting that there is a lot of money for water, energy, rental, mortgage, and utility assistance. She said this is something where staff will be looking to see what area of government that money is funneling through, how they access it, and how they get residents to be able to access it. She said this will be part of the dialogue and staff's understanding as they look at programming that will be recommended for the framework.

Ms. Birch said the last area spoke to a few things she wanted to call out that were at front and center. She said the County heard from the transit agencies last week that they are receiving about \$5.3 million directly as part of the urban transit funding. She said FEMA received more funding for vaccination efforts, and the County is currently coordinating its efforts for the new clinic that was just opened at the JCPenney lot. She said this is something staff will be looking at to make sure that they are complying with all the rules and regulations related to that, which would not be part of the funding they get and would be separate.

Ms. Birch said they are also looking at small business loans, grants, and economic development, as there is considerable funding there. She said Mr. Roger Johnson in the Economic Development Office will be looking at that as they think about programming in terms of how they can better leverage County funding or perhaps pivot and do something differently because they think it is going to be handled from another category.

Ms. Birch said she would go through the process, then pause for the Board to be able to talk about the framework for approaching staff's work. She said the next slide spoke to the process staff is going to undertake and they want to bring back to the Board as it relates to what the funding should help support.

Ms. Birch said this has been a consistent slide that staff has shown throughout the budget process. She said the left-hand slide was the Board's strategic plan, and these were priority projects identified by the Board. She said on the right-hand slide was a triangle, which speaks to the transitional period where the economy has not yet stabilized and where revenues are not back to where they should be.

Ms. Birch said they must transition the government to be able to address the needs of the community in the future, and they must be nimble. She said the triangle speaks to how they can use the one-time funding, prior to ARP, to be able to advance some things that they want to make sure that they are ahead of by the time that they are fully stabilized. She said both sides of the slide were reflected in staff's framework they are bringing to the Board about how they should look at the ARP funding.

Ms. Birch said the next slide was one the Board had seen a few times. She said this was the criteria staff used for the FY 22 Capital Budget. She said they had paused the five-year capital plan for a number of reasons, and much of this was because they are in a transition into a new reality and at the time, they were unsure about what service delivery demands the community would have on the County and how this might change some of the strategic priorities of the Board.

Ms. Birch said in terms of affordability and taxpayer considerations, over a year ago pre-pandemic, they had been thinking about potentially adding real estate tax rates to support some capital plans. She said this was pulled back due to those considerations.

Ms. Birch said the last two boxes on the slide spoke to the guts of the organization. She said they have to resource appropriately in order to execute on the things that the Board and community expect of staff. She said they must be able to execute that while also making sure that when they are approving and considering capital projects, they have an operational lens as to whether or not they can afford to pay for something once it is built and the bill is due. She said she wanted to include this on the slide as it speaks volumes to their thinking about the ARP funding.

Ms. Birch said as staff was preparing for this presentation, the last two slides together helped to educate and inform about the considerations for ARP that the Board would see on the next slide.

Ms. Birch said the next slide was Part A of the framework that staff wanted to put in front of the Board. She said the first consideration is that the County is in a different place, and they have learned a lot from CARES CRF funding. She said they also learned a lot about their ability to execute. She said they were able to execute the \$19 million effectively, but it was not without some heavy lift and some other priorities not getting done, which staff spoke to when they gave an update on the strategic plan a few months ago that Ms. Kristy Shifflett had provided to the Board.

Ms. Birch said staff wants to look at other community partners and figure out how the money is coming through and what funding is out there being used to drive some economic stability. She said staff will be looking at this as they learn more and bringing it back to the Board as they make decisions on how they should spend ARP money and what funding is coming into the community.

Ms. Birch said the second consideration was looking at the strategic priorities already identified, approved projects, and those projects not yet approved but where they are in an outyear of thinking, and they could perhaps bring forward. She said she wanted to caution two things, however. She said they do still have challenges with respect to being able to execute. She said the County has \$180 million of projects that are currently in motion, and so as they look at the ARP funding, they also need to be mindful and figure out what is the appropriate level of resources they might need to add, even temporarily, to be able to execute. She said they need to make sure they get these off the ground in various areas of County Government, including their ability to execute on grant funding.

Ms. Birch added that staff is also starting to get some initial feedback from those in County departments that do construction, most notably Facilities and Environmental Services and their Construction Division. She said anyone who has done a home renovation project knows that costs are coming in quite high, and this is something that as they move forward, and along with the projects the Board has already approved in the capital plan, the question is if there are projects that are perhaps now in jeopardy because they did not have the right budget at the time that it was envisioned. She said they have gone out for bid and are now coming in over budget. She said it was not to say that they cannot do it, but it is a consideration staff will be looking at as they look at how all of this falls into place.

Ms. Birch said the last three considerations include that the plan is to focus on one tranche of money at a time. She said the Board would see on the next few slides that they are really only looking at the framework for the first \$10 million. She said this is the only thing they know of at the moment that might be coming in the near future as they plan for FY 22. She said in addition, a year from now is that the reality might be a little different. She said they will be in a different place in a year and will have learned new things about the community needs and what they might want to advance. She said if they focus on one tranche at a time, it allows them to organize around the need at the time, the need right now, and what they might need to do to help them in the future.

Ms. Birch said the last two considerations were about the County have a triple-A rating three times over for a reason. She said this is because the County does things well, and they want to make sure that they comply with the federal guidelines because if they don't, this becomes a General Fund expense, and throughout the entire FY 22 budget development process, staff has been talking to the Board about some of the challenges to their revenue in the General Fund on the local government side not growing proportionately to be able to absorb the increased needs in the community.

Ms. Birch said if she and her team do not get this right, it will continue to put stress and pressure on the General Fund, which they do not want to do if they do not have to if they are mindful of the compliance regulations.

Ms. Birch said the last consideration was to be mindful of future operating costs. She said staff continues to look at this, and the General Fund has to rebound in order to be able to absorb some operational costs that they have coming down the pike, particularly based on some priorities that the Board has already approved. She said if they do not rebound, or if the economy does not get back to a place that can support that, they will have to look at some different things in the future.

Ms. Birch said the slide mentioned aligning staff resources accordingly. She said they talk a lot about capacity, and it is not necessarily that they cannot do it, but they may need to make different decisions about how they do it. She said having some term contract employees and perhaps looking at the 18 frozen positions are things they can do to get the resources in order to execute on the priorities of the Board.

Ms. Birch said the last slide before the discussion period was about the recommended framework. She noted that this was a very general framework, and it is so general that staff has not even programmed in the full amount of money that they are going to get because they did not know if it would be \$21.2 million, \$21.4 million, or a different number. She said this was a proportional look at a general framework they can use to help staff develop some programming and bring it back to the Board in terms of how they can potentially use this funding.

Ms. Birch said this was the thought process. She said the left-hand side of the slide looked at the County's economic vitality in an aggregate big picture. She said she used the term "economic vitality" very broadly. She said there were two aspects to that, and much of this was consistent with the funding that was provided through CARES CRF so that they can determine what they need to continue doing and what they need to change, as they are in a different place now than they were a year ago. She said the community is in a different place and may have different needs.

Ms. Birch said this puts about \$2 million in efforts related to Human Services, and \$2 million in efforts related to economic activity and business support. She said the County Executive's Office and her team have been working with the partners in this area, which include Ms. Siri Russell and Ms. Phyllis Savides, who are both on the Human Services side, are connected to the needs of the community, and were both involved in the CARES CRF funding. She said Mr. Roger Johnson and his team are partners for business support and economic activity. She said this would be the area funding that would come in from the federal government through the state to the County, and then would pass into the community. She said \$4 million, \$2 million to each area, is what staff would recommend they give back into the community in this first tranche of money.

Ms. Birch said the next two categories are broader and where there could be some flexibility depending on how rigid or broad the guidelines are. She said there is some movement here and things they can do to help support some of the items the Board would see on the next few slides, after the break.

Ms. Birch said the Board made a great decision two weeks ago to hit pause on the \$3 million commitment to broadband, not because they did not want to advance it as a priority, but because they wanted to wait and see what would happen. She said as she shared to Board members, her confidence level in the County's ability to use ARP funding for broadband is extremely high because they look at any of the documentation around broadband, it is a thread that goes through that act. She said there is a lot of funding that will come from various buckets at it relates to broadband.

Ms. Birch said it would be her recommendation that they use about \$3 million, which was the commitment of the Board, out of the ARP funding in this first tranche, which allows the Board to restore about \$2 million back into the pandemic reserve. She said this was the reserve they created from CARES CRF funding when they supplanted the Public Safety salaries that were allowed to be supplanted in FY 21.

Ms. Birch said the recommendation would be to hold this back in the pandemic reserve for the time being for two reasons. She said one is that the pandemic is still going on, and they have almost depleted the entire fund because they are holding resources back to be able to pay the bills from the vaccination clinic until they are able to be reimbursed by the federal government through FEMA. She said it is really a timing issue, but they want to protect the General Fund because the General Fund needs to pay for all the other things that they need to do.

Ms. Birch said her request and recommendation to the Board was to keep this for the moment until they can get over the last vaccination hurdle, get their reimbursement from the federal government, assuming they comply with all the reporting requirements for that funding, then come back to the Board with what is left over, which can go back into the Strategic Priorities Reserve to advance some things that they would see on the next slides after the break.

Ms. Birch said the last part of this would be to restore the \$1 million back to the Strategic Priorities Reserve. She said there were two pots of money they wanted to use to help fund the broadband priority, and so using the \$3 million of ARP funding would allow those two things to happen, where they can give \$1 million back to the Board's Strategic Priorities Reserve, which would bring this back to \$2.1 million. She said the Board currently has \$1.1 million remaining in that reserve.

Ms. Birch said the last bucket on the slide was about \$3 million or so that they would take from the revenue offset, or quite possibly some workforce stabilization, or a mixture of both, depending on how the regulations move forward and what the need is of the government as they look at this funding. She

said regardless of the workforce stabilization, staff thinks they are at about \$5.7 million or \$6 million, depending on how one slices their revenue loss in the General Fund. She said this is an area where they have been conservative because they do not know how to calculate that. She said if they take \$3 million, then the Board would have an opportunity to direct that to some projects they have identified as priorities.

Ms. Birch said she would take a moment to allow the Board to discuss their thoughts on the framework so that staff can develop staffing resources to tackle these things consistent with what the Board deems as a priority.

Ms. McKeel said she appreciated the way the framework was broken down. She said she liked the idea of focusing on the first look at the \$10 million, then coming back later, as she believed this was what Ms. Birch was saying about the other \$10 million.

Ms. Birch said yes.

Ms. McKeel said this is a very good idea because over the next year, things can really change. She said they have all seen how quickly things can change in just a year, and so she appreciated this.

Ms. McKeel asked Ms. Birch about the \$3 million amount on the last slide. She said she understood the revenue offset piece Ms. Birch described, but she needed explanation on what Ms. Birch meant by workforce stabilization.

Ms. Birch replied that one of the areas they may want to look at is more quickly unfreezing the 18 frozen positions. She said as discussed in FY 22 development, they would have to look at the revenue picture and see how it is improving in order for the County to unfreeze those positions. She said one area the Board may want to move on is directing some resources to be unfrozen as they need those positions as they need to do the things that are priorities. She said this is just one example.

Ms. Birch said another thing is that there is a lot of momentum out there for the 5% increase in salary. She said much of it is being driven by the Comp Board, the state, and teachers. She said there may be something the Board wants to advance because they are currently doing 2%, but the Board could say they need to move on a different percentage for the workforce. She added that one of the allowable uses of the funding is premium pay for emergency personnel, and this could be something the County needs to do as part of stabilizing its workforce.

Ms. Birch said there are some options, depending on where they are and how the guidance comes down from the federal government in terms of how restrictive or broad they are, in order to move some items the County could not otherwise afford when they developed the FY 22 budget. She said she hoped this was helpful.

Ms. McKeel said it was, but it made her question things, as she supposed she was viewing this incorrectly. She said she was thinking about the \$10 million and in her mind, she thinks of it as one-time money. She said when there is talk about compensation and unfreezing positions, one-time money is not going to get them there because she is not interested in unfreezing positions, hiring someone for a year, and then determining that the position needs to be frozen again. She said those positions and money are ongoing, and they are not one-time. She said her inference is that one-time money should not be used for salary increases or positions unless there is an understanding that they are temporary positions.

Ms. Birch said there were a couple of ways to look at this. She said she was very appreciative of the Board's keen awareness of ongoing versus one-time funding, particularly as it relates to salaries. She said there are a couple of nuances for the Board to consider, however. She said the first is that they absolutely could have term employment so if there is something they need to get done, they can decide that the term will expire in three years. She said this grant actually gives the County more runway in order to have people on for three years to get this funding out the door. She said this is one area where it is not just six months, but a decent resume time period.

Ms. Birch said the second thing is that if something is a Board priority, this money could advance things that they could not do otherwise. She said if there are things that are impacting their ability to retain talent, much like the FEMA SAFER grant, they know in year three that they will have a large bill on that. She said she sees this funding as an opportunity, if it is a priority, to be able to do that. She said they would be saying they need the resources now and they understand that in three years, they will have to build it into the financial plan. She said as part of their financial planning, they would be able to figure out how they do this and build it in so that in year three, they are not surprised by the funding required for that effort.

Ms. Birch said there are ways they can use the money strategically, though she agreed with Ms. McKeel that it is sometimes a hard thing to wrap one's mind around when it appears that they might be speaking out of both sides of their mouth. She said she did not see it that way, and it would have to be part of a priority. She said the five-year financial plan was halted last fall because if they did one, they

would not know how to capture future revenues because they did not understand where the revenue picture was going.

Ms. Birch said she would recommend that before entertaining anything around ongoing costs from this money, staff would show the Board the impact in the five-year financial plan so the Board could see what a decision made today would do in year three or year four, when the grant funding runs out, and how the economy would need to grow in order to be able to afford what they added to the base of their budget.

Ms. Birch said there are ways to do this, and she would recommend doing this strategically and specifically rather than implementing general raises. She said some other governments were doing that, but she would not recommend it. She said the funding should be used very strategically in certain areas.

Ms. McKeel said she had another clarifying question. She said what she heard Ms. Birch describe is the hiring of personnel to complete a study, help the County with its out-of-date ordinances, and the things they need to do to move the community and the work forward but have a sunset aspect to them.

Ms. Birch said yes.

Ms. McKeel said her final question was about looking at Human Services in that same bucket, but perhaps this was not right.

Ms. Birch said this would include the Community Lift program. She said they had done a lot with food and rent subsidies, and this is what OEI and DSS are working on in terms of programming that would look at what is needed now versus what they needed a year ago when they did the Community Lift program.

Ms. McKeel said those may not be as ongoing and may run over two to three years.

Ms. Birch said yes.

Ms. Mallek asked if any of the ARP money going to Schools is assigned to capital, or it is strictly operations. She said perhaps Ms. Birch answered this and she missed it.

Ms. Birch replied that she did not know. She said she believed it may be a mix, depending on how technology is categorized. She said the intent behind it is educational resources for the loss that has happened with children's education.

Ms. Mallek said it was more about classroom expenses, then, than brick and mortar. She said there was support for low-income, and in the water and energy categories, she knew they had talked off and on about supporting hookup fees for low-income residents to get them on sewer and helping with the weatherization of their homes. She said these were things that could fall under that category.

Ms. Mallek said she agreed tremendously that she was very worried about raises. She said if Ms. Birch had recommended across-the-board raises, she would have pushed back on this because this is going to be paid for by taxpayers. She said the next two years will go by in a blink and all of a sudden, they would have increased their base. She said a 1% raise two or three years ago was \$1.5 million and now, it is probably even more. She said she thinks this will be a lot.

Ms. Mallek said Ms. Birch already said that housing support was included in the Human Services category. She asked if any of the money will possibly include resources for job training. She said there are many people who have lost the jobs they had and would perhaps be interested in moving from hospitality to some other sector if they had job training. She said she did not know what would happen with the WEO programs, as they have not been told that yet by the workforce system. She said she did not know if extra federal money would be coming to that bucket or not.

Ms. Mallek said she agreed with the thought of having the strategic unfreezing of a position as opposed to unfreezing all 19. She said she did not think Ms. Birch was suggesting all 19 be frozen, but if there are a couple of that will well offset their expense by reduction in other staff time, repeated frustration, and poor operational efficiency, then this would be something she could support.

Ms. Mallek said she loved the fact that they did not have a local match currently for the FEMA grant for the firefighters. She said this is a tremendous blessing, but the shoe is going to drop on them, \$1.5 million in three years, then double that in the next three years. She said she hopes they will figure out a way to plan ahead for that increased salary cost that they already know is coming so that they are not surprised later. She said having been in the downturn side where all of a sudden, there all expenses for salary, she does not want to shrink government workforce the way so many jurisdictions did where they laid off 30% of their workforce. She said a lot of programs had to stop to make that happen.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said this was a very good presentation and update. She agreed with Ms. McKeel and Ms. Mallek. She said she now understood that the funding for schools was not for brick and mortar, but for after-school programs and extended school day because of the fact that the children have basically lost a year, and those who are teachers know how devastating that is, especially with younger children. She said anything they can do to help there, she thinks they should do.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she likes the idea of having temporary hires for perhaps one to three years to get some of the Board's priorities done regarding updating the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan. She said the sooner they can get this updated, she thinks this helps to stabilize economic development and recovery, and developers will know what to expect. She said she would be in favor of getting on the fast track with that.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley suggested they could use some of the money to pay for the SAFER grants that will run out in a few years. She said this would also be a good way to offset costs for a couple of years, then have time to work everything into the economic forecast, which they should know more about by 2023.

Ms. Palmer said the Board has talked before about paying salaries out of the capital fund for some of the more project management type of positions. She said she doubted that this made this situation any more fungible, and they would still only be able to pay them out of the capital fund for two years. She asked if this assumption was correct.

Ms. Birch replied yes. She said if Ms. Palmer meant adding employees to get the projects off the ground that are capital in nature, it would have to stay with the capital project. She said she believed it had to be fully appropriated and expended by December 31, 2024.

Ms. Palmer said she is concerned that the prices of construction are going up quickly and that all the other local governments in the region and in Virginia are getting this money. She said the inflationary pressures on the cost of construction are going to go nowhere but up over the next two years. She said she is sure that staff has thought about this, but her first feeling is that they probably should jump on whatever construction things they can do and nail this down as fast as possible.

Ms. Palmer said in the budget, the County Executive recommended the premium pay for last year for all of the employees. She asked how fungible this is, since this has already been written in the budget. She asked if they could use this essential workers premium pay money to cover any of that, or if it was a done deal.

Ms. Birch asked Ms. Palmer which money she meant.

Ms. Palmer clarified that she was speaking about the \$1,000.

Ms. Birch replied that the plan was to appropriate this as the April 7 Board meeting to be in employees' paychecks by the end of April. She said she therefore did not know if the timing would work out in order to use this funding.

Ms. Palmer said the economic vitality category was very broad, but what Ms. Birch was saying was that they really do not know all of the specifics of that. She asked Ms. Birch if she could elaborate at all on what this meant.

Ms. Birch replied that all the framework is suggesting is an endorsement by the Board to ask for \$2 million each for Human Services and economic activity for a total of \$4 million. She said this would be for things they can do in these categories to help provide direct funding to the community. She said this is teeing up for the employees who would be responsible for this programming. She said she knew they were working towards them, and she was not sure if Mr. Richardson wanted to speak to that in more detail.

Mr. Richardson said at this point, as Ms. Birch stated, Ms. Savides and Ms. Russell are aware of this framework, and they know that staff would like to see analyses on what has gone well in the past year on the Human Services side, what has changed, and what recommendations they would make going forward. He said there certainly has been no commitment of ongoing funding beyond what they have with CARES, but they would like to do that analysis in order to be able to come back to the Board and say specifically that if they are supportive of the economic vitality box with a placeholder amount of \$4 million, staff will come back with some refined thoughts about where they have been, what they think has changed, and what is the same. He said this is all tied to need, moving forward.

Mr. Richardson said the same was true for Economic Development, and staff has had initial discussions with Mr. Johnson and his team to suggest that as they transition to 2021 with another pot of money, they think about what is just like it was a year ago and what has changed. He said if the Board is inclined to fund additional support in this area, the question is what this would look like. He said the commitment at present with the economic vitality category is that staff would come back to the Board if

they were to endorse the concept and want to hear more about this key area. He said he would not say that this would happen in the next 30 days as staff needs to land the money and learn more about what the requirements are.

Mr. Richardson said a simple endorsement was needed that day because as Ms. Palmer correctly stated, this is very broad right now, and they are in the early stages of thinking about the programs they have done and how they would connect moving forward.

Ms. Palmer said in terms of the Lift program and what they did with the same criteria, she feels like things are coming roaring back from talking to business owners, and perhaps this was due to the people she was talking to. She said she was wondering about the need for that much money. She said she has no doubt that there are businesses out there that would need the money, but she was thinking of the quantity. She said if they were to say \$4 million today, this did not necessarily mean they had to use \$4 million for those things. She said she had no doubt they would be able to find the use for it in Human Services, but she simply did not know the parameters.

Ms. Palmer said this was her concern and while she was not against it, she was questioning the need for that much.

Ms. Palmer said her biggest question had been, "What does economic vitality mean?" and this could even mean capital projects in parks, to her. She said there have been a lot of emails about opening up soccer fields at Biscuit Run and how this could be a great economic driver for tourism. She asked if this was economic vitality and if Mr. Richardson had any comment about it.

Mr. Richardson agreed that it was broad. He said three weeks in from the President signing the act, and this being the Board's first public discussion about this, this was staff sticking their toe in the water with what they had in the past year, like Ms. Palmer said. He said the first thing was defining it more clearly based on staff feedback, and then determining what is allowable within the context of the regulations.

Ms. Palmer urged staff to consider economic activity with this.

Ms. Birch added that the way the legislation was worded, it was speaking to those who had been impacted by COVID-19. She said some of the broader, prospective economic development items would have to fall into an infrastructure category or revenue offset category, based on her current reading of the legislation. She said it is a consideration, and staff will look at this as the regulations come in, but the way she reads the first category of economic vitality is businesses and community members that have been impacted directly by COVID-19, which may preclude infrastructure, parks, and economic development investment from that category. She said it does not say, however, that they could not figure out how to fund it from another category.

Ms. Palmer said to state the obvious, parks are preventative health. She said Ms. Birch said they were just doing \$3 million currently for the revenue offset, but the estimates are somewhere in the \$6 million for revenue offset. She asked if she had heard this correctly.

Ms. Birch said this was correct.

Ms. Palmer asked why, then, they were only thinking \$3 million if there was \$6 million, as Ms. Birch was talking about the other money that would be coming to the County specifically for revenue offset.

Ms. Birch said this was for two reasons. She said she did not know and had no comfort until they have the calculation for how to determine revenue offset. She said she has been following other finance directors across Virginia and the country, and this is not defined. She said currently, she is thinking about \$3 million in one tranche. She said as they learn more, this could grow, and they could determine it to be \$10 million based on the way it is calculated. She said in that case, they would use \$10 million of the \$20 million in revenue offset, which provides the flexibility for the Board to do other things. She said this was just a placeholder where staff is comfortable at looking at this first tranche at about \$3 million.

Ms. Palmer expressed that perhaps she was incorrect in her thought that the additional money over and above the \$21 million they would get is specifically for revenue offset.

Ms. Birch replied no. She said it is part of the \$21 million.

Ms. Palmer asked if the other money in addition to the \$21 million, then, was just what they had in the bucket for broadband, water, and sewer.

Ms. Birch replied that the confusing part is the capital investment piece of this and if it has to be part of the \$21 million, or if there is another bucket out there that the states could pass down through the

\$10 billion they are receiving in direct capital investments. She said this is the one that is currently confusing.

Ms. Palmer said for some reason, she had in her mind that there was an additional bucket for revenue offset in addition to the \$21 million.

Ms. Birch replied no.

Ms. Palmer asked if colleges are getting money directly to them, along with K-12 schools.

Ms. Birch replied that CARES CRF funding was done this way, so this was her understanding, though she did not know specifically. She said colleges would be a community partner staff would look to in order to see what funding they are getting.

Ms. Palmer said PVCC's Workforce Development, for instance, would get some money.

Ms. Birch said they potentially would.

Ms. Palmer said that as far as the general outline, she had no problem with them going forward with that, knowing that they want to do everything they possibly can, which she knows staff is doing, to stay as flexible as they can as they go forward.

Mr. Gallaway said he was in general agreement with the overall framework. He said he thinks it is very important as constituents and advocacy groups start to weigh in on how this money goes, they be clear on what the money cannot be used for. He noted that he was not suggesting Ms. Birch was being unclear about it. He expressed that moving forward, making sure they explain these categories and how they go forward will be very helpful to make sure that people know what they cannot use the money on and why.

Mr. Gallaway said he could not recall which Supervisor mentioned it, but there was a comment earlier that housing support was in the DSS segment. He asked Ms. Birch if she could speak specifically to what that entails.

Ms. Birch asked Mr. Gallaway if he was referring to mortgage and rent relief.

Mr. Gallaway replied yes and asked Ms. Birch to remind him where this would plug in.

Ms. Birch replied that Health and Human Services is getting some of the money for low-income water and energy assistance. She said she was not quite sure at that moment where the rental, mortgage, and utility assistance would come from, though she assumed it would be HUD. She said staff will follow up on this as they learn more. She said she was not sure where this was coming into the County. She said at the time staff prepared for this conversation, the Director of Social Services was not aware of where the money would be coming from and be filtered down to the County. She said staff will keep the Board apprised of this once they find out where it is coming from and how it will get to the community members who might need it.

Mr. Gallaway said a general comment was that earlier, during Ms. McKeel's questions and comments about the one-time money and future positions, if it goes to something to fund now that ends up being a regular ongoing cost later, then they have to make sure they are positions that should be ongoing positions. He said he knew Ms. Birch spoke to term employment, but he would use the current situation with Fire as an example, where they get the grant, which is good for three years, and they know that by the time the grant is up, they have to pick up the cost of the Fire personnel. He said they know for sure, though, that those Fire personnel are needed and are bringing them on board, which is almost a phase-in for those positions.

Mr. Gallaway said when they scrutinize the need of those positions, there is a lot of analysis and research, and the Supervisors weigh in with the support. He said if a position comes forward in something like this where he agrees they should be thinking of it as one-time money, it cannot just be about getting what they can out of this position for the next year. He said if it is a position they are bringing on and ongoing, then they think of it in the same terms as they did with the Fire positions, even though the grant money is going to pay for the initial few years.

Ms. Price said there were a couple of questions in the chat that she would ask first before making her comments. She said the first question was about Slide 16, with the three buckets that are shown at approximately \$4 million, \$3 million, and \$3 million. She asked if the Board by a vote that day agrees that this is the general outline, they would be able to modify or change the amounts in each of those buckets once they have more details on the regulations.

Ms. Birch replied yes.

Ms. Price asked in terms of a timeline on when the Board could make changes, if this would essentially be all the way up through December 31, 2024. She said she was not suggesting making changes at the last minute, but that throughout the entire time period that this money is available, they could make changes as long as they have not already made an obligation.

Ms. Birch replied yes. She said what will probably happen structurally is that the County will not program any additional funding into FY 25. She said December 31, 2024, is the deadline, so she would not foresee the County programming new funding or making changes because they would need to already know what they were doing to make sure they expend those funds by the deadline.

Ms. Price said this was excellent, along with the foresight put into all these things. She said she had more of a comment, but when she phrases it, she wanted it to be understood as a question as well so that if she says something that is not correct, Ms. Birch can make the correction. She said as she saw it, what they saw up until this point, pre-break, was more generalities. She said as she looks at the outline for the post-break, that is when they are going to go into more specifics. She said at this point, after they finish their questions, she would ask whether the Board needs to take a vote or get consensus on if the Board agrees with this before taking the break.

Ms. Price said using the language of some of the other Supervisors, in their mind, they must look at this as a one-time payment, albeit being provided over two tranches, one coming up soon and one about a year from now. She said therefore, they should be looking at this as one-time expenses, albeit being paid out over a couple of years of time period.

Ms. Price said with that, she sees that what Ms. Birch has explained to the Board are the uncertainties that remain until the issuance of the regulations. She said then, there are the complexities of the post-receipt and expenditure reality, because this is essentially one-time money coming to them over a couple of years, so they must remain cautious on everything that they do about this money because as Ms. Birch and the other Supervisors have reiterated, they have to be very cautious not to expend themselves, using this money, into a financially perilous position with ongoing expenses once this money is gone.

Ms. Birch said yes, adding that what staff will have to do as they look at projects post-break is to ensure that they can get the project done by the time that the December 31, 2024, deadline comes. She said capital projects tend to last for several years, and where they are all concerned is that as she mentioned, there is \$180 million in capital projects right now in the books, and they have to think through and understand the prioritization with them to make sure that they do get the funding spent in time for projects they have identified will be funded from this source.

Ms. Price mentioned funding, administrative capabilities of staff, and the ongoing operational expenses. She asked the Supervisors if they had any additional questions.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she knew that the money was going until December 31, 2024, but she was more concerned about the first \$10 million, which Ms. Birch seemed to be much more focused on. She said she knew this went until 2024, but she wondered if Ms. Birch was looking for that money to be spent first in any given timeline.

Ms. Birch replied no, not particularly. She said they would develop this as they develop the projects that will be funded from this when they get the clarification for the guidance. She said this will all make much more sense once they get through the next section of the discussion.

Ms. Palmer said her question was along those same lines. She asked if they were sure at that point that the second tranche was 2024 that they were actually getting in 2022, or if the guidance was really focused on the first tranche.

Ms. Birch replied no. She said it was focused on the total amount and that it would be delivered over two tranches to be expended by December 31, 2024. She said this was clear.

Ms. Palmer asked if this was clear on the federal level.

Ms. Birch replied yes.

Ms. Price asked Mr. Richardson and Mr. Kamptner if a vote or consensus was needed, or if they were ready to go to the break.

Ms. Mallek said Ms. Birch's comment just gave her a question, which was if signing a contract for a project means it is therefore underway, or did it absolutely have to be finished, paved, seeded, grass growing, and done.

Ms. Birch replied that it is usually on the invoices, so when they pay the invoice, it is part of the grant closeout that they would provide to the federal government saying they spent the funds and are out the door.

Ms. Palmer said they then need to think about projects that can get done quickly.

Ms. Mallek said it was those projects that are shovel-ready and ready to go, or they could figure out a way to replace other dollars for two years from now with something now.

Ms. Birch said hopefully, the next section of the work session would not confuse everyone because it is a puzzle. She told Ms. Price it would be great if the Board could endorse the general framework. She said it was not an approval, but just an endorsement that sets forward in motion what staff needs to prepare to bring back to the Board for consideration.

Ms. Price said she would entertain a motion of an expression of support for the proposal up to this point.

Ms. Mallek **moved** to support the ARP proposal as presented. Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, and Ms. Price.

NAYS: None.

---

Non-Agenda Item. **Recess.** The Board recessed its meeting at 4:23 p.m. and reconvened at 4:33 p.m.

---

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** Federal American Rescue Plan Funding (continued).

Ms. Birch said the next part of the work session was to go through the priority projects that each Board member identified. She said Mr. Richardson spent time with each Supervisor about two weeks ago, and it was the week after the ARP legislation was approved. She said at the time, it was important for staff to get ideas from the Board about what each Board member was thinking in terms of priority projects they would want to advance in the event that infrastructure investment was more widely applied in the guidance that they still do not have.

Ms. Birch said what was shown on the slide was the result of this effort. She said since then, each Board member has had an opportunity to review the entire list shown. She said this was something each Board member contributed to and now has seen in its totality.

Ms. Birch said over the next few slides, she would be walking through a lot of information, but she tried to identify funding sources that they could use to support the advancement of some of these priority projects, knowing that they still do not have ARP guidance to help them with what that funding can specifically support on the capital investment side, but also recognizing that a few of these projects have some critical timing issues that they want the Board to be able to make a decision on whether or not they would like to advance that using other areas of funding.

Ms. Birch said she would go through three slides, and there would be opportunity at the end to talk about and clarify anything she might speak about as they go through the projects.

Ms. Birch said the next slide showed the top four projects, where staff has put into buckets when and what source of funding staff thinks they should use to support that priority. She said the first project is to move forward on a master planning exercise for a proffer site that is located on Berkmar, which would include in it, among other things, a Northern Convenience Center which, in addition to the Southern Convenience Center, the Board has identified as a priority. She said what staff is recommending is to move forward in July of 2021 with appropriating the Strategic Priority Reserve to support that effort.

Ms. Birch said a sister project is the Lambs Lane site, which is located near Albemarle High School. She said they would move forward with a master plan and site plan for that, including an environmental study. She said there is a component of this that is likely to reflect in some school capacity related investments, eventually, which is one of the strategic priorities of the Board.

Ms. Birch said staff recommends that these two projects work in tandem. She said there have been some conversations with the leadership of the School Division on this. She said the County would work to have the Board's Strategic Priority Reserve funding support the master plan work at Berkmar, while the Lambs Lane site plan would be supported by Schools funding, and they would work through their appropriation process. She said both would come before the Board of Supervisors in July for appropriation.

Ms. Birch said the third project was the Rio Road Corridor Plan Study, which would expand the study to the East Rio area that was not part of the original plan. She said staff is recommending to move forward, as the study is underway, and to move on quickly in the event that the Board wants to extend it to the East Rio area. She said staff would recommend bringing it to the Board in May, as it is one of the earlier projects staff would recommend, given the timeline of the planning study, and Strategic Priority Reserves would be used for this. She said as an estimate, this is about \$100,000 that would come from the Strategic Priority Reserves, and a better figure would happen at the time of appropriation.

Ms. Birch said staff is working through some final estimates, but both the master plans and site plans for Berkmar and Lambs Lane were estimated at about \$350,000 in total. She said by the time July comes, it would be no more than about \$300,000 or so for the County's commitment to that project.

Ms. Birch said the last project on the screen was Broadband Infrastructure. She said as seen on an earlier slide, this creates some movement and shifting of funding. She said if the Board goes forward and plan to appropriate that funding, assuming that the guidance and criteria suggests they can do that, and they get the funding in their coffers at the time they are supposed to get it, staff would plan to bring it back in July for appropriation using the local ARP funding.

Ms. Birch said she would continue to go through all the projects so that the Board could see how this was shaped before opening it up to questions. She said she would not be going through the next projects in great detail, but she was happy to answer any questions in addition to the County Executive's Office.

Ms. Birch said the next slide showed the other projects that were identified, and there was nothing here at the moment planned out of the Strategic Priority Reserve, nor was there anything definitive out of the first tranche of the ARP funding. She said depending on how the guidance comes out, the reason why there was a check box in almost all of the projects identified, including Parks and Recreation and others, is because staff would want to take it through an ARP lens to see if there is any funding from the local ARP, or if there is any other funding for ARP, for instance water/sewer connections.

Ms. Birch said staff would be looking at whether there is ARP related funding that is part of the bigger \$1.5 trillion that does not come through state and local that could be eligible for that, or even at the \$10 billion for capital projects that was identified that the state will be receiving.

Ms. Birch said if the County could not pay for those programs from their ARP or from another ARP, staff would look at other options for consideration. She said the right-hand side of the slide showed options such as CIP. She said staff will be working on the CIP in the summer to present to the Board for FY 23 and the five-year CIP, so perhaps those projects would be included as part of some General Fund funding related to that.

Ms. Birch said there was a project listed for Western Park, and she would be showing a timeline and next steps for this on a later slide. She said Western Park will be coming to the Board as an initial appropriation to use the proffer funding for some initial improvements for that park. She said it was only proffer funding at that point, but it would be coming on May 5 for the Board's consideration.

Ms. Birch said this was the general approach, looking at ARP and what they can and cannot do, then figuring out how to work this into the CIP process or into other funding sources that could support. She said this was the plan staff was recommending to the Board.

Ms. Birch said the last slide of projects came out of the conversations and work sessions, specifically related to FY 22, which was why the column headers looked different. She said staff is relating this to the FY 22 operating budget. She said there are four buckets there, and the projects staff heard about, which Ms. McKeel spoke a bit to earlier, was the legal support for ordinance review, speaking to the zoning side and what could be done if they dedicated some funding to a resource to help move through that.

Ms. Birch said the next item was stream health staffing related to the Water Protection Ordinance (WPO). She said a discussion with the Board will be brought forward on April 21, led by CDD, related to a Phase 1a. She said this discussion would be a good opportunity for the Board to consider if there are other additional resources it may want to fund in FY 22 to support promoting this Stream Health Initiative and the Water Protection Ordinance in a different fashion. She said there would be an opportunity on April 21 to have a further conversation with the Board at a policy level related to that effort.

Ms. Birch said neither of these two projects were being recommended at this time to be put into the FY 22 budget, but she was happy to answer any questions about them.

Ms. Birch said with regard to the next two projects, staff has heard through Board discussions is if there is any support the Board would like to provide to CACVB. She said staff believes there is a way to fund this using the County's local share of the ARP funding, but there are also possible other ARP

funding out there that could potentially be used to support this as they learn about the other buckets of money outside of the state and local ARP funding.

Ms. Birch said the last item was the \$15 per hour wage for JAUNT drivers. She said staff would like to continue to work with their partners at JAUNT at this. She said they were not able to reconnect with JAUNT last week, when this question came up with Board members in conversations, but staff plans to do this so they can work through and determine if with the ARP funding JAUNT plans to receive for urban transit needs, they are able to support a \$15 per hour wage for their drivers and what, if anything, should the Board of Supervisors use from the County's local contributions to help support that.

Ms. Birch said this, in general, was staff's approach to what they were thinking they have heard from the Board. She said they also want to make sure they have heard and written down everything that the Board has said they want staff to pursue as either part of the ARP funding or the FY 22 budget in general. She said they believe they have captured it, but they were not sure, so this was another opportunity for the Board to share their thoughts if staff has missed something so that they can come back from a staff perspective and provide a funding recommendation for how they might support that initiative if the Board, as a whole, wants to advance it.

Ms. Birch said she went through this information quickly, but this was the idea for how they can move forward on these projects. She said she could go back to anything the Board would like to, and she paused for the Board to have their round robin discussion on this.

Ms. McKeel asked Ms. Birch if this was the Board's opportunity to go back through the list and make remarks.

Ms. Birch replied yes.

Ms. McKeel asked Ms. Birch if she could go back to the first slide with the first list of projects. She said she has been talking about the Berkmar proffer and the Lambs Lane site now for several years, but she wanted to make sure the way this was listed was that the intent is to have Schools and County Government site plans working together, even though they are different plans. She said this is what would be critical.

Ms. Birch replied yes. She said intention is that they work together in tandem.

Ms. McKeel said it will definitely help school capacity, depending on what happens. She said she was a little nervous when she saw that the only thing identified was the Northern Convenience Center because she thought the last thing she wanted to support was just throwing a convenience center in when they do not have a site plan, and they do not know exactly where it should even go. She said she is in favor of a Northern Convenience Center, and she thinks they need one since this is the County's population center, but she thinks it is important to do the work and have a plan first so that they know how best to use the property. She said she believed this was what she was seeing on the slide.

Ms. Birch replied yes. She said staff did want to include the convenience center specifically because from her understanding, which Mr. Richardson could speak to more clearly, there were several Board members that did speak to the Northern Convenience Center specifically, and so staff wanted to say that this would be part of that, but it is not just for that.

Ms. McKeel said it was she who first put it on the table, and she is supportive of the Northern Convenience Center, but she does not want someone to look at this and think it is all the County is doing there, or that this is limiting. She said they could put the County Police Department's storage facility up there as well, along with buses. She said there are lots of things that could go there, and she wants to make sure that they work together.

Ms. McKeel said she is very supportive of the Rio Road Corridor Plan Study and the Broadband Infrastructure. She asked Ms. Birch to move on to the next slide. She said she wanted to ask about the Older Neighborhood Infrastructure (sidewalks) project. She said this would require more detail about where those sidewalks might go, how much money it would be, and what they could actually do.

Ms. Birch agreed.

Ms. McKeel said what the County has been doing well is building sidewalks in new developments, but not going back and retrofitting them so much in the older neighborhoods.

Ms. McKeel said she finds the Water and Sewer Connection Grant Program for the Elderly intriguing. She said on her list was the Water and Sewer Connection Grant Program because they know that in the Urban Ring, they have 254 parcels that are not connected to public sewer. She said looking at it through the lens of the elderly is fascinating, so this is very intriguing for her.

Ms. McKeel said with respect to “transit shelters and concrete pads,” to make sure that the Board was aware, through her work with a transit art project, she realized that there was no memorandum of understanding between CAT and VDOT, which is why they have no transit shelters, and they have very few concrete pads. She said VDOT and CAT are currently working on that MOU and hopefully, it will be finished before too long.

Ms. McKeel said this was why she put “transit shelters and concrete pads” on the list, because once the MOU is done, CAT plans to purchase over the next three to four years somewhere around 60 to 80 shelters to disperse them throughout the City as well as some in the County. She said she wants to make sure that when that happens, the County has funding somewhere because she does not think there is a magisterial district in the County that could not identify some places for shelters and concrete pads to go for the citizens.

Ms. McKeel asked Ms. Birch to proceed to the next slide. She said she was obviously very supportive of money for an ordinance review, and the Stream Health Initiative was great. She said she was a little cautious, however, about the \$15 per hour wage for JAUNT drivers at that point. She said this was discussed at the last RTP meeting and Ms. Karen Davis, the current acting director, indicated that she did not have a good feel currently for what this would take. She said the partnership has a committee working separately on some wage issues around supporting all the transit drivers in the community. She said this discussion did come up at the last partnership meeting.

Ms. Price asked Mr. Richardson if he had a comment to make.

Mr. Richardson said he did want to clarify a couple of things. He said going back to the first page of projects, the reason those projects were on page 1 was that staff has identified timing considerations for the Board, and he wanted to clarify this for the Board. He said there could be timing considerations that he is not aware of with the items that were listed on page 2, but these were the items that jumped out to him after talking with staff and Board members.

Mr. Richardson said Ms. McKeel and Ms. Birch were exactly right that the Lambs Lane Site Master Plan Review will be moving forward with Schools and therefore, the timing consideration with the Berkmar proffer site is that those two studies need to run in tandem so that they can inform each other.

Mr. Richardson said Ms. Birch was exactly right that the Northern Convenience Center is something that the Board has spoken about, most recently when they talked about siting the Southern Convenience Center. He said in that same meeting, the Board said that it was now time to get moving and get a Northern Convenience Center sited. He said this being listed there showed the intention of the staff to prioritize that based on the Board’s prior direction they have given staff, and staff is showing they are being responsive to that. He said Ms. McKeel was exactly right that the developable piece of property may be somewhere between 35 and 55 acres, depending on the slopes. He said there was one planning meeting with Schools, and what they would be looking at are uses that would be compatible at that site. He said the Northern Convenience Center might be an earlier phase of looking at that, but it would be in concert with everything else they are looking at.

Mr. Richardson said there are timing considerations also with the Rio Road Corridor Plan, as Ms. Birch pointed out. He said the Board acutely pointed out that with broadband, it may be certain, and he believed Ms. Birch solidified, that broadband infrastructure is woven through the ARP language. He said staff would love to know sooner rather than later if the Board likes this strategy for the first tranche. He said these are things staff believes do have timing considerations for the Board that evening. He said staff could answer anything else about page 2.

Ms. McKeel said she was definitely supportive of the projects on the first page and thought this looked great.

Ms. Mallek said her understanding was that the \$3 million that had previously been appropriated into the Broadband bucket will be a source of supplantation so they can possibly do other things with it. She said she would ask more questions about that.

Ms. Mallek said a project being shovel-ready is an important criterion. She asked if there is also criteria if there is outside funding to put to a project. She said it seems like this should be a plus if they are getting equal dollars on another program or if they have a big amount that has already been put into a bucket from citizens. She said she hoped they would take this into consideration.

Ms. Mallek said the Berkmar project was supplanted from ARP broadband funds, and the same was true for Lambs Lane. She said her question for the future for the Rio Road Plan that when they started this, it was with the understanding that it was border to border. She asked before spending this additional money, if they were holding the consultant accountable for what they agreed to do in the first place, as it was quite clear what the County asked them to do. She said she did not have the answer to this and did not need it that day, but she would like to know, and perhaps Mr. Gallaway knew.

Mr. Doug Walker, Deputy County Executive, said he could address this. He said the quick and best answer was that the consultant was performing what he was asked to do. He said there was a change in the scope that is now being corrected to broaden the scope to now include that which was originally considered, which was going from end to end. He said he wanted to clarify for the Board that as it was scoped, the consultant was doing what was being asked.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was a shift in scope between when the Board talked about it and when it was sent out.

Mr. Walker replied this was correct.

Ms. Mallek said the Board did not know about it until now. She said they would work on this more in the future.

Mr. Walker said yes.

Ms. Mallek said she definitely supported the staff person for the WPO, but not in the general program. She said the one she brought up is for the inspector to allow the Board to then adopt the reduced threshold for soil disturbance. She said the only reason they did not adopt it the first time is because they did not have a staff person to carry it out. She said she has been mentioning quite a bit that this is what is going to prevent the ongoing disasters they have all over the County right now, or could. She said trying to refine that process to be for the 2,500-square-foot reduction was what she was talking about when she put it in.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was a health consideration in the ARP bucket, or if this was in some other place. She said in her mind, she was thinking that they could put the passive recreation and parks types of things in a health bucket, but she did not see a discussion about one, so she did not know if there was one.

Ms. Birch replied that the way she read it, it was more about being able to respond to the COVID-19 emergency, such as PPE. She said the general CARES CRF funding support they did was what she read in terms of the funding they are receiving. She said from her reading, there was not anything specifically called out for park-related funding. She said there is such indirect talk of this, however, that she would be interested and have Budget Division staff pursue that to see if there will be some grant funding opportunities to support and broaden parks and recreational facilities. She said they would look at this, but she did not know about this currently.

Ms. Mallek said this may be something they will need to chase those in Richmond and at DCR for.

Ms. Birch clarified that the Board has \$1.1 million in their Strategic Priorities Reserve, regardless of what happens with broadband. She said if they supplant and put the funding back into the Strategic Priorities Reserve and fund broadband out of ARP, it will bring them to \$2.1 million. She said she wanted to clarify that they did not necessarily need the funding if they wanted to move forward more quickly on these of that supplanting of Broadband.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley thanked Ms. Birch for her last remark, adding that this was something they should definitely do to switch the funding. She said she liked everything that was being presented on the first and second pages of projects. She said for parks and recreation, she believed Ms. Mallek was suggesting this could come under a health initiative. She then said she did not understand it correctly.

Ms. Mallek said she did not understand it correctly either, so they were both wrong.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked Ms. Birch if she could address this.

Ms. Birch replied that based on the local ARP funding, there was not, as she read it, specific use for health outcomes or initiatives. She said they could indirectly get there as part of revenue offsets and the puzzle pieces they will work through, but they will try to understand if there will be funding outside of the local funding they receive that will come through another grant opportunity. She said she did not know at that point, but staff would be looking specifically at that, given it has come up several times in the conversations, and she thinks it is important for staff to be able to know and share with the Board.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if part of the plan would be to have a study of all three of the items regarding the improvements and multiuse fields, or if this is something that had already been done by the previous Board, to an extent, that they could piggyback onto.

Ms. Birch asked Mr. Richardson if he could address this.

Mr. Richardson said he would go first, adding that Mr. Trevor Henry was also on the call and could follow in behind him. He said he believed what Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked about was the three

recreational amenities listed on the middle part of the page and about documents that would guide them, moving forward, on consideration of those projects. He asked Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley if he had understood her correctly.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley replied yes. She said if it is something they need to plan for from square one, they need to move faster. She said if it is something they already have documentation on, then they would have more time. She said obviously, these things would not happen overnight.

Mr. Richardson said he would start at the bottom of the list and work his way up. He said Mr. Henry may need to talk more about the Western Park project that was briefly mentioned earlier in terms of the proffer money. He said Darden Towe is one that was previously on the Capital Plan for the Board to consider synthetic turf fields to be installed there. He said that project is no longer on the Capital Plan, and there is no dedicated funding for recreational fields there. He asked Mr. Henry if he could talk about the lights.

Mr. Richardson said the only thing he would say about Biscuit Run is that the Parks and Recreation Department has worked through a multiyear master planning process, and Mr. Henry could talk about what is in the first phase of that. He said what would be considered in the outyear beyond FY 22 is probably outlined as to how it would come on board and what the cost is. He said if it is an outyear consideration, there would be no identified funding at this time for those improvements, so those would be things they would be looking out at beyond one year.

Mr. Richardson asked Mr. Henry if he could jump in and tidy up anything he said, as well as elaborate on the Western Park improvements.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Assistant County Executive, said he would follow the same path, bottom to top, and he believed Mr. Richardson captured this well. He said if he understood the question, it was about how far along the planning of these specific items has occurred, and staff would certainly need direction from the Board to proceed on any of them.

Mr. Henry said the Darden Towe project was a CIP project, and initial work had gone in to move it through a schematic level with an independent study that was done by a consultant, which was paused a year ago when the pandemic hit. He said like many of the other capital projects, it was put into the paused bucket. He said it did not come back through the fall work that the Board of Supervisors, School Board, and CIP Committee did, and so it is in a schematic level of work. He said it has some maturity to it, but more work would be needed to get it to construction.

Mr. Henry said Mr. Richardson was spot-on about Biscuit Run in that it was master planned, and so there is a master plan broken out into phases because of the overall cost. He said they are actively working on Phase 1a, which is getting access into Biscuit Run with initial parking and some light amenities, such as a restroom facility, to allow access and use. He said Phase 1b would include things like multiuse fields. He said that at a master plan level, that work has been contemplated. He said the design, and such would need to proceed in order to get it to construction.

Mr. Henry said finally, Western Park is a project that has been in front of prior Boards in several fashions, tied to the two master plans that have occurred out there. He said a lot of work has been done that Ms. Mallek has participated in between staff and the developer on looking at some partnership opportunities, and they are in the early phase of that. He said there are proffers that are dedicated specifically to that neighborhood and area that could be used for some preliminary or initial playground types of amenities that would at least get this started without necessarily committing to the full master plan project until this goes through a review and approval process with the Board.

Mr. Henry said he did not know if this answered the questions, but there have been elements of work done on all three, some more than others as far as the level of dedication.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley thanked Mr. Henry and Mr. Richardson. She said her question about Darden Towe was if some preliminary work had already been done so that this would not have to be replicated. She said whether or not they have lights, artificial turf, or real turf, that is yet to be decided because the previous plan never went through, but at least in terms of some schematics and location, that kind of work has been done. She asked if she was correct.

Mr. Henry replied that this had been done specifically for artificial turf at Darden Towe.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if part of this could be used for just the location. She said she knew they had to do redo it if it was not artificial turf and if it was natural grass, they would have to do the whole infrastructure. She asked if the location would remain the same.

Mr. Henry replied that without going into a deep dive on that project, what was proposed was putting artificial turf where existing grass turf fields are now.

Ms. Palmer commented that as far as the Darden Towe artificial turf, she was not ready to support that. She said she was very interested in pursuing anything they can to get Biscuit Run on board as quickly as they possibly can. She said she thinks expanding outdoor spaces is really important, though they are nearly over this pandemic, she suspects there will be another one, and she likes the idea of having central soccer and outdoor multiuse fields for the community in an area with a lot of people.

Ms. Palmer said everything else on the second page was fine. She said she was a little confused on the Water/Sewer Connection Grant Program/Program for the Elderly. She said she read this to believe that the Water/Sewer Connection Grant Program was something different, and that the Program for the Elderly was something separate. She asked if she was incorrect.

Ms. Birch replied that through staff's conversations with the Board last week, they modified some of these projects to connect. She said it used to sit by itself as a Program for the Elderly. She said this was an area where they added the water/sewer piece to focus the effort for the elderly on that piece.

Ms. Palmer said she certainly did not know what the situation was with the people who need it now, but in the past, her impression was that some of these older homes that elderly people are living in, they do not use a lot of water, so they do not recognize that a septic field is failing. She said they then move, a new family comes in with kids and suddenly, they find out that it is not working. She said she is sure there are elderly people that have this problem, but she wanted to throw in that sometimes, it does not show up until the house changes hands and the septic system is under more stress.

Ms. Palmer said the other items on the second page were fine with her, and she had one question about page 1. She said regarding Berkmar and the Northern Convenience Center, ever since this was proffered and it was questionable whether the schools would use it for a new school, the County has been very interested in that as a site for a Northern Convenience Center. She said she was happy about this and of course, she thinks it needs to be in done in unison with the Lambs Lane site plan that the school is going through.

Ms. Palmer said her question was about Broadband Infrastructure. She asked if the money from the first tranche is being put in this and if this was \$2 million.

Ms. Birch replied yes.

Ms. Palmer said her question about this is that they do not know yet about the \$130 billion that is going for Water/Sewer and Broadband, and they have to spend this by 2024. She said right now, they projects they are looking at in Broadband are, in large part, grant matching. She said she is sure they can use it, and she wondered if they necessarily wanted to commit to that before they find out about the \$130 million because she wants to make sure they can use the money completely. She said she supposed if it was fungible, they could move it somewhere else if they cannot use it.

Ms. Birch said the hope in the way that the staff structured this is that they plan to come back to the Board in the June timeframe with updated information, as they are expecting to have it. She said in June, before big decisions have to be made, staff is hopeful that they will know enough in that timeframe to give the Board assurance and more detail as to how they can get the first tranche out the door.

Ms. Palmer said this sounded great to her, as long as they were going to discuss this one more time. She said she was fine with everything.

Mr. Gallaway said he appreciated the support that it sounded like the Rio Road Corridor Plan Study was receiving. He said it is important for that, as it is a timely matter, to get the extra piece on with the consultant working as opposed to doing another whole study for that section. He said from a dollar standpoint, he thinks it makes the most sense to get that included in.

Mr. Gallaway said he certainly had no issue with the Berkmar proffer site, but he was fully in support of the idea that it has to be done with site planning at both Berkmar and at Lambs Lane. He said Ms. McKeel mentioned that it was not just about putting anything there. He said there are a lot of acres on the Berkmar site and if they are going to use this appropriately, they need to plan it out and see what can be put in there that could be other County needs as well. He said he had no problem with it.

Ms. Price said a general observation, based partially on her recollection of the Great Recession, was this was a financial situation that really put a great pause, if not a stop, to many construction projects, whereas this current financial situation that they have experienced through the pandemic has affected perhaps some commercial properties, but they have seen a boom in home improvement, remodeling, and new construction. She said over the last year, they have seen an incredible increase in the cost of building materials.

Ms. Price said as the money starts to come from ARP, she thinks they can anticipate that nationwide, there will be an even greater increase in those costs as billions upon billions of those dollars

are likely going to be spent on capital projects throughout the country, and there will be great competition to get contracted, get the prices set, and get the work done in order to then complete it in time.

Ms. Price said she mentioned this because part of what she was thinking was perhaps the County may want to look into putting some money into hiring temporary staff to help work through identifying and getting contracts done on some of the projects they want to have taken care of. She said if they do not act quickly, they may be priced out of the market either in terms of dollars or availability of people to do those projects for them. She said she would be very supportive if County staff came back to say they wanted to put some temporary contract-type positions out so that they can effectuate some of the plans seen on the slides.

Ms. Price said similarly, with regard to the ordinance review, she could see temporary legal support for helping on those sorts of things.

Ms. Price said that for the CACVB, though it was not necessarily the Board's decision, she was not a supporter of closing the brick and mortar office. She said she thinks that it is helpful to have a brick and mortar office and the mobile unit that can go around to festivals. She said if there are ways the Board can support CACVB, she would support that.

Ms. Price said she supports the Board's share towards increasing the minimum wage for JAUNT drivers to \$15 per hour. She said she supports protecting the Board's Strategic Priority Reserve, but this also means she would support taking some of the money out as long as they can put it back in. She said she does not see that as a surplus but as a strategic reserve, and she wants to make sure they protect it.

Ms. Price said she is basically in support of everything on the slides, but with regard to the Water/Sewer Connection Grant Program for the Elderly, she supports this, but she also concurs with some of the previous comments and would look at that more as using the OEI (Office of Equity and Inclusion) equity lens to ensure it is not just the elderly, but that any of the existing homes should be eligible to at least apply and be considered for a grant to connect to the water and sewage systems. She said ultimately, this is better for the community. She said it was not to take away from consideration for the elderly, but she would not want it to be limited solely to the elderly and rather, they should use a broader equity lens.

Ms. Price said with that, this looked like a good plan. She asked the Supervisors if they had additional questions or comments.

Ms. McKeel said she understood exactly what Ms. Price was saying about the water and sewer hookups. She said she wanted to make sure her understanding was correct that the Board will be getting a lot more information on all of this.

Ms. Birch said yes.

Ms. McKeel said this was great.

Ms. Mallek said with respect to the CACVB, they were able to locate smaller, more affordable offices with far better parking and access on Faulkner Drive. She said at least when things open up again, they will be able to do both.

Ms. Palmer said she had forgotten to comment on the last slide regarding the Zoning Ordinance review and the hiring of more inspectors. She said she understands they are needed, and she would certainly support this if it is the need, and it seemed to be since she kept hearing about it.

Ms. Palmer said with respect to the JAUNT drivers' wage, she asked this question specifically because she wanted to find out more about that. She said she assumed there had been a lot of discussion, but when the Board had JAUNT before them the other day, they were not getting it. She said this is something that she thinks the whole Board needs more information about it. She said clearly, some of the Board members knew more about this than the rest.

Ms. Price asked Ms. Birch if this was the time to get a consensus voice from the Board.

Ms. Birch replied yes and that this would be helpful.

Ms. Palmer **moved** to endorse the ARP priority projects and initial funding approach. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, and Ms. Price.

NAYS: None.

\_\_\_\_\_

Ms. Birch said she had a wrap-up that was important to share, given this was a work session with a lot of moving parts. She said she would go through a summary and next steps so that the Board knows how they will stage this and when they should expect to see things.

Ms. Birch presented a summary slide as an overview. She said the Board received information on the ARP funding plan and endorsed the plan. She said the Board also endorsed the priority projects and initial funding approach. She reiterated this was just the framework and initial review of where they see it. She said it will definitely change, but it will at least allow staff to direct their energy appropriately and not get too ahead of the Board or onto a completely different page as the Board as they look at the funding and close out the FY 22 budget development.

Ms. Birch said as staff receives the guidance, they will be working through it and coming back to the Board. She said given the Board did endorse those initial priority projects, as they move forward, staff will come back to the Board for approval.

Ms. Birch said she would walk through the next steps so that the Board could see where things were headed. She said they had originally set aside Thursday, April 1 as another Board work session, but it was only if the Board determined through the process that they needed to have a session. She said the present work session was the first they had as an if-needed session, which was used for this discussion. She said at that point, she recommended they did not need the April 1 work session, and the Board could free this up on their calendars for Thursday, unless she heard otherwise. She said she was looking and listening to see if the Board had anything to discuss there, and she did not hear anything, but she would like confirmation on this.

Ms. Price asked if any Supervisors who believed they should have the work session on April 1 could comment. She said she would concur that it was not necessary, in the absence of anything to the contrary. She heard no comments.

Ms. Birch said they would then cancel the April 1 work session. She said on April 21, CDD staff would be bringing the Stream Health Ordinance Phase 1a discussion to the Board so that the Board can discuss the ordinance, staffing plan, and how they move forward on them. She said on May 5, staff will be bringing the appropriations for proffer funding for the initial phase of the Western Park improvements, along with the Rio Road Corridor Plan Study to extend the East Rio section, for which they will appropriate funding out of the Strategic Priorities Reserve funding.

Ms. Birch said the hope is that staff will have guidance in the next 45 days or so to be able to bring back a good plan and path forward that is much more detailed and less obscure than the present presentation sometime in June, and that would be the next opportunity that the Board would have on the projects, funding, and path forward for that first tranche.

Ms. Birch said the next slide showed what would be coming in July. She said assuming staff receives guidance, and staff and the Board are comfortable with the broadband funding, staff would be bringing this back in July for appropriation of ARP funding to support the Broadband Infrastructure investments of \$3 million. She said also in July, they would be appropriating the funding for Berkmar and the Schools portion of the Lambs Lane site plan and master planning.

Ms. Birch said this was all as far as the next steps, noting they were in the final stages of the FY 22 budget development. She said if things change or if staff learns of new things that are critical to FY 22 before May 5, they will bring them to the Board as they learn of them. She said at the moment, though, they were scheduled to have the Board approve the budget and tax rate on May 5. She concluded her presentation.

Mr. Walker asked if he could clarify one point. He said with regard to the Stream Health Initiative on April 21, that is actually a public hearing on an ordinance authorized by the Board back in March. He said he did not want there to be any confusion on the part of the Board or the public. He said it was not set up as a specific discussion item, and it just creates an opportunity because there is a public hearing on Phase 1 to have more discussion about future phases and staffing needed.

---

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

Ms. Mallek said last Saturday, the Earlysville Volunteer Fire Company held a very successful scavenger hunt in which families toured and visited, in two groups, up to 20 different sites. She said this was a great way to get people connected with the firehouse, and there were lots of visitors.

Ms. Mallek said today was National Vietnam Veterans Day, which she did not know until that morning when she saw the news. She said Albemarle has the oldest Vietnam veteran memorial in the nation, at the end of McIntire Road. She encouraged those who had not visited it to go, as it has remembrances, stories, and pictures of all the locals who perished in Vietnam.

Ms. Mallek said there are plans and fundraising underway by the American Legion and others to design and get plaques made representing Mr. Frank Peregory (Peregoy) and General Alexander Vandegrift, who are the two Albemarle County residents who were awarded the Medal of Honor. She said those would be attached to the war memorial in the front yard, which the Peregory Fund that past winter donated the funds to get it cleaned off. She said those who have not seen it in the past six months should go see it because it is much more suitably attired now without all the soot that had been on there for the past 30 years.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley thanked staff for their excellent presentation and Ms. Mallek for reminding them of National Vietnam Veterans Day, as her older brother served in Vietnam.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that Sunday on Proffit Road, the community spent two hours picking up trash as part of their annual spring cleanup. She said she understood this has been happening since before the 1980s, and it is a great community event.

Ms. Palmer said she has noticed that VDOT has taken a long time picking up the trash that people are putting in bags along the sides of the road. She said she hoped this would not continue.

Mr. Gallaway said that evening at 7:30 p.m., he would be hosting his virtual townhall for the budget.

Ms. Price said she would be holding her virtual townhall the following day at 6:30 p.m. She asked Mr. Richardson if she could have a conversation in the morning with the County staff who would be backing her up on that to close the loop. She said she would like to get three or four slides out of the presentation from that day so she could cover it.

---

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

There was none.

---

Agenda Item No. 5. Adjourn to April 7, 2021, 1:00 p.m., electronic meeting pursuant to Ordinance No. 20-A(16).

At 5:36 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to April 7, 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." Information on how to participate in the meeting will be posted on the Albemarle County website.

---

Chair

Approved by Board
Date 02/15/2023
Initials CKB